



TC/36/11

ORIGINAL: English

DATE: March 1, 2001

INTERNATIONAL UNION FOR THE PROTECTION OF NEW VARIETIES OF PLANTS

GENEVA

TECHNICAL COMMITTEE**Thirty-Sixth Session
Geneva, April 3 to 5, 2000**

REPORT

*adopted by the Technical Committee*Opening of the Session

1. The Technical Committee (hereinafter referred to as “the Committee”) held its thirty-sixth session in Geneva from April 3 to 5, 2000. The list of participants is reproduced in Annex I to this report.
2. The session was opened by Mrs. Elise Buitendag (South Africa, Chairman of the Committee), who welcomed the participants, especially those coming from countries which had become member States since the last Committee meeting. Mrs. Buitendag also highlighted the importance of items, such as the Revision of the General Introduction, in view of the worldwide expansion of UPOV and the progressive extension of plant breeder’s rights to cover plant varieties of all genera and species.

Adoption of the Agenda

3. The Committee adopted the agenda as reproduced in document TC/36/1.

PROGRESS REPORTS ON THE WORK OF THE TECHNICAL WORKING PARTIES,
INCLUDING THE WORKING GROUP ON BIOCHEMICAL AND MOLECULAR
TECHNIQUES AND DNA-PROFILING IN PARTICULAR (BMT)

Progress Report on the Work of the Technical Working Party for Agricultural Crops (TWA)

4. The Technical Working Party for Agricultural Crops held its twenty-eighth session in Ottawa, Canada, from June 22 to 25, 1999, under the chairmanship of Mrs. Françoise Blouet (France) and the Subgroup meeting on Cotton and Rice in the same place on June 21, 1999. The report of that session will appear in document TWA/28/22.

5. During its session, the TWA completed the draft Test Guidelines for Sunflower to be presented to the Committee for adoption. The TWA also discussed, and completed for submission to the professional organizations for comments, draft Test Guidelines for *Bromus*, Cotton, Fodder Radish, Red Clover, Rice, Subterranean Clover and White Mustard. With regard to the Test Guidelines for Rice, it noted the need for further contributions from Asian countries. It also discussed Working Papers on the Test Guidelines for Cocksfoot, Lotus and Meadow and Tall Fescue, which will be discussed again during the next session.

6. In addition to its discussions on Test Guidelines, the TWA:

(a) discussed the inclusion of technical information in the UPOV-ROM and proposed the inclusion of grouping characteristics or information from the Technical Questionnaire, other than the information on the pedigrees and formulas of hybrids;

(b) selected Oilseed Rape and Wheat as the priority species for further discussion in the Working Group on Biochemical and Molecular Techniques and DNA Profiling in Particular (BMT), at the same time emphasizing that studies on other species would be also needed;

(c) discussed a working document for the preparation of a New General Introduction for DUS Tests, and made the following main points:

- i) The New General Introduction should be discussed in the Administrative and Legal Committee and be finally adopted by the Council.
- ii) The main document should comprise basic principles, while open questions and details should be dealt with in a separate collection of associated documents.
- iii) The two main objectives of Test Guidelines, i.e. harmonization of variety description and standardization of the assessment of DUS, should be balanced;

(d) discussed the use of electrophoresis in DUS testing, and noted that the different views especially on its use as supporting evidence might be due to different decision-making systems. It therefore decided to prepare for discussion at the next session a document concerning the general procedure for establishing distinctness, covering supporting evidence and the use of electrophoresis characteristics;

(e) decided to prepare for the next session a document concerning the “envelope

protection” issue. The document will discuss situations where, after the introduction of new characteristics, existing protected varieties contain two or more subgroups with different expressions of the new characteristics;

(f) heard presentations on methods of pre-screening and methods for reducing the size of plantings of reference collections. It decided to prepare, for the next session, a general document entitled “Management of reference collections,” which would contain general guidance on pre-screening and efficient management of reference collections. It also agreed to conduct an empirical survey of pre-screening so as to analyze differences in pre-screening or grouping methods among member States;

(g) heard the proposal for the preparation of future UPOV Test Guidelines, and discussed how to select example varieties for UPOV Test Guidelines, given that UPOV membership was expanding worldwide;

(h) heard the result of the analysis of the degree of uniformity of oilseed rape varieties in Germany and France, where different uniformity standards are applied for oilseed rape;

(i) discussed general principles and procedures for establishing distinctness (and uniformity and stability) in hybrid varieties with the help of the parent formula.

7. The twenty-ninth session of the TWA will be held in Uppsala, Sweden, from June 27 to 30, 2000. At that session, the TWA plans to discuss draft Test Guidelines for *Bromus*, Cotton, Fodder Radish, Red Clover, Rice, Subterranean Clover, Swede and White Mustard and working papers on Test Guidelines for Cocksfoot, Lotus, Meadow and Tall Fescue, Sugarcane, Tobacco, Turnip Rape. In addition to Test Guidelines, discussions are planned on the new General Introduction, the management of reference collections, the survey on pre-screening, the decision on distinctness, envelope protection of varieties, the relative tolerance for uniformity and matters arising from the session of the Committee.

Progress Report on the Work of the Technical Working Party on Automation and Computer Programs (TWC)

8. The Technical Working Party on Automation and Computer Programs held its seventeenth session in Turku, Finland, from June 29 to July 2, 1999, under the chairmanship of Mr. John Law (United Kingdom). The report on that session appears in document TWC/17/13. The main points made by the TWC arising from the session are as described below:

(a) It made several proposals for the revision of the General Introduction to the Test Guidelines, and distributed tasks for the preparation of complementary documents.

(b) It noted the progress made with the UPOV-ROM and insisted on the need for a UPOV Code; it discussed the inclusion of technical information but expressed a range of opinions.

(c) It noted the difficulty of obtaining data for the study of methods for the BMT, and would approach breeders to ask whether they could supply some data.

(d) It noted studies on the possible advantages of incomplete block designs in DUS testing.

(e) It noted several possibilities for reducing the number of reference varieties to be grown every year.

(f) It discussed a threshold model which could be used to check characteristics and their states intended for inclusion in Test Guidelines.

(g) It studied the possibilities for reaching earlier decisions on DUS (e.g. after two years instead of the present three).

(h) It saw the need to agree on terms to be used by crop experts and statisticians (e.g. on qualitative and quantitative characteristics).

(i) It noted the updating, by experts from the United Kingdom, of the Internet Web site <http://www.bioss.sari.ac.uk/links/upov>, with information on database management systems in use in UPOV member States, exchangeable software, e-mail addresses of UPOV technical experts and documents prepared by the TWC.

(j) It noted that the Windows version of the DUSTNT program developed by the United Kingdom experts was now available from the expert from the United Kingdom (e-mail: sally.watson@dani.gov.uk); it encouraged more States to make use of that freely available software, which would facilitate further harmonization among member States.

(k) It noted that the bulletin board for varieties and seed matters would be discontinued as it was not attracting sufficient interest.

9. The eighteenth session of the TWC will be held in Kyiv, Ukraine, from June 12 to 15, 2000. The Working Party also considered the possibility of having a Workshop on Data Handling at the same place, on June 9 and 10, prior to the next meeting for the countries of the region. At that session, the TWC plans to discuss or rediscuss the following items: report on subjects of special interest to the Working Party raised during the thirty-sixth session of the Committee; questions raised by other Technical Working Parties; report on new developments in member States; UPOV-ROM Plant Variety Database; revision of the General Introduction to Test Guidelines; summary paper on image analysis; spatial dependency and plant resources; long-term alpha design trial on sugar beet; update paper on alpha design; one year of alpha design compared with the two-year and three-year approaches; incomplete block design on peas; alpha design considering variety grouping; new document on the result of the simulation study in ryegrass; use of the COYD and COYU approach in more than one location in forage crops; items resulting from the sixth session of the Working Group on Biochemical and Molecular Techniques and DNA Profiling in Particular (BMT); telecommunications, exchangeable software and contacts; developments on the World Wide Web; list of statistical documents prepared by the TWC; list of statistical documents containing recommendations or methods of possible interest to the Technical Working Parties.

Progress Report on the Work of the Technical Working Party for Fruit Crops (TWF)

10. The Technical Working Party for Fruit Crops (TWF) held its thirtieth session in Nitra, Slovakia, from September 6 to 10, 1999, under the chairmanship of Mr. Chris Barnaby (New Zealand). The full report is reproduced in document TWF/30/14. At the session, the TWF completed the Test Guidelines for Pear (Revision) prior to its submission to the professional organizations for comments and in case of no essential comments to the Committee for final adoption. It also (re)discussed working papers on Test Guidelines for Actinidia (Kiwifruit) (Revision), Citrus (Revision), European Plum (Revision), Persimmon, *Prunus* Rootstocks. In addition to the discussions on Test Guidelines, the TWF did the following:

(a) It noted that a new short and precise definition for “maturity” was needed, but that it was difficult to develop this for the time being. It was decided to defer this until an appropriate proposal could be made.

(b) It noted the interest of many experts in new interspecific hybrids (e.g. “plum-cot”) and decided to keep this item for the agenda of the next session.

(c) It confirmed its interest in obtaining more documents in electronic form. It noted that the Office of UPOV planned to establish open and restricted areas on its homepage for the reproduction of certain documents. States with a Web site were invited to provide the UPOV Office with authorization to establish direct links with them and the UPOV Web site.

(d) It agreed to select apple for an inventory on the characteristics actually used for DUS testing in a given species and to ask all member States to submit to the Office of UPOV the list of characteristics they actually used for the testing.

(e) It discussed possibilities on how the UPOV-ROM could be improved and what information could be added. It concluded that all characteristics of the Technical Questionnaire and chapters 5 and 6, excluding any confidential information, are the most appropriate to be included in the UPOV-ROM.

(f) It noted document TWF/30/6 on the “Identification of Molecular Markers for Peach Variety Distinctness” and document TWF/30/7 on the “Identification of Peach Varieties Using Molecular Markers” and recommended the Chairman of the BMT to include them in the agenda for the next session in 2000.

(g) It noted a new draft for a revision of the General Introduction to the Test Guidelines and proposed numerous changes to the Editorial Committee and chairmen meeting on October 1, 1999.

11. The thirty-first session of the TWF is scheduled to be held in Budapest, Hungary, from June 3 to 7, 2000. At that session, the TWF plans to complete discussions on Test Guidelines for Actinidia (Kiwifruit) (revision) for presentation to the Committee for final adoption. It plans moreover to discuss or rediscuss working papers on Test Guidelines for Apricot (Revision), Avocado, Citrus (Revision), Mango, Passion Fruit, Persimmon, Prickly Pear (*Opuntia*), European Plum (Revision), Quince, Raspberry, Fig, *Prunus* Rootstocks and Walnut Rootstocks. In addition, the following other items were planned for discussion: short reports on new developments in member States in plant variety protection for fruit species; questions on the testing of varieties of fruit species; important decisions taken during the

previous sessions of the Working Party and the Committee; discussion on new multi- and interspecific hybrids, crop inventory, new methods, techniques and equipment in the examination of varieties; testing of rootstock varieties; revision of the General Introduction including complementary documents.

Progress Report on the Work of the Technical Working Party for Ornamental Plants and Forest Trees (TWO)

12. The Technical Working Party for Ornamental Plants and Forest Trees (TWO) held its thirty-second session in Pruhonice, near Prague, Czech Republic, from September 13 to 18, 1999, under the chairmanship of Mr. Joost Barendrecht (Netherlands). The full report was reproduced in document TWO/32/9. During the session, the TWO completed the Test Guidelines for Gerbera (Revision), Iris, Kangaroo Paw and *Osteospermum* prior to their submission to the Committee for final adoption. It also completed Test Guidelines for *Calluna*, *Guzmania*, *Hippeastrum*, *Zantedeschia*, prior to their submission to the professional organizations for comments. It furthermore discussed or rediscussed working papers on Test Guidelines for Cupressus, *Dendrobium*, *Eustoma*, Waxflower, Lavandula, and Thyme. In addition to the discussions on Test Guidelines, the TWO also discussed the following topics:

(a) It noted the reports on Image Analysis, and on FLORES™ Image Data Base for Ornamentals and will await reports on the standardization of submitting image information and trials to be continued on bilateral agreement basis.

(b) It discussed the testing of seed-propagated varieties of ornamental species and noted that the key problem was the difference in uniformity between seed-propagated and vegetatively (clone) propagated varieties.

(c) It noted the special cases in new species and decided that a clear definition was necessary on what constituted discovery and what development was needed to grant rights for a new variety obtained from the wild.

(d) It discussed document TC/35/15 Prov. for the preparation of a new General Introduction to Test Guidelines and made some proposals for changes of the present text to the Editorial Committee. A number of experts volunteered to submit documents mentioned in the Annex of TC/35/15 Prov. for further discussion during the meetings of the Editorial Committee and the Working Party.

(e) It noted the report made by experts from CIOFORA and discussed the question of phytoplasma in Poinsettia. It will propose to the Technical Committee that in Poinsettia, phytoplasma-free plant material will be tested in parallel with material containing phytoplasma.

13. The thirty-third session of the TWO is scheduled to be held in Budapest, Hungary, from June 26 to 30, 2000. At that session, the TWO plans to complete the Test Guidelines for *Calluna*, *Guzmania*, *Hippeastrum*, *Zantedeschia* for submission to the Committee for final adoption. It will also discuss or rediscuss Test Guidelines for *Bracteantha*, Celosia, Chrysanthemum (Revision), Clematis, Cupressus, *Dendrobium*, *Eucalyptus gunnii*, *Eustoma*, *Impatiens*, Lavandula, *Leptospermum*, *Nerium*, Ornamental Apple (Revision), Pentas, Petunia, *Poinsettia* (Revision), Tagetes, Thyme, Waxflower. Discussion of the following items is also planned: short reports on special developments in plant variety protection in

ornamental plants and forest trees; important decisions taken during the last session of the Working Party and the Committee; testing of seed-propagated varieties of ornamental species; special cases in new species; revision of the General Introduction to the Test Guidelines including complementary documents.

Progress Report on the Work of the Technical Working Party for Vegetables (TWV)

14. The Technical Working Party for Vegetables held its thirty-third session in Hanover, Germany, from June 5 to 9, 1999, under the chairmanship of Mr. Baruch Bar-Tel (Israel). The report of that session will be reproduced in document TWV/33/15.

15. During its session, the TWV completed, for presentation to the Committee for adoption, draft Test Guidelines for Industrial Chicory and Witloof, Chicory. The TWV also discussed and completed for submission to the professional organizations for comments draft Test Guidelines for Curly Kale, Fennel, Garlic, Globe Artichoke, Swede, Tomato and Turnip. In addition, it discussed draft Test Guidelines for Thyme, which will also be discussed at the forthcoming session of the Technical Working Party for Ornamental Plants and Forest Trees (TWO).

16. In addition to the discussions on Test Guidelines, the TWV

- (a) reconfirmed the need for international cooperation for disease resistance tests;
- (b) noted the discussion in the Community Plant Variety Office (CPVO) concerning the influence of commercialization of hybrids on the novelty of the parent lines and decided to ask the Committee for advice;
- (c) noted that a guideline on variety denominations was being drawn up for the Community Plant Variety Right and EC Common Catalogue. It decided to ask the expert from the CPVO to submit the proposed guideline to an appropriate UPOV forum for discussion;
- (d) discussed the proposed questionnaire concerning the handling of genetically modified varieties in DUS tests;
- (e) rediscussed the duration of DUS tests and noted the difficulty in deciding on one uniform rule because of differences between national practices;
- (f) rediscussed the problems involved in the use of bulk samples, and decided to ask the Technical Working Party on Automation and Computer Programs (TWC) to consider a statistical method for estimating the uniformity of a variety on several bulk samples;
- (g) discussed the inclusion of technical information in the UPOV-ROM and proposed that each member State should provide at least information on the grouping characteristics of protected varieties, but could also provide additional information on protected varieties;
- (h) made several proposals for the revision of the General Introduction to DUS tests.

17. The thirty-fourth session of the TWV will be held in Angers, France, from September 10 to 15, 2000. At that session, the TWV plans to discuss draft Test Guidelines

for Curly Kale, Fennel, Garlic, Globe Artichoke, Swede, Tomato, Turnip and Thyme (subject to completion in the Technical Working Party for Ornamental Plants and Forest Trees) and working papers on Test Guidelines for Basil, Broad Bean, Celeriac and Celery (Revision), Chinese Cabbage (Revision), Horse Radish, Husk Tomato, Kohlrabi (Revision), Lentil, Lettuce (Revision), Rosemary and Squash. In addition to Test Guidelines, there are plans to discuss the new General Introduction, international cooperation in disease resistance tests, GM varieties, plant number in the field and sample size for the assessment of distinctness and uniformity and matters resulting from the session of the Committee.

Progress Report on the Work of the Working Group on Biochemical and Molecular Techniques and DNA-Profiling in Particular (BMT)

18. The Working Group on Biochemical and Molecular Techniques and DNA-Profiling in Particular (BMT) held its sixth session at Angers, France, from March 1 to 3, 2000, under the chairmanship of Mr. Michael Camlin (United Kingdom). The report on the session will be reproduced in document BMT/6/13. The business of the session is described below.

19. Assessment of Uniformity: The BMT heard results of the assessment of variability within varieties and between varieties in sugar beet, wheat, oilseed rape, and maize. It learned from the studies in inbred lines of oilseed rape that the assessment of uniformity by molecular data could be consistent with assessment by phenotypic characteristics at least in some species with certain marker sets. With respect to the problem that the observed level of uniformity could differ according to the choice of markers, it discussed the proposed approach of choosing marker sets that are not only usefully polymorphic, but also sufficiently uniform within existing varieties. It reaffirmed that approaches and standards for the assessment of uniformity would differ, depending on the mode of propagation of varieties, molecular techniques and molecular markers.

20. However, a majority of experts in the BMT expressed optimistic views concerning technical feasibility of uniformity assessment by molecular data. Once approaches to the assessment of distinctness were determined, assessment methods for uniformity could possibly be decided without technical difficulties. The BMT also discussed the role of uniformity criteria in DUS testing. Several experts stated that a uniformity criterion was not as important as distinctness. The assessment of uniformity could not be discussed without considering the assessment of distinctness. The BMT also discussed whether molecular marker sets should or could be standardized in cases where they were to be used for DUS testing.

21. Phenotype and Genotype: The interpretation of “the expression of the characteristics resulting from a given genotype or combination of genotypes” was split between two positions. Some experts insisted that the wording implied “phenotype,” therefore, differences in molecular markers possibly resulting from differences in non-coding parts of DNA could not alone establish distinctness. However, the Vice Secretary-General of UPOV reported the view expressed by the Administrative and Legal Committee (CAJ) that these words did not necessarily mean “phenotype.” The 1991 Act did not require or forbid the use of molecular markers. The decision on the use of molecular markers for the assessment of distinctness should be based upon the views of technical circles who were not circumscribed by the language of the Convention.

22. Minimum distance and distinctness: With respect to the concept of minimum distance, the BMT noted two different views. One view was that the concept of the minimum distance had reduced in significance after the adoption of the 1991 Act and the introduction of essential derivation concept. In practice, the minimum distance had been very small in some cases, such as single-gene controlled characteristics, for example, disease resistance and flower color. Another view was that the concept of the minimum distance should be maintained to ensure the quality of protection. All small differences, such as one band difference in DNA profiling, should not always be regarded as “clearly distinguishable.” The BMT also heard a proposal for investigating a new assessment approach: distinctness would be assessed by the distance between varieties derived from the totality of all characteristics, instead of a characteristic-by-characteristic basis.

23. Supporting evidence: The BMT discussed the introduction of molecular characteristics as supporting evidence. It heard a proposal for the use of molecular characteristics for supporting differences observed in the field, especially in performance characteristics, for judging distinctness. Some experts doubted the legal status of supporting evidence characteristics. Others stated that the status was clearly different from normal characteristics because the use of supporting evidence characteristics is limited to cases where testing experts are strongly convinced of the distinctness of varieties by the results in the field trial.

24. Possible consequences of introducing molecular markers for DUS testing: The BMT also noted other important aspects that should be taken into account in the case of introducing molecular characteristics. The introduction of molecular markers might result in significant changes in the protection system. In this case, there would be the need for special care during a transitional period to protect the rights granted by the present system. Another concern was stability criteria for molecular characteristics, which might result in an extra burden for breeders/maintainers. It was proposed to discuss a wider threshold for stability in molecular characteristics, taking into account its possible impacts on the maintenance practices of breeders.

25. Statistical treatment of molecular data: The BMT heard several presentations on statistical analysis and a brief report from the Chairman of the TWC. It noted again that the lack of assimilated data of a good quality was still the main obstacle to further studies.

26. Management of reference collections. Identification of similar varieties: The BMT heard results of the study of Chrysanthemums for identifying most similar varieties and a proposal for the management of reference collections, including the use of molecular data. It noted that one of the key problems for the use of molecular techniques might still be the lack of good correlation between phenotypic distance and molecular distance.

27. Assessment of essential derivation: The BMT discussed the use of molecular techniques for the judgment of essential derivation, following a presentation on the assessment of genetic conformity between ryegrass varieties. It reconfirmed that the judgment of essential derivation would not be based only on characteristics used for distinctness. In addition, genetic conformity was not the only criterion for the judgment of distinctness.

28. Possible future uses of molecular techniques in DUS testing. Ad hoc Subgroups: The BMT heard several short presentations on molecular techniques. In particular, it noted that the standardization of molecular marker sets was in progress in an EU project for wheat and

tomato, and that the project would eventually test 500 varieties and construct a database. The BMT noted that molecular techniques were entering into a new phase, the phase of application in practice. In view of this situation, the BMT discussed problems associated with the access and sharing of DNA profile data and the construction of databases. The BMT realized that the access to DNA profiles, which were currently collected in isolation by different institutes, would become an issue for further studies and the further application of molecular techniques. Several experts expected UPOV to take the initiative in constructing a central database or in establishing the framework of sharing data. The BMT also discussed the need for a database of phenotypic variety descriptions and the question concerning the ownership of variety description.

29. The BMT discussed how to achieve further progress on the discussion. It agreed to leave several fundamental questions to the Committee, the CAJ and/or a special separate working group. It also decided to propose establishing *Ad hoc* Crop Subgroups during the eighteen-month interval until the next session to make real progress in discussions on possibilities and consequences of the introduction of molecular techniques in DUS testing, the management of reference collection and the judgment of essential derivation. Considering the importance of the involvement of each Technical Working Party in any future use of molecular techniques, it decided to choose chairmen of the subgroups from the Technical Working Party in question. The BMT decided to establish the *Ad hoc* Subgroups for Oilseed Rape, Wheat, Maize, Tomato and Rose.

30. Future program: The experts from Germany offered to host the seventh session. The BMT accepted that offer and agreed to hold its seventh session in Hanover, Germany, in the middle of October 2001*. During the next session, the BMT planned to discuss the following items: (i) Reports on the discussion in the Technical Committee and the Administrative and Legal Committee; (ii) Short presentation on biochemical and molecular techniques: new techniques, advantages and limits of different techniques; (iii) Possibilities and consequences of the introduction of DNA profiling methods in DUS testing (reports from *Ad hoc* Crop Subgroups): (a) Assessment of distinctness, uniformity and stability; (b) Management of reference collection; (c) Essential derivation; (iv) Assessment of variability within varieties and between varieties; (v) Construction and standardization of databases of DNA profiles of varieties; (vi) Statistical methods: (a) Combination of information from diverse data types (AFLP, SSR, morphological data, etc.); (b) Comparison of genetic distances with phenotypic distances; (c) Confidence intervals and improvement of precision of distance estimates; (vii) The use of DNA profiling as a possible tool for management of reference collections in DUS testing; (viii) The use of DNA profiling methods in examining essential derivation.

QUESTIONS PRESENTED BY THE TECHNICAL WORKING PARTIES

31. The Committee noted document TC/36/3, which contains a collection of the most important items discussed and questions raised and presented to the Committee: (i) Matters for information and for a possible decision to be taken by the Committee; (ii) Matters for information.

