



TWA/31/14

ORIGINAL: English

DATE: October 1, 2002

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

**TECHNICAL WORKING PARTY  
FOR  
AGRICULTURAL CROPS**

**Thirty-First Session  
Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, September 23 to 27, 2002**

REPORT ON THE CONCLUSIONS

*adopted by the Technical Working Party for Agricultural Crops*

Opening of the Session

1. The Technical Working Party for Agricultural Crops (hereinafter referred to as "the TWA") held its thirty-first session in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, from September 23 to 27, 2002. The list of participants is reproduced in Annex I to this report.
2. The session was opened by Mrs. Françoise Blouet (France), Chairperson of the TWA, who welcomed the participants, and in particular new participants, to the TWA.

Adoption of the Agenda

3. The TWA adopted the agenda as reproduced in document TWA/31/1 Rev.

Short Reports on Developments in Plant Variety Protection

(a) Reports from members and observers

4. The TWA received short reports on plant variety protection from a number of countries. The expert from the Russian Federation informed the TWA that it now offered protection to all plant genera and species. The expert from Hungary informed the meeting that Hungary planned to accede to the 1991 Act of the UPOV Convention. The expert from Romania reported that

Romania had now started to contribute data to the UPOV -ROM. The representative from the Community Plant Variety Rights Office (CPVO) reported that it had issued its 10,000<sup>th</sup> title of protection.

5. The expert from Canada informed the meeting that a report on the impact of plant variety protection had been made to the Canadian parliament, as part of the ten-year review of its plant variety protection legislation. This report is available on the Website. It showed an increase in the number of plant varieties since the introduction of the legislation and that there had also been an increase in productivity which, at least in part, was due to the introduction of the legislation.

(b) Report on developments within UPOV

6. The TWA received an oral report from the Office of the Union on the last developments on plant variety protection at the Council, the Administrative and Legal Committee (hereinafter referred to as "the CAJ") and the Technical Committee (hereinafter referred to as "the TC").

Molecular Techniques

(a) Report on developments

7. The TWA received an oral report from the Office of the Union on the latest developments concerning biochemical and molecular techniques within UPOV, based on document TC/38/14 Add.-CAJ/45/5 Add.

8. The experts from France and the United Kingdom made presentations on the three options for the possible use of molecular techniques in DUS testing, as they had been presented to the BMT Review Group during its meeting in April 2002. The expert from France confirmed that the GAIA software, used in the French proposal for Option 2, would be made available for testing by members of the Union by the end of the year and should be ready for delivery by April 2003. The TWA noted the conclusions of the BMT Review Group, regarding these proposals, and the views of the TC and CAJ on these conclusions. It also noted the future role of the BMT as agreed by the TC.

(b) Adhoc Crop Subgroups

9. The TWA 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 sugarcane, potato and soybean.

10. The TWA noted that the sugarcane and soybean crop subgroups would be meeting immediately after the TWA session, but that the meeting of the potato crop subgroup had been postponed because of the absence of papers to be discussed. The TWA proposed that the oilseed rape, wheat and potato crop subgroups should meet consecutively, at the same venue, in May or June 2003, by which time papers should, in particular, be available from the UK for oilseed rape and wheat and from France for potato. It agreed that the maize crop subgroup should not meet at this time.

11. The TWA noted that the interim chairpersons of the new crop subgroups agreed between the Chairman of the TC and the Chairperson of the TWA were as follows:

Potato	Beate Rucker (Germany)
Sugarcane	Luis Salaices (Spain)
Soybean	Marcelo Labarta (Argentina)

12. The TWA supported the proposals for the chairpersons of the new crops subgroups.

#### Plant Variety Description and Environmental Effects

13. The expert from Germany introduced document TWA/31/9.

14. The TWA agreed that this document demonstrated the need for greater care when selecting and describing grouping characteristics in the Test Guidelines, in order to reduce observer error. In addition, it noted that consideration needed to be given to the conversion of recorded data into variety descriptions. It was agreed that the results of this study should be presented to the TC and CAJ to demonstrate the difficulties in harmonizing variety descriptions.

15. The expert from the United Kingdom introduced document TWA/31/7.

16. The TWA noted that it had considered the possibility of including gliadin composition in the Test Guidelines for wheat, but had decided against this because of the problems in obtaining agreement between laboratories.

17. The expert from France suggested that it would be useful to compare differences in the "phenotypic distance" measurements between varieties obtained from different countries.

#### Project to Consider the Publication of Variety Descriptions

18. The TWA were invited to consider document TC/38/10 Add.

19. It was agreed that, for agricultural crops, it would not be possible to harmonize variety descriptions to the extent that it would be possible to obtain a single variety description. Thus, the project on such crops could only proceed on the basis that different descriptions for the same variety could be accommodated. It also noted that, as discussed in relation to documents TWA/31/7 and TWA/31/9, more care would need to be given to the selection and description of grouping characteristics. Furthermore, it suggested that consideration should be given to the possible use of "phenotypic distance" measurements in the project.

20. The TWA proposed the following shortlist of species for consideration by the TC:

(a) Barley

It was noted that a substantial amount of work on the comparison of barley variety descriptions had already been undertaken by an expert from Denmark and had been reported to the TWA in its previous session. Furthermore, it noted that a ring test for the development of variety descriptions was underway within Europe and that the results of this study, which would be available in July 2003, could be considered in the UPOV project.

(b) Potato

(c) Soybean.

21. It was noted that the Test Guidelines for Barley and Soybean and the draft of the revised Test Guidelines for Potato all contained electrophoretic characteristics, which might be considered in the project.

22. The TWA agreed that the coordinators for these species should be Denmark for Barley, the Netherlands and CPVO jointly for Potato, and France for Soybean. The following countries expressed their wish to contribute to the study:

Barley: AR, CA, CL, CZ, DE, DK, EE, ES, FI, FR, GB, HU, NL, NZ, RO, SE

Potato: CA, CL, CZ, DE, EE, GB, IL, NL, NZ, CPVO

Soybean: AR, BR, CA, FR, HU.

23. Some experts were unable to make a commitment at the meeting and will advise the Office of the Union by the end of October if they wish to contribute.

24. It was 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 of the Union was requested to issue a questionnaire seeking this information, the results of which could then be presented to the *Adhoc* Working Group on the Publication of Variety Descriptions and the TC, to help in its decision on how to proceed.

#### Project for Exchanging Seed of Selected Varieties Between Interested Countries

25. An expert from Sweden introduced document TWA/31/2.

26. An expert from Japan reported that only six countries had provided seed for the project on rice.

27. After discussion, 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 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.

28. It was agreed that the project should continue on white clover, lupin and rice and that a report on progress would be made at the next TWA session.

#### UPOV Databases

29. The TWA received an oral report from the Office of the Union on the latest developments in the UPOV databases.

#### TGP Documents

*TGP/3.2 Draft 1 "Developments and Explanations Regarding Varieties of Common Knowledge"*

30. The document was introduced by the expert from Germany.

31. The TWA noted the discussions which had taken place in the CAJ concerning the interpretation of a variety whose “existence” was a matter of common knowledge. In particular, it noted that the interpretation in the draft of the General Introduction, that “living plant material must be in existence for a variety to be taken into account for distinctness,” had not been acceptable and had been deleted from the adopted version. In recognition of the problems in trying to clarify this matter, it was agreed that section 4 of the document “Aspects concerning the existence of living plant material” should be deleted. It was also agreed that section 3.1.2 should be deleted and that section 3.2.5 should be modified to refer to comparisons in a growing trial.

