



Disclaimer: unless otherwise agreed by the Council of UPOV, only documents that have been adopted by the Council of UPOV and that have not been superseded can represent UPOV policies or guidance.

This document has been scanned from a paper copy and may have some discrepancies from the original document.

Avertissement: sauf si le Conseil de l'UPOV en décide autrement, seuls les documents adoptés par le Conseil de l'UPOV n'ayant pas été remplacés peuvent représenter les principes ou les orientations de l'UPOV.

Ce document a été numérisé à partir d'une copie papier et peut contenir des différences avec le document original.

Allgemeiner Haftungsausschluß: Sofern nicht anders vom Rat der UPOV vereinbart, geben nur Dokumente, die vom Rat der UPOV angenommen und nicht ersetzt wurden, Grundsätze oder eine Anleitung der UPOV wieder.

Dieses Dokument wurde von einer Papierkopie gescannt und könnte Abweichungen vom Originaldokument aufweisen.

Descargo de responsabilidad: salvo que el Consejo de la UPOV decida de otro modo, solo se considerarán documentos de políticas u orientaciones de la UPOV los que hayan sido aprobados por el Consejo de la UPOV y no hayan sido reemplazados.

Este documento ha sido escaneado a partir de una copia en papel y puede que existan divergencias en relación con el documento original.

INTERNATIONAL UNION FOR THE PROTECTION OF NEW VARIETIES OF PLANTS

GENEVA

ADMINISTRATIVE AND LEGAL COMMITTEE

Twenty-ninth Session

Geneva, October 21 and 22, 1991

REPORT

adopted by the CommitteeOpening of the Session

1. The Administrative and Legal Committee (hereinafter referred to as "the Committee") held its twenty-ninth session on October 21 and 22, 1991, under the chairmanship of Mr. J.-F. Prevel (France). The list of participants is given in the Annex to this report.
2. The session was opened by the Chairman, who welcomed the participants.

Adoption of the Agenda

3. The agenda was adopted as given in document CAJ/29/1, subject to addition of the following item: "Report on the twenty-eighth session of the Committee."

Guidelines Relating to Essentially Derived Varieties

4. Discussions were based on document CAJ/29/2 and on an unofficial document distributed by the Delegation of Japan during the session.
5. Document CAJ/29/6--containing proposals made by the ASSINSEL group for the implementation of the new principle of essentially derived varieties contained in the 1991 Act of the Convention--was distributed during the session, but was not examined. It was emphasized that the document simply reflected initial thoughts.

6. Several delegations announced that, due to the belated distribution of the background document, they would only be able to add their first thoughts to the discussion.

7. Several delegations signaled their agreement with the conclusion in paragraph 5 of document CAJ/29/2 that the guidelines would have to be of a different nature to similar documents drawn up by UPOV since the system of essentially derived varieties would have to be managed not by the plant variety protection authorities, but by the breeders themselves or, in the event of disagreement, by the courts. Guidelines addressed to the breeders could be useful in finding an amicable settlement to a dispute, but would not represent a compulsory legal basis. Three possible aims for such a document, which responded to a need for harmonization at international level, were identified:

(i) to draft recommendations or guidelines for lawmakers, who would have to incorporate the provisions of the 1991 Act in their domestic law, particularly with regard to the onus of proof;

(ii) to constitute a doctrinal opinion for the use of courts when hearing disputes between breeders;

(iii) to provide detailed information for the technical experts required to assist the courts, most of whom would probably be members of plant variety protection authorities.

8. With regard to the part to be played by the plant variety protection authorities in administering the system of essentially derived varieties, the delegation of France said that it would be opposed to publication of information on the genetic origin of varieties; its reason was that such information depended basically on the good faith of breeders in a matter which, since it did not concern the conditions for protection, had no effect on the decision to grant breeders' rights. Access to such information would nevertheless remain open under the provisions on consultation of registers and files. The delegation of Germany wondered whether, in fact, such information could be required of an applicant in view of the provisions in Article 5 of the 1991 Act. The particulars furnished on the technical questionnaire were of a different nature since they were given voluntarily for examination purposes.

9. It was explained, in reply to the delegation of Japan, that in the phrase "while retaining the expression of the essential characteristics" the words "essential characteristics" referred to both quantitative and qualitative characteristics. The delegation of France, pointing to the term "important characteristics" used in the 1978 Act, suggested that it would be almost impossible to give an abstract definition of "essential characteristics."

