



TC/39/16

ORIGINAL: English

DATE: March 12, 2004

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

**TECHNICAL COMMITTEE**

**Thirty-Ninth Session**  
**Geneva, April 7 to 9, 2003**

REPORT

*adopted by the Technical Committee*

Opening of the Session

\*1. The Technical Committee (TC) held its thirty-ninth session in Geneva from April 7 to 9, 2003. The list of participants is reproduced in Annex I to this report.

\*2. The session was opened by Mr. Michael Camlin (United Kingdom), Chairman of the TC, who welcomed the participants, especially those from Belarus and Latvia who had become members of the Union since the last TC meeting held in Geneva from April 15 to 17, 2002, taking the number of members of the Union to 52. He noted that, in addition, the Czech Republic and Hungary had acceded to the 1991 Act of the UPOV Convention since that meeting.

3. The Delegation of Belarus expressed its appreciation for the welcome into UPOV. It explained that the protection of new plant varieties in Belarus would be governed by the new Plant Variety Patent Law and by general rules and implementing regulations made by the Patent Office of Belarus and the Council of Ministers of Belarus. It further explained that the Ministry of Agriculture and Food of the Republic of Belarus was the national body responsible for implementation of the International Convention for the Protection of New Varieties of Plants. The Delegation expressed its appreciation for the assistance offered to the

---

\* The asterisked paragraphs in this report are reproduced from document TC/39/15 (Report on the Conclusions).

Republic of Belarus by the Office of the Union and other national institutions of members of the Union and thanked them for their help and cooperation.

#### Adoption of the Agenda

\*4. The TC adopted the agenda as presented in document TC/39/1.

#### Report on Relevant Matters Discussed in the Last Sessions of the Administrative and Legal Committee, the Consultative Committee and the Council (Oral Report by the Vice Secretary-General)

5. The Vice Secretary-General provided an oral report on the forty-fifth and forty-sixth sessions of the Administrative and Legal Committee (CAJ), the sixty-second and sixty-third sessions of the Consultative Committee (CC) and the nineteenth extraordinary session and thirty-sixth ordinary session of the Council. From the sessions held by these Committees in April 2002, he highlighted in particular that the CAJ, at its forty-fifth session, had discussed a document on specific issues concerning the interface between patents and breeders' rights and had agreed that, with the incorporation of some amendments, this could be the basis for a discussion of a position paper at the Council of UPOV; it had also discussed document TG/1/3 "General Introduction to the Examination of Distinctness, Uniformity and Stability and the Development of Harmonized Descriptions of New Varieties of Plants" and it had agreed to propose, jointly with the TC, this document for adoption by the Council, at its nineteenth extraordinary session to be held on April 19, 2002. He added that the CAJ had considered the project for the publication of variety descriptions and noted that the Office of the Union (the Office) had prepared an updated version of the project following the advice of the *Ad hoc* Working Group on the Publication of Variety Descriptions and that it had approved the schedule of activities as proposed in the revised project.

6. The Vice Secretary-General further noted that during its meeting in April 2003, the CAJ had received a report on the activity of the *Ad hoc* Subgroup of Technical and Legal Experts on Biochemical and Molecular Techniques ("BMT Review Group") and it had agreed with the conclusions of the BMT Review Group that Proposals 1, 2, 3 and 4 could be pursued on the basis of the assumptions, whilst recognizing the need for further work to examine those assumptions and, in the case of Option 2, to improve the relationship between morphological and molecular distances, but it had noted the divergence of views which had been expressed regarding Proposals 5 and 6. He added that the CAJ, in conjunction with the decision taken at the TC, had agreed to the schedule for reporting the outcome of the BMT Review Group meeting and for future meetings of the Crop Subgroups.

7. The Vice Secretary-General added that the CAJ had noted that the Office planned to develop and maintain a single database of information based on species/taxonomic groups (the GENIE database), which would be used to generate different reports, and that the CAJ had endorsed the proposal of the TC on that subject. He reported that the CAJ had examined issues concerning the use of material submitted for DUS examination, and would continue discussions during that week. He noted that the CAJ had received a report on the meeting of the *Ad hoc* Working Group on Variety Denominations, which had proposed the revision of the guidelines for plant variety denominations and the list of classes (document UPOV/INF/12 and its Annex I), and that questionnaires would be sent by the Office seeking information for that purpose.

8. The Vice Secretary-General reported that the CC had recommended to the Council of UPOV that it adopt the document C(Extr.)/19/2 “The Notion of Breeder and Common Knowledge” at its nineteenth extraordinary session as well as the document TG/1/3 mentioned above. The CC took note of the information related to developments in the TRIPS Council concerning the review of Article 27.3(b) of the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (“TRIPS Agreement”) and to biodiversity, plant genetic resources and plant variety protection. Finally, he reported that the Council of UPOV, at its nineteenth extraordinary session, had adopted the two documents as proposed by the CC.

9. From the sessions held in October 2002, the Vice Secretary-General reported that the CAJ had discussed document CAJ/46/2 “Specific issues concerning the interface between patents and plant breeders’ rights” and had agreed with the contents of this document, modified as requested by the CAJ at its forty-fifth session. He reported on discussions concerning the project to consider the publication of variety descriptions and recalled that the CAJ had agreed on a questionnaire to identify the current administrative, legal and financial framework in the field of publication and/or production of variety descriptions. A summary of the responses to the questionnaire would be presented to the CAJ for its consideration at its forty-seventh session in April 2003. He further informed the TC about discussions on issues concerning the use of material submitted for examination of distinctness, uniformity and stability. The CAJ had identified the following subjects for future discussion: arrangements for the transfer of material (either from the breeder to the examination authority or between examination authorities); the possible development of UPOV recommendations to ensure the independence of those DUS examination centers which had, or had links to, breeding activities and it had been particularly suggested that UPOV might consider the development of standard model agreements for such transfers. The Vice Secretary-General noted that the CAJ had received reports concerning the developments on plant variety denominations, particularly from the Working Group on Variety Denominations. He finally recalled discussions on the protection of hybrid varieties through the protection of parent lines.

10. The Vice Secretary-General reported that, at its sixty-fourth session, the CC had examined the conformity of the Protection of Plant Varieties and Farmers’ Rights Act of India with the 1978 Act of the UPOV Convention, had noted the Financial Situation of the Union, had received an oral report from the Chairman of the *Ad hoc* Working Group to Study the Impact of Plant Breeders’ Rights, and had noted the information provided by the Office on developments in the Council for TRIPS concerning the review of Article 27.3(b) of the TRIPS Agreement and about biodiversity, plant genetic resources and plant variety protection.

11. It was reported that, amongst other items, at its thirty-sixth ordinary session, the Council of UPOV had noted the work done by the TC, the Technical Working Parties and the Working Group on Biochemical and Molecular Techniques, and DNA-Profiling in Particular (BMT), and it had approved the program of work. It had also elected, in each case for a term of three years ending with the thirty-ninth ordinary session of the Council in 2005, Mr. Carlos Gómez Etchebarne (Uruguay), Chairman of the Technical Working Party for Agricultural Crops (TWA); Mr. Uwe Meyer (Germany), Chairman of the Technical Working Party for Automation and Computer Programs (TWC); Mr. Erik Schulte (Germany), Chairman of the Technical Working Party for Fruit Crops (TWF); Mr. Chris Barnaby (New Zealand), Chairman of the Technical Working Party for Ornamental Plants and Forest Trees (TWO); Mr. Kees van Ettehoven (Netherlands), Chairman of the Technical Working Party for Vegetables (TWV) and Mr. Gerhard Deneken (Denmark), Chairman of the BMT.

12. The Technical Director reported on the approach to be applied in future by the Office in relation to communication and mailing of documents of the CC and Council of UPOV. He explained that the representatives at the Council had been asked to consider whether it would be acceptable to replace mailing of documents by downloading documents from the UPOV Website, which would reduce the costs of the Union. The same approach was intended to be considered for the TC and the Technical Working Parties (TWPs). The Delegation of France commented that posting documents on the Web was a good idea but requested that the Office take good measures to ensure that the documents were easily available to users. It emphasized that the new approach should not mean a reduction in the time available for reaction. The Technical Director clarified that one objective was to make documents more rapidly available, with the benefit of extending the time for reaction. In relation to accessibility, he pointed out that there would be notifications by e-mail that new documents had been posted on the Website, which would enable users to contact the Office if there were any problems of accessibility.

#### Membership of the Enlarged Editorial Committee

13. The Chairman recalled discussions of the previous year on the composition of the Editorial Committee. It had been agreed that the composition of the Editorial Committee, comprising the four language experts, should remain unchanged and that the Enlarged Editorial Committee (TC-EDC) should continue to include the chairperson and vice-chairperson of the TC, the chairpersons of the TWPs and the chairperson of the BMT and the possibility of a small number of additional members could be included, where and when necessary, to ensure that there was an appropriate range of expertise and experience. He reported that Canada and the United States of America had nominated Mr. Doug Waterhouse as an additional member of the TC-EDC. The Delegation of the United States of America explained that it considered Mr. Doug Waterhouse a very qualified expert who could bring the experience and viewpoint of a country with a breeder testing system. The Delegation of France recalled that, at the outset, the Editorial Committee had been composed of four members, one for each of the UPOV languages, and it had been agreed to incorporate the chairpersons of the TWPs with the aim to improve its efficiency. It requested clarification of the role of the TC-EDC and the reason for having additional members. The Chairman clarified that the TC-EDC was not only discussing Test Guidelines but had also been discussing the General Introduction (document TG/1/3). The TC-EDC had also been committed to examining the TGP documents, which were under development, and for that reason it could be considered useful to incorporate experts with a range of expertise and experience and, for example, to cover breeder-based testing systems.

14. It was agreed that, on the basis of his expertise and experience within a breeder-based testing system, Mr. Doug Waterhouse would become a member of the TC-EDC for a period of three years, to coincide with the terms of the chairpersons of the TWPs, in accordance with the proposal agreed by the TC at its thirty-eighth session.

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), and the *Ad hoc* Crop Subgroups on Molecular Techniques (Crop Subgroups)

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

15. The TWA held its thirty-first session in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, from September 23 to 27, 2002, under the chairmanship of Mrs. Françoise Blouet (France). The Report on the Conclusions is contained in document TWA/31/14 and the detailed Report appears in document TWA/31/15.

16. The session was attended by 40 participants from 23 members of the Union and one observer organization.

17. The TWA received short reports on plant variety protection from a number of countries, and a report on developments within UPOV from the Office. In particular, experts from France and the United Kingdom made presentations on the three options for the possible use of molecular techniques in DUS testing. The TWA noted the conclusions of the BMT Review Group regarding these proposals and the views of the TC and CAJ on these conclusions. The TWA also noted the proposals, developed by the TC, regarding the program for the existing Maize, Oilseed Rape and Wheat Crop Subgroups and for the establishment of new crop subgroups for potato, sugarcane and soybean. The TWA noted that the Sugarcane and Soybean Crop Subgroups would meet immediately after the TWA session and proposed that the Oilseed Rape, Potato and Wheat Crop Subgroups should meet consecutively, at the same venue, in May or June 2003. The TWA supported the proposals for the chairpersons of the new crop subgroups agreed between the Chairpersons of the TC and the TWA as follows:

Potato	Mrs. Beate Rücker (Germany);
Sugarcane	Luis Salaices (Spain);
Soybean	Marcelo Labarta (Argentina).

18. The TWA received a report on the preparatory workshop held during the morning of September 22, 2002, prior to the TWA meeting, noting that this was attended by 16 participants from 8 members of the Union and one international organization. It heard that the participants considered the workshop very useful and that it had been suggested that relevant documents might be sent to the participants in advance.

19. The TWA discussed a number of draft TGP documents, with priority being given to TGP/7 "Development of Test Guidelines," TGP/4 "Management of Variety Collections," TGP/9 "Examining Distinctness" and TGP10 "Examining Uniformity." With regard to other TGP documents, the TWA discussed TGP/3.2 Draft 1 "Developments and Explanations Regarding Varieties of Common Knowledge" and TGP/6.1.2 Draft 1 "Examples of Arrangements for DUS Testing".

20. The TWA also discussed environmental effects on plant variety descriptions, based on documents prepared by experts from Germany and the United Kingdom, and the Project to Consider the Publication of Variety Descriptions. It agreed that the TC and the CAJ should be informed about the difficulties in harmonizing variety descriptions due to environmental effects, which, together with the effect of the examiner, might result in different descriptions for the same variety. Therefore, the TWA considered that the project could only proceed on the basis that different descriptions for the same variety could be accommodated. The TWA

proposed that Barley, Potato and Soybean be included in the project and the coordinators for these species should be Denmark for Barley, France for Soybean, and the Netherlands and the Community Plant Variety Office (CPVO) jointly for Potato. It also agreed that it would be useful for a list of varieties to be provided by each contributing country in order to assess the degree of overlap. The Office was requested to issue a questionnaire seeking this information, the results of which could then be presented to the *Ad hoc* Working Group on the Publication of Variety Descriptions and the TC, to help in its decision on how to proceed.

21. The TWA also considered a project, proposed by an expert from Sweden, for exchanging seed of selected varieties. It was agreed that this project should be aimed at improving the development of suitable grouping and asterisked characteristics in the Test Guidelines and, as such, should become a part of the process of revising or developing Test Guidelines, as described in document TGP/7 "Development of Test Guidelines." It should also seek to identify the extent to which the example varieties would be appropriate within, or beyond, a region. The TWA agreed that the project should continue on Lupins, Rice and White Clover, and that a report on progress should be made at the next TWA session.

22. The TWA finalized the Test Guidelines for White Clover for submission to the TC. It also agreed that the Test Guidelines for Lupins could be submitted to the TC for adoption at its thirty-ninth session in April 2003, subject to agreement by the interested experts on certain characteristics. However, the experts later agreed to discuss the document again at the TWA in 2003. The TWA also planned to continue discussion on Test Guidelines for Coffee, Grain Amaranth, Lotus, Medicago (excluding *M. sativa* L.), Potato and Rice, and decided to begin work on Test Guidelines for Lucerne (Revision), Ryegrass (Revision) and Sesame.

23. At the invitation of the expert from Japan, the TWA agreed to hold its thirty-second session in Tsukuba, Japan, from September 8 to 12, 2003. The TWA proposed to discuss the following items at its next session: Short reports on developments in plant variety protection from members and observers; Report on developments within UPOV; Report on the eighth session of the BMT and Reports from the Crop Subgroups; Publication of Variety Descriptions; Project for exchanging seed of selected varieties between interested countries; TGP Documents; Discussions on draft Test Guidelines; Recommendations on draft Test Guidelines; Date and place of next session; Future program.

24. The TWA noted that it had received offers to host future meetings from: Poland (2004); South Africa (2005); New Zealand (2005 or 2006) and, at the meeting, received an offer from the expert from Hungary to host the TWA in 2007.

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

25. The TWC held its twentieth session in Texcoco, Mexico, from June 17 to 20, 2002, under the chairmanship of Mr. Wieslaw Pilarczyk (Poland). The Report on the Conclusions is contained in document TWC/20/6 and the detailed Report appears in document TWC/20/7.

26. The session was attended by 24 participants from 12 members of the Union.

27. The TWC received short reports on plant variety protection from a number of countries. Experts from Mexico presented a special report on developments in the use of image analysis

in the DUS testing of *Opuntia Mill.* (Cactus Pear). The TWC also received a report on developments within UPOV from the Office.

28. The TWC discussed a number of draft TGP documents with priority being given to TGP/4 "Management of Variety Collections," TGP/9 "Examining Distinctness" and TGP/10 "Examining Uniformity." With regard to other TGP documents, the TWC discussed and made comments on drafts of TGP/8.1 "Use of Statistical Procedures in DUS Testing: Introduction;" TGP/8.2 "Validation of Data Assumptions;" TGP/8.3 "Experimental Design Practice;" TGP/8.4 "Types of Characteristics and their Scale Levels;" TGP/8.5 "Statistical Method for DUS Examination" and TGP/8.6 "Examining DUS in Bulk Samples." In addition, the TWC discussed and made comments on TGP/14.3 "Glossary of Statistical Terms."

29. The TWC also discussed: statistical methods for data produced by biochemical and molecular methods; information obtained from a survey on probability levels for uniformity standards for COYU, where it was agreed that further information was necessary to be able to propose a recommendation; a preliminary report on the efficiency of incomplete block designs in herbage DUS trials; and a report on the Flores<sup>TM</sup> image database.

30. With regard to the report on the Working Group on the Publication on Variety Descriptions, the TWC proposed that an expert from the TWC should be involved in the work of this group and agreed that this should be taken forward with the Chairperson of the TWC.

31. Mr. Kristian Kristensen (Denmark), coordinator of the Workshop on Data Handling, which took place from June 12 to 14, 2002, in Texcoco, Mexico, made a brief report on that activity. He noted that 27 participants from seven different countries and one participant from an observer organization had attended the Workshop. The main objective had been to introduce the main statistical principles used in DUS testing and to provide guidance on the use of the COY program.

32. At the invitation of the expert from Denmark, the TWC proposed to hold its twenty-first session in Tjele, Denmark, from June 10 to 13, 2003. During the twenty-first session, the TWC planned to discuss or re-discuss the following items: Reports from members and observers; Reports on developments within UPOV; Molecular techniques; Project to Consider the Publication of Variety Descriptions; UPOV Databases; Chi square distribution; Alternative method to COYU when the requirements on degrees of freedom for COYU are not fulfilled; Relative tolerances in the number of off-types; Incomplete block design; Glossary on Statistical Terms; Efficiency of Incomplete Block Design in DUS Herbage Trials; Calculation of phenotypic distances; TGP documents; List of statistical documents prepared by the TWC; Telecommunications, exchangeable software and contacts; Date and place of the next session; Future program; the Report on the Conclusions of the Session.

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

33. The TWF held its thirty-third session in San Carlos de Bariloche, Argentina, from November 25 to 29, 2002, under the chairmanship of Mr. József Harsányi (Hungary). The Report on the Conclusions is contained in document TWF/33/21 and the detailed Report is reproduced in document TWF/33/22.

34. The session was attended by 20 participants from 14 members of the Union and two observer organizations.

35. The TWF received oral reports from the participants on developments in plant variety protection in their respective countries and organizations. Experts from Argentina provided a detailed presentation on the activities of its national office on plant variety protection. The TWF also received a report on developments within UPOV from the Office.

36. The TWF received a report on the discussions in the BMT regarding the possible establishment of an *Ad hoc* Crop Subgroup for Peach and/or Citrus. The TWF concluded that it would not be appropriate to propose the establishment of such a crop subgroup at this time. However, it welcomed the proposal from the expert from France to prepare a summary of work on molecular characteristics in fruit crops for review at the next TWF meeting. This summary would explain the technical progress, but would also consider whether there were plans for this work to be applied for the examination of DUS and, therefore, provide support for the establishment of a crop subgroup.

37. The TWF discussed a number of draft TGP documents with priority being given to TGP/7 "Development of Test Guidelines," TGP/4 "Management of Variety Collections," TGP/9 "Examining Distinctness" and TGP10 "Examining Uniformity." With regard to other TGP documents the TWF discussed TGP/13 "Guidance for New Types and Species;" and TGP/14.2 "Glossary of Technical, Botanical and Statistical Terms Used in UPOV Documents: Plant Shapes."

38. With regard to the Project to Consider the Publication of Variety Descriptions, the TWF suggested that apple and strawberry be proposed for consideration by the TC for inclusion in the model study. The coordinating members would be Israel and the United Kingdom, respectively.

39. The TWF agreed that the following draft Test Guidelines should be submitted to the TC for adoption in April 2003: Cherimoya, Grapefruit and Pummelos (Revision), Lemons and Limes (Revision), Mandarin (Revision), Oranges (Revision), *Poncirus*, Persimmon (Revision), Quince (Revision) and Raspberry (Revision).

40. The TWF decided to discuss further the following draft Test Guidelines at its next session in 2003: Apple (Revision), Apricot (Revision), Avocado (Revision), Cactus Pear (*Opuntia*) and Mango (Revision). The TWF also decided to discuss drafts of the following Test Guidelines at its next session: Banana (*Musa* spp.) (Revision), Blackberry and Hybrid Berries (Revision), Coffee, Fig, Passion Fruit (edible species), Pecan Nut (*Carya illinoensis*) and Pineapple. The TWF agreed to propose to the TC that the TWF should be the leading TWP for the Test Guidelines for Coffee.

