



TWF/31/12

ORIGINAL: English

DATE: December 1, 2000

INTERNATIONAL UNION FOR THE PROTECTION OF NEW VARIETIES OF PLANTS
GENEVA

**TECHNICAL WORKING PARTY
FOR
FRUIT CROPS**

**Thirty-First Session
Budapest, July 3 to 7, 2000**

REPORT

adopted by the Technical Working Party for Fruit Crops

Opening of the Session

1. The thirty-first session of the Technical Working Party for Fruit Crops (hereinafter referred to as “the Working Party”) was held in Budapest, Hungary, from July 3 to 7, 2000. The list of participants is presented in Annex I to this report.
2. Mr. József Rátkai, Head of Plant Variety Trials Department, National Institute for Agricultural Quality Control, Hungary, welcomed the participants to Budapest. The session was opened by Mr. József Harsányi (Hungary), Chairman of the Working Party.

Adoption of the Agenda

3. The Working Party adopted the agenda for its thirty-first session, which is reproduced in document TWF/31/1 Rev., after having agreed to slightly change the order of the items for discussion, to add an item for discussion of the proposal by the Tropical Fruit Net for cooperation, to delete the item on new multi and interspecific hybrids, as the document for it was not ready, and to delete Fig and Passion Fruit in item 12. The Working Party decided to include discussion on the Annex to Circular U 2976 in item 11. The Citrus, Prickly Pear

(Opuntia), Quince and Raspberry subgroups were to meet and reports for general discussion would be made to the Working Party.

4. The Working Party decided to continue to improve the distribution of documents by the Office of UPOV to the experts. As in some cases distribution by ordinary mail had been found rather slow, the Working Party supported the suggestion made by the Office to send documents by e-mail.

5. The UPOV official reminded the experts about the possibility of using the UPOV Website, where all documents concerning the Working Party were available in the restricted area. The password for the restricted area had been sent to the member State representatives on the UPOV Council.

Short Reports on New Developments in Member States in Plant Variety Protection in Fruit Species

6. The Working Party received short reports from the experts on recent developments in their countries. In the majority of member States the number of applications in fruit species was stable or had slightly decreased or increased. The expert from South Africa reported that some new scientific programs had been launched (e.g. seediness, extension of growing period). In some countries preparations for acceding to the 1991 Act of the UPOV Convention had been completed or were close to completion. The Republic of Korea and Romania intended to deposit their instruments of accession to the UPOV Convention in the year 2000. The expert from the CPVO reported on the project of evaluation of real costs for DUS-Testing, and it had been found out that current fees were smaller than real expenses. The CPVO tried to settle the problem by first subsidizing the Offices and then increasing the fees, which could influence the number of applications.

7. The UPOV official reported on new member States which had joined UPOV recently and on the latest changes in the structure of the Office itself as had been adopted by the Council of UPOV.

Questions on the Testing of Varieties of Fruit Species

8. The Working Party discussed the document prepared by the Chair on spare plants. This problem was rather important for testing in fruit species as planting material was comparatively expensive, more time was needed to establish the plot and there were some problems if the number of plants was not enough for performing the test (e.g. if the fruit tree had died). In some member States it was not a problem at all, as, for example, in Canada fruit trees were examined in commercial orchards where the number of plants was always sufficient. The expert from Germany explained that his Office asked for additional planting material to avoid the risk of the repetition of the test but it was voluntary for the applicant. The Working Party summarized its opinion as follows: in the Test Guidelines, the number of plants required for the test should be indicated as a minimal quantity, but the national authorities might ask for additional planting material if it were found necessary.

Important Decisions taken during the Previous Sessions of the Technical Working Party and the Technical Committee

9. The UPOV official presented a brief report on the main items discussed at the previous session of the Technical Committee, and referred participants needing further details to the full report which would shortly be available.

10. The Working Party discussed the proposal of the Working Group on Biochemical and Molecular Techniques and DNA Profiling in Particular (BMT), approved by the Technical Committee to establish *ad hoc* crop subgroups on molecular techniques for each of five selected crops. The Working Party expressed interest in the BMT proposal and decided to ask the TC to add to the *ad hoc* crop subgroups the subgroup for Peach species. If the decision of the TC was positive the Working Party agreed to nominate Mr. Raymond Saunier (France) as Chair of the Subgroup for Peach species.

