



TWA/34/14

ORIGINAL: English

DATE: November 4, 2005

INTERNATIONAL UNION FOR THE PROTECTION OF NEW VARIETIES OF PLANTS
GENEVA

**TECHNICAL WORKING PARTY
FOR
AGRICULTURAL CROPS**

**Thirty-Fourth Session
Christchurch, New Zealand, October 31 to November 4, 2005**

REPORT

adopted by the Technical Working Party for Agricultural Crops

Opening of the Session

1. The Technical Working Party for Agricultural Crops (TWA) held its thirty-fourth session in Christchurch, New Zealand, from October 31 to November 4, 2005. The list of participants is reproduced in Annex I to this report.
2. The TWA was welcomed by Mr. Maitland Maltby, Assistant Commissioner of Plant Variety Rights, Plant Variety Rights Office, who provided an overview of the plant variety protection system in New Zealand.
3. The session was opened by Mrs. Beate Rücker (Germany), acting Chairperson of the TWA, who welcomed the participants and, in particular, new participants to the TWA.

Adoption of the Agenda

4. The TWA adopted the agenda as reproduced in document TWA/34/1 Rev.

Short Reports on Developments in Plant Variety Protection*(a) Reports from members and observers*

5. The expert from Australia reported that in early 2005, the Interactive Variety Description System (IVDS) had been introduced for qualified persons (QPs) in order to streamline the plant breeders' rights application procedure. The main purpose of the IVDS was to harmonize variety descriptions at both a national and an international level. The IVDS allowed QPs to complete descriptions on-line by accessing relevant test guidelines and selecting specific characteristics with their states of expression from the options provided. The IVDS incorporated all the approved UPOV Test Guidelines and Australian national descriptors into interactive forms with easy to use drop-down menus. The QPs could build their own additional / special characteristics where those were not available as options. The IVDS can also handle statistical information.

6. An expert from the European Community reported that the European Community had attended the thirty-ninth session of the Council of UPOV for the first time as a UPOV member on October 27, 2005. He further reported that the Community plant breeders' rights regulations had been amended to align the provisions on compulsory licenses to be in line with the provisions in the directive on biotechnological inventions. The fees for the Community plant variety system had been amended and, in particular, would result in the reduction of annual fees from 300 Euros to 200 Euros as from January 1, 2006. The TWA heard that a seminar on enforcement had been organized in Brussels in October 2005. Another expert from the European Community informed the TWA that a strategic discussion on the modalities of DUS testing had been launched and would consider aspects such as the concentration and centralization of DUS testing, involvement of breeders and the role of the Community Plant Variety Office in relation to the examination offices. It was also confirmed that the centralized database on variety denominations had been put on-line.

7. The TWA was informed by an expert from Japan that, in Japan, a total of 18,420 applications were filed during the period from 1978 to 2004. At the end of 2004, the total number of protection titles granted was 13,185. In 2004, the number of applications rose to 1,337, the highest number ever, of which 469 applications (35% of the total) were filed by foreign applicants. 84% of the total applications were for flower and ornamental varieties, 4.7% for vegetable varieties, 3.5% for food crops and 3.4% for fruit trees. Since 1978, 764 applications had been received for food crop varieties of which 484 were for rice, 77 for soybean, 52 for wheat, 45 for potato, 44 for barley and 41 for sweet potato. The Seeds and Seedlings Law was amended in June 2005, to further strengthen the plant breeder's right. Firstly, the duration of protection was extended from 20 years to 25 years (in the case of woody plants, from 25 years to 30 years). Secondly, the breeder's right was extended to cover products made directly from the harvested material of the protected variety. In order to help breeders to exercise their rights on such products, variety identification techniques based on DNA analysis had been developed for rice, red bean, kidney bean, rush (for Tatami mat), tea, wheat and strawberry. As the result of the amendment of the Custom Tariff Law in 2003, and in cooperation with the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, the Customs House can stop the import of products infringing PBR. Furthermore, the National Center for Seeds and Seedlings (NCSS) appointed four Plant Variety Protection Advisers on April 1, 2005, with the task of offering consultation and advice on possible measures against infringements, collecting and providing information on infringements and providing expert opinion concerning the identity of varieties. Studies continued with the aim of developing techniques to identify varieties using DNA analysis. DNA analysis had enabled the identification of more than 200 varieties of rice, 46 varieties of tea, 17 varieties of Japanese rush and some red bean varieties.

8. An expert from the Republic of Korea reported that plant variety protection had been extended to a further 42 plant genera and species on December 1, 2004 and was now available for a total of 155 plant genera and species. A total of 326 applications had been received in 2005 up to September. Since the introduction of plant variety protection in 1998, the total number of applications had reached 2,264 and the number of titles granted was 1,419. It was reported that, as a part of the program for the development of a set of example varieties for North East Asia, a trial containing 20 varieties provided by Japan and the Republic of Korea had been grown. The results of the descriptions produced in Japan and the Republic of Korea were compared in March 2005. It was reported that there had been similar descriptions for some characteristics, but that other characteristics showed different expression.

(b) Reports on developments within UPOV

9. The TWA received an oral report from the Office of the Union on the latest developments within UPOV.

Molecular Techniques

(a) Report on developments

10. The Office of the Union introduced document TWA/34/2 and reported on the outcome of the discussions in the fifty-second session of the Administrative and Legal Committee, held in Geneva on October 24 and 25, 2005.

(b) Ad hoc Crop Subgroups and the Working Group on Biochemical and Molecular Techniques, and DNA-Profiling in Particular (BMT)

11. The TWA heard that a meeting of the *Ad hoc* Crop Subgroup on Molecular Techniques for Ryegrass (Crop Subgroup for Ryegrass), which had been planned to be held in conjunction with the thirty-fourth session of the TWA, had been cancelled due to a lack of papers. Mr. Michael Camlin (United Kingdom) made a report on an International Seed Federation (ISF) sponsored study assessing possible essential derivation relationships between ryegrass varieties, a copy of which is provided as an Addendum to document TWA/34/2.

12. The TWA heard that a group in Denmark was working on a project to consider an Option 2 approach for ryegrass. Microsatellite data had been obtained and data on morphological distances would start to be generated at the beginning of 2006.

13. The expert from France reported that further work was intended to be conducted on maize with a view to assist in the management of reference collections. It was possible that an initial report on that work could be made at the thirty-fifth session of the TWA.

Use of TGP/7 in the Preparation of Test Guidelines

14. The TWA received a presentation from the Office on the use of the Test Guidelines drafters' kit which had been made available on the first restricted area of the UPOV website.

15. It was clarified that characteristics which were contained in adopted UPOV Test Guidelines could be omitted from the “Collection of approved characteristics” (document TGP/7, Annex 4) where considered appropriate by the Enlarged Editorial Committee.

16. The TWA agreed that the user notes for the collection of approved characteristics should explain that the indication of the characteristic number, the method of observation, type of characteristic and the indications of (+) and (*) had been retained from the Table of Characteristics from which the characteristic had originated, but should clarify that that information might not be appropriate for other Test Guidelines.

17. The TWA recalled the importance of respecting the deadlines for the submission of documents to the Office and, thereafter, to the TWA and agreed that any documents received after the deadline for submission to the Office should not be considered at the TWA session. All draft Test Guidelines and TGP documents would be required to be made available to the members of the TWA at least four weeks prior to its session. Therefore, the Office was requested not to prepare any drafts received after the deadline. The Office confirmed that it would continue to work on the basis of two weeks for the preparation of Test Guidelines between receipt and issue to the TWA. The TWA further agreed, where considered appropriate by the subgroup concerned, to suggest deadlines for interim draft Test Guidelines to be prepared by the leading expert for circulation to the subgroup of interested experts and for comments to be received from the subgroup. Those deadlines would be set suitably in advance of the deadline for the submission of Test Guidelines to the Office. It was noted that the circulation of interim drafts within the subgroup was a matter for the leading expert.

Discussion on Draft Test Guidelines (Subgroups)

Coffee (documents TG/COFFEE(proj.3 Rev.) and TWA/34/8)

18. The subgroup discussed document TG/COFFEE(proj.3 Rev.), presented by Mr. Luís Gustavo Asp Pacheco (Brazil), and agreed the following:

Cover page	the common names Coffee (English), Caf��ier (French), Kaffee (German) and Cafeto (Spanish) to be added for <i>Coffea canephora</i> . German name to be checked.
1.	to delete the word “their”.
2.3	to read “The minimum quantity of plant material, to be supplied by the applicant, should be: i) Vegetatively propagated varieties: 5 one-year-old plants; ii) Seed-propagated varieties: 20 one-year-old plants”
3.3.1	final sentence to read “Observations should be made after the third year of planting. In particular, it is essential that the plants produce a satisfactory crop of fruit in each of the two growing cycles.”
3.3.2	to be deleted

3.4.1	to read: “3.4.1 For seed-propagated varieties: Each test should be designed to result in a total of at least 20 plants” “3.4.2 For vegetatively propagated varieties: Each test should be designed to result in a total of at least 5 plants”
3.5	to read: “Vegetatively propagated varieties: Unless otherwise indicated, all observations should be made on 5 plants or parts taken from each of 5 plants.” “Cross-pollinated varieties: Unless otherwise indicated, all observations should be made on 20 plants or parts taken from each of 20 plants.”
4.2	to read: “4.2.2 The assessment of uniformity for seed-propagated varieties should be according to the recommendations for cross-pollinated varieties in the General Introduction.” “4.2.3 For the assessment of uniformity of vegetatively propagated varieties, a population standard of 1% and an acceptance probability of at least 95% should be applied. In the case of a sample size of 5 plants, no off-types are allowed.”
6.4.2	to be deleted
6.5	VG-MG reference to be deleted
Char. 1	proposal made by TWF (see document TWA/34/8) to be considered
Char. 4	states 3 and 7 to read “few” and “many”, respectively. To provide explanation of when to observe.
Char. 5	to read “Shoot: length of internode” and to be checked. Example varieties “Caturra” and “Typica” to be added for state 3. To provide explanation of when to observe.
Char. 6	to read “Plagiotropic branch: intensity of ramification” and to check if it is necessary to differentiate between primary and secondary branching. To provide explanation of when to observe.
Char. 8	state 7 to read “broad”
Char. 9	states to have the order: lanceolate (1); ovate (2); elliptic (3)
Char. 10	to read “Young leaf: color” and to check if state 2 is appropriate. (+) to be added with an explanation of the timing of the observation
Char. 11	to have the states: absent or weak (1) (example variety “Laurina”); medium (2) (example variety “Mundo Novo”); strong (3) (“Typica”)
Char. 12	to be deleted
Char. 14	to be checked
Char. 16	to have the states: few (3); medium (5); many (7)
Char. 17	to read “Pollination incompatibility” with the states: incompatible (1); partially compatible (2); fully compatible (3). To be moved after Char. 32.
Char. 20	example variety “Caturra Amarillo” to be checked
Char. 21	to read “Fruit: sepal dehiscence” with the states: absent (1); present (9) (example variety “Bourbon Amarelo”)