41. At the invitation of Canada, the TWF proposed to hold its thirty-fourth session, in Niagara Falls, Canada, from September 29 to October 3, 2003. During its thirty-fourth session, the TWF planned to discuss the following items: Short reports on developments in plant variety protection from members and observers; Report on developments within UPOV; Molecular techniques; Project to Consider the Publication of Variety Descriptions; UPOV databases; Standardized explanation for "maturity of fruit" characteristics; TGP documents; Draft Test Guidelines; Recommendations on draft Test Guidelines; Date and place of the next session ; Future program; Report on the Conclusions of the session.



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

42. The TWO held its thirty-fifth session in Quito, from November 18 to 22, 2002, under the chairmanship of Miss Elizabeth Scott (United Kingdom). The Report on the Conclusions is contained in document TWO/35/22 and the detailed Report appears in document TWO/35/23.
43. The session was attended by 31 participants from 15 members of the Union and two observer organizations.
44. The Chairperson noted that, because of its geographical situation and special environment, Ecuador was a very interesting country and had worldwide connections in the export of its roses and other ornamental crops.
45. The TWO received a presentation on plant variety protection in Ecuador and short oral reports on developments in plant variety protection from participants. The TWO also received a report on developments within UPOV from the Office.
46. The Chairperson of the Rose Crop Subgroup reported that the meeting of the Rose Crop Subgroup, planned to take place prior to the meeting of the TWO, had been postponed because only one paper had been proposed.
47. The TWO discussed a number of draft TGP documents with priority being given to TGP/7 "Development of Test Guidelines," TGP/4 "Management of Variety Collections," TGP/9 "Examining Distinctness" and TGP/10 "Examining Uniformity." With regard to other TGP documents, the TWO discussed TGP/8.6 Draft 1 "Examining DUS in Bulk Samples."
48. The TWO discussed document TWO/35/16, Results of the Questionnaire on Testing of Seed-Propagated Ornamental Varieties. It was agreed that this survey should be repeated over the next three years in order to know the species for which the demand for the preparation of Test Guidelines was greatest.
49. With regard to the Project to Consider the Publication of Variety Descriptions, the TWO proposed that the model study should include Petunia.
50. The TWO heard that a preparatory workshop, held the day before the start of the session, was attended by 16 participants from five different countries and one observer organization. Comments on the workshop had been favorable and the following proposals had been made: to circulate copies of the workshop documents and presentations to the participants in advance of the workshop; to include an item on how to use the UPOV Website; to continue the practice of organizing a preparatory workshop before the TWO.
51. The TWO agreed that the following draft Test Guidelines should be presented to the TC in April 2003: *Bracteantha*; *Calibrachoa*; *Dendrobium*; *Leptospermum*; Ornamental Apple; Petunia; Phalaenopsis; Verbena<sup>1\*</sup>; Willow (Revision).

---

<sup>1</sup> After discussion between the leading experts, Mr. Joost Barendrecht, and Mr. Chris Barnaby, Chairman of TWO, it was subsequently agreed that draft Test Guidelines for Verbena should be rediscussed at the TWO in 2003.

52. The TWO agreed that the following draft Test Guidelines should be discussed at the TWO in 2003: Alstroemeria (Revision); Argyranthemum; Brachyscome; *Catharanthus roseus*; Chrysanthemum (Revision); Clematis; Dahlia; Diascia; Hibiscus; *Hypericum* L. (berry-producing species); Gypsophila; *Impatiens walleriana*; Poinsettia (Revision); Rose (Revision – all types); Tagetes; Verbena<sup>1</sup>; Waxflower.

53. At the invitation of Canada, the TWO proposed to hold its thirty-sixth session in Niagara Falls, Canada, from September 22 to 26, 2003. During the thirty-sixth session, the TWO planned to discuss or re-discuss the following items: Short reports on developments in plant variety protection; Molecular techniques; Project to consider the publication of variety descriptions; UPOV databases; TGP documents; Survey on “Testing of Seed-Propagated Ornamental Varieties;” Uniformity requirements for variegated varieties; Discussions on draft Test Guidelines (Subgroups); Recommendations on draft Test Guidelines (plenary); Date and place of the next session; Future program; Report on the Conclusions of the Session.

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

54. The TWV held its thirty-sixth session in Tsukuba, Japan, from September 9 to 13, 2002, under the chairmanship of Ms. Julia Borys (Poland). The Report on the Conclusions is contained in document TWV/36/13, and the detailed Report appears as document TWV/36/14.

55. The session was attended by 63 participants from 14 members of the Union, seven observer States and two observer organizations. The participants included the trainees from a three-month plant variety protection training course organized by the Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) from September to October 2002.

56. The TWV received oral reports from the participants on developments in plant variety protection in their respective countries. The TWV noted, in particular, that a study was underway in the United Kingdom on the use of image analysis applied to the measurement of stem and flower characteristics in pea, and that a ring test had been conducted in Slovenia with the participation of the Czech Republic, France, Hungary, the Netherlands, Poland and Slovakia to compare descriptions of 14 lettuce varieties. It was noted that such a ring test was useful for the international harmonization of variety descriptions and for the drafting of Test Guidelines and should be considered for other crops. The TWV also received an oral report on developments within UPOV from the Office.

57. With regard to the report on developments in UPOV concerning molecular techniques, the TWV agreed that Option 1 (a) (Use of molecular characteristics which are directly linked to traditional characteristics) as explained in document TC/38/14—CAJ/45/5, would be useful for the detection of certain vegetable characteristics, such as disease resistance and male sterility, and could be considered in conjunction with the discussion of individual Test Guidelines documents. The TWV observed that the usefulness of Option 2 (Calibration of threshold levels for molecular characteristics against the minimum distance in traditional characteristics) for the management of reference varieties in DUS testing for vegetable varieties was worthy of examination. However, the examination by the TWV in this area would depend on the availability of data on both molecular and conventional distances.

58. The TWV noted that the first meeting of the *Ad hoc* Crop Subgroup on Molecular Techniques for Mushroom would be held on the afternoon of Friday, September 13, 2002, and supported the nomination of Mr. van Marrewijk as Chairman of the Subgroup.

59. The TWV received an oral report from the Office on the latest developments in the Project to Consider the Publication of Variety Descriptions. The TWV agreed that Chinese Cabbage and Lettuce should be placed on the short list of species for which a model study could be conducted and noted that Mr. Keiji Tanaka (Japan) and Mr. Kees van Ettehoven (Netherlands) would act as coordinators of the respective crop species.

60. The TWV discussed a number of draft TGP documents with priority being given to TGP/7 "Development of Test Guidelines," TGP/4 "Management of Variety Collections," TGP/9 "Examining Distinctness" and TGP/10 "Examining Uniformity." With regard to other TGP documents, the TWV discussed TGP/3.2 "Developments and Explanations Regarding Varieties of Common Knowledge" and TGP/12.1 "Characteristics Expressed in Response to External Factors: Disease Resistance." The TWV recalled that it had proposed, at its thirty-fifth session, that a separate TGP document be prepared on scent and flavor (TGP/12.4). However, the TWV considered that it did not have sufficient experience and knowledge, for the time being, to use scent or flavor characteristics for the conduct of DUS testing for vegetable varieties.

61. The TWV agreed that draft Test Guidelines for Basil, Broad Bean (Revision), Chinese Cabbage (Revision), Chinese Chive, Chives, Endives (Revision), Lentil, Lettuce (Revision) and Runner Bean (Revision) should be submitted to the TC for adoption.

62. The TWV agreed to seek the advice of the Chairperson of the TWO on whether the draft Test Guidelines for Perilla, as amended, should be considered by the TWO.

63. The TWV agreed to discuss or re-discuss draft Test Guidelines for Husk Tomato, Melon, Mushroom, Perilla and Rosemary during its next session.

64. At its thirty-seventh session, the TWV planned to discuss or re-discuss: Short reports on developments in plant variety protection; Report on the last session of the TC and recommendations resulting from that session; Molecular techniques; TGP documents; Discussion on draft Test Guidelines for: Brussels Sprout (Revision); Cabbage (Revision); Carrot (Revision); Chard/Leaf Beet (Revision); Ginseng; Husk Tomato; Melon (Revision); Mushroom; Parsnip; Perilla; Rosemary; Watermelon (Revision); Date and place of the next session; Future program; Adoption of the Report on the Conclusions of the session.

65. At the invitation of the expert from the Netherlands, the TWV proposed to hold its thirty-seventh session in Roelofarendsveen, Netherlands, from June 23 to 27, 2003.

66. The representative from the International Seed Federation (ISF) noted that in document TWA31/10, Report on the Conclusions, Mrs. Ivana Vilela should appear as an ISF representative rather than as one of the official experts from Brazil. The CPVO reported on developments for the publication of variety descriptions of strawberry and apple varieties.

#### Matters Arising from the Technical Working Parties

\*67. The TC considered document TC/39/3.

68. The Technical Director introduced paragraphs 1 to 4 of the Annex to document TC/39/3. He drew attention to two issues in particular, the GAÏA software and the proposal from the TWV for the Office to prepare a document on the possible use of molecular techniques in DUS examination. In relation to the first item, the Delegation of France clarified that the GAÏA software calculated a morphological difference between varieties, based on a multivariate approach. The aim of the software was to identify the most similar varieties and those varieties which would not require comparison in a field trial. It emphasized that the program needed to be calibrated for different species and environments and, therefore, knowledge of those aspects was important for use of the program. It reported that the GAÏA software should be ready for distribution to members of the Union in the form of a CD-ROM by the end of April 2003, and would include a user guide and information on its application. The experts from France would also provide some initial guidance on its application. The TC also heard that the software had been distributed to five countries for testing. The Delegation of Germany noted that at present, DUS testing was being made on a characteristic-by-characteristic approach and pointed out that the GAÏA software under test represented a multivariate approach which was currently not a UPOV-recommended method. It suggested that the approach should be considered in the appropriate TGP document, with clear explanations on the conditions under which the GAÏA software might be used. The Delegations of Denmark and the United Kingdom commented that they were testing the software using their own data set. The Office added that it would provide information on how to obtain the software on the restricted area of its Website. It was noted that the GAÏA software and its application would be discussed at the twenty-first session of the TWC, to be held in Tjele, Denmark, from June 10 to 13, 2003.

69. The TC discussed the proposal from the TWF for the preparation of a document on the possible use of molecular markers in the DUS examination. The Delegation of Denmark considered that it would be useful to include in document TC/38/14 Add.-CAJ/45/5 Add. some additional information on the possible benefits of molecular techniques in DUS testing. The Delegation of France considered that document TC/38/14 Add.-CAJ/45/5 Add. was a good document and suggested that this should be the basis for developing any new document, mentioning that the Crop Subgroups had raised some questions which might be addressed and that it might be useful to focus on practical matters. The Delegation of the United Kingdom supported the proposal from France to focus on practical matters and considered it useful to provide information to help people follow the developments which had taken place. It was agreed that the Office, in conjunction with the Chairpersons of the TC and the BMT, would use existing documents and, in particular, document TC/38/14 Add.-CAJ/45/5 Add. to develop a summary of the current position, which would be considered by the TC at its fortieth session in spring 2004. The TC would then consider whether to invite the CAJ to examine the document. In the meantime, it agreed that the TWPs should be given the opportunity to discuss document TC/38/14 Add.-CAJ/45/5 Add. in more depth at their sessions in 2003.

70. The TC noted the work of the Crop Subgroups in 2002 as laid down in paragraphs 5 to 30 of document TC/39/3 and agreed their programs of work in 2003, subject to meetings only being held where there were sufficient papers for consideration. In respect of the possible meeting of a Rose Crop Subgroup, the Delegation from the Netherlands informed the TC that a meeting of that group was foreseen and the possible venue would be June 25, 2003, in the Netherlands.

\*71. With regard to the report from the Mushroom Crop Subgroup, the TC clarified its view that the request for guidance should have been related to the possible use of molecular markers, without reference to the preparation of Test Guidelines. It also expressed its concern at the content of paragraph 19 of document TC/39/3 and recommended that these matters be addressed by the TWV, when it considered this report at its thirty-seventh session in June 2003.

\*72. With regard to the proposal from the Sugarcane Crop Subgroup for the production of an updated explanation and analysis of available molecular methods, summarizing their advantages and disadvantages, the TC emphasized that this should have referred to their use in variety characterization and not DUS testing. The Chairman of the TC confirmed that this proposal and that of the Sugarcane Crop Subgroup, to prepare a draft standard protocol to obtain and store molecular data relevant to the species, could be considered under the relevant agenda items of the eighth session of the BMT, to be held in Tsukuba, Japan, from September 3 to 5, 2003.

73. The TC noted the information provided in Section II “Matters for Information” of document TC/39/3 without making further comments.

#### Chairmanship of the *Ad hoc* Crop Subgroups on Molecular Techniques

\*74. The TC considered document TC/39/7 and approved the following Crop Subgroups Chairpersons:

- Nico van Marrewijk (Netherlands): Mushroom
- Beate Rücker (Mrs.) (Germany): Potato
- Marcelo Labarta (Argentina): Soybean
- Luis Salaices (Spain): Sugarcane

#### Preparatory Workshops

75. The TC considered document TC/39/8. The Delegations from Argentina, France, Mexico and Spain noted the importance of these workshops for experts attending TWP's for the first time and stressed the need to continue this activity in a less formal setting, compared to a TWP meeting, and with enough flexibility to adapt the program to the needs of the participants.

\*76. It was noted that the preparatory workshops which took place in 2002 had proved useful and it was agreed that preparatory workshops should be organized in conjunction with the TWP meetings to be held in 2003. In order to further improve the value of the workshops, it was recommended that the Office issue a questionnaire, to potential participants, seeking information on items which would be of particular interest.

TGP Documents

\*77. The TC considered documents TC/39/5, TGP/7 draft 2 and TC/39/6.

(a) *TGP/7 “Development of Test Guidelines”*

78. The Chairman reminded the TC that, at its previous session, it had discussed TGP/7 based on document TC/38/8, and that TGP/7 Draft 1 had been produced, incorporating the comments agreed by the TC and had then been circulated to the TWPs for discussion. After this first round of discussion, the TC-EDC had considered the comments made by the TWPs, and TGP/7 Draft 2 had been prepared for discussion by the TC. He proposed that the TC should identify those areas where there was agreement in the wording and those where further discussion was needed in a further round of discussion by the TWPs.

79. The TC first considered Sections 1 to 4 of TGP/7 Draft 2.

80. The Delegation of France noted the active role of the Office in the development of Test Guidelines and suggested reflecting this in future drafts of TGP/7. During discussion concerning the procedure for the development of Test Guidelines (Section 2 of TGP/7 draft 2), the TC noted the value of activities such as the Asian Regional Meeting in the development of Test Guidelines, particularly for those crops for which there was a lack of expertise at the TWP. In reply to a question from the Delegation of Colombia, the Technical Director clarified that the type of work carried out in the Asian region could take place in other parts of the world provided that resources were made available.

81. Several delegations pointed to the need to establish clear deadlines for the preparation and submission of draft Test Guidelines. They noted that those documents were first forwarded to the relevant crop experts in the country for comments, and were then passed on to the delegate attending the UPOV TWP meeting. It was suggested that different deadlines could be considered for those Test Guidelines which were at the final stage of development by the TWPs and those which were still in an early stage of drafting. The TC considered that the need to set deadlines for the preparation and submission of Test Guidelines was also valid for Test Guidelines which were to be submitted for adoption by the TC and for missing or complementary information requested by the TC to be provided by the leading expert. The Delegations of Australia and New Zealand proposed to include some clarifications concerning the role of the TC-EDC in the development process of UPOV Test Guidelines. In reply to a question from the Delegation of Germany, the Technical Director explained that in the development process of Test Guidelines, as described in TGP/7, there was no separate step for comments to be provided by the professional organizations, as there had been in the past. He added that those organizations were directly involved in the development because they participated in the TWPs.

82. The TC gave particular consideration to the proposal in paragraph 4.4.3.2.2 for different options for the wording of characteristics with states of expression “absent” or “present”. The Delegations of France, Germany, Mexico, the Netherlands and Spain considered it necessary to retain the presentation as “absent (1)” and “present (9)”. They noted that having “absent (0)” could lead to errors because note “0 (zero)” might be interpreted as “without information” instead of “absent”.

83. The TC then examined the Annex I to document TGP/7, the “TG Template”.

[84.](#) Some delegations expressed their concern about the wording of section 4.1.2 “Consistent Differences” and recalled the long discussion on that subject during the development of the General Introduction (document TG/1/3).

[85.](#) The representative of ISF noted that breeders considered that the possibility to carry out DUS tests in a second testing place, when necessary for examining the expression of a characteristic relevant for the examination, should be a valid option for the testing authority and proposed (TG Template: Section 3.2) to replace the word “may” by “should” to give more emphasis to the recommendation. He further suggested that some of the information provided in the Technical Questionnaire of the TG Template should be treated as confidential and offered to provide examples of how this could be addressed. The Delegations of Colombia and the United Kingdom considered that it should be left to each member of the Union to decide on the matter of confidential status. The Technical Director recalled that previous discussions on the subject in UPOV had also concluded that confidentiality was a matter for each member of the Union.

[86.](#) In relation to Section 6 of the Technical Questionnaire, the Delegation of France noted that it might be possible for two varieties to have the same note for the expression of a given characteristic but nevertheless they could be different. For that reason, it proposed to offer the applicant the possibility to make written comments, in addition to filling out the proposed table.

[87.](#) The Delegation of Germany considered that it was not correct to make reference to the Test Guidelines in Section 9.2 of the Technical Questionnaire because the breeder, who is the person completing this part, might not be provided with other sections of the document. It further noted the importance of including information about the method used for assessing the presence of plant diseases or prior chemical treatment in the plant material submitted for examination.

[88.](#) The TC then considered Annex II of document TGP/7 draft 2, noting that it contained the proposed additional standard wording (ASW).

[89.](#) It was clarified that those paragraphs, where the text had been agreed by the TC in 2002, had been identified by means of a hash (#). Some delegations wondered whether ASW 7 should refer to “growing cycles” instead of “years”. The Delegations of Australia and Germany noted that COYD might not be used for all the characteristics used in the DUS test of a given variety and proposed to modify the wording accordingly by adding “Where the COYD method is used” at the beginning of ASW 7. The Chairman noted that it was a new text and that further consideration was required before the TC took a final decision.

[90.](#) The TC noted that, in ASW 9, it was necessary to include a new paragraph to cover plant varieties which were seed-propagated only.

[91.](#) The representative of ISF wondered whether, in the wording of ASW 15, “can” should be replaced by “should”, taking into account that it would apply “where the parent lines are to be submitted as part of the examination”. In respect to ASW 15, he stated that the breeders were not in favor of the submission of a color photograph with the Technical Questionnaire. He added that a note had been sent to the Office explaining the reasons. However, he suggested that the TWO might be able to explain the purpose for including that request, which might help ISF members to understand the purpose. Mr. Chris Barnaby (New Zealand), Chairman of the TWO, explained that the TWO had included the item in the agenda for its



meeting in 2003 and that a reply would be given to ISF. The Chairman proposed that ASW 15 should be considered by the TWPs during 2003.

92. The TC examined Annex III of document TGP/7 Draft 2 noting that it contained guidance notes intended to assist drafters in the preparation of Test Guidelines.

93. When discussing GN 11, different opinions were expressed concerning the need to add an asterisk to characteristics included in the Technical Questionnaire. On the one hand, the Delegations from Germany and the Netherlands considered that, whenever a characteristic was included in the TQ, it should be given an asterisk, whilst, on the other hand, the Chairperson of the TWO noted that for the TWO that might not always be the case and he preferred to have some flexibility.

94. In respect of GN 12, the Delegation of Australia considered that, under item “(a) Purpose of example varieties”, the circumstances under which example varieties prove more accurate than actual measurement should be clarified, because, in some cases, measurements were useful. This could require some rewording of the third paragraph of section (ii). The Delegation of Germany noted the difficulty for a drafter to estimate the “expected life” of the variety, as mentioned under item “(c) Availability”. The ex-Chairperson of the TWO clarified that the intention in having that point in GN 12 was for the drafter to take into account the fact that plant material of varieties which were newly launched or not very well known could prove difficult to obtain. She explained that, in this respect, the TWO was placing emphasis on the use of diagrams as far as possible. The representative from ISF accepted the difficulty in assessing the expected life of a variety but recognized the importance of readily available example varieties and recalled the proposal made by ISF last year of having the possibility of updating the list of example varieties without the need to modify the whole Test Guidelines. The Delegation of France noted the importance and complexity of the issue, which deserved careful consideration and expressed the need to limit the number of characteristics with example varieties to those where they were strictly needed.