UPOV Documents in Electronic Form

11. The Working Party noted that the Office of UPOV had prepared the prototype UPOV TG-ROM which contained all adopted Test Guidelines. The Working Party expressed its opinion that the recent innovations made by the Office of UPOV with regard to its Website, UPOV ROM, UPOV TG-ROM would be very helpful for national Offices and it supported the work done in that area by the Office of UPOV.

Cooperation with the Tropical Fruit Network (TFNet)

12. It discussed the proposal from the Tropical Fruit Network (TFNet), an independent global network set up under the auspices of FAO, for a collaborative program. The TFNet had been set up for the promotion of production, processing, marketing, consumption and international trade in respect of tropical fruits. It was both intergovernmental and inter-institutional in nature and reported its activities to the Sub-Group on Tropical Fruits of the FAO Intergovernmental Group on Bananas and on Tropical Fruits. Countries of tropical regions could use only a few UPOV Test Guidelines (e.g. Banana, Guava, Watermelon, Citrus, Mango). A lot of crops needed Test Guidelines to be prepared for fruits such as Rambutan, Durian, Mangosteen, Jackfruit, etc. The Working Party found the proposal for cooperation useful and decided that Japan would take a lead together with South Africa and Mexico and would suggest that the TFNet participate in the preparation of Test Guidelines for tropical fruits, starting with Mango.

Crop Inventory on Apple

13. The Working Party discussed document TWF/31/2, Circular U 2874 and documents distributed at the session by experts from Japan and the United Kingdom. In order to find out how far the number of characteristics actually used in each member State differed from the adopted UPOV Test Guidelines, how many and which of the non-asterisk characteristics had been selected and which additional characteristics had been used, the Working Party at its thirtieth session in Nitra, Slovakia, agreed to select the species Apple and to ask all member States to submit to the Office of UPOV the list of characteristics they actually used for the

testing, including characteristics needed only once or a few times in special cases. After discussion of the documents, the Working Party concluded that the majority of the Offices used the complete list of characteristics regardless of whether those characteristics were marked with asterisks or not, and in some cases special technology, enhancement of characteristics or additional characteristics were used.

Variety Description Study

14. The Working Party noted the presentation made by Mr. Zoltán Veress, National Institute for Agricultural Quality Control, Hungary, on a method to supplement the study of variety description to determine the similarity of variety groups by using the variety descriptions and to decrease the number of varieties involved in a trial.

Test Guidelines for Mango (Revision)

15. The expert from South Africa reported that no new proposals for revision of the Test Guidelines for Mango had been sent to her Office since the last session in Nitra, Slovakia. The Working Party decided that revision of these Test Guidelines should be continued in the framework of cooperation with the TFNet as decided earlier in the session.

Test Guidelines for Avocado (Revision)

16. The Working Party noted documents TG/97/3 and TWF/31/8 and concluded that the expert from Mexico would collect information and make further proposals if so desired. On the basis of those additional proposals it would be decided whether a revision of TG/97/3 would be necessary or not for discussion by the Working Party.

Final Discussion on Draft Test Guidelines

Test Guidelines for Actinidia

17. The Working Party noted document TG/98/4(proj.) and made the following main changes in it:

(i) Chapters I to VI to have standard wording copied from the latest adopted Test Guidelines.

(ii) Conduct of Tests, paragraph 1; Grouping of Varieties, paragraph 2; Technical Questionnaire, chapter 5 to read “hermaphrodite” instead of “hermaphroditic”.

(iii) Methods and Observations: Paragraph 1 to read: “Unless otherwise stated, all observations should be made on 8 plants or two parts from each of 8 plants”.