* fixed from November 21 to 23, 2001

I. MATTERS FOR INFORMATION AND FOR A POSSIBLE DECISION TO BE TAKEN BY THE COMMITTEE

General Introduction

32. The subject of paragraphs 1 to 7 was discussed altogether considering documents TC/36/5, TC/36/6 and TC/36/7, item 5, of the Agenda. The Committee noted the procedure followed up in the revision of the General Introduction after its last session. During 1999, the Technical Working Parties discussed draft working document TC/35/13 concerning the revision of the General Introduction, which was a revised version of document TC/35/9 drawn up on the basis of comments received on document TC/35/9 and discussions at the meeting of the Editorial Committee on March 24 and 25, 1999, and at a meeting of a small *ad hoc* group which met in Geneva on May 10 and 11, 1999. Following comments received on document TC/35/13 and discussions at an *ad hoc* meeting held on October 1, 1999, in addition to the discussions in the Technical Working Parties, document TC/35/15 was distributed for comments. The revisions resulting from comments received on the latter document have been reproduced in document TC/36/6, but there were still some open points that needed further discussion:

- (a) Interpretation of the definition of variety (Article 1(vi), especially the last sub-sentence (e.g. some landraces are not varieties), what about ecotypes, breeding material?, etc).
- (b) Possible use of multivariate analysis for DUS testing.
- (c) The use of hybrid parentage formula for DUS testing.
- (d) The use of supporting evidence for DUS testing.
- (e) The use of different degrees of resistance for DUS testing.
- (f) To consider whether example varieties for one state should represent the same fact (e.g. the same cm, mm, etc.).
- (g) The notion of common knowledge and to request the advice of the CAJ.

33. Procedure for discussion and adoption: The Committee also noted that documents TC/36/5 and TC/36/7 contained the first draft of the complementary documents to the General Introduction, that some of these were documents which already existed but it was necessary to update them, other documents were papers prepared by individual experts as a starting point for discussion that were in an early stage of development and that some documents were still missing. The Committee was informed that these documents were not intended to be discussed at that meeting, but were to be sent to the Technical Working Parties for discussion before coming back to the Committee. The Office of UPOV proposed the following procedure for the documents TC/36/5, TC/36/6 and TC/36/7:

- (a) Send documents TC/36/5 and TC/36/7 to all Technical Working Parties, asking for comments before May 10, 2000.
- (b) Send Circular to the Committee asking for comments on open points before end of April 2000.

(c) Prepare, by May 15, 2000, updated document TC/36/6, send together with comments from the Committee on open points and summary of changes to TC/36/6 to the Committee and all Technical Working Parties for information. Comments should reach UPOV before end of May 2000 (if needed, further Editorial Committee meeting).

(d) Send comments received on TC/36/5 and TC/36/7 to all Technical Working Parties by May 20, 2000.

(e) Prepare by September 15, 2000, updated version of TC/36/6 for comments to the CAJ session in October 2000.

(f) Prepare by February 1, 2001, updated version of TC/36/6 and comments or proposals for rewording of some paragraphs made by CAJ to the TC session in April 2001 and to the Council session either in April (if Council would meet in April) or October 2001.

34. Several experts at the Committee expressed their concerns about asking for comments on a long list of documents. It was necessary to have open discussions on them but in order to avoid having excessive delay in their adoption a timetable should be set up. Experts also wondered about how it would be possible to merge the different points of view from the different Technical Working Parties. It was suggested that the Editorial Committee, enlarged by the Chairman of the Technical Committee, Chairmen of the Technical Working Parties and the Chairman of the BMT could deal with this task. The Vice Secretary-General suggested that a joint meeting of the Committee and the Administrative and Legal Committee could be held to discuss some of these points.

35. TGP documents: The expert from France proposed that the discussion on and possible future adoption of document TC/36/6 should be made to some extent independently from the approval of the whole set of complementary documents (TGP documents). He considered that TC/36/6 was an important document for future UPOV member States and its adoption should not be delayed more than necessary. Most experts agreed with the proposal. The expert from Australia expressed his opinion that if the documents were discussed separately the documents adopted first would set up a precedent for the later ones which could lead to inconsistencies between them. Action should be taken to avoid that. He also considered that the General Introduction should be discussed in full at the TC which, unlike the TWPs, was the proper place to make broad policy decisions.

36. An expert from the Office of UPOV explained that the Enlarged Editorial Committee would take care of that and that the revision of an already approved document was no obstacle to keeping consistency with one adopted later. The expert from Germany requested clarification on the content of the set of associated documents, whether they should contain subjects under discussion or should explain different points of view, or whether they should contain only subjects upon which there was an agreed position within UPOV. It was explained that they would contain only subjects where there was an agreed position before final adoption.

37. Finally, the Committee agreed to follow the procedure proposed in paragraph 33, that the Enlarged Editorial Committee would suggest changes in it if they considered it necessary. The Enlarged Editorial Committee would be the task group for the preparation of the documents before they reached the stage for discussion at the Committee, that it would check for consistency between the whole set of documents, would set up priority of documents within the set of complementary documents (TGP documents) and that the Chairmen of the

Technical Working Parties might also point out the documents considered of interest for their particular group.

38. The Committee also agreed that the Enlarged Editorial Committee would meet after the Committee session and that the expert from ASSINSEL and any other expert at the Committee who might have comments to document TC/36/6 could put them in writing and hand them in for consideration.

New Approach to Characteristic Type

39. The Committee noted paragraphs 8, 97 and 98 of document TC/36/3 describing discussions at the TWC concerning different approaches for the assessment of characteristics between crop experts, who considered characteristics mainly as qualitative or quantitative, and the statisticians, who considered characteristics mainly according to the type of data used, ordinal and nominal. The TWC agreed that a document should be prepared linking both approaches and it could be included in TGP 8. The expert from Germany pointed out that it would be helpful to have a document clarifying the situation to avoid future misunderstandings. An expert from the United Kingdom also highlighted the fact that the main objective of the proposal was to make a document useful to the crop experts, thus building a bridge between both sciences.

40. The Committee agreed that the TWC would continue working on the preparation of that document.

New Variety Selected from Existing Varieties or Populations, the Notion of Common Knowledge (TGP/3), and Discovered and Developed

41. The Committee noted paragraphs 9 to 17 of document TC/36/3.

42. New variety selected from existing varieties or populations: Paragraphs 9 to 11 reviewed the discussion at the TWV about the possibility of selecting new varieties in two different situations. Situation 1: the selection was made from already protected varieties, which the TWV agreed should not be allowed; situation 2: the selection was made from populations, which raised three questions: a) the notion of common knowledge, b) the possibility of the assessment of distinctness, uniformity and stability between material of different degrees of uniformity, c) whether a candidate variety could be compared to a local population.

43. The notion of common knowledge: Paragraphs 12 and 13 reported on discussions on the notion of common knowledge at the TWF and TWO. These Working Parties discussed possible criteria to be considered, among others, the availability and existence of living material, and whether the plant grouping should fulfill the definition of variety.

44. Several experts at the Committee expressed their concern about the different meanings of the word "population." In some cases, it could apply to plant varieties and, in other cases, it referred to a plant grouping that could not be considered a plant variety. The expert from Australia considered that selection from any plant grouping, irrespective of whether it was a plant variety or not, should not be prohibited and that it was necessary to have a clear definition of the word "population." An expert from the Office of the Union explained that

the objective was to avoid considering as clearly different two varieties that, for a given characteristic, had the same state of expression but a different level of uniformity. The expert from France reminded the Committee that populations could be described and maintained provided that the proper size of sample were used, that selection from populations is one specific case of plant breeding, and that generally plant breeding also involves crossing and further work. An expert from the United Kingdom recalled that at the TWA, discussions had been mainly on the possibility of making selection from protected varieties. The expert from Germany suggested using another term instead of “population” to avoid misunderstandings. Some experts also considered that this was an important issue from the point of view of the policy of the Union and that it should be carefully considered before a final decision were reached. Others wondered if a variety that was not described could be considered as belonging to common knowledge. At that point, the Vice Secretary-General of the Union pointed out that the text of the Convention required clear distinction irrespective of the origin of the variability from which a variety was developed and that, in his opinion, to be part of common knowledge, a variety had to exist and had to be known, and a description should not be a requirement.

45. The Chairman of the Committee concluded that it was not necessary to arrive at a final conclusion at that moment and that the notion of common knowledge presented in document TC/36/7 under TGP 3 was a first draft which should also be discussed at the Administrative and Legal Committee. Comments to that document were welcomed.

46. Discovered and developed: Paragraphs 14 to 17 of document TC/36/3 referred to discussions at the TWO and TWF about the protection of material discovered in the wild. Two situations were considered: 1) Plant material was collected from the wild and afterwards a selection was made from it. Both Working Parties agreed on the right to protect plant varieties obtained in that way. 2) The second situation was the selection being made directly on the wild material with no changes. While some experts considered that in the second case the situation was not as clear as in the first and that for vegetatively-propagated species it should be allowed to protect plant varieties obtained in that way, other experts said that a breeding activity was necessary and that morphological changes must be required. The Working Parties also discussed the problem of how to assess distinctness between varieties of different levels of uniformity, and the Committee noted that there was no final conclusion on that subject.

47. An expert on the Committee said that, in his opinion, “collection” did not mean breeding activity while “selection” did. The expert from Australia said that breeding was both process and product and therefore the development of a new variety was as important as the process(es) involved in its creation. He also said that breeders made collection and selection in one attempt at the same time and it was not possible to separate them. The expert from France pointed out that experts should be careful to avoid the introduction of a new requirement such as the breeding of a variety. The expert from Kenya suggested using the term “natural material” instead of “wild material” in order to avoid possible confusion with material owned by communities.

48. The Chairman recalled that the TWO has to deal with varieties of new species and it needed some guidance on how to approach these situations. She concluded that discussion on these subjects would continue in the Committee and other UPOV Committees and asked the expert from Australia to document his point of view and send it to the Enlarged Editorial Committee.

Inclusion of Technical Information in the UPOV-ROM

49. The Committee noted paragraphs 19 to 25 of document TC/36/3 referring to the discussions in all Technical Working Parties about the possibility of including technical information in the UPOV-ROM. Concerning the extent of the data to be included, the Committee noted that most experts at the Technical Working Parties agreed to include the information required in item 5 of the Technical Questionnaire of the UPOV Test Guidelines. A text file could be prepared to include information for those species for which there are no UPOV Test Guidelines and for those countries wishing to bring more information. The Technical Working Parties also considered that technical information should be included in a special field of the database out of the taxon code. The Committee was informed about the confidential status of some information in several countries. Some experts at the Technical Working Parties wondered what kind of information should be included, whether it should only be information obtained or checked by the national authority or whether provisional information, such as data from a first year trial or submitted by the applicant or breeder in the application, could be included as well. The Committee also noted the concerns of some experts at the Technical Working Parties that some national legislation required payment for the issuing of DUS test reports while in other countries the descriptive data was public information. Finally it noted the suggestion of including information about the applicant and breeder.

50. Experts from the Office of the Union reminded the Committee about the discussion at the BMT on the ownership of information and on the difference between a plant variety description and the DUS test report. They also asked the Committee to note that there would be a heavy workload for the national authorities for the collection and submission of such information. The Vice Secretary-General suggested that the Committee reflect on the balance between the cost and benefit of including descriptive information in the UPOV-ROM. He considered that it might help new member States to run their offices in a more effective way.

51. The expert of the CPVO asked the Committee to consider if the data included should be from already protected varieties only or whether varieties in the examination process should be included as well. Other experts on the Committee emphasized that it was necessary to keep certain control on the information to be included in the UPOV-ROM, that the environment might change the description of the varieties and this should be considered when building up the database. Some experts suggested that information from item 7 (Additional Information) of the Technical Questionnaire of the UPOV Test Guidelines could be included while others considered that only item 5 (Variety Characteristics) of the Technical Questionnaire should be included. The expert from Australia suggested that extra information could be included in a text file, and an expert from the United Kingdom suggested starting with a selected group of species. At the proposal of the expert of the CPVO, the Committee considered including information of protected varieties at this first stage and to request the Technical Working Parties to set up a list of characteristics for those species for which there are no UPOV Test Guidelines. The expert from ASSINSEL supported the idea of including technical information in the UPOV-ROM and suggested putting it on the UPOV Web site.

52. As a result of the discussions, the Chairman of the Committee proposed to include in the UPOV-ROM the information of item 5 of the Technical Questionnaire, that it should be structured in a searchable database, that a section for further information should be included and that the place where the data was recorded should also be included. One expert proposed to include a warning explanation in the database about the extent of its use. The Committee agreed to the proposal.

Taxon Code

53. The Committee noted paragraph 26 of document TC/36/3 informing that the Technical Working Parties had considered the proposal from the Office of UPOV for the taxon code to be used in the UPOV-ROM and according to an expert at the TWF there were no remarks on it.

54. An expert wondered if the inclusion of the status identifying changes to each record would be useful. It was explained that this function was requested for those countries that download information into their systems. In order to set up the procedure to finalize the taxon code the following actions were proposed by the Office of UPOV for the improvement of the UPOV-ROM.

Plan for the Improvement of the UPOV-ROM

Finalization of the Taxon Code of Species

(a) Last corrections to be included by the Office of UPOV before distribution to member States with request for comments;

(b) ask for *ad hoc* meeting of selected experts from data suppliers, crop experts and legal experts;

(c) introduction of the code into reduced amount of data (selected species);

(d) after successful trial under (c), introduction of the code into data of each member State as soon as possible.

Inclusion of Technical Data

55. Once the proposal had been approved by the Committee, request for national offices to include technical information in the data (e.g. all information from item 5 of the Technical Questionnaire). Discuss with JOUVE whether a structured format – instead of the text-only format (ASCII) – could be used in order to facilitate search. Consultant in computer matters may be needed in this respect.

Other Possible Changes to the Software

56. Ask all States to make proposals for other improvements to be made to the UPOV-ROM ready to be incorporated in the next upgrading of the JOUVE application software.

Other Improvements not Related to the Software

(a) Regularly check whether the submitted information is complete, coherent and valid, according to the detailed information given by each contributor.

(b) Systematically report essential corrections and/or possible improvements to each concerned data provider.

(c) Prepare a circular letter urging member States to specify the status of each record contained in their data (whether the information is new, unchanged or amended).

(d) Encourage all member States not yet submitting data to do so.

57. The Committee agreed to the proposal.

Bulk Sample

58. The Committee noted paragraphs 27 and 28 of document TC/36/3 reporting on the acknowledgement of the Technical Working Parties of the discussion at the Committee during its previous session, recommending that when chemical characteristics were used for the assessment of distinctness, they should also be tested on a plant-by-plant basis for the assessment of uniformity. The Committee also noted that some experts at the TWC and TWV considered that that approach may not be possible in every case but, nevertheless, they were useful characteristics.

59. An expert from the United Kingdom clarified that for the TWC it was a matter of the acceptable level of risk and that there were some statistical methods that could be explored for that purpose. He also mentioned that it was expected that a paper would be introduced at the following TWC dealing with the use of bulk sample in DUS testing.

60. The Chairman of the Committee concluded by requesting the TWC to work on the use of bulk samples for DUS testing.

Use of Electrophoresis in Cross-Fertilized Varieties

61. The Committee noted paragraphs 29 to 35 of document TC/36/3 which summed up the discussions at the TWA on the possible uses of electrophoresis in cross-fertilized crops. Two papers had been presented at the TWA, one of them considering electrophoresis as a phenotypic characteristic and the possible consequences in the minimum distance between varieties. The other document explored the possibility of using electrophoresis as supporting evidence, but in that case the consequences of using it in that way should be studied. The document also considered that the conviction of the examiner expert of the distinctness of the variety should be a pre-requisite for its use. The concerns of breeders on the burden for the maintenance of plant varieties and the possibility of plagiarism, their position against the use of electrophoresis for the assessment of DUS in cross-fertilized crops, and their acceptance of its possible use in self-fertilized crops as supporting evidence were also mentioned.

62. Discussions which had taken place at the TWA, where some experts considered that the use of electrophoresis as supporting evidence was similar to an additional characteristic, were reported. Some experts at that Working Party expressed their opinion that clear conditions for using electrophoresis in order to assure consistency of results should be laid down. The Committee finally noted that a document on the general procedure for the procedure of establishing distinctness would be discussed during the next TWA meeting.

63. The expert from ASSINSEL said that it was very clear that the requirements for listing varieties in a national catalogue were different than those for granting PBR, but if electrophoresis could be used for the DUS assessment, then yield could also be used. Some experts replied saying that identification is different from DUS assessment. The expert from France said that there were cases where it was difficult to identify the exact characteristic that made two varieties different, but nevertheless the crop expert was convinced that they were different and that there were tools that could be used in specific cases. He pointed out that in those situations the expert should be convinced rather than just have the impression that the varieties were distinct. The Vice Secretary-General added that from the legal point of view it would be difficult to accept that, on the one hand, there were characteristics for DUS and, on the other hand, characteristics for supporting evidence.

64. The expert from Germany expressed his opinion that in these cases clear rules should be laid down for the supporting evidence and that it should be used in combination with other things, such as other characteristics and the conviction of the expert. An expert from France supported that. He added that the objective was not to propose a new system of DUS testing and that, in any case, it was important to be able to trace back to the characteristic where distinctness had been assessed after the granting of the PBR. Experts from the United Kingdom expressed their concern about the possible erosion of the strength of the PBR. They also stated that, if this approach was taken, clear rules should be laid down for the use of electrophoresis as supporting evidence and to what extent the standard criteria for examination might be decreased in the use of routine characteristics to allow the use of supporting evidence.

65. An expert wondered whether the conviction of the expert was enough and what evidence of distinctness was really necessary. However, another expert considered that conviction was not enough and that distinctness should be assessed and proved and that the description was the basis for the granting of PBR. He finally added that, in his opinion, it would be difficult to defend a grant of PBR without the description of the variety. The Vice Secretary-General reminded the Committee that the UPOV Convention provided for an examination of the distinctness, uniformity and stability of the variety before the granting of the PBR.

66. The Chairman of the Committee concluded that further work had to be done before a final conclusion on that issue could be reached.

Consequences of the Introduction of New Characteristics in DUS for Already Protected Varieties

67. The Committee noted the first part of paragraphs 9 and 36 of document TC/36/3 which summarized the discussions at some Technical Working Parties about the consequences of the introduction in DUS testing of new characteristics which had not previously been used for the examination of DUS. On the one hand, a TWA expert from the United Kingdom mentioned the possibility that, when introducing a new characteristic, such as electrophoresis, two or more subgroups could be identified within the varieties already protected or listed. The TWA concluded that characteristics should be carefully studied before being introduced for DUS testing and a document would be prepared for the next meeting of the Working Party. On the other hand, experts at the TWO highlighted uniformity as not being a big problem in ornamental crop varieties and they were used to introducing new characteristics without major problems or consequences in previously protected varieties.

68. The expert from Spain gave his point of view. He said that two different situations were possible. One was when for a given characteristic two varieties had a different range of variation, but the mean value of the expression of the characteristic was different as well. The second case was when two varieties had a different range of variability but had the same mean value. In his opinion, in the second case, the two varieties should not be considered different because the value of the characteristic was the same and there was only a difference in the uniformity, whilst in the first case the situation was not very clear. The expert from the Netherlands pointed out that most ornamental varieties were vegetatively-propagated and the variability within varieties was very low. He added that experts at the TWO were not against the conclusions reached at the TWA but they were used to including new characteristics when necessary which later on were included in the Test Guidelines, and they would like to continue with that practice. The expert from Germany agreed with the statement by the expert from Spain and he added that when a characteristic was used for the assessment of distinctness both the candidate and the already registered varieties should be uniform for that characteristic. He said that it would be possible for an older variety to be less uniform than a new one, but nevertheless distinctness should be assessed using the statistical rules available. The expert from France pointed out that the key issue was that uniformity should not be the criteria for judging whether two varieties were distinct or not.

69. The situation that might result from the examination of varieties of new crops was highlighted by the expert from Australia, who wondered as to the extent the requirement of uniformity to comparative varieties might cause a difficult situation. The expert from ASSINSEL expressed his concern about the possible increase in the required level of uniformity, that it would be a burden on the maintenance of the variety and that the introduction of new characteristics should not weaken the protection granted to already existing varieties. The expert from the Russian Federation expressed that, in his opinion, if a population was permanently reproduced as a defined entity that confirmed its existence, it represented a sufficiently uniform plant material and therefore could be regarded as a variety. He added that selecting a subgroup within that population was just one kind of selection hence this might be subject to protection and compete with the initial population.

70. The Chairman summarized by proposing that the Enlarged Editorial Committee considered all these issues when discussing the New General Introduction. The Committee agreed to the proposal.

Prescreening of Varieties: Definition of Pre-screening, Method for Selecting Comparable Varieties used in France, Electrophoresis for Pre-screening, Multivariate Approach

71. The Committee noted paragraphs 37 to 39 of document TC/36/3 which summarized the discussions on the Definition of Pre-screening at the TWA and TWF. For some experts at the TWA, pre-screening implied the selection of the most similar varieties while for other experts the objective was to eliminate those that did not need to be compared with the candidate variety. At the TWF, experts agreed that they did make pre-screening or grouping because, in the reference collection of varieties of fruit crops, growing a variety was independent from the candidates. The Committee also noted paragraph 40 reporting on the Method for selecting comparable varieties used in France for maize. In that method, the comparable varieties were selected by means of a multivariate analysis using characteristics; the differences were weighed according to the difference observed, the genetic background, the environmental influence and the reliability of the data. Finally it was explained that electrophoresis was one

of the characteristics used but the method had been developed in a way that distinctness could not be assessed by electrophoresis alone.

72. Electrophoresis for pre-screening. Paragraph 41 of TC/36/3 informed on discussions which took place at the TWA where, on the one hand, some experts considered that the characteristics to be used for pre-screening should be the same as those used for grouping and, on the other hand, the use of DNA characteristics could be a good tool for pre-screening. Paragraphs 42 and 43 reported on discussions at the TWA and TWF in the possible use of Multivariate approach for DUS testing. At the TWA, the expert from France considered that it was necessary to discuss the possibility of its use, that the notion of minimum distance was more natural and that it could be used on a non-routine basis. Other experts raised concerns about that approach which was different from the one that was being used at the time and that it might also cause problems with the assessment of uniformity. Experts agreed that the subject should be considered in the complementary document TGP/4 (Management of Reference Collections) to the General Introduction and an empirical survey on the management of reference collection of barley would be prepared for the next meeting of the Working Party. At the TWF, experts agreed that they did not need to use that approach when dealing with visually assessed characteristics and that it could be dangerous to assess distinctness without knowing in which characteristic the difference existed.

73. An expert from France pointed out that the multivariate approach proposed used the classical characteristics. The expert from ASSINSEL considered that the proper management of reference collections would be very important in the near future but expressed his concerns about the possible use of molecular markers for that purpose, and an expert from the United Kingdom considered that from the statistical point of view there was no problem in using multivariate analysis for DUS testing but that advice from the TWC should be requested and that there were some doubts in how to assess uniformity.

74. An expert from France clarified that in the management of reference collections two different risks were being dealt with. The first one was the risk of working with a small reference collection and that a candidate variety may not be compared with all similar varieties of the same species. The second risk was to work with a larger reference collection of varieties, using tools that might enable identification of those varieties that did not need to be compared to a candidate variety. In his opinion, the second risk was smaller than the first and this situation would be more complicated when more member States joined the Union. He also expressed that this approach did not mean the use of biomolecular techniques or complicated statistical procedures. He explained that the management of reference collections had been thought out with the use of morphological characteristics, that good knowledge of their genetic regulation as well as their effect on the environment was necessary. The expert from Germany supported the use of special tools for the management of reference collections but emphasized that clear rules should be laid down and the risks involved should be measured somehow.

75. The Chairman concluded that all the comments made would be considered in the preparation of the new version of the General Introduction and in the complementary document TGP/4.

