



CAJ/72/10

ORIGINAL: English

DATE: October 24, 2016

INTERNATIONAL UNION FOR THE PROTECTION OF NEW VARIETIES OF PLANTS

Geneva

ADMINISTRATIVE AND LEGAL COMMITTEE**Seventy-Second Session
Geneva, October 26 and 27, 2015**

REPORT

*adopted by the Administrative and Legal Committee**Disclaimer: this document does not represent UPOV policies or guidance*Opening of the session

- *1. The Administrative and Legal Committee (CAJ) held its seventy-second session in Geneva on October 26 and 27, 2015, under the chairmanship of Mr. Martin Ekvad (European Union).
- *2. The session was opened by the Chair, who welcomed the participants. The list of participants is reproduced in the Annex to this report.
- *3. The Chair reported that Montenegro had deposited its instrument of accession to the 1991 Act of the UPOV Convention on August 24, 2015, and had become the seventy-third member of the Union on September 24, 2015.
- *4. The Chair reported that the United Republic of Tanzania had deposited its instrument of accession to the 1991 Act of the UPOV Convention on October 22, 2015, and would become the seventy-fourth member of the Union on November 22, 2015.
- *5. The Chair reported that Canada, which had been a member of the Union since March 4, 1991, had deposited its instrument of ratification of the 1991 Act of the UPOV Convention on June 19, 2015, and had become bound by the 1991 Act on July 19, 2015.
- *6. The Chair confirmed that the report of the seventy-first session of the CAJ, held in Geneva on March 26, 2015 (document CAJ/71/11), had been adopted by correspondence and made available on the UPOV website.

Adoption of the agenda

- *7. The CAJ adopted the draft agenda, as proposed in document CAJ/72/1 Rev. with the addition of document CAJ/72/4 Add. under item 5.

* An asterisk next to the paragraph number indicates that the text is reproduced from the Report on the Conclusions (document CAJ/72/9).

Development of information materials concerning the UPOV Convention

*8. The CAJ considered documents CAJ/72/2, UPOV/EXN/EDV/2 Draft 6 and UPOV/EXN/PPM/1 Draft 5.

*9. The CAJ noted the presentation of the European Union on its system concerning essentially derived varieties. A copy of the presentation has been provided in an addendum to document CAJ/72/2.

*10. The CAJ endorsed the proposal for the Office of the Union to organize a meeting to exchange information with the International Community of Breeders of Asexually Reproduced Ornamental and Fruit Varieties (CIOPORA), the International Seed Federation (ISF) and the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), in order to explore the possible role of UPOV in alternative dispute settlement mechanisms for matters concerning essentially derived varieties, including the provision of experts on EDV matters.

*11. The CAJ agreed the following amendments to document “Explanatory Notes on Essentially Derived Varieties under the 1991 Act of the UPOV Convention” (Revision) (document UPOV/EXN/EDV/2 Draft 6):

Paragraph 4	To read as follows: “The requirement of predominant derivation from an initial variety means that a variety can only be essentially derived from one <u>initial</u> variety. The intention is that a variety should only be essentially derived from another variety when it retains virtually the whole genotype of the other variety. A derived variety could not, in practice, retain the expression of the essential characteristics of the variety from which it is derived unless it is almost entirely derived from that <u>initial</u> variety.”
Paragraph 4	Spanish version to read as follows: “El requisito de derivación principal de una variedad inicial implica que una variedad solo puede ser esencialmente derivada de una <u>sola</u> variedad <u>inicial</u> . La intención es que una variedad solo sea esencialmente derivada de otra variedad cuando conserve prácticamente todo el genotipo de la otra variedad. En la práctica, una variedad derivada no puede conservar la expresión de los caracteres esenciales de la variedad de la que deriva excepto si deriva casi exclusivamente de esa variedad <u>inicial</u> .”
Paragraph 5	To read as follows: “The phrase “while retaining the expression of the essential characteristics” requires that the expression of the essential characteristics <u>conforms to and</u> be derived from the initial variety.”
Paragraph 11	To read as follows: “The derived variety must retain almost the totality of the genotype of the initial variety and be <u>distinguishable different</u> from that variety by a very limited number of characteristics (<u>typically by one</u>).”
Paragraphs 20 and 21	20. Another example of an indirect way in which it might be possible to obtain an essentially derived variety from an initial variety could be the use of a hybrid variety to obtain a variety which is essentially derived from one of the parent lines of the hybrid. 21. The use of molecular data from an initial variety, for the purpose of selection of genotypes from a population that is mostly related to the initial variety, to produce a variety with a similar phenotypic expression of the essential characteristics may provide an indication of predominant derivation, if the variety fulfills the definition in Article 14(5)(b). A joint proposal on paragraphs 20 and 21 to be provided by ESA and ISF for consideration by the CAJ at its seventy-third session. ESA and ISF would be invited to present to the CAJ the background issues to paragraphs 20 and 21 and the proposed text.
Paragraph 31	Spanish version to read as follows: “Tanto la derivación <u>predominante principal</u> (por ejemplo, datos sobre la conformidad genética con la variedad inicial) como la conformidad respecto de los caracteres esenciales (por ejemplo, datos sobre la conformidad en la expresión de los caracteres esenciales de la variedad inicial) son posibles puntos de partida para ofrecer indicios de que una variedad podría ser esencialmente derivada de la variedad inicial.”

Paragraph 32	To read as follows: "In some situations, relevant information provided by the breeder of the initial variety on predominant derivation and/or on conformity on the essential characteristics might be used as the basis for the reversal of the burden of proof. In such situations, the other breeder might need to prove that the other variety is not essentially derived from the initial variety. For instance, the other breeder would need to provide information on the breeding history of the second <u>other</u> variety to prove that the variety was not <u>essentially</u> derived from the initial variety."
Paragraph 32	Spanish version to read as follows: "En algunas situaciones, podría utilizarse como base de la inversión de la carga de la prueba información pertinente proporcionada por el obtentor de la variedad inicial relativa a la derivación predominante <u>principal</u> o la conformidad respecto de los caracteres esenciales. En tales situaciones, el otro obtentor podría estar obligado a demostrar que su variedad no es esencialmente derivada de la variedad inicial. Por ejemplo, el otro obtentor debería aportar información sobre el método de obtención de la segunda variedad para demostrar que la variedad no se derivó de la variedad inicial."

* 12. The CAJ agreed that a new draft of the "Explanatory Notes on Essentially Derived Varieties under the 1991 Act of the UPOV Convention (Revision)" (document UPOV/EXN/EDV/2 Draft 7), incorporating the changes and reflecting the approach agreed by the CAJ at its seventy-second session, be posted as soon as possible for consideration by the CAJ at its seventy-third session.

Explanatory Notes on Variety Denominations under the UPOV Convention (Revision)

* 13. The CAJ noted that a report on work concerning the possible development of a UPOV similarity search tool for variety denomination purposes and proposals concerning a possible revision of document UPOV/INF/12 "Explanatory Notes on Variety Denominations under the UPOV Convention" were provided in document CAJ/72/3 "Variety denominations".