Char. 22	wording of characteristic to be improved and states to be reviewed accordingly
Char. 26	to be indicated as PQ and to read “Seed: intensity of silver skin color”
Char. 28	to read “Time of harvest maturity (at 80% of mature fruits)”. (+) to be added with explanation to be provided. To be moved after Char. 29.
Char. 29	to read “Time of beginning of flowering”
Char. 30	to be checked and to move to after Char. 21
Char. 31	to move after Char. 26
Char. 32	to move after Char. 25 and to be checked
8.1 (a)	to read “Observations should be made on plants in the third fruiting year, after the second harvest”
8.1 (e)	to read “Observations or measurements are made on a sample of 20 seeds”
Ad. 5	to read “The length of the internode should be observed in the middle third of the shoot”.
Ad. 9	to be updated according to changes in the Table of Characteristics
Ad. 17	to be updated according to changes in the Table of Characteristics
Ad. 19	drawing to be improved
Ad. 23-25	to explain whether to look at flat or round seeds and the difference between them
Ad. 26	to be updated according to changes in the Table of Characteristics
Ad. 32	to clarify the relevance of the moisture content and to explain how to assess and why it is necessary to use only flat seeds

Common Millet (document TG/COM-MIL(proj.3))

19. The subgroup discussed document TG/COM-MIL(proj.3), presented by Mr. Oleksandr Gonchar (Ukraine) and Mr. Oleh Slyvchenko (Ukraine), and agreed the following:

2.3	to be amended to 100 panicles, in line with the Test Guidelines for spring barley, spring wheat, spring oats and rice
3.4.2	to be corrected to “1,000” and to “ <u>Single panicle rows</u> : if tests ...”
4.2.2	to read “ <u>Row plots</u> : For the assessment of uniformity, a population standard of 95% and an acceptance probability of at least 0.1% should be applied. In the case of a sample size of 1,000 plants, 3 off-types are allowed.”
4.2.3	to read “ <u>Single panicle rows</u> : For the assessment of uniformity, a population standard of 95% and an acceptance probability of at least 1% should be applied. In the case of a sample size of 50 panicle rows, 2 off-type panicle rows are allowed.”
5.3	to be updated according to changes in the Table of Characteristics
Table of Characteristics	to provide guidance on the appropriate part of the plant to be observed e.g. to look at the middle third of the panicle for panicle characteristics

Chars. 1, 2, 3	to be indicated as “VG” and to read “Flag leaf: ...”
Char. 1	state 7 to read “semi-drooping”
Chars. 4, 5	to be indicated as “MS”
Char. 7	to be indicated as “VG / MS” and to read “Stem: length of upper internode”. (+) to be added with an illustration.
Char. 8	to be indicated as “VG / MS” and to read “Stem: thickness of node”
Char. 9	“51-55” to be deleted. To read “Time of panicle emergence”. (+) to be added with an explanation of the proportion of plants which need to be at a stage to be specified (e.g. first spikelet visible on 50% of panicles (taken from Test Guidelines for Oat))
Char. 10	to read “Plant: natural height”
Char. 11	to be indicated as QN and to consider presenting with notes 1-5: very acute (1); moderately acute (2); right angle (3); moderately obtuse (4); very obtuse (5) – with a new illustration to be added between existing states 1 and 2.
Char. 12	state 4 to read “strongly drooping”
Char. 13	to be indicated as “65-69” and to read “Panicle: length (excluding peduncle)”
Char. 14	to be indicated as “81-89”. (+) to be added with an explanation of how to observe, particularly for drooping panicles.
Char. 15	to be indicated as “VG”
Char. 16	to be clarified, possibly using the Test Guidelines for Oat as a source of guidance
Char. 17	to check if the characteristic provides useful discrimination beyond that of Char. 12 and Char. 15. To provide an illustration if retained.
Chars. 18, 18a	to be indicated as VG and to check if there is a botanical term for “pillow”. To consider combining Chars. 18 and 18a into, either: “Panicle: number of pillows” with the states: none or very few (1); few (3); medium (5); many (7); very many (9), or “Panicle: proportion of branches with pillows” with the states: none or very low (1); low (3); medium (5); high (7); very high (9)
Char. 19	to be indicated as VG and to read “Panicle: length of primary branches”
Char. 20	to be indicated as VG. (+) to be added with an illustration to be provided. To have the states: oblong elliptic (1); elliptic (2); round (3).
Char. 21	to read “Spikelet: intensity of yellow color”
Chars. 22, 23	to consider combining into a single characteristic to read “Glume: anthocyanin coloration”, with the states: absent or very weak (1); weak (3); medium (5); strong (7)
Char. 24	to check if only two clear-cut states exist (QL). To read “Stigma: color”
Chars. 25-29	characteristics to be ordered as 29, 27, 25, 26, 28

Char. 25	to read “Grain: color”. To review if all states are useful, e.g. to consider combining “white” and “cream” into “whitish” and “dark yellow” and “golden”. To check if orange should be included. State 4 to read “medium yellow”, state 8 to read “medium red” and state 10 to read “red brown”.
Char. 26	to read “Grain: presence of spots”
Char. 27	to be indicated as VG. To have the states: narrow elliptic (was oblong) (1), broad elliptic (was ovate) (2); round (was globular) (3).
Char. 28	to read “Grain: size of spots”
Char. 29	to be indicated as MS
Char. 30	to read “Weight per 1000 grains”
Char. 31	to read “Kernel (not polished): color”, with the states: whitish (1); light yellow (2); medium yellow (3); dark yellow (4); green yellow (5).
Char. 32	to read “Kernel: intensity of brown color of placental spot”. “(almost dark)” to be deleted in state 7. (+) to be added with an illustration to be provided
Chars. 33.1 to 33.6	to be presented as follows: 33. Resistance to smut (<i>Sporisorium destruens</i> Yank) 33.1 Race 1 33.2 Race 2 etc. Table of example varieties and resistance to races to be provided.
Ad. 2	to be deleted
Ad. 3	to be deleted
Ad. 11	to be amended according to changes to Table of Characteristics
Ad. 15	heading to be moved above illustration and fourth illustration to be deleted
Ad. 18	to provide improved illustration
Ad. 19	notes and measurements to be deleted
Ad. 24	to be deleted
Ad. 27	formula to be deleted and illustration to be updated according to changes in the Table of Characteristics
Ad. 29	notes and measurements to be deleted
Ad. 33.1 – 33.6	“Conditions for inoculation” to be moved to left-hand column. Information to be provided for type of inoculum and conditions for inoculation. Wording to be improved.
8.2	to provide reference for the decimal code
9.	references 11-13 to be deleted
TQ 5	to review whether the non-grouping characteristics included are necessary

Festuca/Lolium hybrids (Festulolium) (document TG/FESTL(proj.1))

20. The subgroup discussed document TG/FESTL(proj.1), presented by Mr. Michael Camlin (United Kingdom).

21. The subgroup agreed that the draft should be updated according to the changes made to the draft Test Guidelines for Ryegrass (see below). In addition, it agreed that the next draft of the Test Guidelines should include appropriate characteristics from the Test Guidelines for Meadow Fescue and Tall Fescue and that some characteristics should be indicated for “Only Lolium type varieties” or “Only Festuca type varieties”, with an explanation of how to determine to which type a variety belongs.

Grain Amaranth (document TG/AMARAN(proj.4))

22. The subgroup discussed document TG/AMARAN(proj.4), presented by Mr. Aquiles Carballo (Mexico), and agreed the following:

4.2.3	to check if the inbred lines are self-pollinated
5.3	to be completed
Table of Characteristics	to limit the number of example varieties to a maximum of three for each state. To add asterisks for appropriate characteristics
Chars. 1-3	to replace “pigmentation” with “coloration”
Char. 4	to read “Young leaf blade: main color of upper side” and to have notes 1, 2, 3.
Char. 5	to read “Young leaf blade: predominant color of lower side”
Char. 6	to read “Young leaf blade: secondary color of upper side (at beginning of growth)”. Example variety “Revancha” to be deleted from state 2.
Char. 7	to read “Young leaf blade: distribution of secondary color of upper side (at beginning of growth)”. (+) to be added and illustrations to be provided. To have the states: speckled (1) (to be checked); central blotch (2); one “V” shaped stripe (3); two “V” shaped stripes (4); on margins and veins (5); in strip (6); one pale green or chlorotic strip on green (7).
Char. 8	to be moved after Char. 3. To have notes 1 and 2.
Char. 9	to be deleted
Char. 10	to be moved after Char. 13. To read “Mature leaf: type of margin”.
Char. 11	to be moved after Char. 13. To read “Mature leaf: shape”.
Char. 12	to be indicated as QN. To read “Mature leaf: length”
Char. 13	to read “Mature leaf: width”
Char. 14	to read “Petiole: anthocyanin coloration” and to be moved after Char. 21
Char. 15	to read “Petiole: intensity of anthocyanin coloration” and to be moved after Char. 21
Char. 16	to read “Mature leaf: prominence of veins”