95. Under GN12, item “(e) Illustration of the range of expression within the variety collection,” the Delegation of Germany considered that the example for quantitative characteristics could be further developed and also questioned the use of the term “component” for qualitative characteristics. The Delegation of France highlighted once more the complexity of the issue, noting that, in many cases, to cover the whole variability of the expression of given characteristics all over the world, in one single set of example varieties, would not be possible and different sets of example varieties should be prepared for different regions of the world. Several delegations expressed doubts about the need to include more than one set of example varieties in the Test Guidelines and proposed that a second set, if necessary, could be developed by experts of the region concerned without involving the leading expert for that purpose but notifying the Office once agreed. The Chairman suggested that having example varieties in annexes might ease updating of Test Guidelines, without needing to modify the main body of the Test Guidelines themselves. The Delegation of Australia emphasized the importance of being able to refer to the example varieties used when producing a variety description and requested that this be kept in mind.

96. The Delegation of France considered it would be useful to include some guidance for the development of national example variety lists and proposed to ask the advice of the TWPs in that respect. The Technical Director recalled that the development of a new section dealing with the preparation of national test guidelines had already been considered by the TC.



97. The TC examined Annex II as far as GN 17 without making further comments.

\*98. The TC decided that the following sections of TGP/7 Draft 2 should be considered as matters which required further discussion before agreement could be reached. It agreed that these sections should be highlighted in the next draft of TGP/7, to be considered by the TWPs during their sessions in 2003, to ensure it was understood that this text had not been agreed by the TC.

<i>Section</i>	<i>Comment</i>
	<u>Main document</u>
2.2.5.1.2	Section to be redrafted to differentiate between those Test Guidelines at the final draft stage, which the TWP may decide to present to the TC, and other drafts to be considered further at meetings of the TWPs. A deadline of four weeks prior to the TWP meeting would be set for dispatch of the “final draft” Test Guidelines, to the TWP members, by the Office. The deadline for receipt of the documents by the Office, in order to meet this deadline would be set by the Office in conjunction with the Chairperson of the TWP concerned.
2.2.6	To be revised to allow variation of the deadline by the Chairperson of the TWP concerned. A deadline for the dispatch of draft Test Guidelines, by the Office, to the members of the TC to be introduced.
2.2.7.3(b)	To amend the deadline to three months after the TC, or before the next session of the TWP concerned, whichever is the sooner.
	<u>Annex 1 (TG Template)</u>
General	“Latin” name to be replaced by appropriate term (e.g. botanical, taxonomic or scientific name). Guidance for presentation of such names in italics to be developed and applied throughout TGP/7.
Title Page	To consider the possibility of introducing reference to the development of harmonized descriptions of new varieties of plants in the title of the document and the usefulness of a paragraph explaining the purpose of the Test Guidelines.
3.2	To consider if the text should be revised to recommend that authorities use an additional place to examine varieties where it is necessary to observe characteristics of the variety, which are relevant for the examination of DUS, but which cannot be observed at the initial location.
4.1.2	To be redrafted to reflect more closely the text of the General Introduction.
Section 10 (TQ)	International Seed Federation (ISF) to provide the Office with examples of how confidential information might be handled in the TQ of the UPOV Test Guidelines. The Office to prepare proposals for further consideration in future drafts to be considered by the TWPs and TC.
Section 10 (TQ) 9	Consideration to be given to the possible inclusion of ASW 16 as standard wording in the TG Template.

<i>Section</i>	<i>Comment</i>
	<p><u>Annex 2 (Additional Standard Wording)</u></p> <p>ASW 7 Further consideration to be given to the possible inclusion of this text as additional standard wording. If included, the first sentence should be prefixed with “Where the COYD method is used ...” and “years of test” should be replaced by “growing cycles.” Also, if included, consideration would need to be given to the reference to three years of test.</p> <p>ASW 8 Further consideration to be given to the possible inclusion of this text as additional standard wording. If included, the first sentence should be prefixed with “Where the COYU method is used ...” and “years of test” should be replaced by “growing cycles.”</p> <p>ASW 15 Further consideration to be given to the use of this additional standard wording in the Technical Questionnaire of Test Guidelines. The Chairman of the TWO offered to inform ISF of the purpose of including this requirement. ISF will provide information on their concerns regarding the supply of a color photograph.</p> <p><u>Annex 3 (Guidance Notes for the TG Template)</u></p> <p>GN 11 Consideration to be given to whether the “/or” should be deleted in 3(a).</p> <p>GN 12(a) Second paragraph to be revised to explain that measurements can be influenced by the environment. Third paragraph, second sentence of (ii): “would” to be replaced by “could.”</p> <p>GN 12(b) To be revised to clarify the importance of illustrations as an alternative to example varieties. To consider the use of a flow chart presentation of the choices concerning the use of example varieties.</p> <p>GN 12(c) To be revised to remove reference to the expected lifetime of varieties.</p> <p>GN 12 (e) First bullet point to be revised to cater for quantitative characteristics presented in a condensed scale (e.g. 1, 2, 3). Second bullet point to be revised with a better term than “components.”</p> <p>GN 12(h)(i) New option to be developed based on the development of lists of example varieties to be provided to UPOV. These lists would not be incorporated within the UPOV Test Guidelines, nor as an annex, but would be made available on the UPOV Website.</p> <p><u>Annex 4 (Collection of Approved characteristics)</u></p> <p>New Section 5 to be developed</p>

\*99. The TC did not examine Section 4, GN18 to GN30, in Annex 3, and Annex 4 of the document and agreed that the highlighted text in these sections should remain highlighted in the future drafts of the document. With this exception and the exception of the matters identified in paragraph 17, the TC agreed, in principle, to the document on the basis of certain editorial changes and the following revisions to the text:

<i>Section</i>	<i>Comment</i>
	<u>Main document</u>
1.3	Paragraphs 3.1 and 3.2 to be revised to clarify that the wording was <i>currently considered to be</i> appropriate.
2.1.2	To make reference to the work of the TC-EDC.
2.2.4.4	To make reference to the role of the Office in preparing Test Guidelines for the TWP meetings.
2.2.7.1	Explanation of the role of the TC-EDC, based on document TC/38/9, to be provided in this section.
2.5.2.1	Proj.3 stage to refer to “Draft to TWX subgroup meeting (2006) (e.g. at UPOV Regional Technical Meeting.”
2.5.4	Proj.3 stage to refer to “Draft to TWX subgroup meeting (2006) (e.g. at UPOV Regional Technical Meeting.”
4.4.3.2.2	Option 1 “absent (1) and present (9)” to be presented in this section. Other options, and the table, to be deleted.
	<u>Annex 1 (TG Template)</u>
Section 10 (TQ) 4	Headings for 4.1 and 4.2 to be presented in lower case, apart from the first letter of the first word.
Section 10 (TQ) 6	“Comments” box to be introduced.
Section 10 (TQ) 9.2	First sentence to read: “The plant material should not have undergone any treatment which would affect the expression of the characteristics of the variety, unless the competent authorities allow or request such treatment. If the plant material has undergone such treatment, full details of the treatment must be given. In this respect, please indicate below, to the best of your knowledge, if the plant material to be examined has been subjected to.”
	<u>Annex 2 (Additional Standard Wording)</u>
ASW 8(c) and (e)	French translation of “assessment” to be revised.
ASW 9	Option (a) to be titled “Test Guidelines covering seed-propagated and vegetatively propagated varieties.” New option (c) to be developed for Test Guidelines covering only seed-propagated varieties, with reference only to “a new seed stock.”

Section	Comment
ASW 12	<p>Wording to be amended to read “In the case of hybrid varieties which are the subject of an application for plant breeders’ rights, and where the parent lines are to be submitted as a part of the examination of the hybrid variety, this Technical Questionnaire should be completed for each of the parent lines, in addition to being completed for the hybrid variety.”</p> <p><u>Annex 3 (Guidance Notes for the TG Template)</u></p>
GN 11	<p>Guidance to be provided concerning the development of color groups for those grouping characteristics where the states of expression in the Table of Characteristics is presented as an RHS Colour Chart number.</p>

\*100. It was agreed that, on the basis of paragraph 18, the document should be used as the basis for the development of Test Guidelines in 2003.

*(b) Program for the development of TGP documents*

101. The TC considered document TC/39/6 and received an oral report from the Chairman of the TC on the views of the TC-EDC, which had been developed during its meeting on the previous day.

102. The TC confirmed the proposal laid down in Annex II of TC/39/6 and agreed that TGP/7 “Development of Test Guidelines” should continue to receive highest priority and that all TWPs should be invited to consider TGP/7 at their sessions in 2003. It also confirmed that TGP/4 “Management of Variety Collections,” TGP/9 “Examining Distinctness” and TGP/10 “Examining Uniformity” should continue to receive the next highest priority. However, it considered that TGP/7 would take a substantial amount of time to be discussed and agreed that the TWPs should not be requested to consider TGP/4, TGP/9 or TGP/10 at their sessions in 2003.

103. The TC considered Annex I of document TC/39/6. The Technical Director clarified that the proposal was that the Office would put together the sections of these documents based on existing information. The Delegation of France supported the proposal and considered it very useful to have a single document. It further proposed to circulate the flow chart to the TWPs to get their input, and maintain the guidance nature of the document when drafting the new document. The TC agreed that the flow diagram, in Annex I of document TC/39/6, showing the proposed restructuring of TGP/3, TGP/4 and TGP/9 should be elaborated and presented to the TWPs at their sessions in 2003. Furthermore, it agreed that TGP/3 should not be discussed further in the TC and should be a matter for the CAJ.

\*104. The TC agreed that, during 2003, the Office should produce full drafts of TGP/4 and TGP/9, based on the existing information in the individual sections and the restructuring set out in Annex I of document TC/39/6, to ease the consideration of these documents by the TWPs at their sessions in 2004. With regard to other TGP documents, the TC agreed that the TWP should continue to discuss drafts of those documents for which they were responsible as far as time allowed.

\*105. The TC agreed with the proposal in document TC/39/6 that drafts of TGP/5 “Experience and Cooperation in DUS Testing,” TGP/6 “Arrangements for DUS Testing” and

TGP/12.2.1 “Chemical Constituents: Protein Electrophoresis” could be submitted to the TC, at its session in Spring 2005, without discussion in the TWPs.

\*106. It was agreed that the Office should provide an updated program for the development of TGP documents in accordance with this approach and that this program should be circulated to the TC and TWPs.

#### Publication of Variety Descriptions

107. Discussions were based on document TC/39/9 and the oral report from the Technical Director on the views of the *Ad hoc* Working Group on the Publication of Variety Descriptions (WG-PVD). The representative from ISF considered that the project had gone beyond its original aim, which he considered was the simple publication of variety descriptions, because issues such as variability of descriptions and the possible use of the information were now being addressed. The Technical Director noted that the aims of the project had not changed and emphasized that they had been made very clear at the outset, namely “(a) to increase the availability of variety description information to interested parties (i.e. DUS examiners, breeders and maintainers of varieties of common knowledge) and thereby to maximize the effectiveness of the examination of distinctness; and (b) to use appropriate elements of the variety description, in the process of examining distinctness, to eliminate varieties which do not require further comparison and to identify those varieties against which a further comparison is required”. The Delegation of France recalled that the role of the TC was to focus its work on the technical aspects of the project.

\*108. On the basis of the proposals from the TWPs, and the proposal made by the WG-PVD for a study on rose, the TC agreed that the model study for the project on the publication of variety descriptions should be based on the species identified below, with the coordinators and interested parties as shown:

<u>Species / Crop</u>	<u>Proposing TWP</u>	<u>Coordinator</u>	<u>Interested Parties</u>
Apple	TWF	GB	AR, BE, CA, CZ, DE, FR, GB, HU, NL, NZ, CPVO
Barley	TWA	DK	AR, CA, CL, CZ, DE, DK, EE, ES, FI, FR, GB, HR, HU, NL, NZ, RO, RU, SE, ZA
Chinese Cabbage	TWV	JP	CN, DE, NL, JP, KR, PL, CPVO, ISF
Lettuce	TWV	NL	CZ, DE, FR, HU, NL, PL, ES, CPVO, ISF
Petunia	TWO	DE	AU, CA, DE, JP, NZ, KR, CPVO
Potato	TWA	NL / CPVO	CA, CL, CZ, DE, EE, GB, IL, NL, NZ, ZA, CPVO
Rose			CA, KE, NL, CPVO
Strawberry	TWF	IL	AR, CA, DE, ES, FR, HU, IL, KE, NZ, CPVO

\*109. The Office requested that any other interested parties should notify the Office of the Union by the end of April 2003 if they wished to be included in the study for any of the species.<sup>+</sup>

\*110. On the basis of the lists of soybean varieties in different countries, and lack of varieties in common between different countries, it concluded that it would not be appropriate to conduct a model study involving this species.

111. With regard to a possible study on Rose, some delegations considered that it might be too ambitious to try to cover all types of rose varieties and it might be better to restrict the study to a specific type. It was agreed that consideration should be given to including only one type of rose in any study and that the matter should be discussed further by the TWO.

\*112. In the case of barley, it agreed that the model study should build on the information already obtained by a previous project reported to the TWA in document TWA/29/19.

\*113. As a first step in the model study, the TC agreed that the coordinators, in conjunction with the Office, should obtain lists of varieties and identify those varieties which appeared in the lists of more than one country. The coordinator should then seek descriptions on a manageable number of varieties for comparison. The descriptions should be according to the characteristics in the latest version of the UPOV Test Guidelines and the location at which the descriptions were produced should be clearly identified.

\*114. It was recommended that the TWC should be invited to review the work conducted previously by the expert from Denmark, as reported in document TWA/29/19, and give its advice on the management of the data. Furthermore, it was agreed that the delegate from Denmark, in conjunction with the Office, should develop some initial guidance for the coordinators to help in their planning and conduct of the study.

\*115. The TC agreed that the Chairman of the TWC should be invited to participate in the WG-PVD.

#### Issues Concerning the Use of Material Submitted for the Examination of Distinctness, Uniformity and Stability

116. The TC considered document TC/39/10. The representative of the European Community (EC) welcomed the idea of developing a model agreement for the transfer of plant material. The Delegation of France had some concerns as to whether publishing variety descriptions might offer an effective means of examining distinctness where plant material was unavailable. The Chairman noted that the viewpoints of the TC would be considered by the CAJ in the development of the document.

---

<sup>+</sup> The table has been updated to include other interested parties which notified their wish to be included in the study.

### Extension of Protection to Hybrid Varieties Through Protection of Parent Lines

117. The TC considered document TC/39/11 and noted the analysis it provided on the extension of protection to hybrid varieties through protection of parent lines. It agreed that the footnote on page 2 of that document should be deleted.

### The Notion of “Essentially Derived Variety” in the Breeding of Ornamental Varieties

\*118. The TC considered document TC/39/12 and noted that this matter would be discussed at the forty-seventh session of the CAJ, to be held in Geneva on April 10, 2003.

### UPOV Information Databases

119. Discussions were based on document TC/39/13. The representatives from the European Community (EC) and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) supported the development of the UPOV code and GENIE database. In reply to questions from the Delegations of the Netherlands and the United Kingdom, the Technical Director explained that the aim of the UPOV code was to resolve problems of synonyms and variation in naming in the UPOV databases, and further clarified that the UPOV code would, in general, remain unchanged, even if the botanical name of the crop changed. He added that the aim was to include the UPOV code in the information that contributors sent to the Office for the UPOV-ROM, for which purpose there was already a specific field. The Delegation of Denmark considered it would be useful to include the denomination class.

120. The TC agreed on the approach for the development of a UPOV code set out in document TC/39/13, the work program for the development and introduction of the proposed UPOV code set out in paragraph 16 and the proposal for the development of the “GENIE” database.

### Review of the UPOV-ROM Plant Variety Database

121. The TC considered document TC/39/14-CAJ/47/5. The Delegation of Australia noted that if new fields for information were added, they would need to be agreed by members of the Union, and it recommended that new developments should be compatible with Microsoft programs. The Delegation of Colombia considered it very important to develop new tools to identify synonyms. In response to concerns from some delegations, it was clarified that the UPOV code related to the genus/species and was not a code for varieties. The Delegations of Mexico and the United Kingdom welcomed the project and supported the approach to the long-term issues. They asked the Office to consider the benefits of the different actions proposed in order to allocate priorities to its development. The representative from the EC explained that the CPVO planned to create a plant variety denomination database which would be available on-line on the Website of the CPVO by 2005 and would include a search function. The representative from OECD said the list of varieties included in the OECD seed certification scheme could be added and was already available on the OECD Website. The Technical Director explained that the matter would also be discussed by the CAJ and further clarified that the inclusion of the database on the Web would not necessarily mean the elimination of the UPOV-ROM.

[122.](#) The TC supported the developments proposed in the document and clarified that any proposals to change the fields in the UPOV-ROM to be considered as mandatory would need to be agreed by the members of the Union.

### Award of UPOV Medals

\*123. The Vice Secretary-General awarded Mr. Wieslaw Pilarczyk with a bronze UPOV medal, in recognition of his chairmanship of the TWC for the period 2000 to 2002.

### Test Guidelines

\*124. The Committee considered and adopted the following Test Guidelines on the basis of the amendments as specified in Annex II and the linguistic changes recommended by the Enlarged Editorial Committee:

<i>Document</i>	<i>English</i>	<i>French</i>	<i>German</i>	<i>Spanish</i>	<i>Latin</i>
TG/9/5(proj.1)	Runner Bean	Haricot d'Espagne	Prunkbohne	Judía escarlata	Phaseolus coccineus L.
TG/13/8(proj.3)	Lettuce	Laitue	Salat	Lechuga	Lactuca sativa L.
TG/38/7(proj.3)	White Clover	Trèfle blanc	Weißklee	Trébol blanco	Trifolium repens L.
TG/43/7(proj.2)	Raspberry	Framboisier	Himbeere	Frambueso	Rubus idaeus L.
TG/100/4(proj.2)	Quince	Cognassier	Quitte	Membrillero	Cydonia Mill. sensu stricto
TG/105/4(proj.1)	Chinese Cabbage	Chou chinois	Chinakohl	Repollo chino	Brassica pekinensis L.
TG/118/4(proj.1)	Endive	Chicorée (frisée, scarole)	Endivie	Escarola	Cichorium endivia L.
TG/192/1(proj.2)	Apple (ornamental varieties)	Pommier (variétés ornementales)	Apfel (Ziersorten)	Manzano (variedades ornamentales)	Malus Mill.
TG/198/1(proj.1)	Chives, Asatsuki	Ciboulette, Civette	Schnittlauch	Cebollino	Allium schoenoprasum L.
TG/199/1(proj.1)	Chinese Chives			Cive chino	Allium tuberosum Rottler ex Spreng
TG/BASIL(proj.1)	Basil	Basilic	Basilikum	Albahaca	Ocimum basilicum L.
TG/BRACTE(proj.2)	Bracteantha, Everlasting Daisy	Immortelle à bractées	Gartenstrohblume	Siempreviva, Perpetua	Helichrysum bracteatum (Vent.) Andr.
TG/BROADBEAN (proj.1) (TG/8/4 Rev.)	Broad Bean	Fève	Dicke Bohne (Puffbohne)	Haba de huerta, Haba de verdeo	Vicia faba L. var. major Harz
TG/CALIBR(proj.2)	Calibrachoa	Calibrachoa	Calibrachoa	Calibrachoa	Calibrachoa Llave & Lex.
TG/CHERIM(proj.2)	Cherimoya	Chérimolier	Cherimoya	Cherimoya, Chirimoyo	Annona cherimola Mill.