Explanatory Notes on Propagating Material under the UPOV Convention

* 14. The CAJ agreed the following amendments to document "Explanatory Notes on Propagating Material under the UPOV Convention" (document UPOV/EXN/PPM/1 Draft 5):

Section (a)	To delete Section (a) and incorporate in the Annex to the document the provisions of the UPOV Convention where reference is made to the notion of propagating material.
Paragraph 1	To read as follows: "The UPOV Convention does not provide a definition of 'propagating material'. Propagating material encompasses reproductive and vegetative propagating material. The following are non-exhaustive examples of factors that have been considered by members of the Union in relation to whether material is propagating material: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "(i) plant or part of plants used for the variety reproduction; "(ii) whether the material has been used to propagate the variety; "(iii) whether the material is capable of producing entire plants of the variety and is factually used for propagating purposes; "(iv) whether there has been a custom/practice of using the material for propagating purposes or, as a result of new developments, there is a new custom/practice of using the material for that purpose; "(v) the intention on the part of those concerned (producer, seller, supplier, buyer, recipient, user); "(vi) if, based on the nature and condition of the material and/or the form of its use, it can be determined that the material is "propagating material"; or "(vii) the variety material where conditions and mode of its production meet the purpose of reproduction of new plants of the variety but not of final consumption."

*15. The CAJ agreed that a draft of document “Explanatory Notes on Propagating Material under the UPOV Convention” incorporating the changes agreed by the CAJ at its seventy-second session, be presented for adoption by the Council at its extraordinary session in March 2016.

Program for the development of information materials

*16. The CAJ considered the program for the development of information materials in conjunction with the discussions on the scheduling of the CAJ sessions, under the item “Program for the seventy-third session” (see document CAJ/72/8), and agreed as follows

Explanatory Notes on Essentially Derived Varieties under the 1991 Act of the UPOV Convention (Revision) (UPOV/EXN/EDV/2 Draft 7)

Explanatory Notes on Variety Denominations under the UPOV Convention (Revision)

Possible revision of the Explanatory Notes on Conditions and Limitations Concerning the Breeder's Authorization in Respect of Propagating Material under the UPOV Convention (document UPOV/EXN/CAL/1)

UPOV Model Plant Breeders' Rights Gazette (Revision)

*17. The CAJ noted that, at its seventy-first session, the CAJ had agreed to defer the preparation of a draft revision of document UPOV/INF/5 “UPOV Model Plant Breeders' Rights Gazette (Revision)” (document UPOV/INF/5/1 Draft 1), pending developments in relation to the development of a prototype electronic form (see documents CAJ/71/4 “Electronic Application Systems” and CAJ/71/10 “Report on the Conclusions”, paragraph 30).

Variety descriptions and role of plant material

*18. The CAJ recalled that, at its seventy-first session, it had noted that the TC had agreed to include discussion on variety descriptions and the role of plant material, including minimum number of growing cycles for DUS examination, during its fifty-second session of the TC, to be held in Geneva in 2016.¹ The CAJ noted that any matter concerning variety descriptions and the role of plant material for consideration by the CAJ would be reported by the TC to the CAJ (See document CAJ/71/10 “Report on the Conclusions”, paragraph 24).

Variety denominations

*19. The CAJ considered document CAJ/72/3.

*20. The CAJ noted the presentation of Argentina on variety denominations, a copy of which would be provided in an addendum to document CAJ/72/3.

*21. The CAJ noted the work by the Working Group for the Development of a UPOV Denomination Similarity Search Tool (WG-DST) concerning the possible development of a UPOV similarity search tool for variety denomination purposes.

*22. The CAJ noted the following elements from the oral report by the Vice Secretary-General on the third meeting of the WG-DST, held in Geneva on October 2, 2015:

(a) Members of the Union had been invited, by means of a circular E-15/156 of August 19, 2015, to participate in the second step of the Test Study for the development of an effective denomination similarity search tool. The objective of the second step was to refine the algorithm that had been identified as the best algorithm in the first step of the Test Study. On the basis of the results of the second step, the Office of the Union would refine the algorithm during November/December 2015 and would customize the algorithm by December 2015. The revised algorithm would be reviewed by the WG-DST at its fourth meeting, to be held on February 4, 2016;

¹ See document CAJ/71/10 “Report on the Conclusions”, paragraph 24.

(b) With regard to non-acceptable terms, the WG-DST had proposed to consider botanical and common names as non-acceptable terms. In the case of common names, it had agreed that it would be necessary to restrict the common names, perhaps to those in the GENIE database and for selected crops/species only;

(c) With regard to comparatives/superlatives, the WG-DST had agreed to investigate the feasibility of including a list of comparatives/superlatives as non-acceptable terms. That possibility would be reviewed by the WG-DST at its fourth meeting;

(d) The WG-DST had concluded that it would not be feasible to address “established practice” with regard to the use of denominations consisting solely of figures and had noted that this was not a difficult matter for members of the Union to implement.

*23. The CAJ agreed the following next steps for the revision of the “Explanatory Notes on Variety Denominations under the UPOV Convention”:

(a) to expand the mandate and the composition of the Working Group for the Development of a UPOV Denomination Similarity Search Tool (WG-DST) to prepare recommendations for the CAJ concerning the revision of document UPOV/INF/12 “Explanatory Notes on Variety Denominations under the UPOV Convention” (Working Group on Variety Denominations (WG-DEN));

(b) the Office of the Union to issue a circular with a request to CAJ members and observers to participate in the WG-DEN and, if appropriate, to present proposals for revisions of document UPOV/INF/12, by January 20, 2016;

(c) the WG-DEN to meet during the week of the UPOV sessions in March 2016;

(d) the WG-DEN to take the proposals received in response to the circular in paragraph (b) above and the proposals in paragraphs 28 to 37 and 41 of document CAJ/72/3 in conjunction with the work on the development of an effective UPOV similarity search tool;

(e) the WG-DEN to consider proposals for the expansion of the content of PLUTO database to include all recognized varieties, including those that had not been, or were no longer, registered/protected (see document CAJ/72/6 “UPOV Information Databases”, paragraph 38).

Harvested material

*24. The CAJ considered documents CAJ/72/4 and CAJ/72/4 Add.

*25. The CAJ noted the presentations concerning harvested material made by Argentina, the European Union and the Russian Federation.

26. The representative of CIOPORA noted that the Basic Regulation of the European Union did not define the term “harvested material” but provided a definition of the term “variety constituents” to designate plants and parts of plants which could produce entire true-to-type plants.

27. The Delegation of the European Union confirmed that the Basic Regulation did not provide a definition of harvested material. For that reason, the Delegation had referred to “variety constituents”. It indicated that a plant or a part of a plant could be considered either as harvested material or as variety constituent.

28. The Vice Secretary-General requested clarification on the example relating to Article 16(a) or (b), of the Basic Regulation, which could be interpreted as indicating that an action for infringement could be taken outside the territory of the European Union.

29. The Delegation of the European Union explained that it was specifically referring to material that had been exported to a third country for the purposes of final consumption but that had been actually used as propagating material, without the authorization of the breeder. It said that, in such a scenario, the breeder would be able to take an action for infringement on harvested material that entered the territory of the European Union.

30. The Delegation of Argentina noted that infringement actions could be filed when the breeder had not given their authorization. The Delegation also noted that harvested material was not defined in the Basic

Regulation of the European Union. It further requested clarification about the fact that constituents of the variety could be exported in another form that would allow an illicit use.