(iv) Table of Characteristics

Characteristics

- 2 To read: "Hermaphrodite varieties only: Plant: self fruit setting"
- 3 To have the states "haploid, triploid, heptaploid" deleted, to read example variety as "Hort16A" instead of "Hort 16A" throughout the document
- 5 To have example variety "King" for the state "present (9)"
- 7 To have asterisk deleted
- 12 To read: "Stem: hairiness"
- 18 To read: "Stem: proximal face of bud support", to have the states "perpendicular (1), sloping (2)"
- 20 To read: "Stem: profile of proximal face of bud support (if sloping)", to have the state "straight (2)" instead of "flat (2)"
- 21 To read example variety for the state "present (9)" as "Hayward" instead of "Haywar"
- 26 NZ, HU and ZA to improve diagram
- 27 To have the following order of the states: "caudate (1), emarginate (2), retuse (3), rounded (4), acute (5), acuminate (6)"
- 39 To read: "Petiole: anthocyanin coloration of upper side"
- 40 To have the state "absent or very weak (1)" instead of "absent to very weak (1)"
- 49 To be placed after characteristic 44
- 51 To have the states: "absent or very weakly expressed (1), weakly expressed (2), strongly expressed (3)", NZ to supply example varieties for the states (2) and (3)
- 62 To have the following order of the states: "erect (1), semi-erect (2), horizontal (3), both erect and horizontal (4)"
- 68 To read the state "squared (1)" instead of "square (1)"
- 72 To have note (2) for the state "conspicuous"
- 73 To have example variety "Hort16A" deleted for the state "medium green (2)", to have the state "yellow brown (5)" with example variety "Hort16A" added after the state "greenish brown (4)"
- 87 DE to check if the wording in the German language was right
- 91 Asterisk to be added

(v) Explanations on the Table of Characteristics: To have separated: Ad. 21: Stem: presence of bud cover and Ad. 22: Stem: size of hole in bud cover. Ad. 28: Leaf blade: arrangement of basal lobes, diagram for “touching” to be improved.

(vi) Literature: To have standard view.

(vii) Technical Questionnaire: Chapter 1 to add wording: “Species (specify)”, chapter 5 to have wording “For male varieties” and “For female and hermaphrodite varieties” in bold and underlined.

General Introduction

18. The Working Party discussed document TC/36/5, TC/36/7, TC/36/8, U2976 and made the following remarks or came to the following conclusions:

Annex to Circular U 2976: Comments on Individual Paragraphs of TC/36/8 :

Add. 31 The Working Party disagreed with the Office proposal and proposed not to mention phytoplasma specifically as it was included in disease.

Add. 32 The Working Party proposed to delete the whole non-numbered paragraph after paragraph 32 as both sentences of the non-numbered paragraph were not quite correct and could be misleading.

Add. 40 The Working Party agreed with the Office proposal.

Add. 54 The Working Party agreed with the Office proposal.

Add. 115 The Working Party agreed with the Office proposal.

Add. 144 The Working Party agreed with the Office proposal.

The Working Party proposed to put the text of Explanation (i), paragraph 144, as a continuation of paragraph 142. This text is very important, especially for new member States, and should remain in the General Introduction as all explanations would be deleted.

Annex to Circular U 2976: Comments on Open Points of TC/36/8:

1.4 Reference Collection The expert from the United Kingdom volunteered to prepare a short document with explanations on what was meant by Reference Collection in the different contexts.

1.5 Application of Quantitative Data The Working Party totally disagreed with the last sentence of paragraph 1.5 in the Annex to Circular U 2976 where fruit species testing was mentioned as a “whole plant” approach rather than characteristic by characteristic.

1.7 Example Varieties The Working Party first of all decided to stress that example varieties were guides only. The expert from Hungary expressed his disagreement with the sentence in the Annex to Circular U 2976: “States of expression often represent a range and two example varieties could show the upper and lower limit of that range”. The Working Party agreed in general that the situation with example varieties in the UPOV Test Guidelines should be improved mainly because the number of member States had increased and new geographical regions were involved in UPOV activity. It was very important to explain to new member States what example variety meant in practice as in some cases misunderstandings had been reported. Many experts reported on problems arising from variety descriptions they received from other member States. Many States wanted to have their own set of example varieties. It would be important to set up guidelines for establishing the set of example varieties to follow if a State decided to have its own set, to clarify the meaning of “high-low”, “wide-narrow” etc., in a given case, taking into consideration the environmental influence. The expert from Australia suggested a conception of so-called “benchmark varieties”, instead of the example varieties as they existed at present in TG’s. Benchmark varieties could be established from which a State could choose according to its environmental conditions. The Working Party decided to support all statements mentioned in the proposals “About Example Varieties” which had been prepared before the session by the expert from France (Mr. Joël Guiard) and concluded that the document on this matter should be promoted. It also suggested adding as an annex to the Test Guidelines the list of example varieties used in a given Test Guidelines mentioning the country which had proposed the variety. The expert from Spain did not agree with the proposal. The experts from Australia and Canada volunteered to prepare a document “Quantitative characteristics. Environment influence and plant variety description”. The expert from Australia would also prepare a document on the use of benchmark varieties. Both documents would be discussed at the next session of the Working Party concerning complementary documents for the General Introduction.