32. The TWA agreed that the way forward on the problem of obtaining material of varieties of common knowledge was for the technical experts to clarify the practical basis on which variety collections were established and highlight the differences between these collections and the potential collection of all varieties of common knowledge. This would then allow the Testing Authorities to evaluate the risks of possible wrong decisions on distinctness and decide if this risk was unacceptable, what supplementary procedures it should take to address the problem. It noted that the General Introduction made reference to such supplementary procedures in section 5.3.1.2. Furthermore, it noted that the issues concerning the development of variety collections would be handled in document TGP/4.1 “General Guidance for the Management of Variety Collections”. It proposed that a reference to this document should be made in document TGP/3.1 and the difference between all varieties of common knowledge and variety collections highlighted.

*TGP/4.1 Draft 2 General Guidance for the Management of Variety Collections*

33. The document was introduced by the expert from France.

34. The TWA proposed the following changes to the document:

Paragraph 9: In the last sub-paragraph of paragraph 9(a) and in 9(b)(i), rather than to supra-national organizations, it should refer to certain territories or countries, where the variety collection might be limited, by taking into account some physiological traits of the variety.

Paragraph 9(b): The headings should refer to other territories, rather than countries.

Paragraph 13(c)(i): Indicate that, wherever possible, the representative seed sample should be obtained from the Testing Authority to which the initial application was made. In addition, a separate section on the difficulties of maintaining a collection of vegetatively propagated varieties (e.g. cost, virus infection and risk of mutation) should be added, indicating that this would make it impractical for Testing Authorities to establish such collections.

Paragraph 13(iv): “... can only be based...” should be replaced by “... may be possible ...” and

Paragraph 13(v): a reference should be made to document TGP/9.5 “Use of the Parental Formula for Examining Distinctness in Hybrids.”

Paragraph 14: to read “... and also, in most cases, unnecessary...”

35. It was agreed that a separate section should be included on the benefits of cooperation between Testing Authorities, for improving the efficiency of managing variety collections.

36. The TWA discussed whether a variety which was a parent line submitted exclusively for the examination of DUS of hybrid varieties, and included in the variety collection of a Testing Authority, would be considered to be in common knowledge. It noted that the inclusion of such a parent line in a collection of varieties held by a Testing Authority for the examination of DUS did not, in itself, make this parent line a matter of common knowledge, since such a collection was not “publicly accessible” (Section 5.2 .2.1(c) of the General Introduction). However, it noted that parent lines would, in some members of the Union, become a matter of common knowledge by commercialization of the hybrid.

37. The TWA also noted that the CAJ was considering certain issues concerning the use of material submitted for DUS examination, including the ability of Testing Authorities to exchange parent lines submitted for DUS examination of hybrid varieties.

38. The TWA noted that the comments made by the TWC had already been addressed in document TGP/4.1 draft 2 and that the comments made by the TWV would be addressed by the changes proposed above.

*TGP/6.1.2 Draft 1 “Examples of Arrangements for DUS Testing”*

39. The TWA considered that this document provided a useful explanation of the different arrangements for DUS testing in the countries concerned. It agreed that further elaboration of certain aspects would be helpful. The expert from New Zealand proposed to prepare an example of the system used in his country. The TWA proposed that the documents should be presented as illustrative examples of systems and not primarily as the system of a particular country.

*TGP/7.1 Draft 1 “Guidance for Drafters of Test Guidelines”*

40. The TWA proposed the following changes to the document:

ASW3(d)

41. To read A: spaced plants

ASW5(e)

42. The expert from Germany to draft appropriate wording after consultation with the Chairman of the TWC.

ASW9

43. It was proposed that, where appropriate, an additional standard wording should be provided for the title box of the Technical Questionnaire, to read: “Technical Questionnaire to be completed in connection with an application for plant breeders’ rights and for the parent lines of hybrid varieties which are the subject of an application for plant breeders’ rights.”

ASW10

44. The TWA noted the objections of the International Seed Federation (ISF) to the requirement for a photograph to accompany the Technical Questionnaire. The TWA also proposed that the sentence should be reworded as follows: “A representative color photograph of the relevant characteristics of the variety should accompany the Technical Questionnaire.”

## GN6

45. The TWA considered that it would be practically impossible to create a detailed formula and proposed that Option 2 should be presented first, to indicate that this would be the most suitable approach. Regarding Option 1 (b), it proposed to replace the word “should” with “may.” In Option 2 (b), it proposed that the word “proportion” should be replaced by “quantity.”

## GN10

46. The TWA proposed that this section should be redrafted to emphasize that there are relatively few characteristics where harmonized variety descriptions can be developed. It also proposed that the examples in (a) should be more realistic to reflect the interaction of characteristics with the environment.

47. Regarding the presentation of multiple sets of example varieties the TWA proposed that the example varieties should be presented in an Annex to the Test Guidelines. It agreed that these could be presented in a tabulated format as follows: that

	Country A					
Example varieties	Ch.1	Ch.2	Ch.3	Ch.4	Ch.5	Ch.6
Variety A	3	1	3		3	7
Variety B	5	2	7	1	1	5
Variety C	7	3	5	9	2	
Variety D		4			4	3

	Country B					
Example varieties	Ch.1	Ch.2	Ch.3	Ch.4	Ch.5	Ch.6
Variety I	3	4	5		1	3
Variety II	5	2	3	1	2	5
Variety III	7	1	7	9	3	
Variety IV		3			4	7

48. It was agreed that a column for example varieties should be retained in the table of characteristics, but this would be left blank for each Testing Authority to complete as appropriate. This blank column would be of a reduced width to reduce the size of the Test Guidelines as far as possible.

GN14

49. The TWA noted that it was important for all the criteria set out in GN 11 to be checked before including a characteristic in the Test Guidelines. It noted that, at present, there were no problems with the size of the Table of Characteristics in the Test Guidelines developed by the TWA and proposed that it would be more appropriate to consider any schemes for indicating the extent of use of a characteristic if this became a real issue.

GN21

50. It was proposed that the title of part (b) should be deleted and the text should refer to the recognition of independent characteristics.

GN22 and 23

51. The TWA noted that these sections would be superseded by document TGP/7.3 "Standardized UPOV Terms and Explanations." However, with regard to GN23, it noted the value of retaining the "1 -5" scale for quantitative characteristics.

GN24

52. It was proposed that the text following (b) should read "unless it is considered unrealistic to expect breeder to describe these characteristics."

*TGP/7.2 Draft 1 "TG Template"*

53. The TWA proposed the following changes to the document:

Section 3.5 "Number of Plants/Parts of Plant to be Examined":

54. The existing standard wording should be omitted and introduced as additional standard wording using the following revised wording:

"Unless otherwise indicated, all observations on single plants should be made on {xx} plants or {xx} part taken from each of {xx} plants."

