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The Technical Working Party for Fruit Crops (TWF), at its forty-fifth session, held in Marrakesh, Morocco, from May 26 to 30, 2014, considered document TWF/45/15 “Revision of Document TGP/8: Part I: DUS Trial Design and Data Analysis, New Section: Minimizing the Variation due to Different Observers”, and agreed on the importance on minimizing the variation between different observers and also between authorities and therefore suggested to consider the possibility to start a new project on harmonized variety description for an agreed set of apple varieties (see document TWF/45/32 “Report”, paragraph 30).

The TWF, at its forty-fifth session, agreed with the proposal made by the expert from Germany to present at its forty-sixth session, a protocol for the project with an agreed list of varieties to be examined, in order to consider if it could be relevant to further develop the study (see document TWF/45/32 “Report”, paragraph 30).

The TWF at its thirty- fifth session, held in Marquardt, Germany, from July 19 to 23, 2004 received a presentation of the results of a study on harmonized variety descriptions in apple. The study was carried out with 10 varieties, and 13 countries were participating, and submitted variety descriptions for evaluation. While QL-characteristics were found being consistent between the different descriptions, the submitted variety descriptions differed strongly in respect to QN characteristics, due to different environments, observers, and methods of observation (see document TWF/35/11 “Report” paragraph 30).

The following considerations may help the TWF participants to decide on how to proceed with this matter:

1. To consider which are the aims of such a project: to provide useful information for the revision of document TGP/8, to allow for an evaluation of certain characteristics, to provide clarification and harmonized understanding of the method of assessment, even with improving the referring indications in the guidelines, or to allow for a whole guidelines revision, or anything else?
2. To select suitable varieties for the project – short or long list (details see paragraph 5 of this document);
3. To decide whether to carry out new characteristic assessments in the field, or to make use of historical data from the member states' own databases;
4. To agree upon the duration of the project and the period of the data assessment or the data survey: one year, two subsequent years, or even more than two years;
5. To refer to the whole set of characteristics, or to select those ones, of which gaining harmonization is of most importance;
6. To submit data, together with explanatory notes, immediately, or just upon request once data evaluation has occurred. Explanatory notes could refer to
   * 1. Test Guidelines version used for the description
     2. Age of plants
     3. Cultivation details
     4. Rootstock(s) used
     5. Particular weather or growing conditions
     6. Number of locations (more than one?)
     7. Assessment by one or more examiners
     8. Number of assessment periods the submitted data refer to, if not earlier agreed
     9. Details concerning the assessment (methods, tools)
     10. Details on the data calculation
     11. Any further remark
7. To decide on a coordinator of such project;
8. To find out if anything else may need being considered.

As a proposal for possible varieties to be included into the project a survey of apple varieties which so have been a matter of registration in the various member of UPOV was carried out, by making use of the variety denomination database of the Community Plant Variety Office of the European Union (CPVO). As an outcome, the suitable varieties for the project may be agreed upon from the following list. [varieties and UPOV members marked with an asterisk (\*), were already included in the earlier study on harmonized variety descriptions in apple.]

