

**Technical Committee****TC/53/5****Fifty-Third Session  
Geneva, April 3 to 5, 2017****Original:** English  
**Date:** February 28, 2017

---

**TGP DOCUMENTS***Document prepared by the Office of the Union**Disclaimer: this document does not represent UPOV policies or guidance***EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

1. The purpose of this document is to provide an overview of proposals concerning possible future revisions of TGP documents.
2. The TC is invited to:
  - (a) note the matters for future revision of TGP documents that will be considered in documents TC/53/15, TC/53/16, TC/53/17, TC/53/18 and TC/53/19;
  - (b) consider whether to revise document TGP/7 “Development of Test Guidelines” to introduce new standard wording in the Test Guidelines template and amend Additional Standard Wording 2 to clarify the duration of DUS examination, as set out in paragraph 10 of this document;
  - (c) consider whether UPOV codes and botanical names on the cover page of draft Test Guidelines should continue to be displayed in alphabetical order;
  - (d) consider whether the methods of observation of a characteristic should continue to be presented in alphabetical order; and whether to include an explanation on this matter in document TGP/7 “Development of Test Guidelines”;
  - (e) consider whether to revise document TGP/7 “Development of Test Guidelines” in order to indicate that a comma could be used to separate different types of example varieties (e.g. (w) winter type, (s) spring type); and that the indication of type should precede the denomination of each example variety (e.g. (w) alpha, (w) beta, (s) gamma, (s) sigma);
  - (f) consider whether explanations covering all characteristics should be displayed before Chapter 8.1 “Explanations covering several characteristics”, noting that this would require the inclusion of a free text box in the web-based TG Template;
  - (g) consider whether characteristics with the same explanation could be displayed in Chapter 8.2 “Explanations for individual characteristics”, as set out in paragraph 20 of this document;
  - (h) consider whether to amend document TGP/7, Guidance Note 18(3), to clarify that, in addition to the state of expression of a preceding qualitative characteristic, in some cases the state of expression of a preceding pseudo-qualitative characteristic could also determine that a subsequent characteristic would not be applicable and to establish the criteria to be used for this approach;
  - (i) whether to amend document TGP/7 to allow the addition of new proposals for partial revisions of Test Guidelines at any time during the year, subject to the provision of sufficient time for checking of the proposals by relevant experts and UPOV members;
  - (j) note that the expert from Israel had withdrawn the proposed revision of the term “recurved”;

(k) consider whether to revise document TGP/14: Section 2: Subsection 2: Shapes and structures to amend the “grid for position of broadest part and width/ratio” presented in Alternative 2 to remove the wording on “ratio” and to display “width” in a separate column from the scale of broad to narrow;

(l) consider whether to revise document TGP/14 “Glossary of terms used in UPOV documents” to replace the current list of UPOV Color Groups by a new list created on the basis of the Sixth Edition of the RHS Colour Chart;

(m) consider the TWO request for the expert from Germany with support by the experts from Australia, Canada, European Union, the Netherlands, New Zealand and the United Kingdom to draft guidance on the factors to be considered for creating color groups for grouping of varieties and organizing the growing trial;

(n) consider the program for the development of TGP documents, as set out in the Annex to this document.

3. The structure of this document is as follows:

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	1
BACKGROUND .....	3
FUTURE REVISIONS OF TGP DOCUMENTS.....	3
TGP/7: DEVELOPMENT OF TEST GUIDELINES.....	3
(i) Drafter’s Kit for Test Guidelines .....	3
TGP/8: TRIAL DESIGN AND TECHNIQUES USED IN THE EXAMINATION OF DISTINCTNESS, UNIFORMITY AND STABILITY .....	3
(ii) The Combined-Over-Years Uniformity Criterion (COYU).....	3
(iii) New Section: Examining DUS in Bulk Samples .....	3
(iv) New Section: Data Processing for the Assessment of Distinctness and for Producing Variety Descriptions .....	3
TGP/10: EXAMINING UNIFORMITY .....	3
(v) New section: Assessing Uniformity by Off-Types on Basis of More than One Growing Cycle or on the Basis of Sub-Samples.....	3
NEW PROPOSALS FOR FUTURE REVISIONS OF TGP DOCUMENTS .....	3
TGP/7: DEVELOPMENT OF TEST GUIDELINES .....	3
(i) Duration of DUS tests in the fruit sector .....	3
(ii) Order of UPOV codes and botanical names .....	4
(iii) Order of methods of observation.....	5
(iv) Presentation of different types of example varieties.....	5
(v) Explanations covering all characteristics.....	5
(vi) Subsequent explanations covering several characteristics .....	5
(vii) Characteristics which only apply to certain varieties .....	6
(viii) Procedure for partial revision of UPOV Test Guidelines .....	6
TGP/14: GLOSSARY OF TERMS USED IN UPOV DOCUMENTS.....	7
(ix) Definition of “recurved”.....	7
(x) Grid for shape characteristics .....	8
(xi) Revision of UPOV Color Groups.....	9
PROGRAM FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF TGP DOCUMENTS .....	9
ANNEX: Program for the development of TGP documents	