Section 6.5 "Legend":

55. The legend indicating QL, QN and PQ to be omitted and introduced as additional standard wording.

Section 10.1 "Subject of the Technical Questionnaire":

56. In the case of Test Guidelines covering more than one species, the templates should provide for applicant to indicate to which species the application applied.

Section 10.6 "Similar varieties and differences from these varieties"

57. The examples given should be omitted and suitable examples could be provided for individual Test Guidelines.



*TGP/7.4Draft1 “ProceduresfortheIntroductionandRevisionofTestGuidelines”*

58. The TWA did not have time to consider this document and were invited to send written comments to the Office of the Union. It also agreed that the next draft should incorporate steps for the exchange of seed of varieties in order to develop good grouping and asterisked characteristics.

*TGP/9.1.1Draft1 “GeneralProceduresforDeterminingDistinctness:OfficialTesting”*

59. The document was introduced by experts from France and the Netherlands. After discussion it was agreed that it would be very difficult to develop a generalized approach to the examination of distinctness. It was, therefore, agreed that different examples of approaches to the examination of distinctness should be provided in the same way as adopted for document TGP/6.1.2 “Examples of Arrangements for DUS Testing” and the merging of these two documents should be considered. It was also agreed that the title of the documents should be changed accordingly.

*TGP/9.1.2.1 Draft 1 “General Procedures for Determining Distinctness: Breeder Testing (Australia)”*

60. The TWA agreed that this document presented a clear explanation of the Australian system of breeder testing. It noted that this document addressed the overall examination of DUS and not just distinctness and should, therefore, be incorporated in document TGP/6.1.2 “Examples of Arrangements for DUS Testing.”

*TGP/9.1.2.2Draft1 “General ProceduresforDeterminingDistinctness:WiththeParticipationofBreeders(France).”*

61. It was proposed that this document should be covered within a new draft of document TGP/6.1.2 “Examples of Arrangements for DUS Testing,” explaining the French arrangements for DUS testing.

*TGP/9.1.3Draft1 “GeneralProceduresforDeterminingDistinctness:General”*

62. It was noted that this document was very similar to document TGP/9.1.1 and would be covered by the proposals concerning that document and its merging with document TGP/6.1.2 “Examples of Arrangements for DUS Testing.”

*TGP/9.3.1Draft1 “ConsiderationofAllVarietiesofCommonKnowledgeintheExaminationofDistinctness”*

63. The TWA noted that issues raised in this document were addressed more to document TGP/3.2 “Developments and Explanations Regarding Varieties of Common Knowledge.” It noted the difficulties there had been in discussions on document TGP/3.2 when trying to elaborate the term “varieties whose existence is a matter of common knowledge,” beyond that agreed in Section 5.2 of the General Introduction. It proposed that the CAJ should be invited to comment on whether it would be appropriate to try to elaborate this matter further. If the CAJ considered this to be appropriate, the TWA proposed that the drafters of document TGP/3.2 draft 1 and document TGP/9.3.1 draft 1, should collaborate to produce a new draft of document TGP/3.2, taking into account the comments made on their respective documents.

*TGP/10.2Draft1 “ AssessingUniformityAccordingtotheFeaturesofPropagation”*

64. It was agreed that paragraph 4(b) would be elaborated, perhaps with examples, to clarify the proposed approach, it was proposed that the document should avoid the use of the term “type.”

65. The TWA did not have time to consider the following documents at the meeting and requested that written comments be sent to the Office by the end of November.

TGP/9.3.2Draft	Consideration of All Varieties of Common Knowledge in the Examination of Distinctness: The Use of ‘Phenotypic Distance’ for Examining Distinctness (see paragraph 8 concerning GAIA software)
TGP/9.4.1 Draft1	Examining Distinctness in Different Types of Variety: General
TGP/9.5Draft1	Use of the Parental Formula for Examining Distinctness in Hybrids
TGP/8.6 Draft1	Examining DUS in Bulk Samples
TGP/8.4 Draft1	Types of Characteristics and Their Scale Levels
TGP/12.1.1 Draft1	Characteristics Expressed in Response to External Factors: Disease Resistance.
TGP/12.1.2. Draft1	Characteristics Expressed in Response to External Factors: Chemical Response (Australia)
TGP/12.1.3 Draft1	Characteristics Expressed in Response to Living Organisms: Insect Resistance (France)

Discussion on Draft Test Guidelines (Subgroups)

*Rice (TG/16/8(proj.1) and documents TWA/31/8 and TWA/31/8Add.)*

66. The TWA agreed the following changes to document TG/16/8(proj.1):

3. Method of Examination

*Section 3.1 “Duration of Tests”*

Replace “a single growing cycle” by “two independent growing cycles.”

5. Grouping of Varieties and Organization of the Growing Trial

*Section 5.3*

Delete (a) Basal leaf: sheath color.

7. Table of Characteristics

It was agreed that separate sets of example varieties should be provided for the European, South East Asia (including Southern China) and Northern Asia regions. The leading expert explained that the current example varieties provided by Spain were being updated with more widely available varieties.

- Char.1 Japant o provide example varieties  
Leading expert to check if this characteristic is linked to Char.2
- Char.9 Leaf auricles. To be deleted (only 5 IRR I accessions have the state “absent”)
- Char.11 Leaf collar. To be deleted (only 5 IRR I accessions have the state “absent”)
- Char.13 Leaf: ligule. To be deleted (only 5 IRR I accessions have the state “absent”)
- Char.14 Leaf: shape of ligule. To indicate that it should be examined at growth stage 40
- Char.15 Leaf: color of ligule. To insert new state (1) “colorless”
- Char.20 Culm: kneeling ability (for floating rice only). (+) to be added. Thailand to provide explanation
- Char.21 Culm: attitude. Japan to provide illustration
- Char.23 Male sterility. China to be asked to consider deleting the characteristic and introducing it in Section 4 of the Technical Questionnaire. If the characteristic is retained, China to provide their three states of expression, method of examination and example varieties.
- Char.24- 26 These characteristics to be repeated at growth stage 92. Interested countries will check if these additional characteristics would provide useful additional discrimination.
- Char.35 Panicle: number per plant. Republic of Korea to provide explanation
- Char.36 Panicle: color of awns (early observation). Leading expert requested example varieties
- Char.41 Panicle: length of longest awns. To be recorded at growth stage 70 -80 and moved to the correct place in the Test Guidelines
- Char.47 Time of maturity. State (5) to read “intermediate”. To delete example variety “Bahia” from state (5)
- Char.48 Leaf senescence. To check if state (5) should be medium or intermediate
- New  
(after Char.48)  
Lemma: color. To have states: straw (1); straw with gold furrows (2); gold (3); brown furrows on straw (4); brown (tawny) (5); reddish to light purple (6); purple spots on straw (7); purple furrows on straw (8); purple (9); black (10)
- Char.54 Delete “s” from “absentes” and “presentes” in French version