Char. 17	to read “Mature leaf: main color of upper side”
Char. 18	to read “Leaf blade: presence of blotch on upper side”
Char. 19	to read “Mature leaf: size of blotch”
Char. 20	to read “Mature leaf: color of blotch”
Char. 21	to read “Mature leaf blade: shape distribution of patch”. State 2 to read “elliptic”
Char. 22	“(see (b))” to be deleted. To be moved after Char. 41.
Char. 23	to be indicated as VG. “of inflorescence” to be deleted.
Char. 24	to be indicated as VG
Char. 25	to consider splitting into three characteristics: Stem: number of colors, with the states: one (1); more than one (2); <u>Only varieties with one color</u> : Stem: color (at anthesis), with the states: green (1); orange (2); pink (3); red (4); purple (5). Stem: color of stripes, with the states: red (1); purple (2)
Char. 26	to replace “pigmentation” with “coloration”
Char. 27	to add “(cross-section)”. To delete duplicate “A”. (+) to be added with an explanation or an illustration.
Char. 28	to read “Inflorescence: attitude”
Char. 29	to be indicated as VS
Char. 30	order of states of expression to be checked
Char. 32	to check terminology
Char. 34	to be indicated as VG. (+) to be added and illustration to be provided
Char. 35	(+) to be added with an explanation of maturity
Char. 39	(+) to be added with illustration to be provided. Wording of states to be checked.
Char. 40	wording of states to be checked
Char. 41	to be indicated as MG
8.1	to provide an explanation of young leaf and mature leaf
Ad. 6	to be provided
Ad. 28	to add illustrations for states 3 and 9
Ad. 31	explanation to be improved
Ad. 32	illustration to be improved
Ad. 36	to read “From the base of the tip to the tip of the inflorescence”
Ad. 37	explanation to be improved
Ad. 41	explanation to be improved
9.	further literature to be added

TQ 5	to be completed
TQ 6	example to be provided

Hop (documents TG/HOP(proj.2 Rev.) and TWA/34/9)

23. The subgroup discussed documents TG/HOP(proj.2 Rev.) and TWA/34/9, presented by Mr. Rudolf Becher (Germany), and agreed the following:

6.5	to add “37-89 See Explanations on the Table of Characteristics in Chapter 8.3”
Char. 1	(+) to be deleted and (a) added
Chars. 2, 6, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17, 22	states 1 and 9 to be deleted (no example varieties)
Char. 2-5	To add (b)
Char. 3	state 9 to be deleted (no example varieties)
Char. 5	to add “.” after 5
Char. 7	Stage 2 to be deleted and to be indicated as QL. (+) to be deleted.
Char. 8	to have the states: fusiform (1); fusiform to cylindrical (2); cylindrical (3); cylindrical to club-shaped (4); club-shaped (5); cylindrical to conic (6); conic (7).
Char. 10	“middle third” to be underlined. State 1 to be deleted (no example varieties).
Char. 11	“upper third” to be underlined
Char. 12	to replace “leaves” with “foliage”
Char. 13	“mean” to be deleted
Char. 14	“middle third” to be underlined
Char. 15	“upper third” to be underlined
Chars. 17-24	“(b)” to be replaced by “(c)”
Char. 18	state 1 to read “cylindrical”
Char. 19	to have the states: closed (1); just open (2); clearly open (3)
Char. 20	to add “.” after 20. To read “Cone: intensity of green color”.
Char. 21	to be deleted
8.1	To add “(a) Characteristic 1 to 5: Dwarf types should be observed at a comparable stage of development to that of normal types” (a) and (b) to be replaced by (b) and (c)
Ad. 1	to be deleted
Ad. 6	to read “Approximately 70% of flowers open on 50% of plants.”

Ad. 7	to be deleted
Ads. 8, 9	new illustration provided in document TWA/34/9, page 3. Last line: to delete “combination with”
Ad. 18	to be updated according to changes to the Table of Characteristics
Ad. 21	to be deleted
Ad. 24	to indicate what part is to be observed
TQ 9	to be updated according to TGP/7

Maize (Partial revision) (documents TG/2/7(proj.1) and TWA/34/11)

24. The subgroup discussed document TWA/34/11, presented by Mr. Ferenc Kovács (Hungary), and agreed the following:

New Char. 1	to be indicated as VG; state 3 = light, state 7 = dark; Characteristic useful for all varieties
New Char. 2	to be indicated as VG; Concerns were expressed about its inclusion because of environmental dependence. The expert from Hungary to provide more information about reproducibility, range of variation, effect for additional distinction.
New Char. 3	to be indicated as VG; Concerns were expressed about its inclusion because of environmental dependence. The expert from Hungary to provide more information about reproducibility, range of variation, effect for additional distinction. To check if “tip” should be replaced by “apex”
New Char. 4	(+) to be added with an explanation for the genetic basis; to clarify which colors can be observed. To consider replacing “Corn” by ”Kernel”
New Char. 5	to read “... intensity of yellow color”; to check whether applicable for all varieties or only for single colored varieties To consider replacing “Corn” by ”Kernel”
New Chars. 6-8	to check whether the most appropriate characteristic is length, width, shape
New Char. 9	(+) to be added with an explanation of the method and a definition of the harvest time. To check the number of notes.
New Char. 10	To be moved before New Char. 2. (+) to be added with method to be provided
New Char. 11	to read “...: Type of popped grain”, to check wording for note 2.

Medics (document TG/MEDICS(proj.3))

25. The subgroup discussed document TG/MEDICS(proj.3), presented by Ms. Robyn Hierse (South Africa), and agreed the following:

Cover page	English name to read “Medics”
2.3	to be amended to 500 g
5.3 (d)	to include the New Char. 1 and New Char. 2 (replacing Char. 18) as in the Table of Characteristics (see below)
Char. 2	state 6 to be deleted
Char. 3	state 6 to read “over whole surface” and state 7 to be deleted
Char. 4	to be deleted
Char. 13	to be indicated as MS. To read “Leaflet: ratio length/width”, with the states: small (3); medium (5); large (7). Example varieties to be provided.
Char. 14	to be deleted
Char. 16	states 1 to 3 to be amended to: acute (1); obtuse (2); rounded (3)
Char. 18	to be replaced by two characteristics:
New 1	to read “Leaflet: pubescence on <u>upper</u> side”, with the states: absent (1) (example varieties: Circle Valley (M.p.), Pavlovskaya 7 (M.f.), Rivoli (M.to.); present (9) (example varieties: Mogul (M.tr.), Harbinger (M.l.), Kelson (M.s.))
New 2	to read “Leaflet: pubescence on <u>lower</u> side”, with the states: absent (1) (example varieties: Circle Valley (M.p.), Pavlovskaya 7 (M.f.); present (9) (example varieties: Mogul (M.tr.), Harbinger (M.l.), Kelson (M.s.), Rivoli (M.to.))
Char. 19	to read “Leaflet: density of pubescence on <u>upper</u> side”. To be moved after New 1.
Char. 20	to be deleted
Char. 21	to read “Leaflet: density of pubescence on <u>lower</u> side”. To be moved after New 2.
Char. 22	to be deleted
Char. 27	to be indicated as QN and to have the states: two (1); three (2); four (3); five (4); six or more (5). Example varieties to be provided.
Char. 28	to be deleted
Char. 29	to read “Flower: intensity of yellow color of petal”
Char. 30	to read “Flower: marks on calyx”
Char. 31	to be deleted

Chars. 32 to 42	example varieties to be provided
Char. 34	state 5 to be deleted if no example varieties provided
Chars. 39 to 41	to begin with “ <u>Only varieties with spined texture of whorl edges:...</u> ”
Char. 40	to be indicated as QN
Ad. 15	state 3 to be updated with illustration provided at session
Ad. 28, 29	to be deleted
Ad. 30	more than one illustration to be provided for state 9
Ad. 40	illustration to show orientation of whole pod in relation to spines
TQ 1.1.2	to read “Medics”
TQ 5.4	to include the New Char. 1 and New Char. 2 (replacing Char. 18) as in the Table of Characteristics (see above)
TQ 6	to have: Pod: shape / globular / ovoid
TQ 9.3	to be deleted

26. The subgroup agreed that the Test Guidelines for Medics should be proposed for adoption by the Technical Committee (TC) in 2006, subject to agreement by correspondence of the example varieties. The leading expert was requested to supply the necessary example varieties to the Office by November 30, 2005. The Office would circulate the proposals to the TWA by mid-December 2005 with a deadline for comments of mid-January 2006 and, in the absence of objections, the Test Guidelines would be prepared for the forty-second session of the TC.

Peas (Revision) (documents TG/7/10(proj.2) and TWA/34/10)

27. The subgroup discussed documents TG/7/10(proj.2) and TWA/34/10 and agreed the following:

General	Order of characteristics to be changed according to the stage of development
Char.1	Differentiation of state 4, 5, 6 not clear. To combine the three notes as “irregular”
Char. 8	To be deleted. Classification is not clear because Char. 69 is QL. Very difficult to be observed.
Char. 9	Asterisk to be added
Char. 10	to be indicated as MG/VG
Char. 11, Ad. 11	Asterisk to be deleted. Explanation to be improved to make it clearer that the characteristic cannot be observed under short daylength conditions.
Char. 19	To read “Leaf: waxiness of upper side of leaflet”
Char. 27	Ibiza and Progeta to be deleted. To check if there are any existing example varieties for states 2 and 3 and, if not, the characteristic to be deleted (Australia will check)

Char. 28-33	To clarify which characteristics can be assessed manually and which can only be assessed by image analysis. Methods have to be clearly defined. The illustration does not show how to measure the characteristic: the fix-points are not clear; does not work for other leaf shapes.
Char. 45, 46	To be retained. Good differentiation in collection, easy to observe.
Char. 50	To check if this is the frequency of bracts (normally there is a maximum of two bracts per pod? To check if the 1 to 9 scale is appropriate.
Char. 53	to have the states: not entire (1); entire (2)
Char. 54	to read “ <u>Only varieties without entire parchment: ...</u> ”
Char. 55, 56	Relationship between the two characteristics is unclear. What is the expression of Char. 56 if there is state 2 in Char. 55? Char. 55 cannot be QL, intermediate state necessary.
Char. 58, 59	To be deleted. No additional information provided. Char. 59 state 3 = convex; there are no example varieties for convex. States 1 and 2 are fully covered by Char. 56.
Char. 65	Stage of development to be checked. Explanation necessary on whether aborted ovules are to be counted.
Char. 69	To check French and German. To check notes 1 to 9.
Char. 71	Asterisk to be deleted because not useful for agricultural peas and it has to be observed by a special test.
Ad. 38	To read “The time of flowering is when 30% of plants have at least one flower open.”
Ad 52 (1)	To explain what “Snap Peas” are. The term is not used anywhere else in the Test Guidelines.
TQ	To delete 5.6, 5.10, 5.21, 5.22, 5.23 (no reliable information given by the applicant or not used for planning the growing trial)
TQ	To keep 5.18, very important for planning the growing trial
TQ 7.3	To check if it is useful for DUS purposes to differentiate so many types of use.
TQ 7.3	Resistances to diseases: to add lines for each disease as follows Resistant [] Susceptible [] Not tested []
Annex 1	The TWA agreed with the TWV comment that “the leading expert to select information directly relevant to the DUS examination for insertion into Section 8 ... ” and propose that it be considered if the Annex is useful for DUS purposes.