| **Denomination** | **total no. of registration** | **has been, or still is, registered in e.g.** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| AKANE | 6 | CZ, FR, NL, SK |
| BAIGENT | 19 | AR, AU, BR, CL, FR, NL, NZ, QZ, RS, US, UY, ZA |
| BEL-EL | 18 | BE\*, CA\*, CL, CZ\*, DE\*, GB\*, HU\*, NL\*, PL, QZ\*, SK, US |
| CAUDLE\* | 14 | AU, CH, CL, CZ\*, FR, HU\*, NL\*, NZ\*, QZ\*, US, ZA |
| CIVNI | 20 | AR, BR, CA\*, CH, CL, HU\*, NL\*, NZ\*, QZ\*, RS, US, ZA |
| CRIPPS PINK | 18 | AR, DE\*, ES, FR, IT, MX, NL\*, NZ\*, PT, QZ\*, RS, ZA |
| DALINBEL | 8 | CH, CL, FR, NL\*, NZ\*, QZ\*, ZA |
| ELISE | 13 | BE\*. CH, DE\*, FR, GB\*, NL\*, PL, QZ\* |
| ELSHOF | 12 | BE\*, CH, DE\*, ES, HU\*, NL\*, PL, QZ\* |
| FIESTA | 13 | BE\*, CH, DE\*, FR, GB\*, NL\*, NZ\*, SE, ZA |
| FUJI FUBRAX | 10 | AR, AU, BR, CL, KR, RS, US, UY |
| GALAXY | 23 | AR, AT, AU, BE\*, CA\*, CH, DE\*, ES, FR, GB\*, HU\*, IT, MX, NL\*, NZ\*, PT, TR |
| GOLDEN DELICIOUS | 14 | AR, CZ\*, FR, HU\*, NL\*, PL, SK, TR, RO, RU, ZA |
| HIDALA\* | 18 | BE\*, CA\*, CH, DE\*, DK, ES, FR, GB\*, IT, NL\*, NZ\*, QZ\*, RS |
| JONAGOLD | 12 | AR, CZ\*, FR, HU\*, NL\*, PLP, RO, SK, TR |
| JONAGORED SUPRA | 14 | CA\*, CH, CL, CZ\*, HU\*, NL\*, PL, QZ\*, RS, US |
| LUNA | 5 | CH, CZ\*, NL\*, QZ\* |
| MARIRI RED | 11 | AR, AU, CL, FR, NL\*, NZ\*, QZ\*, RS, US, ZA |
| MILWA | 10 | CA\*, CH, CL, FR, MX, NL\*, QZ\*, US, ZA |
| NICOGREEN | 22 | AR, AU, BR, BY, CA\*, CH, CL, IL, JP, MD, MX, NL\*, NZ\*, QZ\*, RS, RU, TR, US, UY, ZA |
| NICOTER | 22 | AR, AU, BR, BY, CA\*, CH, CL, IL, JP, MD, MX, NL\*, NZ\*, QZ\*, RS, RU, TR, US, UY, ZA |
| PINOVA\* | 27 | BE\*, BG, CH, CL, CZ\*, DE\*, FR, HU\*, NL\*, NZ\*, PL, QZ\*, SK, US, ZA |
| RED ELSTAR | 17 | AU, BE\*, CH, DE\*, DK, ES, FR, GB\*, NL\*, ZA |
| RED JONAPRINCE | 24 | CH, CL, CZ\*, FR, HU\*, NL\*, PL, QZ\*, RS, SK, TR, US, ZA |
| REGAL PRINCE | 18 | BE\*, DE\*, DK, ES, FR, HU\*, IT, NL\*, NZ\* |
| ROHO 3615 | 10 | AR, CH, CL, NL\*, QZ\*, RU, US |
| ROSY GLOW | 9 | AR, AU, BR, CL, FR, NZ\*, QZ\*, RS, ZA |
| SCHNEICA | 15 | BE\*, DE\*, DK, FR, GB\*, HU\*, IT, NL\*, PL |
| SCIFRESH | 15 | AR, AU, BR, CA\*, CH, CL, FR, JP, NZ\*, QZ\*, US, UY, ZA |
| SCILATE | 7 | AU, CH, CL, FR, NZ\*, QZ\*, US |
| TENROY\* | 14 | AR, CL, DE\*, FR, HU\*, IT, NL\*, TR |
| TOPAZ | 21 | AR, CH, CZ\*, DE\*, FR, HU\*, NL\*. NZ\*, PL, QZ\*, RS, SI, SK |

Finally, when taking into consideration the above items: to ask if this project would promise to successfully provide useful information for the revision of TGP/8, in particular for minimizing the variation due to different observers.
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