- Char.56&57 Decorticated grain length/width: “MS” to be indicated as method of examination
- Char.59 Decorticated grain: color. State (9) to read “dark purple / black”. Leading expert requested example varieties for the state (9) black. To add(\*)
- Char.60 Endosperm: presence of amylose. Replace “presence of amylose” with “type.” To add(\*)
- Char.61 Endosperm: content of amylose. Japan to provide example varieties
- Char.62 To read: Polished grain: white core in endosperm, with states: less than 5% (1); 5 -10% (3); 11 -20% (5); 21 -40% (7); over 40% (9). Republic of Korea to provide illustration
- Char.63 Decorticated grain: white belly in endosperm. To read: less than 5% (1); 5 -10% (3); 11 -20% (5); 21 -40% (7); over 40% (9). Republic of Korea to provide illustration
- Char.63 Alkali digestion. Japan to provide explanation
- Char.64 Decorticated grain: aroma. Spain to provide explanation
- Char.65 Add(\*)

8. Explanations on the Table of Characteristics

Ad.18/19 “Reflexed” to be replaced by “Recurved”

Ad.24 -26 Add indication of palea

Ad.43/44 Legend for drawing to be corrected regarding states of expression

Ad.64 Japan to provide improved explanation

9. Literature

Japan to advise correct reference. IRR I reference to be provided.

10. Technical Questionnaire

To be updated.

67. The TWA agreed that a new document including the above -mentioned amendments be prepared for discussion by the Working Party at its thirty-second session.

*Lotus(documentTWA/31/3)*

68. The Technical Working Party agreed the following changes to be submitted to the leading expert for inclusion in the document:

General:

Title of the document to read: "Draft Test Guidelines for Lotus spp."

3. Method of Examination

Section 3.3.1.

To have "MG: single measurement of a group of plants or parts of plants" instead of "M: actual measurement M: actual measurement"

Paragraph 3.4.2:

To be modified following the text used in the Test Guidelines for White Clover.

7. Table of Characteristics:

To add example varieties to the table.

Ch. 5: to add an explanation and (+)

Ch. 9: to add explanation and (+)

Ch. 12: to be moved before Ch. 10.

Ch. 16: to check with the leading expert whether "B" should be deleted or "VG" added.

Ch. 17: to have "MG" instead of "M" and to clarify if the characteristic should be assessed on these seeds submitted by the applicant or on harvested seed.

Technical Questionnaire

Section 1: to add boxes to mark the species of the variety and to add the text "please indicate".

69. The TWA agreed that a new document including the above -mentioned amendments be prepared for discussion by the Working Party at its thirty-second session.

*White Clover(documentTWA/31/4)*

70. The Technical Working Party agreed the following changes:

3. Method of Examination

Section 3.3.1

To add: "MG: single measurement of a group of plants or parts of plants"

### Section 3.3.2 Type of observation

To read: "A: spaced plants" instead of "A: spaced plant".

## 5. Grouping of Varieties and Organization of the Growing Trial

paragraph 5.3, sentence (b) to read:

"(b) Leaf: intensity of white marks (characteristic 4)"

## 6. Introduction to the Table of Characteristics

### Section 6.5 Legend

To delete the reference (QL), (QN) and (PQ)

## 7. Table of Characteristics

Char. 1: to delete brackets in the number of the characteristic and to read: "Plant: tendency to form inflorescences before vernalization"

Chars. 2 and 4: to add B and VG

Char. 5: to add B and MG

Char. 6: to add B, MG, (+) and explanation on the timing for observation

Char. 7: to add (+) and explanation on the timing for observation

Char. 10: to delete the underlining in columns English and Example Varieties

Char. 15: to read "Inflorescence : length of peduncle" and to add (+) and the corresponding explanation

Char. 16: to add (+) and the corresponding explanation

New Char. 7(a): "Plant: growth habit" with states of expression "semi-erect (3)"; "intermediate (5)" and "prostrate (7)" and to have the legend "B -VG" and "A -VS"

New Char. 7(b): "Stem: internode length", states of expression to be agreed among the interested experts

New Char. 15(a): "Inflorescence: thickness of peduncle", states of expression to be agreed among the interested experts

New Char. 16(a): "Inflorescence: diameter", states of expression to be agreed among the interested experts

New Char. "Plant: foliage density", states of expression to be agreed among the interested experts.

8. Explanations on the Table of Characteristics

Ad.1: to modify according to the table.

Ad.3: to have a new explanation if it is possible to agree among interested experts

Ad.4: to read: "The observations should be made ~~at the beginning of~~ before flowering..."

Ad.5: to have a new explanation

Ad. 8: second paragraph to read: "The thickness (diameter) of the stolon should be measured at a point midway between the third and the fourth node counted from the growing tip."

Ad.9 and 10: to read "The petiole of the third expanded leaf counted from the growing tip of the stolon should be selected for measurement. The thickness should be measured at the widest point of the petiole.

Ad.13 and 14: to refer to characteristic number (11) instead of (10)

10. Technical Questionnaire

Section 5, characteristic "Plant: intensity of white leaf marks," example variety for state of expression (1) to read "Steinacher Weißklee"

71. The TWA agreed that, if agreement on the new characteristics was achieved by the interested experts, the Test Guidelines for White Clover could be presented to the TC for adoption at its thirty-ninth session in April 2003.

Discussion on Working Paper on Test Guidelines (Subgroups)

*Potato (document TWA/31/6)*

72. The TWA agreed the following changes to document TWA/31/6:

3. Method of Examination

Section 3.3.1 Remove boxes "a" and "b" (also from the Table of Characteristics for characteristics 3-11 and 32-34).

Section 3.3.1 Lightsprout: to read "All observations on the lightsprout should be made on a total of at least 6 tubers, about 12 weeks after starting the test. The method is provided in Chapter 8."

Section 3.4.2 Remove ", " after "of"

Section 3.5 To read: "...total number of 60 plants"

Section 4.2.3      Change sample size to 6

5.    Grouping of Varieties and Organization of the Growing Trial

Section 5.3      Delete proposal from Australia

6.    Introduction to the Table of Characteristics

Section 6.5      Delete QL, QN, PQ

7.    Table of Characteristics

Char. 3            (+) to be added

Char. 5            (+) to be added

Chars. 8 -10      (+) to be added

Char./Ad. 12      to read "Plant: foliage structure"

Char./Ad. 13      State to be changed to 3, 5, 7.

Char./Ad. 14      to read "Stem: proportion of stems with anthocyanin coloration"

Char. 16            to read "Leaf: openness."

Char./Ad. 17      to read "Leaf: presence of secondary leaflets"

Char. 18            (+) to be added

Char./Ad. 19      to read "Leaf: proportion of anthocyanin coloration of midrib on upper side"

Chars. 23 -25      (+) to be added

New Char.      to read "Leaflet: pubescence of blade of young leaflets of apical rosette".  
Russian Federation to provide several example varieties for the characteristic to be seen by other countries.

Char./Ad. 26      to read "Flower bud: proportion of anthocyanin coloration"

Char./Ad. 30      to read "Inflorescence: proportion of anthocyanin coloration of peduncle"

Char. 31, 32      (+) to be added

Char. 33            to read "Flower corolla: proportion of blue in anthocyanin coloration of inner side"

Char./Ad. 34      to read "Flower corolla: proportion of coloration"



Char.38 Leading expert to check if the current wording is suitable for “russet” type varieties.

