

Technical Working Party for Agricultural Crops

TWA/50/6

Fiftieth Session

Arusha, United Republic of Tanzania, June 21 to 25, 2021

Original: English

Date: June 21, 2021

COMMENTS ON GUIDANCE AND INFORMATION MATERIALS

Document prepared by the Office of the Union

Disclaimer: this document does not represent UPOV policies or guidance

1. The purpose of this document is to report the comments on guidance and information materials made by the Technical Working Party for Vegetables (TWV)¹ and the Technical Working Party for Ornamental Crops and Forest Trees (TWO)² at their sessions in 2021.

2. The structure of this document is as follows:

DOCUMENTS FOR ADOPTION IN 2021	1
Review of document UPOV/INF/17 "Guidelines for DNA-Profiling: Molecular Marker Selection and Database Construction ('BMT Guidelines')"	1
Development of document UPOV/INF/23 "UPOV Code System"	2
DOCUMENTS FOR ADOPTION AFTER 2021	2
Revision of document TGP/5 "Experience and cooperation in DUS testing", Section 6 "UPOV Report on Technical Examination and UPOV Variety Description"	2
Testing facility and location	2
Additional information to be included in DUS test reports	2
TGP/8 Trial Design and Techniques Used in the Examination of Distinctness, Uniformity and Stability (Revision)	3
(i) Data Processing for the Production of Variety Descriptions for Measured Quantitative Characteristics	3
The Combined-Over-Years Uniformity Criterion (COYU)	3

3. The following abbreviations are used in this document:

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

DOCUMENTS FOR ADOPTION IN 2021

Review of document UPOV/INF/17 "Guidelines for DNA-Profiling: Molecular Marker Selection and Database Construction ('BMT Guidelines')"

4. The TWV and TWO agreed with the revision of document UPOV/INF/17/1 on the basis of document UPOV/INF/17/2 Draft 5 and document TWP/5/7, Annex II (see documents TWV/55/16 "Report", paragraph 50 and TWO/53/11 "Report", paragraph 58).

¹ At its fifty-fifth session, hosted by Turkey and held via electronic means from May 3 to 7, 2021

² At its fifty-third session, hosted by the Netherlands and held via electronic means from June 7 to 11, 2021

Development of document UPOV/INF/23 “UPOV Code System”

73 The TWV and the TWO, at their sessions in 2021, agreed with the proposal for amending the UPOV code system to provide information on variety types, groups and denomination class, as set out in document UPOV/INF/23/1 Draft 2 (see documents TWV/55/16 “Report”, paragraph 73 and TWO/53/11 “Report”, paragraph 38).

DOCUMENTS FOR ADOPTION AFTER 2021

Revision of document TGP/5 “Experience and cooperation in DUS testing”, Section 6 “UPOV Report on Technical Examination and UPOV Variety Description”

5. The TWV and TWO considered document TWP/5/14.

Testing facility and location

6. The TWV and TWO agreed with the proposal to amend document TGP/5 Section 6, chapters “UPOV Report on Technical Examination” and “UPOV Variety Description”, as follows (see documents TWV/55/16 “Report”, paragraph 19 and TWO/53/11 “Report”, paragraph 19):

Chapter: UPOV Report on Technical Examination

13. Testing ~~station~~ facility(ies) and ~~place~~ location(s)

[...]

16. Date and document number of UPOV Test Guidelines

17. Date and/or document number of Reporting Authority’s test guidelines

Chapter: UPOV Variety Description

Item 11 to read “Testing ~~station~~ facility(ies) and ~~place~~ location(s)”

7. The TWO agreed that the term “testing facility” could better describe the situation when the authority utilizes breeders’ premises or other areas, in addition to officially run testing stations. The TWO agreed that the term “location” would not change the current requirement of providing the locality where examination was conducted.

8. The TWO noted the cross-references to “testing station” and “place” in document TGP/5 Section 6 and agreed to propose to update the document according to the new proposed wording (“Testing facility and location”) in Chapter “UPOV Variety Description”, items 16.2 and 18 (see document TWO/53/11 “Report”, paragraphs 20 and 21).

Additional information to be included in DUS test reports

9. The TWV and TWO considered the proposal to revise document TGP/5, Section 6 “UPOV Report on Technical Examination and UPOV Variety Description” to include additional information in DUS test reports.

10. The TWV agreed that the proposed additional information was not useful for individual DUS test reports and presented practical difficulties for reporting authorities. The TWV agreed that the proposed additional information should be provided through other means, such dedicated information platforms and specified in cooperation agreements, where appropriate (see document TWV/55/16 “Report”, paragraph 20).

11. The TWO agreed with the TWV that the proposed additional information was not useful for individual DUS test reports and presented practical difficulties for reporting authorities (see document TWO/53/11 “Report”, paragraphs 22 to 24).

12. The TWO considered whether alternative approaches to provide the desired information might be appropriate. The TWO agreed that authorities should communicate regarding varieties for inclusion in trials before commissioning examination or request further information for particular cases.

13. The TWO noted the comments from Australia and New Zealand that information on the most similar variety and differences from the candidate variety were important for utilizing existing DUS test reports. The TWO recalled that authorities were invited to provide this information in Item 16 of the “UPOV Variety Description”.

TGP/8 Trial Design and Techniques Used in the Examination of Distinctness, Uniformity and Stability (Revision)

(i) Data Processing for the Production of Variety Descriptions for Measured Quantitative Characteristics

14. The TWV and TWO considered document TWP/5/10 (see documents TWV/55/16 “Report”, paragraphs 21 to 24 and TWO/53/11 “Report”, paragraphs 25 to 28).

15. The TWV and TWO noted that the TC had agreed to invite the TC Chairperson in conjunction with the Office of the Union to develop proposals on next steps for developing guidance, to be presented to the TWPs and the TC at their sessions in 2021.

16. The TWV and TWO agreed with the inclusion of the guidance on “Different forms that variety descriptions could take and the relevance of scale levels” in document TGP/8 Part I Section 2 “Data to be recorded” as new Section 2.5.

17. The TWV and TWO agreed to invite members of the Union to propose the inclusion of software incorporating their methods for converting observations into notes in document UPOV/INF/16 or document UPOV/INF/22, as appropriate, with a reference to the availability of such methods in document TGP/8 Part I, new Section 2.5

The Combined-Over-Years Uniformity Criterion (COYU)

18. The TWV and TWO considered document TWP/5/11.

19. The TWV and TWO considered the proposed revision of document TGP/8, Section 9 “The Combined-Over-Years Uniformity Criterion (COYU);” on the basis of the draft presented in the Annexes to document TWP/5/11.

20. The TWV noted the report from the expert from the United Kingdom that DUS Centers in that country would evaluate the COYU Splines software on a range of crops in 2021 and that the COYU Splines method likely to be implemented from 2022. The TWV agreed to invite the United Kingdom to make a presentation at its fifty-sixth session to report on the evaluation of COYU Splines for any vegetable crops (see document TWV/55/16 “Report”, paragraphs 25 to 27).

21. The TWO recalled that COYU was not commonly used for ornamental plants (see document TWO/53/11 “Report”, paragraphs 30 and 31).

22. The TWO noted the report from the United Kingdom made at the TWV, at its fifty-third session, that DUS Centers in that country would evaluate the COYU Splines software on a range of crops in 2021 and that the COYU Splines method was likely to be implemented in 2022.

[End of document]