31. The Delegation of the European Union explained that breeders, when signing contracts concerning subsequent propagation, did not necessarily contemplate all the possible situations that might arise afterwards, particularly in relation to the use of harvested material for propagation purposes. The Delegation reported that contracts often did not incorporate the provision that harvested material had to be used for final consumption. However, the Delegation clarified that the use of harvested material for further propagation would be considered as an infringement, unless otherwise authorized.

32. The Delegation of Argentina noted that there were various circumstances in which harvested material could be used as propagating material, including circumstances where there was no contract, e.g. use by a third party. It indicated that the breeder had the right to stop the export and could also take an action for infringement in a second or third country provided that the variety was protected in those countries.

33. The Delegation of the European Union welcomed the presentation made by Argentina and noted that there were both similarities and differences in the way members of the Union addressed the question of harvested material. It seemed crucial to continue exchanging views in order to better understand the issue before starting to draft guidance. In that regard, the Delegation was in favor of inviting experts to provide further information concerning the subject matter.

34. The Delegation of Argentina expressed its support for the proposal made by the Delegation of the European Union to invite experts from the members of the Union to exchange views and knowledge.

35. The Delegation of the African Intellectual Property Organization (OAPI) agreed with the Delegations of the European Union and Argentina that exchanges of views and presentations concerning the various interpretations given to harvested material by the members of the Union should be organized in order to make progress on the subject.

36. The Delegation of the United States of America expressed its support to the organization of a meeting or a seminar to exchange views in order to improve understanding of the different interpretations of harvested material.

37. The Delegation of the European Union supported the proposal to organize a seminar on the subject of harvested material, and also suggested to invite speakers with judicial expertise to present their experience.

*38. The CAJ agreed to propose to the Council to organize a one-day seminar on propagating and harvested material to be held in conjunction with the UPOV sessions in October 2016. The seminar should include speakers to report on cases in which the notions of harvested material and/or propagating material have been considered, and speakers from relevant academic institutions and judicial authorities to provide perspectives on the subject. CAJ members and observers would be invited to propose speakers. The Office of the Union, Chair of the CAJ and President of the Council would prepare a draft program for consideration by the Consultative Committee and approval by the Council in March 2016.

Information and databases

(a) Electronic application systems

*39. The CAJ considered document CAJ/72/5 and received an oral report by the Vice Secretary-General on the Sixth Meeting on the Development of a Prototype Electronic Form (Sixth EAF Meeting), held in Geneva on October 26, 2015, as summarized below.

*40. The CAJ noted that the Sixth EAF Meeting had agreed that the prototype electronic application form Version 1 (PV1) had demonstrated the feasibility of the project, including the validation on the data transfer from breeders to the participating PVP Offices, in terms of data completeness and in conformity with the agreed data model. The CAJ agreed with the following proposals made by the EAF/6 Meeting:

Prototype Version 2 (PV2)

- (a) The aim of the Prototype Version 2 (PV2) will be to demonstrate the scalability of the system, i.e. addition of further crops, languages and PVP Offices, and also to demonstrate the feasibility of implementation by PVP Offices.

- (b) The following items to be addressed in PV2:
 - (i) Different languages;
 - (ii) Addition of other crops:
 - to add 3 or 4 of: apple; potato; rose; soybean, in an order of priority to be established according to the interest of participating PVP Offices and breeders and the ability of the participating PVP Offices to provide relevant Technical Questionnaire information;
- (c) Addition of other PVP Offices;
- (d) Payment modalities and user authentication;
- (e) Possibility for participating UPOV members to introduce or modify their questions in the form using an online interface;
- (f) Legal aspects;
- (g) Compliance with Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG);
- (h) Security requirements such as:
 - (i) Data confidentiality;
 - (ii) Access rights management;
- (i) High availability (HA) of the system;
- (j) Communication with existing and external systems such as the GENIE Database, WIPO Users Account and existing systems in PVP Offices;
- (k) Architecture of the system.

*41. The CAJ noted that the participating members in the EAF would be invited to test the system in stages, through different interim test releases, in order to obtain regular feedback. Comments would be taken into consideration for the development of subsequent test releases in order to have a fully functioning prototype (PV2) by August 2016 for a final test campaign in September 2016, before presentation at the sessions of the CAJ, the Consultative Committee and the Council in October 2016, as appropriate.

*42. The CAJ agreed that all members of the Union should have the opportunity to participate in the development of PV2, whilst noting that in order to be able to participate the following information would need to be provided to the Office of the Union by November 30, 2015:

- (a) Applications forms and other application information requirements for PVP Offices that did not provide their forms for PV1;
- (b) Technical Questionnaire information for apple, potato, rose and soybean;
- (c) Payment procedures;
- (d) Application authorization procedures;
- (e) Security requirements for data transfer and receipt;
- (f) Communication protocols for those PVP Offices that wish:
 - (i) to receive application data from the EAF system;
 - (ii) to enable breeders to retrieve data from their PVP Offices via the EAF system.

*43. The CAJ noted that, in the case of PVP Offices using forms in languages other than English, French, German or Spanish, the PVP Offices would need to arrange for translation of the forms of all participating members of the Union in the language concerned.

*44. In parallel with the development of PV2, the CAJ agreed that the following items would be addressed prior to launch of the EAF:

- (a) Operations such as:
 - (i) users support;
 - (ii) routine maintenance provisions;

- (b) Integration with PVP Offices systems;
- (c) Training for PVP Offices and applicants; and
- (d) Publicity of the availability of the system for breeders.

45. The representative of the African Regional Intellectual Property Organization (ARIPO) noted from the presentation that most of the PVP Offices participating in the test phase were from long-term members of the Union. He proposed to identify further offices that had just started applying plant variety protection, to see the suitability of the system at all levels. That approach would help identify some of the challenges that the system might pose to less experienced PVP Offices. The representative of ARIPO reported that the contribution of breeders from public institutions should also be taken into consideration. He explained that those breeders were also facing challenges and would be able to test the system as well. The representative asked about the consequences of such an electronic application system on the fees for the breeders/applicants.

46. The Vice Secretary-General explained that UPOV members were welcome to join the project at any time. In terms of breeders, he reported that various breeders' organizations were involved. Regarding the fees, the Vice Secretary-General explained that the UPOV Office would not determine the fees applicable for the individual PVP Offices, but there would be a modest charge for using the system.

47. The Delegation of the African Intellectual Property Organization (OAPI) expressed its support for the project and expressed its wish to take part into the development of PV2. The Delegation of OAPI noted that the second testing phase would allow further public and private breeders organizations and national authorities to join the project, and that new functions and languages would be added. It expressed its interest in taking an active part in the second phase to convey the particular needs of OAPI.

48. The Delegation of Argentina asked whether it would be possible to file a paper version of the electronic application form if it was so required by the PVP Office. The Office of the Union clarified that such an option existed in the EAF Project.

*49. The CAJ noted that the Council would need to approve the launch of an EAF system and charges to be paid by applicants.

(b) UPOV information databases

*50. The CAJ considered document CAJ/72/6.

*51. The CAJ noted the updates concerning the GENIE and PLUTO databases, as provided in document CAJ/72/6, paragraphs 6 to 16.

*52. The CAJ received an oral report by the Vice Secretary-General on the third meeting of the WG-DST, held on October 2, 2015, in Geneva.

*53. The CAJ noted the proposal to accept accents and special characters in denominations provided in the PLUTO database, while noting that the denomination search tool on the PLUTO database would only use the character set ASCII [American Standard Code for Information Interchange] representation, as defined in ISO [International Standards Organization] Standard 646 (see document CAJ/72/6, paragraph 20). It agreed that the matter should be referred to the WG-DEN.