8. ExplanationsontheTableofCharacteristics

Ad.1 -11 Thewavelengthofincandescentbulbsshouldbespecifiedifthisiskeptasthe method.

Ad.13 Tobeupdatedre. Char.13  
Ad.14,30,34 Tobeup datedre. Char.14,30,34

Ad.15to25 Toread“Allobservationsontheleafshouldbemadeonfullydeveloped leavesfromthecenteroftheplant.”

Ad.15 -17and20 Toread“ Fortheobservationofcharacteristics 15, 16, 17and20, leavesshouldbe takenfromthemiddleofastemofeachof20plants.”

Ad.22 Toread“ Proportionofcoalescentleavesshouldbeobserved”

Ad.36 Toread“ Theaverageshapesshouldbeobservedontheharvestedsamplefrom thewholeplot.”Indextobedeleted.

OptimalStageofAssessmentofCharacteristics: To read “ 1=bud stage; 2=flowering stage;3=ripeningstageoftubers;4=afterharvest”

Section10.6“Similarvarietiesanddifferencesfromthesevarieties” Theexamplesgiven shouldbeomittedandsuitableexamplesprovided.

PartIII.1 NumberoftubersforDUSstobechangedto6.Referencetocheckingidentity tobedeleted.

73. TheTWAnotedthattheringtestonelectrophoretic characteristicswouldbecompletedin early2003.

*Lupins(documentTWA/3 1/5)*

74. The TWA agreed the following changes to document TWA/31/5 (file name TG/66/4(proj.1).doc)

Coverpage AdditionalEnglishnameof“Narrowleaflupin”tobeaddedfor *Lupinus angustifolius* L.

1. SubjectoftheTestGuidelines

Section1. 1 Deleterepeated“of”

2. MaterialRequired

Section2.3 Tobechangedto2.5Kgforalltypes

3. Method of Examination

Section 3.3.1 To read "All observations on the grains should be made on grain of fully mature pod harvested from the plots, unless otherwise indicated."

Section 3.5 To be updated according to the changes to TGP/7.2 draft 1.

6. Introduction to the Table of Characteristics

Section 6.5 Delete QL, QN, PQ

7. Table of Characteristics

Char. 2 To read "Plant: height at vegetative stage (+) to be added"

Char. 3 Delete

Char. 4 To read "Leaf: green color prior to bud emergence"

Char. 5 To read "Stem: anthocyanin coloration prior to bud emergence"

Char. 11 Delete states "medium yellow (7)" and "orange (9)"

Char. 12 To delete state of expression "red purple"

Char. 17 and 18 To swap the order.

8. Explanations on the Table of Characteristics

Ad. 1 To read "The bitter principle should be assessed on the seed submitted by the applicant. The Grain -Cut-Method after... The cut surface of the bitter grains discolor to brown, but those of the non-bitter grains remain yellow."

Ad. 2 To read "To be observed on the whole trial before bud emergence of the earliest variety"

Ad. 3 To be deleted

Ads. 9, 10 To read "Central leaflet: length and width. All observations on the leaf should be made at the time of full flowering on a central leaflet of the leaf just below the uppermost branch carrying flowers."

Ad. 11, 12 The wording to change to Flower: color of wing and Flower: color of tip of carina. Diagram for wings and carina to be provided.

The second sentence to read "Observations should be made on the middle of the inflorescence on flowers at the stage of pollen release."

Ad. 13 Explanation of determinate and indeterminate types to be provided. Drawing to be improved

Ad18 To read “sparse” instead of “weak” and “dense” instead of “strong”, to delete ad. for characteristics

Ad.20 to read: “Time of flowering”

10. Technical Questionnaire

To add box in Section I and to add sentence with “Please indicate.”

Section 5.5: To read “Time of flowering (quoted date of flowering of variety as well as of two well-known comparable varieties)

Section 6. To delete the example.

75. The TWA agreed that, if agreement was achieved by the interested experts, the Test Guidelines for Lupins could be presented to the TC for adoption at its thirty-ninth session in April 2003.

*Coffee (document TWA/31/11)*

76. The Technical Working Party agreed the following changes:

To delete the Annex to the document.

I. Subject of these Test Guidelines

The scientific names to read as follows: *Coffea arabica* L. (Arabica type) and *Coffea canephora* L. (Robusta type)

II. Material Required

To require 20 seedlings for *Coffea arabica* L.; 30 plants for seed propagated varieties for *Coffea canephora* L. and 20 plants in the case of interspecific hybrids. In all cases, the plants should not be older than one year.

III. Conduct of Tests

Third sentence of paragraph 3 to read: “Each plot should include 5, 20 or 30 plants according to the species and their reproductive system as required in Section II.”

IV. Methods and Observations

To specify the age of the trees on which observations will be made.

Paragraph 1 to read: Unless otherwise indicated, all observations should be made on 5 plants or part taken from each of 5 plants.

Paragraph 2: to change the population standard to 5% in the case of *Coffea arabica* L. and 10% in the case of *Coffea canephora* L. and to refer the number of off-types to the sample size in Section III.

V. Grouping of Varieties

The interested experts to consider by e-mail the possible inclusion of example varieties.

VII. Table of Characteristics

To clarify that the example varieties are *Coffea arabica* L. only.

To have the following order: 1 -2-3-34-16-5-6-7-8-9-10-11-12-13-14-15-32-17-18-19-20-21-22-23-24-31-36-25-26-27-28-29-30-35-37-38

Char.1 To check wording of stage of expression 4.

Char.3 To read: "Plant: diameter of canopy"

Char.4 To read: "Stem (main and lateral): length of internodes"

Char.5 To read: "Plagiotropic branch: attitude"

Char.11 To read: "Leaf: undulation of the margin"

Char.12 To read: "Leaf: degree of undulation of margin"

Char.16 To read: "Plant: number of inflorescence per axil"

Char.17 To read: "Inflorescence: number of flowers"

Char.18 To read: "Flower: pollen fertility"

Char.19 To be reworded

Char.22 To read: "Fruit: color" and to add explanation

Char.23 To read: "Sepal: type" with states of expression "dehiscent" (1) and "non-dehiscent" (2)

Char.24 To add explanation

Char.29 To read: "Seed: shade of subskin"

Char.30 To read: "Time of maturity (at 80% of mature fruits)"

Char.32 To read: "First flowering" and to add explanation

Char.33 To read: "Plagiotropic branch: ramification" with states of expression "weak" (3), "medium" (5) and "strong" (7)

Char.34 To read: "Plant: basal orthotropic branching" with states of expression "weak" (3), "medium" (5) and "strong" (7)

Char.35 To be deleted

Char.36 To read: "For *C. Canephora* L. only) Fruit: juiciness of mesocarp"

Char.37 To read "Seed: caffeine content" and to add explanation

77. The TWA agreed that a new document including the above -mentioned amendments to be prepared for discussion at its thirty -second session.

*Grain Amaranth* (document TWA/31/12)

78. The Technical Working Party agreed the following changes:

I. Subject of these Test Guidelines

To mention the scientific names of the four species covered by these Test Guidelines and the phrase "excluding ornamental types".