Annex to Circular U 2976: Comments on document TC/36/5: The Working Party decided not to make any comments on the document as it had been prepared by the TWF. Some input from the TWV was still expected. Experts from South Africa and the United Kingdom would prepare a document with the list of terms which still needed to be harmonized. Comments on document TC/36/5 contained in the Annex to Circular U 2976 would be included by the experts from South Africa and the United Kingdom in a new draft.

Annex to Circular U 2976: Comments on document TC/36/7: The Working Party decided not to discuss all the comments as presented in the Annex to Circular U 2976 but to concentrate on the TGP documents which the Working Party was supposed to prepare or cooperate in preparing.

TGP/3 (A) (here and below: as numbered in document TC/36/7) The Concept of Varieties of Common Knowledge: The Working Party disagreed with the comment on this document as in the Annex to Circular U 2976, concerning paragraph 5 (b). A variety might fail to be accepted for protection for a number of reasons, for example because of novelty criteria but it still could be marketed and thus far it was still a variety. The Working Party disagreed with the comment on paragraph 5 (e) because an old variety could be re-entered but had to be rejected, although it would still be kept as a variety of common knowledge.

TGP/6 (B) DUS Testing by or on Behalf of the Breeder: The Working Party supported the idea of preparing a document on the basis of a Circular prepared by the Office of UPOV as had been decided by the TWA and, with some modification concerning the Circular, by the TWO. The expert from Australia expressed her disagreement with the comment on document TGP/6 in Circular U 2976 that breeding testing was mainly useful in species with few applications.

TGP/13 (B) DUS Testing of New Species: The Working Party decided to ask for more clarification on page 132, paragraph 1, and for page 133, paragraph 5, before commenting.

TGP/17 Model Technical Questionnaire: The Working Party decided to support the proposal made by the TWO for the amended Chapter 6 (page 146 of document TC/36/7). It disagreed with the proposal to add a new section 9 “Declaration of Freedom from Secondary Factors”, because the existing TQ had sufficient possibilities to secure the information needed, for example in Chapter 4.5 “Other information”.

Discussions on Working Papers on Test Guidelines

Test Guidelines for *Prunus* Rootstocks

19. The Working Party noted documents TWF/25/4, TWF/27/6, TWF/30/5 and TWF/31/5, and made the following main changes in document TWF/31/5:

- (i) Material Required: To have “virus free” deleted.
- (ii) Conduct of Test: Paragraph 1 to read: “To assess distinctness, at least two independent growing cycles are necessary”.
- (iii) Methods and Observations: Paragraph 2 to add new sentence: “For the assessment of uniformity of open-pollinated varieties relative uniformity standards should be applied.”
- (iv) Grouping of Varieties: Paragraph 2 to read “Plant” instead of “Tree”.
- (v) Table of Characteristics

Characteristics

- 8 To read: “One-year-old shoot: anthocyanin coloration of apex”
- 10 To have the states “acute (1), obtuse (2), rounded (3)”, to be placed after characteristic 8
- 12 DE to add diagram
- 13 To read: “Young shoot: intensity of anthocyanin coloration of young leaf (during rapid growth)”
- 21 To have the state “elliptic (2)” instead of “broad elliptic (2)”, HU to supply the example variety for the state “obovate (5)”

- 26 To have example variety “Gisela 5” deleted, to have the notes as (3), (5), (7)
- 27 To read: “Leaf blade: shape of base”, DE to improve diagram
- (vi) Explanations: DE to check spelling for variety “Myrobalane B”.
- (vii) Literature: To have standard view.
- (iv) Technical Questionnaire: To have standard layout copied from the latest adopted Test Guidelines.
20. DE would prepare the final draft and send it to the Office of UPOV, and the document should be sent to professional organizations for comments.