*54. The CAJ agreed that matters concerning the possible expansion of the content of the PLUTO database to include all recognized varieties, including these that have not been, or were no longer, registered/protected as set out in document CAJ/72/6, paragraph 24, be referred to the WG-DEN.

*55. The CAJ noted that developments concerning non-acceptable terms for variety denominations were considered in document CAJ/72/3 "Variety Denominations".

*56. The CAJ noted that the second training course on "Contributing data to the PLUTO database" had been held in Geneva, from September 7 to 9, 2015, in English, and that Oman, South Africa, and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia had participated in the training. The CAJ also noted that South Africa had reported that it would provide data to the PLUTO database from December 2015, and that Oman and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia had expressed their intention to submit data to the PLUTO database once applications were received.

*57. The CAJ noted that the third training course on “Contributing data to the PLUTO database” had been held in Geneva, from October 12 to 14, 2015, in Spanish, and that Argentina, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay and Uruguay had participated in the training. The CAJ also noted that commitments to start submitting data had been made by Argentina: from the middle of December 2015; Bolivia (Plurinational State of): from the end of 2015; Colombia: from the end of February 2016; Ecuador: from the first week of December 2015; Mexico: from the end of 2015; Nicaragua: from the end of November 2015; Panama: from the end of 2015; Paraguay: middle of December 2015; and Uruguay: from the end of 2015; and noted that Chile and Costa Rica had submitted the data just before the training course.

(c) *Exchange and use of software and equipment*

*58. The CAJ considered document CAJ/72/7.

*59. The CAJ noted that the TC, at its fifty-second session, to be held in Geneva from March 14 to 16, 2016, would be informed that the discussion on the inclusion of the SISNAVA software in document UPOV/INF/16 would be continued at the Technical Working Party on Automation and Computer Programs (TWC), at its thirty-fourth session, to be held in 2016.

Program for the seventy-third session

*60. The CAJ considered document CAJ/72/8.

*61. The following program was agreed for the seventy-third session of the CAJ:

1. Opening of the session
2. Adoption of the agenda
3. Report on developments in the Technical Committee
4. Development of information materials concerning the UPOV Convention
 - (a) Explanatory Notes on Essentially Derived Varieties under the 1991 Act of the UPOV Convention (Revision) (document UPOV/EXN/EDV/2 Draft 7) and presentations by the European Seed Association (ESA) and the International Seed Federation (ISF)
 - (b) Possible revision of the Explanatory Notes on Conditions and Limitations Concerning the Breeder's Authorization in Respect of Propagating Material under the UPOV Convention (document UPOV/EXN/CAL/1)
5. Variety denominations
6. Information and databases
 - (a) Electronic application form
 - (b) UPOV information databases
 - (c) Exchange and use of software and equipment
7. TGP documents
8. Molecular techniques
9. Program for the seventy-fourth session
10. Adoption of the report on the conclusions (if time permits)
11. Closing of the session

62. The representative of the European Seed Association (ESA) expressed concern that the scheduling of only one session per year would slow down the work of the CAJ.

63. The representative of CropLife International indicated that it was more appropriate to keep two sessions per year in order to progress more rapidly. He considered that the sessions should be held on either one or two days, subject to the quantity and complexity of the issues under examination.

64. The Delegation of Argentina proposed to hold a single session of the CAJ each year and to establish a consultative group, similar to the CAJ-AG, which would meet at the fringes of the CAJ for consideration of specific issues that required extensive deliberations. It suggested that the outcome of the discussions could be reported during the same week to the CAJ. The Delegation of Argentina explained that some delegations, in particular those located far from Geneva, could not afford the costs for travel and accommodation for attendance of two CAJ sessions per year.

65. The Delegation of the European Union welcomed the proposal made by the Delegation of Argentina and supported the idea of holding a two-day session of the CAJ once a year.

66. The representative of ISF reported that, while certain matters on the CAJ agenda were particularly complex, two sessions per year would provide the opportunity to keep track of the subject and to exchange views more frequently.

67. The representative of the International Association of Horticultural Producers (AIPH) noted that developments in the seed industry were rapid, but implementation of measures to address such developments was only possible once the CAJ had taken a position on the related issues. Therefore, she considered that the CAJ should meet twice a year in order to render its conclusions at the earliest time.

68. The Vice Secretary-General emphasized that the intention was not to reduce the rate of progress on CAJ matters, but rather to find the most efficient means of making progress. He recalled that the CAJ had agreed to broaden the scope of the Working Group on Denominations (WG-DEN) and to organize a seminar on harvested and propagating material to allow extensive exchanges of views and experiences. Such initiatives would enable matters to be progressed more effectively than discussions in the CAJ. He also recalled that observer organizations had indicated that they needed more time to consult on draft documents, and explained that a six-month cycle of sessions did not allow documents to be made available more than six weeks before the session. He noted that one session per year would allow documents to be produced much more in advance, and members would have sufficient time to consider and coordinate relevant matters before the session in order to address questions in a more effective way.

69. The representative of CIOPORA supported the approach presented by the Vice Secretary-General and was in favor of holding one session of the CAJ per year, provided that the working groups could report on progress made, if possible with the participation of observers.

70. The Delegation of Argentina suggested that it would be necessary for the working groups to meet before the CAJ session, for example on the Monday, in order to report relevant developments to the CAJ.

71. The Chair recalled that it would still be possible to hold a session of the CAJ in March should there be urgent matters to be addressed.

72. The Delegation of the United States of America considered that it would be more sensible to keep the two sessions per year, with the possibility to cancel a session if there were not sufficient matters for consideration. It explained that it was easier for the delegates to plan ahead in terms of budget and travel and to subsequently cancel rather than to make arrangements if it had not been planned in advance.

*73. The CAJ considered the work program for the seventy-third session of the CAJ and proposed not to hold a CAJ session in March 2016 and to hold a two-day CAJ session in October 2016.

*74. The CAJ noted that a report on the conclusion of the CAJ, on the schedule of the CAJ sessions for 2016, would be made to the Consultative Committee, at its ninetieth session, to be held on October 28, 2015.

75. *This report was adopted by correspondence.*

[Annex follows]

ANNEXE / ANNEX / ANLAGE / ANEXO

LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS / LIST OF PARTICIPANTS /
TEILNEHMERLISTE / LISTA DE PARTICIPANTES

(dans l'ordre alphabétique des noms français des membres /
in the alphabetical order of the French names of the Members /
in alphabetischer Reihenfolge der französischen Namen der Mitglieder /
por orden alfabético de los nombres en francés de los miembros)

I. MEMBRES / MEMBERS / VERBANDSMITGLIEDER / MIEMBROSALLEMAGNE / GERMANY / DEUTSCHLAND / ALEMANIA

Barbara SOHNEMANN (Frau), Justiziarin, Leiterin, Rechtsangelegenheiten, Sortenverwaltung, Gebühren, Bundessortenamt, Hannover (e-mail: barbara.sohnemann@bundessortenamt.de)

ARGENTINE / ARGENTINA / ARGENTINIEN / ARGENTINA

Raimundo LAVIGNOLLE, Presidente del directorio, Instituto Nacional de Semillas (INASE), Buenos Aires (e-mail: rlavignolle@inase.gov.ar)