III. Conduct of Tests

Paragraph 2: the third sentence to read: "As a minimum each test should include a total of 50 plants in the case of inbred lines and 150 plants in the case of cross -pollinated varieties."

Paragraph 4: to be deleted.

IV. Methods and Observations

Paragraph 2 to add: "For the assessment of uniformity of inbred lines, a population standard..."

To add a paragraph with standard wording for relative uniformity in the case of cross-pollinated varieties.

To add a paragraph: "Unless otherwise indicated all characteristics of the inflorescence should be observed in the main inflorescence."

Paragraph 5 to read: "When disease resistance characteristics are used..."

VII. Table of Characteristics

To have the following order: 1 -2-3-4-37-20-5-6-7-8-9-10-11-12-13-14-15-16-18-17-19-21-22-23-24-25-26-27-28-29-35-31-32-33-34-36-38-39-40-41-30-42-43-44-45-46-47-48-49-50-51-52-53-54-55

To delete the word "Main" in all the characteristic s referring to main inflorescence.

Char.1 To be deleted

Char.2,3, and 4 To add explanations and to check if they are not correlated.

Char.6 To check states of expression

- Char.7 To divide into two characteristics:  
“Leaf: incision of margin” with states of expression “entire” (1) and “crenate” (2)  
“Ondulation of margin” with states of expression “absent” (1) and “present” (9)
- Char.10 To read: “Anthocyanin pigmentation of blade”
- Char.11 To read: “Leaf: intensity of anthocyanin pigmentation of petiole”.
- Char.14 To check and provide drawings
- Char.15 To read: “Leaf: basic color”
- Char.17 To add explanation
- Char.19 To read: “Leaf: shape of spot”
- Char.20 To read: “Leaf: distribution of pigmentation at the beginning of the growth”,  
to add explanation on the time of observation
- Char.21 To add explanation
- Char.23 To check with the experts whether it could be split into two characteristics:  
absence-presence and intensity and to provide explanation
- Char.24 To check with experts
- Char.26 To check with experts the states of expression
- Char.29 To look for a better wording that describes the best way of assessment
- Char.34 State 3 to read “loose” (3)
- Char.35 To check with the experts the way of assessment and the real need of these  
characteristics for DUS purposes
- Char.37 To read: “Plant: growth type”
- Char.39 To read: “Plant: presence of axillary inflorescence”
- Char.37 and 41 To check whether they are not the same assessment
- Char.43 To read: “Leaf: time of pigmentation at maturity of the grain”
- Char.44 To check time of observation
- Char.45 To add explanations
- Char.46 To add explanation on the way of assessment for the different types of plants

Char.47 To check whether the different states of expression are not characteristics of the different species

Char.48 State of expression to read "light brown" and to delete stage 8

Char.50 To read: "Seed: testa" and to check the wording of the states of expression

Char.51 To add explanation on the way of assessment

Char.52 To be deleted

Char.53,54 and 55 To add the explanations

### VIII. Explanations on the Table of Characteristics

Ad.6 and 7: To add more drawings

Ad.36 To add examples for upright inflorescences also.

### X Technical Questionnaire

Refer to GRAIN AMARANTH and to include the four species in item 1.

79. The TWA agreed that a new document including the above mentioned amendments be prepared for discussion at its thirty second session.

*Medicago* (document TWA/31/10)

80. No record of the Subgroup discussions is available.

### Recommendations on Draft Test Guidelines (Plenary)

81. Draft Test Guidelines on the following crops will be sent to the professional organizations and then submitted to the TC for approval in April 2003, on the basis of the amendments presented in paragraphs 70, 71 and 74, 75 of this document.

- White Clover (TG/38/6; document TWA/30/4)
- Lupins (TG/66/3; document TWA/30/2)

82. The TWA decided to discuss further the following draft Test Guidelines or working papers on draft Test Guidelines at its next session:

- Rice
- Lotus
- Potato
- Coffee
- Grain Amaranth
- *Medicago* (excl. sativa)

83. The TWA agreed to prepare the following draft Test Guidelines for discussion at its next session:

- Sesame
- Ryegrass (Revision)
- Lucerne (Revision)

Future Program, Date and Place of the Next Session

84. 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.

85. The TWA noted that it had already received offers from the following countries to host future meetings:

2004	Poland
2005	New Zealand
2006	South Africa

86. The expert from Hungary offered to host the TWA in 2007.

87. The TWA proposed to discuss the following items at its next session:

1. Short reports on developments in plant variety protection:
  - (a) reports from members and observers (brief oral reports by the participants)
  - (b) report on developments within UP OV (oral report by the Office of the Union)
2. Molecular techniques:
  - (a) Report on the eighth session of the BMT
  - (b) Reports from *Adhoc* Crop Subgroups
3. Publication of Variety Descriptions
4. Project for exchanging seed of selected varieties between interested countries (report on the development of the project)
5. TGP Documents
6. Discussions on draft Test Guidelines (Subgroups)
7. Discussions on working paper on draft Test Guidelines (Subgroups)
8. Recommendations on draft Test Guidelines (Plenary)
9. Date and place of next session
10. Future program

[Annex I follows]



LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

I. MEMBER STATES

ARGENTINA

Marcelo LABARTA, Director de Registro de Variedades, ex -Instituto Nacional de Semillas, Secretaría de Agricultura, Ganadería, Pesca y Alimentación (SAGPYA), Paseo Colón 922, 3 piso, of. 347, 1063 Buenos Aires (tel.: +54 11 4349 2445, fax: +54 11 4349 2444, e-mail: mlabar@sagpya.minproduccion.gov.ar)

AUSTRALIA

George PIPERIDIS, Research Scientist, Bureau of Sugar Experiment Stations, P.O. Box 86, 7 Romea Str., Queensland, The Gap Q4061 (tel.: +61 7 3331 3373, fax: +61 7 3871 0383, e-mail: gpiperidis@bses.org.au)

BRAZIL

Álvaro Antônio NUNES VIANA, Serviço Nacional de Proteção de Cultivares (SNPC), Ministério da Agricultura do Abastecimento, Esplanadados Ministérios, Bloco D, Anexo A, Térreo, Salas 1 -12, Brasília 70043 -900 (tel.: + 55 61 2182163, fax: + 55 61 2242842, e-mail: aviana@agricultura.gov.br)

Ariete DUARTE FOLLE (Sra.), Coordenadora Geral, Serviço Nacional de Proteção de Cultivares (SNPC), Secretariade Desenvolvimento Rural (SDR), Ministério da Agricultura e do Abastecimento, Esplanadados Ministérios, Bloco D, Anexo A, Térreo, Salas 1 -12, Brasília 70043-900 (tel.: +55612182163, fax: +55612242842, e-mail: ariete@agricultura.gov.br)

George SIMON, Serviço Nacional de Proteção de Cultivares (SNPC), Ministério da Agricultura do Abastecimento, Esplanadados Ministérios, Bloco D, Anexo A, Térreo, Salas 1-12, Brasília 70043 -900 (tel.: + 55 61 2182163, fax: + 55 61 2242842, e-mail: simon@agricultura.gov.br)