4. The following abbreviations are used in this document:

CAJ:	Administrative and Legal Committee
TC:	Technical Committee
TC-EDC:	Enlarged Editorial Committee
TWA:	Technical Working Party for Agricultural Crops
TWC:	Technical Working Party on Automation and Computer Programs
TWF:	Technical Working Party for Fruit Crops
TWO:	Technical Working Party for Ornamental Plants and Forest Trees
TWV:	Technical Working Party for Vegetables
TWPs:	Technical Working Parties

## BACKGROUND

5. The approved TGP documents are published on the UPOV website at [http://www.upov.int/upov\\_collection/en/](http://www.upov.int/upov_collection/en/).

## FUTURE REVISIONS OF TGP DOCUMENTS

6. The following possible future revisions of TGP documents were agreed to be considered by the TC at its fifty-third session:

### TGP/7: Development of Test Guidelines

- (i) *Drafter's Kit for Test Guidelines*  
See document TC/53/15

### TGP/8: Trial Design and Techniques Used in the Examination of Distinctness, Uniformity and Stability

- (ii) *The Combined-Over-Years Uniformity Criterion (COYU)*  
See document TC/53/16
- (iii) *New Section: Examining DUS in Bulk Samples*  
See document TC/53/17
- (iv) *New Section: Data Processing for the Assessment of Distinctness and for Producing Variety Descriptions*  
See document TC/53/18

### TGP/10: Examining uniformity

- (v) *New section: Assessing Uniformity by Off-Types on Basis of More than One Growing Cycle or on the Basis of Sub-Samples*  
See document TC/53/19

7. *The TC is invited to note the matters for future revision of TGP documents that will be considered in documents TC/53/15, TC/53/16, TC/53/17, TC/53/18 and TC/53/19.*

## NEW PROPOSALS FOR FUTURE REVISIONS OF TGP DOCUMENTS

### TGP/7: Development of Test Guidelines

- (i) *Duration of DUS tests in the fruit sector*

8. The TC, at its fifty-second session, agreed to consider whether to seek to amend the guidance in document TGP/7 on the duration of DUS testing for fruit crops after further discussions by the TWF, at its session in 2016. In that regard, it requested the TWF to review whether the existing guidance in

TGP documents precluded the conclusion of a DUS examination after one growing cycle (see document TC/52/29 Rev. "Revised Report", paragraph 122).

9. The TWF, at its forty-seventh session, held in Angers, France, considered document TWF/47/19 "Duration of DUS tests in the fruit sector" (see document TWF/47/25 "Report", paragraphs 47 and 48).

10. The TWF considered the proposal from an expert from the European Union and agreed to propose to modify the wording of document TGP/7 as follows, in order to reflect common practice in the fruit sector (~~Strikethrough~~ (highlighted) indicates proposed deletion of text; Underlining (highlighted) indicates proposed insertion of text):

- **Addition of a standard sentence at the point 3 of the UPOV TG Template so that it reads:**

"3. Method of Examination

"3.1 Number of Growing Cycles

"The minimum duration of tests should normally be:

"{ **ASW 2** (Chapter 3.1(.1)) – number of growing cycles }

"{ GN 8 (Chapter 3.1.2) – explanation of the growing cycle }

"{ **ASW 3** (Chapter 3.1.2) – explanation of the growing cycle }

As soon as it can be established with certainty that the outcome of the DUS test will be negative, it can be stopped independently from the number of growing cycles carried out so far.