Pearl Millet (document PRL_MIL(proj.2))

28. The subgroup discussed document PRL_MIL(proj.2), presented by Mr. Luís Gustavo Asp Pacheco (Brazil), and agreed the following:

4.2.3	to check the appropriate population standard and to correct the number of off-types
5.3	to be reviewed
Table of Characteristics	example varieties to be provided
Char. 1	“intensity of” to be deleted
Char. 3	“to drooping” to be deleted from state 3. To add state 7: drooping.
Char. 4	to consider deleting “white or”
Chars. 6, 7	to check if “VG” should be added
Char. 10	“absent” and “present” to be reversed
Char. 14	“d” to be replaced by “DS 6+”
Char. 15	DS 6 to be deleted
Char. 17	to consider adding “VG”
Char. 19	to read “Leaf sheath: anthocyanin coloration”, with the states: absent or very weak (1); weak (3); moderate (5); strong (7)
Char. 21	to have the states: short (3); medium (5); long (7)
Char. 24	to check if this should become an anthocyanin coloration characteristic. (+) to be deleted.
Char. 25	to read “Glume: anthocyanin coloration of tip”
Char. 26	to read “Glume: intensity of anthocyanin coloration of tip”
Char. 27	to be indicated as “VG”. “Present” to have note 9.
Char. 28	to have notes 1, 2, 3
Char. 29	to consider changing to read “Scur: anthocyanin coloration”, with the states: absent or very weak (1); weak (3); moderate (5); strong (7)
Char. 30	to read “Scur: type”
Char. 31	“only” to be deleted from state 1
Char. 32	“ <u>only</u> ” to be deleted. State 5 to read “medium”
Chars. 34, 35	to check if independent of Char. 29
Char. 37	to have the states: few (3); medium (5); many (7). To check if the characteristic is reliable.
Char. 38	to read “Culm: number of nodal tillers” with the states: few (3); medium (5); many (7).
Chars. 39, 40	to check if these should become anthocyanin coloration characteristics

Char. 42	to correct spelling of “Brix”. To have the notes 1,2 3,
Chars. 43, 44	reliability of characteristic to be checked
Char. 46	to read “Seed: exertion”, with the states: absent or weakly exerted (1), moderately exerted (2); strongly exerted (3)
Char. 47	to be indicated as “DS 9+”
Char. 48	(g) to be deleted and to be indicated as “DS 9+”
Chars. 49, 50	(h) to be deleted and to be indicated as “DS 9++”
8.1	to read “8.1 Explanations for individual characteristics”
Ad. 3	illustration for state 5 to become state 7 and new illustration to be provided for state 5
Ad. 15	to read “Time of flowering is when 50% of plants emit the stigma in the main panicle”
Ad. 23	sentence to be deleted
Ad. 24	to be deleted
Ad. 29	to be deleted
Ad. 32	illustration to be provided for state 5
Ad. 33	illustration to be provided for state 5
Ad. 42	spelling of “Brix” to be corrected. To read “Assess from the medium third of the culm. Measure the juice brix using a refractometer...”
Ad. 46	illustrations to be reversed
Ad. 47	sentence to be deleted
Ad. 49	to use illustrations with the same general seed shape
8.2	“Key” column to be deleted. To add “DS 6”, “DS 9+” and “DS 9++” to correspond to (d), (g) and (h).

Ryegrass (Revision) (document TG/4/8(proj.2))

29. The subgroup discussed document TG/4/8(proj.2), presented by Mr. Michael Camlin (United Kingdom), and agreed the following:

General	it was agreed that the Test Guidelines should cover <i>Lolium rigidum</i> Gaudin. and that the necessary changes should be made e.g. the removal of square brackets on the cover page and Chapter 1.
3.4.1	to read “Each test should be designed to result in a total of at least 60 spaced plants which should be divided between at least 2 replicates. In addition, the test may include 8 meters of row plot which should be divided between at least 2 replicates. The density of the seed should be such that around 200 plants / meter can be expected”

5.3	to replace “ <u>Annual varieties:</u> ” with “ <u><i>Lolium multiflorum</i> Lam. var. <i>westerwoldicum</i> and <i>Lolium rigidum</i> Gaudin.</u> ” and to replace “ <u>Biennial and Perennial varieties:</u> ” with “ <u><i>Lolium perenne</i> L., <i>Lolium multiflorum</i> Lam. ssp. <i>italicum</i> (A. Br.) Volkart and <i>Lolium boucheanum</i> Kunth.</u> ” and to update the wording of the characteristics according to the Table of Characteristics
6.4.2	to add “(Lr) <u><i>Lolium rigidum</i> Gaudin.</u> ”
6.5	to amend “(a)” to “(a) – (f)” to add “(Lr) <u><i>Lolium rigidum</i> Gaudin.</u> ” to add key for growth stages
Table of Characteristics	order of states to be changed to follow the growth stage of observation
Char. 1	to be indicated as “C” only
Char. 2	to change the example varieties for the states listed below as follows: state 3: Lemtal (Lmi), Yatsyn (Lp) state 5: Jumbo (Lp), Limeta (Lmi)
Char. 3	to change the example varieties for the states listed below as follows: state 1: Bargold (Lp), Barmultra (Lmi) state 9: Weldra (Lmw)
Char. 4	to read “ <u>Only varieties of Lmw and Lr:...</u> ” and to change the example varieties for the states listed below as follows: state 1: Grazer (Lmw) state 3: Lifloria (Lmw) state 5: Elunaria (Lmw)
Char. 5	(+) to be deleted and growth stage “50” to be changed to “20-29”. To change the example varieties for the states listed below as follows: state 5: Bellem (Lmi), Melino (Lp) state 9: Avon (Lp)
Char. 6	to change the example varieties for the states listed below as follows: state 3: Grasslands Nui (Lp), Lemtal (Lmi)
Chars. 7, 8	example varieties to be provided and to be circulated for approval. Order of characteristics to be reversed. Growth stage to be indicated as “20-29” and method of observing the characteristic to read “VG B”.
Char. 8	to replace “broad” with “long”
Char. 9	to be indicated as “30-39” and “VG B”. To change the example varieties for the states listed below as follows: state 3: Polarstar (Lp) state 7: Fox (Lmi)

Char. 10	to be indicated as “MS A” and VS A”
Char. 11	to read “ <u>Only varieties of Lp, Lmi and Lb:...</u> ”. To change the example varieties for the states listed below as follows: state 1: Limona (Lp) state 5: Greenway (Lp), Lemtal (Lmi) state 7: Livonne (Lp) state 9: Barpolo (Lp)
Char. 12	to change the example varieties for the states listed below as follows: state 3: Superstar (Lp) state 5: Polly (Lb) state 9: no example varieties
Char. 13	to be indicated as “MS A” and “VS A”
Char. 14	to change the example varieties for the states listed below as follows: state 3: Sauvignon (Lp) state 5: Abergold (Lp), Brutus (Lb), Fastyl (Lmi)
Char. 15	to change the example varieties for the states listed below as follows: state 5: Limona (Lp) state 7: Eurostar (Lp), Skipper (Lb)
Char. 17	(+) to be added with the explanation “To be recorded in the field from ground level, when the inflorescence is fully expanded.”. To change the example varieties for the states listed below as follows: state 3: Loretta (Lp) state 5: Lipondo (Lp) state 7: Lilotta (Lp) state 9: Emily (Lmi)
Char. 18	to be deleted
Char. 19	(+) to be added and explanation provided. “on longest stem” to be deleted. Example varieties to be provided and to be circulated for approval
Char. 20	to change the example varieties for the states listed below as follows: state 3: Alamo (Lmi), Bargold (Lp) state 5: Taurus (Lp), Vigor (Lp) state 7: Lilotta (Lp) state 9: no example variety
Char. 21	to change the example varieties for the states listed below as follows: state 5: Acento (Lp), Lemtal (Lmi)

Char. 22	(+) to be added and explanation to be provided. To change “sparse” to “lax”
Chars. 25 to 27	to be deleted
Char. 28	to be indicated as “50”. To be checked if the characteristic is an aftermath characteristic and to be deleted if it is an aftermath characteristic. To change the example varieties for the states listed below as follows: state 1: Bargold (Lp) state 3: Lipresso (Lp) state 5: Gator (Lp) state 7: Ausric (Lp)
New Char.	to consider adding “Stem: thickness”. Experts from the Republic of Korea to provide the leading expert with the methodology, together with variety data and example varieties.
8.1 (a)	first sentence to read “Characteristic 2 may be recorded during the growing season in which the trials are planted” and reference to characteristic 6 to be deleted.
8.1 (b)	to read “Characteristic 4: Timing of observations will depend upon time of planting.” and reference to characteristic 11 to be deleted” <u>Row plots</u> section to read “The date of inflorescence emergence is the date at which the average plot stage 2 (Growth Stage DC 50) has been reached. This date should, if necessary, be obtained by interpolation.”
8.1 (c)	to be revised to cover observation as VS A
8.1 (d)	to read “To be recorded on each individual plant at the time of inflorescence emergence, (Growth Stage DC 50) that is, at the same time as Characteristic 4 for <i>Lolium multiflorum</i> Lam. var. <i>westerwoldicum</i> and <i>Lolium rigidum</i> Gaudin. and Characteristic 11 for <i>Lolium perenne</i> L., <i>Lolium multiflorum</i> Lam. ssp. <i>italicum</i> (A. Br.) Volkart and <i>Lolium boucheanum</i> Kunth.”
8.1 (e)	to read “Measurements for characteristics 19, 20, 21, 22, 23 and 24 should be made on the longest stem.”
8.3	to read “ ... This decimal code is in close conformity with the BBCH-code (Meier, 1997).”
Ad. 5	to be deleted
9.	to add the reference for the Zadok’s code and to provide a reference for cytological methods for ploidy determination.
TQ 5	to be updated according to changes to the Table of Characteristics
TQ 6	example to be provided
TQ 7	to add a new section 7.3 requesting information on whether the variety is for forage or amenity use

30. The subgroup agreed that the Test Guidelines for Ryegrass should be proposed for adoption by the TC in 2006, subject to agreement by correspondence of the points concerning characteristics 7, 8 and 19 and the new characteristic for stem thickness. The leading expert was requested to supply the necessary information to the Office by November 30, 2005. The Office would circulate the proposals to the TWA by mid-December 2005 with a deadline for comments of mid-January 2006 and, in the absence of objections, the Test Guidelines would be prepared for the forty-second session of the TC.