Leontino RESENDE TAVIERA, Serviço Nacional de Proteção de Cultivares (SNPC), Ministério da Agricultura do Abastecimento, Esplanadados Ministérios, Bloco D, Anexo A, Térreo, Salas 1 -12, Brasília 70043 -900 (tel.: + 55 61 2182163, fax: + 55 61 2242842, e-mail: leontino@agricultura.gov.br)

Maria Celia SOÛB (Sra.), Serviço Nacional de Proteção de Cultivares (SNPC), Ministério da Agricultura do Abastecimento, Esplanadados Ministérios, Bloco D, Anexo A, Térreo, Salas 1-12, Brasília 70043 -900 (tel.: + 55 61 2182163, fax: + 55 61 2242842, e-mail: mariacelia@agricultura.gov.br)

Maria Telza ÁVILA BASTOS (Sra.), Serviço Nacional de Proteção de Cultivares (SNPC), Ministério da Agricultura do Abastecimento, Esplanada dos Ministérios, Bloco D, Anexo A, Térreo, Salas 1 -12, Brasília 70043 -900 (tel.: + 55 61 2182163, fax: + 55 61 2242842, e-mail: telza@agricultura.gov.br)

Roberto Lorenade BARROSSANTOS, Serviço Nacional de Proteção de Cultivares (SNPC), Ministério da Agricultura do Abastecimento, Esplanada dos Ministérios, Bloco D, Anexo A, Térreo, Salas 1 -12, Brasília 70043 -900 (tel.: + 55 61 2182163, fax: + 55 61 2242842, e-mail: robertolbs@agricultura.gov.br)

Vera Lúcia DOS SANTOS MACHADO (Sra.), Serviço Nacional de Proteção de Cultivares (SNPC), Ministério da Agricultura do Abastecimento, Esplanada dos Ministérios, Bloco D, Anexo A, Térreo, Salas 1 -12, Brasília 70043 -900 (tel.: + 55 61 2182163, fax: +55612242842, e-mail: veramachado@agricultura.gov.br)

Ivana VILELA (Sra.), SCS Q, 1 Ed. Baracat, sala 501, CEP 70309 -900, Brasília (tel.: +61 2269022, fax: +612269022, e-mail: ivanavilela@braspov.com.br)

#### CANADA

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](mailto:vsisson@inspection.gc.ca), webpage: [www.cfi-as-acia.gc.ca](http://www.cfi-as-acia.gc.ca))

#### CHILE

Enzo CERDA, Jefe Subdepartamento Registro de Variedades, Departamento Semillas, Departamento de Semillas, Servicio Agrícola y Ganadero (SAG), Avda. Bulnes 140 -Piso 2, Santiago de Chile (tel: +56 2 696 2296, fax: + 56 2 697 2179, e-mail: enzo.cerda@sag.gob.cl.)

#### CZECH REPUBLIC

Jiří SOUCEK, Head of Department, Central Institute for Supervising and Testing in Agriculture, Department of Plant Variety Rights and DUS Tests, Za opravnou 4, 150 06 Praha 5 -Motol (Tel. +420257211755; 420257 277752. fax +420 -2-57211752, e-mail: [jiri.soucek@ooz.zeus.cz](mailto:jiri.soucek@ooz.zeus.cz); web page: [www.zeuds.cz](http://www.zeuds.cz).)

## DENMARK

Gerhard DENEKEN, Director, Danish Institute of Agricultural Sciences, Department of Variety Testing, Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Fisheries, Postbox 7, Teglvaerksvej 10, Tystofte, 4230 Skaelskoer (tel.: +45 58 160601, fax: +45 58 160606, e-mail: [gerhard.deneken@agrsci.dk](mailto:gerhard.deneken@agrsci.dk), [plantseinfo.co.uk/SDB](http://plantseinfo.co.uk/SDB).)

Erik LAW AETZ, Department of Variety Testing, Postbox 7, Teglvaerksvej 10, 4230 Skaelskoer (tel.: +45 58 160603, fax: +45 58 160606, e-mail: [erik.lawaetz@agrsci.dk](mailto:erik.lawaetz@agrsci.dk))

## ESTONIA

Pille ARDEL (Mrs.), Head of Department, Variety Control Department, Estonian Plant Production Inspectorate, 71024 Viljandi (tel.: +372 4 334 650, fax: +372 4 334 650, e-mail: [pille.ardel@plant.agri.ee](mailto:pille.ardel@plant.agri.ee), [www.plant.agri.ee](http://www.plant.agri.ee).)

## FINLAND

Kaarina PAAVILAINEN (Ms.), Plant Production Inspection Centre, Seed Testing Department, P.O. Box 111, 32201 Loimaa (tel.: +358-2-760 56247, fax: +358-2-760 506 222, e-mail: [kaarina.paavilainen@kttk.fi](mailto:kaarina.paavilainen@kttk.fi))

## FRANCE

Françoise BLOUET (Mrs.), Ingénieur de Recherches, GEVES, La Minière, 78285 Guyancourt Cédex (tel.: +33 1 3083 3582, fax: +33 1 3083 3678, e-mail: [francoise.blouet@geves.fr](mailto:francoise.blouet@geves.fr))

Joël GUIARD, Directeur adjoint, Groupe d'étude et de contrôle des variétés et des semences (GEVES), La Minière, 78285 Guyancourt Cédex (tel.: +33 1 3083 3580, fax: +33 1 3083 3629, e-mail: [joel.guiard@geves.fr](mailto:joel.guiard@geves.fr); [www.geves.fr](http://www.geves.fr))

## GERMANY

Beate RÜCKER (Frau), Bundessortenamt, Osterfelddamm 80, 30627 Hannover (tel.: +49 511 956 6650, fax: +49 511 5633 62, e-mail: [beate.ruecker@bundessortenamt.de](mailto:beate.ruecker@bundessortenamt.de), [www.bundessortenamt.de](http://www.bundessortenamt.de))

## HUNGARY

Tamás HARANGOZÓ, National Institute for Agricultural Quality Control, Keleti K. u. 24, 1024 Budapest (tel.: +36 1 225 7629, fax: +36 1 212 2673, e-mail: [tharangozo@ommi.hu](mailto:tharangozo@ommi.hu))

László LÁZÁR, Counsellor, National Institute for Agricultural Quality Control (NIAQC),  
P.O. Box 30.93, 1525 Budapest 114 (tel.: +36 1 212 31 27, fax: +36 1 212 58 00,  
e-mail: [ommiszam@mail.datanet.hu](mailto:ommiszam@mail.datanet.hu);lazarl@ommi.hu;www.ommi.hu)

### ISRAEL

Baruch BAR -TEL, Plant Breeders' Rights Testing Unit, Agricultural Research Organisation,  
The Volcani Center, P.O.Box 6, Bet -Dagan 50250 (tel.: +972 3 968 3458,  
fax:+97239683669,e -mail:ilpbr -tu@int.gov.il)

### JAPAN

Chukichi KANEDA, Technical Councilor, Association for International Cooperation of  
Agriculture and Forestry (AICAF), Ichibancho 19, Chiyoda -ku, Tokyo 102 -0082  
(tel.:+81332637377,fax:+81332345137,e -mail:c.kan eda@aicaf.or.jp)