Document	English	French	German	Spanish	Latin
TG/DENDRO(proj.2)	Dendrobium	Dendrobium	Dendrobium, Baumwucherer	Dendrobium	Dendrobium Nees
TG/LENTIL(proj.1)	Lentil	Lentille	Linse	Lenteja	Lens culinaris Medik.
TG/LEPTOS	Leptospermum, Tea Tree	Leptosperme	Südseemyrte	Leptospermum	Leptospermum J.R. et G. Forst.
TG/PETUNI(proj.2)	Petunia	Pétunia	Petunie	Petunia	Petunia Juss.
TG/PHALAE(proj.2)	Phalaenopsis	Phalaenopsis	Phalaenopsis	Phalaenopsis	Phalaenopsis Blume
TG/WILLOW(proj.2) TG/72/4(Rev.)	Willow	Saule	Weide	Sauce	Salix L.
TG/MANDA(proj.3) (TG/83/3 Rev.)	Mandarins	Mandariniers	Mandarinen	Mandarinos	Citrus; Grp 1
TG/ORANG(proj.3) (TG/83/3 Rev.)	Oranges	Orangers	Orangen	Naranjos	Citrus; Grp 2
TG/LEM-LIM(proj.3) (TG/83/3 Rev.)	Lemons and Limes	Citronniers et Limettiers	Zitronen und Limetten	Limones y Limas	Citrus; Grp 3
TG/GRA-PUM(proj.3) (TG/83/3 Rev.)	Grapefruit and Pummelo	Pomelo et Pam- plemoussier	Grapefruit und Pampelmuse	Pomelo y Pummelo	Citrus; Grp 4
TG/PONCI(proj.3) (TG/83/3 Rev.)	Trifoliate Orange	Oranger trifolié	Dreiblättrige Orange	Naranjo trifoliado	Poncirus Raf.; Grp 5

\*125. It was agreed that the Test Guidelines for Persimmon (TG/92/4(proj.2)) should be referred back to the TWF for clarification of the astringency classification of varieties.

\*126. The representative of the International Seed Federation (ISF) expressed the view that the Test Guidelines for Lettuce should be adopted, but noted that it might be appropriate for a revision to be discussed by the TWV, during the course of 2003, to address certain developments concerning *Bremia* resistance.

\*127. The Delegation of Mexico noted that the proposed deletion of “Mexican Lime, limón mexicano” in document TG/LEM-LIM(proj.3) should be checked.

\*128. The TC agreed the plans for the development of new Test Guidelines and the revision of existing ones by the TWPs as shown in Annex II of document TC/39/2. It agreed that, on the basis that the expert from Brazil would be attending the TWA, the Test Guidelines for Coffee should be developed by that TWP, but that the TWF should also be involved in the development of the Test Guidelines. It invited the TWA to consider the development of Test Guidelines for *Panicum miliaceum* L., based on the national guidelines developed by Ukraine.

\*129. The TC noted the status of the existing Test Guidelines as listed in Annex III of document TC/39/2. It noted that the “(proj.)” for TG/65/4, TG/90/6, TG/117/4, TG/119/4 and TG/172/2 should be deleted.

List of Species in Which Practical Knowledge Has Been Acquired or for Which National Test Guidelines Have Been Established

\*130. The TC considered document TC/39/4. It noted that, in the Spanish version of paragraph 4 the codes for China and Colombia should be amended.

\*131. The TC discussed the proposal in paragraph 7, but concluded that there was no consensus to change the current presentation of information in the document.

Program for the Fortieth Session

\*132. The following draft agenda was agreed for the fortieth session of the TC to be held in Geneva in 2004:

1. Opening of the session
2. Adoption of the agenda
3. Report on relevant matters discussed in the last sessions of the Administrative and Legal Committee, the Consultative Committee and the Council (oral report by the Vice Secretary-General)
4. Progress reports on the work of the Technical Working Parties, including the BMT and Crop Subgroups
5. Matters arising from the Technical Working Parties
6. TGP documents
7. Publication of variety descriptions
8. UPOV information databases and UPOV-ROM
9. Preparatory workshops
10. Test Guidelines
11. List of species in which practical knowledge has been acquired or for which national test guidelines have been established
12. Program for the forty-first session
13. Adoption of the report on the conclusions reached in the session (if time permits)
14. Closing of the session.

*133. 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

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

I. MEMBRES / MEMBERS / VERBANDSMITGLIEDER / MIEMBROS

ALLEMAGNE / GERMANY / DEUTSCHLAND / ALEMANIA

Uwe MEYER, Referatsleiter Informationstechnologie, Referat 111, Bundessortenamt, Postfach 610440, 30604 Hannover (tel.: +49 511 956 6689 fax: +49 511 563 362 e-mail: uwe.meyer@bundessortenamt.de)

Beate RÜCKER (Frau), Referatsleiterin DUS-Prüfung, Referat 301, Bundessortenamt, Osterfelddamm 80, 30627 Hannover (tel.: +49 511 956 6639 fax: +49 511 5633 62 e-mail: beate.ruecker@bundessortenamt.de)

Erik SCHULTE, Referatsleiter Obst und Stauden, Prüfstelle Wurzen, Bundessortenamt, Torgauerstr. 100, 04808 Wurzen (tel.: +49 3425 90 40 24 fax: +49 3425 90 40 20 e-mail: erik.schulte@bundessortenamt.de)

ARGENTINE / ARGENTINA / ARGENTINIEN

Néstor FERNÁNDEZ, Responsable Semillas, Secretaría de Agricultura, Ganadería, Pesca y Alimentos (SAGPyA), Ministerio de la Producción, Paseo Colón 922, 3er piso, of. 302, 1063 Buenos Aires (tel.: +54 11 4349 2497 fax: +54 11 4349 2417 e-mail: nesfer@sagpya.minproduccion.gov.ar)

Marcelo LABARTA, Director de Registro de Variedades, ex-Instituto Nacional de Semillas, Secretaría de Agricultura, Ganadería, Pesca y Alimentos (SAGPyA), Ministerio de la Producción, Paseo Colón 922, 3er piso, of. 347, 1063 Buenos Aires (tel.: +54 11 4349 2445 fax: +54 11 4349 2444 e-mail: mlabar@sagyp.mecon.gov.ar)

AUSTRALIE / AUSTRALIA / AUSTRALIEN

Doug WATERHOUSE, Registrar, Plant Breeders' Rights Office, Department of Primary Industries and Energy, Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry - Australia, GPO Box 858, Canberra, ACT 2601 (tel.: +61 2 6272 3888 fax: +61 2 6272 3650 e-mail: doug.waterhouse@affa.gov.au)

AUTRICHE / AUSTRIA / ÖSTERREICH

Barbara FÜRNEWEGER (Frau), Leiterin, Institut für Pflanzenbau, Landwirtschaftliche Untersuchungen und Forschung Wien, Bundesamt für Ernährungssicherheit, Spargelfeldstrasse 191, Postfach 400, 1226 Wien (tel.: +43 1 732 16 4172 fax: +43 1 732 16 4211 e-mail: barbara.fuernweger@lwvie.ages.at)

BÉLARUS / BELARUS / BELARÚS

Sergei ALEINIK, Ambassador, Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission, 15, avenue de la Paix, 1211 Geneva, Switzerland (tel.: +41 22 7482450 fax: +41 22 7482451)

Irina EGOROVA (Mrs.), First Secretary, Permanent Mission, 15, avenue de la Paix, 1211 Geneva, Switzerland (tel.: +41 22 7482450 fax: +41 22 7482451)

BELGIQUE / BELGIUM / BELGIEN / BÉLGICA

Camille VANSLEMBROUCK (Mme), Ingénieur, Office de la Propriété Intellectuelle, North Gate III, 5ème étage, 16, blvd. du Roi Albert II, 1000 Bruxelles (tel.: +32 2 2065158 fax: +32 2 2065750 e-mail: camille.vanslembrouck@mineco.fgov.be)

BRÉSIL / BRAZIL / BRASILIEN / BRASIL

Álvaro A. NUNES VIANA, Service national de protection des cultivars (SNPC), Ministère de l'agriculture, de l'élevage et de l'approvisionnement, CEP 70043-900, Esplanada dos Ministerios, Bloco D, Anexo A, Térreo, Salas 1-12, Brasilia, D.F. (tel.: +55 61 2242842 fax: +55 61 2242842 e-mail: aviana@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 K1A 0Y9 (tel.: +1 613 225 2342 fax: +1 613 228 6629 e-mail: vsisson@inspection.gc.ca)

CHINE / CHINA

LÜ Bo, Division Director, DUS Test Division, Development Center for Science and Technology, Ministry of Agriculture, Building 18, Mai Zi Dian Street, Beijing 100026 (tel.: +86 10 6592 5213 fax: +86 10 6592 5213 e-mail: lvbo@agri.gov.cn)

LI Yanmei (Mrs.), Project Administrator, Department for International Cooperation, State Intellectual Property Office (SIPO), P.O. Box 8020, 6, Xitucheng Road, Haidian District, Beijing 100088 (tel.: +86 10 6209 3288 fax: +86 10 6201 9615 e-mail: liyanmei@sipo.gov.cn)

HAN Li (Mrs.), First Secretary, Permanent Mission, 11, chemin de Surville, 1213 Petit-Lancy 2, Switzerland (tel.: +41 22 879 5635 fax: +41 22 879 5637 e-mail: c\_hanliu@yahoo.com)

COLOMBIE / COLOMBIA / KOLUMBIEN

Alvaro ABISAMBRA, Gerente General, Instituto Colombiano Agropecuario (ICA), Ministerio de Agricultura, Calle 37, No. 8-43, pisos 4 y 5 Aereo 7984, 1511123 El Dorado, Bogotá D.F (tel.: +57 1 2884438 fax: +57 1 288 4169 e-mail: gerencia@ica.gov.co)

Ana Luisa DÍAZ JIMÉNEZ (Sra.), Coordinador Nacional, Derechos de Obtentor de Variedades y Producción de Semillas, Instituto Colombiano Agropecuario (ICA), Calle 37, # 8-43, Piso 4, Bogotá D.F. (tel.: +57 1 232 8643 fax: +57 1 232 4697 e-mail: semillas@ica.gov.co, semillasica@hotmail.com)

Rocio SAÑUDO DE ANGEL (Sra.), Jefe Oficina Jurídica, Instituto Colombiano Agropecuario (ICA), Calle 37, # 8-43, Piso 5, Bogotá D.C. (tel.: +57 1 232 4690 fax: +57 1 288 4037 e-mail: juridica@ica.gov.co)

Luis G. GUZMAN VALENCIA, Ministro Consejero, Misión Permanente, 17-19, chemin du Champ-d'Anier, 1209 Ginebra, Suiza

CROATIE / CROATIA / KROATIEN / CROACIA

Ruzica ORE (Mrs.), Head of Plant Variety Protection and Registration, Institute for Seeds and Seedlings, Vinkovacka cesta 63c, 31000 Osijek (tel.: +385 31 275206 fax: +385 31 275193 e-mail: r.ore@zsr.hr)

DANEMARK / DENMARK / DÄNEMARK / DINAMARCA

Gerhard DENEKEN, Head, Department of Variety Testing, Danish Institute of Agricultural Sciences, Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Fisheries, Postbox 7, Teglværksvej 10, Tystofte, 4230 Skaelskoer (tel.: +45 58 160601 fax: +45 58 160606 e-mail: gerhard.deneken@agrsci.dk)

ESPAGNE / SPAIN / SPANIEN / ESPAÑA

Luis SALAICES, Jefe de Área del Registro de Variedades, Oficina Española de Variedades Vegetales (OEVV), Ministerio de Agricultura, Pesca y Alimentación (MAPA),  
Avda. de Ciudad de Barcelona No. 6, 28007 Madrid (tel.: +34 91 3476712  
fax: +34 91 3476703 e-mail: lsalaice@mapya.es)

Cecilio PRIETO MARTIN, Director Técnico de Evaluación de Variedades, Subdirección General de Investigación y Tecnología (INIA), Carretera de la Coruña km. 7.5,  
28003 Madrid (tel.: +34 91 347 6963 fax: +34 91 347 4168 e-mail: prieto@inia.es)

ESTONIE / ESTONIA / ESTLAND

Maria ABAKUMOVA (Ms.), Chief Inspector, Variety Control Department, Estonian Plant Production Inspectorate, 71024 Viljandi (tel.: +372 43 346 50 fax: +372 43 346 50  
e-mail: maria.abakumova@plant.agri.ee)

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

Karen M. HAUDA (Mrs.), Patent Attorney, Office of International Affairs,  
United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO), Washington, D.C. 20231  
(tel.: +1 703 305 9300 ext. 129 fax: +1 703 305 8885 e-mail: karen.hauda@uspto.gov)

Dominic KEATING, Intellectual Property Attaché, Office of the United States Trade Representative (USTR), Permanent Mission, 11, route de Pregny, 1292 Chambésy,  
Switzerland (tel.: +41 22 749 52 81 fax: +41 22 749 4880 e-mail: dkeating@ustr.gov)

Ria THOMAS (Ms.), Third Secretary, Permanent Mission, 11, route de Pregny,  
1292 Chambésy, Switzerland (tel.: +41 22 749 4111 fax: +41 22 7494880)

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

Yuri A. ROGOVSKIY, Deputy Chairman, Chief of Methods Department,  
State Commission of the Russian Federation for Selection Achievements Test and Protection,  
Orlikov per., 1/11, Moscow 107139 (tel.: +70 095 208 6775 fax: +70 095 207 8626  
e-mail: statecommission@mtu-net.ru)

Madina OUMAROVA (Mrs.), Expert of Methods Department, State Commission of the Russian Federation for Selection Achievements Test and Protection, Orlicov per., 1/11,  
Moscow 107139 (tel.: +70 095 208 6775 fax: +70 095 207 8626 e-mail: desel@agro.aris.ru)

FINLANDE / FINLAND / FINNLAND / FINLANDIA

Kaarina T. PAAVILAINEN (Ms.), Senior Inspector, KTTK Seed Testing Department, Plant Production Inspection Centre, Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, P.O. Box 111, 32201 Loimaa (tel.: +358 2 7605 6247 fax: +358 2 7605 6222 e-mail: kaarina.paavilainen@kttk.fi)

FRANCE / FRANKREICH / FRANCIA

Nicole BUSTIN (Mlle), Secrétaire général, Comité de la protection des obtentions végétales (CPOV), Ministère de l'agriculture et de la pêche, 11, rue Jean Nicot, 75007 Paris (tel.: +33 1 4275 9314 fax: +33 1 4275 9425 e-mail: nicole.bustin@geves.fr)

Joël GUIARD, Directeur adjoint, Service administratif toutes espèces, Groupe d'étude et de contrôle des variétés et des semences (GEVES), La Minière, 78285 Guyancourt Cedex (tel.: +33 1 3083 3580 fax: +33 1 3083 3629 e-mail: joel.guiard@geves.fr)

Françoise BLOUET (Mlle), Ingénieur de recherches, GEVES, La Minière, 78285 Guyancourt Cedex (tel.: +33 1 3083 3582 fax: +33 1 3083 3678 e-mail: francoise.blouet@geves.fr)

HONGRIE / HUNGARY / UNGARN / HUNGRÍA

Karoly NESZMÉLYI, General Director, National Institute for Agricultural Quality Control (NIAQC), Keleti Karoly u. 24, P.O. Box 30, 93, 1024 Budapest (tel.: +36 1 212 4711 fax: +36 1 438 0698 e-mail: neszmelyik@ommi.hu)

József HARSANYI, Head of Department, Department for Fruit and Grapevine, Variety Testing Division, National Institute for Agricultural Quality Control (NIAQC), 1525 Budapest 114 (tel.: +36 1 212 3127 fax: +36 1 212 5367 e-mail: harsanyij@ommi.hu)

IRLANDE / IRELAND / IRLAND / IRLANDA

John V. CARVILL, Controller of Plant Breeders' Rights, Plant Variety Rights Office, Department of Agriculture and Food, National Crop Variety Testing Centre, Backweston, Leixlip, Co. Kildare (tel.: +353 1 630 2902 fax: +353 1 628 0634 e-mail: john.carvill@agriculture.gov.ie)

JAPON / JAPAN / JAPÓN

Keiji MARUYAMA, Director, Plant Variety Protection 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: keiji\_maruyama@nm.maff.go.jp)

Jun KOIDE, Deputy Director, International Affairs, Seeds and Seedlings Division, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF), 1-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, 100-8950 Tokyo (tel.: +81 3 3591 0524 fax: +81 3 3502 6572  
e-mail: jun\_koide@nm.maff.go.jp)

Masayoshi MIZUNO, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, 3, chemin des Fins, 1211 Grand-Saconnex, Switzerland (tel.: +41 22 717 3238 fax: +41 22 788 3368  
e-mail: mizuno.masayoshi@bluewin.ch)

KENYA / KENIA

Evans O. SIKINYI, Manager, Plant Variety Rights Office, Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate Service (KEPHIS), P.O. Box 49592, Waiyaki Way, Nairobi (tel.: +254 2 4440087  
fax: +254 2 4448940 e-mail: pvpo@kephis.org)

LETTONIE / LATVIA / LETTLAND / LETONIA

Iveta OZOLINA (Ms.), Senior Officer, Plant Production Division, Ministry of Agriculture, 2 Republikas laukums, 1981 Riga (tel.: +371 7027258 fax: +371 7027514  
e-mail: iveta.ozolina@zm.gov.lv)

MEXIQUE / MEXICO / MEXIKO / MÉXICO

Enriqueta MOLINA MACÍAS (Sra.), Encargada del Despacho de la Dirección, Servicio Nacional de Inspección y Certificación de Semillas (SNICS), Secretaría de Agricultura, Ganadería, Desarrollo Rural, Pesca y Alimentación (SAGARPA), Av. Presidente Juárez 13, Col. El Cortijo, 54000 Tlalnepantla (tel.: +52 55 5384 2213 fax: +52 55 5390 1441  
e-mail: enriqueta.molina@webtelmex.net.mx)

Karla T. ORNELAS LOERA (Sra.), Tercer Secretaria, Misión Permanente, 16, avenue de Budé, 1202 Ginebra, Suiza (tel.: +41 22 748 0707 fax: +41 22 748 0708  
e-mail: mission.mexico@ties.itu.int)

NORVÈGE / NORWAY / NORWEGEN / NORUEGA

Haakon SØNJU, Registrar, Plant Variety Board, P.O. Box 3, 1431 Aas (tel.: +47 64 944400 fax: +47 64 944410 e-mail: haakon.sonju@slt.dep.no)



NOUVELLE-ZÉLANDE / NEW ZEALAND / NEUSEELAND / NUEVA ZELANDIA

Chris BARNABY, Examiner of Fruit and Ornamental Varieties, Plant Variety Rights Office (PVRO), P.O. Box 130, Lincoln, Canterbury (tel.: +64 3 325 6355 fax: +64 3 983 3946 e-mail: chris.barnaby@pvr.govt.nz)

PAYS-BAS / NETHERLANDS / NIEDERLANDE / PAÍSES BAJOS

Joost BARENDRECHT, Expert, Plant Research International (PRI), P.O. Box 16, 6700 AA Wageningen (tel.: +31 317 47 68 93 fax: +31 317 41 80 94 e-mail: joost.barendrecht@wur.nl)

Kees VAN ETTEKOVEN, Responsible for PBR and Registration of Vegetable Varieties, Naktuinbouw, Sotaweg 22, Postbus 40, 2370 AA Roelofarendsveen (tel.: +31 71 332 6128 fax: +31 71 332 6363 e-mail: c.v.ettekoven@naktuinbouw.nl)

Arnold J.P. VAN WIJK, Head, Plant Variety Research, Centre for Genetic Resources (CGN), P.O. Box 16, 6700 AA Wageningen (tel.: +31 317 477012 fax: +31 317 418094 e-mail: arndjan.vanwijk@wur.nl)

POLOGNE / POLAND / POLEN / POLONIA

Edward S. GACEK, Director General, Research Centre for Cultivar Testing (COBORU), 63-022 Slupia Wielka (tel.: +48 61 2852341 fax: +48 61 2853558 e-mail: e.gacek\_coboru@bptnet.pl)

Julia BORYS (Ms.), Head, DUS Testing Department, 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, Expert Statistician, Centralny Ośrodek Badania Odmian Roslin Uprawnionych (COBORU), Research Center for Cultivar Testing, 63-022 Slupia Wielka (tel.: +48 61 285 2341 Ext. 224 fax: +48 61 285 35 58 e-mail: wpilar@owl.au.poznan.pl)

PORTUGAL

José S. DE CALHEIROS DA GAMA, Conseiller juridique, Mission permanente, 33, rue Antoine-Carteret, 1202 Genève, Suisse (tel.: +41 22 658 3191 fax: +41 22 918 0228 e-mail: mission.portugal@ties.itu.int)