Sheep's Fescue (including Hard Fescue) and Red Fescue (Revision) (document TG/67/5(proj.2))

31. The subgroup discussed document TG/67/5(proj.2), presented by Mr. Henk Bonthuis (Netherlands), and agreed the following:

3.4.1	to read "Each test should be designed to result in a total of at least 60 spaced plants which should be divided between at least 2 replicates. In addition, the test may include 8 meters of row plot which should be divided between at least 2 replicates. The density of the seed should be such that around 200 plants / meter can be expected"
6.5	to read "(a), (b)"
Table of Characteristics	further example varieties to be provided
Char. 1	to be indicated as "C" only
Char. 2	(*) to be deleted
Char. 6	example variety "Biljart (Fo)" to be deleted
Char. 7	state 7 to read "dark"
Char. 8	to be indicated as VG B. To check if the characteristic is truly qualitative and, if not, to be deleted.
Char. 10	growth stage of observation to be deleted and to read "Plant: time of inflorescence emergence"
Char. 11	growth stage of observation to be deleted and to read "Plant: natural height at time of inflorescence emergence (excluding the flag leaf blade)"
Char. 12	example varieties to be provided for at least state 3
Char. 18	to be indicated as VG B
Char. 19	to be deleted
Char. 20	to be deleted
Char. 21	to be deleted
Ad. 5	to read "Total leaf length is the length including the leaf blade and leaf sheath."

Ad. 9	to read “Rhizomes can be observed at the bottom of the stem. Absent or weak development of rhizomes is assessed when no rhizome development or rhizome primordia can be observed with a magnifying glass. Medium development of rhizomes is assessed when few and short rhizomes are observed. Strong development of rhizomes is assessed when abundant and long rhizomes are observed.”
Ad. 10	B to read “The date of heading is the date at which the average plot stage DC 54 has been reached. This date should – if necessary – be obtained by interpolation.”
Ad. 1	to read “The ploidy of the plant should be determined by standard cytological methods”
Ad. 12 and 13	to read “... Length should be measured to an accuracy of at least 1mm from the tip of the leaf blade to the leaf sheath. Width should be measured to an accuracy of at least 0.5 mm at the widest point of the leaf blade.”
Ad. 15, 16, 17	Char. 15 explanation to be moved to separate explanation.
Ad. 19, 20, 21	to be deleted
8.3	to read “ ... This decimal code is in close conformity with the BBCH-code (Meier, 1997).” and DC 68+ line to be deleted
9	to add references for cytological methods and statistical methods (as for Test Guidelines for Ryegrass)
TQ 1	blank row between 1.5.1 and 1.5.2 to be deleted
TQ 4.2	text to be deleted
TQ 6	example to be provided

32. The subgroup agreed that the Test Guidelines for Fescues should be proposed for adoption by the TC in 2006, subject to agreement by correspondence of the example varieties. The leading expert was requested to supply the necessary example varieties to the Office by November 30, 2005. The Office would circulate the proposals to the TWA by mid-December 2005 with a deadline for comments of mid-January 2006 and, in the absence of objections, the Test Guidelines would be prepared for the forty-second session of the TC.

Tea (document TG/TEA(proj.1))

33. The subgroup discussed document TG/TEA(proj.1), presented by Mr. Chen Ruming and Mr. Yang Kun (China), and agreed the following:

General	additional species to be covered by the Test Guidelines are to be specified. An explanation of how to distinguish ornamental and other varieties to be provided.
Char. 2	to be indicated as QL. To read “Plant: position of first branching in relation to base”, with the states: at or very near (1); moderately above (2); far above (3)

Char. 3	to be indicated as QN
Char. 4	state 3 to read “open”
Char. 6	to be indicated as MG / VG. To read “Young shoot: time of beginning of first growth at ‘one and a bud’ stage”.
Char. 7	(+) to be deleted and to read “Young shoot: color of the second leaf at ‘two and a bud’ stage”
Char. 8	to be indicated as VG
Char. 9	to be indicated as VG and to have the states: weak (3); medium (5); strong (7)
Char. 12	to read “Young shoot: length of internode at middle third” and to be checked
Char. 13	to consider changing to: upwards (1); outwards (2); downwards (3)
Char. 16	to consider changing to length/width ratio
Char. 17	(+) to be deleted and example varieties to be provided
Char. 19	to read “Leaf blade: texture of upper surface” and state 3 to read “strongly rugose”. To review the states to see if there is a clear cut-off between smooth slightly rugose (i.e. qualitative characteristic) or if it is a quantitative characteristic.
Char. 20	to have the states: acuminate (1); narrow acute (2); broad acute (3); obtuse (4) and illustrations to be amended. To be checked.
Char. 21	to have the states: absent or very weak (1); medium (2); strong (3)
Char. 22	to check if there are different types of serration (denticulate, crenulate, serrulate)
Char. 23	state 1 to read “attenuate”. To be checked.
Char. 24	to have the states: weak (3); medium (5); strong (7)
Char. 25	to read “Time of beginning of flowering” and to be moved after Char. 40
Char. 27	to replace “exterior” with “outer”
Char. 28	to check if this is a qualitative characteristic
Char. 29	to read “Flower: diameter”
Char. 31	(+) to be added with an explanation of which is the largest petal
Char. 32	to check if should be inner petal or inner side of petal. (+) to be deleted.
Char. 34	to have the states: absent or very weak (1); medium (2); strong (3)
Char. 36	state 1 to read “very few”
Char. 38	to read “Flower: position of stigma relative to stamens”, with the states: below (1); same level (2); above (3)
Char. 39	to be deleted
Char. 40	to be deleted

8.1 (c)	line indicating “5mm” to be deleted
Ad. 2	order of illustrations to be reversed
Ad. 3	new illustration to be provided
Ad. 7	to be deleted
Ad. 17	to be deleted
Ad. 30	to be amended or to be deleted
Ad. 36	illustration to be improved
Ad. 38	to be amended

TGP Documents

34. The Office of the Union introduced documents TWA/34/3 and TC/41/5 Add.

Revision of TGP/7/1 “Development of Test Guidelines”

35. The TWA agreed that the proposal, contained in document TWA/34/3, paragraph 14 (b), to amend GN 20 should be clarified concerning the reference to “one or more fixed states” for quantitative characteristics.

36. The TWA agreed that, with regard to any future revision of TGP/7/1, consideration should be given to introducing deadlines for the submission of non-final draft Test Guidelines to the Technical Working Parties.

37. It was agreed that, as a part of the revision of TGP/7/1, the wording of the methods of observation (MG, MS, VG, VS) should be amended according to the wording agreed for TGP/9 (see document TGP/9 Draft 4: Section 4.1.2).

38. It was clarified that any proposals developed by the Technical Working Parties for revisions to document TGP/7/1 would be put forward for consideration by the TC.

(a) *TGP documents to which the TC has given highest priority:*

*TGP/4/1 Constitution and Management of Variety Collections
(document TGP/4/1 Draft 4)*

39. The TWA discussed documents TGP/4/1 Draft 4 and TWA/34/3, Annex 1, and agreed to propose the following:

2.1.1.2	it was agreed that types of varieties identified by breeders in the Technical Questionnaire should be included. The TWA also agreed that the section should be reviewed to ensure coherence with TGP/9/1 Draft 4 sections 2.1 and 2.2.
---------	--

2.1.1.4	the TWA noted that the change of wording proposed by the TWO would result in a narrower scope of varieties covered and it was agreed to propose that the wording be retained unchanged
2.2	the TWA noted that there was a need for TGP/3 “Varieties of Common Knowledge” to provide guidance on a variety whose <u>existence</u> is a matter of common knowledge, in order to assist in addressing varieties for which living plant material no longer existed.
3.1.2.1.1	it was agreed that the row in the table for authorities responsible for the official register should be deleted, on the basis that that was not a frequent source of material. However, it was proposed to add a note after the table indicating that such authorities could be a source of material in some circumstances, e.g. where the PBR authority in that territory did not maintain a variety collection. It was agreed that the term “official register” should be explained to ensure that it was not confused with the PBR system.

TGP/9/1 Examining Distinctness (document TGP/9/1 Draft 4)

40. The TWA discussed documents TGP/9/1 Draft 4, TWA/34/3, Annex 2, and TWA/34/7 and agreed to propose the following:

Schematic overview	to add an item for basic legal aspects within the box of items for TGP/4 “Constitution of Variety Collections”
General	(a) to separate the underlying principles involved in the examinations of distinctness and guidance and information on the practical assessment. With regard to the practical guidance, to provide an overview of the following cases: where statistical based methods are used routinely (e.g. COYD); small trials comprising side-by-side comparisons without statistical analysis; and cases where tools such as GAIA are used to manage large variety collections and large trials. (b) to review the use of the term “type of variety” for consistency throughout the document
Section 2 Introduction	the TWA noted the proposal of the TWF for consideration to be given to the addition of “The most important consideration in selecting varieties for inclusion in the growing trial is the identification of the most similar varieties of common knowledge. Once identified, at least the most similar varieties should be included in the variety collection and the growing trial. Other similar varieties may be excluded on the basis of grouping characteristics”. However, it urged caution at the use of the term “most similar varieties” in a way which could cause confusion with the use of the term “similar variety” elsewhere and, in particular, its use in Section 6 of the Technical Questionnaire and in the UPOV Variety Description (see document TGP/5 “Experience and Cooperation in DUS Testing” Section 6: 16)
2.1	to be reviewed to be more coherent with TGP/4, sections 2.1.1.2 and 2.1.1.3 and to update the reference