- **Additional option(s) to be included in the ASW 2**

ASW 2 (TG Template: Chapter 3.1) – Number of growing cycles

(a) *Single growing cycle*

"The ~~minimum~~ duration of tests should ~~normally~~ typically be a single growing cycle. At the end of the growing cycle the competent authority will determine whether or not a following growing cycle is required."

(b) *Two independent growing cycles*

"The ~~minimum~~ duration of tests should ~~normally~~ typically be two independent growing cycles. Nevertheless, at the end of each growing cycle the competent authority will determine whether or not a following growing cycle is required.

11. *The TC is invited to consider whether to revise document TGP/7 "Development of Test Guidelines" to introduce new standard wording on the Test Guidelines template and amend Additional Standard Wording 2 to clarify the duration of DUS examination, as set out in paragraph 10 of this document.*

(ii) *Order of UPOV codes and botanical names*

12. The TC-EDC, at its meeting in January 2017, recommended to the TC to consider whether UPOV codes and botanical names on the cover page of draft Test Guidelines should continue to be displayed in alphabetical order. In case another order of information would be preferred (e.g. species with largest number of applications first), the TC-EDC recommended that Test Guidelines adopted in 2017 be amended prior to publication. In such a case, the next version of the web-based TG Template should allow the UPOV codes presentation order to be modified.

13. *The TC is invited to consider whether UPOV codes and botanical names on the cover page of draft Test Guidelines should continue to be displayed in alphabetical order.*

*(iii) Order of methods of observation*

14. The TC-EDC, at its meeting in January 2017, recommended to the TC to consider whether the methods of observation of a characteristic (MG/MS/VG/VS) should continue to be presented in alphabetical order and to consider whether an explanation on this matter should be included in document TGP/7 "Development of Test Guidelines".

15. *The TC is invited to consider whether:*

*(a) the methods of observation of a characteristic should continue to be presented in alphabetical order; and*

*(b) to include an explanation on this matter in document TGP/7 "Development of Test Guidelines"*

*(iv) Presentation of different types of example varieties*

16. The TC-EDC, at its meeting in January 2017, recommended to the TC to consider whether document TGP/7 "Development of Test Guidelines" should be revised to indicate that a comma could be used to separate different types of example varieties (e.g. (w) winter type, (s) spring type) and whether the indication of type should precede the denomination of each example variety (e.g. (w) alpha, (w) beta, (s) gamma, (s) sigma).

17. *The TC is invited to consider whether to revise document TGP/7 "Development of Test Guidelines" in order to indicate that:*

*(a) a comma could be used to separate different types of example varieties (e.g. (w) winter type, (s) spring type); and*

*(b) the indication of type should precede the denomination of each example variety (e.g. (w) alpha, (w) beta, (s) gamma, (s) sigma).*

*(v) Explanations covering all characteristics*

18. The TC-EDC, at its meeting in January 2017, recommended to the TC to consider whether explanations covering all characteristics should be displayed before Chapter 8.1 "Explanations covering several characteristics", noting that this would require the inclusion of a free text box in the web-based TG Template.

19. *The TC is invited to consider whether explanations covering all characteristics should be displayed before Chapter 8.1 "Explanations covering several characteristics", noting that this would require the inclusion of a free text box in the web-based TG Template.*

*(vi) Subsequent explanations covering several characteristics*

20. The TC-EDC, at its meeting in January 2017, recommended to the TC to consider whether characteristics with the same explanation could be displayed in Chapter 8.2 "Explanations for individual characteristics". The explanation for the first characteristic would display the appropriate text/illustration and explanations for the subsequent characteristics would reference the first explanation.

e.g.: Ad. 10 "[explanation text/illustration]"

Ad. 11 "See Ad. 10"

[...]