Example Varieties in UPOV Test Guidelines

76. The Committee noted paragraphs 46 to 48 of document TC/36/3. Discussions which had taken place at the TWA and TWV about the importance of the use of example varieties in the UPOV Test Guidelines were reported on. At the TWA, it was considered that as UPOV expanded so the importance of the list of example varieties would become lower and that in the end each country should select its own set of example varieties. Experts at that Technical Working Party considered that the availability must be considered when selecting example varieties and they also wondered whether the change in the availability of example varieties would lead to a revision of the Test Guidelines. It was also mentioned that experts at the TWA and TWV had discussed the possibility of changing the way in which example varieties were selected for Test Guidelines. Some experts considered the possibility of including a second set of example varieties in an Annex but some problems, such as consistency between two or more lists of example varieties for a given Test Guideline and the necessity to identify the location where the different sets had been tested, had been raised.

77. Several experts at the Committee stressed the importance for harmonization of variety descriptions of having a good list of up-to-date example varieties and considered the possibility of having more than one list for a given Test Guideline. An expert from the United Kingdom suggested that a second list of example varieties could be included in the UPOV Web site. The expert from France highlighted the importance of looking for a good approach when selecting example varieties and that it became more relevant with the expansion of UPOV. The Committee asked the expert from France to prepare a summary of items to be considered of importance in future discussions on criteria for selecting example varieties.

78. The expert from the Russian Federation explained that for the locally developed varieties they had an approach for finding out the relevant example varieties from the ones from the original region of the variety. He added that, in the case of receiving an application from abroad for an already protected foreign variety, that variety would be grown and compared to those local ones for identification of similar characteristics. In the end the candidate foreign variety would be used in the same way as an example variety.

79. At the end of the session, the expert from France presented the Committee with the following proposal:

About Example Varieties

Actual Situation

80. More and more difficulties arise regarding the establishment of a relevant list of example varieties which is agreed upon by all member States due to the diversity of variety breeding programs and of environmental conditions.

81. In addition, variety turnover is moving faster and faster and very often the availability of the example varieties is not possible in all countries making DUS tests on a given species.

How to Improve this Situation?

82. Different solutions can be considered depending on the type of characteristics:

- Characteristics for which the states of expression are evident or are easily described with drawings: no need for example varieties.
- Characteristics not or only very slightly susceptible to environmental effect: example varieties can be proposed.

In this case, varieties must be largely well-known and available. If necessary, more than one list can be established depending on growing conditions (open field/greenhouse, autumn/spring sowing, ...) and on world regions, but the states of expression of the example varieties in the different lists must be stable and consistency between the lists established.

- Characteristics susceptible to environment and/or for which an important interaction is observed: in this case, there is no possibility to establish a link between the lists of example varieties. Each country or group of countries has its own list which represents the variability observed and the different states of expression.

There is no real need to indicate these lists in the UPOV Test Guidelines but it would be very helpful:

- to define in the General Introduction clear rules on how to establish the list of example varieties and how to handle it;
- to consider the full range of variability observed in the reference collection used to conduct DUS tests in a given country of a region;
- to have access to the list of example varieties used and to the range of variability observed when a description has to be considered by any country.

These are suggestions that have to be discussed. The expert from France explained that it was basically a brief document for reflection and discussion and that he could develop it if he received comments on it.

83. The Committee agreed to send this proposal to the Technical Working Parties for comments.

Assessment of DUS of Hybrid Varieties with the Help of the Parent Formula

84. The Committee noted paragraphs 49 to 51 and 54 which advised on the discussions at the TWA about the use of the parental formula of hybrid varieties for DUS assessment. While some experts confirmed that this was possible, others considered that the hybrid should be different itself but the formula might be used for a pre-screening system providing that knowledge of the lines and its characteristics were available. At that point, the Office of UPOV advised that the possibility of using a pre-screening system based on the parental formula of hybrid varieties had already been considered in some Test Guidelines.

85. The Committee also noted paragraph 52 which reported on the discussions at the TWA about the usefulness of information relative to the parental formula of hybrid varieties. Most experts agreed that it was very useful information, mainly in the case of a large number of hybrid varieties developed from a small number of parental lines. Some experts at the TWA

reported that the submission of information on the parental formula of hybrid varieties was mandatory in their countries.

86. The expert from ASSINSEL at the Committee wondered about the requirement of requesting material of the inbred lines by national offices that did not use the parental formula for DUS assessment. Several experts replied that it was necessary for checking the hybrid and for the protection of the parental lines itself. The Vice Secretary-General of UPOV clarified that the UPOV Convention considered the special nature of hybrid breeding and the use of the inbred lines and it provided for special treatment when assessing stability for hybrid varieties. For that purpose, it was necessary to get the lines which were necessary for the protection of the parental lines as well.

87. The Chairman of the Committee proposed that an associated document to the General Introduction dealing with the use of parental formula for DUS assessment be drawn up. The proposal was supported by an expert from the United Kingdom and agreed to by the Committee.

88. Protection of components maintained by artificial methods. The Committee noted paragraph 53 reporting on the discussions at the TWA on how to examine hybrid components produced or maintained by artificial methods and the necessity for clear rules on that specific situation. Some experts wondered whether a component that could not be produced without the use of an artificial method, such as screening by using herbicide resistance, could be protected.

89. On the one hand, some experts considered that the case should be considered as a special cycle of production, as in hybrid varieties. On the other hand, some experts, although they agreed that that case could be considered a special cycle of production, had concerns about the consequences of reaching a general conclusion without examining each case more carefully. They also mentioned some practical problems for the DUS assessment for material containing plants that are resistant and susceptible to herbicides. Most experts agreed that the word “artificial” was not the appropriate one for identifying those methods.

90. The Chairman concluded that further knowledge should be obtained before reaching a conclusion, and that those methods should not be called “artificial” ones. The Committee agreed.

Duration of DUS Tests: Early Decision-Making for DUS Testing

91. The Committee noted paragraphs 55 to 58 advising on the discussions at the TWC and TWV about the possibility of shortening the period of DUS testing. At the TWC two possibilities were discussed. The first was to take a decision after a one-year trial, which the experts considered would require high standards to be set to ensure that a large difference in one year would not become insignificant later. The second possibility was to use trials from two different locations. Different ways of processing the information were proposed (independently for each location or combining data from both locations). In both cases experts at the TWC noted that some thought had to be given to the way of making the assessment of uniformity.

92. At the TWV some experts stressed that the arrangement of the tests should be left to the judgment of the testing expert. Finally, the Committee noted that experts from both the TWV

and the TWC Working Parties agreed that the general principle of two-year tests in the same place should be kept and any deviation from this basic principle should be discussed in the preparation of individual Test Guidelines.

93. An expert from the United Kingdom emphasized that most ornamental varieties were vegetatively-propagated and DUS tests were run under controlled conditions. In that case a one-year test was routine practice. Several experts at the Committee agreed that it would be difficult to make a general statement covering all the situations and it should be left to the experts at the Technical Working Parties to decide whether a shorter DUS test could be performed for a specific crop. Most experts at the Committee agreed to take an open position on new approaches for DUS testing enabling the shortening of the testing period, but nevertheless the experts also stressed that special care should be taken in order to measure the risk involved and to ensure the quality of the results as well. The expert from ASSINSEL considered that instead of speaking of years of testing it would be better to speak about number of trials. After several proposals the Committee agreed to refer to the trials as “independent growing trials.”

94. Discussions then focused on the possibility of replacing years of trials by number of repetitions. An expert from the United Kingdom said that from the statistical point of view the environment/genotype interaction was different from the site/genotype interaction and that the DUS trials for some crops, such as agricultural crops, were more influenced by the environment than other crops, such as ornamental ones. An expert from France said that it was up to the crop expert to evaluate to what extent differences observed in two locations could be due to the environment or to genetic differences. He added that there could be different ways of shortening the DUS trial. He mentioned the possible use of data obtained by the applicant, but he highlighted the importance that, in any case, the differences should be the consequence of differences in the genotype on the varieties and not in the environmental conditions of the trials. An expert from the United Kingdom considered that trials run in controlled conditions should be considered different from trials run in the open air and this should be taken into account in the preparation of the General Introduction.

95. The Committee concluded that trials run in a controlled environment were different from field trials and this should be taken into consideration in the preparation of the General Introduction. The Committee agreed that from that moment onwards instead of referring to “years of testing” they should refer to “independent growing cycles” when preparing the Test Guidelines. Finally, the Committee also agreed to be open to the study of different possibilities for shortening the DUS testing period but decisions on that matter should be carefully considered by the crop experts in order to assure the quality of the results.

Questions on the Testing of Varieties of Fruit Species

96. The Committee noted paragraphs 59 and 60 on discussions at the TWF about the different interpretations of the terms “maturity at harvest.” Experts at the Technical Working Party wondered whether it meant maturity at harvest, maturity for consumption or physiological maturity. Experts agreed that different situations could be considered according to different crops. In the end, the experts at the TWF agreed that clear explanations should be given in the appropriate chapter of the corresponding Test Guidelines.

97. The Committee noted the conclusions reached at the TWF.

Testing of Seed-Propagated Varieties of Ornamental Species

98. The Committee noted paragraph 61 of document TC/36/3 which reported on discussions at the TWO about the difference in the degree of uniformity between seed-propagated varieties and vegetatively-propagated varieties of the same species. Several applications for seed-propagated varieties had been received from plant breeders at some national offices. The Technical Working Party concluded that further discussions and development were necessary.

99. The expert from the Netherlands gave a brief report on a meeting held in his country in January 2000 between experts from national offices and experts from the private sector, to discuss the possibility of protecting seed-propagated varieties of ornamental species. He explained that at that meeting most experts agreed that it would be possible to make DUS examination on the basis of relative uniformity and that the protection would cover the variety but not each individual plant. Therefore it would be possible to take a plant from a seed-propagated variety and to develop a vegetatively-propagated variety from that plant. The expert from ASSINSEL expressed his view that the objective of that meeting was solely to introduce the subject and that breeders would have a meeting in August 2000 where this matter would again be discussed.

100. Experts from Germany and Spain expressed their concern about the possibility that protection of very heterogeneous varieties might cover the whole variability of the species with a small group of initially protected varieties and might block the development of future varieties. Other experts wondered whether it were possible to compare varieties with different levels of uniformity. The expert from the Netherlands explained that a clonal variety could be compared with the mean of a seed-propagated variety for distinctness and that uniformity should be assessed individually for each variety. Several experts agreed with him and considered that varieties with different degrees of uniformity could be compared. One expert expressed his doubts as to how both types of varieties, seed-propagated and vegetatively-propagated, could coexist and added that, in his opinion, breeders might choose between one or the other way of multiplication within one single and the same species. An expert from the United Kingdom highlighted the difference between mechanical admixtures and open-pollinated varieties. He clarified that, in the TWO, experts had been discussing open-pollinated varieties and that it was clear that mechanical admixtures would not fall within the definition of variety of the UPOV Convention. The expert from ASSINSEL explained that breeders were mainly interested in two points: the first was the possibility of protecting seed-propagated varieties of ornamental species and the second the possibility of protecting vegetatively-propagated varieties selected from them. He finally added that if the protection given to seed-propagated varieties was strong enough they would apply.

101. The Committee concluded by asking the Chairman of the TWO to continue discussions on this subject. It did not want to block the possibility of selecting vegetatively-propagated varieties from within seed-propagated varieties in ornamental crops.

Special Cases in New Species

102. The Committee noted paragraph 62 reporting on the question raised by the expert from South Africa at the TWO on clarification of the definition of discovery and development. The expert from South Africa at the TWO explained that her country contained a lot of new species with potential for development as ornamental crops and they should be very careful

when granting rights from material taken from the wild. She added that information on the origin and breeding history should be required when applying for plant breeder's rights.

103. The Committee agreed that this issue had already been discussed and it would be considered by the Technical Working Parties during the preparation of the complementary documents to the General Introduction.

Judgment of Phytoplasma or Endophyte

104. The Committee noted paragraphs 63 to 68 of document TC/36/3 in which it was reported that the Technical Working Parties had noted the recommendation of the Committee that differences caused only by phytoplasmas should not be used as the basis for distinctness. The Committee noted that at the TWO experts considered it possible to remove the phytoplasma but there was uncertainty about the result when reintroducing it. At the TWO it had also been considered that the variety should be tested in any case with and without the phytoplasma but that a double testing would increase the costs. The TWO were of the view that the tests should be carried out on non-infected varieties for protection purposes and there should be a transitional period while phytoplasma-free material of the whole collection of varieties was obtained.

105. The expert from Denmark explained that, in his country, DUS testing was being done at present with infected material but they were going to change that in the future. He said that they aimed to make DUS testing in phytoplasma-free material by the year 2004 and that, in the meantime, a transitional period would exist. When the examination on non-infected material was finally ready, they would give the option to applicants to make descriptions on infected material but for identification purposes only. He explained that in spite of having taken the decision to work in that way there were still doubts on the stability of mutations when removing the phytoplasma and possible lack of distinctness from phytoplasma-free varieties. The expert from Australia proposed to forward the question to the Administration and Legal Committee (CAJ) to examine the consequences of having more than one description for already protected varieties. The expert from the CPVO expressed the necessity to be very clear that the first description was done on plant material of the variety infected with the phytoplasma while the second one was done on plant material free of phytoplasma. An expert from the Office of UPOV also highlighted the difference between the previous rights granted on the basis of plant material containing the phytoplasma and the future ones that would examine the plant material without the phytoplasma and it might affect the right on already existing varieties.

106. The Committee agreed that from a technical point of view the solution proposed by the expert from Denmark was acceptable but it also considered it necessary to request the opinion of the CAJ as to whether it was acceptable from the legal point of view.

Documents in Electronic Format and Development in the UPOV Web Page

107. The Committee noted paragraphs 69 and 70 reporting on the discussions during the Technical Working Party sessions on the necessity of the availability of documents in electronic format. The Office of UPOV also advised that documents would be available in a restricted area on the UPOV Web site and that the password for it would be sent to the official representatives of member States in the Council of UPOV.

108. The expert from the International Plant Genetic Resources Institute (IPGRI) offered to share their experience in the management of technical databases. Experts at the Committee welcomed the new developments and encouraged the Office to continue that trend.

Discussion Groups – E-mail Bulletin Board

109. The Committee noted paragraph 71 reporting on the lack of success of the e-mail bulletin board at that TWC and also the proposal of that Working Party that the Office of UPOV should manage future developments in that area. The Office of UPOV reported on discussions at the Editorial Committee on the same subject. The Editorial Committee suggested having e-mail bulletin boards for each Technical Working Party and another for general discussion with the participation of experts from all the Technical Working Parties and that the participation in these e-mail bulletin boards would be limited to official experts attending sessions of the Technical Working Parties and the Committee.

110. The expert from the United States of America asked about the possibility of having special e-mail bulletin boards for special subjects. The expert from France requested clear conditions for working with these e-mail bulletin boards and the responsibilities entailed. He also stressed that the Office of the Union should have some control over the discussions in order to avoid the existence of parallel discussions with the Technical Working Parties that might lead to different conclusions.

111. The Office of the Union would note all the comments, to be considered in the development of the e-mail bulletin boards.

Sixth Session of the Working Group on Biochemical and Molecular Techniques and DNA-Profiling in Particular

Phenotype vs Genotype. Minimum Distance. New Approach for the Assessment of Distinctness

112. The Committee noted paragraphs 1 to 8 of document TC/36/3 Add. which reported on discussions concerning the interpretation of the wording “the expression of the characteristics resulting from a given genotype or combination of genotype” in Article 1(vi) of the 1991 Act of the UPOV Convention. For some experts at the BMT the meaning was “phenotype.” The Vice Secretary-General reminded the Committee of the conclusion at the CAJ that the language of the 1991 Act of the Convention did not require or forbid the use of molecular markers for the judgment of distinctness. The Committee also noted discussions at the BMT on the concept of “minimum distance” and the impact of the introduction of molecular techniques on “minimum distance.” Some experts at the BMT considered that the concept of minimum distance had reduced significance after the adoption of the 1991 Act and that the essential derivation concept had released national offices from the most extreme forms of minimum distance dilemma. On the other hand, other experts at the BMT considered that, on judging distinctness, the concept of minimum distance should be taken into consideration in order to ensure the quality of protection. Finally, the Committee noted discussions which had taken place at the BMT about the proposed new approach made by the expert from France, assessing distinctness not on a characteristic-by-characteristic basis, but by the combination of characteristics, in which distinctness would be assessed by the distance between varieties

derived from the totality of differences of all characteristics, including, for example, molecular distance.

113. Some experts on the Committee considered that the wording “the expression of the characteristics resulting from a given genotype or combination of genotypes” of the UPOV Convention meant phenotype. The Vice Secretary-General of UPOV explained that according to the Records of the Diplomatic Conference, and also to discussions at the CAJ, the use of biomolecular techniques in the technical examination of plant varieties was not forbidden. He clarified that it did not mean that they had to use them at the moment, but that technicians were free to use them when the proper method had been found. The expert from France expressed that it was very important for the future of PBR to find out a way for using these tools without weakening the system.

114. The Chairman of the BMT clarified that that Working Group would discuss the possible advantages or disadvantages in the use of molecular techniques in some crops and that it was obvious that this kind of analysis should be made before taking action or final decisions. He added that it was necessary to seek advice from the CAJ.

115. The Committee agreed that the Office of UPOV would forward the questions raised by document TC/36/3 Add. to the CAJ.

Transitional Period, Stability

116. The Committee noted paragraphs 13 to 18 of documents TC/36/3 Add. reporting on the discussions at the BMT about the consequences of the introduction of molecular characteristics for plant variety and the possibility of having a transitional period where some thresholds could be set up for those varieties that had been examined before the introduction of the new techniques. Possible problems in the stability of older varieties and the burden on breeders in the maintenance of the varieties was also discussed.

117. The expert from ASSINSEL advised that the paper they had introduced at the BMT was not a proposal for discussion but a list of items for further thinking.

118. The Committee took note.

Ad hoc Crop Subgroups

119. The Committee noted paragraphs 23 to 26 of document TC/36/3 Add. which reported on the decision taken after discussions at the BMT and the further proposal to set up *Ad hoc* Crop Subgroups formed jointly by crop experts and biomolecular technicians for further studies in the possible use of molecular techniques in DUS testing and its consequences. The BMT proposed that the role of the *Ad hoc* Crop Subgroups would not be to make any decisions, but to prepare documents that could be a basis for further discussions in the BMT, the Technical Working Parties and the Committee. The BMT confirmed that the Technical Working Parties should be the decision-making bodies for the introduction of new characteristics into DUS testing for each species. The Committee noted that the BMT proposed the creation of *Ad hoc* Crop Subgroups for the following five species: a) Oilseed Rape, b) Wheat, c) Maize, d) Rose and e) Tomato.

120. Several experts at the Committee recalled discussions at the BMT on the possibility of a subgroup of legal and technical experts to discuss some of these questions about the possible use of molecular techniques for DUS purposes in addition to the *Ad hoc* Crop Subgroups.

121. The Office of UPOV proposed the following work program for the *Ad hoc* Crop Subgroups:

Suggested work program of the *Ad hoc* Crop Subgroups of the BMT

Item	Questions
<p>1. Methods available and suitability for use</p>	<p>(a) What reliable methods are available and which would be most appropriate for each crop? - advantages and disadvantages of various molecular techniques</p> <p>(b) Are standardized systems available and, in particular, are results repeatable? - on a plant-to-plant basis - on repeated sampling of varieties - between laboratories What are the factors necessary for improving the repeatability?</p> <p>(c) Long-term reliability of molecular characteristics - How different are DNA profiles in different years/generations?</p> <p>(d) Are suitable markers available? - Are there any molecular markers/bands with links to phenotypic characteristics? - If not, can linked markers be developed in the near future? - How do choices of marker sets influence variabilities in molecular characteristics and what kinds of molecular markers are desired?</p> <p>(e) Are molecular distances highly correlated with phenotypic/morphological distances? - How can the correlation be improved? - Are robust and reliable generic distance methods available?</p>
<p>2. Variability between and within variety and variety uniformity</p>	<p>(a) Variability between varieties - To what extent are DNA profiles different between pairs of close existing varieties (How many bands are different and how large are molecular distances) ? - Can selected molecular techniques/markers detect all phenotypic distinctness?</p>

2. (cont.)	(b) Variability within varieties - Has variability within variety uniformity been assessed to the same accuracy as for phenotypic characteristics and are there any exceptional cases of within variety disuniformity for existing varieties or uniformity for existing disuniform varieties? - What kinds of approaches are available for assessing uniformity?
3. Constructing application models and drafting necessary criteria and requirements	(a) Establishment of DUS (or supporting evidence for conventional characteristics)? (b) Management of reference collection? (c) Assessment of essential derivation? (d) Use for identification (inclusion in variety description)?
4. Identifying unsolved problems and possible impacts of the introduction	(a) Unsolved problems/necessary work (b) Possible impacts of the introduction on the protection system (c) Need for transitional arrangement

122. Most experts supported the creation of the *Ad hoc* Crop Subgroups and the working program. The expert from France suggested moving item 4 of the work program forward and she highlighted the importance of taking a practical approach to the discussions in the subgroups in order to avoid a repetition of the work of the BMT.

123. The Committee agreed to the creation of the *Ad hoc* Crop Subgroups proposed by the BMT and asked the Office of the Union to take action and to contact the Chairmen of the CAJ and BMT concerning the possibility of creating another subgroup formed by legal and technical experts.

II. MATTERS FOR INFORMATION

Species to be Discussed in the BMT and New Methods, Techniques and Equipment for the Examination of Varieties

124. The Committee noted paragraphs 72 to 74 of document TC/36/3 concerning discussions which took place at the TWA, TWC and TWV meetings as a result of the request from the BMT to select priority species. The TWA selected Oilseed Rape and Wheat, and the TWV chose Lettuce, while experts at the TWC decided to focus on the development of statistical methods for DUS assessment for microsatellites and AFLPs. Within these techniques, their

work would be based on Rose, Oilseed Rape and Ryegrass. The Committee was informed about developments in the use of molecular markers for the identification of peach varieties.

UPOV-ROM Plant Variety Database

125. The Committee noted paragraphs 75 and 76 of document TC/36/3 concerning developments in the UPOV-ROM Plant Variety Database during the year 1999. The Committee was also informed that up to that moment 31 member States and two organizations had submitted information. The OECD List of Cultivars Eligible for Certification was available in the database and also information on protected varieties prepared by the Community Plant Variety Office of the European Union.

Crop Inventory

126. The Committee noted paragraph 77 of document TC/36/3 reporting on the decision at the TWF to ask member States for the list of characteristics used for DUS purposes in apple in order to find out to what extent the characteristics used at national level differed from those included in the UPOV Test Guidelines.

Novelty of Parental Lines of Hybrids

127. The Committee noted paragraphs 78 to 81 of document TC/36/3 advising on the discussions at the TWV about the assessment of novelty of parental lines of hybrids. The expert from the CPVO at the TWV reported that, in principle, the CPVO had considered that the commercialization of the hybrid did not constitute commercialization of the parental lines in terms of novelty. Nevertheless at a later meeting at the CPVO the opposite was concluded, namely that the commercialization of the hybrid would influence the novelty of the parental lines. The Committee also noted that the TWV concluded that the subject should be discussed in the appropriate forum of UPOV.

128. The expert of the CPVO at the Committee added that since the TWV session there had been another meeting at the CPVO, and that the issue would be introduced in the CAJ.

Variety Denomination

129. The Committee noted paragraphs 82 and 83 of document TC/36/3 reporting on the information given at the TWV by the expert from the Netherlands and the CPVO on guidelines for variety denomination, which would be applied to all new varieties of both the EC Common Catalogue and Community Plant Variety Rights.

130. The expert from the CPVO at the Committee explained that the objective of these guidelines was to have clear and common rules for plant variety denomination for the CPVO and the EC Common Catalogue and he added that these guidelines would be introduced for consideration at the following CAJ.