2.2	the TWA supported the proposals reported in TWA/34/3 for examples of grouping using quantitative characteristics to be used and for more realistic examples showing that grouping could be more complex.
2.2.2.2	with regard to the TWF proposal concerning the use of Technical Questionnaire characteristics for non-grouping purposes, it was agreed that an example would be useful
2.3	the TWA agreed that the use of the term “Phenotypic distance” to exclusively describe combined distances from several characteristics should be avoided, because phenotypic distance could also be applicable at the individual characteristic level, e.g. a difference in notes. The experts from France were invited to develop a suitable term which would indicate a combined or global phenotypic distance obtained by combining information across characteristics.
2.3.1	<p>The TWA considered document TWA/34/7 in conjunction with section 2.3.1.</p> <p>It was agreed that the introduction in 2.3.1 should be revised by the experts from France and should clarify that, in the context of that section, the (combined / global) phenotypic distance was proposed for excluding varieties from the growing trial and organizing the growing trial (see document TWA/34/7, paragraph 7, sentences 2 and 3). Use of the approach for a decision on distinctness (see document TWA/34/7, paragraph 7, sentence 1) should be considered under the relevant section. It was also agreed that it would be useful to indicate the circumstances where the (combined / global) phenotypic distance would be most useful e.g. for self-pollinated varieties where there were a large number of varieties included in the growing trial.</p> <p>The experts from France were invited to produce a revised version of 2.3.1 on the basis of TWA/34/7 and the comments made at the session.</p>
2.3.2.1	it was agreed that the detailed aspects of the methodology of GAIA in section 2.3.2.1 should be combined with the details provided in TGP/8/1 Draft 1 section 7 and should be provided as an Annex to TGP/9 or in TGP/8, if the title and content of TGP/8 was revised in an appropriate way (see comments on TGP/8/1 Draft 1 below).
3.3.1.3	to be redrafted to cover the use of different locations to observe specific characteristics e.g. winter hardiness
3.3.3.2	to be redrafted with the assistance of TWA experts, including in particular experts from Australia, France and the United Kingdom. To address aspects such as: the need to develop rules for decisions on distinctness according to the features of the crop concerned; the risk of calculating averages for descriptions produced in different locations; and the importance of a final description produced at a single location (with exceptions for specific characteristics observed in separate growing tests – see comments to 3.3.1.3).
3.5	to introduce a new sub-section to cover the use of randomized trials as an alternative to organizing the growing trial so that similar varieties are grouped together

4.	<p>To provide an introduction explaining the importance of suitable training to ensure reliable and accurate observation of characteristics (both measurements and visual observations).</p> <p>To explain the relationship and difference between the observation of characteristics for distinctness, uniformity and description purposes.</p>
4.1.2	to add a sentence after the definitions stating “For observations of a group of plants (MG, VG), the single record may be obtained from either a single observation or by combining several observations.”. TGP/7 to be amended according to the wording agreed for TGP/9.
4.1.5	Example 1 to refer to “several visual observation” and a check made throughout the document to ensure that “observation” was not used where “visual observation” was intended. Example 2 to be replaced by the measurement of plant height
4.1.5.2	to be deleted
4.1.7	to add “single,” before “individual plants” for consistency with the definitions of VS and MS.
4.2.1.2	to be revised and moved to the beginning of section 4 (see proposal above). To consider wording such as “Where they fulfill the requirements for the examination of DUS, visual observations may be used. They are generally quicker and cheaper but require experience and training if repeatability between observers is to be achieved”
4.2.3	to replace the word “normal” with “common”
4.3	<p>To delete references to distinctness and uniformity in the examples (see proposal for 4. above).</p> <p>To replace the current examples taken from actual Test Guidelines with anonymous examples for the same characteristics, to avoid the need for on-going revisions.</p>
5. Title	title to read “Assessing distinctness based on the growing trial”
5.3 Title	title to read “Assessing distinctness on quantitative characteristics (QN) characteristics”
5.3	to be restructured to reflect the fact that a direct comparison may be done by visual observation, by notes or by measurement. For visual observation (section 5.3.2.1) to refer to side-by-side comparison in the growing trial.
5.3.2.2.1	to elaborate how the text of the General Introduction, referring to the explanation in TGP/9, is addressed
5.3.3	to refer to “statistics” in the title
5.3.4	it was noted that the term “minimum distance” was used in relation to the COYD criterion but was not used in relation to distinctness based on a difference of two notes. In respect of two notes for quantitative characteristics representing a minimum distance, it was recalled that varieties could be concluded to be distinct on the basis of a side-by-side comparison in a growing trial, notwithstanding the fact that there might be less than two notes difference in the descriptions (see TGP/9, section 5.3.4.2.1).

5.3.4.1, 5.3.4.3	in relation to the proposal of the TWO concerning the two note rule (document TWA/34/3, Annex 2, 5.3.4.1), the TWA agreed that section 5.3.4 should start by explaining that the notes for quantitative characteristics should be meaningful in relation to the range of variation of the characteristic and for the assessment of distinctness.
5.4	structure to be reviewed as for 5.3. To consider how to address the use of color charts.
5.5	to be moved to a new section with a title such as “tools for assisting the assessment of distinctness”
5.5.1.1	to be deleted
5.6	to be combined with section 4.2.3 to provide an overall summary of sections 4 and 5
6.4	to be moved to the new section “tools for assisting the assessment of distinctness”
6.3.6 (6.4.6)	to be revised to clarify that the involvement of the breeder is a possibility, but is not always required

TGP/10/1 Examining Uniformity (document TGP/10/1 Draft 1)

41. The TWA considered documents TGP/10/1 Draft 1 and TWA/34/3, Annex 3, and agreed to propose the following:

General	(a) to identify the elements of TGP/10 which provide practical guidance and information for DUS examiners and those which concern statistical procedures (e.g. Sections 2.1.3 to 2.1.5, 3.1.7 and 3.1.9) and to consider moving the statistical procedures elements to TGP/8;
	(b) to include a section on how to observe characteristics for uniformity purposes and, in addition, to explain the relationship and difference between the observation of characteristics for distinctness, uniformity and description purposes, in the same way as proposed for TGP/9/1 section 4.
Section 2	to be moved after section 3

(b) *Other TGP documents:*

TGP/8 Use of Statistical Procedures in DUS Testing (document TGP/8/1 Draft 1)

42. The TWA considered documents TGP/8/1 Draft 1 and TWA/34/3, Annex 4, and agreed to propose the following:

General	(a) to separate the document into two sections: one containing the scientific principles underlying the statistical procedures used for DUS testing and another section containing practical guidance and tools. The title of document TGP/8 to be amended accordingly. The section on practical guidance should provide guidance on how to handle categorical data, e.g. using Chi square;
	(b) the TWA agreed that the provision of an overview of the TGP documents in TGP/1 (General Introduction with explanations), including a schematic overview similar to that in TGP/9, would be useful and would facilitate the modification of the titles of TGP/4, TGP/9 and TGP/12 without the need to amend the General Introduction (document TG/1/3).

TGP/12 Section 1.1 Characteristics Expressed in Response to External Factors: Introduction (document TGP/12 Section 1.1 Draft 1)

43. The TWA considered document TGP/12 Section 1.1 Draft 1 and agreed to propose the following:

General	(a) to amend the title of TGP/12 to clarify that TGP/12 only considers situations where external factors are deliberately used to develop characteristics for the examination of DUS and does not have the purpose to address external factors which distort the DUS examination;
	(b) to explain that, notwithstanding the fact that varieties may exhibit such traits, special tests for characteristics based on response to external factors do not need to be used where the routine characteristics resolve distinctness.

TGP/12 Section 1.2 Characteristics Expressed in Response to External Factors: Disease Resistance (document TGP/12 Section 1.2 Draft 4)

44. The TWA considered document TGP/12 Section 1.2 Draft 4 and agreed to propose the following:

General	(a) to focus the text more clearly on issues concerning the examination of DUS, e.g. paragraphs 1 to 5 are not of direct relevance in the context of a TGP document;
	(b) to address the states of expression for disease resistance characteristics and, in particular, how to present disease resistance when expressed in a quantitative way;

	(c) paragraph 6 and subsequent paragraphs to be aligned with the criteria for a characteristic set out in the General Introduction: document TG/1/3, Chapter 4, section 4.6.1 and the particular considerations set out in document TGP/12 Section 1.1 Draft 1.
--	---

TGP/12 Section 1.3 Draft 3: Characteristics expressed in response to external factors: chemical response

45. The TWA considered document TGP/12 Section 1.3 Draft 3, introduced by Mr. Tanvir Hossain (Australia), and agreed to propose the following:

General	to provide only a very brief overview of plant growth regulators, in accordance with the clarification that TGP/12 only considers situations where external factors are deliberately used to develop characteristics for the examination of DUS and does not have the purpose to address external factors which distort the DUS examination.
2.4.1	to replace “table grape variety ‘Thompson Seedless’” with “table grape ‘Thompson Seedless’”.
3.2	to be revised to reflect the fact that response to plant growth regulators could, in certain circumstances, be used as a characteristic if the requirements set out in TGP/12 Section 1.1 were fulfilled.

TGP/13 Draft 3: Guidance for New Types and Species (document TGP/13 Draft 3)

46. The TWA considered document TGP/13 Draft 3, introduced by an expert from the European Community, and agreed to propose the following:

2.2	it was noted that, particularly for new genera and species, a Technical Questionnaire may not exist and that the section should refer to information provided by the breeder.
2.2.1	to include the need for information on the genus or species for the variety
2.5.3 (c)	to consider introducing an indication of the need to set a reasonable minimum level of uniformity with regard to distinctness of later candidate varieties. It was noted that a report on the issue of setting appropriate standards for new varieties had been published by Australia, which might prove helpful for future drafting.

(c) Program for the development of TGP documents

47. The TWA discussed the program for the development of TGP documents set out in document TC/41/5 Add. and proposed that the program be amended to allow an opportunity for the TWA to see new drafts of TGP/9/1, TGP/10/1, TGP/8/1 and TGP/13/1 at its thirty-fifth session in 2006. The TWA noted that TGP/10/1 Draft 1 was more advanced in its development than TGP/9/1 Draft 4 and that an early adoption of the document would be welcome, but also

noted that there were practical advantages to adopting TGP/9, TGP/10 and possibly TGP/8 at the same time.

UPOV Information Databases

48. The TWA considered document TWA/34/4 and received a report on the plans for the launch of the GENIE database on the UPOV website.

49. The TWA agreed that the participants at the session would check the UPOV code amendments as set out in the appropriate versions of Annex V of document TWA/34/4 for their authority and send any comments to the Office. It was explained that the Office would inform the experts when the spreadsheets on the website had been updated and when the checking could begin, together with a deadline for comments. It was noted that the UPOV codes to be checked by countries which did not have participants at the TWA session would be checked by at least one participant at the TWA session.

Variety Denomination Classes

50. The TWA considered document TWA/34/5. The TWA noted the information from International Seed Federation (ISF) that commercial mixtures could contain varieties of species from both classes 203 and 204. However, the TWA did not agree that it would be appropriate to amend the proposals for classes 203 and 204, contained in TWA/34/5, Annex II, Part II. The expert from Australia expressed concern with regard to variety denomination classes based on seed mixtures. The proposal to delete the class for Helianthus and the proposal for two classes within Brassica (1.1 Brassica oleracea and 1.2 other Brassica) were agreed.