Test Guidelines for European Plum (Revision)

21. The Working Party noted documents TG/41/4, TWF/25/6, TWF/27/8, TWF/30/12 and TWF/31/6, and made the following main changes in document TWF/31/6:
- (i) Subject of these Guidelines: To have wording “*P. salicina* Lindl. and their hybrids” deleted.
- (ii) Material Required: To read for the quantity of plant material: “five trees (five one-year-old grafted trees) or 8 dormant shoots for grafting.”, second non-numbered paragraph, first sentence to delete wording “the competent authority prescribes”.
- (iii) Methods and Observations: Paragraph 1, second sentence the wording “a minimum of” to be deleted.
- (iv) Table of Characteristics

Characteristics

- 2 DE to check wording for example variety “Reine Claude verte ou Dorée”
- 6 To read: “One-year-old shoot: intensity of pubescence (upper third)”
- 8 To read: “Flowering shoot: number of flowers”, to be placed after characteristic 31
- 9 To read: “Flower: type”, to have the states “single only (1), single and double (2)”, to be placed after replaced characteristic 8
- 11 To read: “One-year-old shoot: shape of apex of vegetative bud”, to have the states “acute (1), obtuse (2), rounded (3)”
- 28 To read: “Leaf: position of nectary”, to have the state “on base of blade and petiole (3)” instead of “both on base and petiole (3)”
- 29 To have example variety “Reine Claude d’Althan” replaced by “Althanova”

- 31 To have the state “sparse (3)” instead of “weak (3)”
- 33 To read: “Flower: relative position of margins of petals (predominant situation)”, to have the state “free (1)” instead of “apart (1)”
- 35 To read: “Calyx: attitude of sepals”
- 44 To add the states “ovate” with example varieties “Valjevka” and “Hanita”, and “obovate” with example variety “Hauszwetsche”
- 45, 48, 60 To be deleted
- 57 To have the states “narrow elliptic (1), elliptic (2), circular (3)”
- 58 To add the states “ovate (5) and obovate (6)”, DE to improve diagram, HU to supply with example varieties for the new states
- (iv) Synonyms of example varieties: DE to check spelling.
- (v) Technical Questionnaire: To have standard layout copied from the latest adopted Test Guidelines, chapter 1 to read: “EUROPEAN PLUM (Fruit varieties only)”.
22. DE would prepare the final draft and send it to the Office of UPOV, and the document should be sent to professional organizations for comments.

Test Guidelines for Apricot (Revision)

23. The Working Party noted documents TG/70/3, TWF/30/8 and TWF/31/4, and made the following main changes in document TWF/31/4:
- (i) Material Required: to read: “five trees (one year old grafts) or three budsticks or five dormant shoots for grafting, sufficient to propagate 5 trees.”
- (ii) Methods and Observations: Paragraph 1, second sentence to read: “Unless otherwise stated, all observations determined by measurement, weighing or counting should be made on 15 parts of plants, three from each tree.”, paragraph 2 the third and the fourth sentences “If the number of plants ... could be tested for uniformity” to be deleted, paragraph 6 to read: “All observations on the fruit and the stone should be made on 25 fruits, five from each of five trees.”, paragraph 7 to be deleted.
- (iii) Table of Characteristics: To have not more than two or three example varieties for the state, HU to check spelling of all example varieties.