Uniformity Criteria in Measured Characteristics of Different Categories of Varieties

131. The Committee noted paragraphs 84 and 85 of document TC/36/3 reporting on a document introduced at the TWA which compared the different treatments for the assessment of uniformity for rape seed varieties in two member States. The document concluded that no significant difference had been found, but the TWA agreed to continue discussions in order to reach a better level of harmonization within UPOV.

132. The Committee agreed to the conclusion of the TWA.

GM Varieties

133. The Committee noted paragraph 86 of document TC/36/3 reporting on the decision of the TWV to distribute a questionnaire on DUS testing of GM varieties in member States. The TWV asked the expert who prepared the questionnaire to collect comments on the proposed questionnaire and to prepare a revised version for the following session of the Working Party.

134. The expert from France on the Committee asked what was the position of UPOV concerning the modification of and improvements in the UPOV Test Guidelines concerning older versions and if these modifications should be considered as adopted also for the previous TG documents in spite of the fact that the modification had not been issued. He mentioned the example of Chapter 8 of the Technical Questionnaire of the UPOV Test Guidelines, which was adopted by the Committee and not included in the Corrigendum of document TG/2/6.

135. The Committee agreed that all the adopted modifications to the UPOV Test Guidelines should also be considered as adopted for the documents approved previously without the necessity of reprinting them. Therefore, the Committee clarified that Chapter 8 of the Technical Questionnaire should be also considered as adopted for the specific case of document TG/2/6 + Corr.

Image Analysis

136. The Committee noted paragraphs 87 to 90 of document TC/36/3 reporting on the introduction to the TWO and TWC of a pictorial database for pre-screening purposes prepared by the expert from the Netherlands. The Committee noted that while some experts at the TWO wondered about the introduction of the system in practice, owing to its reliance on the quality of the equipment, other experts had seen positive features in the system. At the TWC experts had considered the possibility of having a ring test to test the system. Finally, the Committee noted that there were developments in image analysis in other countries.

Incomplete Block Design. Management of Reference Collection

137. The Committee noted paragraphs 91 to 93 of document TC/36/3 reporting on several examples of the use of incomplete block designs for DUS testing. The TWC agreed to keep on studying the possibility of those designs for DUS assessment.

138. The Committee noted paragraphs 94 and 95, reporting on two methods for the reduction of the number of varieties under trials introduced at the TWC and TWA. The first method, which was developed by experts from the United Kingdom and introduced at the TWC and TWA, consisted of allocating the control varieties to three groups, one of which was omitted cyclically from trial each year. The expert concluded that a small reduction in the stringency of distinctness and a slight increase in the stringency of uniformity were expected. The second method was introduced by the expert from the Netherlands at the TWC and consisted of measuring the variability of every characteristic in the collection which was then divided according to a “yardstick” calculated on the basis of the visually assessed characteristics. As a result, the reference collection appeared divided into blocks, with some varieties in each block and candidate varieties allocated to the blocks according to a randomization of the reference collection every three years. Uniformity was not assessed by the second method.

Handling Visually Assessed Characteristics

139. The Committee noted paragraphs 96 to 98 of document TC/36/3. The first paragraph reported discussions at the TWC about the application of the threshold model to visually assessed characteristics. The conclusion of that Working Party was that threshold methods were good for establishing whether experimental divisions of a characteristic had to be considered when revising Test Guidelines of a given species and that it was necessary to keep studying those methods. The other two paragraphs reported on the discussions based on a document prepared by the expert from Germany which studied the type of characteristics, and the data and method used for their assessment. The TWC concluded that statisticians and crop experts have a different approach when considering the type of characteristics and type of data and that it was necessary to come to an agreement between them.

Telecommunication and Exchangeable Software

140. The Committee noted paragraph 99 of document TC/36/3 reporting on the update of document TWC/17/4 on developments in telecommunications within UPOV and document TWC/17/7 on telecommunications, exchangeable software and contacts. Those countries which wanted to change or update information should send it by e-mail to Mr. Mike Talbot (United Kingdom) (e-mail: mike@bioess.sari.ac.uk). The information was also available on Internet <http://www.bioess.sari.ac.uk/links/upov>).

UPOV Questionnaire Concerning DUS and VCU Databases and Computer Systems

141. The Committee noted paragraph 100 of document TC/36/3 reporting on discussions at the TWC about a questionnaire concerning DUS and VCU prepared by the expert from Poland. It contained the answers from 16 countries. The Working Party agreed to repeat the questionnaire every two years.

DUST for Windows (DUSTNT)

142. The Committee noted paragraphs 101 and 102 reporting on the development of the program DUST, which was available for Windows. The Committee also noted that the DUSTNT system could be obtained in three days by contacting Dr. Sally Watson, Biometrics

Division, Department of Agriculture for Northern Ireland, Newforge Lane, Belfast BT9 5PX, United Kingdom, tel: (44) 1232 255292, fax: (44) 1232 681216, e-mail: sally.watson@dani.gov.uk.

List of Species in Which Practical Technical Knowledge has been Acquired

143. The Committee noted document TC/36/4, which contained an updated version of the list of species in which practical technical knowledge had been acquired.

144. Many experts considered that the document was very useful and stressed the importance of keeping it updated.

Test Guidelines

145. During the session, the Committee adopted the following Test Guidelines after having agreed on changes proposed orally by the Editorial Committee:

TG/15/2(proj.): Pear/Poirier/Birne/Peral

TG/77/8(proj.): Gerbera/Gerbera/Gerbera/Gerbera

TG/81/5(proj.): Sunflower/Tournesol/Sonnenblume/Girasol

TG/173/2(proj.): Witloof, Chicory/Chicorée, Endive/Zichorie/Endivia

TG/174/2(proj.): Iris (bulbous)/Iris (bulbeux)/Iris (zwiebelbildende)/
Lirio (bulboso)

TG/175/2(proj.): Kangaroo Paw/Anigosanthe de Mangles/Kängurublume/
Anigozanthos

TG/176/2(proj.): Osteospermum/Osteospermum/Osteospermum/Osteospermum

Program for the Thirty-Seventh Session

146. The thirty-seventh session of the Committee is scheduled to take place in Geneva from April 2 to 4 (noon), 2001, followed by the sessions of the Administrative and Legal Committee and the Consultative Committee. It is planned that the following items will be discussed during the session: progress reports and questions presented by the Technical Working Parties; progress reports presented by the *Ad hoc* Crop Subgroups on Molecular Techniques, the revision of the General Introduction to Test Guidelines. In addition, the Committee will take decisions on the Test Guidelines that are submitted by the Technical Working Parties for final adoption.

Status of Test Guidelines

147. Annex II to this document contains an updated account of the status of Test Guidelines as of April 5, 2000.

Special Acknowledgement

148. The Committee noted that Mr. Max-Heinrich Thiele-Wittig retired on October 31, 1999. The Committee thanked Mr. Thiele-Wittig for his excellent work during the 26 years he has been working for UPOV and wished him a happy retirement.

149. *The present report has been adopted by correspondence.*

[Annex I follows]

ANNEXE I/ANNEX I/ANLAGE I/ANEXO I

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

(dans l'ordre alphabétique des noms français des États/
in the alphabetical order of the French names of the States/
in alphabetischer Reihenfolge der französischen Namen der Staaten/
por orden alfabético de los nombres en francés de los estados)

I. ÉTATS MEMBRES/MEMBER STATES/VERBANDSSTAATEN/
ESTADOS MIEMBROS

AFRIQUE DU SUD/SOUTH AFRICA/SÜDAFRIKA/SUDÁFRICA

Elise BUITENDAG (Mrs.), Principal Plant and Quality Control Officer, Directorate: Genetic Resources, Private Bag X11208, Nelspruit 1200 (tel. +27-13-753 2071, fax +27-13-752 3854, e-mail: elise@itsc.agric.za)

ALLEMAGNE/GERMANY/DEUTSCHLAND/ALEMANIA

Georg FUCHS, Regierungsdirektor, Bundessortenamt, Postfach 61 04 40, 30604 Hannover (tel. +49-511-95 66 639, fax +49-511-56 33 62, e-mail: georg.fuchs@bundessortenamt.de)

ARGENTINE/ARGENTINA/ARGENTINIEN/ARGENTINA

Marcelo LABARTA, Director de Registro de Variedades, Instituto Nacional de Semillas, Secretaria de Agricultura, Ganadería, Pesca y Alimentación, Ministerio de Economía y Obras y Servicios Públicos, Avenida Paseo Colón 922, 3^{er} piso, 1063 Buenos Aires (tel. +5411-4349 24 44 , 4349 24 45, fax +5411-4362 25 42 / 4349 24 17 / 4349 24 44, e-mail: mlabar@sagyp.mecon.ar)

AUSTRALIE/AUSTRALIA/AUSTRALIEN/AUSTRALIA

Doug WATERHOUSE, Registrar, Plant Breeders' Rights Office, Commonwealth Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry, P.O. Box 858, Canberra, A.C.T. 2601 (tel. +61-2-272 4228, fax +61-2-272 3650, e-mail: doug.waterhouse@affa.gov.au)

AUTRICHE/AUSTRIA/ÖSTERREICH/AUSTRIA

Barbara FÜRNWEGER (Frau), Leiterin der Abteilung Sortenschutz und Registrierprüfung, Sortenschutzamt, Bundesamt und Forschungszentrum für Landwirtschaft, Spargelfeldstraße 191, 1226 Wien (tel. +43-1-732 16-4172, fax +43-1-732 16 4211, e-mail: bfuernweger@bfl.at)

BRÉSIL/BRAZIL/BRASILIEN

Ariete DUARTE FOLLE (Mrs.) Chefe, Serviço Nacional de Proteção de Cultivares, Ministério da Agricultura e do Abastecimento/ SNPCC, Esplanada dos Ministérios, Bloco "D," Anexo "A," Térreo, Salas 1-12, CEP 70043-900, Brasília, D.F. (tel. +55-61-218 25 57, fax +55-61-224 28 42, e-mail: ariete@agricultura.gov.br)

CANADA/KANADA/CANADÁ

Valerie SISSON (Ms.), Commissioner, Plant Breeders' Rights Office, Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA), Camelot Court, 59 Camelot Drive, Nepean, Ontario, K2E 5K5 (tel. +1-613-225-2342, fax +1-613-228 6629, e-mail: vsisson@em.agr.ca)

COLOMBIE/COLOMBIA/KOLUMBIEN/COLOMBIA

Jorge Enrique SUÁREZ CORREDOR, Jefe, División de Semillas, Instituto Colombiano Agropecuario (I.C.A.), Ministerio de Agricultura, Oficina 413, Calle 37 N° 8-43, piso 4, Santa Fe de Bogotá, D.F. (tel. +57-1-232 46 97, fax +57-1-23 24 695, e-mail: semilla@impsat.net.co)

DANEMARK/DENMARK/DÄNEMARK/DINAMARCA

Gerhard DENEKEN, Head, Department of Variety Testing, P.O. Box 7, Teglværksvej 10, 4230 Skaelskør (tel. +45-58-160 600, fax +45-58-1606 06, e-mail: gerhard.deneken@agrsci.dk)

ÉQUATEUR/ECUADOR

Antonio RODAS POZO, Ministro, Representante Permanente Adjunto, Misión Permanente, 139, rue de Lausanne, 1202 Ginebra, Suiza (tel. +41-22-731 52 89, fax +41-22-738 26 76)

ESPAGNE/SPAIN/SPANIEN/ESPAÑA

Cecilio PRIETO MARTIN, Director Técnico de Evaluación de Variedades y Laboratorios, Oficina Española de Variedades Vegetales (OEVV), José Abascal 4, 28003 Madrid (tel. +34-91-347 69 63, fax +34-91-594 2768, e-mail: prieto@inia.es)

Luis SALAICES, Jefe de Área de Registro de Variedades, Oficina Española de Variedades Vegetales (OEVV), José Abascal 4, 28003 Madrid (tel. +34-91-347 69 21, fax +34-91-594 27 68, e-mail: lsalaice@mapya.es or salaices@inia.es)

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

Ann Marie THRO (Ms.), Commissioner, Plant Variety Protection Office, Department of Agriculture, Room 500, NAL Bldg, 10301 Baltimore Blvd, Beltsville, Maryland 20705 (tel. +1-301-504 74 75 / 55 18, fax +1-301-504 52 91, e-mail: annmarie.thro@usda.gov)

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

Yury A. ROGOVSKIY, Deputy Chairman, Chief of Methods Department, State Commission of the Russian Federation for Selection Achievements Test and Protection, Orlicov per. 1/11, 107139 Moscow (tel. +7-095-208 67 75, fax +7-095-207 86 26, e-mail: desel@agro.aris.ru)

Madina O. OUMAROVA (Mrs.), Expert, State Commission of the Russian Federation for Selection Achievements Test and Protection, Orlicov per. 1/11, 107139 Moscow (tel. +7-095-204 42 97, fax +7-095-207 87 26, e-mail: desel@agro.aris.ru)

FINLANDE/FINLAND/FINNLAND/FINLANDIA

Kaarina PAAVILAINEN (Ms.), Senior Inspector, KTTK Seed Testing Department, Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, P.O. Box 111, 32201 Loimaa (tel. +358-2-760 56 247, fax +358-2-760 56 222, e-mail: kaarina.paavilainen@kttk.fi)

FRANCE/FRANKREICH/FRANCIA

Joël GUIARD, Directeur adjoint, GEVES, La Minière, 78285 Guyancourt Cédex (tel: +33-1 30 83 35 80, fax +33-1-30 83 36 29, e-mail: joel.guiard@geves.fr)

Françoise BLOUET (Mlle), Responsable des études DHS, GEVES, La Minière, 78285 Guyancourt Cedex (tel. +33-1 30 83 35 82, fax +33-1 30 83 36 78, e-mail: francoise.blouet@geves.fr)

HONGRIE/HUNGARY/UNGARN/HUNGRÍA

József HARSANYI, Head of Department, National Institute for Agricultural Quality Control, Budapest II, Keleti K. u. 24, P.O. Box 30,93 1525 Budapest 114 (tel. +36-1-212-3127,ext. 2342, fax + 36-1-212-5367, e-mail: harsanyij@ommi.hu)

IRLANDE/IRELAND/IRLAND/IRLANDA

John V. CARVILL, Controller, Department of Agriculture and Food, National Crop Variety Testing Center, Backweston, Leixlip, Co. Kildare (tel. +353-1-628 0608, fax +353-1-628 0634, e-mail: backwest@indigo.ie)

ITALIE/ITALY/ITALIEN/ITALIA

Pier Giacomo BIANCHI, Head, General Affairs Office, Ente Nazionale Sementi Elette (ENSE), Via Fernanda Wittgens 4, 20123 Milano (tel. +39-02 806 91626, fax +39-02 8069 1649, e-mail: aff-gen@ense.it)

JAPON/JAPAN/JAPÓN

Yasuji NAKAGAWA, Director, Plant Variety Examination Office, Seeds and Seedlings Division, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF), 1-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, 100-8950 Tokyo

Kimiko ISHIKAWA (Mrs.), Examiner, Plant Variety Examination Office, Seeds and Seedlings Division, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF), 1-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, 100-8950 Tokyo (tel. +81-3-3581-0518, fax +81-3-3502 6572, e-mail: kimiko_ishikawa@nm.maff.go.jp)

KENYA/KENIA

Chagema John KEDERA, Managing Director, Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate Service (KEPHIS), Waiyaki Way, P.O. Box 49592, Nairobi (tel. +254-2-440087, fax +254-2-448940, e-mail: kephis@nbnet.co.ke)

MEXIQUE/MEXICO/MEXIKO/MÉXICO

Eduardo BENÍTEZ PAULÍN, Director del Servicio Nacional de Inspección y Certificación de Semillas (SNICS), Lope de Vega No. 125-2º Piso, Chapultepec-Morales, 11570 México, D.F. (tel. +52-5-203 9427, fax +52-5-250 64 83, e-mail: eduardo.benitez@sagar.gob.mx)

NORVÈGE/NORWAY/NORWEGEN/NORUEGA

Haakon SØNJU, Secretary, Plant Variety Board, Fellesbygget, 1432 Ås-NLH (tel. +47-64 94 92 30 or 64 94 92 11, fax +47-64 94 02 08, e-mail: haakon.sonju@slt.dep.no)

NOUVELLE-ZÉLANDE/NEW ZEALAND/NEUSEELAND/NUEVA ZELANDIA

Bill WHITMORE, Commissioner of Plant Variety Rights, Plant Variety Rights Office, P.O. Box 130, Lincoln, Canterbury (tel. +64-3-325-6355, fax +64-3-325-2946, e-mail: whitmore@pvr.govt.nz)

PAYS-BAS/NETHERLANDS/NIEDERLANDE/PAÍSES BAJOS

Joost BARENDRECHT, Permanent Expert, Dutch Board for Breeders' Rights, Plant Research International, Postbox 16, 6700 AA Wageningen (tel. +31-317-4768 93, fax +31-317-418 094, e-mail: C.J.Barendrecht@plant.wag-ur.nl)

POLOGNE/POLAND/POLEN/POLONIA

Julia BORYS (Ms.), Head of DUS Department, The Research Centre for Cultivar Testing (COBORU), 63-022 Slupia Wielka (tel. +48-61-285 23 41, fax +48-61-285 35 58, e-mail: coboru@bptnet.pl)

Wieslaw PILARCZYK, The Research Centre for Cultivar Testing (COBORU), 63-022 Slupia Wielka, Poland (tel. +48-61 28-523 41, ext. 274, fax +48-61 28-523 58, e-mail: wpilar@owl.au.poznan.pl)

PORTUGAL

Carlos PEREIRA GODINHO, Head, Plant Variety Office, CENARVE, Edificio II DGPC, Tapada da Ajuda, 1300 Lisboa (tel. +351-21-361 32 16, fax +351-21-361 32 22, e-mail: dgpc.cenarve@mail.telepact.pt)

José Sérgio DE CALHEIROS DA GAMA, Conseiller juridique, Mission permanente, 33, rue Antoine-Carteret, 1202 Genève, Suisse (tel. +41-79 65 83 191, fax +41-22-918 0228, e-mail: josesergiogama@freesurf.ch)

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

Dumitru BRINZILA, President, State Commission for Crops Variety Testing and Registration, Bul. Stefan cel Mare 162, 2004 Chisinau (tel. +373-2-24 62 22, fax +373-2-24 69 21, e-mail: brinzila@csip.moldova.md)

RÉPUBLIQUE TCHÈQUE/CZECH REPUBLIC/TSCHECHISCHE REPUBLIK/
REPÚBLICA CHECA

Jiří SOUČEK, Head, Department of Plant Breeders' Rights, Central Institute for Supervising and Testing in Agriculture (ÚKZÚZ), Za opravnou 4, 15006 Praha 5-Motol (tel. +420-(0)2-572 11 755, fax +420-(0)2-572 11 752, e-mail: soucek@ooz.zeus.cz)

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

Peter John BUTTON, Technical Liaison Officer, Plant Variety Rights Office and Seeds Division, Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, White House Lane, Huntingdon Road, Cambridge CB3 0LF (tel. +44-1223-34 23 84, fax +44-1223-342 386, e-mail: p.j.button@pvs.maff.gov.uk)

Michael CAMLIN, Department of Agriculture and Rural Development, Plant Testing Station, 50 Houston Road, Crossnacreevy, Belfast BT6 9SH (tel. +44-1232-548 000, fax +44-1232-548001, e-mail: michael.camlin@dani.gov.uk)

John Richard LAW, Head DUS Statistics, National Institute of Agricultural Botany (NIAB), Huntingdon Road, Cambridge CB3 0LE (tel. +44-1223-276 381, fax +44-1223-277 602, e-mail: john.law@niab.com)

Elizabeth SCOTT (Miss), Head of Ornamental Plants Section, NIAB, Huntingdon Road, Cambridge CB3 0LE, United Kingdom (tel. +44-1223-342 399, fax +44-1223-342 229, e-mail: e.scott@pvs.maff.gov.uk)

SLOVAQUIE/SLOVAKIA/SLOWAKEI/ESLOVAQUIA

Eva HAVELKOVÁ (Mrs.), Third Secretary, Permanent Mission, 9, chemin de l'Ancienne-Route, 1218 Grand-Saconnex, Switzerland (tel. +41-22-747 7411, fax +41-22-747 7434)

SUÈDE/SWEDEN/SCHWEDEN/SUECIA

Evan WESTERLIND, Head of Office, National Plant Variety Board, Box 1247, 171 24 Solna (tel. +46-8-783 12 60, fax +46-8-83 31 70, e-mail: info@vaxtsortnamnden.se)

SUISSE/SWITZERLAND/SCHWEIZ/SUIZA

Pierre-Alex MIAUTON, Chef, Service de certification et contrôle des semences, Station fédérale de recherches en production végétale, RAC, Changins, 1260 Nyon (tel: (+41-22) 363 46 68 fax (+41-22) 361 54 69, e-mail: pierre.miauton@rac.admin.ch)

II. ÉTATS OBSERVATEURS/OBSERVER STATES/
BEOBACHTERSTAATEN/ESTADOS OBSERVADORES

EYGPTE/EGYPT/EGIPTO/ÄGYPTEN

Gamal Eissa ATTYA, Director, Breeders' Rights and Variety Registration Department, Central Administration for Seed Testing and Certification, Ministry of Agriculture, 8, Gamma El Kahera Street, Giza, Cairo (tel. & fax +20-2-571 85 62)

GRÈCE/GREECE/GRIECHENLAND/GRECIA

Apostolina LIOUSSA (Mrs.), Director, Variety Research Institute of Cultivated Plants, Ministry of Agriculture, 574 00 Sindos – Thessaloniki (tel. +30-31-796 264, fax +30-31-796 343, e-mail: varinst@spark.net.gr)

INDE/INDIA/INDIEN/INDIA

Dolly CHAKRABARTY (Mrs.), Deputy Secretary, Department of Agriculture & Cooperation, Ministry of Agriculture, Krishi Bhawan, Dr. Rajendra Prasad Road-1, New Delhi - 110 001 (tel. : +91-11-338 44 68 / 338 66 81, fax +91-11-338 44 68, e-mail: dolly_chakrabarty@hotmail.com)

MAROC/MOROCCO/MAROKKO/MARRUECOS

Fatima EL MAHBOUL (Mme), Conseiller, Mission permanente, 18A, chemin François-Lehmann, Case postale 244, 1218 Grand-Saconnex, Suisse (tel. +41-22-791 8181, fax +41-22-791 8180)

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

Chang Hyun KIM, Director, National Seed Management Office, 433 Anyang 6-dong, Anyang City, Kyunggi-do 430-016 (tel. +82-343-444 4161, fax +82-331-203 7431, e-mail: chakim@seed.go.kr)

Myung Soo LEE, Agricultural Counsellor, Permanent Mission, 20, route de Pré-Bois, P.O.B. 1828, 1215 Geneva 15, Switzerland (tel. +41-22-791 8237, fax +41-22-788 6249, e-mail: myungslee@hanimail.com)

ROUMANIE/ROMANIA/RUMÄNIEN/RUMANIA

Dana BURCA (Ms.), Examiner, Examination Department, State Office for Inventions and Trademarks, 5 Jon Ghica, Sector 3, P.O. Box 52, 70018 Bucharest (tel. +40-1-315 90 66, fax +40-1-312 38 19)

Ruxandra URUCU (Mrs.), Legal Advisor, State Office for Inventions and Trademarks, 5 Jon Ghica, Sector 3, P.O. Box 52, 70018 Bucharest (tel. +40-1-315 9066, fax +40-1-312 38 19)

III. ORGANISATIONS/ORGANIZATIONS/
ORGANISATIONEN/ORGANIZACIONES

COMMUNAUTÉ EUROPÉENNE (CE)/
EUROPEAN COMMUNITY (EC)/
EUROPÄISCHE GEMEINSCHAFT (EG)/
COMUNIDAD EUROPEA (CE)