Carmen Amelia M. GIANNI (Sra.), Coordinadora de Propiedad Intelectual / Recursos Fitogenéticos, Instituto Nacional de Semillas (INASE), Buenos Aires (e-mail: cgianni@inase.gov.ar)

María Inés RODRIGUEZ (Sra.), Consejera, Misión Permanente de la República Argentina, Ginebra (e-mail: mariaines.rodriguez@missionarg.ch)

AUSTRALIE / AUSTRALIA / AUSTRALIEN / AUSTRALIA

Nik HULSE, Senior Examiner of PBR, Plant Breeder's Rights Office, IP Australia, Phillip (e-mail: nik.hulse@ipaaustralia.gov.au)

BÉLARUS / BELARUS / BELARUS / BELARÚS

Uladzimir BEINIA, Director, State Inspection for Testing and Protection of Plant Varieties, Minsk (e-mail: belsort@mail.ru)

Marina SALADUKHA (Ms.), Head, International Cooperation Department, State Inspection for Testing and Protection of Plant Varieties, Minsk (e-mail: belsort@mail.ru)

Tatsiana SIAMASHKA (Ms.), Deputy Director of DUS Testing, State Inspection for Testing and Protection of Plant Varieties, Minsk (e-mail: tatianasort@mail.ru)

BELGIQUE / BELGIUM / BELGIEN / BÉLGICA

Françoise DE SCHUTTER (Mme), Attachée, Office belge de la Propriété intellectuelle (OPRI), Bruxelles (e-mail: francoise.deschutter@economie.fgov.be)

BOLIVIE (ÉTAT PLURINATIONAL DE) / BOLIVIA (PLURINATIONAL STATE OF) /
BOLIVIEN (PLURINATIONALER STAAT) / BOLIVIA (ESTADO PLURINACIONAL DE)

Sergio Rider ANDRADE CÁCERES, Director Nacional de Semillas del INIAF, Instituto Nacional de Innovación Agropecuaria y Forestal (INIAF), La Paz (e-mail: rideran@yahoo.es)

Freddy CABALLERO LEDEZMA, Responsable de la Unidad de Fiscalización y Registro de Semillas, Registros y protección de Variedades Vegetales, Instituto Nacional de Innovación Agropecuaria y Forestal (INIAF), La Paz (e-mail: calefred@yahoo.es)

Carlos ROMÁN ESCOBAR, Especialista en Semillas, Instituto Nacional de Innovación Agropecuaria y Forestal (INIAF), La Paz (e-mail: romancarlitos@gmail.com)

Luis Fernando ROSALES LOZADA, Primer Secretario, Misión Permanente de Bolivia ante la Oficina de las Naciones Unidas en Ginebra, Ginebra (e-mail: fernando.rosales@bluewin.ch)

CANADA / CANADA / KANADA / CANADÁ

Anthony PARKER, Commissioner, Plant Breeders' Rights Office, Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA), Ottawa (e-mail: anthony.parker@inspection.gc.ca)

CHILI / CHILE / CHILE / CHILE

Manuel TORO UGALDE, Jefe Subdepartamento, Registro de Variedades Protegidas, División Semillas, Servicio Agrícola y Ganadero (SAG), Santiago de Chile (e-mail: manuel.toro@sag.gob.cl)

Marcela PAIVA VÉLIZ (Sra.), Consejera, Misión Permanente de Chile ante la Organización Mundial del Comercio (WTO), Ginebra

CHINE / CHINA / CHINA / CHINA

Yinghui ZHANG (Ms.), Project Administrator, International Cooperation Department, State Intellectual Property Office, Beijing (e-mail: zhangyinghui@sipo.gov.cn)

COLOMBIE / COLOMBIA / KOLUMBIEN / COLOMBIA

Ana Luisa DÍAZ JIMÉNEZ (Sra.), Directora Técnica de Semillas, Dirección Técnica de Semillas, Instituto Colombiano Agropecuario (ICA), Bogotá (e-mail: ana.diaz@ica.gov.co)

Juan Camilo SARETZKI-FORERO, Consejero, Misión Permanente de Colombia ante las Naciones Unidas, Ginebra (e-mail: juan.saretzki@misioncolombia.ch)

CROATIE / CROATIA / KROATIEN / CROACIA

Ivana BULAJIĆ (Ms.), Head of Plant Health Service, Directorate for Food Quality and Fitosanitary Policy, Ministry of Agriculture, Zagreb (e-mail: ivana.bulajic@mps.hr)

DANEMARK / DENMARK / DÄNEMARK / DINAMARCA

Maria LILLIE SONNE (Ms.), Head of Legal, Centre of Plants and Agricultural Holdings Act, Danish AgriFish Agency, Copenhagen (e-mail: maliso@naturerhverv.dk)

ESPAGNE / SPAIN / SPANIEN / ESPAÑA

Luis SALAICES SÁNCHEZ, Jefe del Área del Registro de Variedades, Subdirección General de Medios de Producción Agrícolas y Oficina Española de Variedades Vegetales (MPA y OEVV), Ministerio de Agricultura, Alimentación y Medio Ambiente (MAGRAMA), Madrid (e-mail: luis.salaices@magrama.es)

ESTONIE / ESTONIA / ESTLAND / ESTONIA

Renata TSATURJAN (Ms.), Chief Specialist, Plant Production Bureau, Ministry of Agriculture, Tallinn (e-mail: renata.tsaturjan@agri.ee)

ÉTATS-UNIS D'AMÉRIQUE / UNITED STATES OF AMERICA / VEREINIGTE STAATEN VON AMERIKA / ESTADOS UNIDOS DE AMÉRICA

Kitisri SUKHAPINDA (Ms.), Patent Attorney, Office of Policy and External Affairs, United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO), Alexandria (e-mail: kitisri.sukhapinda@uspto.gov)

Theodore ALLEGRA, Deputy Chief of Mission, Permanent Mission of the United States of America to the United Nations and Other International Organizations in Geneva

Ruihong GUO (Ms.), Deputy Administrator, AMS, Science & Technology Program, United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), Washington D.C. (e-mail: ruihong.guo@ams.usda.gov)

Melissa KEHOE (Ms.), Counselor, Economic and Science Affairs Section, Permanent Mission of the United States of America to the United Nations and Other International Organizations in Geneva

Kristine SCHLEGELMILCH (Ms.), Intellectual Property Attaché, Economic and Science Affairs, Permanent Mission of the United States of America to the United Nations and Other International Organizations in Geneva

Elaine WU (Ms.), Patent Attorney, United States Patent and Trademark Office, Alexandria (e-mail: elaine.wu@uspto.gov)

FÉDÉRATION DE RUSSIE / RUSSIAN FEDERATION / RUSSISCHE FÖDERATION / FEDERACIÓN DE RUSIA

Vitaly S. VOLOSHCHENKO, Chairman, State Commission of the Russian Federation for Selection Achievements Test and Protection, Moscow (e-mail: gossort@gossort.com)

Yury A. ROGOVSKIY, Deputy Chairman, Head of Methodology and International Cooperation, State Commission of the Russian Federation for Selection Achievements Test and Protection, Moscow (e-mail: yrogovskij@yandex.ru)

Viktor I. STARTCEV, Deputy Chairman, State Commission of the Russian Federation for Selection Achievements Test and Protection, Moscow (e-mail: gossort@gossort.com)

