



WG-PVD/Mar04/1

ORIGINAL: English

DATE: July 30, 2004

**INTERNATIONAL UNION FOR THE PROTECTION OF NEW VARIETIES OF PLANTS**  
GENEVA

**AD HOC WORKING GROUP ON THE  
PUBLICATION OF VARIETY DESCRIPTIONS**

**Meeting  
Geneva, March 31, 2004**

REPORT

*adopted by the  
Ad hoc Working Group on the Publication of Variety Descriptions*

1. The *Ad hoc* Working Group on the Publication of Variety Descriptions (WG-PVD) held a meeting in Geneva, on March 31, 2004. The list of participants is reproduced in Annex I to this report.
2. The meeting was opened by Mr. Rolf Jördens (Vice Secretary-General), Chairman of the WG-PVD, who welcomed the participants, especially Mr. Joost Barendrecht and Mr. Chris Barnaby, who were both participating for the first time as the Coordinator for the Model Study on *Alstroemeria* and Chairman of the Technical Working Party for Ornamental Plants and Forest Trees (TWO), respectively.
3. The WG-PVD welcomed the participation of the coordinators of model studies and the Chairmen of the Technical Working Parties in the WG-PVD meetings where this was possible in conjunction with their attendance at the sessions of the Technical Committee (TC). It agreed that such invitations should be extended for future meetings.

Adoption of the Agenda

4. The WG-PVD adopted the agenda as presented in Annex II of this document.

## Model Study

5. The WG-PVD based its discussions on document TC/40/7 and a report of the discussions in the TC, based on that document, as presented in the Report on the Conclusions (see document TC/40/10, paragraphs 24 to 28), which is reproduced here for ease of reference:

### “Publication of Variety Descriptions

“24. Discussions were based on document TC/40/7.

“25. The TC welcomed the proposals concerning work on the model studies. It agreed a model study on *Alstroemeria* and that a model study on rose should not be pursued at present.

“26. The TC recommended that the following initial guidance for the Coordinators of the model studies, developed by the TWC, in conjunction with Mr. Gerhard Deneken (Denmark), should be followed as far as possible:

(a) where practically possible, the study should be conducted on all characteristics included in the UPOV Test Guidelines;

(b) contributors of variety descriptions should be requested to provide their “official” descriptions of the varieties concerned, i.e. the description resulting from the DUS examination of the variety. In making this recommendation, it noted that the description may have been re-calibrated in the meantime, but considered that, if such changes could not be accommodated in the comparison of variety descriptions, the aims of the project could not be met;

(c) in the case of authorities wishing to contribute variety descriptions for which they did not have “official” descriptions, e.g. for varieties which had been acquired for their reference collections, the description to be provided should be that produced at the end of the first complete cycle of testing in which the variety was included;

(d) contributors should be requested to specify the reference of the UPOV Test Guidelines on which the description had been developed; and

(e) contributors should be requested to provide the variety denomination, breeder’s reference, breeder and applicant for each variety to verify, as far as possible, whether varieties were the same or different.

“27. The TC agreed that the Chairman of the TWC should, after consultation with the members of the TWC, develop guidance on how to present the variation in the states of expression between different descriptions of the same variety and communicate this guidance to the coordinators of the model studies via the Office.

“28. The TC noted the developments in the CAJ and the *Ad hoc* Working Group on Publication of Variety Descriptions (WG-PVD).”

6. Discussions focussed on the number of varieties for which descriptions were to be compared. The WG-PVD noted that, for example, in barley, lettuce and potato there were very large numbers of varieties and, therefore, large numbers of descriptions which would be compared. In two of the crops, namely Chinese Cabbage and *Alstroemeria*, there was a relatively small number of varieties, but this was because the number of varieties described in

more than one territory was very small. However, it was noted that in two crops, namely Apple and Strawberry, there might be some encouragement to include a larger number of varieties. In order to increase the range of coverage of the model study overall, it was agreed that the Office of the Union (Office) should circulate, to all members of the Union, the lists of varieties on which the model studies would be based, and to encourage members to provide descriptions of those varieties where available. It was considered important to emphasize that it was not necessary to provide descriptions of all the varieties if some were not available. It was also emphasized that descriptions would be useful even where these did not contain all the characteristics.

7. The WG-PVD discussed the need to conduct a thorough analysis of the data received and how to present that data. It was noted that, in general, this was a matter for the statisticians and that the TC had agreed that the Chairman of the TWC should, after consultation with the members of the TWC, develop guidance on how to present the variation in the states of expression between different descriptions of the same variety and communicate this guidance to the coordinators of the model studies via the Office. However, it was noted that the GAIA software developed in France might be used in the model study and recommended that this be considered further by the TWC.

8. The Technical Director informed the meeting that Mrs. Alison Lean (United Kingdom) had advised that she would no longer be able to act as the Coordinator for the Model Study on Apple after 2004. In the case that the TWF were unable to find a successor, the Technical Director indicated that the Office would endeavor to take over the role of Coordinator. In response to an offer from Mr. Joël Guiard, it was agreed that, if that situation occurred, the Office would collate the description information in a standardized format and present this to the experts from France for the analysis to be conducted using GAIA.

9. The WG-PVD considered the development of the project in relation to the development of the web-based UPOV Plant Variety Database, because of the possibility of including variety description information in that database in the future - if that was decided to be appropriate. It was concluded that it was necessary to bear in mind the possibility of including descriptions, but also photographs and ways of linking the two types of information for a variety.

10. Discussions took place regarding the way in which description information included in the UPOV Plant Variety Database might be used. The WG-PVD recalled that the aim of the project was:

(a) to increase the availability of variety description information to interested parties (i.e. DUS examiners, breeders and maintainers of varieties of common knowledge) and thereby to maximize the effectiveness of the examination of distinctness; and

(b) to use appropriate elements of the variety description, in the process of examining distinctness, to eliminate varieties which do not require further comparison and to identify those varieties against which a further comparison is required,

and clarified that, with respect to the UPOV Plant Variety Database, the intention was not to develop an "on-line" DUS examination.

Administrative, Legal and Financial Considerations

11. The WG-PVD based its discussion on document CAJ/47/3, paragraphs 7, 8 and 11.

12. It was agreed that, at this stage, there were no administrative, legal or financial barriers to the model studies and no urgent matters concerning administrative, legal and financial issues that needed to be addressed. For that reason, the meeting planned in October 2004 to look at the administrative and legal issues was cancelled and it was agreed that the next meeting would take place in April 2005 when there could be review of progress on the model studies.

Date of Next Meeting

13. The date of the next meeting was provisionally set for April 6, 2005.

[Annex I follows]

ANNEX I

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

WG-PVD Members

Mr. Doug Waterhouse (Australia)  
Mr. Gerhard Deneken (Denmark)  
Ms. Nicole Bustin (France)  
Mr. Joël Guiard (France)  
Mr. José Elena (European Community-CPVO)

Others:

Mr. Joost Barendrecht (Coordinator for Model Study on Alstromeria)  
Mr. Chris Barnaby (Chairman of TWO)

Office of the Union:

Mr. Rolf Jördens  
Mr. Peter Button  
Mr. Raimundo Lavignolle  
Mrs. Yolanda Huerta

[Annex II follows]

ANNEX II

DRAFT AGENDA

1. Model study (document TC/40/7 and oral report of TC discussions).
2. Administrative, legal and financial considerations (document CAJ/47/3, paragraphs 7, 8 and 11).
3. Work plan (document TC/38/10 Annex: Project to consider the publication of variety descriptions).
4. Date of next meeting.

[End of Annex II and of document]