Marco VALVASSORI, Principal Administrator, European Commission, 84, rue de la Loi, 1049 Brussels, Belgium (tel. +32-2-295 69 71, fax +32-2-296 9399 e-mail: marcantonio.valvassori@dg6.cec.be)

José M. ELENA, Vice-President, Community Plant Variety Office (CPVO), P.O. Box 2141, 49021 Angers, Cedex 02, France (tel. +33-2-41 36 84 59, fax + 33-2-41 36 84 60, e-mail: elena@cpvo.fr)

Dirk THEOBALD, Head of Unit, Community Plant Variety Office (CPVO), P.O. Box 2141, 49021 Angers, Cedex 02, France (tel. +33-2-41 36 84 61, fax + 33-2-41 36 84 60, e-mail: theobald@cpvo.fr)

ASSOCIATION INTERNATIONALE DES SÉLECTIONNEURS POUR LA PROTECTION
DES OBTENTIONS VÉGÉTALES (ASSINSEL)/
INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF PLANT BREEDERS FOR THE PROTECTION OF
PLANT VARIETIES (ASSINSEL)/
INTERNATIONALER VERBAND DER PFLANZENZÜCHTER FÜR DEN SCHUTZ
VON PFLANZENZÜCHTUNGEN (ASSINSEL)/
ASOCIACIÓN INTERNACIONAL DE LOS SELECCIONADORES PARA LA
PROTECCIÓN DE LAS OBTENCIONES VEGETALES (ASSINSEL)

Bernard LE BUANEC, Secrétaire général, ASSINSEL, 7, chemin du Reposoir, 1260 Nyon, Suisse (tel. +41-22-365 44 20, fax +41-22-365 44 21, e-mail: assinsel@worldseed.org)

Patrick HEFFER, Assistant to the Secretary General, ASSINSEL, 7, chemin du Reposoir, 1260 Nyon, Suisse (tel. +41-22-365 44 20, fax +41-22-365 44 21, e-mail: p.heffer@worldseed.org)

COMMUNAUTÉ INTERNATIONALE DES OBTENTEURS DE PLANTES
ORNAMENTALES ET FRUITIÈRES DE REPRODUCTION ASEXUÉE (CIOPORA)/
INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY OF BREEDERS OF ASEXUALLY REPRODUCED
ORNAMENTAL AND FRUIT-TREE VARIETIES (CIOPORA)/
INTERNATIONALE GEMEINSCHAFT DER ZÜCHTER VEGETATIV VERMEHR-
BARER ZIER- UND OBSTPFLANZEN (CIOPORA)/
COMUNIDAD INTERNACIONAL DE OBTENTORES DE VARIEDADES ORNAMEN-
TALES Y FRUTALES DE REPRODUCCIÓN ASEXUADA (CIOPORA)

Frédérique ROYON (Mme), Secrétaire général suppléant, Ophira II, 630, route des Dolines, 06560 Valbonne, Sophia Antipolis, France (tel. +33-4-93 95 81 80, fax +33-4-93 95 81 80, e-mail : ciopora@atsat.com)

INSTITUT INTERNATIONAL DES RESSOURCES PHYTOGÉNÉTIQUES (IPGRI)
INTERNATIONAL PLANT GENETIC RESOURCES INSTITUTE (IPGRI)
INTERNATIONALES INSTITUT FÜR PFLANZENGENETISCHE RESSOURCEN
(IPGRI)
INSTITUTO INTERNACIONAL DE RECURSOS FITOGENÉTICOS (IPGRI)

Adriana ALERCIA (Mrs.), Germplasm Information Specialist, Documentation, Information and Training Group, Via delle Sette Chiese 142, 00145 Rome, Italy (tel. +39-06-518 92 410 / switchboard: 518 921, fax +39-06-575 03 09, e-mail: a.alercia@cgiar.org)

IV. BUREAU/OFFICERS/VORSITZ/OFICINA

Elise BUITENDAG (Mrs.), Chairperson
Michael CAMLIN, Vice-Chairman

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

Barry GREENGRASS, Vice Secretary-General
Raimundo LAVIGNOLLE, Senior Program Officer
Evgeny SARANIN, Consultant
Sumito YASUOKA, Associate Officer
Max-Heinrich THIELE-WITTIG, Consultant

[L'annexe II suit/
Annex II follows/
Anlage II folgt/
Sigue el Anexo II]

Test Guidelines or Draft Test Guidelines for the Conduct of Tests for Distinctness, Uniformity and Stability
(the documents in this series are trilingual (English, French and German = Tril.)
and/or in separate versions in English (E), French (F), German (G) or Spanish (S))
(as of April 5, 2000)

Principes directeurs pour la conduite de l'examen des caractères
distinctifs, de l'homogénéité et de la stabilité ou leurs projets
(les documents de cette série sont trilingues (anglais, français et allemand = Tril.)
et/ou en versions séparées en anglais (E), français (F), espagnol (S) ou allemand (G))
(état au 5^e avril 2000)

Richtlinien und Entwürfe für Richtlinien für die Durchführung der Prüfung auf
Unterscheidbarkeit, Homogenität und Beständigkeit
(Die Dokumente dieser Serie sind dreisprachig (englisch, französisch und deutsch = Tril.) und/oder in getrennten Fassungen
in englischer (E), französischer (F), deutscher (G) oder spanischer (S) Sprache abgefaßt)
(Stand vom 5. April 2000)

Directrices o directrices provisionales para la ejecución del examen
de la distinción, la homogeneidad y la estabilidad
(los documentos de esta serie existen en versión trilingüe (inglés, francés y alemán = Tril.)
y/o en versiones separadas en inglés (E), francés (F), alemán (G) o español (S))
(al 5 de abril de 2000)

Numerical Order of Test Guidelines[#]/
Principes directeurs dans l'ordre numérique[#]/
Numerische Anordnung der Prüfungsrichtlinien[#]/
Directrices de examen por orden numérico[#]

	Doc. No. No du doc. Dok.-Nr. Nº del doc.	Year/Language Année/Langue Jahr/Sprache Año/Idioma	English	Français	Deutsch	Español	Latin
*	TG/01/2	1979 E, F, G, S	General Introduction	Introduction générale	Allgemeine Ein- führung	Introducción general	
*	TG/02/6 + Corr.	1994 1999 Tril.	Maize	Maïs	Mais	Maíz	Zea mays L.
*	TG/03/11 + Corr.	1994 1996 Tril. + S	Wheat	Blé	Weizen	Trigo	Triticum aestivum L.
*	TG/04/7	1990 Tril.	Ryegrass	Ray-grass	Weidelgras	Raygrás	Lolium multiflorum Lam., L. perenne L. & hybrids/ hybrides/ Hybriden/ híbridos
*	TG/05/4	1985 Tril.	Red Clover	Trèfle violet	Rotklee	Trébol rojo	Trifolium pratense L.
-	TG/05/5		Red Clover (revision)	Trèfle violet (révision)	Rotklee (Revision)	Trébol rojo (revisión)	Trifolium pratense L.

* Adopted/Adoptés/Angenommen/Adoptados

+ , - , o: Not yet generally available/Pas encore officiellement disponible/Noch nicht offiziell verfügbar/No disponible oficialmente por el momento

+ Committee to adopt/Auprès du Comité technique pour adoption/Vom Technischen Ausschuß anzunehmen/Ante el Comité Técnico para su adopción

- Professional organizations to comment/Pour observations par les organisations professionnelles/Zuleitung an die Berufsverbände zur Stellungnahme/Para observaciones por las organizaciones profesionales

o In preparation or planned/En préparation ou prévus/In Vorbereitung oder geplant/En preparación o previstos

Reference numbers of Test Guidelines in alphabetical order of their English names are given at the end of this Annex/Les numéros de référence des principes directeurs d'examen en ordre alphabétique des noms français figurent à la fin de la présente annexe/Referenznummern der Prüfungsrichtlinien in alphabetischer Reihenfolge der deutschen Namen sind am Ende dieser Anlage angegeben/Los números de referencia de las Directrices para la ejecución del examen por orden alfabético de los nombres figuran al final del presente anexo.

	Doc. No. No du doc. Dok.-Nr. Nº del doc.	Year Année Jahr Año	English	Français	Deutsch	Español	Latin
*	TG/06/4	1988 Tril.	Lucerne	Luzerne	Luzerne	Alfalfa	Medicago sativa L., Medicago X varia Martyn
*	TG/07/9 + Corr.	1994 Tril.	Peas	Pois	Erbse	Guisante, Arveja	Pisum sativum L. sensu lato
*	TG/08/4 + Corr.	1984 1985 Tril.	Broad Bean, Field Bean	Fève, Féverole	Dicke Bohne, Ack- erbohne	Haba, Haboncillo	Vicia faba L.
°	TG/08/...?		Field Bean (revision)	Féverole (révision)	Ackerbohne (Revision)	Haboncillo (revisión)	Vicia faba L.
°	TG/...?		Broad Bean (revision)	Fève (révision)	Dicke Bohne (Revision)	Haba (revisión)	Vicia faba L.
*	TG/09/4	1988 Tril.	Runner Bean	Haricot d'Espagne	Prunkbohne	Judía escarlata	Phaseolus coccineus L.
*	TG/10/7	1988 Tril.	Euphorbia Fulgens	Euphorbia fulgens	Korallenranke	Euforbia	Euphorbia fulgens Karw. ex Klotzsch
*	TG/11/7	1990 Tril.	Rose	Rosier	Rose	Rosal	Rosa L.
*	TG/12/8 + Corr.	1994 1995 Tril.	French Bean	Haricot	Bohne	Judía común, Frijol, Poroto	Phaseolus vulgaris L.
*	TG/13/7	1993 Tril.	Lettuce	Laitue	Salat	Lechuga	Lactuca sativa L.
°	TG/13/...?		Lettuce (revision)	Laitue (révision)	Salat (Revision)	Lechuga (revisión)	Lactuca sativa L.
*	TG/14/5	1986 Tril.	Apple (only for ornamental varieties)	Pommier (seulement pour variétés ornementa- les)	Apfel (nur für Ziersorten)	Manzano (únicamente para variedades ornamentales)	Malus Mill.
°	TG/...?		Apple (ornamental varieties) (revision)	Pommier (variétés ornamentales) (révision)	Apfel (Ziersorten) (Revision)	Manzano (variedades ornamentales) (revisión)	Malus Mill.
*	TG/14/8	1995 Tril.	Apple (fruit varieties)	Pommier (variétés fruitières)	Apfel (Fruchtsorten)	Manzano (variedades frutales)	Malus Mill.
*	TG/15/3	2000 E, F, G, S	Pear	Poirier	Birne	Peral	Pyrus communis L.
*	TG/16/4	1985 Tril.	Rice	Riz	Reis	Arroz	Oryza sativa L.
-	TG/16/5 (proj.)		Rice (revision)	Riz (révision)	Reis (Revision)	Arroz (revisión)	Oryza sativa L.
*	TG/17/5 + Corr.	1994 1996 Tril.	African Violet	Saintpaulia	Usambaraveilchen	Saintpaulia	Saintpaulia ionantha H. Wendl.
*	TG/18/4	1986 Tril.	Elatior Begonia	Bégonia elatior	Elatior-Begonie	Begonia elatior	Begonia- Elatiorhybrids/ hybrides/ Hybriden/ híbridos, Syn.: Begonia X hiemalis Fotsch
*	TG/19/10	1994 1996 Tril.	Barley	Orge	Gerste	Cebada	Hordeum vulgare L. sensu lato

	Doc. No. No du doc. Dok.-Nr. Nº del doc.	Year Année Jahr Año	English	Français	Deutsch	Español	Latin
*	TG/20/10	1994 Tril.	Oats	Avoine	Hafer	Avena	<i>Avena sativa</i> L. & <i>Avena nuda</i> L.
*	TG/21/7	1981 Tril.	Poplar	Peuplier	Pappel	Alamo	<i>Populus</i> L.
*	TG/22/9	1995 Tril.	Strawberry	Fraisier	Erdbeere	Fresa, Frutilla	<i>Fragaria</i> L.
*	TG/23/5	1986 Tril. + S	Potato	Pomme de terre	Kartoffel	Patata, Papa	<i>Solanum tuberosum</i> L.
*	TG/24/5	1981 Tril.	Poinsettia	Poinsettia	Poinsettie	Flor de Pascua	<i>Euphorbia pulcherrima</i> Willd. ex Klotzsch
°	TG/24/...?		Poinsettia (revision)	Poinsettia (révision)	Poinsettie (Revision)	Flor de Pascua (revisión)	<i>Euphorbia pulcherrima</i> Willd. ex Klotzsch
*	TG/25/8	1990 Tril.	Carnation (vegetatively- propagated varieties)	Oeillet (variétés à multi- plication végétative)	Nelke (vegetativ vermehrte Sorten)	Clavel (variedades de mul- tiplicación vegeta- tiva)	<i>Dianthus</i> L.
*	TG/26/4	1979 Tril.	Chrysanthemum (Perennial)	Chrysanthème (vivace)	Chrysantheme (mehnjährig)	Crisantemo (perenne)	<i>Chrysanthemum spec.</i>
°	TG/26/...?		Chrysanthemum (Perennial) (revision)	Chrysanthème (vivace) (révision)	Chrysantheme (mehnjährig) (Revision)	Crisantemo (perenne) (revisión)	<i>Chrysanthemum spec.</i>
*	TG/27/6	1984 Tril.	Freesia (vegetatively- propagated varieties)	Freesia (variétés à multi- plication végétative)	Freesie (vegetativ vermehrte Sorten)	Fresia (variedades de mul- tiplicación vegeta- tiva)	<i>Freesia</i> Eckl. ex Klatt
*	TG/28/8	1987 Tril.	Zonal Pelargonium, Ivy-leaved Pelar- gonium	Pélargonium zonale, Géranium- lierre	Zonalpelargonie, Efeupelargonie	Geranio	<i>Pelargonium zonale</i> hort. non (L.) L'Hérit. ex Ait., <i>P. peltatum</i> hort. non (L.) L'Hérit. ex Ait.
*	TG/29/6	1987 Tril.	Alstroemeria	Alstroemère	Inkalilie	Alstroemeria	<i>Alstroemeria</i> L.
*	TG/30/6	1990 Tril.	Bent	Agrostide	Straußgras	Agrostis	<i>Agrostis</i> spp.
*	TG/31/6	1984 Tril.	Cocksfoot	Dactyle	Knautgras	Dactilo	<i>Dactylis glomerata</i> L.
°	TG/31/...?		Cocksfoot (revision)	Dactyle (révision)	Knautgras (Revision)	Dactilo (revisión)	<i>Dactylis glomerata</i> L.
*	TG/32/6	1988 Tril.	Common Vetch	Vesce commune	Saatwicke	Veza común	<i>Vicia sativa</i> L.
*	TG/33/6	1990 Tril.	Kentucky Bluegrass	Pâturin des prés	Wiesenrispe	Poa de los prados	<i>Poa pratensis</i> L.
*	TG/34/6	1984 Tril.	Timothy	Fléole	Lieschgras	Fleo	<i>Phleum pratense</i> L. & <i>Phleum bertolonii</i> DC.
*	TG/35/6	1995 Tril.	Cherry	Cerisier	Kirsche	Cerezo	<i>Prunus avium</i> (L.) L., <i>P. cerasus</i> L.
*	TG/36/6	1996 E, F, G, S	Rape Seed	Colza	Raps	Colza	<i>Brassica napus</i> L. oleifera
*	TG/37/7	1988 Tril.	Turnip, Turnip Rape	Navet, Navette	Herbst-, Mairübe, Rübsen	Nabo	<i>Brassica rapa</i> L.emend. Metzg.
-	TG/37/8 (proj.)		Turnip (revision)	Navet (révision)	Herbst-, Mairübe (Revision)	Nabo (revisión)	<i>Brassica rapa</i> L. var. <i>rapa</i> (L.) Thell.

	Doc. No. No du doc. Dok.-Nr. Nº del doc.	Year Année Jahr Año	English	Français	Deutsch	Español	Latin
°	TG/...?		Turnip Rape (revision)	Navette (révision)	Rübsen (Revision)	Nabina (revisión)	Brassica rapa L. var. silvestris (Lam.) Briggs.
*	TG/38/6	1985 Tril.	White Clover	Trèfle blanc	Weißklee	Trébol blanco	Trifolium repens L.
*	TG/39/6	1984 Tril.	Meadow Fescue, Tall Fescue	Fétuque des prés, Fétuque élevée	Wiesen-, Rohr- schwingel	Festuca de los pra- dos, Festuca alta	Festuca pratensis Huds. & Festuca arundinacea Schreb.
°	TG/39/...?		Meadow Fescue, Tall Fescue (revision)	Fétuque des prés, Fétuque élevée (révision)	Wiesen-, Rohr- schwingel (Revision)	Festuca de los pra- dos, Festuca alta (revisión)	Festuca pratensis Huds. & Festuca arundinacea Schreb.
*	TG/40/6	1989 Tril.	Black Currant	Cassis	Schwarze Johannis- beere	Grosellero negro (casis)	Ribes nigrum L.
*	TG/41/4	1977 Tril.	European Plum (fruit varieties, root- stocks excluded)	Prunier européen (variétés à fruits à l'exclusion des porte-greffes)	Pflaume (fruchttragende Sorten, Unterlagen ausgeschlossen)	Ciruelo europeo (variedades frutales, portainjertos exclu- idos)	Prunus domestica L. & Prunus insititia L.
°	TG/41/...?		European Plum (fruit varieties root- stocks excluded) (revision)	Prunier européen (variétés à fruits à l'exclusion des porte-greffes) (révision)	Pflaume (frucht- tragende Sorten, Unterlagen aus- geschlossen (Revision)	Ciruelo europeo (variedades frutales, portainjertos exclu- idos) (revisión)	Prunus domestica L. & Prunus insititia L.
*	TG/42/6	1995 Tril.	Rhododendron	Rhododendron	Rhododendron	Rododendro	Rhododendron L.
*	TG/43/6	1986 Tril.	Raspberry	Framboisier	Himbeere	Frambueso	Rubus idaeus L.
°	TG/43/...?		Raspberry (revision)	Framboisier (révision)	Himbeere (Revision)	Frambueso (revisión)	Rubus idaeus L.
*	TG/44/7	1992 Tril.	Tomato	Tomate	Tomate	Tomate	Lycopersicon lycopersicum (L.) Karst. ex. Farw.
–	TG/44/8 (proj.)		Tomato (revision)	Tomate (révision)	Tomate (Revision)	Tomate (revisión)	Lycopersicon lycopersicum (L.) Karst. ex. Farw.
*	TG/45/6	1995 Tril.	Cauliflower	Chou-fleur	Blumenkohl	Coliflor	Brassica oleracea L. convar. botrytis (L.) Alef. var. botrytis
*	TG/46/6	1999 E, F, G, S	Onion, Shallot	Oignon, Échalote	Zwiebel, Schalotte	Cebolla, Chalota	Allium cepa L., Allium ascalonicum L.
*	TG/47/5	1985 Tril.	Streptocarpus	Streptocarpus	Drehfrucht	Streptocarpus	Streptocarpus X hybridus Voss
*	TG/48/6	1992 Tril.	Cabbage	Chou pommé	Kopfkohl	Col, Repollo	Brassica oleracea L. convar. capitata (L.) Alef.
*	TG/49/6	1990 Tril.	Carrot	Carotte	Möhre	Zanahoria	Daucus carota L.
*	TG/50/8	1999 E, F, G, S	Grapevine	Vigne	Rebe	Vid	Vitis L.
*	TG/51/6	1987 Tril.	Gooseberry	Groseillier à maquereau	Stachelbeere	Grosellero espinoso	Ribes uva-crispa L.
*	TG/52/5	1990 Tril.	Red and White Currant	Groseillier à grappes	Rote und Weiße Johannisbeere	Grosellero rojo y blanco	Ribes sylvestre (Lam.) Mert. & W.O.J. Koch (Syn. Ribes rubrum L.), R. niveum Lindl.

	Doc. No. No du doc. Dok.-Nr. Nº del doc.	Year Année Jahr Año	English	Français	Deutsch	Español	Latin
*	TG/53/6	1995 Tril.	Peach, Nectarine	Pêcher, Nectarinier	Pfirsich, Nektarine	Melocotonero, Duraznero, Nectarino	Prunus persica (L.) Batsch
*	TG/54/6	1990 Tril.	Brussels Sprouts	Chou de Bruxelles	Rosenkohl	Col de Bruselas	Brassica oleracea L. convar. oleracea var. gemmifera DC.
*	TG/55/6	1996 E, F, G, S.	Spinach	Epinard	Spinat	Espinaca	Spinacia oleracea L.
*	TG/56/3	1978 Tril.	Almond	Amandier	Mandel	Almendro	Prunus amygdalus Batsch
*	TG/57/6	1995 Tril.	Flax, Linseed	Lin	Lein	Lino	Linum usitatissimum L.
*	TG/58/6	1999 E, F, G, S	Rye	Seigle	Roggen	Centeno	Secale cereale L.
*	TG/59/6	1991 Tril.	Lily	Lis	Lilie	Lirio	Lilium L.
*	TG/60/6	1996 E, F, G, S	Beetroot	Betterave rouge	Rote Rübe	Remolacha de mesa	Beta vulgaris L. var. conditiva Alef.
*	TG/61/6 + Corr.	1993 Tril.	Cucumber, Gherkin	Concombre, Cornichon	Gurken	Pepino, Pepinillo	Cucumis sativus L.
*	TG/62/6	1999 E, F, G, S	Rhubarb	Rhubarbe	Rhabarber	Ruibarbo	Rheum rhabarbarum L.
*	TG/63/6	1999 E, F, G, S	Black Radish	Radis d'été, d'automne et d'hiver	Rettich	Rábano negro	Raphanus sativus L. var. niger (Mill.) S. Kerner
*	TG/64/6	1999 E, F, G, S	Radish	Radis de tous les mois	Radieschen	Rabanito	Raphanus sativus L. var. sativus Pers.
*	TG/65/3	1980 Tril.	Kohlrabi	Chou-rave	Kohlrabi	Col rábano	Brassica oleracea L. var. gongyloides L.
°	TG/65/...?		Kohlrabi (revision)	Chou-rave (révision)	Kohlrabi (Revision)	Col rábano (revisión)	Brassica oleracea L. var. gongyloides L.
*	TG/66/3	1979 Tril.	Lupins	Lupins	Lupinen	Altramuces	Lupinus albus L., L. angustifolius L., L. luteus L.
*	TG/67/4	1980 Tril.	Sheep's Fescue (including Hard Fescue), Red Fescue	Fétuque ovine (y compris Fétuque durette), Fétuque rouge	Schafschwingel (einschließlich Härtlicher Schwin- gel), Rotschwingel	Festuca ovina (incluida Cañuela), Festuca roja	Festuca ovina L. sensu lato & F. rubra L.
*	TG/68/3	1979 Tril.	Berberis (vegetatively- propagated)	Berberis (à multiplication végétative)	Berberitze (vegetativ ver- mehrte)	Berberis (de multiplicación vegetativa)	Berberis L.
*	TG/69/3	1979 Tril.	Forsythia	Forsythia	Forsythie	Forsythia	Forsythia Vahl
*	TG/70/3 + Corr.	1979 1990 Tril.	Apricot	Abricotier	Aprikose	Albaricoquero, Damasco	Prunus armeniaca L.
°	TG/70/...?		Apricot (revision)	Abricotier (révision)	Aprikose (Revision)	Albaricoquero (revisión)	Prunus armeniaca L.
*	TG/71/3	1979 Tril.	Hazelnut	Noisetier	Haselnuß	Avellano	Corylus avellana L. & C. maxima Mill.
*	TG/72/4	1985 Tril.	Willow (tree varieties only)	Saule (variétés arborescentes seulement)	Weide (nur Sorten von Baumweide)	Sauce (únicamente varie- dades de árboles)	Salix L.