Ad. 50 "See Ad. 10"

21. *The TC is invited to consider whether characteristics with the same explanation could be displayed in Chapter 8.2 “Explanations for individual characteristics”, as set out in paragraph 20 of this document.*

*(vii) Characteristics which only apply to certain varieties*

22. The TC-EDC, at its meeting in January 2017, recommended consideration by the TC on whether an amendment should be developed to document TGP/7, Annex 3, Guidance Note 18, Paragraph 3 “Characteristics which only apply to certain varieties” to clarify that, in some cases, the state of expression of a preceding pseudo-qualitative characteristic could also determine that a subsequent characteristic would not be applicable. The criteria used for this approach would also need to be established. The relevant extract of document TGP/7 is reproduced below:

“GN 18 (TG Template: Chapter 7: column 3) – Presentation of Characteristics: Heading of a characteristic

[...]

“3. *Characteristics which only apply to certain varieties*

“In some cases, the state of expression of a preceding qualitative characteristic determines that a subsequent characteristic is not applicable e.g. it would not be possible to describe the shape of leaf lobes for a variety which did not have leaf lobes. In cases where this is not obvious, or where the characteristics are separated in the Table of Characteristics, the heading of the subsequent characteristic is preceded by an underlined reference to the types of varieties to which it applies, on the basis of the preceding characteristic, e.g.:

“Only varieties with flower type: single: Flower: shape”

23. *The TC is invited to consider whether:*

*(a) to amend document TGP/7, Guidance Note 18(3), to clarify that, in addition to the state of expression of a preceding qualitative characteristic, in some cases the state of expression of a preceding pseudo-qualitative characteristic could also determine that a subsequent characteristic would not be applicable; and*

*(b) to establish the criteria to be used for this approach.*

*(viii) Procedure for partial revision of UPOV Test Guidelines*

24. The TWV expressed some concerns about the speed for making partial revisions of Test Guidelines, especially in relation to disease characteristics, which are particularly relevant in the vegetable sector. The TWV considered the guidance provided in document “TGP/7/4 – Section 2: Procedure for the Introduction and Revision of UPOV Test Guidelines”, as reproduced below, and invited the TC to consider whether a revision of this existing guidance could be envisaged to allow more flexibility to add new proposals for partial revision at any time in the course of the year (see document TWV/50/25 “Report”, paragraphs 59 and 60):

“2.2.1 STEP 1 Proposals for the Commissioning of Work

“The Technical Committee is responsible for the commissioning of any work concerning Test Guidelines. Proposals for the commissioning of work by the Technical Committee can be made: TGP/7/4 – Section 2: Procedure for the Introduction and Revision of UPOV Test Guidelines

“(a) by a UPOV body

“Most Test Guidelines are commissioned on the basis of proposals from a TWP, but may also be proposed by the Technical Committee itself, the Council, the Consultative Committee or the Administrative and Legal Committee (hereinafter referred to as “the CAJ”).

“(b) directly to the Technical Committee by a member of the Union;

“(c) directly to the Technical Committee by an observer State or observer organization to the Technical Committee.

[...]

### “2.3.3 Partial Revision

“2.3.3.1 Where it is appropriate to update only a specific part of the Test Guidelines without undertaking a comprehensive review of the entire Test Guidelines, a “partial revision” is undertaken.

“2.3.3.2 Partial revisions often arise as a result of new breeding developments, for example requiring the introduction of a new state of expression for an existing characteristic, or a new characteristic, or as a result of new developments for characteristics such as disease resistance, for example resulting in the need for new states for disease races. In such cases, in order to retain internationally harmonized variety descriptions, in particular for asterisked characteristics, it is beneficial to have the possibility of a rapid procedure for revision of Test Guidelines. Therefore, as an alternative to following the procedure for a full revision of the Test Guidelines (see Section 2.3.2), any member of the Union or observer State or observer organization to the Technical Committee may make a proposal for a partial revision directly to the relevant TWP(s). It is not necessary for a Leading Expert or subgroup of interested experts to be established, although it would be beneficial for the proposer of the partial revision to consult with interested experts before developing a specific proposal.