Project to Consider the Publication of Variety Descriptions

51. The TWA considered documents TWA/34/6 and TWA/34/13.

52. The TWA received presentations from Mr. Gerhard Deneken (Denmark), Coordinator for the Model Study for Barley, and Mr. Henk Bonthuis (Netherlands), Joint Coordinator for the Model Study for Potato, copies of which it was agreed should be produced as an Addendum to document TWA/34/13.

53. The TWA noted that caution was needed in the interpretation of the scatter diagrams included in the presentations. In particular, it was recalled that the points in the scatter diagrams became less meaningful where there were only small numbers of variety comparisons and the effects could be due to chance.

54. The TWA concluded that the model studies indicated that published variety descriptions might be used in a limited way for selecting varieties for inclusion in the growing trial but, in order to use such an approach, it was important for the user of the descriptions to have a detailed knowledge of the level of harmonization of variety descriptions in relation to the descriptions to be used and to understand the basis for variation in variety descriptions. If that condition was not fulfilled, there was a risk of making a wrong assessment of distinctness. With regard to possible improvements in other relevant aspects of UPOV's work, it was agreed that the use of ringtests and the use of example varieties was important with regard to the calibration of

descriptions and that quality control measures were valuable in improving harmonization. It was considered that, at the UPOV level, the development of tools such as CD-ROMs containing photographs could enhance the understanding of the characteristics used in the Test Guidelines and thereby reduce observer error.

Project for Exchanging Seed of Selected Varieties Between Interested Countries

55. The TWA received a report from the expert from Japan who explained that the project concerning the exchange of seed of varieties of rice had, as reported at the previous session, been completed. The TWA was informed of developments concerning ringtests involving various members of the Union.

Development of Regional Sets of Example Varieties for the Test Guidelines for Rice

56. The TWA noted document TWA/34/12, introduced by the expert from Japan. It heard that a new document would be produced for the thirty-fifth session by experts from China, Japan or the Republic of Korea.

Recommendations on draft Test Guidelines

(a) Test Guidelines to be put forward for adoption by the TC

57. The TWA agreed that the draft Test Guidelines below would be sent to the TC for adoption at its forty-second session, to be held in Geneva in April 2006, on the basis of the specified documents, with the amendments and actions presented in this document:

Hop	TG/HOP(proj.2 Rev.)
Medics	TG/MEDICS(proj.3)
Ryegrass (Revision)	TG/4/8 (proj.2)
Sheep's Fescue, Red Fescue and other Fescues (Revision)	TG/67/5(proj.2)

58. It was noted that the Office would incorporate the amendments specified in this document in order to prepare the draft Test Guidelines for the TC. The leading experts noted that they were not required to submit revised draft Test Guidelines, but were required to provide the Office with all the information necessary for the document to be finalized.

(b) Test Guidelines to be discussed at the next session

59. The TWA agreed to revise the characteristics proposed for Sweetcorn, as set out in document TWA/34/11, and to integrate them in the Test Guidelines for Maize. It was agreed that there was a need for a full revision of TG/2/6 covering the table of characteristics and the description of protein characteristics in the Annex. The TWA was informed that a ringtest for protein characteristics had been performed by experts from France, Spain and Germany in 2005. The ringtest would be continued to clarify some open questions during November 2005.

Interested experts were invited to indicate their interest in participating in that laboratory ringtest to the leading expert by the end of 2005.

60. The TWA decided to discuss the following draft Test Guidelines at its next session:

- Common Millet
- Coffee
- Festulolium (Festuca / Lolium hybrids)
- Grain Amaranth
- Lotus
- Maize
- Peas
- Pearl Millet
- Sesame
- Sweet potato
- Tea

61. The leading experts, interested experts and timetables for the development of the Test Guidelines are set out in Annex II.

Date and Place of the Next Session

62. At the invitation of the experts from China, the TWA agreed to hold its thirty-fifth session in China, with a provisional date set for July 3 to 7, 2006.

Future Program

63. The TWA heard that the Republic of Korea had written to UPOV confirming its interest to host a future session of the TWA.

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

1. Opening of the Session
2. Adoption of the agenda
3. Short reports on developments in plant variety protection
 - (a) Reports from members and observers (oral reports by the participants)
 - (b) Reports on developments within UPOV (oral report by the Office of the Union)
4. Molecular Techniques

5. TGP documents
6. UPOV Information Databases
7. Project to consider the publication of variety descriptions
8. Project for exchanging seed of selected varieties between interested countries
9. Development of regional sets of example varieties for the Test Guidelines for Rice
10. Discussion on draft Test Guidelines (Subgroups)
11. Recommendations on draft Test Guidelines
12. Date and place of the next session
13. Future program
14. Report on the session (if time permits)
15. Closing of the session

Visit

65. On the afternoon of November 2, 2005, the TWA made technical visits to: Crop and Food Research, Canterbury Agriculture and Science Centre (CASC), Lincoln, where it received presentations from Mr. Bill Griffin on the Crop and Food Research breeding and variety development programs, and from Ms. Gail Timmerman-Vaughan on the application of molecular technologies to breeding and use for germplasm and variety identification; Lincoln Research Farms, where a visit was made to the DUS trials for ryegrass and clover, guided by Ms. Jenny Jebson, Examiner for Agricultural and Vegetable Crops, Plant Variety Rights Office; and AgResearch Research Farm where Mr. Lester Fletcher made a presentation on their breeding program for ryegrass endophyte and Mr. Shaun Monk provided a tour of the seed multiplication unit.

66. The TWA adopted this report at the close of the session.

[Annexes follow]

ANNEX I

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

I. MEMBERS

ARGENTINA

Marcelo LABARTA, Director de Registro de Variedades, Instituto Nacional de Semillas (INASE), Paseo Colón 922, 3 piso, of. 347, 1063 Buenos Aires (tel.: +54 11 4349 2445 fax: +54 11 4349 2444 e-mail: mlabar@mecon.gov.ar)

AUSTRALIA

Tanvir HOSSAIN, Examiner, Plant Breeder's Rights Office, IP Australia, P.O. Box 200, Woden, ACT 2606 (tel.: +61 2 6283 7984 fax: +61 2 6283 7999 e-mail: tanvir.hossain@ipaaustralia.gov.au)

BRAZIL

Luís Gustavo ASP PACHECO, Federal Agricultural Inspector, Ministerio da Agricultura, Esplanada dos Ministerios, Bloco D, Anexo A 2 andar, sala 250, 70043-900 Brasilia, D.F. DF (tel.: +55 61 321 82549 fax: +55 61 3224 2842 e-mail: luispacheco@agricultura.gov.br)

CANADA

Michael BURVILL, Examiner, Plant Breeders' Rights Office, Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA), Camelot Court, 59 Camelot Drive, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0Y9 (tel.: +1 613 225 2342 fax: +1 613 228 6629 e-mail: burvillme@inspection.gc.ca)

Valerie SISSON (Ms.), Commissioner, Plant Breeders' Rights Office, Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA), 59 Camelot Drive, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0Y9 (tel.: +1 613 225 2342 fax: +1 613 228 6629 e-mail: vsisson@inspection.gc.ca)

CHINA

CHEN Rumeng, Division Director, Plant Variety Protection Office, Ministry of Agriculture, Building 20, Maizidian Street, Chaoyang District, Beijing 100026 (tel.: +86 10 65921326 fax: +86 10 65923176 e-mail: cnpvp@agri.gov.cn)

YANG Kun, Management of DUS testing, DUS Testing Center for the PVP, Ministry of Agriculture, Building 18, Mai Zi Dian Street, Chao Yang District, 100026 Beijing (tel.: +86 10 65922934 fax: +86 10 65925213 e-mail: yang_kun1978@263.net)

YANG Yang (Ms.), Examiner, Office for Protection of New Varieties of Plants, Ministry of Agriculture, Building 20, Mai Zi Dian Street, Chao Yang District, Beijing 100026 (tel.: +86 10 659 25051 fax: +86 10 659 23176 e-mail: yangyang@agri.gov.cn)

YANG Xuhong (Mrs.), Office for the Protection of New Varieties of Plants, Ministry of Agriculture, Building 20, Maizidan Street, Beijing 100026 (tel.: +86 10 659 26315
fax: +86 10 659 23176 e-mail: yangxuhong@agri.gov.cn)

CZECH REPUBLIC

Radmila SAFARIKOVA (Mrs.), Dept. of DUS Tests, Central Institute for Supervising and Testing in Agriculture (UKZUZ), Hroznová 2, 656 06 Brno (tel.: +420 543 548221
fax: +420 543 212440 e-mail: radmila.safarikova@ukzuz.cz)

DENMARK

Gerhard DENEKEN, Head, Department of Variety Testing, Danish Institute of Agricultural Sciences, Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Fisheries, Postbox 7, Teglvaerksvej 10, Tystofte, 4230 Skaelskoer (tel.: +45 58 16 0601 fax: +45 58 160606
e-mail: gerhard.deneken@agrsci.dk)

EUROPEAN COMMUNITY

Jacques GENNATAS, Chef de secteur, Direction Générale Santé et Protection des Consommateurs, Commission européenne, 232, rue Belliard, Office: B.232-9/4, 1040 Brussels (tel.: +32 2 295 9713 fax: +32 2 296 9399 e-mail: jacques.gennatas@cec.eu.int)

Dirk THEOBALD, Head of the Technical Unit, Community Plant Variety Office (CPVO), 3, boulevard Maréchal Foch, B.P. 62141, 49021 Angers Cedex 02 (tel.: +33 2 4125 6442
fax: +33 2 4125 6410 e-mail: theobald@cpvo.eu.int)

Anne WEITZ (Mrs.), Expert for Agricultural Crops, Community Plant Variety Office (CPVO), BP 62141, 49021 Angers Cedex 2 (tel.: +33 241 256 437 fax: +33 241 256 410
e-mail: weitz@cpvo.eu.int)

FINLAND

Kaarina PAAVILAINEN (Ms.), Senior Officer, KTTK Seed Testing Department, Plant Production Inspection Centre, P.O. Box 111, 32201 Loimaa (tel.: +358 20 7725 370
fax: +358 20 7725 317 e-mail: kaarina.paavilainen@kttk.fi)