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

LEE Byung-Mook, Director, Plant Variety Protection Division, National Seed Management Office (NSMO), 433, Anyang 6-dong, Anyang City, Kyunggi-do 430-016  
(tel.: +82 31 467 0150 fax: +82 31 467 0161 e-mail: byungm@seed.go.kr)

CHOI Keun-Jin, Examination Officer/Senior Researcher, Plant Variety Protection Division, National Seed Management Office (NSMO), 433 Anyang 6-dong, Anyang-si, Anyang City, Kyunggi-do 430-016 (tel.: +82 31 4670190 fax: +82 31 4670161 e-mail: kjchoi@seed.go.kr)

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

Dumitru BRINZILA, President, State Commission for Crops Variety Testing and Registration, Ministry of Agriculture, Bd. Stefan cel Mare 162, C.P. 1873, 2004 Chisinau  
(tel.: +373 2 246222 fax: +373 2 246921 e-mail: brinzila@csip.moldova.md)

Ion PARASCHIV, Chief, State Seed Inspection, Bd. Stefan cel Mare, 162, 1508 Chisinau  
(tel.: +373 2 210267 fax: +373 2 210267)

RÉPUBLIQUE TCHÈQUE / CZECH REPUBLIC / TSCHECHISCHE REPUBLIK /  
REPÚBLICA CHECA

Jirí SOUCEK, Head of Department, Department of Plant Variety Rights and DUS Tests, Central Institute for Supervising and Testing in Agriculture (ÚKZÚZ), Za opravnou 4, 150 06 Praha 5 - Motol (tel.: +420 257 211 755 fax: +420 257 211 752  
e-mail: jiri.soucek@ukzuz.cz)

Daniel JUREČKA, Director, Plant Variety Division, Central Institute for Supervising and Testing in Agriculture (ÚKZÚZ), Hroznová 2, Brno 656 06  
(tel.: +420 5 43217646 fax: +420 5 43212440 e-mail: daniel.jurecka@ukzuz.cz)

ROUMANIE / ROMANIA / RUMĂNIEN / RUMANIA

Adriana PARASCHIV (Mrs.), Head, State Office for Inventions and Trademarks (OSIM), 5, Jon Ghica, Sector 3, 70018 Bucharest (tel.: +40 21 3155698 fax: +40 21 3123819  
e-mail: adriana.paraschiv@osim.ro)

Ruxandra URUCU (Ms.), Legal Adviser, Legal and International Affairs Division, State Office for Inventions and Trademarks (OSIM), 5, Jon Ghica, Sector 3, 70018 Bucharest  
(tel.: +40 1 3132492 fax: +40 1 3123819 e-mail: ruxandra.urucu@osim.ro)

Mihaela Rodica CIORA (Mrs.), Expert, State Institute for Variety Testing and Registration, Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Forestry, 61, Marasti, Sector 1, 71329 Bucharest  
(tel.: +40 21 223 1425 fax: +40 21 222 5605 e-mail: mihaela\_ciora@gmx.net)

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

Michael S. CAMLIN, Department of Agriculture and Rural Development, Plant Testing Station, 50 Houston Road, Crossnacreevy, Belfast BT6 9SH (tel.: +44 2890 548000 fax: +44 2890 548001 e-mail: michael.camlin@dardni.gov.uk)

Mike WRAY, Technical Manager, Plant Variety Rights Office, Seed Division, Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA), White House Lane, Huntingdon Road, Cambridge CB3 0LF (tel.: +44 1223 342384 fax: +44 1223 342386 e-mail: mike.wray@defra.gsi.gov.uk)

Elizabeth M.R. SCOTT (Miss), Head, Ornamental Crops, Plant Variety Rights Group, NIAB, Huntingdon Road, Cambridge CB3 0LE (tel.: +44 1223 342399 fax: +44 1223 342229 e-mail: elizabeth.scott@niab.com)

SLOVAQUIE / SLOVAKIA / SLOWAKEI / ESLOVAQUIA

Katarina BENOVSKÁ (Mrs.), Senior Officer, Plant Breeders' Rights Office, Central Institute for Testing in Agriculture (UKSUP), Matuskova 21, 833 16 Bratislava (tel.: +421 2 54654282 fax: +421 2 54654282 e-mail: odrody@uksup.sk)

Milan MÁJEK, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, 9, chemin de l' Ancienne Route, 1218 Grand-Saconnex, Switzerland (tel.: +41 22 747 7411 fax: +41 22 747 7434 e-mail: milan.majek@ties.itu.int)

SUÈDE / SWEDEN / SCHWEDEN / SUECIA

Gunnar KARLTORP, Head of Office, National Plant Variety Board, Box 1247, 171 24 Solna (tel.: +46 8 7831260 fax: +46 8 833170 e-mail: karltorp@svn.se)

SUISSE / SWITZERLAND / SCHWEIZ / SUIZA

Pierre Alex MIAUTON, Station fédérale de recherches en production végétale de Changins, Cas postale 254, 1260 Nyon 1 (tel.: +41 22 3634668 fax: +41 22 3615469 e-mail: pierre.miauton@rac.admin.ch)

Manuela BRAND (Frau), Koordinatorin, Büro für Sortenschutz, Bundesamt für Landwirtschaft, Mattenhofstrasse 5, 3003 Bern (tel.: +41 31 3222524 fax: +41 31 3222634 e-mail: manuela.brand@blw.admin.ch)

Eva TSCHARLAND (Frau), Wissenschaftliche Mitarbeiterin, Bundesamt für Landwirtschaft, Mattenhofstrasse 5, 3003 Bern (tel.: +41 31 322 2524 fax: +41 31 323 5455 e-mail: Eva.tscharland@blw.admin.ch)

UKRAINE / UCRANIA

Valentyna ZAVALEVSKA (Mrs.), First Deputy Chairman, State Service on Right Protection for Plant Varieties, 15, Henerala Rodimtseva vul., 03041 Kyiv (tel.: +380 44 2579933 fax: +380 44 2579934 e-mail: vartest@iptelecom.net.ua)

Oksana ZHMURKO (Mrs.), Head, International Relations Department, State Service on Right Protection for Plant Varieties, 15, Henerala Rodimtseva vul., 03041 Kyiv (tel.: +380 44 257 9938 fax: +380 44 257 9934 e-mail: zhmurko@sops.gov.ua)

URUGUAY

Carlos GÓMEZ ETCHEBARNE, Director del Registro de Propiedad de Cultivares y del Registro Nacional de Cultivares, Instituto Nacional de Semillas (INASE), Casilla Correo 7731 - Pando, 90 000 Canelones (tel.: +598 2 2887099 fax: +598 2 2887077 e-mail: inasecge@adinet.com.uy)

II. OBSERVATEURS / OBSERVERS / BEOBACHTER / OBSERVADORES

ÉGYPTE / EGYPT / ÄGYPTEN / EGIPTO

Gamal EISSA ATTYA, Director, Breeders' Rights Department, Central Administration for Seed Testing and Certification (CASC), 8 Gamma Street, P.O. Box 147, Giza, 12211 Cairo (tel.: +20 2 5720839 fax: +20 2 5725998 e-mail: seedcert@brainy1.ie-eg.com)

Walter FROELICH, Technical Advisor to Central Administration of Seed Certification, Seed Certification Project, CASC/GTZ, GTZ-Office, 4D El Gezira Street, Zamalek, Cairo (tel.: +20 2 5733477 fax: +20 2 5718562 e-mail: walter.froelich@gmx.net)

III. ORGANISATIONS / ORGANIZATIONS / ORGANISATIONEN / ORGANIZACIONES

ORGANISATION DES NATIONS UNIES POUR L'ALIMENTATION ET L'AGRICULTURE (FAO) / FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS (FAO) / ERNÄHRUNGS- UND LANDWIRTSCHAFTS-ORGANISATION DER VEREINTEN NATIONEN (FAO) / ORGANIZACIÓN DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS PARA LA AGRICULTURA Y LA ALIMENTACIÓN (FAO)

Nuria URQUÍA FERNÁNDEZ (Ms.), Networking Officer (Plant Genetic Resources), Seed and Plant Genetic Resources Service, Plant Production and Protection Division, Agricultural Department, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla s/n, 00100 Rome, Italy (tel.: +39 06 57053751 fax: +39 06 57053152 e-mail: nuria.urquia@fao.org)

COMMUNAUTÉ EUROPÉENNE / EUROPEAN COMMUNITY / EUROPÄISCHE  
GEMEINSCHAFT / COMUNIDAD EUROPEA

Bart KIEWIET, President, Community Plant Variety Office (CPVO), 3, boulevard Maréchal Foch, B.P. 2141, 49021 Angers Cedex 02 (tel.: +33 2 4125 6410 fax: +33 2 4125 6410 e-mail: kiewiet@cpvo.eu.int)

José M. ELENA ROSSELLÓ, Vice-President, Community Plant Variety Office (CPVO), 3, boulevard Maréchal Foch, B.P. 2141, 49021 Angers Cedex 02, France (tel.: +33 2 4125 6414 fax: +33 2 4125 6410 e-mail: elena@cpvo.eu.int)

Jacques GENNATAS, Chef de secteur - Droit d'obtenteurs, Direction générale santé et protection des consommateurs, Unité E1, Commission européenne, 1040 Bruxelles, Belgique (tel.: +32 2 295 97 13 fax: +32 2 295 60 43 e-mail: jacques.gennatas@cec.eu.int)

Marcantonino VALVASSORI, Administrateur principal, Semences et matériel de multiplication, Direction générale de l'agriculture, Commission européenne, 101, rue Froissart, bureau F101 05-60, 1049 Bruxelles, Belgique (tel.: +32 2 295 6971 fax: +32 2 2969399 e-mail: marcantonio.valvassori@cec.eu.int)

Martin EKVAD, Head of Legal Affairs, Community Plant Variety Office (CPVO), 3, boulevard Maréchal Foch, B.P. 2141, 49021 Angers Cedex 02 (tel.: +33 2 4125 6415 fax: +33 2 4125 6410 e-mail: ekvad@cpvo.eu.int)

Dirk THEOBALD, Head of the Technical Unit, Community Plant Variety Office (CPVO), 3, boulevard Maréchal Foch, B.P. 2141, 49021 Angers Cedex 02, France (tel.: +33 2 4125 6400 fax: +33 2 4125 6410 e-mail: theobald@cpvo.eu.int)

ORGANISATION DE COOPÉRATION ET DE DÉVELOPPEMENT ÉCONOMIQUES  
(OCDE) / ORGANISATION FOR ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT  
(OECD) / ORGANISATION FÜR WIRTSCHAFTLICHE ZUSAMMENARBEIT UND  
ENTWICKLUNG (OECD) / ORGANIZACIÓN DE COOPERACIÓN Y DESARROLLO  
ECONÓMICOS (OCDE)

Bertrand DAGALLIER, Administrator, Agricultural Codes and Schemes, Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), 2, rue André-Pascal, 75775 Paris Cedex 16, France (tel.: +33 1 45 24 18 78 fax: +33 1 44 30 61 17 e-mail: bertrand.dagallier@oecd.org)

ASSOCIATION INTERNATIONALE D'ESSAIS DES SEMENCES (ISTA) /  
INTERNATIONAL SEED TESTING ASSOCIATION (ISTA) / INTERNATIONALE  
VEREINIGUNG FÜR SAATGUTPRÜFUNG (ISTA) / ASOCIACIÓN INTERNACIONAL  
PARA EL ENSAYO DE SEMILLAS (ISTA)

Bettina KAHLERT (Ms.), International Seed Testing Association (ISTA), Zürichstrasse 50, P.O. Box 308, 8303 Bassersdorf, Switzerland (tel.: +41 1 838 6000 fax: +41 1 838 6001 e-mail: ista.office@ista.ch)

FÉDÉRATION INTERNATIONALE DES SEMENCES (ISF) / INTERNATIONAL SEED  
FEDERATION (ISF) / INTERNATIONALER SAATGUTVERBAND (ISF) /  
FEDERACIÓN INTERNACIONAL DE SEMILLAS (ISF)

Bernard LE BUANEC, Secretary General, International Seed Federation (ISF), 7, chemin du  
Reposoir, 1260 Nyon, Switzerland (tel.: +41 22 365 44 20 fax: +41 22 365 44 21  
e-mail: isf@worldseed.org)

Marcel BRUINS, Manager Plant Variety Protection, Seminis Vegetable Seeds, Intellectual  
Resource Protection and Regulatory Affairs, Nude 54D, 6702 DN Wageningen, Netherlands  
(tel.: +31 317 450 218 fax: +31 317 450 217 e-mail: marcel.bruins@seminis.com)

Jean DONNENWIRTH, International Intellectual Property Manager, Pioneer Hi-Bred  
S.A.R.L., Chemin de l'Enseigne, 31130 Aussonne, France (tel.: +33 5 61062084  
fax: +33 5 61062091 e-mail: jean.donnenwirth@pioneer.com)

Huib GHIJSEN, Global Manager Germplasm Protection, Oilseeds Department,  
Bayer BioScience N.V., 22, J. Plateaustraat, 9000 Gent, Netherlands (tel.: +32 9 235 8451  
fax: +32 9 223 1923 e-mail: huib.ghijzen@bayercropscience.com)

Pierre ROGER, Directeur de la propriété intellectuelle, Groupe Limagrain Holding,  
Rue Limagrain, Boîte postale 1, 63720 Chappes, France (tel.: +33 4 7363 4069  
fax: +33 4 7364 6737 e-mail: pierre.roger@limagrain.com)

IV. BUREAU / OFFICERS / VORSITZ / OFICINA

Michael CAMLIN, Chairman  
Julia BORYS (Mrs.), Vice-Chairperson

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

Rolf JÖRDENS, Vice Secretary-General  
Peter BUTTON, Technical Director  
Raimundo LAVIGNOLLE, Senior Counsellor  
Makoto TABATA, Senior Counsellor  
Yolanda HUERTA (Mrs.), Senior Legal Officer  
Paul Therence SENGHOR, Senior Program Officer  
Vladimir DERBENSKIY, Consultant

[L'annexe II suit/  
Annex II follows/  
Anlage II folgt/

Signe

el

Anexo

II]

## ANNEX II

\*AMENDMENTS TO THE UPOV DRAFT TEST GUIDELINES PRIOR TO THEIR ADOPTION AT THE THIRTY-NINTH SESSION OF THE TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

I. GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS BY THE TC-EDC CONCERNING ALL DRAFT TEST GUIDELINES

A. Standard Wording and General Principles Applied to the Draft Test Guidelines, Prior to their Submission to the TC, on the Basis of the TC-EDC Meeting in January 2003

#	Wording already agreed by the TC at its thirty-eighth session, held in Geneva from April 15 to 17, 2002.
{...}	Blank for the relevant information to be inserted by the drafter of the Test Guidelines.

1. Section 2.3: Seed quality requirements

The TC-EDC considered that the following additional standard wording options should be used as appropriate:

(a) *Test Guidelines which only apply to seed-propagated varieties*

# Option 1: “The seed should meet the minimum requirements for germination, species and analytical purity, health and moisture content, specified by the competent authority. In cases where the seed is to be stored, the germination capacity should be as high as possible and should, be stated by the applicant.”

Option 2: “The seed should meet the minimum requirements for germination, species and analytical purity, health and moisture content, specified by the competent authority.”

(b) *Test Guidelines which apply to seed-propagated as well as other types of varieties*

# Option 1: “In the case of seed, the seed should meet the minimum requirements for germination, species and analytical purity, health and moisture content, specified by the competent authority. In cases where the seed is to be stored, the germination capacity should be as high as possible and should, be stated by the applicant.”

Option 2: “In the case of seed, the seed should meet the minimum requirements for germination, species and analytical purity, health and moisture content, specified by the competent authority.”

2. Section 3.4: Test design

The TC-EDC considered that the following wording should be additional standard wording and not necessarily included in all Test Guidelines and, in particular, not in those Test Guidelines where there were only a very small number of plants in the examination:

---

\* Reproduced from document TC/39/15 (Report on the Conclusions).

“The design of the tests should be such that plants or parts of plants may be removed for measurement or counting without prejudice to the observations which must be made up to the end of the growing cycle.”

3. Section 3.5: Number of plants / parts of plants to be examined

The TC-EDC considered that the following additional standard wording options should be used as appropriate:

(a) *Test Guidelines where all plants in the test are observed for all characteristics*

Option 1: “Unless otherwise indicated, all observations should be made on { x } plants or parts taken from each of { x } plants.”

Option 2: “Unless otherwise indicated, all observations should be made on { x } plants or parts taken from each of { x } plants. In the case of parts of plants, the number to be taken from each of the plants should be { y }.”

(b) *Test Guidelines where the observation of certain characteristics is made on a sample of plants in the test*

Option 1: “Unless otherwise indicated, all observations on single plants should be made on { x } plants or parts taken from each of { x } plants and any other observations made on all plants in the test.”

Option 2: “Unless otherwise indicated, all observations on single plants should be made on { x } plants or parts taken from each of { x } plants and any other observations made on all plants in the test. In the case of observations of parts taken from single plants, the number of parts to be taken from each of the plants should be { y }.”

4. Section 4.2: Uniformity assessment by off-types

The TC-EDC considered that the following additional standard wording should be used for the assessment of uniformity by off-types:

“For the assessment of uniformity, a population standard of { x }% and an acceptance probability of at least { y } % should be applied. In the case of a sample size of { a } plants, [{ b } off-types are] / [1 off-type is] allowed.”

5. Section 4.3.2: Stability assessment: general

The TC-EDC considered that the following additional standard wording options should be used as appropriate:

(a) *Test Guidelines other than those covering only vegetatively propagated varieties*

“Where appropriate, or in cases of doubt, stability may be tested, either by growing a further generation, or by testing a new seed or plant stock to ensure that it exhibits the same characteristics as those shown by the previous material supplied.”



*(b) Test Guidelines covering only vegetatively propagated varieties*

“Where appropriate, or in cases of doubt, stability may be tested, either by growing a further generation, or by testing a new plant stock to ensure that it exhibits the same characteristics as those shown by the previous material supplied.”

6. Chapter 7 (Table of Characteristics): Explanations covering several characteristics

The TC-EDC considered that the use of a letter key (e.g. (a)) should be restricted to explanations concerning several characteristics and should be presented in a section at the beginning of Chapter 8, thereby keeping all explanations together. Explanations relating to individual characteristics should be indicated by (+) in the normal way. The letter key should be presented between “( )” in the same format as for the “(+)”.

B. Standard Wording and General Principles, Proposed by the TC-EDC in April 2003 to be Applied to the Draft Test Guidelines as the Basis for their Adoption

1. Presentation of Latin names

It was agreed that the Test Guidelines should follow the standard practice for presenting Latin names, namely that the family, genus and species should be presented in italics.

2. Section 4.2: Uniformity assessment

The TC-EDC considered that the additional standard wording for section 4.2 should read as follows:

*(a) Cross-pollinated varieties*

“The assessment of uniformity should be according to the recommendations for cross-pollinated varieties in the General Introduction.”

*(b) Hybrid varieties*

“The assessment of uniformity for hybrid varieties depends on the type of hybrid and should be according to the recommendations for hybrid varieties in the General Introduction.”

3. Section 4.3.2: Stability assessment: general

The TC-EDC considered that the additional standard wording options for section 4.3 should read as follows:

*(a) Test Guidelines covering seed-propagated and vegetatively propagated varieties*

“Where appropriate, or in cases of doubt, stability may be assessed, either by growing a further generation, or by testing a new seed or plant stock, as appropriate, to ensure that it exhibits the same characteristics as those shown by the previous material supplied.”

(b) *Test Guidelines covering only vegetatively propagated varieties*

“Where appropriate, or in cases of doubt, stability may be assessed, either by growing a further generation, or by testing a new plant stock to ensure that it exhibits the same characteristics as those shown by the previous material supplied.”

(c) *Test Guidelines covering only seed-propagated varieties*

“Where appropriate, or in cases of doubt, stability may be assessed by testing a new seed stock to ensure that it exhibits the same characteristics as those shown by the previous material supplied.”

4. Chapter 7: Characteristics only applicable to certain varieties

The TC-EDC recommended that the Test Guidelines should be checked to ensure that the wording, for those “restricted” characteristics, which only applied to certain varieties, followed the standard approach. In particular, the initial characteristic, which determines the varieties to which the “restricted” characteristic applied, should be clear in the title of the “restricted” characteristic and should be underlined.