	Doc. No. No du doc. Dok.-Nr. Nº del doc.	Year Année Jahr Año	English	Français	Deutsch	Español	Latin
*	TG/73/6	1988 Tril.	Blackberry	Ronce fruitière	Brombeere	Zarza, Zorzamora	Rubus subgenus Eubatus Sect. Moriferi & Ursini & hybrids/ hybrides/Hybriden/ híbridos
*	TG/74/3	1980 Tril.	Celeriac	Céleri-rave	Knollensellerie	Apio nabo	Apium graveolens L. var. rapaceum (Mill.) Gaud.
°	TG/74/...?		Celeriac (revision)	Céleri-rave (révision)	Knollensellerie (Revision)	Apio nabo (revisión)	Apium graveolens L. var. rapaceum (Mill.) Gaud.
*	TG/75/6	1998 E, F, G, S	Cornsalad	Mâche	Feldsalat	Hierba de los canónigos	Valerianella locusta L. & V. eriocarpa Desv.
*	TG/76/7	1994 Tril.	Sweet Pepper	Piment	Paprika	Pimiento	Capsicum annum L.
*	TG/77/9	2000 E, F, G, S	Gerbera	Gerbera	Gerbera	Gerbera	Gerbera Cass.
*	TG/78/3 + Add.	1980 1994 Tril.	Kalanchoe (vegetatively- propagated)	Kalanchoë (à multiplication végétative)	Kalanchoe (vegetativ vermehrte)	Kalanchoe (de multiplicación vegetativa)	Kalanchoë A. Adans.
*	TG/79/3	1980 Tril.	White Cedar	Thuya du Canada	Lebensbaum	Tuya	Thuya occidentalis L.
*	TG/80/6	1998 E, F, G, S	Soya Bean	Soja	Sojabohne	Soja, Soya	Glycine max (L.) Merrill
*	TG/81/6	2000 E, F, G, S	Sunflower	Tournesol	Sonnenblume	Girasol	Helianthus annuus L. & Helianthus debilis Nutt.
*	TG/82/3	1982 Tril.	Celery	Céleri-branche	Bleichsellerie	Apio	Apium graveolens L. var. dulce (Mill.) Pers.
°	TG/82/...?		Celery (revision)	Céleri-branche (révision)	Bleichsellerie (Revision)	Apio (revisión)	Apium graveolens L. var. dulce (Mill.) Pers.
*	TG/83/3	1982 Tril.	Citrus (varieties of Oranges, Mandarins, Lemons and Grapefruit; excluding rootstock varieties)	Agrumes (variétés d'oranger, de mandarinier, de citronnier et de limetier, de pomélo; à l'exclusion des variétés porte- greffes)	Zitrus (Sorten von Orange, Mandarine, Zitrone und Grapefruit; Unterlagssorten ausgeschlossen)	Cítricos (variedades de naranja, manda rino, limonero, limero y pomelo; excepto las variedades portainjertos)	Citrus L.
°	TG/83/...?		Citrus (varieties of Oranges, Mandarins, Lemons and Grape-fruit; excluding rootstock varieties) (revision)	Agrumes (variétés d'oranger, de mandarinier, de citronnier et de limetier, de pomélo; à l'exclusion des variétés porte- greffes) (révision)	Zitrus (Sorten von Orange, Mandarine, Zitrone und Grapefruit; Unterlagssorten ausgeschlossen) (Revision)	Cítricos (variedades de naranja, mandarino, limonero, limero y pomelo; excepto las variedades portainjertos) (revisión)	Citrus L.
*	TG/84/3	1982 Tril.	Japanese Plum (fruit varieties only)	Prunier japonais (variétés à fruits seulement)	Ostasiatische Pflaume (nur fruchttragende Sorten)	Ciruelo japonés (variedades frutales únicamente)	Prunus salicina Lindl. & other diploid plums/ autres pruniers diploides/ andere diploide Pflaumensorten/otros ciruelos diploides

	Doc. No. No du doc. Dok.-Nr. Nº del doc.	Year Année Jahr Año	English	Français	Deutsch	Español	Latin
*	TG/85/6	1999 E, F, G, S	Leek	Poireau	Porree	Puerro	Allium porrum L.
*	TG/86/5	1995 Tril.	Anthurium	Anthurium	Flamingoblume	Anthurium	Anthurium Schott
*	TG/87/2	1983 Tril.	Narcissi (including Daffodils)	Narcisse, Jonquille	Narzisse	Narciso	Narcissus L.
*	TG/88/3	1985 Tril.	Cotton	Cotonnier	Baumwolle	Algodón	Gossypium L.
-	TG/88/4 (proj.)		Cotton (revision)	Cotonnier (révision)	Baumwolle (Revision)	Algodón (revisión)	Gossypium L.
*	TG/89/3	1984 Tril.	Swede	Chou-navet Rutabaga	Kohlrübe	Colinabo	Brassica napus L. var. napobrassica (L.) Rchb.
-	TG/89/4 (proj.)		Swede (revision)	Chou-navet Rutabaga (révision)	Kohlrübe (Revision)	Colinabo (revisión)	Brassica napus L. var. napobrassica (L.) Rchb.
*	TG/90/3	1984 Tril.	Curly Kale	Chou frisé	Grünkohl	Berza	Brassica oleracea L. var. sabellica L.
-	TG/90/4 (proj.)		Curly Kale (revision)	Chou frisé (révision)	Grünkohl (Revision)	Berza (revisión)	Brassica oleracea L. convar. acephala (DC.) Alef
*	TG/91/3	1984 Tril.	Crown of Thorns	Epine du Christ	Christusdom	Azofaifa de la esquina de Cristo	Euphorbia milii Desmoulins & its hybrids/ses hybrides/ seine Hybriden/sus híbridos
*	TG/92/3	1984 Tril.	Persimmon (fruit varieties only)	Kaki (seulement variétés fruitières)	Kaki (nur Obstsorten)	Caqui (únicamente variedades frutales)	Diospyros kaki L.
°	TG/92/...?		Persimmon (fruit varieties only) (revision)	Kaki (seulement variétés fruitières) (révision)	Kaki (nur Obstsorten) (Revision)	Caqui (únicamente variedades frutales) (revisión)	Diospyros kaki L.
*	TG/93/3	1985 Tril.	Groundnut	Arachide	Erdnuß	Cacahuete, Maní	Arachis L.
*	TG/94/3	1985 Tril.	Ling, Scotch Heather	Callune	Besenheide	Calluna	Calluna vulgaris (L.) Hull
-	TG/94/4 (proj.)		Ling, Scotch Heather (revision)	Callune (révision)	Besenheide (Revision)	Calluna (revisión)	Calluna vulgaris (L.) Hull
*	TG/95/3	1985 Tril.	Lagerstroemia	Lagerstroemia	Lagerstroemia	Lagerstroemia	Lagerstroemia indica L.
*	TG/96/4	1995 Tril.	Norway Spruce (ornamental varieties)	Epicéa commun (variétés ornementales)	Gemeine Fichte (Ziersorten)	Abeto, Picea común (variedades ornamentales)	Picea abies (L.) Karst.
*	TG/97/3	1985 Tril.	Avocado	Avocatier	Avocado	Aguacate, Palta	Persea americana Mill.
°	TG/97/...?		Avocado (revision)	Avocatier (révision)	Avocado (Revision)	Aguacate, Palta (revisión)	Persea americana Mill.
*	TG/98/3	1985 Tril.	Kiwifruit	Actinidia	Kiwi	Kiwi	Actinidia chinensis Pl.
-	TG/98/4 (proj.)		Actinidia (revision)	Actinidia (révision)	Actinidia (Revision)	Actinidia (revisión)	Actinidia Lindl.

	Doc. No. No du doc. Dok.-Nr. Nº del doc.	Year Année Jahr Año	English	Français	Deutsch	Español	Latin
*	TG/99/3	1985 Tril.	Olive (vegetatively-propagated fruit varieties)	Olivier (variétés fruitières à multiplication végétative)	Olive (vegetativ vermehrte Sorten zur Fruchterzeugung)	Olivo (variedades frutales de multiplicación vegetativa)	Olea europaea L.
*	TG/100/3	1985 Tril.	Quince (fruit varieties and rootstock varieties)	Cognassier (variétés fruitières et variétés portegreffes)	Quitte (Sorten zur Fruchterzeugung und Unterlagssorten)	Membrillero (variedades frutales y variedades portainjertos)	Cydonia Mill. sensu stricto
°	TG/100/...?		Quince (fruit varieties and rootstock varieties) (revision)	Cognassier (variétés fruitières et variétés portegreffes) (révision)	Quitte (Sorten zur Fruchterzeugung und Unterlagssorten) (Revision)	Membrillero (variedades frutales y variedades portainjertos) (revisión)	Cydonia Mill. sensu stricto
*	TG/101/3	1987 Tril.	Christmas Cactus	Cactus de Noël	Weihnachtskaktus	Cactus de Navidad	Schlumbergera Lem. including/y compris/ einschließlich/incluid o Zygocactus K. Schum.
*	TG/102/3	1986 Tril.	Impatiens	Impatiente	Impatiens	Impatiens	Impatiens L.
°	TG/102/...?		Impatiens (revision)	Impatiente (révision)	Impatiens (Revision)	Impatiens (revisión)	Impatiens L.
*	TG/103/3	1986 Tril.	Juniper	Genévrier	Wacholder	Enebro	Juniperus L.
*	TG/104/4 + Add.	1987 1988 Tril.	Melon	Melon	Melone	Melón	Cucumis melo L.
*	TG/105/3	1987 Tril.	Chinese Cabbage	Chou chinois	Chinakohl	Repollo chino	Brassica pekinensis L.
°	TG/105/...?		Chinese Cabbage (revision)	Chou chinois (révision)	Chinakohl (Revision)	Repollo chino (revisión)	Brassica pekinensis L.
*	TG/106/3	1987 Tril.	Leaf Beet	Poirée	Mangold	Acelga	Beta vulgaris L. var. vulgaris L.
*	TG/107/3	1988 Tril.	Tuberous Begonia Hybrids	Bégonia tubéreux hybride	Knollenbegonie	Begonia tuberosa	Begonia X tuberhybrida Voss
*	TG/108/3	1988 Tril.	Gladiolus	Glaïeul	Gladiole	Gladiolo	Gladiolus L.
*	TG/109/3	1987 Tril.	Regal Pelargonium	Pélargonium des fleuristes	Edelpelargonie	Pelargonio	Pelargonium grandiflorum hort. non Willd.
*	TG/110/3	1987 Tril.	Guava	Goyavier	Guave	Guayabo	Psidium guajava L.
*	TG/111/3	1987 Tril.	Macadamia	Macadamia	Macadamia	Macadamia	Macadamia integrifolia Maiden et Betche; M. tetraphylla L.A.S. Johnsten
*	TG/112/3	1987 Tril.	Mango (revision)	Manguier (révision)	Mango (Revision)	Mango (revisión)	Mangifera indica L.
°	TG/112/...?		Mango	Manguier	Mango	Mango	Mangifera indica L.
*	TG/113/2	1987 Tril.	Easter Cactus	Cactusjonc	Osterkaktus	Cactus de Pascua	Rhipsalidopsis Britt. et Rose, including/y compris/einschließlic h/ incluido Epiphylopsis Berger
*	TG/114/3	1988 Tril.	Exacum	Exacum	Exacum	Exacum	Exacum L.

	Doc. No. No du doc. Dok.-Nr. Nº del doc.	Year Année Jahr Año	English	Français	Deutsch	Español	Latin
*	TG/115/3	1988 Tril.	Tulip	Tulipe	Tulpe	Tulipán	Tulipa L.
*	TG/116/3	1988 Tril.	Black Salsify, Scorzonera	Salsifis noir, Scorsonère	Schwarzwurzel	Escorzonera, Salsifi negro	Scorzonera hispanica L.
*	TG/117/3	1988 Tril.	Egg Plant	Aubergine	Aubergine, Eier- frucht	Berenjena	Solanum melongena L.
*	TG/118/3	1988 Tril.	Endive	Chicorée (frisée, Scarole)	Endivie	Escarola	Cichorium endivia L.
*	TG/119/3	1988 Tril.	Vegetable Marrow, Squash	Courgette	Gartenkürbis, Zucchini	Calabacín, Zapallito alargado	Cucurbita pepo L.
°	TG/119/...?		Vegetable Marrow, Squash (revision)	Courgette (révision)	Gartenkürbis, Zucchini (Revision)	Calabacín, Zapallito alargado (revisión)	Cucurbita pepo L.
*	TG/120/3	1988 Tril.	Durum Wheat	Blé dur	Hartweizen	Trigo duro	Triticum durum Desf.
*	TG/121/3	1989 Tril.	Triticale	Triticale	Triticale	Triticale	X Triticosecale Witt.
*	TG/122/3	1989 Tril.	Sorghum	Sorgho	Mohrenhirse	Sorgo	Sorghum bicolor L.
*	TG/123/3	1989 Tril.	Banana	Bananier	Banane	Platanera	Musa acuminata Colla
*	TG/124/3	1989 Tril.	Chestnut	Châtaignier	Kastanie	Castaño	Castanea sativa Mill.
*	TG/125/6	1999 E, F, G, S	Walnut	Noyer	Walnuß	Nogal	Juglans regia L.
*	TG/126/4	1990 Tril.	Lachenalia	Lachenalia	Lachenalia	Lachenalia	Lachenalia Jacq. f. ex Murray
*	TG/127/3	1990 Tril.	Leucadendron	Leucadendron	Leucadendron	Leucadendron	Leucadendron R. Br.
*	TG/128/3	1990 Tril.	Leucospermum	Leucospermum	Leucospermum	Leucospermum	Leucospermum R. Br.
*	TG/129/3	1989 Tril.	Protea	Protea	Protea	Protea	Protea L.
*	TG/130/3	1990 Tril.	Asparagus	Asperge	Spargel	Espárrago	Asparagus officinalis L.
*	TG/131/3	1990 Tril.	Chincherinchee	Ornithogale	Milchstern	Ornithogalum	Ornithogalum L.
*	TG/132/4	1992 Tril.	Dieffenbachia	Dieffenbachia	Dieffenbachia	Dieffenbachia	Dieffenbachia Schott
*	TG/133/3	1991 Tril.	Hydrangea	Hortensia	Hortensie	Hortensia	Hydrangea L.
*	TG/134/3	1990 Tril.	Safflower	Carthame	Saflor	Cártamo	Carthamus tinctorius L.
*	TG/135/3	1990 Tril.	Spathiphyllum	Spathiphyllum	Spathiphyllum	Spathiphyllum	Spathiphyllum Schott
*	TG/136/4	1991 Tril.	Parsley	Persil	Petersilie	Perejil	Petroselinum crispum (Mill.) Nym. ex A.W. Hill
*	TG/137/3	1991 Tril.	Blueberry	Myrtille	Kulturheidelbeere	Arándano americano	Vaccinium corymbosum L., Vaccinium myrtillus L.

	Doc. No. No du doc. Dok.-Nr. N° del doc.	Year Année Jahr Año	English	Français	Deutsch	Español	Latin
*	TG/138/3	1991 Tril.	Jostaberry	Caseillier	Jostabeere	Grosellero	Ribes nidigrolaria R. & A. Bauer
*	TG/139/3	1991 Tril.	Lingonberry	Airelle rouge	Preiselbeere	Arándano encarnado	Vaccinium vitis-idaea L.
*	TG/140/3	1991 Tril.	Pot Azalea	Azalée en pot	Topfazalee	Azalea	Rhododendron simsii Planch.
*	TG/141/3	1992 Tril.	Aster	Aster	Aster	Aster	Aster L.
*	TG/142/3	1993 Tril.	Watermelon	Pastèque	Wassermelone	Sandía	Citrullus lanatus (Thunb.) Matsum. et Nakai
*	TG/143/3	1993 Tril.	Chick-Pea	Pois chiche	Kichererbse	Garbanzo	Cicer arietinum L.
*	TG/144/3	1993 Tril.	Evening Primrose	Oenothère, Onagre	Nachtkerze	Onagra	Oenothera L.
*	TG/145/2	1994 Tril.	Gentian	Gentiane	Enzian	Genciana	Gentiana L.
*	TG/146/2	1994 Tril.	Nerine	Nerine	Nerine	Nerine	Nerine Herb.
*	TG/147/2	1994 Tril.	Pyracantha, Firethorn	Pyracantha, Buisson Ardent	Feuerdorn	Espino de fuego	Pyracantha M.J. Roem.
*	TG/148/2	1994 Tril.	Weigela	Weigela	Weigelia	Weigela	Weigela Thunb.
*	TG/149/2	1994 Tril.	Japanese Pear	Poirier japonais	Japanische Birne	Peral japonés	Pyrus pyrifolia (Burm. F.) Nakai var. cultu (Mak.) Nakai
*	TG/150/3	1994 Tril.	Fodder Beet	Betterave fourragère	Runkelrübe	Remolacha forrajera	Beta vulgaris L.
*	TG/151/3	1995 Tril.	Sprouting Broccoli, Calabrese	Brocoli	Brokkoli	Brócoli	Brassica oleracea L. convar. botrytis (L.) Alef. var. cymosa Duch. including/y compris/ einschließ- lich/ incluyendo Brassica oleracea L. convar botrytis (L.) Alef. var. italica
*	TG/152/3	1995 Tril.	Chamomile	Camomille	Kamille	Manzanilla	Chamomilla recutita (L.) Rauschert
*	TG/153/3	1996 E, F, G, S	Ginger	Gingembre	Ingwer	Jengibre	Zingiber officinale Rosc.
*	TG/154/3	1996 E, F, G, S	Leaf chicory	Chicorée à feuille (sauvage)	Blattzichorie	Achicoria de hoja	Cichorium intybus L. partim
*	TG/155/3	1996 E, F, G, S	Pumpkin	Potiron, Giraumon	Riesenkürbis	Calabaza, Zapallo	Cucurbita maxima Duch.
*	TG/156/3	1996 E, F, G, S	Firelily	Cyrtanthus	Cyrtanthus	Cyrtanthus	Cyrtanthus Ait.
*	TG/157/3	1996 E, F, G, S	Serruria	Serruria	Serruria	Serruria	Serruria Salisb.
*	TG/158/3	1998 E, F, G, S	Bouvardia	Bouvardia	Bouvardia	Bouvardia	Bouvardia Salisb.
*	TG/159/3	1998 E, F, G, S	Loquat	Néflier du Japon	Japanische Mispel, Loquat	Nispero	Eriobotrya japonica (Thunb.) Lindl.
*	TG/160/3	1998 E, F, G, S	Mume (Japanese Apricot)	Abricotier japonais	Japanische Aprikose	Albaricoquero japonés	Prunus mume Sieb. et Zucc.

	Doc. No. No du doc. Dok.-Nr. Nº del doc.	Year Année Jahr Año	English	Français	Deutsch	Español	Latin
*	TG/161/3	1998 E, F, G, S	Welsh Onion, Japanese Bunching Onion	Ciboule	Winterzwiebel	Cebolleta	Allium fistulosum L.
-	TG/162/2 (proj.)		Garlic	Ail	Knoblauch	Ajo	Allium sativum L.
*	TG/163/3	1999 E, F, G, S	Apple Rootstocks	Porte-greffes du pommier	Apfel-Unterlagen	Portainjertos de manzano	Malus Mill.
*	TG/164/3	1999 E, F, G, S	Cymbidium	Cymbidium	Cymbidie	Cymbidium	Cymbidium Sw.
*	TG/165/3	1999 E, F, G, S	Dill	Aneth	Dill	Eneldo	Anethum graveolens L.
*	TG/166/3	1999 E, F, G, S	Opium/Seed Poppy	Pavot	Mohn	Adormidera, Ama- pola	Papaver somniferum L.
*	TG/167/3	1999 E, F, G, S	Okra	Okra	Okra	Ocra	Abelmoschus esculentus (L.) Moench.
*	TG/168/3	1999 E, F, G, S	Statice	Limonium, Statice	Statice	Limonium	Limonium Mill., Goniolimon Boiss., Psylliostachys (Jaub. & Spach) Nevski
*	TG/169/3 + Corr.	1999 2000 E, F, G, S	Pyrus Rootstocks	Porte-greffes de pyrus	Pyrus-Unterlagen	Portainjertos de pyrus	Pyrus L.
-	TG/170/2 (proj.)		Subterranean Clover	Trèfle souterrain	Bodenfrüchtiger Klee	Trébol subterráneo	Trifolium subterraneum, incl. ssp. subterraneum, ssp. yannicum & ssp. brachycalycinum
*	TG/171/3	1999 E, F, G, S	Weeping Fig	Ficus benjamina	Birkenfeige	Ficus benjamina	Ficus benjamina L.
-	TG/172/2 (proj.)	2000 E, F, G, S	Industrial Chicory	Chicorée industrielle	Wurzelzichorie	Achicoria	Cichorium intybus L. partim
*	TG/173/3	2000 E, F, G, S	Witloof, Chicory	Chicorée, Endive	Chicorée	Endivia	Cichorium intybus L. partim
*	TG/174/3	2000 E, F, G, S	Iris (bulbous)	Iris (bulbeux)	Iris (zwiebel- bildende)	Lirio (bulboso)	Iris L.
*	TG/175/3	2000 E, F, G, S	Kangaroo Paw	Anigosanthos de Mangles	Kängurublume	Anigozanthos	Anigozanthos Labill.
*	TG/176/3	2000 E, F, G, S	Osteospermum	Osteospermum	Osteospermum	Osteospermum	Osteospermum ecklonis (DC) Norl.
-	TG/177/1 (proj.)		Zantedeschia	Calla	Kalla, Zantedeschia	Cala	Zantedeschia Spreng.
-	TG/178/1 (proj.)		Fodder Radish	Radis oléifère, Radis chinois	Ölrettich	Rábano oleaginoso	Rhaphanus sativus L. var. oleiformis Pers.
-	TG/179/1 (proj.)		White Mustard	Moutarde blanche	Weisser Senf	Mostaza blanca	Sinapis alba L.
-	TG/180/1 (proj.)		Rescue Grass, Alaska Brome- Grass	Brome cathartique Brome sitchensis	Horntrespe, Alaska- Trespe	Cebadilla, Triguillo, Bromo	Bromus catharticus Vahl, Bromus sitchensis Trin., Bromus auleticus Trin.
-	TG/181/1 (proj.)		Amaryllis	Amaryllis	Amaryllis	Amarilis	Hippeastrum Herb.
-	TG/182/1 (proj.)		Guzmania	Guzmania	Guzmania	Guzmania	Guzmania Ruiz et Pav.

	Doc. No. No du doc. Dok.-Nr. Nº del doc.	Year Année Jahr Año	English	Français	Deutsch	Español	Latin
-	TG/183/1 (proj.)		Fennel	Fenouil	Fenchel	Hinojo	Foeniculum vulgare Miller
-	TG/184/1 (proj.)		Globe Artichoke	Artichaut	Artischoke	Alcachofa, Alcaucil	Cynara scolymus L.