Characteristics

- 4 To read: “Tree: distribution of flower buds”, to have the states: “mainly on spurs (1), mainly on one-year-old shoots (2), on spurs and on one-year-old shoots (3)”
- 5 To read: “Young shoot: anthocyanin coloration of apex (during rapid growth)”

- 9 To read: "Leaf blade: ratio length/width", to have the states: "very small (1), small (3), medium (5), large (7), very large (9)"
- 10 To read: "Leaf blade: intensity of green color of upper side"
- 12 HU to improve diagram
- 14 To read: "Leaf blade: incisions of margin"
- 16 To read: "Leaf blade: shape in cross section (on spurs or at base of flowering shoots)"
- 18 To have the states: "small (3), medium (5), large (7)"
- 20 To read: "Petiole: intensity of anthocyanin coloration of upper side"
- 23 To read: "Flower: diameter (petals pressed into horizontal position)"
- 24 To have the states: "far below (1), slightly below (3), same level (5), slightly above (7), far above (9)"
- 25 To read: "Petal: shape (excluding claw)", to have the states: "broad elliptic (1), circular (2), transverse elliptic (3)"
- 29 To read: "Fruit: shape in lateral view", to have the following order of the states: "elliptic (1), circular (2), oblate (3), rectangular (4), triangular (5), ovate (6), obovate (7)"
- 30 To read: "Fruit: shape in ventral view", to have the order of the states as for characteristic 29
- 31 To read: "Fruit: ratio lateral width/ventral width", to have the states: "small (3), medium (5), large (7)"
- 32 To read: "Fruit: ratio height/ventral width", to have the states: "small (3), medium (5), large (7)"
- 33 To read: "Fruit: predominant symmetry along suture", to have the states: "asymmetric (1), symmetric (2)"
- 36 To have the following order of the states: "acute (1), rounded (2), flat (3), depressed (4)"
- 37 To read: "Fruit: mucro", to have the note (9) for the state "present", to have example variety "Cegledi bibor" replaced by "Rutbhart"
- 38 To read the state "bumpy (2)" instead of "bumped (2)"
- 39 To have the note (9) for the state "present"

- 40 To have the following order of the states: “white (1), yellowish (2), yellow green (3), light orange (4), medium orange (5), dark orange (6)”
- 41 To read: “Fruit: intensity of over color of skin”
- 42 To read: “Fruit: amount of over color of skin”
- 43 To have the state “medium orange (5)” instead of “orange (5)”
- 46 To read: “Fruit: weight of stone compared to weight of fruit”, to have the states: “small (3), medium (5), large (7)”, to have asterisk deleted
- 48 To read: “Stone: shape in lateral view”, to have the following order of the states: “oblong (1), elliptic (2), circular (3), ovate (4), obovate (5)”
- 49 To have asterisk deleted

(iv) Synonyms of example varieties: HU to add synonym for “Rutbhart”.

(v) Literature: HU to check spelling, to have standard view.

(vi) Technical Questionnaire: To have standard layout copied from the latest adopted Test Guidelines.

24. HU would prepare a new draft for discussion at the next session of the Working Party.

Test Guidelines for Persimmon (Revision)

25. The Working Party noted documents TG/92/3, TWF/30/10 and TWF/31/9, and made the following main changes in document TWF/31/9:

(i) Material Required: Paragraph 1 to read: “five plants (one-year-old grafted plants) on rootstocks of *Diospyros kaki* or of *Diospyros lotus*.”

(ii) Method and Observations: Paragraph 3, second sentence to read: “All observations on the one-year-old shoot should be made on its middle third.”

(iii) Table of Characteristics: To have standard layout copied from the latest adopted Test Guidelines.

Characteristic:

- 2 To have the states: “upright (1), semi-upright (2), spreading (3), drooping (4)”
- 10 To read: “One-year-old shoot: size of bud support”
- 11 To read: “One-year-old shoot: shape of bud support”, to have the states: “elongate (1), obovate (2), circular (3), oblate (4)”, JP to check example variety “Kaki Tipo”