5. Chapter 8: Associated indications

The TC-EDC proposed that any tables presenting trade names, trademarks, or other similar indications associated with variety denominations, should be deleted from the Test Guidelines pending a discussion of this matter by the TC and CAJ. In particular, it proposed that the matter should be referred to the Working Group on Variety Denominations.

6. Section 10: TQ 4.1: Information on breeding scheme

The TC-EDC considered that the standard wording for section 4.1.1(b) of the Technical Questionnaire should read as follows:

“(b) partially known cross [ ]  
(please state known parent variety(ies))”

## II. AMENDMENTS TO INDIVIDUAL TEST GUIDELINES

### **TG/9/5(proj.1): Runner Bean**

(a) Changes proposed by the Enlarged Editorial Committee in January 2003, which are already incorporated in the Test Guidelines submitted to the TC

---

Not considered by the TC-EDC in January 2003

---

(b) Changes agreed by the leading expert and all interested experts, which are already incorporated in the Test Guidelines submitted to the TC

---

Ch. 1 and 8	An asterisk received
Ch. 12 and 13	Additional state of expression “pink” inserted with the example variety “Reley”
Ch. 18	Example variety “Hestia” received for state 1
Ch. 23	Example variety “Titan” received for state 1
Ch. 23	State “circular” deleted
Ch. 29	Example variety “Painted Lady” received for state 1
Ad. 9	Deleted
Sect. 8.1 (b)	To read: “All observations on the seed should be made at the mature dry stage on the harvested material”

---

(c) Additional Changes proposed by the Enlarged Editorial Committee in April 2003, which are to be included in the Test Guidelines submitted to the TC

---

Sect. 4.2.2	To use the standard wording.
Ch. 1	Hypocotyledon to be corrected as “ <u>hypocotyl</u> ” in English and Spanish
Ch. 6	State 2 to read “green” rather than “true green”
Ch. 6	The spelling of the example variety “Kelvedon” to be corrected
Ch. 7	To read: “ <u>Varieties with green color only</u> : intensity of color”
Ch. 19	New illustration should be provided by NL
Ch. 26	“flat” to be replaced by “narrow elliptic”
Ch. 29	To read: “ <u>predominant secondary color</u> ”
Ch. 31	To read: “ <u>Varieties with seed: main color white only</u> : Seed: veining”; the state “strong” to receive the note “7”
Sect. 10, TQ, Sect. 4.1.1 (b)	To read: “(b) partially <u>known</u> cross”
Chap. 10, TQ, Sect. 4.2	To delete: “(a) Self-pollination”

---

**TG/13/8(proj.3): Lettuce**

(a) Changes proposed by the Enlarged Editorial Committee in January 2003, which are already incorporated in the Test Guidelines submitted to the TC

---

Not considered by the TC-EDC in January 2003

---

(b) Changes agreed by the leading expert and all interested experts, which are already incorporated in the Test Guidelines submitted to the TC

---

Ch. 33 to 35	Placed after ch. 38, and key (a) in the second column removed
Ch. 36 and 37	An “(a)” received
Ad. 39	Under “ <u>Test of <i>Bremia Isolates</i></u> ,” “the Plant Research International (PRI) (formerly IPO)” replaced by “the NAK”

---

(c) Additional Changes proposed by the Enlarged Editorial Committee in April 2003, which are to be included in the Test Guidelines submitted to the TC

---

Sect. 5.3	The heading to read: “Plant: growth type”
Sect. 5.4	Grouping characteristics: (c) bolting is ch. 35
Ch. 14	State of expression “thick” for note 7 should be added
Ch. 18	The example varieties “donatello” and “revolution” should appear in the table in Section 8.
Ch. 33	Delete the key (a)
Ad. 39	The first paragraph under <u>Isolates with at least one Dm-gene component</u> to be replaced as follows: “ <u>Isolates with at least one Dm-gene component</u> “Lettuce varieties should be described either according to their resistance to isolates defined by known Dm virulence component(s) or according to the presence of Dm-resistance genes in their genetic background. This takes into account the possibility to describe known or unknown Dm-resistance genes, whose absence or presence has not been tested.”
Ad. 39	Under resistance testing methods, “lines” should be replaced by “varieties/breeding lines.”

---

**TG/38/7(proj.3): White Clover**

(a) Changes proposed by the Enlarged Editorial Committee in January 2003, which are already incorporated in the Test Guidelines submitted to the TC

---

No changes proposed

---

(b) Changes agreed by the leading expert and all interested experts, which are already incorporated in the Test Guidelines submitted to the TC

---

All characteristics To insert QN to all characteristics and to include the key for QN, QL and PQ in section 6.5, Legend.

---

Ch. 9 To have “semi-prostrate” for note 7 instead of “prostrate”.

---

Sect. 8.1 Following the recommendation of the TC-EDC to create Sect. 8.1, where common explanations for the following characteristics were included:

Explanation (a) for ch. 7, 8 and 9

Explanation (b) for ch. 10, 11 12, 13, 14, 15 and 16.

The explanations on individual characteristics were included in Sect. 8.2

---

Sect. 8.2, Ad. 6 Ad. 6 to read:

“Ad. 6: Plant: time of flowering

“In single spaced plants, a plant is considered as flowering when three inflorescences per plant are showing color. Observations should be made at least twice weekly. The time of flowering for all plants in a variety is observed and the time of flowering of the variety is determined as the time when 50% of the plants had flowered.

“In row plots, a plant is considered as flowering when three inflorescences per plant are showing color. Observations should be made at least twice weekly. The time of flowering for all plants in a variety is observed and the time of flowering of the variety is determined as the time when 80% of the plants had flowered.”

---

(c) Additional Changes proposed by the Enlarged Editorial Committee in April 2003, which are to be included in the Test Guidelines submitted to the TC

---

Sect. 2.3 To read:

“2.3 The minimum quantity of plant material, to be supplied by the applicant, should be: 1.0 kg of seed.”

---

Sect. 3.4.2 To read:

“3.4.2 Plot design

“Each test should be designed to result in a total of at least 60 spaced plants and 10 meters of row plot.

“Plots with spaced plants: Each test should consist of 60 spaced plants per variety arranged in 3, 4, 5 or 6 replicates, i.e. plots of 20, 15, 12 or 10 plants.

“Row plots: Each test which includes row plots should consist of at least 10 meters of row arranged in two replicates, each of 5 meters. The density of sowing should be such that about 200 plants per meter should be obtained.

“Where observations can be made in both spaced plants and row plots, it is likely that the expression of the characteristics will be different. Therefore, these different observations may not be interchangeable in the DUS examination.”

---

---

Sect. 3.5	To read: “3.5 Number of Plants / Parts of Plants to be Examined “Unless otherwise indicated, all observations determined by measuring or counting should be made on 60 plants or parts taken from each of 60 plants. “Observations on rows should be made on each row as a whole.”
Sect. 4.1.1.2	To be deleted
Sect. 4.2.2	Revised ASW to be applied
Sect. 4.3.2	Revised ASW to be applied
Ch. 7	To read: “Plant: height”
Ch. 20	To have states of expression: “few (3)”; “medium (5)”; “many (7)”
Ad. 6	To read: “ <u>Ad. 6: Plant: time of flowering</u> “Observations should be made at least twice weekly. “(a) In single spaced plants the time of flowering for all plants in a variety is observed and the time of flowering of the variety is the time when 50% of the plants would have had three inflorescences per plant showing color. “(b) In row plots the time of flowering for all plants in a variety is observed and the time of flowering of the variety is the time when 80% of the plants would have been flowering.”
Ad. 18 and 19	Title to read: “ <u>Ad. 18, 19: Inflorescence: length (18) and thickness (19) of the peduncle</u> ”
Ad. 21	To read: “ <u>Ad. 21: Inflorescence: diameter</u> “Time of assessment as for characteristic 20. The size of the inflorescences on the plant should be estimated on each of the 60 plants of the variety, on a 1-9 scale, on the plant taken as a whole.”

---

**TG/43/7(proj.2): Raspberry**

(a) Changes proposed by the Enlarged Editorial Committee in January 2003, which are already incorporated in the Test Guidelines submitted to the TC

---

Not considered by the TC-EDC in January 2003

---

(b) Changes agreed by the leading expert and all interested experts, which are already incorporated in the Test Guidelines submitted to the TC

---

Ch. 39 Wording of states (1) and (3) should start with “only”

---

Ad. 33 Explanation improved

---

Ad. 40, 42, 44, 46 Explanation provided

---

Ad. 41, 43, 45, 47 Explanation provided

---

(c) Additional Changes proposed by the Enlarged Editorial Committee in April 2003, which are to be included in the Test Guidelines submitted to the TC

---

Sect. 2.4 Second sentence to be deleted (repetition of Sect. 2.2); following wording to be added after first sentence:

(E) “It should especially be free from viruses as required by the competent authorities.

(G) “Es sollte insbesondere frei von Viren gemäß den Vorschriften der zuständigen Behörde sein.”

---

Sect. 3.1 Order to be changed according to the Template: “... For the purpose of these Test Guidelines, a growing cycle refers to the fruiting cycle.”

---

Sect. 4.2.1 To complete the wording according to the Template: “... However, the following points are provided for elaboration or emphasis in these Test Guidelines.”

---

Ch. 1 In the French version, change “coubée” to “arquée” and modify subsequently in the German version with “überhängend”.

---

Ch. 9 Change “year’s cane” to “season’s cane”

---

Ch. 10 To read: “Varieties which fruit on current season’s cane in autumn”

---

Ch. 11 To read: “Varieties which fruit on previous season’s cane in summer”

---

Ch. 47 To be redrafted as follows (only in the German version): “Sorten, die an der Jahresrute im Herbst fruchten: Dauer der Ernteperiode an der Jahresrute”

---

Ad. 42 To read Ad. 42 and 43

---

Ad. 44 To read Ad. 44 and 45 with wording of explanation to be changed as per Test Guidelines for Chives (TG/198/1(proj.1)): “The time of beginning of fruit ripening is when the fruit is most easily removed from the plug.”

---

Chap. 10, TQ,  
Sect. 4.2.2 Deleted

---

**TG/100/4(proj.2): Quince**

- (a) Changes proposed by the Enlarged Editorial Committee in January 2003, which are already incorporated in the Test Guidelines submitted to the TC

---

Not considered by the TC-EDC in January 2003

---

- (b) Changes agreed by the leading expert and all interested experts, which are already incorporated in the Test Guidelines submitted to the TC

---

Ch. 37 Example variety for state 7 provided

---

Ad. 9 Illustration provided

---

Ad. 15, 22, 30, 31 Completed

---

- (c) Additional Changes proposed by the Enlarged Editorial Committee in April 2003, which are to be included in the Test Guidelines submitted to the TC

---

Cover page “sensu stricto” not in italic

---

Sect. 2.3 In French version, change “plantes” to “plants”

---

Ch. 3 Change “habit” to “form”; German: “Form”

---

Ch. 4 In the French version, to read: “Rameau d’un an: longueur de l’entre-nœud” and delete all “s” in the states

---

Ch. 8 Change in the French version: “... à la pousse” to “...aux rameaux” and add the example variety “Ronda” to the state 3

---

Ch. 12 Ensure that state 3 is typed “ovate”

---

Ch. 14, 21 Example variety for state 2 to read: “Mezötúri”

---

Ch. 22 Change QN to PQ and add the example variety “Portugal” for state 4

---

Ch. 25 Example variety for state 1 to read: “Mezötúri”

---

Ch. 29 Deleted

---

Ch. 30 In German version, to read: “Frucht: Hals”

---

Ch. 37 To read in French version: “Epoque de débourement des bourgeons”

---

Ad. 9 To be amended as in Test Guidelines for Pears (TG/15/3), and to have petioles upright always and leaves blade to change its attitude only

---

Ad. 30, 31 To read: “Fruit: neck and length of neck”

---

Ad. 39 Wording of the explanation to be changed as per Test Guidelines for Chives (TG/198/1(proj.1)): “The time of beginning of fruit ripening is when the fruit is most easily picked from the tree.”

---

Chap. 9, fifth reference To read as follows: “Popov, E., 1958: “B”lgarska Pomologiya”. D”rzhavno Izdatelstvo za Selskostopanska Literatura, Sofiya.”

---

Chap. 10, TQ, Sect. 1.1 “sensu stricto” not in italic

---

Chap. 10, TQ, Sect. 4.2.2 deleted

---

Chap. 10, TQ, Sect. 4.3.2 read “The plant material is virus free”

---



**TG/105/4(proj.1): Chinese Cabbage**

- (a) Changes proposed by the Enlarged Editorial Committee in January 2003, which are already incorporated in the Test Guidelines submitted to the TC

---

Not considered by the TC-EDC in January 2003

---

- (b) Changes agreed by the leading expert and all interested experts, which are already incorporated in the Test Guidelines submitted to the TC

---

No changes proposed

---

- (c) Additional Changes proposed by the Enlarged Editorial Committee in April 2003, which are to be included in the Test Guidelines submitted to the TC

---

Sect. 4.2.3	“or hybrids” to be removed
Ch. 1	“horizontal” to be replaced by “spreading” (étalé, breitwüchsig)
Ch. 6	“pointed” to be replaced by “obtuse”
Ch. 9	State 2 to be named “green” rather than “true green”
Ch. 10	English: “ <u>Varieties with green outer leaves only: ...</u> ” German: “ <u>Nur Sorten mit grünen Umblättern: ...</u> ”
Ch. 14	State 2 to be “straight” (droit, gerade, directo)
Ch. 25	To read: “Head: type”
Chap. 10, TQ, Sect. 4.2 (a)	“(a) Self-pollination” to be deleted

---

**TG/118/4(proj.1): Endive**

- (a) Changes proposed by the Enlarged Editorial Committee in January 2003, which are already incorporated in the Test Guidelines submitted to the TC

---

Not considered by the TC-EDC in January 2003

---

- (b) Changes agreed by the leading expert and all interested experts, which are already incorporated in the Test Guidelines submitted to the TC

---

Chap. 5	Varieties should be grouped by plant types which are included in the Table of Characteristics. Plant types are to be divided by two-step, first according to botanical variety: plain type ( <i>Cichorium endivia</i> var. <i>latifolia</i> ) and cut type ( <i>Cichorium endivia</i> var. <i>crispa</i> ) and their intermediate type; secondly by chicory types.
Ch. 29	Example varieties “Sally (3), Géante d’Hiver (5), Wallone (7), Corne d’Anjou (9)” received
Ch. 30	Additional example varieties “Isadora, Noveli (1)” and “Excel, Foxie, Snoopie (9)” received
Ad. 1, 2, 3	Explanation received
Ad. 14	Deleted

---

- (c) Additional Changes proposed by the Enlarged Editorial Committee in April 2003, which are to be included in the Test Guidelines submitted to the TC

---

Sect. 2.3	The number of seed should be “10,000”
Sect. 3.5.	To add the standard wording “determined by measuring or counting”
Ch. 3	To read: “ <u>Non-plain type varieties only</u> : ...”
Ch. 14	State 2 to read “green”
Sect. 8.1 (c)	To read: “ <u>Stem</u> : All observations on the stem should be made on a flowering stem”
Ads. 1, 2, 3	(B): the indication (non-plain) should be deleted
Ads. 1, 2, 3	(C): to read: “ <u>Intermediate type</u> ”
Chap. 10, TQ, Sect. 4.2	“(a) Self-pollination, (i) population, (ii) synthetic” to be deleted

---

**TG/192/1(proj.2): Ornamental Apple**

(a) Changes proposed by the Enlarged Editorial Committee in January 2003, which are already incorporated in the Test Guidelines submitted to the TC

---

Not considered by the TC-EDC in January 2003

---

(b) Changes agreed by the leading expert and all interested experts, which are already incorporated in the Test Guidelines submitted to the TC

---

No changes proposed

---

(c) Additional Changes proposed by the Enlarged Editorial Committee in April 2003, which are to be included in the Test Guidelines submitted to the TC

---

Sect. 2.3	To read: "The minimum quantity of plant material, to be supplied by the applicant, should be: 5 trees"
Sect. 2.4	Second sentence to read: "The rootstock should be named when the plant material is supplied."
Sect. 5.3 (b)	Color Group to be added: white, light pink, dark pink, red, purple
Ch. 1, 4, 5, 6, 9, 17, 21, 30, 32, 36, 38	To check the example varieties which combine species and variety names
Ch. 17	To read: "Leaf blade: length (from fourth to sixth fully expanded leaf)"; to be moved after ch. 27
Ch. 18	To read: "Leaf blade: width (from fourth to sixth fully expanded leaf)"; to be moved after ch. 27 and 28 (old 17)
Ch. 35	Order of the states with notes 1, 2, 3, 4 to be changed to: whitish yellow (1); yellow (2); whitish green (3); green yellow (4)
Ch. 36	Order of the states with notes 3, 4 to be swapped to: yellowish (3); greenish (4)

---

**TG/198/1(proj.1): Chives**

(a) Changes proposed by the Enlarged Editorial Committee in January 2003, which are already incorporated in the Test Guidelines submitted to the TC

---

Not considered by the TC-EDC in January 2003

---

(b) Changes agreed by the leading expert and all interested experts, which are already incorporated in the Test Guidelines submitted to the TC

---

Chap. 7	Example variety “NOE-198” removed globally from the Table of Characteristics
Chap. 7	Example variety “Kirgo” replaced globally by “Kirdo”
Ch. 1	Example variety “Wulkan” inserted for state 7
Ch. 3	Example variety “Prazská” replaced with “Wulkan”
Ch. 6, 7, 12	Example variety “Prazská” deleted
Ch. 9	Example varieties “Morava” and “Wulkan” inserted for states 5 and 7, respectively
Ch. 11	Example variety “Jemná” inserted for state 2
Ch. 13	Example variety “Prazská” inserted for state 7
Ch. 14	Example varieties “Polyvert, Wilau” inserted for state 9
Ch. 15	To read: “Inflorescence: diameter (at flowering stage)”
Ch. 16	Example variety “Wulkan” inserted for state 5
Ch. 17	Example varieties “Bohemia, Kirdo (3)”, “Polyvert (5)” and “Fitlau, Wilau (7)” inserted
Ch. 18	Example variety “Wulkan” inserted for state 5
Ch. 19	Example varieties “Wulkan” and “Polyvert” inserted for states 5 and 7, respectively
Ch. 21	States of expression to read: “absent (1)” and “50% present (2)” with example varieties “Hylau Cut (1)” and “Toplau (2)”

---

(c) Additional Changes proposed by the Enlarged Editorial Committee in April 2003, which are to be included in the Test Guidelines submitted to the TC

---

Ch. 6	State 2 to read “green” rather than “true green”
Ch. 17	French: “Époque de démarrage”
Ad. 17	To read: “The time of sprouting is when 10% of one-year-old plants show new sprouts at the beginning of the next year after sowing.”
Ad. 20	To read: “The time of drying out is when 10% of one-year-old plants show dry leaves in the end of vegetation of the next year after sowing.”
Ad. 21	To read: “50% present: 50% of the plants tested show male sterility.”
Chap. 10, TQ, Sect. 4.2 (a)	“(a) Self-pollination” deleted

---

**TG/199/1(proj.1): Chinese Chive**

(a) Changes proposed by the Enlarged Editorial Committee in January 2003, which are already incorporated in the Test Guidelines submitted to the TC

---

Not considered by the TC-EDC in January 2003

---

(b) Changes agreed by the leading expert and all interested experts, which are already incorporated in the Test Guidelines submitted to the TC

Ch. 1	Example variety “Wanda gurin beruto” inserted for note 7
Ch. 2	Example variety “Wanda gurin beruto” inserted for note 5
Ch. 4	Example varieties “Tairyo (1), Daiyampndo beruto (2), Gurin beruto (3), Kuraun beruto (4), Tenda poru (5)” inserted
Ch. 5	Example variety “Kuraun beruto” inserted for note 7
Ch. 6	Example varieties “Tenda poru (3), Tairyo (7)” inserted
Ch. 7	Example variety “Kuraun beruto” inserted for note 7
Ch. 8	Example varieties “Tenda poru (3), Tairyo (7)” inserted
Ch. 10	Example varieties “Wand gurin beruto (3), Kuraun beruto (7)” inserted
Ch. 11	Example varieties “Tairyo (3), Ooba nanyou nira (7)” inserted
Ch. 12	Example variety “Wanda gurin beruto” inserted for note 2
Ch. 13, 14	Example variety “Kuraun beruto” inserted for note 7
Ch. 15	Example variety “Kuraun beruto” inserted for note 1
Ch. 16	Example variety “Tenda poru” inserted for note 3
Ch. 17, 18	Example variety “Wanda gurin beruto” inserted for note 7
Chap. 8	Literature inserted

(c) Additional Changes proposed by the Enlarged Editorial Committee in April 2003, which are to be included in the Test Guidelines submitted to the TC

Sect. 2.2 and 2.3	The word “seedlings” to be replaced by “plantlets” (French: “jeunes plantes”)
Ch. 1	“tall” to be replaced by “high”
Ch. 5 to 11	To receive note (a)
Ch. 11	Replace states “few” and “many” by “weak” and “strong”
Ch. 12 to 16	In German “Pseudostamm” instead of “Pseudotrieb”
Chap. 10, TQ, Sect. 4.2.1	“(A) self pollination, (i) population, (ii) synthesis, and (see below)” to be deleted; specific questions about hybrids also to be deleted

**TG/BASIL(proj.1): Basil**

- (a) Changes proposed by the Enlarged Editorial Committee in January 2003, which are already incorporated in the Test Guidelines submitted to the TC

---

Not considered by the TC-EDC in January 2003

---

- (b) Changes agreed by the leading expert and all interested experts, which are already incorporated in the Test Guidelines submitted to the TC

---

Ch. 7 Example variety “Lemon” removed

---

Ch. 14 of Deleted  
TWV/36/10

---

Ch. 25 State of expression “light-violet” deleted;  
State of expression “pink” inserted with the example variety “Red Rubin”

---

- (c) Additional Changes proposed by the Enlarged Editorial Committee in April 2003, which are to be included in the Test Guidelines submitted to the TC

---

Sect. 3.5 “measure” corrected to “measuring”

---

Sect. 4.2.2 To read: “The assessment of uniformity should be according to the  
recommendations for cross-pollinated varieties in the General Introduction.”