Test Guidelines in preparation or planned
for which no reference number has been assigned yet

Principes directeurs en préparation ou prévus
qui n'ont pas encore reçu de numéros de référence

Prüfungsrichtlinien in Vorbereitung oder geplant,
die noch keine Referenznummer erhalten haben

Directrices de examen en preparación o previstos
que no han recibido todavía un número de referencia

Doc. No. No du doc. Dok.-Nr. Nº del doc.	Year Année Jahr Año	English	Français	Deutsch	Español	Latin
°		Basil	Basilic	Basilikum	Albahaca	Ocimum basilicum L.
°		Bracteantha, Everlasting	Immortelle à bractées	Gartenstrohblume	Siempreviva, Perpetua	Helichrysum bracteatum (Vent.) Andr.
°		Celosia	Celosie, Crête de Coq	Hahnenkamm	Cresta de gallo	Celosia L.
°		Clematis	Clématite	Waldrebe	Clemátide	Clematis L.
°		Cupressus	Cyprès	Zypresse	Ciprés	Cupressus L.
°		Dendrobium	Dendrobium	Dendrobium, Baumwucherer	Dendrobium	Dendrobium Nees
°		Eucalyptus gunnii	Eucalyptus gunnii	Eucalyptus gunnii	Eucalyptus gunnii	Eucalyptus gunnii
°		Eustoma, Prairie Gentian	Eustoma	Eustoma	Eustoma	Eustoma russellianum (Hook) G. Don
°		Fig	Figuier	Echte Feige	Higuera	Ficus carica
°		Horse Radish	Rainfort sauvage	Meerrettich	Rábano salvaje	Armoracia rusticana Gaertn., Mey. et Scherb.
°		Husk Tomato	Caqueret	Blaskirsche	Tomatillo	Physcalis ixocarpa Brot. ex. Hornem.
°		Lavender	Lavande vraie, Lavandins	Echter Lavendel, Lavendel	Lavanda, Lavendin	Lavandula angustifolia Mill., Lavandula x burnatii Briq.
°		Lentil	Lentille	Linse	Lenteja	Lens culinaris Medik.
°		Leptospermum	Leptosperme	Südseemyrte	Leptospermum	Leptospermum J.R. et Forst.
°		Lotus, Bird's Foot Trefoil	Lotier corniculé	Hornschotenklee	Lotus	Lotus corniculatus L.
°		Nerium Oleander, Rose Bay	Laurier rose, Nerium oléandre	Oleander	Adelfa, Laurel rosa	Nerium oleander L.
°		Passion Fruit, Granadilla	Barbadine	Passionsfrucht, Granadilla	Granadilla	Passiflora edulis Sims
°		Pentas	Pentas	Pentas	Pentas	Pentas lanceolata (Forsk.) K. Schum.
°		Petunia	Pétunia	Petunie	Petunia	Petunia Juss.
°		Prickly Pear (Opuntia)	Tuna	Feigenkaktus (Opuntie)	Tuna	Opuntia Mill.
°		Prunus Rootstocks	Porte-greffes de Prunus	Prunus-Unterlagen	Portainjertos de prunus	Prunus L.
°		Rosemary	Romarin officinal	Rosmarin	Romero, Rosmarino	Rosmarinus officinalis L.
°		Sugarcane	Canne à sucre	Zuckerrohr	Caña de azúcar	Saccharum officinarum L.

	Doc. No. No du doc. Dok.-Nr. Nº del doc.	Year Année Jahr Año	English	Français	Deutsch	Español	Latin
°			Tagetes, Marigold	Tagète, Oeillet d'Inde, Rose d'Inde	Sammetblume	Clavel de las Indias, Clavelán	Tagetes L.
°			Thyme	Thym	Thymian	Tomillo	Thymus L.
°			Tobacco	Tabac	Tabak	Tabaco	Nicotiana tabacum L.
°			Walnut Rootstocks	Porte-greffes du noyer	Walnuß- Unterlagen	Portainjertos de nogal	Juglans regia L.
°			Waxflower	Chamelaucium	Chamelaucium	Chamelaucium	Chamelaucium Desf.

**REFERENCE NUMBERS OF TEST GUIDELINES IN ALPHABETICAL
ORDER OF THEIR ENGLISH NAMES**

Actinidia	TG/98	Endive	TG/118	Loquat	TG/159
African Violet	TG/17	Euphorbia Fulgens	TG/10	Lotus	-
Alaska Brome-Grass	TG/180	European Plum	TG/41	Lucerne	TG/06
Almond	TG/56	Eustoma	-	Lupins	TG/66
Alstroemeria	TG/29	Eucalyptus gunnii	-	Macadamia	TG/111
Amaryllis	TG/181	Evening Primrose	TG/144	Maize	TG/02
Anthurium	TG/86	Everlasting	-	Mandarins	TG/83
Apple	TG/14	Exacum	TG/114	Mango	TG/112
Apple Rootstocks	TG/163	Fennel	TG/183	Marigold	-
Apricot	TG/70	Field Bean	TG/08	Meadow Fescue	TG/39
Artichoke	TG/184	Fig	-	Melon	TG/104
Arum-lily	-	Firelily	TG/156	Mume	TG/160
Asparagus	TG/130	Firethorn	TG/147	Narcissi	TG/87
Aster	TG/141	Flax	TG/57	Nectarine	TG/53
Avocado	TG/97	Fodder Beet	TG/150	Nerine	TG/146
Banana	TG/123	Fodder Radish	TG/178	Nerium oleander	-
Barley	TG/19	Forsythia	TG/69	Norway Spruce	TG/96
Basil	-	Freesia	TG/27	Oats	TG/20
Beetroot	TG/60	French Bean	TG/12	Okra	TG/167
Bent	TG/30	Garlic	TG/162	Oleander	-
Berberis	TG/68	General Introduction	TG/01	Olive	TG/99
Bird's Foot Trefoil	-	Gentian	TG/145	Onion	TG/46
Black Currant	TG/40	Gerbera	TG/77	Opium/Seed Poppy	TG/166
Black Radish	TG/63	Gherkin	TG/61	Oranges	TG/83
Black Salsify	TG/116	Ginger	TG/153	Opuntia	-
Blackberry	TG/73	Gladiolus	TG/108	Ornamental Apple	-
Blueberry	TG/137	Globe Artichoke	TG/184	Osteospermum	-
Bouvardia	TG/158	Gooseberry	TG/51	Paprika	TG/76
Bracteantha	-	Granadilla	-	Parsley	TG/136
Broad Bean	TG/08	Grapevine	TG/50	Passion Fruit	-
Broccoli	TG/151	Groundnut	TG/93	Peach	TG/53
Brome	-	Guava	TG/110	Pear	TG/15
Brussels Sprouts	TG/54	Guzmania	TG/182	Peas	TG/07
Bunching Onion	TG/161	Hard Fescue	TG/67	Pentas	-
Cabbage	TG/48	Hazelnut	TG/71	Persimmon	TG/92
Cardoon	-	Horse Radish	-	Petunia	-
Calabrese	TG/151	Hot Pepper	TG/76	Poinsettia	TG/24
Carnation	TG/25	Husk Tomato	-	Poplar	TG/21
Carrot	TG/49	Hydrangea	TG/133	Poppy, Opium/Seed	TG/166
Cauliflower	TG/45	Ifafa Lily	TG/156	Pot Azalea	TG/140
Celeriac	TG/74	Impatiens	TG/102	Potato	TG/23
Celery	TG/82	Industrial Chicory	TG/172	Prairae Gentian	-
Celosia	-	Iris	TG/174	Prickly Pear	-
Chamomile	TG/152	Ivy-leaved Pelargonium	TG/28	Protea	TG/129
Cherry	TG/35	Japanese Apricot	TG/160	Prunus Rootstocks	-
Chestnut	TG/124	Japanese Bunching Onion	TG/161	Pumpkin	TG/155
Chick-Pea	TG/143	Japanese Pear	TG/149	Pyracantha	TG/147
Chicory	-	Japanese Plum	TG/84	Pyrus Rootstocks	TG/169
Chinese Cabbage	TG/105	Jostaberry	TG/138	Quince	TG/100
Chincherinchee	TG/131	Juniper	TG/103	Radish	TG/64
Christmas Cactus	TG/101	Kalanchoe	TG/78	Rape Seed	TG/36
Chrysanthemum	TG/26	Kangaroo Paw	TG/175	Raspberry	TG/43
Citrus	TG/83	Kentucky Bluegrass	TG/33	Red Cabbage	TG/48
Clematis	-	Kiwifruit	TG/98	Red Clover	TG/05
Cocksfoot	TG/31	Kohlrabi	TG/65	Red Currant	TG/52
Common Vetch	TG/32	Lachenalia	TG/126	Red Fescue	TG/67
Cornsalad	TG/75	Lagerstroemia	TG/95	Regal Pelargonium	TG/109
Cotton	TG/88	Lavender	-	Rescue Grass	TG/180
Crown of Thorns	TG/91	Leaf Beet	TG/106	Rhododendron	TG/42
Cucumber	TG/61	Leaf Chicory	TG/154	Rhubarb	TG/62
Cucurbita maxima	-	Leek	TG/85	Rice	TG/16
Curly Kale	TG/90	Lemons	TG/83	Rose	TG/11
Cymbidium	TG/164	Lentil	-	Rose Bay	-
Cupressus	-	Leptospermum	-	Rosemary	-
Daffodils	TG/87	Lettuce	TG/13	Runner Bean	TG/09
Dendrobium	-	Leucadendron	TG/127	Rye	TG/58
Dieffenbachia	TG/132	Leucospermum	TG/128	Ryegrass	TG/04
Dill	TG/165	Lily	TG/59	Safflower	TG/134
Durum Wheat	TG/120	Limonium	TG/168	Savoy Cabbage	TG/48
Easter Cactus	TG/113	Ling	TG/94	Scorzonera	TG/116
Egg Plant	TG/117	Lingonberry	TG/139	Scotch Heather	TG/94
Elatior Begonia	TG/18	Linseed	TG/57	Sea Lavender	TG/168

Serruria.....	TG/157	Tagetes.....	-	Waxflower.....	-
Shallot.....	TG/46	Tall Fescue.....	TG/39	Weeping Fig.....	TG/171
Sheep's Fescue.....	TG/67	Thyme.....	-	Weigela.....	TG/148
Sorghum.....	TG/122	Timothy.....	TG/34	Welsh Onion.....	TG/161
Soya Bean.....	TG/80	Tobacco.....	-	Wheat.....	TG/03
Spathiphyllum.....	TG/135	Tomato.....	TG/44	White Cabbage.....	TG/48
Spinach.....	TG/55	Triticale.....	TG/121	White Cedar.....	TG/79
Sprouting Broccoli.....	TG/151	Tuberous Begonia		White Clover.....	TG/38
Squash.....	TG/119	Hybrids.....	TG/107	White Currant.....	TG/52
Statice.....	TG/168	Tulip.....	TG/115	White Mustard.....	TG/179
Strawberry.....	TG/22	Turnip.....	TG/37	Willow.....	TG/72
Streptocarpus.....	TG/47	Turnip Rape.....	TG/37	Witloof.....	TG/173
Subterranean Clover.....	TG/170	Vegetable Marrow.....	TG/119	Zelosia.....	-
Sunflower.....	TG/81	Vine.....	TG/50	Zantedeschia.....	TG/177
Sugarcane.....	-	Walnut.....	TG/125	Zonal Pelargonium.....	TG/28
Swede.....	TG/89	Walnut Rootstocks.....	-		
Sweet Pepper.....	TG/76	Watermelon.....	TG/142		

NUMÉROS DE RÉFÉRENCE DES PRINCIPES DIRECTEURS D'EXAMEN EN ORDRE ALPHABÉTIQUE DES NOMS FRANÇAIS

Abricotier	TG/70	Caqueret	-	Lupins	TG/66
Abricotier japonais	TG/160	Cornichon	TG/61	Luzerne	TG/06
Actinidia	TG/98	Cotonnier	TG/88	Macadamia	TG/111
Agrostide	TG/30	Courgette	TG/119	Mâche	TG/75
Agrumes	TG/83	Crête de Coq	-	Maïs	TG/02
Ail	TG/162	Cucurbita maxima	-	Mandarinier	TG/83
Airelle rouge	TG/139	Cymbidium	TG/164	Manguier	TG/112
Alstroemère	TG/29	Cyprès	-	Melon	TG/104
Amandier	TG/56	Cyrtanthus	TG/156	Moutarde blanche	TG/179
Amaryllis	TG/181	Dactyle	TG/31	Myrtille	TG/137
Aneth	TG/165	Dendrobium	-	Narcisse	TG/87
Anigozanthos	TG/175	Dieffenbachia	TG/132	Navet	TG/37
Anthurium	TG/86	Echalote	TG/46	Navette	TG/37
Arachide	TG/93	Endive	TG/173	Nectarinier	TG/53
Artichaut	TG/184	Epicéa commun	TG/96	Neflier du Japon	TG/159
Asperge	TG/130	Epinard	TG/55	Nerine	TG/146
Aster	TG/141	Epine du Christ	TG/91	Nerium oléandre	-
Aubergine	TG/117	Eucalyptus gunnii	-	Noisetier	TG/71
Avocatier	TG/97	Euphorbia fulgens	TG/10	Noyer	TG/125
Avoine	TG/20	Eustomia	-	Oeillet	TG/25
Azalée en pot	TG/140	Exacum	TG/114	Oeillet d'Inde	-
Banancier	TG/123	Fenouil	TG/183	Oenothère	TG/144
Barbadine	-	Fétuque des prés	TG/39	Oeillet d'Inde	-
Basilic	-	Fétuque durette	TG/67	Oignon	TG/46
Bégonia elatior	TG/18	Fétuque élevée	TG/39	Olivier	TG/99
Bégonia tubéreux hybride	TG/107	Fétuque ovine	TG/67	Onagre	-
Berberis	TG/68	Fétuque rouge	TG/67	Oranger	TG/83
Betterave fourragère	TG/150	Fève	TG/08	Orge	TG/19
Betterave rouge	TG/60	Féverole	TG/08	Ornithogale	TG/131
Blé	TG/03	Ficus benjamina	TG/171	Osteospermum	-
Blé dur	TG/120	Figuier	-	Pastèque	TG/142
Bouvardia	TG/158	Fléole	TG/34	Pâturin des prés	TG/33
Brocoli	TG/151	Forsythia	TG/69	Pavot	TG/166
Brome	TG/180	Fraisier	TG/22	Pêcher	TG/53
Buisson ardent	TG/147	Framboisier	TG/43	Pélagonium des fleuristes	TG/109
Cactus de Noël	TG/101	Freesia	TG/27	Pélagonium zonale	TG/28
Cactus jonc	TG/113	Genévrier	TG/103	Pentas	-
Calla	TG/177	Gentiane	TG/145	Persil	TG/136
Callune	TG/94	Géranium-lierre	TG/28	Pétunia	-
Camomille	TG/152	Gerbera	TG/77	Peuplier	TG/21
Canne à sucre	-	Gingembre	TG/153	Piment	TG/76
Cardon	-	Giraumon	TG/155	Poinsettia	TG/24
Carotte	TG/49	Glaïeul	TG/108	Poireau	TG/85
Carthame	TG/134	Gombo	TG/167	Poirée	TG/106
Caseillier	TG/138	Goyavier	TG/110	Poirier	TG/15
Cassis	TG/40	Groseillier à grappes	TG/52	Poirier japonais	TG/149
Céleri-branche	TG/82	Groseillier à maquereau	TG/51	Pois	TG/07
Céleri-rave	TG/74	Guzmania	TG/182	Pois chiche	TG/143
Celosie	-	Haricot	TG/12	Pomélo	TG/83
Cerisier	TG/35	Haricot d'Espagne	TG/09	Pomme de terre	TG/23
Chamelaucium	-	Hortensia	TG/133	Pommier	TG/14
Châtaignier	TG/124	Immortelle à bractées	-	Pommier ornemental	-
Chicorée (frisée, Scarole)	TG/118	Impatiente	TG/102	Porte-greffes de Prunus	-
Chicorée industrielle	TG/172	Introduction générale	TG/01	Porte-greffes du Poirier	-
Chicorée à feuilles (sauvage)	TG/154	Iris	TG/174	Porte-greffes du Noyer	-
Chicorée, Endive	TG/173	Jonquille	TG/87	Porte-greffes du Pommier	TG/163
Chou cabus	TG/48	Kaki	TG/92	Porte-greffes du Pyrus	TG/169
Chou Chinois	TG/105	Kalanchoë	TG/78	Potiron	-
Chou de Bruxelles	TG/54	Lachenalia	TG/126	Prairie Gentian	-
Chou de Milan	TG/48	Lagerstroemia	TG/95	Protea	TG/129
Chou-fleur	TG/45	Laitue	TG/13	Prunier européen	TG/41
Chou frisé	TG/90	Laurier-rose	-	Prunier japonais	TG/84
Chou-navet	TG/89	Lavande vraie	-	Pyracantha	TG/147
Chou pommé	TG/48	Lavandins	-	Radis d'été, d'au-tomme et d'hiver	TG/63
Chou-rave	TG/65	Lentille	-	Radis de tous les mois	TG/64
Chou rouge	TG/48	Leptosperme	-	Radis chinois	-
Chrysanthème	TG/26	Leucadendron	TG/127	Radis oléifère	TG/178
Ciboule	TG/161	Leucospermum	TG/128	Rainfort sauvage	-
Citronnier	TG/83	Limettier	TG/83	Ray-grass	TG/04
Clématite	-	Lin	TG/57	Rhododendron	TG/42
Cognassier	TG/100	Limonium	TG/168	Rhubarbe	TG/62
Colza	TG/36	Lis	TG/59	Riz	TG/16
Concombre	TG/61	Lotier corniculé	-		

Romarin officinal	-	Tabac	-
Ronce fruitière.	TG/73	Tagète	-
Rose d'Inde.	-	Thuya du Canada	TG/79
Rosier	TG/11	Thym	-
Rutabaga	TG/89	Tomate	TG/44
Saintpaulia	TG/17	Tournesol	TG/81
Salsifis noir.	TG/116	Trèfle blanc	TG/38
Saule	TG/72	Trèfle souterrain	TG/170
Scorsonère.	TG/116	Trèfle violet	TG/05
Seigle	TG/58	Triticale	TG/121
Serruria	TG/157	Tulipe	TG/115
Soja	TG/80	Tuna	-
Sorgho	TG/122	Vesce commune.	TG/32
Spathiphyllum	TG/135	Vigne	TG/50
Statice.	TG/168	Weigela	TG/148
Streptocarpus.	TG/47	Zelosia	-

REFERENZNUMMERN DER PRÜFUNGSRICHTLINIEN IN ALPHABETISCHER
 REIHENFOLGE DER DEUTSCHEN NAMEN

Ackerbohne	TG/08	Guave	TG/110	Nektarine	TG/53
Alaska Trespe	TG/180	Gurken	TG/61	Nelke	TG/25
Allgemeine Einführung	TG/01	Guzmania	TG/182	Nerine	TG/146
Amaryllis	TG/181	Hafer	TG/20	Ölrettich	TG/178
Apfel	TG/14	Hahnenkamm	-	Okra	TG/167
Apfelunterlagen	TG/163	Härtlicher Schwingel	TG/67	Oleander	-
Aprikose	TG/70	Hartweizen	TG/120	Olive	TG/99
Artischoke	TG/184	Haselnuß	TG/71	Opuntie	-
Aster	TG/141	Herbstrübe	TG/37	Orange	TG/83
Aubergine	TG/117	Himbeere	TG/43	Ostasiatische Pflaume	TG/84
Avocado	TG/97	Hornschatenklees	-	Osteospermum	-
Banane	TG/123	Horntrespe	TG/180	Osterkaktus	TG/113
Basilikum	-	Hortensie	TG/133	Pappel	TG/21
Baumwolle	TG/88	Impatiens	TG/102	Paprika	TG/76
Baumwucherer	-	Ingwer	TG/153	Passionsfrucht	-
Berberitze	TG/68	Inkalilie	TG/29	Pentas	-
Besenheide	TG/94	Iris	TG/174	Pistazie, echte	-
Birkenfeige	TG/171	Japanische Aprikose	TG/160	Petersilie	TG/136
Birne	TG/15	Japanische Birne	TG/149	Petunie	-
Blasenkirsche	-	Japanische Mispel	TG/159	Pfirsich	TG/53
Blattzichorie	TG/154	Jostabeere	TG/138	Pflaume	TG/41
Bleichsellerie	TG/82	Kaki	TG/92	Poinsettie	TG/24
Blumenkohl	TG/45	Kalanchoe	TG/78	Porree	TG/85
Bohne	TG/12	Kalla	TG/177	Prairae Gentian	-
Bodenfrüchtiger Klee	TG/170	Kamille	TG/152	Preiselbeere	TG/139
Bouvardia	TG/158	Känguruhblume	TG/175	Protea	TG/129
Brokkoli	TG/151	Kardon	-	Prunkbohne	TG/09
Brombeere	TG/73	Kartoffel	TG/23	Prunus-Unterlagen	-
Chamelaucium	-	Kastanie	TG/124	Pyrus-Unterlagen	TG/169
Chinakohl	TG/105	Kichererbse	TG/143	Quitte	TG/100
Chicorée	TG/173	Kirsche	TG/35	Radieschen	TG/64
Christusdorn	TG/91	Kiwi	TG/98	Raps	TG/36
Chrysantheme	TG/26	Knaulgras	TG/31	Rebe	TG/50
Cymbidie	TG/164	Knoblauch	TG/162	Reis	TG/16
Cyrtanthus	TG/156	Knollenbegonie	TG/107	Rettich	TG/63
Dendrobium	-	Knollensellerie	TG/74	Rhabarber	TG/62
Dicke Bohne	TG/08	Kohlrabi	TG/65	Rhododendron	TG/42
Dieffenbachia	TG/132	Kohlrübe	TG/89	Ribes indigolaria	-
Dill	TG/165	Kopfkohl	TG/48	Riesenkürbis	TG/155
Drehfrucht	TG/47	Korallenranke	TG/10	Roggen	TG/58
Echte Kamille	TG/152	Kulturheidelbeere	TG/137	Rohrschwingel	TG/39
Echter Lavendel	-	Lachenalia	TG/126	Rose	TG/11
Echte Feige	-	Lagerstroemia	TG/95	Rosenkohl	TG/54
Edelpelargonie	TG/109	Lavendel	-	Rosmarin	-
Efeupelargonie	TG/28	Lebensbaum	TG/79	Rote Johannisbeere	TG/52
Eierfrucht	TG/117	Lein	TG/57	Rote Rübe	TG/60
Elatior-Begonie	TG/18	Leucadendron	TG/127	Rotklee	TG/05
Endivie	TG/118	Leucospermum	TG/128	Rotkohl	TG/48
Enzian	TG/145	Lieschgras	TG/34	Rotschwingel	TG/67
Erbsen	TG/07	Lilie	TG/59	Rübsen	TG/37
Erdbeere	TG/22	Limonium	TG/168	Runkelrübe	TG/150
Erdnuß	TG/93	Linse	-	Saatwicke	TG/32
Eustoma	-	Loquat	TG/159	Saflor	TG/134
Exacum	TG/114	Lupinen	TG/66	Salat	TG/13
Feige	-	Luzeer	TG/06	Sammetblume	-
Feigenkaktus	-	Macadamia	TG/111	Schafschwingel	TG/67
Feldsalat	TG/75	Mairübe	TG/37	Schalotte	TG/46
Fenchel	TG/183	Mais	TG/02	Schwarze Johannisbeere	TG/40
Feuerdorn	TG/147	Mandarine	TG/83	Schwarzwurzel	TG/116
Flamingoblume	TG/86	Mandel	TG/56	Serruria	TG/157
Forsythie	TG/69	Mango	TG/112	Sojabohne	TG/80
Freesie	TG/27	Mangold	TG/106	Sonnenblume	TG/81
Gartenkürbis	TG/119	Meerrettich	-	Spargel	TG/130
Gartenstrohblume	-	Meerlavendel	TG/168	Spathiphyllum	TG/135
Gemeine Fichte	TG/96	Melone	TG/104	Spinat	TG/55
Gerbera	TG/77	Milchstern	TG/131	Stachelbeere	TG/51
Gerste	TG/19	Mohn	TG/166	Statice	TG/168
Gladiole	TG/108	Möhre	TG/49	Straußgras	TG/30
Granadilla	-	Mohrenhirse	TG/122	Südseemyrte	-
Grapefruit	TG/83	Nachtkerze	TG/144	Tabak	-
Grünkohl	TG/90	Narzisse	TG/87	Tagetes	-