Antonina TRETINNIKOVA (Ms.), Deputy Head, Methodology and International Cooperation Department, State Commission of the Russian Federation for Selection Achievements Test and Protection, Moscow (e-mail: tretinnikova@mail.ru)

FRANCE / FRANCE / FRANKREICH / FRANCIA

Arnaud DELTOUR, Directeur général, Groupe d'étude et de contrôle des variétés et des semences (GEVES), Beaucouzé Cedex (e-mail: arnaud.deltour@geves.fr)

Anne CHAN-HON-TONG (Mme), Chargée d'étude pôle semences, Bureau des semences et de la santé des végétaux, Direction Générale de l'Alimentation Service de la Prévention des Risques Sanitaires de la Production Primaire Sous-direction de la Qualité et de la Protection des Végétaux, Ministère de l'Agriculture, de l'Agroalimentaire et de la Forêt, Paris (e-mail: anne.chan-hon-tong@agriculture.gouv.fr)

Yvane MERESSE (Ms.), Juriste, Groupe d'Etude et de Contrôle des Variétés et des Semences (GEVES), Beaucouzé Cedex (e-mail: yvane.meresse@geves.fr)

HONGRIE / HUNGARY / UNGARN / HUNGRÍA

Tamás HARANGOZÓ, PVP Expert, Directorate of Plant Production and Horticulture, National Food Chain Safety Office (NÉBIH), Budapest (e-mail: harangozoT@nebih.gov.hu)

Krisztina KOVÁCS (Ms.), Head, Industrial Property Law Section, Hungarian Intellectual Property Office (HIPO), Budapest (e-mail: krisztina.kovacs@hipo.gov.hu)

Mónika HORTOBÁGYINÉ SPEKLA (Ms.), Patent Examiner, Hungarian Intellectual Property Office (HIPO), Budapest (e-mail: monika.spekla@hipo.gov.hu)

IRLANDE / IRELAND / IRLAND / IRLANDA

John CLAFFEY, Officer, Office of the Controller of Plant Breeders' Rights, National Crop Evaluation Centre, Department of Agriculture, Leixlip (e-mail: john.claffey@agriculture.gov.ie)

ISRAËL / ISRAEL / ISRAEL / ISRAEL

David OPATOWSKI, Minister, Counsellor, Agricultural Affairs, Permanent Mission of Israel to the United Nations and International Organizations, Geneva (e-mail: agriculture@geneva.mfa.gov.il)

JAPON / JAPAN / JAPAN / JAPÓN

Akira MIYAKE, Senior Policy Advisor, Intellectual Property Division, Food Industry Affairs Bureau, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF), Tokyo (e-mail: akira_miyake@nm.maff.go.jp)

KENYA / KENYA / KENIA / KENYA

Esther KIMANI, Acting Managing Director, Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate Service (KEPHIS), Nairobi (e-mail: director@kephis.org)

LETTONIE / LATVIA / LETTLAND / LETONIA

Zanda MILTINA (Ms.), Senior Officer, Department of Agriculture, Ministry of Agriculture, Riga (e-mail: Zanda.Miltina@zm.gov.lv)

LITUANIE / LITHUANIA / LITAUEN / LITUANIA

Sigita JUCIUVIENE (Ms.), Head, Plant Variety Division, Registration and Legal Protection, State Plant Service under the Ministry of Agriculture of the Republic of Lithuania, Vilnius (e-mail: sigita.juciuviene@vatzum.lt)

MAROC / MOROCCO / MAROKKO / MARRUECOS

Zoubida TAOUSSI (Ms.), Chargée de la protection des obtentions végétales, Office National de Sécurité de Produits Alimentaires, Rabat (e-mail: ztaoussi67@gmail.com)

NORVÈGE / NORWAY / NORWEGEN / NORUEGA

Marianne SMITH (Ms.), Senior Advisor, Norwegian Ministry of Agriculture and Food, Oslo (e-mail: marianne.smith@lmd.dep.no)

Tor Erik JØRGENSEN, Head of Section, National Approvals, Norwegian Food Safety Authority, Brumunddal
(e-mail: tor.erik.jorgensen@mattilsynet.no)

Martin GARFJELL, Advisor, Norwegian Food Safety Authority, Brumunddal
(e-mail: Martin.garfjell@mattilsynet.no)

NOUVELLE-ZÉLANDE / NEW ZEALAND / NEUSEELAND / NUEVA ZELANDIA

Christopher J. BARNABY, Assistant Commissioner / Principal Examiner for Plant Variety Rights, Plant Variety Rights Office, Intellectual Property Office of New Zealand, Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment, Christchurch (e-mail: Chris.Barnaby@pvr.govt.nz)

OMAN / OMAN / OMAN / OMÁN

Mohamed Salim AL MARDHOOF AL SAADI, Commercial Affairs, Permanent Mission of the Sultanate of Oman to the United Nations and other international organizations in Geneva, Chambésy
(e-mail: almardhoof@gmail.com)

ORGANISATION AFRICAINE DE LA PROPRIÉTÉ INTELLECTUELLE (OAPI) /
AFRICAN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION (OAPI) /
AFRIKANISCHE ORGANISATION FÜR GEISTIGES EIGENTUM (OAPI) /
ORGANIZACIÓN AFRICANA DE LA PROPIEDAD INTELECTUAL (OAPI)

Juliette DOUMATEY AYITE (Mme), Directeur Général Adjoint, Organisation africaine de la propriété intellectuelle (OAPI), Yaoundé (e-mail: ayijuliette@yahoo.fr)

Wéré Régine GAZARO (Mme), Directeur, Protection de la propriété industrielle, Organisation africaine de la propriété intellectuelle (OAPI), Yaoundé (e-mail: were_regine@yahoo.fr)

PARAGUAY / PARAGUAY / PARAGUAY / PARAGUAY

Blanca Julia NÚÑEZ DE MATTO (Sra.), Jefa, Departamento de Protección y Uso de Variedades, Dirección de Semillas (DISE), Servicio Nacional de Calidad y Sanidad Vegetal y de Semillas (SENAVE), San Lorenzo
(e-mail: blanca.nunez@senave.gov.py)

Daysi Carolina O'HIGGINS DURÉ (Sra.), Técnica, Departamento de Protección y Uso de Variedades, Dirección de Semillas (DISE), Servicio Nacional de Calidad y Sanidad Vegetal y de Semillas (SENAVE), San Lorenzo (e-mail: daysi.ohiggins@senave.gov.py)

PAYS-BAS / NETHERLANDS / NIEDERLANDE / PAÍSES BAJOS

Marien VALSTAR, Senior Policy Officer, Seeds and Plant Propagation Material, Ministry of Economic Affairs, DG AGRO, The Hague (e-mail: m.valstar@minez.nl)

Kees Jan GROENEWOUD, Secretary, Plant Variety Board (Raad voor Plantenrassen), Naktuinbouw, Roelofarendsveen (e-mail: c.j.a.groenewoud@naktuinbouw.nl)

Kees VAN ETTEKOVEN, Head of Variety Testing Department, Naktuinbouw, Roelofarendsveen
(e-mail: c.v.ettekoven@naktuinbouw.nl)

POLOGNE / POLAND / POLEN / POLONIA

Edward S. GACEK, Director General, Research Centre for Cultivar Testing (COBORU), Slupia Wielka
(e-mail: e.gacek@coboru.pl)