---

Ch. 1 In French “dressée”

---

Ch. 21 The states 4 and 6 to be deleted; to ask the leading expert to provide example  
varieties for state 7

---

Ad. 1 Drawing for state 2 should be improved (without using a picture taken at flowering  
stage)

---

Chap. 10, TQ, “(a) Self-pollination, (i) population, (ii) synthetic variety” to be deleted  
Sect. 4.2.1

---

**TG/BRACTE(proj.2): *Bracteantha***

(a) Changes proposed by the Enlarged Editorial Committee in January 2003, which are already incorporated in the Test Guidelines submitted to the TC

---

Not considered by the TC-EDC in January 2003

---

(b) Changes agreed by the leading expert and all interested experts, which are already incorporated in the Test Guidelines submitted to the TC

Ch. 1	To have states: “basal clusters” (1) and “bushy” (2)
Ch. 4	“+” to be added
Ch. 11	“+” to be deleted
Ch. 16	To have states: “absent or weak” (1), “medium” (2) and “strong” (3)
Ch. 17	To read: “Flowering shoot: length”
Ch. 18	To read: “Flowering shoot: branching”
Ch. 21 to 40	“(c)” to be added
Ch. 22	“+” to be deleted
Sect. 8.1, (a), (b)	Explanations updated
Sect. 8.1, (c)	To be added; explanations provided
Ad. 1	Added proposed drawings
Ad. 3, 4	Explanations updated; added proposed drawings
Ad. 7, 8, 9, 10	Added proposed drawing
Ad. 11	To be deleted
Ad. 17-20	Explanations added; added proposed drawings
Ad. 21	Added proposed drawings
Ad. 22	Deleted
Ad. 23, 24	Added proposed drawings
Ad. 26	Explanations added
Ad. 28, 29, 30, 31 to 39	Added proposed drawing
Chap. 10, TQ, 5.1	To have states: “basal clusters” (1) and “bushy” (2)

(c) Additional Changes proposed by the Enlarged Editorial Committee in April 2003, which are to be included in the Test Guidelines submitted to the TC

Sect. 2.3	To delete: “for vegetatively propagated varieties:”
Sect. 5.3 (d)	To delete: “Gr. 1: white; Gr. 2: yellow; Gr. 3: orange; Gr. 4: pink; Gr. 5: red”
Ch. 23	To read: “Flower head: side view of <u>lower</u> part”
Ch. 24	To read: “Flower head: side view of <u>upper</u> part”
Ad. 17	To read: “Plant type: basal clusters” instead of “Plant type: basal clusers”
Ad. 19, 20	Last paragraph to read: “Flower bud main color should be recorded after removing a bract from the middle third of the bud. The color of the middle third of the outside of the bract should be assessed.”

**TG/BROADBEAN(proj.1): Broad Bean**

- (a) Changes proposed by the Enlarged Editorial Committee in January 2003, which are already incorporated in the Test Guidelines submitted to the TC

---

Not considered by the TC-EDC in January 2003

---

- (b) Changes agreed by the leading expert and all interested experts, which are already incorporated in the Test Guidelines submitted to the TC

---

Chap. 7	Example variety “Hedosa” removed globally
Chap. 7	Example variety “Sutton” corrected to be “The Sutton”
Ch. 8	Example variety “Futura” inserted for state 5
Ch. 14	Example variety “Futura” inserted for state 5
Ch. 22	Example variety “Futura” inserted for state 9
Ch. 25	Example variety “Futura” inserted for state 7
Ch. 26	Example variety “Futura” inserted for state 3
Ch. 28	Example variety “Futura” inserted for state 7
Ch. 29	Example variety “Futura” inserted for state 3
Ch. 30	Example variety “Futura” inserted for state 1

---

- (c) Additional Changes proposed by the Enlarged Editorial Committee in April 2003, which are to be included in the Test Guidelines submitted to the TC

---

Cover page	Latin name “ <u>Vicia faba</u> L. var. <i>major</i> Harz” to be corrected
Chap. 1	Latin name “ <u>Vicia faba</u> L. var. <i>major</i> Harz” to be corrected
Sect. 3.5	The standard wording “determined by measuring or counting” to be inserted
Sect. 4.2.2	To read: “The assessment of uniformity should be according to the recommendations for cross-pollinated varieties in the General Introduction.”
Ch. 2	To receive drawings from Test Guidelines for Field Bean
Ch. 9	To read: “Leaflet: length (basal pair of leaflet at secondary node)”
Ch. 10, 11	To receive “(as for ch. 9)”
Ch. 34	To be checked with the leading expert for timing of growth stage
Chap. 10, TQ, Sect. 1.1	Latin name “ <u>Vicia faba</u> L. var. <i>major</i> Harz” to be corrected
Chap. 10, TQ, Sect. 4.2	“(a) Self-pollination, (i) population, (i) synthetic variety, (c) Hybrid” to be deleted; all questions concerning the formulae of hybrid to be deleted

---



**TG/CALIBR(proj.2): Calibrachoa**

(a) Changes proposed by the Enlarged Editorial Committee in January 2003, which are already incorporated in the Test Guidelines submitted to the TC

---

Not considered by the TC-EDC in January 2003

---

(b) Changes agreed by the leading expert and all interested experts, which are already incorporated in the Test Guidelines submitted to the TC

---

Ad. 3, 6, 11, 12, 16 Added proposed drawings

---

Chap. 8 List of Associated Indications to be added

---

Chap. 9 New reference to be added:

“Wijsman, H.J.W. (1982): On the Interrelationships of Certain Species of *Petunia* I. Taxonomic Notes on the Parental Species of *Petunia* Hybrida. Acta Bot. Neerl. 31 (5/6), pp. 477-490.”

---

(c) Additional Changes proposed by the Enlarged Editorial Committee in April 2003, which are to be included in the Test Guidelines submitted to the TC

---

Sect. 3.3.1 Last sentence: wording “In particular,” to be deleted

---

Sect. 5.3 (d) Color group to be added: white, yellow, yellow orange, red, blue pink, blue red, purple red, purple, violet, blue violet

---

Ch. 3, 4, 6, 21 Example variety to read “KLEC00070”

---

Ch. 12 To read: “Sepal: width (longest part which is not fused)

---

Ch. 12, 15 Example variety to read “KLEC99R14”

---

Ch. 15 Example variety “Carillion Rose” to be checked

---

Ch. 20 “(as for 17)” to be added at the end

---

Ch. 22 “(as for 17)” to be deleted

---

Ch. 24 To read: “Corolla tube: maximum length”

---

Ad. 3, 11, 12, 15, 24 Drawing to be updated as proposed, see document TC-EDC/Apr03/1, Annex III

---

Chap. 8, page 16 Title of the table to be deleted; associated indications for example varieties “Carillion Rose”, “Lazzpersa” and “Sumcali 01” to be added

---

Chap. 10, TQ, Set. 5.6 (21) To read: “Corolla lobe: conspicuousness of veins on upper side”

---

Chap. 10, TQ, Sect. 6 To read: “Corolla lobe: main color of upper side” with expression for the similar variety: “white” and with expression for candidate variety: “blue pink”

---

**TG/CHERIM(proj.2): Cherimoya**

(a) Changes proposed by the Enlarged Editorial Committee in January 2003, which are already incorporated in the Test Guidelines submitted to the TC

---

Not considered by the TC-EDC in January 2003

---

(b) Changes agreed by the leading expert and all interested experts, which are already incorporated in the Test Guidelines submitted to the TC

---

Ch. 46 State 7: To have example variety “Bay ott”

---

(c) Additional Changes proposed by the Enlarged Editorial Committee in April 2003, which are to be included in the Test Guidelines submitted to the TC

---

Cover page To check whether there is another common name in English (Custard apple?).

---

Sect. 2.3 To delete:  
“eight plants (one-year old grafts) on rootstocks of *Annona cherimola* Mill”

---

Ch. 7 To have states of expression: “broad ovate” (1); “ovate” (2); “narrow ovate” (3); and “lanceolate” (4)

---

Ch. 9 To have states of expression: “light” (3); “medium” (5) and “green”(7) and note QN

---

Ch. 14 To be moved after characteristic 11

---

Ch. 15 To read: “Flowering shoot: density of flowers”

---

Ch. 20 To be moved after characteristic 15

---

Ch. 22 and 23 To have states of expression: “weak” (3); “medium” (5) and “strong” (7)

---

Ch. 24 To have states of expression: “narrow cordate” (1); “cordate” (2) and “broad cordate” (3)

---

Ch. 34 To read: “Fruit: protuberances on surface”

---

Ch. 36 To read: “Fruit: firmness of flesh”

---

Ch. 47 Is very similar to characteristic 45. If kept, to add drawings for the states of expression

---

Sect. 8.1 (a) To read:  
“(a) Shoot: Observations on the old shoot should be made on the middle third of one year old shoots during the dormant season.”

---

Ad. 34 To have notes 1-3-5-7 instead of 1-2-3-4

---

Chap. 9, first reference In line 2, to read: “Clonal” instead of “Clonial”

---

Chap. 10, TQ, Sect. 4 To delete: “4.2.2 Seed”

---

**TG/DENDRO(proj.2): Dendrobium**

(a) Changes proposed by the Enlarged Editorial Committee in January 2003, which are already incorporated in the Test Guidelines submitted to the TC

---

Not considered by the TC-EDC in January 2003

---

(b) Changes agreed by the leading expert and all interested experts, which are already incorporated in the Test Guidelines submitted to the TC

---

Sect. 2.2 To read: “The material is to be supplied in the form of two-year old plants that have not previously flowered.”

---

Sect. 3.3.2 The third sentence to be replaced with two new separate sentences:  
“Planting: February – March  
“Substrate: Porous with good aeration. Size of pot: medium”

---

Ch. 10 State for note 1 to read: “narrow elliptic”

---

Ch. 17 To read: “Inflorescence: position of adherence to pseudobulb”

---

Ch. 33, 40, 56 State for note 1 to read: “narrow elliptic”

---

Ch. 33, 40, 56 New state “transverse elliptic” (5) to be added

---

Ch. 33, 40, 56 State “spatulate” (5) to become state “spatulate” (6).

---

Ad. 23 To be updated

---

Ad. 33, 40, 56 To be updated

---

(c) Additional Changes proposed by the Enlarged Editorial Committee in April 2003, which are to be included in the Test Guidelines submitted to the TC

---

Sect. 3.3.2 First sentence to read:  
“3.3.2 The tests should be conducted in a greenhouse with the following conditions for the Northern Hemisphere.”  
To check the use of italic font in the botanical names.

---

Sect. 5.3 To have the following color grouping in item (h):  
“Green – White – Yellow – Pink – Red – Purple – Reddish”

---

Ch. 15 To read: “Leaf: pubescence”

---

Ch. 22 To have notes 1-2-3-4 instead of 1-3-5-7; to have note “PQ” instead of “QN”

---

Ch. 25 To read: “Flower: general appearance of petals and sepals”

---

Ch. 41 To read: “Lateral sepal: cross section” with states of expression:  
“strongly concave” (1); “moderately concave” (3); “straight” (5);  
“moderately convex” (7); and “strongly convex” (9)

---

Ch. 47 To read: “Varieties with shaded sepals only: Sepal: extent of shading”

---

Ch. 48 To read: “Varieties with shaded sepals only: Sepal: color of shading”

---

Ch. 49 To read: “Varieties with edged sepals only: Sepal: color of edging”

---

Ch. 50 To read: “Varieties with stripped sepals only: Sepal: color of stripes”

---

**TG/DENDRO(proj.2): Dendrobium (continued)**

Ch. 51	To read: “ <u>Varieties with netted sepals only</u> : Sepal: color of netting”
Ch. 52	To read: “ <u>Varieties with netted spotted only</u> : Sepal: color of spots”
Ch. 57	To read: “Petal: cross section” with states of expression: “strongly concave” (1); “moderately concave” (3); “straight” (5); “moderately convex” (7); and “strongly convex” (9)
Ch. 63	To read: “ <u>Varieties with shaded petals only</u> : Petal: extent of shading”
Ch. 64	To read: “ <u>Varieties with shaded petals only</u> : Petal: color of shading”
Ch. 65	To read: “ <u>Varieties with edged petals only</u> : Petal: color of edging”
Ch. 66	To read: “ <u>Varieties with stripped petals only</u> : Petal: color of stripes”
Ch. 67	To read: “ <u>Varieties with netted petals only</u> : Petal: color of netting”
Ch. 68	To read: “ <u>Varieties with spotted petals only</u> : Petal: color of spots”
Ch. 76	To read: “Lip: eye”
Ch. 81	To read: “ <u>Varieties with shaded lips only</u> : Lip: extent of shading”
Ch. 84	To read: “ <u>Varieties with shaded lips only</u> : Lip : color of shading”
Ch. 85	To read: “ <u>Varieties with edged lips only</u> : Lip: color of edging”
Ch. 86	To read: “ <u>Varieties with striped lips only</u> : Lip: color of stripes”
Ch. 87	To read: “ <u>Varieties with netted lips only</u> : Lip: color of netting”
Ch. 88	To read: “ <u>Varieties with spotted lips only</u> : Lip: color of spots”
Ch. 93	To check the font for the example variety
Ch. 98	To have states of expression “very late” (1); “early” (2); “medium” (5)
Sect. 8.1 (d)	Rewording Proposal:  “To be assessed on the most recently opened flower on the inflorescence, before the color starts to fade, at the time when 50 % of the flowers on the inflorescence have opened.”

**TG/LENTIL(proj.1): Lentil**

- (a) Changes proposed by the Enlarged Editorial Committee in January 2003, which are already incorporated in the Test Guidelines submitted to the TC

---

Not considered by the TC-EDC in January 2003

---

- (b) Changes agreed by the leading expert and all interested experts, which are already incorporated in the Test Guidelines submitted to the TC

---

Chap. 7	Example variety “Lentillon rosé de Champagne” amended to “Lentillon rosé d’hiver”
Ch. 2	Example variety “Anica” inserted for state 3
Ch. 10	Example varieties “Dora, Flora” inserted for state 5
Chap. 8	Literature added

---

- (c) Additional Changes proposed by the Enlarged Editorial Committee in April 2003, which are to be included in the Test Guidelines submitted to the TC

---

General	Remarks in the margin to be deleted in the final version
Chap. 7	The example variety “izka” globally to be removed from the table
Ch. 6	To have the states “elliptic, ovate, rectangular”
Ch. 8	The absolute figures to be deleted; France to provide example varieties
Ch. 15	To read: “Pod: intensity of color (before dry harvest maturity)”
Ch. 19, 20	To ask the leading expert whether the characteristics should be examined at <u>dry</u> harvest maturity as in the case of characteristics 17 and 18
Ch. 20	The state 2 to read “truncate to pointed”
Ch. 25	To read “ <u>Varieties with more than one testa color only</u> : ...”
Ch. 28	The states 4 and 6 to be deleted; to ask the leading expert to provide example varieties for state 7
Chap. 9	The title of the literature should be completed
Chap. 10, TQ, Sect. 4.2	“(B) cross pollination, (i) population, (ii) synthetic variety” to be deleted

---

**TG/LEPTOS(proj.2): *Leptospermum***

(a) Changes proposed by the Enlarged Editorial Committee in January 2003, which are already incorporated in the Test Guidelines submitted to the TC

---

Not considered by the TC-EDC in January 2003

---

(b) Changes agreed by the leading expert and all interested experts, which are already incorporated in the Test Guidelines submitted to the TC

---

Sect. 5.3(d)	To read: “Flower: number of whorls of petals (characteristic 22)”
Sect. 6.5	The key “(d)” added to the second sentence from the bottom to read: “(a)-(d) See Explanations on the Table of Characteristics in Chapter 8, Section 8.1”
Ch. 6	“+” deleted
Ch. 6 to 8	“(a)” added
Ch. 8	“+” deleted
Ch. 9	“(b)” added
Ch. 10 to 19	“(a)” replaced with “(b)”
Ch. 16	“+” deleted
Ch. 20, 21	“(b)” replaced with “(c)”
Ch. 22	To read: “Flower: number of whorls of petals” with the states: “one (1)” and “more than one (2)”; “+” deleted; indicated as QL; “(*)” added
Ch. 22 to 34	“(c)” replaced with “(d)”
Ch. 23	To read: “Flower: number of fertile stamens”; “+” deleted; indicated as QN
Ch. 35	To read: “Petal: color change after first opening”; “(d)” added
Ch. 36 to 38	“(c)” replaced with “(d)”
Ch. 39 to 41	“(d)” added
Ch. 42, 43	“(c)” replaced with “(d)”
Sect. 8.1	New key “(a)” added to read as follows:  “Observations on the young shoot and young leaf should be made on the distal part of the shoot on fully expanded leaves during active growth. The color of the young leaf should be observed on the upper side.”  The old “(a)” replaced with “(b)”; the old “(b)” replaced with “(c)”; the old “(c)” replaced with “(d)”
Ad. 6, 8, 16, 22, 23	Deleted
Chap. 10, TQ, Sect. 5.4	To read: “Flower: number of whorls of petals” with the states: “one (1)” and “more than one (2)”

---

**TG/LEPTOS(proj.2): *Leptospermum* (continued)**

- (c) Additional Changes proposed by the Enlarged Editorial Committee in April 2003, which are to be included in the Test Guidelines submitted to the TC

Cover page	To add common name in English: “Manuka”
Chap. 1	To check the font of the botanical name.
Sect. 2.3	To read: “2.3 The minimum quantity of plant material, to be supplied by the applicant, should be: 10 rooted cuttings.”
Sect. 3.3.1	To read: “3.3.1 The tests should be carried out under conditions ensuring satisfactory growth for the expression of the relevant characteristics of the variety and for the conduct of the examination. Observations should be made on plants which are at least two years old.”
Sect. 5.3 (c) and (e)	To read: “(c) Leaf blade: main color of upper side (excluding hairs) (characteristic 16) with the following groups: “Gr. 1 (green): yellow green; light green; medium green; dark green “Gr. 2 (grey green): grey green “Gr. 3 (red): red; red brown; red purple; dark purple” “(e) Petal: main color at first opening (characteristic 36) with the following groups: “Gr. 1: green yellow “Gr. 2: white “Gr. 3: red pink “Gr. 4: red “Gr. 5: red purple “Gr. 6: purple violet “Gr. 7: violet”
Ch. 6	To have states of expression: “yellow green” (1); “light green” (2); “medium green” (3); “reddish green” (4); “orange brown” (5); “red” (6); and “purple” (7)
Ch. 13	To have states of expression: “v-shaped” (1); “incurved” (2); “flat” (3); and “recurved” (4)
Ch. 19 and 20	To have states of expression: “absent or weak” (1); “medium” (2); and “strong” (3)
Ch. 27	To be moved after characteristic 22
Ch. 34	To read: “ <u>Varieties with two or more colors on upper side of petal only</u> : Petal: distribution of secondary color”
Ch. 37	To read: “ <u>Varieties with two or more colors on upper side of petal only</u> : Petal: secondary color at first opening”
Ch. 40	To read: “ <u>Varieties with two or more colors on upper side of petal only</u> : Petal: secondary color two weeks after first opening”
Ad. 25 and 26	To have both characteristics in the same explanation
Chap. 10, TQ, Sect. 1.1.1	To check the use of italic font
Chap. 10, TQ, Sect. 6	To have as example characteristic: “Petal: main color at first opening” and example states “red” and “violet”