“2.3.3.3 For a partial revision of Test Guidelines, a new draft of the Test Guidelines should not be prepared. The proposer of the partial revision should prepare a TWP document specifying only the revisions to be made to the adopted Test Guidelines. The timetable for the consideration of the proposal by the Technical Working Parties is as follows:

Action	Latest date before the TWP session
Circulation of draft TWP document to TWP by proposer (to be distributed by the Office):	14 weeks
Comments to be received from TWP:	10 weeks
Sending of draft TWP document to the Office by the proposer:	6 weeks
Posting of TWP document on website by the Office:	4 weeks

“2.3.3.4 The procedure for approval of the proposed partial revision would be as set out in Sections 2.2.6 to 2.2.8, except that reference to draft Test Guidelines would be replaced by reference to a TC document specifying the revisions to be made to the adopted Test Guidelines and the reference to Leading Expert and interested experts would be replaced by reference to the proposer and the TWP, respectively.”

25. The TWV agreed that it would be important for examination offices and DUS experts to have opportunity to make a proposal for a partial revision of existing UPOV Test Guidelines, in the period after the TC but before the TWP. It further agreed that sufficient time would be given to inform all relevant experts and members of UPOV and for the relevant experts to be able to check the proposal, if necessary.

26. *The TC is invited to consider whether to amend document TGP/7 to allow the addition of new proposals for partial revisions of Test Guidelines at any time during the year, subject to the provision of sufficient time for checking of the proposals by relevant experts and UPOV members.*

### TGP/14: Glossary of Terms Used in UPOV Documents

(ix) *Definition of “recurved”*











27. The TC, at its fifty-second session, noted the plans of the TWF to consider whether to propose to revise the definition of “recurved” in document TGP/14.

28. The TWF, at its forty-seventh session noted that the expert from Israel had withdrawn the proposed revision of the term “recurved” and that therefore no document would be considered under this agenda item. The TWF agreed that this matter should not be considered further (see document TWF/47/25 “Report”, paragraph 63).

29. The TC is invited to note that the expert from Israel had withdrawn the proposed revision of the term “recurved”.

(x) Grid for shape characteristics

30. The TC-EDC, at its meeting in January 2017, recommended consideration by the TC on whether to amend the grid for position of broadest part and width/ratio presented in document TGP/14: Section 2: Subsection 2: Shapes and structures (Alternative 2) as follows (~~highlighting and strikethrough~~ for deletions and highlighting and underline for addition):

		← broadest part →			
		(below middle)	at middle	(above middle)	
<div style="display: flex; flex-direction: column; align-items: center;"> <div style="display: flex; align-items: center; margin-bottom: 5px;"> <span style="font-size: 2em;">↑</span> </div> <div style="text-align: center; margin-bottom: 5px;">width</div> <div style="display: flex; align-items: center; margin-bottom: 5px;"> <span style="font-size: 2em;">→</span> </div> <div style="text-align: center; margin-bottom: 5px;">width (ratio-length/width) → narrow (high)</div> <div style="display: flex; align-items: center; margin-bottom: 5px;"> <span style="font-size: 2em;">↓</span> </div> <div style="text-align: center; margin-bottom: 5px;">broad (low) ←</div> </div>			 6 linear		
			 5 oblong	 8 ob lanceolate	 9 spatulate
	 1 triangular	 2 ovate	 4 elliptic	 7 obovate	 10 obtriangular
			 3 circular		



31. *The TC is invited to consider whether to revise document TGP/14: Section 2: Subsection 2: Shapes and structures to amend the “grid for position of broadest part and width/ratio” presented in Alternative 2 to remove the wording on “ratio” and to display “width” in a separate column from the scale of broad to narrow.*

(xi) *Revision of UPOV Color Groups*

32. The TWO considered document TWO/49/20 “Definition of color groups from RHS Colour Charts” (see document TWO/49/25 “Report”, paragraphs 57 to 62).

33. The TWO considered the color names used in the Sixth Edition of the RHS Colour Chart and agreed they did not always reflect the color similarity among different patches. The TWO noted that similar colors in the RHS Colour Chart were grouped under the same UPOV color group and agreed that the current UPOV system was more suitable for variety description purposes.

34. The TWO considered the terms used in color names of the Sixth Edition of the RHS Colour Chart and agreed they were not suitable for use in DUS examination and producing variety descriptions (e.g. “pale”, “moderate”, “vivid”, “brilliant”, “deep”, “strong”).

35. The TWO noted that some charts of the 1986 Edition and later versions of the RHS Colour Chart had different colors than the same charts in the Sixth Edition and agreed to use the Sixth Edition as the basis to create a new revised list to replace the current UPOV Color Groups, as presented in document TGP/14 “Glossary of terms used in UPOV documents.”