Toshiharu SHIMAZAKI, Examiner for Agricultural Crops, Seeds and Seedlings Division,  
Plant Variety Examination Office, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, 1 -2-1  
Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda -ku, 100 -8950 Tokyo (tel.:+81 335 81 0518, fax:+81 335 02 6572,  
e-mail: [toshiharu\\_shimazaki@nm.maff.go.jp](mailto:toshiharu_shimazaki@nm.maff.go.jp); [www.rinshu.maff.go.jp](http://www.rinshu.maff.go.jp))

### MEXICO

Aquiles CARBALLO CARBALLO, Professor -Investigator, Colegio de Postgraduados (CP),  
Km. 35.5 Carretera México -Texcoco, 56230 Montecillo (tel.: +52 55 5804 5900 ext. 1552,  
fax:+525558045962,e -mail:carballo@colpos.colpos.mx)

### NETHERLANDS

Henk BONTHUIS, Plant Research International, Postbox 16, 6700 AA Wagening en  
(tel.: +31 317 47 68 23 fax: +31 317 41 80 94 e -mail: [h.bonthuis@plant.wag-ur.nl](mailto:h.bonthuis@plant.wag-ur.nl);  
[www.plant.wag-ur.nl](http://www.plant.wag-ur.nl);www.kwekersrecht.nl)

### NEWZEALAND

Philip RHODES, Examiner, Agricultural & Vegetable Varieties, Plant Variety Rights Office,  
P.O. Box 130, Lincoln, Canterbury (tel.: +64 3 325 6356, fax: +64 3 783 3946,  
e-mail: [phil.rhodes@pvr.govt.nz](mailto:phil.rhodes@pvr.govt.nz);pvr.pr.govt.nz)

ROMANIA

Adriana PARASCHIV (Mrs.), Head, Examination Department, State Office for Inventions and Trademarks, 5, Jon Ghica, Sector 3, 70018 Bucarest (tel.: +40 1 315 5698, fax:+4013123819,e -mail: [adriana.paraschiv@osim.ro](mailto:adriana.paraschiv@osim.ro);www.office@osim.ro.)

RUSSIANFEDERATION

Tatiana NIKOLAEVSKAYA (Mrs.), State Commission of the Russian Federation for Selection Achievements Test and protection, Orlicov per. 1/11, 107139 Moscou (tel.: +70 95 204 49 23, fax: +70 95 207 86 26, e -mail: [desel@agro.aris.ru](mailto:desel@agro.aris.ru); [statecommission@mtu-net.ru](mailto:statecommission@mtu-net.ru))

SOUTHAFRICA

Robyn HIERSE (Mrs.), Private Bag X5044, Stellenbosch 7599 (tel.: +27 2 1 809 1655, fax:+27218872264,e -mail:robynh@nda.agric.za)

SPAIN

Cecilio PRIETO MARTIN, Subdirección General de Investigación y Tecnología (INIA), CarreteradelaCoruña km.7.5,28040Madrid(tel.:+34913476963,fax:+34913474168, e-mail:prieto@inia.es)

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)

SWEDEN

Gunnar KARLTORP, Head of Office, National Plant Variety Board, Box 1247, 17124 Solna (tel.:+4687831260,fax:+468833170,e -mail: [karlthorp@svn.se](mailto:karlthorp@svn.se),www.svn

Ulf KJELLSTRÖM, Swedish Seed Testing and Certification Institute, Onsjövägen, 26881 Svalöv(tel.:+4641667407,fax:+4641667408,e -mail:ulf.kjellstrom@su -kontroll.se)

UNITEDKINGDOM

Michael S. CAMLIN, Department of Agriculture and Rural Development, Plant Testing Station, 50 Houston Road, Crossnacreevy, Belfast BT6 9SH (tel.: +44 2890 548000, fax:+442890548001,e -mail:michael.camlin@dardni.gov.uk)

Robert J. COOKE, Head of Plant Variety Group (NIAB), Huntingdon Road, Cambridge CB3 0LE  
(tel.: +44 1223 342331, fax: +44 1223 277602, e-mail: robert.cooke@niab.com)

## II. OBSERVER

### COMMUNITY PLANT VARIETY OFFICE

Dirk THEOBALD, Head of the Technical Unit, Community Plant Variety Office (CPVO),  
3, boulevard Maréchal Foch, B.P. 2141, 49021 Angers Cedex 02 (tel.: +33 2 4125 6442,  
fax: +33 2 4125 6410, e-mail: theobald@cpvo.eu.int)

Anne WEITZ (Mrs.), Community Plant Variety Office (CPVO),  
3, boulevard Maréchal Foch, B.P. 2141, 49021 Angers Cedex 02 (tel.: +33 2 4125 6442,  
fax: +33 2 4125 6410, e-mail: weitz@cpvo.eu.int)

## III. OFFICER

Françoise BLOUET (Mrs.), Chairperson

## IV. OFFICE OF UPOV

Peter BUTTON, Technical Director, 34, chemin des Colombettes, 1211 Geneva 20,  
Switzerland (tel. +41 22 338 8672, fax +41 22 733 0336, e-mail: peter.button@upov.int,  
Website: <http://www.upov.int>)

Raimundo LAVIGNOLLE, Senior Counsellor, 34, chemin des Colombettes, 1211 Geneva 20,  
Switzerland (tel. +41 22 338 9565, fax +41 22 733 0336, e-mail:  
raimundo.lavignolle@upov.int)

[Annex II follows ]

## ANNEXII

## LISTOFLEADINGEXPERTS

Species	Basicdocument	Leadingexperts	Interestedexperts (countries) (fornameofexpertssee ListofParticipants, AnnexI)
Lotus	TWA/31/3	CarlosGómez -UY	DE,FR,NZ,UK
Rice	TG/16/8(proj.1).	LuisSalaices -ES	BR,CN, FR,HU,IT,JP, KR,UY
Potato	TWA/31/6	BeateRücker -DE	AR,AU*,BR,CA,ES, FR,GB,IL,NL,NZ, RU,SE,UY,ZA,CPVO
Lucerne	TG/06/4	JoëlGuiard -FR	AR,AU*,CZ,DE,EE, ES,HU,ZA,CPVO
Medics(Medicago spp.otherthansativa)	TWA/31/10	JoanSadie -ZA	AR,AU*,ZA
Coffee	TWA/31/11	AlvaroViana -BR	KE,MX
GrainAmaranth	TWA/31/12	AquilesCarballoCarballo -MX	BR,HU,ZA
PearlMillet	-	-	FR
Ryegrass(Revision)	TG/04/7	MichaelCamlin -UK	AR,CPVO,CZ,DE, DK,FR,HU,NL,NZ, ZA
Sesame	Firstdraft	BaruchBar -Tel -IL	

\*ExpertisMr.TanvirHossain, Examiner,PlantBreeder'sRightsOffice,Departmentof  
Agriculture,FisheriesandForestry,EdmundBartonBuilding,BartonACT, GPOBox858,  
Canberra2601,Australia(tel.:+61262724228,fax:61 262723650,  
e-mail:Tanvir.Hossain@affa.gov.au

[EndofAnnexIIandofdocument]