**TG/PETUNI(proj.2): Petunia**

(a) Changes proposed by the Enlarged Editorial Committee in January 2003, which are already incorporated in the Test Guidelines submitted to the TC

---

Not considered by the TC-EDC in January 2003

---

(b) Changes agreed by the leading expert and all interested experts, which are already incorporated in the Test Guidelines submitted to the TC

---

Sect. 2.3, last sentence	To read: “- for seed propagated varieties: 600 seeds, preferably supplied in 6 portions, each of 100 seeds, or 0.2 g seeds”
-----------------------------	---

---

Ch. 11	“+” deleted <u>as a misprint</u>
--------	----------------------------------

---

Chap. 8	List of Associated Indications added
---------	--------------------------------------

---

Ad. 3, 8, 14, 15	Added proposed drawings
------------------	-------------------------

---

Ad. 19 and 20	Existing drawings replaced with proposed drawings
---------------	---

---

(c) Additional Changes proposed by the Enlarged Editorial Committee in April 2003, which are to be included in the Test Guidelines submitted to the TC

---

Sect. 2.3	Last sentence to read: “- for seed propagated varieties: 600 seeds.”
-----------	--

---

Sect. 3.3.1	Last sentence: wording “In particular,” to be deleted
-------------	---

---

Sect. 4.2.2	To be updated, add following sentence at the end: “In the case of a sample size of 40 plants, 2 off-types are allowed.”
-------------	---

---

Sect. 4.2.3	To be amended as follows:  “For the assessment of uniformity of seed-propagated varieties which are hybrids, the recommendations in the General Introduction for hybrid varieties should be followed, as appropriate.”
-------------	--

---

Ch. 10	To read: “ <u>Varieties with non-variegated leaves only</u> : Leaf blade: green color of upper side”
--------	--

---

Ch. 14	To read: “Sepal: length (longest part which is not fused)”
--------	--

---

Ch. 15	To read: “Sepal: width (broadest part which is not fused)”
--------	--

---

Ch. 20	To have states: “salverform” (1) and “funnelform” (2). French translation of the states to be changed.
--------	--

---

Ch. 21	French translation of the states to be changed, “s” to be added at the end of each of the states
--------	--

---

Ch. 24	Wording in brackets “(as for ch. 22)” to be added at the end
--------	--

---

Ch. 25	PQ to be changed with QL
--------	--------------------------

---

Ch. 26	Wording in brackets “(as for ch. 22)” to be added at the end
--------	--

---

Ch. 32	To read: “Anther: color before dehiscence”
--------	--

---

Ad. 3, 7, 8, 14, 15, 16, 19, 20, 25, 29	Drawings to be updated as proposed in document TC-EDC/Apr03/1, Annex III
---	--

---



**TG/PETUNI(proj.2): Petunia (continued)**

---

Ad. 14 and 15	To read as proposed in document TC-EDC/Apr03/1, Annex III “Ad. 14: Sepal: length (longest part which is not fused)” “Ad. 15: Sepal: width (broadest part which is not fused)”
Ad. 19 and 20	States to read: “salverform” (1) and “funnelform” (2)
Chap. 8, page 19	Title of the table to be deleted; associated indications to be added for example varieties: Flowerfalls Light Pink; Trumpet Pink and Yellow Apple Pie
Chap. 10, TQ, Sect. 4.2.2	To read: “4.2.2 Seed a) self-pollinated b) hybrid”
Chap. 10, TQ, Sect. 6	To read: “Corolla lobe: main color of upper side” with expression for the similar variety: “white” and with expression for candidate variety: “blue pink”

---

**TG/PHALAE(proj.2): *Phalaenopsis***

(a) Changes proposed by the Enlarged Editorial Committee in January 2003, which are already incorporated in the Test Guidelines submitted to the TC

---

Not considered by the TC-EDC in January 2003

---

(b) Changes agreed by the leading expert and all interested experts, which are already incorporated in the Test Guidelines submitted to the TC

---

Sect. 3.3.2	Fourth sentence to read: “Substrate: Porous with good aeration. Size of pot: medium”
Ch. 30	New state “striped and spotted” (8) added; state “edged and striped” (8) becomes “edged and striped” (9)
Ad. 49, 50, 52, 54	To be updated

---

(c) Additional Changes proposed by the Enlarged Editorial Committee in April 2003, which are to be included in the Test Guidelines submitted to the TC

---

Sect. 2.4	To be deleted
Sect. 3.3.2	Wording “Northern hemisphere” to be moved to the first sentence to read: “It is recommended that the tests be conducted in a greenhouse under the following conditions in the Northern hemisphere.”
Sect. 4.2.3	To update: “... for cross-pollinated and/or hybrid varieties should be followed, as appropriate.”
Ch. 10	State “compound raceme” to be replaced with “panicle”
Ch. 16	To read: “Flower: general appearance of petals and sepals”. Note 1 for state “incurving” to be added (English version only)
Ch. 26	To read: “Sepal : cross section”. State “flat” to be replaced with “straight”
Ch. 30, 34, 45, 58, 62	State “even” to be replaced with “evenly colored”
Ch. 53	(+) to be added. Illustration to be provided. Order of the states to be changed to the following : ovate (1), elliptic (2), obovate (3), orbicular (4), semi-circular (5), deltoid (6), obdeltoid (7), rhombic (8)
Sect. 8.1 (b)	To be improved as for TG/DENDRO(proj.2) (Dendrobium)
Ad. 10	State “compound raceme” to be replaced with “panicle”
Ad. 11	Drawing to be improved. Position of arrow to be changed
Ad. 49, 50, 52, 54	Arrow for “1: Column” to be added
Chap. 10, TQ, Sect. 4.2	To be amended as follows: “4.2 Method of Propagating the Variety 4.2.1 Vegetative propagation (a) cuttings [ ] (b) <i>in vitro</i> propagation [ ] (c) other (state method) [ ] 4.2.2 Seed [ ] 4.2.3 Other [ ] (please provide details)”

---

**TG/WILLOW(proj.2): Willow**

(a) Changes proposed by the Enlarged Editorial Committee in January 2003, which are already incorporated in the Test Guidelines submitted to the TC

---

Not considered by the TC-EDC in January 2003

---

(b) Changes agreed by the leading expert and all interested experts, which are already incorporated in the Test Guidelines submitted to the TC

---

Ch. 23 To read: "Stipule: type". To have states: type 1 (1); type 2 (2); type 3 (3)

---

Ad. 23 Updated to correspond to the numbering of the types

---

(c) Additional Changes proposed by the Enlarged Editorial Committee in April 2003, which are to be included in the Test Guidelines submitted to the TC

---

Sect. 2.2 To read: "The material is to be supplied in the form of hardwood cuttings with a diameter of at least 1 cm and a length of 20 cm, or well rooted one year old plants."

---

Sect. 2.3 To read: "The minimum quantity of plant material, to be supplied by the applicant, should be: 30 hardwood cuttings or 15 plants."

---

Sect. 2.4 Second sentence to read: "The applicant should indicate to the authorities, if possible, the location of at least one adult tree of the variety."

---

Sect. 3.1 To read: "The minimum duration of tests should normally be two independent growing cycles. In particular, the first two growing cycles after planting should not be considered to produce satisfactory expressions of characteristics."

---

Sect. 3.3.2 "(Northern Hemisphere)" to be moved to the end of the first sentence.

---

Ch. 3 State "curved" to read "moderately curved"; state "sinuous" to be replaced with "tortuous" and example variety "Tortuosa" for note 5 to be added

---

Ch. 15 To be notified as QN, not PQ

---

Chap. 7 To check with leading expert what characteristics would be useful as asterisked characteristics

---

Chap. 7 To check with leading expert what additional example varieties could be provided

---

**CITRUS L.: TG/MANDA(proj.3): Mandarins – Group 1**  
**TG/ORANG(proj.3): Oranges – Group 2**  
**TG/LEM-LIM(proj.3): Lemons and Limes – Group 3**  
**TG/GRA-PUM(proj.3): Grapefruit and Pummelo – Group 4**  
**TG/PONCI(proj.3): Trifoliate Orange – Group 5**

(a) Changes agreed by the Enlarged Editorial Committee in January 2003, which are already incorporated in the Test Guidelines submitted to the TC

---

Sect. 1.4	To read:  “... <i>Citrus L.</i> , even where the variety is clearly distinguishable ... In these circumstances, the characteristics from the Test Guidelines covering the parent species, or characteristics from the overall set of citrus characteristics, presented in the Annex, may be particularly useful.”
Sect. 3.1	To read:  “The minimum duration of tests should normally be two independent growing cycles. For the purposes of these Test Guidelines, a growing cycle refers to the fruiting cycle.”
Sect. 3.3.1	Add new sentence 2:  “In particular, a satisfactory crop of fruit must be produced in at least two fruiting cycles.”
Sect. 3.3.3	Move whole section to chapter 8 under new section 8.1 “Explanations covering several characteristics”
Sect. 4.3.2	To read: “..., or by testing a new plant stock, ...”
Sect. 6.5	(+) to read: “... in Chapter 8, Section 8.2”  Replace “(a) to (i)” with “(a) to (h)” and read: “See Explanations on the Table of Characteristics in Chapter 8, Section 8.1”
Chap. 7, column 2	Replace letters (b) to (i) with (a) to (h) respectively
Ch. 2 (c2.)	Replace letter (a) in 2 <sup>nd</sup> column with (+) in 1 <sup>st</sup> column
Sect. 8.1	Replace letter (a) with (+) and move item to new section 8.2 “Explanations for individual characteristics”: <u>“Ad. 2 (c2.): Tree: Growth habit</u> “The observation on the growth habit of the tree should be made immediately after harvest.”
Sect. 8.1 (b)-(i)	Replace letters (b) to (i) with (a) to (h) respectively
Sect. 8.1 (a)-(h)	To read “Observations ...”
Sect. 8.1 (e)	To read:  “Observations on the fruit should be made at the stage of optimum ripeness. This stage should be determined by the ratio: total soluble solids/acid content of juice. The fruit should be tested weekly and harvested as soon as this stage has been reached.”

---

**CITRUS L.: Overall Table of Characteristics**

---

Cover page	To read “Mandarins and their hybrids” (in all languages) “Oranges and their hybrids” = Plural in all languages “Lemons and Limes and their hybrids” = Plural in all languages
Ch. 2	Add (+)

---

(b) Changes agreed by the leading expert and all interested experts

**CITRUS L.: TG/MANDA(proj.3): Mandarins – Group 1**  
**TG/ORANG(proj.3): Oranges – Group 2**  
**TG/LEM-LIM(proj.3): Lemons and Limes – Group 3**  
**TG/GRA-PUM(proj.3): Grapefruit and Pummelo – Group 4**  
**TG/PONCI(proj.3): Trifoliolate Orange – Group 5**

Page 1, cover page	Further to replacement of table of Alternative Names on page 1 with extended list of species on page 2, box in the center of page to read:  <p style="text-align: center;">“CITRUS L. – Group X Common name”</p>
Page 1, Alternative Names	Replace table with sentence: “[ See the list of alternative names and corresponding subgroups on page 2 ]”
Page 2	Insert table “Alternative Names and Corresponding Subgroups”
Sect. 1.2	To read: “...:  <p style="text-align: center;">“Group X. COMMON NAME AND ITS [THEIR] HYBRIDS “See page 2 for the list of species and their subgroups.”</p>
Sect. 3.3.2	To read “not less than 3 years after planting”
Sect. 6.4	To read: “... Each example variety is followed by the abbreviation of its subgroup in brackets.”
Sect. 8.1 (d)	To read:  <p>“Flower bud: Observations on the flower bud should be made when the petal tips are visible just before the opening of the bud. ...”</p>
Sect. 8.1 (e)	To read:  <p>“Observations on the fruit should be made at the stage of optimum ripeness. The fruit should be tested weekly and harvested as soon as this stage has been reached.”</p>
Chap. 8, List of example varieties	Title of column 2 = “Subgroup”
Chap. 10, TQ, Sect. 1	Further to replacement of table of Alternative Names on page 1 with extended list of species on page 2, to read:  <p style="margin-left: 40px;">(a) Subgroup:       (i) Abbr. [ ]                              (ii) Abbr. [ ]                              (iii) Abbr. [ ]                              etc.</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">(b) Species (please specify): .....</p>

**TG/MANDA(proj.3): Mandarins – Group 1**

Everywhere	To read “Mandarins”
Ch. 32 (c48.)	Example variety 2 = Clemenules (CLE)
Ch. 87 (c114)	Example variety 7 = Oronules (CLE)
Ch. 92 (c119)	Example variety 1 = Clemenules (CLE) Example variety 2 = Nova (HMA)
Ch. 99 (c126)	Example variety 1 = Clemenules (CLE) Example variety 3 = Ellendale (TNR) Example variety 7 = Común (MMN)
Ch. 103 (c130)	Example variety 1 = Kinow (HMA)
Chap. 8, List of example varieties	Title of column 4 = “Associated indication”
Chap. 8, List of example varieties	Add example variety “Oronules – CLE”

**TG/ORANG(proj.3): Oranges – Group 2**

Everywhere	To read “Oranges”
Ch. 77 (c119)	Example variety 1 = Valencia Late (SWO) Example variety 3 = Washington Navel (SWO)
Ch. 81 (c123)	Example variety 3 = Sucreña (SWO)
Ch. 84 (c126)	Example variety = Salustiana (SWO)      1 Example variety = Valencia Late (SWO)      3 Example variety = Pineapple (SWO)      7
Ch. 97 (c138)	Example variety 1 = Pineapple (SWO)
Chap. 8, List of example varieties	Remove column 3 “Observations”

**TG/LEM-LIM(proj.3): Lemons and Limes – Group 3**

---

Everywhere	To read “Lemons and Limes” in all languages
------------	---

---

Page 2, Alternative Names	Column 2 remove question marks (?)
---------------------------	------------------------------------

---

Ch. 2 (c2)	Example variety 1 = Lisbon Frost (LEM)
------------	--

---

Ch. 50 (c85)	Example variety 3 = Eureka (LEM)
--------------	----------------------------------

---

Ch. 74 (c126)	Example variety 1 = Tahiti (LAL) Example variety 3 = Verna (LEM) Example variety 7 = Eureka (LEM)
---------------	---

---

Chap. 8, List of example varieties	Title of column 3 = “Associated indication”
------------------------------------	---

---

Chap. 8, List of example varieties	Add “Colima 02” and “Colima 03” = SAL
------------------------------------	---------------------------------------

---

Chap. 8, List of example varieties	Column 3, delete “Mexican Lime, limón mexicano”
------------------------------------	---

---

Chap. 9	To “refine” (punctuation, presentation)
---------	---

---

**TG/GRA-PUM(proj.3): Grapefruit and Pummelo – Group 4**

---

Ch. 2 (c2.)	Example variety 2 = Marsh (GRA) Example variety 3 = Oroblanco (HGP)
-------------	--

---

Chap. 7, column 7	Add abbreviation of subgroup next to each example variety
-------------------	---

---

Ch. 92 (c136.)	Example variety 3 = Marsh (GRA)
----------------	---------------------------------

---

Chap. 8, List of example varieties	Column 2 to contain GRA, PUM or HGP (subgroup abbreviation) next to corresponding example varieties
------------------------------------	---

---

Chap. 8, List of example varieties	Remove column 3 “Observations”
------------------------------------	--------------------------------

---

Chap. 10, TQ, sect. 5.5 (92)	Example variety 3 = Marsh (GRA)
------------------------------	---------------------------------

---

**TG/PONCI(proj.3): Trifoliate Orange – Group 5**

---

Chap. 8, List of example varieties	Remove column 3 “Observations”
------------------------------------	--------------------------------

---

Chap. 8, List of example varieties	Add Example variety “Troyer (CTG)”
------------------------------------	------------------------------------

---

**CITRUS L.: Overall Table of Characteristics**

Page 2	(G) to read: “Zitronen und Limetten ...”
Page 2	(F) to read: “Pomelo et pamplemoussier ...”
Ch. 48	To read: “Fruit: shape in transverse section
Ch. 50-51	Move to 53
Ch. 50-51	To read: “ <u>Only varieties without fruit neck</u> : Fruit: ...”
Ch. 52-54	Move to 50-52
Ch. 53-54	To read: “ <u>Necked varieties only</u> : Fruit: ...”
Ch. 59	Remove (+)
Ch. 59	To read: “...: Fruit: depression at stalk attachment”
Ch. 91-92	To read: “ <u>Varieties with pitting only</u> : Fruit surface: ...”
Ch. 93-94	To read: “ <u>Varieties with pebbling only</u> : Fruit surface: ...”
Ch. 125	To read: “Fruit: number of seeds (controlled manual self-pollination)”
Ch. 126	Remove (+)
Ch. 138	Remove (+)

- (c) Additional Changes proposed by the Enlarged Editorial Committee in April 2003, which are to be included in the Test Guidelines submitted to the TC

**CITRUS L.: Overall Table of Characteristics**

Page 2	Remove plural for species in French and Spanish (ex.: <i>Mandariniers</i> )
Numbering	To start with “201” instead of “c1” for easier reference in individual TGs
Ch. 20	To read: “Leaf blade: green color”
Ch. 82	To read: “Fruit surface: predominant color(s)”; state 1-grp 4 to read: “greenish yellow” and swap with state 2-grps 1, 3, 4, 5
Ch. 91-92	To read: “ <u>Varieties with fruit surface: pitting on oil glands present only</u> : Fruit surface: ...”
Ch. 93-94	To read: “ <u>Varieties with fruit surface: pebbling on oil glands present only</u> : Fruit surface: ...”
Ch. 114	Example varieties to be provided
Ch. 122	Example varieties to be provided
Ch. 125	Add (+): “Ad. xx (c125.): Fruit: ... (controlled manual self-pollination): “Manual self-pollination is necessary to ensure a consistent production of seed.”
Ch. 126	Add (+): “Ad. xx (c126.): Fruit: ... (open pollination): “Open pollination means natural pollination between trees of the same variety.”
Ch. 131	To read: “ <u>Varieties with seed: surface wrinkled only</u> : Seed: ...”



---

Ch. 134 To read: “Varieties with seed: polyembryony present only: Seed: Color ...”

---

Ch. 138 Add (+):

“Ad. xx (c138.): Plant: self-incompatibility:

“A variety is self-incompatible when the fertile pollen of its own flower or of other flowers of the same variety is not able to fertilize the ovary.”

---

**CITRUS L.: TG/MANDA(proj.3): Mandarins – Group 1**

**TG/ORANG(proj.3): Oranges – Group 2**

**TG/LEM-LIM(proj.3): Lemons and Limes – Group 3**

**TG/GRA-PUM(proj.3): Grapefruit and Pummelo – Group 4**

**TG/PONCI(proj.3): Trifoliate Orange – Group 5**

---

Chap. 10, TQ, Sect. 4 Add new Section 4.3:

“4.3 Virus status

4.3.1 The plant material is virus-free [ ]

4.3.2 The plant material is virus tested  
(indicate against which viruses) [ ]

4.3.3 The virus status is unknown [ ]”

---

**TG/MANDA(proj.3): Mandarins – Group 1**

---

Page 2, Alternative Names Add new line: “*Citrus ichangensis* Swing. x *C. reticulata* Blanco – HMR – Ichandarin”

---

Sect. 8.1 Remove (a) & (d) [not applicable]

---

**TG/ORANG(proj.3): Oranges – Group 2**

---

Sect. 8.1 Remove (a) & (d) [not applicable]

---

**TG/PONCI(proj.3): Trifoliate Orange – Group 5**

---

Sect. 8.1 Remove (d) [not applicable]

---

[End of Annex II and of document]