36. The TWO considered whether the UPOV color groups for the RHS Colour Charts could be used for grouping of varieties and organization of the growing trial and agreed that the difference between UPOV color groups was smaller than would be appropriate for excluding varieties from comparison in a growing trial. The TWO agreed that the color groups created for grouping varieties and organizing a growing trial required a very clear and large difference between colors.

37. The TWO agreed to request the expert from Germany with support by the experts from Australia, Canada, European Union, the Netherlands, New Zealand and the United Kingdom to draft guidance on the factors to be considered for creating color groups for grouping of varieties and organizing the growing trial (e.g. knowledge on the range of variation within the species and necessary difference between colors for varieties to be considered clearly distinct).

38. *The TC is invited to consider:*

*(a) whether to revise document TGP/14 “Glossary of terms used in UPOV documents” to replace the current list of UPOV Color Groups by a new list created on the basis of the Sixth Edition of the RHS Colour Chart; and*

*(b) the TWO request for the expert from Germany with support by the experts from Australia, Canada, European Union, the Netherlands, New Zealand and the United Kingdom to draft guidance on the factors to be considered for creating color groups for grouping of varieties and organizing the growing trial.*

PROGRAM FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF TGP DOCUMENTS

39. The Annex to this document presents the program for the development of TGP documents as agreed by the TC, as its fifty-second session, and the CAJ, at its seventy-third session (see document TC/52/29 Rev. “Revised Report”, paragraphs 124 and 125, and document CAJ/73/10 “Report on the Conclusions”, paragraph 53, respectively).

40. In accordance with the program for the development of TGP documents, there are no matters anticipated to be put forward by the TC for adoption by the Council in 2017.

*41. The TC is invited to consider the program for the development of TGP documents, as set out in the Annex to this document.*

[Annex follows]

TC/53/5

ANNEX

PROGRAM FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF TGP DOCUMENTS

Title of document	Current approved documents	2017					2018					2019					
		TC-EDC	TC/53	TWPs	CAJ/74	C/51	TC-EDC	TC/54	TWPs	CAJ/75	C/52	TC-EDC	TC/55	TWPs	CAJ/76	C/53	
TGP/0	List of TGP Documents and Latest Issue Dates																TGP/0/10 Adopt
TGP/1	General Introduction with Explanations																
TGP/2	List of Test Guidelines Adopted by UPOV																
TGP/3	Varieties of Common Knowledge																
TGP/4	Constitution and Maintenance of Variety Collections																
TGP/5	Experience and Cooperation in DUS Testing																
TGP/6	Arrangements for DUS Testing																
TGP/7	Development of Test Guidelines																
	Drafter's Kit for Test Guidelines (Drafter: Office of the Union)		TC/53/15	TWP/[xx]/x				x	x	x							TGP/7/6 Adopt
TGP/8	Trial Design and Techniques Used in the Examination of Distinctness, Uniformity and Stability																
	Method of Calculation of COYU (Drafter: Adrian Roberts (GB))		TC/53/16	TWP/[xx]/x				x	x	x							TGP/8/4 Adopt
	Examining DUS in Bulk Samples (Drafter: Office of the Union)		TC/53/17	TWP/[xx]/x				x	x	x							TGP/8/4 Adopt
	Data Processing for the Assessment of Distinctness and for Producing Variety Descriptions (Drafter: Office of the Union)		TC/53/18	TWP/[xx]/x				x	x	x							TGP/8/4 Adopt
TGP/9	Examining Distinctness																
TGP/10	Examining Uniformity																
	Assessing Uniformity by Off-types on the Basis of More than One Growing Cycle or on the Basis of Sub-Samples (Drafter: Office of the Union)		TC/53/19	TWP/[xx]/x				x	x	x							TGP/10/2 Adopt
TGP/11	Examining Stability																
TGP/12	Guidance on Certain Physiological Characteristics																
TGP/13	Guidance for New Types and Species																
TGP/14	Glossary of Terms Used in UPOV Documents																
TGP/15	Guidance on the Use of Biochemical and Molecular Markers in the Examination of Distinctness, Uniformity and Stability (DUS)																

[End of Annex and of document]