- 13 To read: “Bud: shape of apex”, to have the states: “acute (1), obtuse (2), rounded (3)”
- [14] To be deleted
- 17 To have the states: “ovate (1), elliptic (2), obovate (3)”
- 19 To have the following order of the notes: (1), (2), (3)
- 21 To read: “Leaf blade: color at leaf fall”
- 25 To be placed before characteristic 24
- 26 To read: “Female flower: shape of calyx”, to have the states: “circular (1), elliptic (2), square (3), regular cross (4), irregular cross (5)”, to be placed after characteristic 23
- 28 To read: “Fruit: general shape in longitudinal section”
- 29 To have the states: “circular (1), intermediate (2), square (3)”
- 30 To read: “Fruit: shape of apex in longitudinal section”, to have the states: “acute (1), obtuse (2), rounded (3), truncate (4), depressed (5)”
- 31 To read: “Fruit: grooving at apex”, to have the states: “absent or very weakly expressed (1), weakly expressed (2), strongly expressed (3)”
- 32 To read: “Fruit: shallow concentric cracking around apex”, to have the states: “absent or very weakly expressed (1), weakly expressed (2), strongly expressed (3)”, JP to add diagram
- 33 To read: “Fruit: radial cracking of apex”, to have the states: “absent or very weakly expressed (1), weakly expressed (2), strongly expressed (3)”, JP to add diagram
- 34 To be deleted
- 36 To read: “Fruit: calyx attachment”
- 37 To read: “Fruit: groove at calyx end”
- 38 To read: “Fruit: separation of base of calyx”, to have the states: “absent or very weakly expressed (1), weakly expressed (2), strongly expressed (3)”, asterisk to be deleted
- 39 To read: “Only varieties with firm flesh at eating: Fruit: color of skin at time of maturity for consumption”
- 40 To read: “Only varieties with soft flesh at eating: Fruit: color of skin at time of physiological ripening”, asterisk to be deleted
- 43 To have the state “absent or very small (1)” instead of “absent or very few (1)”
- 44 To read: “Fruit: size of fibrous central zone”

- 45 To read: “Fruit: width of broadest sepal”
- 46 To read: “Fruit: diameter of calyx in relation to fruit”
- 47 To read: “Fruit: attitude of sepals relative to fruit”, to have the states: “adpressed (1), slightly held out (2), markedly held out (3), erect or convergent (4)”
- 49 To be placed after characteristic 47
- 51 To have the following order of the states: “narrow elliptic (1), elliptic (2), reniform (3), subovate (4), subtriangular (5), subcircular (6)”, asterisk to be deleted
- 52 To have the state “medium brown (2)” instead of “brown (2)”
- 53 To read: “Female flowers only: Time of flowering”
- 54 To read: “Time of vegetative budburst”
- 55 To read: “Only varieties with firm flesh at eating: Time of maturity for consumption”
- 56 To read: “Only varieties with soft flesh at eating: Time of physiological ripening”
- 57 To have the states: “always absent irrespective of presence of seed (1), always present irrespective of presence of seed (2), presence depending on number and presence of seed (3)”

(iv) Explanations on the Table of Characteristics: Ad. 26 Female flower: shape of calyx: JP to improve diagram for the state “elliptic (2)”.

(v) Technical Questionnaire: To have standard layout copied from the latest adopted Test Guidelines, chapter 1 to read: “PERSIMMON (Fruit varieties only)”.

26. JP would prepare a new draft for the discussion at the next session of the Working Party.

Test Guidelines for Citrus (Revision)

27. The Working Party noted documents TG/83/3, TWF/27/14, TWF/30/2 and TWF/31/3. A subgroup met in the evenings to discuss document TWF/30/2. The results were reported in the session. As a result of the discussion it was decided to prepare for discussion at the next session separate Test Guidelines for: 1. Citrus Rootstocks, 2. Grapefruit and Pummelo, 3. Lemon and Lime, 4. Mandarin, 5. Orange, 6. Yuzu. The expert from Spain would prepare new drafts for Citrus Rootstocks, Lemon and Lime, Mandarin, and Orange. The expert from South Africa would prepare a new draft for Grapefruit and Pummelo document. The expert from Japan would prepare a new document for Yuzu.

Test Guidelines for Prickly Pear (Opuntia)

28. The Working Party noted document TWF/31/7 and comments from the Subgroup meeting which took place in the bus during the technical visits. A new draft will be prepared by the expert from Mexico for discussion at the next session.

Test Guidelines for Quince (Revision)

29. The Working Party noted documents TG/100/3, TWF/31/10 and comments from the Subgroup meeting which took place in the evening. A new draft will be prepared by the expert from Germany for discussion at the next session.

Test Guidelines for Raspberry (Revision)

30. The Working Party noted documents TG/43/6, TWF/31/11 and comments from the Subgroup meeting which took place in the evening. A new draft will be prepared by the expert from Germany for discussion at the next session.