10. It was further pointed out that a slight change in the genotype, a single-gene mutation for instance, could have considerable phenotypic consequences affecting numerous characteristics. Several delegations felt that the retaining of essential characteristics had to be assessed overall and not characteristic by characteristic. The delegation of the United States of America, basing itself on the background of Article 14(5) and on the fact that the delegation of Japan had not wished to introduce a substantive change into the Basic Proposal during the Diplomatic Conference, considered that the criterion had to be assessed at the genotype level. That was also the feeling of the delegation of France. In that context, the delegation of Denmark noted that paragraph 20 of document CAJ/29/2 was confusing.

11. Several delegations felt that it would be useful to hold a discussion with the breeders' organizations--particularly ASSINSEL, which had already begun examining that matter--in view of the part the breeders would be required to play in managing the system of essentially derived varieties. A symposium could be held for that purpose on the occasion of the 1992 session of the Council and document CAJ/29/2 could be considered as an initial discussion paper, which in no way committed UPOV.

12. With regard to the succession of statutory texts over time (retroactive-ness), the delegation of France emphasized that the matter was one for the constitutional law of each country and that no specialist in such law was a member of the Committee. The delegation of Japan pointed out, with respect to the questions raised in paragraph 22 of document CAJ/29/2, that dependency existed irrespective of protection for an essentially derived variety.

13. As for the example 2.1 given in the Annex to document CAJ/29/2 (selection within a variety), the delegation of Germany noted that, in cases (a), (b) and (c), elements A and B could only differ in characteristics that would not have been chosen when examining the initial variety; element B did not therefore satisfy the condition of distinctness. In case (d), covered by tolerance with regard to homogeneity, it was not possible to make a definite statement; on the contrary, it was necessary to refer to the three conditions set out in Article 14(5)(b). That example, just as the others, showed up the limitations of the document which, as had already been ascertained by the Technical Committee, could in no way provide the basis for a decision.

14. With regard to example 6 (natural and induced mutations) and the unofficial document by the delegation of Japan, several delegations pointed to the two basic rules for extending breeders' rights to essentially derived varieties:

(i) Such extension could only exist where the initial variety was protected. It was inconceivable that a variety in the public domain--either because its breeder had not had it protected or because protection had expired--should return to the private domain on account of someone having obtained an essentially derived variety from it.

(ii) An essentially derived variety could not generate a right in a variety essentially derived from it since that right had been designed to protect the interests of the person who had created the original genotype or original combination of genotypes and not of the person who had transformed it.

Examination of Distinctness under Article 7 of the 1991 Act of the Convention

15. Discussions were based on document CAJ/29/3.

16. In general, the Committee agreed with the analysis made by the Office of the Union and its conclusion that the new wording of the distinctness condition did not require changes in the examination procedures.

17. The delegation of Czechoslovakia pointed out that, in some countries, the comparative basis for examining distinctness was worldwide for the purposes of plant variety protection and national for the purposes of the system of national lists of varieties authorized for sale. It stressed that unification would be desirable.

18. With regard to the question raised in paragraph 27 of document CAJ/29/3, the delegations of Denmark, France, Germany, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom held that it was not appropriate to undertake activities for promoting or perfecting the system for cooperation in examination within UPOV. Those delegations stressed the extent of the activities carried out on a bilateral basis and in the European context as also the already heavy workload of the plant variety protection authorities that were required to contribute to adaptation of national legislation to the 1991 Act and to the drafting of regional legislation.

19. The delegation of Germany nevertheless admitted that the current system of cooperation had been set up by States which carried out growing trials on a closely harmonized basis and that other States could experience difficulties in participating in the system. It would have no objection to the matter being reexamined at a later juncture.

20. To conclude the discussion, the Chairman stressed the fact that the decision recorded in paragraph 18 above was based on the present situation.

Interactive Access to International Data--International Data Base on Variety Denominations

21. Discussions were based on document CAJ/29/4.

22. All delegations spoke in favor of the principle of setting up an international data base and of the need to carry out a feasibility study in the very short term.

23. Several delegations felt that the data base should be initially limited to published data and should therefore exclude technical data that was hard to interpret. The delegation of Denmark considered that a data base of that kind could be usefully supplemented by means of an international system of examination of the variety denominations. In that respect, the delegation of France announced that an international system had been developed in France and should therefore be taken into account in the feasibility study. The delegation of Spain, for its part, pointed to the problems arising from differences in pronunciation. Finally, the delegation of Australia drew attention to the need for technical parity and even administrative parity since those were both a prior condition for an efficient international system.