Marcin BEHNKE, Deputy Director General for Experimental Affairs, Research Centre for Cultivar Testing (COBORU), Slupia Wielka (e-mail: m.behnke@coboru.pl)

Alicja RUTKOWSKA-ŁOŚ (Ms.), Head, National Listing and Plant Breeders' Rights Protection Office, Research Centre for Cultivar Testing (COBORU), Slupia Wielka (e-mail: a.rutkowska@coboru.pl)

RÉPUBLIQUE DE CORÉE / REPUBLIC OF KOREA / REPUBLIK KOREA / REPÚBLICA DE COREA

Jin-Ou YOO, Deputy Director, Trademark Examination Policy Division, Korean Intellectual Property Office (KIPO), Daejeon Metropolitan City

Eun-Sun CHUNG (Ms.), Senior Examiner, Plant Variety Division, Korea Seed and Variety Service (KSVS), Ministry for Food, Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MIFAFF), Anyang City (e-mail: eschung@korea.kr)

Beonkoo LEE, Examiner, Dongbu Office, Korea Seed and Variety Service (KSVS) (e-mail: gilttara@korea.kr)

RÉPUBLIQUE DE MOLDOVA / REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA / REPUBLIK MOLDAU /
REPÚBLICA DE MOLDOVA

Mihail MACHIDON, Chairman, State Commission for Crops Variety Testing and Registration (SCCVTR),
Chisinau (e-mail: info@cstsp.md)

RÉPUBLIQUE TCHÈQUE / CZECH REPUBLIC / TSCHECHISCHE REPUBLIK / REPÚBLICA CHECA

Radmila SAFARIKOVA (Ms.), Head of Division, Central Institute for Supervising and Testing in Agriculture
(UKZUZ), National Plant Variety Office, Brno (e-mail: radmila.safarikova@ukzuz.cz)

RÉPUBLIQUE-UNIE DE TANZANIE / UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA /
VEREINIGTE REPUBLIK TANSANIA / REPÚBLICA UNIDA DE TANZANÍA

Patrick NGWEDIAGI, Registrar, Plant Breeders' Rights Office, Ministry of Agriculture, Food Security and
Cooperatives, Dar es Salaam (e-mail: ngwedi@yahoo.com)

ROUMANIE / ROMANIA / RUMÄNIEN / RUMANIA

Cristian Irinel MOCANU, Head of Legal Department, State Institute for Variety Testing and Registration,
Bucharest (e-mail: irinel_mocanu@istis.ro)

Aura Giorgiana MINDRUTA (Ms.), Expert, State Institute for Variety Testing and Registration (ISTIS),
Bucarest (e-mail: aura_mindruta@istis.ro)

ROYAUME-UNI / UNITED KINGDOM / VEREINIGTES KÖNIGREICH / REINO UNIDO

Andrew MITCHELL, Head of Varieties and Seeds, Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs
(DEFRA), Cambridge (e-mail: andrew.mitchell@defra.gsi.gov.uk)

SLOVAQUIE / SLOVAKIA / SLOWAKEI / ESLOVAQUIA

Bronislava BÁTOROVÁ (Ms.), National Coordinator for the Cooperation of the Slovak Republic with UPOV/
Senior Officer, Department of Variety Testing, Central Controlling and Testing Institute in Agriculture
(ÚKSÚP), Nitra (e-mail: bronislava.batorova@uksup.sk)

L'uba GASPAROVÁ (Ms.), Senior Officer, Deputy of the National Coordinator for the Cooperation of the
Slovak Republic with UPOV, Central Controlling and Testing Institute in Agriculture (UKSUP), Bratislava
(e-mail: Luba.Gasparova@uksup.sk)

SUÈDE / SWEDEN / SCHWEDEN / SUECIA

Olof JOHANSSON, Head, Plant and Environment Department, Swedish Board of Agriculture, Jönköping
(e-mail: olof.johansson@jordbruksverket.se)

SUISSE / SWITZERLAND / SCHWEIZ / SUIZA

Manuela BRAND (Ms.), Plant Variety Rights Office, Federal Department of Economic Affairs Education and
Research (EAER), Plant Health and Varieties, Federal Office for Agriculture FOAG, Bern
(e-mail: manuela.brand@blw.admin.ch)

Eva TSCHARLAND (Frau), Juristin, Direktionsbereich Landwirtschaftliche Produktionsmittel, Bundesamt für
Landwirtschaft, Bern (e-mail: eva.tscharland@blw.admin.ch)

TUNISIE / TUNISIA / TUNESIEN / TÚNEZ

Tarek CHIBOUB, Directeur général, Direction générale de la protection et du contrôle de la qualité des
produits agricoles, Ministère de l'Agriculture, des Ressources Hydrauliques et de la Pêche, Tunis
(e-mail: tarechib@yahoo.fr)

TURQUIE / TURKEY / TÜRKEI / TURQUÍA

Mehmet SAHIN, Director, Variety Registration and Seed Certification Centre, Ministry of Agriculture and
Rural Affairs, Yenimahalle - Ankara (e-mail: mehmet_sahin@gthb.gov.tr)

Mehmet SIĞIRCI, Head, Seed Department, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs, Ankara
(e-mail: mehmet.sigirci@tarim.gov.tr)

Hasan ÇELEN, Variety Protection Expert, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs, Ankara
(e-mail: hcelen@kkgm.gov.tr)

Alper ŞAHIN, Coordinator, PBR Unit, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs, Ankara
(e-mail: alper.sahin@tarim.gov.tr)

UNION EUROPÉENNE / EUROPEAN UNION / EUROPÄISCHE UNION / UNIÓN EUROPEA

Marien VALSTAR, Senior Policy Officer, Seeds and Plant Propagation Material, Ministry of Economic Affairs, DG AGRO, The Hague (e-mail: m.valstar@minez.nl)

Päivi MANNERKORPI (Ms.), Head of Sector - Unit E2, Plant Reproductive Material, Section Direction Générale Santé et Sécurité Alimentaire, Commission européenne (DG SANCO), Bruxelles (e-mail: paivi.mannerkorpi@ec.europa.eu)

Isabelle CLEMENT-NISSOU (Ms.), Policy Officer - Unité E2, Plant Reproductive Material Sector, Direction Générale Santé et Sécurité Alimentaire, Commission européenne (DG SANCO), Bruxelles (e-mail: isabelle.clement-nissou@ec.europa.eu)

Martin EKVAD, President, Community Plant Variety Office (CPVO), Angers (e-mail: ekvad@cpvo.europa.eu)

Carlos GODINHO, Vice-President, Community Plant Variety Office (CPVO), Angers (e-mail: godinho@cpvo.europa.eu)

Francesco MATTINA, Head of Legal Unit, Community Plant Variety Office (CPVO), Angers (e-mail: mattina@cpvo.europa.eu)

II. OBSERVATEURS / OBSERVERS / BEOBACHTER / OBSERVADORES

ALGÉRIE / ALGERIA / ALGERIEN / ARGELIA

Fayssal ALLEK, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Bellevue, Switzerland (e-mail: allek@mission-algeria.ch)

ARABIE SAOUDITE / SAUDI ARABIA / SAUDI-ARABIEN / ARABIA SAUDITA

Fahad AL HARBI, Director, Examination Department, General Directorate of Patents, King Abdulaziz City for Science and Technology (KACST), Riyadh (e-mail: falharbi@kacst.edu.sa)