Thymian.....	-	Weißkohl.....	TG/48
Tomate.....	TG/44	Weizen.....	TG/03
Topfazalee.....	TG/140	Widerstoß.....	TG/168
Trespe.....	-	Wiesenrispe.....	TG/33
Triticale.....	TG/121	Wiesenschwingel.....	TG/39
Tulpe.....	TG/115	Winterzwiebel.....	TG/161
Usambarveilchen.....	TG/17	Wirsing.....	TG/48
Wacholder.....	TG/103	Wurzelzichorie.....	TG/172
Waldrebe.....	-	Zantedeschia.....	TG/177
Walnuß.....	TG/125	Zelosia.....	-
Walnußunterlagen.....	-	Zierapfel.....	-
Wassermelone.....	TG/142	Zitrone.....	TG/83
Weide.....	TG/72	Zitrus.....	TG/83
Weidelgras.....	TG/04		
Weigelie.....	TG/148		
Weihnachtskaktus.....	TG/101		
Weisser Senf.....	TG/179		
Weiß Johannisbeere.....	TG/52		
Weißklee.....	TG/38		

NÚMEROS DE REFERENCIA DE LOS DIRECTRICES EN ORDEN ALFABÉTICO DE LOS NOMBRES ESPAÑOLES

Abeto	TG/96	Clemátide	-	Lachenalia	TG/126
Acelga	TG/106	Col de Bruselas	TG/54	Lagerstroemia	TG/95
Achico Gria	-	Col de Milán	TG/48	Laurel rosa	-
Achicoria de hoja	TG/154	Col rábano	TG/65	Lavanda	-
Achicoria	TG/172	Col.	TG/48	Lavandin	-
Adelfa	-	Coliflor	TG/45	Lechuga	TG/13
Adormidera	TG/166	Colinabo	TG/89	Lenteja	-
Agrostis	TG/30	Colza	TG/36	Leptospermum	-
Agucate	TG/97	Cresta de gallo	-	Leucadendron	TG/127
Ajo	TG/162	Crisantemo	TG/26	Leucospermum	TG/128
Alamo	TG/21	Cymbidium	TG/164	Limonium	TG/168
Albahaca	-	Cyrtanthus	TG/156	Lino	TG/57
Albaricoquero	TG/70	Dactilo	TG/31	Lirio	TG/59
Albaricoquero japonés	TG/160	Damasco	TG/69	Lombarda	TG/48
Alcachofa	TG/184	Dendrobium	-	Lotus	-
Alcaucil	TG/184	Dieffenbachia	TG/132	Macadamia	TG/111
Alfalfa	TG/06	Duraznero	TG/53	Maíz	TG/02
Algodón	TG/88	Endivia	TG/173	Mango	TG/112
Almendro	TG/56	Enebro	TG/103	Maní	TG/93
Alstroemeria	TG/29	Eneldo	TG/165	Manzanilla	TG/152
Altramuces	TG/66	Escarola	TG/118	Manzano ornamental	-
Amapola	TG/166	Escorzonera	TG/116	Manzano	TG/14
Amarilis	TG/181	Espárrago	TG/130	Melocotonero	TG/53
Anigozanthos	TG/175	Espinaca	TG/55	Melón	TG/104
Anthurium	TG/86	Espino de fuego	TG/147	Membrillero	TG/100
Apio	TG/82	Eucalyptus gunnii	-	Mostaza blanca	TG/179
Apio nabo	TG/74	Euforbia	TG/10	Nabo	TG/37
Arándano americano	TG/137	Eustoma	-	Narciso	TG/87
Arándano encarnado	TG/139	Exacum	TG/114	Nectarino	TG/53
Arroz	TG/16	Festuca alta	TG/39	Nerine	TG/146
Arveja	TG/07	Festuca de los prados	TG/39	Nispero	TG/159
Aster	TG/141	Festuca ovina	TG/67	Nogal	TG/125
Avellano	TG/71	Festuca roja	TG/67	Okra	TG/167
Avena	TG/20	Ficus benjamina	TG/171	Olivo	TG/99
Azalea	TG/140	Fleo	TG/34	Onagra	TG/144
Azofaifa de la espina de Cristo	TG/91	Flor de Pascua	TG/24	Ornithogalum	TG/131
Begonia elatior	TG/18	Forsythia	TG/69	Osteospermum	-
Begonia tuberosa	TG/107	Frambueso	TG/43	Palta	TG/97
Berberis	TG/68	Fresa	TG/22	Papa	TG/23
Berenjena	TG/117	Fresia	TG/27	Patata	TG/23
Berza	TG/90	Frijol	TG/12	Pelargonio	TG/109
Bouvardia	TG/158	Frutilla	TG/22	Pentas	-
Brócoli	TG/151	Garbanzo	TG/143	Pepinillo	TG/61
Bromo	Tg/180	Genciana	TG/145	Pepino	TG/61
Cacahuete	TG/93	Geranio	TG/28	Peral	TG/15
Cactus de Navidad	TG/101	Geranio hiedra	TG/28	Peral japonés	TG/149
Cactus de Pascua	TG/113	Gerbera	TG/77	Perejil	TG/136
Cala	TG/177	Girasol	TG/81	Perpetua	-
Calabacín	TG/119	Gladiolo	TG/108	Petunia	-
Calluna	TG/94	Granadilla	-	Pimiento	TG/76
Caña de azúcar	-	Grosellero	TG/138	Platanera	TG/123
Cañuela	TG/67	Grosellero espinoso	TG/51	Poa de los prados	TG/33
Caqui	TG/92	Grosellero negro (casis)	TG/40	Poroto	TG/12
Cártamo	TG/134	Grosellero rojo y blanco	TG/52	Prairae Gentian	-
Castaño	TG/124	Guayabo	TG/110	Protea	TG/129
Cebada	TG/19	Guisante	TG/07	Portainjertos de manzano	TG/163
Cebadilla	TG/180	Guzmania	TG/182	Portainjertos de nogal	-
Cebolla	TG/46	Haba	TG/08	Portainjertos de prunus	-
Cebolleta	TG/161	Haboncillo	TG/08	Portainjertos de pyrus	TG/169
Centeno	TG/58	Hierba de los canónigos	TG/75	Puerdo	TG/85
Cerezo	TG/35	Higuera	-	Rabanito	TG/64
Chalota	TG/46	Hinojo	TG/183	Rábano	TG/64
Chamelaucium	-	Hortensia	TG/133	Rábano negro	TG/63
Ciprés	-	Impatiens	TG/102	Rábano oleaginoso	TG/178
Ciruelo europeo	TG/41	Introducción general	TG/01	Rábano salvaje	-
Ciruelo japonés	TG/84	Lirio	TG/174	Ray-grass	TG/04
Cítricos	TG/83	Jengibre	TG/153	Remolacha de mesa	TG/60
Clavel	TG/25	Judía común	TG/12	Remolacha forrajera	TG/150
Clavel de las Indias	-	Judía escarlata	TG/09	Repollo	TG/48
Clavelón	-	Kalanchoe	TG/78	Repollo chino	TG/105
		Kiwi	TG/98	Rododendro	TG/42

Romero	-	Tabaco	-	Weigela	TG/148
Rosal.....	TG/11	Tomate	TG/44	Zanahoria.....	TG/49
Rosmarino	-	Tomillo.....	-	Zapallo	TG/155
Ruibarbo.....	TG/62	Tomatillo.....	-	Zapallito alargado.....	TG/119
Saintpaulia.....	TG/17	Trébol blanco.....	TG/38	Zarza.....	TG/73
Salsifi negro.....	TG/116	Trébol rojo	TG/05	Zarzamora	TG/73
Sandía.....	TG/142	Trébol subterráneo	TG/170	Zelosia	-
Sauce.....	TG/72	Trigo	TG/03		
Serruria.....	TG/157	Trigo duro	TG/120		
Siempreviva	-	Triguillo.....	TG/180		
Soja.....	TG/80	Triticale	TG/121		
Sorgo.....	TG/122	Tulipán.....	TG/115		
Soya.....	TG/80	Tuna	-		
Spathiphyllum.....	TG/135	Tuya	TG/79		
Streptocarpus.....	TG/47	Veza común.....	TG/32		
		Vid	TG/50		

REFERENCE NUMBERS OF TEST GUIDELINES IN ALPHABETICAL ORDER OF THEIR LATIN NAMES
NUMÉROS DE RÉFÉRENCE DES PRINCIPES DIRECTEURS D'EXAMEN EN ORDRE ALPHABÉTIQUE DES NOMS LATINS
REFERENZNUMMERN DER PRÜFUNGSRICHTLINIEN IN ALPHABETISCHER REIHENFOLGE DER LATEINISCHEN NAMEN
NÚMEROS DE REFERENCIA DE LOS PRINCIPIOS RECTORES EN ORDEN ALFABÉTICO DE LOS NOMBRES LATINOS

Agrostis canina L.....	TG/30	Cicer arietinum L.....	TG/143	Lavandula x burnatii Briq....	-
Agrostis gigantea Roth.....	TG/30	Cichorium endivia L.....	TG/118	Leptospermum J.R. et Forst. .	-
Agrostis stolonifera L.....	TG/30	Cichorium intybus L.....	-	Leucadendron R. Br.....	TG/127
Agrostis spp.....	TG/30	Cichorium intybus L. partim. .	TG/154	Leucospermum R. Br.....	TG/128
Allium ampeloprasum L.....	-	Citrullus lanatus (Thunb.)		Lens culinaris Medik.....	-
Allium ascalonicum L.....	TG/46	Matsum. et Nakai.....	TG/142	Lilium L.....	TG/59
Allium cepa L.....	TG/46	Citrus L.....	TG/83	Limonium Mill.....	TG/168
Allium fistulosum L.....	-	Clematis L.....	-	Linum usitatissimum L.....	TG/57
Allium porrum L.....	TG/85	Corylus avellana L.....	TG/71	Lolium multiflorum Lam. . .	TG/04
Allium sativum L.....	TG/162	Corylus maxima Mill.....	TG/71	Lolium perenne L.....	TG/04
Alstroemeria L.....	TG/29	Cucumis melo L.....	TG/104	Lotus corniculatus L.....	-
Anethum graveolens L.....	TG/165	Cucumis sativus L.....	TG/61	Lupinus albus.....	TG/66
Anigozanthos Labill.....	-	Cucurbita maxima Duch.....	TG/155	Lupinus angustifolius.	TG/66
Anthemis L.....	TG/152	Cucurbita pepo L.....	TG/119	Lupinus luteus.....	TG/66
Anthurium Schott.....	TG/86	Cupressus.....	-	Lycopersicon lycopersicum	
Apium graveolens L. var.		Cydonia Mill. sensu stricto. .	TG/100	(L.) Karst. ex. Farw.....	TG/44
dulce (Mill) Pers.....	TG/82	Cymbidium Sw.....	TG/164	Macadamia integrifolia	
Apium graveolens L. var.		Cynara scolymus L.....	TG/184	Maiden et Betche.....	TG/111
rapaceum (Mill) Gaud.....	TG/74	Cyrtanthus Ait.....	TG/156	Macadamia tetraphylla L. A. S.	
Arachis L.....	TG/93	Dactylis glomerata L.....	TG/31	Johnsten.....	TG/111
Armoracia rusticana Gaertn.,		Daucus carota L.....	TG/49	Malus Mill. (fruit).....	TG/14
Mey.et Scherb.....	-	Dendrobium Nees.....	-	Malus Mill. (ornamental). . .	TG/14
Asparagus officinalis L.....	TG/130	Dianthus L.....	TG/25	Malus Mill. (rootstocks). . .	TG/163
Aster L.....	TG/141	Dieffenbachia Schott.....	TG/132	Mangifera indica L.....	TG/112
Avena nuda L.....	TG/20	Diospyros kaki L.....	TG/92	Medicago sativa L.....	TG/06
Avena sativa L.....	TG/20	Epiphyllopsis Berger.....	TG/113	Medicago X varia Martyn. . .	TG/06
Begonia X hiemalis Fotsch. .	TG/18	Eriobotrya japonica		Musa acuminata Colla.....	TG/123
Berberis L.....	TG/68	(Thunb.) Lindl.....	TG/159	Narcissus L.....	TG/87
Beta vulgaris L.....	TG/150	Eucalyptus Nees.....	-	Nerium Herb.....	TG/146
Beta vulgaris L. var. conditiva		Euphorbia fulgens Karw.		Nerium oleander L.....	-
Alef.....	TG/60	ex Klotzsch.....	TG/10	Nicotiana tabacum L.....	-
Beta vulgaris L. var. vulgaris L.	TG/106	Euphorbia milii Desmoulin.	TG/91	Ocimum basilicum L.....	-
Beta vulgaris L. ssp.		Euphorbia pulcherrima Willd.		Oenothera L.....	TG/144
vulgaris L. var. alba DC... .	-	ex Klotzsch.....	TG/24	Olea europaea L.....	TG/99
Bouvardia Salisb.....	TG/158	Eustoma russellianum (Hook)		Ornithogalum L.....	TG/131
Brassica napus L. oleifera .	TG/36	G. Don	-	Opuntia Mill.....	-
Brassica napus L. var.		Exacum L.....	TG/114	Oryza sativa L.....	TG/16
napobrassica (L.) Rchb..	TG/89	Festuca arundinacea Schreb.	TG/39	Osteospermum L.....	-
Brassica oleracea L. var.		Festuca ovina L. sensu lato.	TG/67	Papaver somniferum L.....	TG/166
bullata DC.....	TG/48	Festuca pratensis Huds.....	TG/39	Passiflora edulis Sims.....	-
Brassica oleracea L. var.		Festuca rubra L.....	TG/67	Pelargonium grandiflorum	
capitata L. f. alba DC... .	TG/48	Ficus benjamina L.....	TG/171	hort. non Willd.....	TG/109
Brassica oleracea L. var.		Ficus carica.....	-	Pelargonium peltatum hort.	
capitata L. f. rubra (L.) Thell.	TG/48	Foeniculum vulgare P. Mill..	TG/183	non (L.) L'Hérit. ex Ait....	TG/28
Brassica oleracea L. var.		Forsythia Vahl.....	TG/69	Pelargonium zonale hort.	
- gongyloides L.....	TG/65	Fragaria L.....	TG/22	non (L.) L'Hérit. ex Ait....	TG/28
- sabellica L.....	TG/90	Freesia Eckl. ex Klatt.....	TG/27	Pentas lanceolata (Forssk.)	
- sabauda L.....	TG/48	Gentiana L.....	TG/145	K. Schum.....	-
Brassica oleracea L. convar.		Gerbera Cass.....	TG/77	Persea americana Mill.....	TG/97
acephala (DC.) Alef.....	-	Gladiolus L.....	TG/108	Petroselinum crispum (Mill.)	
Brassica oleracea L. convar.		Glycine max (L.) Merrill... .	TG/80	Nym. ex-A. W. Hill.....	TG/136
botrytis (L.) Alef. var.		Goniolimon Boiss.....	TG/168	Petunia.....	-
- botrytis.....	TG/45	Gossypium L.....	TG/88	Phaseolus coccineus L.....	TG/09
- cymosa Duch.....	TG/151	Guzmania Ruiz et Pav.....	TG/182	Phaseolus vulgaris L.....	TG/12
- italica.....	TG/151	Helianthus annuus L.....	TG/81	Phleum bertolonii DC.....	TG/34
Brassica oleracea L. convar.		Helianthus debilis Nutt.....	TG/81	Phleum pratense L.....	TG/34
oleracea var. gemmifera DC..	TG/54	Helichrysum bracteatum		Physcalis ixocarpa Brot.	
Brassica pekinensis L.....	TG/105	(Vent.) Andr.....	-	ex. Hornem.....	-
Brassica rapa L. emend. Metzg.	TG/37	Hippeastrum Herb.....	TG/181	Picea abies (L.) Karst.....	TG/96
Bromus catharticus Vahl... .	TG/180	Hordeum vulgare L. sensu lato	TG/19	Pisum sativum L. sensu lato. .	TG/07
Broms sitchensis Trin.	TG/180	Hydrangea L.....	TG/133	Poa pratensis L.....	TG/33
Calluna vulgaris (L.) Hull... .	TG/94	Impatiens L.....	TG/102	Populus L.....	TG/21
Capsicum annuum L.....	TG/76	Iris L.....	-	Protea L.....	TG/129
Carthamus tinctorius L.....	TG/134	Juglans regia L. (fruit).....	TG/125	Prunus amygdalus Batsch.....	TG/56
Castanea sativa Mill.....	TG/124	Juglans regia L. (rootstocks) .	TG/125	Prunus armeniaca L.....	TG/70
Celosia L.....	-	Juniperus L.....	TG/103	Prunus avium (L.) L.....	TG/35
Chamelaucium Desf.....	-	Kalanchoë Adans.....	TG/78	Prunus cerasus L.....	TG/35
Chamomilla recutita (L.)		Lachenalia Jacq. f. ex Murray.	TG/126	Prunus domestica L.....	TG/41
Rauschert.....	TG/152	Lactuca sativa L.....	TG/13	Prunus insititia L.....	TG/41
Chrysanthemum spec.....	TG/26	Lagerstroemia indica L.....	TG/95	Prunus L.....	-
		Lavandula angustifolia Mill..	-	Prunus mume Sieb. et Zucc... .	TG/160

Prunus persica (L.) Batsch.	TG/53	Ribes sylvestre (Lam.) Mert.		Thuja occidentalis L.	TG/79
Prunus salicina Lindl.	TG/84	& W. Koch.	TG/52	Thymus L.	-
Psidium guajava L.	TG/110	Ribes uva-crispa L.	TG/51	Trifolium pratense L.	TG/05
Psylliostachys (Jaub & Spach)		Rosa L.	TG/11	Trifolium repens L.	TG/38
Nevski.	TG/168	Rosmarinus officinalis L.	-	Trifolium subterraneum.	TG/170
Pyracantha M. J. Roem.	TG/147	Rubus idaeus L.	TG/43	Triticum aestivum L.	TG/03
Pyrus L. (rootstocks).	TG/169	Rubus subgenus Eubatus Sect.		Triticum durum Desf.	TG/120
Pyrus communis L.	TG/15	Moriferi & Ursini.	TG/73	Tulipa L.	TG/115
Pyrus pyrifolia (Burm f.)		Saccharum officinarum L.	-	Vaccinium corymbosum.	TG/137
Nakai var. culta (Mak.) Nakai.	TG/149	Saintpaulia ionantha H. Wendl.	TG/17	Vaccinium myrtillus L.	TG/137
Rhaphanus sativus L. var.		Salix L.	TG/72	Vaccinium vitis-idaea L.	TG/139
niger (Mill.) S. Kerner.	TG/63	Schlumbergera Lem.	TG/101	Valerianella eriocarpa Desv.	TG/75
Rhaphanus sativus L. var.		Scorzonera hispanica L.	TG/116	Valerianella locusta L.	TG/75
oleiformis Pers.	TG/178	Secale cereale L.	TG/58	Vicia faba L.	TG/08
Rhaphanus sativus L. var.		Serruria Salisb.	TG/157	Vicia sativa L.	TG/32
radicola Pers.	TG/64	Sinapis alba L.	TG/179	Vitis L.	TG/50
Rheum rhabarbarum L.	TG/62	Solanum melongena L.	TG/117	Weigela Thunb.	TG/148
Rhipsalidopsis Britt. et Rose. ...	TG/113	Solanum tuberosum L.	TG/23	X Triticosecale Witt.	TG/121
Rhododendron L.	TG/42	Sorghum bicolor L.	TG/122	Zantedeschia.	TG/177
Rhododendron simsii Planch.	TG/140	Spathiphyllum Schott.	TG/135	Zea mays L.	TG/02
Ribes grossularia L.	TG/51	Spinacia oleracea L.	TG/55	Zelosia.	-
Ribes nidigrolaria.	TG/138	Statice.	-	Zingiber officinale Rosc.	TG/153
Ribes nigrum L.	TG/40	Streptocarpus X hybridus Voss	TG/47	Zygocactus K. Schum.	TG/101
Ribes niveum Lindl.	TG/52	Tagetes L.	-		

General Overview - Status of Test Guidelines (as per April 5, 2000)

<i>Technical Working Party Stage</i>	<i>Agricultural Crops</i>	<i>Fruit Crops</i>	<i>Ornamental Plants and Forest Trees</i>	<i>Vegetables</i>
Adopted (total 173)	Barley Bent Broad Bean, Field Bean Cocksfoot Common Vetch Cotton Durum Wheat Flax, Linseed Fodder Beet Groundnut Kentucky Bluegrass Lucerne Lupins Maize Meadow Fescue, Tall Fescue Oats Opium/Seed Poppy Peas Potato Rape Seed Red Clover Rice Rye Ryegrass Safflower Sheep's Fescue, Red Fescue Sorghum Soya Bean Sunflower Swede Timothy Triticale Turnip, Turnip Rape Wheat White Clover	Almond Apple Apple Rootstocks Apricot Avocado Banana Black Currant Blackberry Blueberry Cherry Chestnut Citrus European Plum Grapevine Gooseberry Guava Hazelnut Japanese Pear Japanese Plum Jostaberry Kiwifruit Lingonberry Loquat Macadamia Mango Mume Olive Peach Pear Persimmon (Kaki) Pyrus Rootstocks Quince Raspberry Red and White Currant Strawberry Walnut	African Violet Alstroemeria Anthurium Apple Aster Berberis Bouvardia Carnation Chinchinchee Christmas Cactus Chrysanthemum Crown of Thorns Cymbidium Dieffenbachia Easter Cactus Elatior Begonia Euphorbia Fulgens Exacum Firelily Forsythia Freesia Gentian Gerbera Gladiolus Hydrangea Impatiens Juniper Iris (bulbous) Kalanchoë Kangaroo Paw Lachenalia Lagerstroemia Leucadendron Leucospermum Lily Ling, Scotch Heather Narcissi Nerine Norway Spruce Osteospermum Poinsettia Poplar Pot Azalea Protea Pyracantha Regal Pelargonium Rhododendron Rose Serruria Spathiphyllum Statice Streptocarpus Tuberous Begonia Hybrids Tulip Weeping Fig Weigela White Cedar Willow Zonal Pelargonium, Ivy-leaved Pelargonium	Asparagus Beetroot Black Radish Black Salsify, Scorzonera Broad Bean, Field Bean Broccoli Brussels Sprouts Cabbage Carrot Cauliflower Celeriac Celery Chamomile Chick-pea Chinese Cabbage Cornsalad Cucumber, Gherkin Curly Kale Dill Egg Plant Endive Evening Primrose French Bean Ginger Kohlrabi Leaf Beet Leaf Chicory Leek Lettuce Melon Okra Onion Opium/Seed Poppy Parsley Peas Pumpkin Radish Rhubarb Runner Bean Spinach Swede Sweet Pepper Tomato Turnip, Turnip Rape Vegetable Marrow, Squash Witloof, Chicory Watermelon Welsh Onion

<i>Technical Working Party Stage</i>	<i>Agricultural Crops</i>	<i>Fruit Crops</i>	<i>Ornamental Plants and Forest Trees</i>	<i>Vegetables</i>
Professional organizations to comment (total 21)	Rescue Grass Cotton ^o Fodder Radish Red Clover ^o Rice ^o Swede ^o Subterranean Clover White Mustard	Actinidia ^o	Amaryllis Guzmania Ling, Scotch Heather ^o Zantedeschia	Curly Kale ^o Fennel Garlic Globe Artichoke Industrial Chicory Swede ^o Tomato ^o Turnip ^o
Planned	Cocksfoot ^o Field Bean ^o Lotus Meadow Fescue, Tall Fescue ^o Sugarcane Tobacco Turnip Rape ^o	Apricot ^o Avocado ^o Citrus ^o European Plum ^o Fig Mango ^o Passion Fruit Persimmon ^o Prickly Pear Quince ^o Prunus Rootstocks Raspberry ^o Walnut Rootstocks	Bracteantha Celosia Chrysanthemum ^o Clematis Cupressus <i>Dendrobium</i> Eucalyptus gunnii Eustoma Impatiens ^o Lavender Leptospermum Nerium oleander Ornamental Apple ^o Pentas Petunia <i>Poinsettia</i> ^o Tagetes Thyme Waxflower	Basil Broad Bean ^o Celery ^o Chinese Cabbage ^o Horse Radish Husk Tomato Kohlrabi ^o Lentil Lettuce ^o Rosemary Vegetable Marrow, Squash ^o

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