24. On October 22, Mr. Paul Claus, Director-Advisor, World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), gave a demonstration of the ROMARIN system referred to in document CAJ/29/4. The subsequent discussions highlighted the advantage for UPOV of a system employing regularly updated CD-ROMs.

Coverage by Fees of the Costs of the Plant Variety Protection Offices

25. Discussions were based on document CAJ/29/5.

26. The delegation of Czechoslovakia stressed that the problem of fees also arose in those States that were in transition towards a market economy. The disparity between the purchasing power of national currency and its value on the exchange market meant that fees based on costs would be prohibitive for national applicants and at the same time very low for foreigners. He inquired --and was given a negative reply--whether it would not be possible to have fees that varied depending on the origin of the applicant.

27. With regard to the questions raised in paragraph 4 of document CAJ/29/5, several delegations felt that:

(i) it was not appropriate to make recommendations on the method of financing the plant variety protection authorities since UPOV could hardly influence national policies on the cost of administrative services;

(ii) it was not appropriate, for the same reasons, to make recommendations on the basis for calculation of self-financing or the structure of the schedules of fees;

(iii) there was no need to update the Recommendation on Fees in Relation to Cooperation in Examination since that Recommendation contained an escape clause.

28. The delegation of Germany stressed, however, that there were problems in the field of cooperation in examination and that the issue would have to be reexamined in a year or two.

29. The delegation of New Zealand stated that the self-financing had been restricted in its country to activities on behalf of the breeders and that it did not cover those concerning advice to government.

Form of the Reports Given in Council by the Representatives of Member States on the Situation in the Legislative, Administrative and Technical Fields in their Countries

30. Several delegations drew attention to the need to make Council sessions more attractive for observers from non-member States and from organizations to ensure large and fruitful participation. It would also be opportune to give thought to the interface between the Consultative Committee and the Council. Others felt that the sole concern should be the effectiveness of the Council in carrying out its tasks.

31. The Committee finally recommended the system of written reports submitted sufficiently early for them to be compiled and presented in the various working languages and asked the Office of the Union to suggest a model format to the member States.

Report on the Twenty-eighth Session

32. The delegation of Denmark announced that it had orally informed the Vice Secretary-General on March 4, 1991, on the occasion of the opening of the Diplomatic Conference, of its wish to make a change to paragraph 62 of the report (document CAJ/28/6). Unfortunately, the final report had been drawn up before the delegation had been able to communicate the amended text. It requested that the text be recorded in the report on the current session.

33. The text read as follows:

"62. The delegation of Denmark explained that it would be difficult for Denmark to ratify, within a short time, a new Convention unless it was possible to include in the final text a provision providing for exceptions with respect to territories corresponding to Article 36 of the 1978 Convention. The reason was that a Danish

plant variety protection act would require acceptance by the competent authorities of the Faroe Islands and of Greenland before becoming applicable to their territories. [Rest unchanged]"

That wording replaced the following text:

"62. The delegation of Denmark asked whether it would be possible to include in the final text a provision corresponding to Article 36 of the 1978 Convention."

34. This report has been adopted by correspondence.

[Annex follows]

ANNEXE/ANNEX/ANLAGE

LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS*/LIST OF PARTICIPANTS*/TEILNEHMERLISTE*

I. ETATS MEMBRES/MEMBER STATES/VERBANDSSTAATEN

AFRIQUE DU SUD/SOUTH AFRICA/SUEDAFRIKA

Schalk VISSER, Agricultural Attaché, South African Embassy, 59, quai d'Orsay, 75007 Paris, France

Andries J. CRONJE, Deputy Director, Directorate of Plant and Quality Control, Department of Agriculture, Private Bag X258, Pretoria 0001

ALLEMAGNE/GERMANY/DEUTSCHLAND

Wolfgang BURR, Ministerialrat, Bundesministerium für Ernährung, Landwirtschaft und Forsten, Rochusstrasse 1, 5300 Bonn 1

Georg FUCHS, Regierungsdirektor, Bundessortenamt, Osterfelddamm 80, Postfach 61 04 40, 3000 Hannover 61

AUSTRALIE/AUSTRALIA/AUSTRALIEN

Henry L. LLOYD, Director, Plant Variety Rights Office, Department of Primary Industries and Energy, P.O. Box 858, Canberra, A.C.T. 2601