ÉGYPTE / EGYPT / ÄGYPTEN / EGIPTO

Ahmed AGIBA, Head of CASC - Under Secretary of the Ministry of Agriculture, Agricultural Services Sector, Ministry of Agriculture & Land Reclamation, Central Administration for Seed Testing and Certification (CASC), Giza (e-mail: casc.egypt@hotmail.com)

Samy Hamed EL DEIB SALLAM, Head, Technical Secretary of Variety Registration Committee, Central Administration for Seed Certification (CASC), Giza (e-mail: sllamsamy@yahoo.com)

Saad NASSAR, Head of Working Group Review, Formulation Policies and Agricultural Legislations, Ministry of Agriculture and Land Reclamation, Giza (e-mail: Casc.egypt@hotmail.com)

ÉMIRATS ARABES UNIS / UNITED ARAB EMIRATES / VEREINIGTE ARABISCHE EMIRATE / EMIRATOS ÁRABES UNIDOS

Nasir AL ALI, Director, Legal Affairs Department, Ministry of Environment and Water, Dubai (e-mail: nmsultan@moew.gov.ae)

Fatmah AL KALBANI, Director, Health and Agriculture Development Department, Ministry of Environment and Water, Dubai

Habib AL ABOUDI, Assistant Expert, Ministry of Environment and Water, Dubai (e-mail: hhalabodi@moew.gov.ae)

Hana AL ASLAI (Ms.), International Relations Coordinator, Ministry of Environment and Water, Dubai (e-mail: haalasli@moew.gov.ae)

Amal LOUBARI (Ms.), Accountant, Ministry of Environment and Water, Dubai (e-mail: amloubari@moew.gov.ae)

III. ORGANISATIONS / ORGANIZATIONS / ORGANISATIONEN / ORGANIZACIONES

ASSOCIATION FOR PLANT BREEDING FOR THE BENEFIT OF SOCIETY (APBEBES)

Sangeeta SHASHIKANT (Ms.), President, Association for Plant Breeding for the Benefit of Society (APBEBES), Bonn, Germany (e-mail: sangeeta@twnetwork.org)

Laurent GABERELL, Association for Plant Breeding for the Benefit of Society (APBEBES), Berne Declaration, Zürich, Switzerland (e-mail: Laurent.gaberell@mission-bolivia.ch)

Susanne GURA (Ms.), Coordinator, Association for Plant Breeding for the Benefit of Society (APBEBES), Bonn, Germany (e-mail: food@evb.ch)

ASSOCIATION INTERNATIONALE DES PRODUCTEURS HORTICOLES (AIPH) /
INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF HORTICULTURAL PRODUCERS (AIPH) /
INTERNATIONALER VERBAND DES ERWERBSGARTENBAUES (AIPH) /
ASOCIACIÓN INTERNACIONAL DE PRODUCTORES HORTÍCOLAS (AIPH)

Mia BUMA (Ms.), Secretary, Committee for Novelty Protection, International Association of Horticultural Producers (AIPH), Reading, United Kingdom (e-mail: info@miabuma.nl)

ORGANISATION RÉGIONALE AFRICAINE DE LA PROPRIÉTÉ INTELLECTUELLE (ARIPO) /
AFRICAN REGIONAL INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION (ARIPO) /
AFRIKANISCHE REGIONALORGANISATION ZUM SCHUTZ GEISTIGEN EIGENTUMS (ARIPO) /
ORGANIZACIÓN REGIONAL AFRICANA DE LA PROPIEDAD INTELECTUAL (ARIPO)

Emmanuel SACKEY, Chief Examiner, Industrial Property Directorate, Harare, Zimbabwe (e-mail: esackey@aripo.org)

COMMUNAUTÉ INTERNATIONALE DES OBTENTEURS DE PLANTES ORNEMENTALES ET
FRUITIÈRES À REPRODUCTION ASEXUÉE (CIOPORA) / INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY OF
BREEDERS OF ASEXUALLY REPRODUCED ORNAMENTAL AND FRUIT PLANTS (CIOPORA) /
INTERNATIONALE GEMEINSCHAFT DER ZÜCHTER VEGETATIV VERMEHBARER ZIERUND
OBSTPFLANZEN (CIOPORA) / COMUNIDAD INTERNACIONAL DE OBTENTORES DE VARIEDADES
ORNAMENTALES Y FRUTALES DE REPRODUCCIÓN ASEXUADA (CIOPORA)

Edgar KRIEGER, Secretary General, International Community of Breeders of Asexually Reproduced Ornamental and Fruit Plants (CIOPORA), Hamburg, Germany (e-mail: edgar.krieger@ciopora.org)

Hélène JOURDAN (Mme), Secrétaire générale, Association des Obtenteurs Horticoles Européens (AOHE), Le Luc en Provence, France (e-mail: licprot@meilland.com)

Bruno ETAVARD, Board Member, International Community of Breeders of Asexually Reproduced Ornamental and Fruit Plants (CIOPORA), Hamburg, Germany (e-mail: bruno@meilland.com)

Dominique THÉVENON (Mme), Board member, International Community of Breeders of Asexually Reproduced Ornamental and Fruit Plants (CIOPORA), Hamburg, Germany (e-mail: t.dominique4@orange.fr)

CROPLIFE INTERNATIONAL

Marcel BRUINS, Consultant, CropLife International, Brussels, Belgium (e-mail: mbruins1964@gmail.com)

EUROPEAN SEED ASSOCIATION (ESA)

Szonja CSÖRGÖ (Mrs.), Director, Intellectual Property & Legal Affairs, European Seed Association (ESA), Brussels, Belgium (e-mail: szonjacsorgo@euroseeds.org)

Christiane DUCHENE (Mrs.), Manager, Regulatory Affairs/Limagrain, Limagrain, Brussels, Belgium (e-mail: christiane.duchene@limagrain.com)

INTERNATIONAL SEED FEDERATION (ISF)

Hélène GUILLOT (Mlle), Juriste, Union Française des Semenciers (UFS), Paris, France (e-mail: helene.guillot@ufs-asso.com)

Stevan MADJARAC, representative, American Seed Trade Association (ASTA), Alexandria, United States of America (e-mail: smadjarac@gmail.com)

SOUTH CENTRE / CENTRE SUD / CENTRO DEL SUR

Mirza ALAS PORTILLO (Ms.), Research Associate, South Centre, Geneva, Switzerland
(e-mail: alas@southcentre.int)

IV. BUREAU / OFFICER / VORSITZ / OFICINA

Martin EKVAD, Chair

V. BUREAU DE L'UPOV / OFFICE OF UPOV / BÜRO DER UPOV / OFICINA DE LA UPOV

Francis GURRY, Secretary-General

Peter BUTTON, Vice Secretary-General

Yolanda HUERTA (Ms.), Legal Counsel

Jun KOIDE, Technical/Regional Officer (Asia)

Ben RIVOIRE, Technical/Regional Officer (Africa, Arab Countries)

Leontino TAVEIRA, Technical/Regional Officer (Latin America, Caribbean)

Ariane BESSE (Ms.), Administrative Assistant

[Fin de l'annexe et du document/
End of Annex and of document/
Ende der Anlage und des Dokuments/
Fin del Anexo y del documento]