FRANCE

Françoise BLOUET (Madame), Directeur de la coordination nationale du secteur Étude des Variétés, Groupe d'étude et de contrôle des variétés et des semences (GEVES), La Minière, 78285 Guyancourt Cedex (tel.: +33 1 3083 3582 fax: +33 1 3083 3539
e-mail: francoise.blouet@geves.fr)

GERMANY

Rudolf BECHER, Bundessortenamt, Pruefstelle Hassloch, Boehler Str. 100, 67454 Hassloch (tel.: +49 63 24 92 40 11 fax: +49 63 24 92 40 30
e-mail: rudolf.becher@bundessortenamt.de)

Beate RÜCKER (Frau), Referatsleiterin DUS-Prüfung, Bundessortenamt, Postfach 61 04 40,
30604 Hannover (tel.: +49 511 956 6639 fax: +49 511 5633 62
e-mail: beate.ruecker@bundessortenamt.de)

HUNGARY

Ferenc KOVÁCS, National Institute for Agricultural Quality Control (OMMI),
Keleti K. u. 24, Budapest (e-mail: kovacs@ommi.hu)

JAPAN

Masashi NOTO, Seeds and Seedlings Division, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries,
1-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 100-8950 (tel.: +81 3 3592 0305
fax: +81 3 3502 6572 e-mail: masashi_noto2@nm.maff.go.jp)

KENYA

Evans O. SIKINYI, Manager, Plant Variety Rights Office, Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate
Service (KEPHIS), P.O. Box 49592-00100, Oloolua Ridge, Karen, Nairobi
(tel.: +254 020 884545 fax: +254 020 882265 e-mail: esikinyi@kephis.org)

MEXICO

Aquiles CARBALLO, Professor-Investigator, Colegio de Postgraduados (CP), Km. 36.5
Carretera México-Texcoco, Montecillo, Texcoco, Edo de Mexico 56230
(tel.: +52 55 5804 5900 ext. 1552 fax: +52 55 5804 5962 e-mail: acc1@prodigy.net.mx)

NETHERLANDS

Henk BONTHUIS, Technical Liaison Officer, Board of Plant Breeders' Rights/Wageningen UR,
Dutch Plant Variety Office, Postbox 16, 6700 AA Wageningen (tel.: +31 317 47 68 23
fax: +31 317 423 110 e-mail: henk.bonthuis@wur.nl)

Lysbeth HOF (Mrs.), Scientist, CGN-Plant Variety Research, P.O. Box 16, 6700 AA
Wageningen (tel.: +31 317 477 236 fax: +31 317 423 110 e-mail: lysbeth.hof@wur.nl)

NEW ZEALAND

Christopher J. BARNABY, Assistant Commissioner of Plant Variety Rights / Examiner of Fruit
and Ornamental Varieties, New Zealand Plant Variety Rights Office (PVRO), Private Bag 4714,
Christchurch 8001 (tel.: +64 3 962 6206 fax: +64 3 962 6202
e-mail: chris.barnaby@pvr.govt.nz)

Jennifer JEBSON (Ms.), Plant Variety Rights Office, Private Bag 4714, Christchurch
(tel.: +64 4 560 1622 fax: +64 4 560 1691 e-mail: jennifer.jebson@pvr.govt.nz)

Maitland MALTBY, Assistant Commissioner of Plant Variety Rights, Plant Variety Rights
Office, Private Bag 4714, Christchurch (tel.: +64 4 560 1624 fax: +64 4 560 1619
e-mail: maitland.maltby@iponz.govt.nz)

Jeff E. MILLER, IP Manager, Grasslanz Technology Limited, Private Bag 11008, Palmerston North 5301 (tel.: +64 6 3518027 fax: +64 6 3518240 e-mail: Jeff.miller@grasslanz.com)

REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Chan-Woong PARK, Variety Testing Division, National Seed Management Office, 233-1, Mangpo-dong, Yeong Tong-gu, Suwon-si, Gyeonggi-do, Suwon 442-400 (tel.: +82 31 273 4146, fax: + 82 31 203 243, e-mail: chwopark@seed.go.kr)

Choi Su YONG, National Seed Management Office, West Branch 109t-41, Seokcheon-ri, Nangson-Myun, Iksan-si, chunlabuk-do (tel.: +82 63 862 1661 fax: +82 63 862 0069 e-mail: choisy@seed.go.kr)

SOUTH AFRICA

Robyn HIERSE (Ms.), Department of Agriculture, Genetic Resources, Private Bag X5044, Stellenbosch 7599 (tel.: +27 21 809 1655 fax: +27 21 887 2264 e-mail: robynh@nda.agric.za and hierse@absamail.co.za)

M. SCHAFFNER, Department of Agriculture, Genetic Resources, P/Bag X 11, Gezina 0031, Pretoria (tel.: +27 12 808 5386 fax: +27 12 808 5386 e-mail: variety.control@nda.agric.za)

SWEDEN

Gunnar KARLTORP, Head of Office, National Plant Variety Board, Box 1247, 171 24 Solna (tel.: +46 8 783 1260 fax: +46 8 833 170 e-mail: karltorp@svn.se)

Ulf KJELLSTRÖM, Swedish Seed Testing and Certification Institute (Statens Utsädeskontroll), Onsjövägen, 26881 Svalöv (tel.: +46 418 667 420 fax: +46 418 667 408 e-mail: ulf.kjellstrom@su-kontroll.se)

UKRAINE

Oleksandr M. GONCHAR, Director, Ukrainian Institute for Plant Variety Examination, 15, Henerala Rodimtseva str., 03041 Kyiv (tel.: +380 44 2579933 fax: +380 44 257 9963 e-mail: sops@sops.gov.ua)

Oleh SLYVCHENKO, Leading expert, State Service on Right Protection for Plant Varieties, Ukrainian Institute for Plant Variety Examination, 16, Henerala Rudimtseva vul., 03041 Kyiv (tel.: +380 44 257 9933 fax: +380 44 257 9963 e-mail: sops@sops.gov.ua)

UNITED KINGDOM

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)

Robert J. COOKE, Head, Variety and Seeds Group, NIAB, Huntingdon Road, Cambridge CB3 0LE (tel.: +44 1223 342 331 fax: +44 1223 277 602 e-mail: robert.cooke@niab.com)

II. OBSERVER

INTERNATIONAL SEED FEDERATION (ISF)

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

Alan STEWART, International Seed Federation (ISF), PGGWrightson, PO Box 3100,
Christchurch 8015, New Zealand (tel.: +64 3 3490723 fax: +64 3 3490721
e-mail: astewart@pggwrightson.co.nz)

III. OFFICE OF UPOV

Peter BUTTON, Technical Director, 34, chemin des Colombettes, 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland
(tel. +41-22-338 8672, fax +41-22-733 03 36, e-mail: peter.button@upov.int,
website: <http://www.upov.int>)

[Annex II follows]

ANNEX II

LIST OF LEADING EXPERTS

**DRAFT TEST GUIDELINES TO BE SUBMITTED
TO THE TECHNICAL COMMITTEE IN 2006**

All requested information to be submitted to the Office of the Union

before December 16, 2005**

Test Guidelines	Document	Leading expert(s)
Hop	TG/HOP(proj.2 Rev.)	Beate Rücker (DE)
Medics (Medicago spp. other than M. sativa)	TG/MEDICS (proj.3)	Robyn Hierse (ZA)
Ryegrass (Revision)	TG/4/8(proj.2)	Michael Camlin (GB)
Sheep's Fescue, Red Fescue and other Fescues (Revision)	TG/67/5(proj.2)	Henk Bonthuis (NL)

** The TWA agreed that for Medic, Ryegrass and Sheep's Fescue the Test Guidelines should be proposed for adoption by the Technical Committee in 2006, subject to agreement by correspondence of certain points, including example varieties to be provided. The respective leading experts were requested to supply the necessary information to the Office by **November 30, 2005**. The Office would circulate the proposals to the TWA by mid-December 2005 with a deadline for comments of mid-January 2006 and, in the absence of objections, the Test Guidelines would be prepared for the forty-second session of the TC.

POSSIBLE "FINAL" DRAFT TEST GUIDELINES
TO BE DISCUSSED AT TWA/35

before May 19, 2006

**(Guideline date for Subgroup draft to be circulated by Leading Expert: March 17, 2006
Guideline date for comments to Leading Expert by Subgroup: April 21, 2006)**

Species	Basic Document	Leading expert(s)	Interested experts (countries) ¹
Common Millet	TG/COM_MIL (proj.3)	Maksym Melnychuk (UA)	AT, DE, FR, HU, MX, RU, ZA.
Grain Amaranth	TG/AMARAN (proj.4)	Aquiles Carballo Carballo (MX)	BR, HU, JP, ZA
Lotus	TG/193/1(proj.3)	Carlos Gómez (UY)	AT, DE, FR, GB, NZ
Pearl Millet	TG/PRL_MIL (proj.2)	Luís Gustavo Asp Pacheco (BR)	AT, ES, FR, KE, MX, UA, RU.

¹ for name of experts, see List of Participants

DRAFT TEST GUIDELINES TO BE DISCUSSED AT TWA/35

New draft to be submitted to the Office of the Union

before May 19, 2006

(Guideline date for Subgroup draft to be circulated by Leading Expert: March 17, 2006

Guideline date for comments to Leading Expert by Subgroup: April 21, 2006)

Species	Basic Document	Leading expert(s)	Interested experts (countries) ¹
Coffee	TG/COFFEE (proj.3 Rev.)	Luís Gustavo Asp Pacheco (BR)	KE, MX
Festulolium (Festuca / Lolium hybrids)	TG/FESTL(proj.1)	Michael Camlin (GB)	AR, CZ, DE, DK, FR, HU, NL, NZ, QZ, ZA
Maize	TG/2/6 + Corr.	Joel Guiard (FR) / Tamás Harangozó (HU ²)	AR, AT, BR ² , CN, CZ, DE ² , ES, KE, KR, MX, NL, PL, QZ, SK, UA, ZA ²
Peas	TG/7/10(proj.2)	Mr. Niall Green (GB) TWV	DE, DK, ES, FI, FR, GB, HU, NZ, QZ
Sesame	TG/SESAME (proj.1)	Baruch Bar-Tel (IL)	BR, CN, JP, KR
Sweet potato (Ipomoea batatas (L.) Lam.)	new	Choi Su Yong (KR)	NZ, JP
Tea	TG/TEA(proj.1)	Lin Xiangming (CN)/ Evans O. Sikinyi (KE) (joint leading experts)	BR, JP, KR

[End of Annex II and of document]

² Includes interest in sweetcorn