BELGIQUE/BELGIUM/BELGIEN

Marc GEDOPT, Premier secrétaire, Mission permanente de la Belgique, 58, rue de Moillebeau, Case postale 473, 1211 Genève 19, Suisse

CANADA/KANADA

Grant L. WATSON, Associate Director, Variety Section, Plant Products Division, K.W. Neatby Bldg., 960 Carling Avenue, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0C6

DANEMARK/DENMARK/DAENEMARK

Flemming ESPENHAIN, Chairman, Plant Novelty Board, Plant Directorate, Skovbrynet 20, 2800 Lyngby

* Dans l'ordre alphabétique des noms des Etats et des sigles des organisations en français /In the alphabetical order of the names of the States and the acronyms of the organizations in French/In alphabetischer Reihenfolge der Namen der Staaten und der Akronyme der Organisationen in französisch

ESPAGNE/SPAIN/SPANIEN

José M. ELENA ROSSELLÓ, Jefe de Area del Registro de Variedades, Instituto Nacional de Semillas y Plantas de Vivero, José Abascal 56, 28003 Madrid

Rafael DE LA CIERVA GARCIA-BERMUDEZ, Jefe Brevets Mecanicas, Registro Propiedad Industrial, Calle Panamá 1, 28071 Madrid

ETATS-UNIS D'AMERIQUE/UNITED STATES OF AMERICA/VEREINIGTE STAATEN VON AMERIKA

H. Dieter HOINKES, Senior Counsel, Office of Legislation and International Affairs, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, Box 4, Washington, D.C. 20231

Alan Aubrey ATCHLEY, Plant Variety Examiner, USDA/AMS/SD/PVPO, National Agricultural Library, Room 500, 10301 Balto. Blvd., Beltsville, MD 20705

Edward T. ROBINSON, Chairman, American Seed Trade Association, Intellectual Property Rights Committee, The J.C. Robinson Seed Co., 100 J.C. Robinson Blvd, Waterloo, Nebraska 48069

Michael ROTH, Patent Counsel, Pioneer Hi-Bred International Inc., 700 Capital Square, 400 Locust Street, Des Moines, Iowa 50309

FRANCE/FRANKREICH

Jean-François PREVEL, Directeur du Bureau de la sélection végétale et des semences, Ministère de l'agriculture et de la forêt, 78, rue de Varenne, 75700 Paris

Nicole BUSTIN (Mlle), Secrétaire général, Comité de la protection des obtentions végétales, Ministère de l'agriculture, 11, rue Jean Nicot, 75007 Paris

François GOUGÉ, Président, Comité de la protection des obtentions végétales, Ministère de l'agriculture, 11, rue Jean Nicot, 75007 Paris

Joël GUIARD, Directeur adjoint du GEVES, La Minière, 78285 Guyancourt cédex

HONGRIE/HUNGARY/UNGARN

Károly NESZMELYI, Director General, Institute for Agricultural Qualification, Ministry of Agriculture and Food, Keleti Károly u. 24, P.O. Box 93, 1024 Budapest

Gusztáv VÉKÁS, Vice-President, National Office of Inventions, Garibaldi u. 2, 1054 Budapest

Agnes SZABO (Miss), Head of International Legal Department, Ministry of Agriculture and Food, Kossuth Lajos tér 11, 1054 Budapest

Ernö SZARKA, Head of the Patent Section for Biotechnology and Agriculture, National Office of Inventions, Garibaldi u. 2, 1054 Budapest

IRLANDE/IRELAND/IRLAND

John V. CARVILL, Director, Plant Breeders' Rights, Department of Agriculture and Food, Agriculture House TW, Kildare Street, Dublin 2

ISRAEL

Menahem ZUR, Chairman, Plant Breeders' Rights Council, Agricultural Research Organization, Volcani Centre, P.O. Box 6, Bet Dagan 50250

Shalom BERLAND, Legal Adviser of Agriculture and Registrar of Plant Breeders' Rights, Ministry of Agriculture, Arania St. 8, Hakiria, Tel Aviv

ITALIE/ITALY/ITALIEN

Marco G. FORTINI, Ambassadeur, Délégué aux accords pour la propriété intellectuelle, Ministère des affaires étrangères, Palazzo Farnesina, 00100 Rome

JAPON/JAPAN/JAPAN

Yasuhiro HAYAKAWA, Deputy Director, Seeds and Seedlings Division, Agricultural Production Bureau, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, 1-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo

Kouichi HOSHINO, Technical Officer, Japanese Patent Office, 1-3-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo

NOUVELLE-ZELANDE/NEW ZEALAND/NEUSEELAND

Frank W. WHITMORE, Commissioner of Plant Variety Rights, Plant Variety Rights Office, P.O. Box 24, Lincoln

PAYS-BAS/NETHERLANDS/NIEDERLANDE

Bart P. KIEWIET, Chairman, Board for Plant Breeders' Rights, P.O. Box 104, 6700 AC Wageningen

Hielke HIJMANS, Legal Adviser, Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries, Bezuidenhoutseweg 73, The Hague

Paul H.M. VAN BEUKERING, Secretary, Board for Plant Breeders' Rights, P.O. Box 104, 6700 AC Wageningen

ROYAUME-UNI/UNITED KINGDOM/VEREINIGTES KOENIGREICH

John ROBERTS, Senior Executive Officer, Plant Variety Rights Office, White House Lane, Huntingdon Road, Cambridge CB3 0LF

SUEDE/SWEDEN/SCHWEDEN

Fredrik VON ARNOLD, Legal Adviser, Ministry of Justice, Rosenbad, 103 33 Stockholm

Evan WESTERLIND, Head of Office, Statens Växsortsnämnd, Box 1247, 171 24 Solna

SUISSE/SWITZERLAND/SCHWEIZ

Maria JENNI (Frau), Leiterin des Büros für Sortenschutz, Bundesamt für Landwirtschaft, Mattenhofstrasse 5, 3003 Bern

Pierre-Alex MIAUTON, Chef du Service des semences, Station fédérale de recherche agronomique, Changins, 1260 Nyon

Catherine METTRAUX (Frau), Juristin, Bundesamt für geistiges Eigentum, Einsteinstrasse 2, 3003 Bern

II. ETATS OBSERVATEURS/OBSERVER STATES/BEOBACHTERSTAATEN

ARGENTINE/ARGENTINA/ARGENTINIEN

Héctor A. ORDÓÑEZ, Asesor de Gabinete, Ministerio de Economía, Subsecretaría de Agricultura, Ganadería y Pesca, Paseo Colón 981 - 1º Piso, 1063 Buenos Aires

FINLANDE/FINLAND/FINNLAND

Arto VUORI, Adviser, Department of Agriculture, Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, Hallituskatu 3B, 00170 Helsinki

KENYA/KENIA

Nancy CHELUCET, Deuxième secrétaire, Mission permanente de la République du Kenya, 2, chemin des Mines, 1202 Genève, Suisse

TCHECOSLOVAQUIE/CZECHOSLOVAKIA/TSCHECHOSLOWAKEI

Erik SCHWARZBACH, Director of Variety Testing Branch, Central Institute for Control and Testing in Agriculture (UKZUZ), Hroznova 2, 656 06 Brno

TURQUIE/TURKEY/TUERKEI

Nazmi DEMIR, Agricultural Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Turkey to the European Communities, 4, rue Montoyoer, Brussels, Belgium

URUGUAY

Gustavo BLANCO DEMARCO, Director Adjunto, Unidad Ejecutora de Semillas - DIGRA, Ministerio de Agricultura y Pesca, Avenida Uruguay 1016, C.P. 11100, Montevideo

III. ORGANISATION INTERGOUVERNEMENTALE/
INTERGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATION/
ZWISCHENSTAATLICHE ORGANISATION

COMMUNAUTE ECONOMIQUE EUROPEENNE (CEE)/
EUROPEAN ECONOMIC COMMUNITY (EEC)/
EUROPAEISCHE WIRTSCHAFTSGEMEINSCHAFT (EWG)

Dieter M.R. OBST, Chef adjoint d'unité, Commission des Communautés européennes, Direction générale de l'agriculture, 200, rue de la Loi (Loi 84-1/11A), 1049 Bruxelles, Belgique

IV. BUREAU/OFFICER/VORSITZ

Jean-François PREVEL, Président

V. BUREAU DE L'UPOV/OFFICE OF UPOV/BUERO DER UPOV

Arpad BOGSCH, Secretary-General
Barry GREENGRASS, Vice Secretary-General
André HEITZ, Senior Counsellor
Max-Heinrich THIELE-WITTIG, Senior Counsellor
Makoto TABATA, Senior Program Officer

[Fin du document/
End of document/
Ende des Dokuments]