Status of Test Guidelines

31. The Working Party agreed that the draft Test Guidelines for Actinidia (Revision) should be sent to the Technical Committee for final adoption.

32. The Working Party agreed that the draft Test Guidelines for *Prunus* Rootstocks and for European Plum (Revision) should be sent to the professional organizations for comments.

33. The Working Party decided to postpone the preparation of the Working Paper on Test Guidelines for Walnut Rootstocks.

34. The Working Party made a proposal for the Technical Committee to improve the practice for the preparation of the Test Guidelines whereby the submission of the draft of the new TG's to the professional organizations for comments should be done in parallel with the submission of the draft TG's to the Committee for final adoption, subject to no important comments from the professional organizations.

Future Program, Date and Place of Next Session

35. On the basis of written information, which was also confirmed by Mr. Pedro Chomé Fuster, the Working Party agreed to hold its thirty-second session in Valencia, Spain, from October 1 to 5, 2001. It was planned to have five full days for the session including the afternoon of Friday, October 5, 2001. For the afternoon of Monday, October 1, 2001, it was decided to have Subgroup meetings only. It was planned that the following items would be discussed at the forthcoming session:

- (a) Short reports on new developments in member States in plant variety protection in fruit species (oral reports);

- (b) Questions on the testing of varieties of fruit species;
- (c) Important decisions taken during the previous sessions of the Working Party and the Technical Committee (oral report);
- (d) Discussion on new multi and interspecific hybrids (Israel to prepare a Working Paper);
- (e) New methods, techniques and equipment in the examination of varieties;
- (f) Final discussion on draft Test Guidelines for *Prunus* Rootstocks and for European Plum (Revision) (TG/41/5(proj.));
- (g) Complementary documents to the General Introduction;
- (h) Discussions on working papers on Test Guidelines for
 - Annona Cherimola (Japan and Mexico to prepare a Working Paper)
 - Apricot (Revision) (TG/97/3, TWF/31/8; Hungary to prepare a new Working Paper)
 - Avocado (Revision) (TG/70/3, TWF/30/8, TWF/31/4; Mexico to collect any possible proposals for revision)
 - Citrus Rootstocks (Revision) (TG/83/3, TWF/27/14, TWF/30/2, TWF/31/3; Spain and South Africa to prepare a new Working Paper)
 - Fig (TWF/30/4; Israel to prepare a new Working Paper)
 - Grapefruit and Pummelo (Revision) (TG/83/3, TWF/27/14, TWF/30/2, TWF/31/3; South Africa to prepare a new Working Paper)
 - Lemon and Lime (Revision) (TG/83/3, TWF/27/14, TWF/30/2, TWF/31/3; Spain and South Africa to prepare a new Working Paper)
 - Mandarin (Revision) (TG/83/3, TWF/27/14, TWF/30/2, TWF/31/3; Spain and South Africa to prepare a new Working Paper)
 - Orange (Revision) (TG/83/3, TWF/27/14, TWF/30/2, TWF/31/3; Spain and South Africa to prepare a new Working Paper)
 - Prickly Pear (*Opuntia*) (TWF/31/7; Mexico to prepare a new Working Paper)
 - Passion Fruit (Israel to prepare a new Working Paper)
 - Persimmon (Revision) (TG/92/3, TWF/30/10, TWF/31/9; Japan to prepare a new Working Paper)

- Quince (Revision) (TG/100/3, TWF/31/10; Germany to prepare a new Working Paper)
- Raspberry (Revision) (TG/43/6, TWF/31/11; Germany to prepare a new Working Paper)
- Yuzu (Revision) (TG/83/3, TWF/27/14, TWF/30/2, TWF/31/3; Japan and South Africa to prepare a new Working Paper)

36. In view of the long list of Test Guidelines planned, the Working Party agreed to nominate in the above planned list one leading expert and ask other interested experts to cooperate with the leading expert by correspondence in the preparation of a more advanced document. An amended list of species and their leading experts is reproduced in Annex II to this report. The Working Party decided that the leading experts would send by e-mail a final draft of the document for which they were responsible to the members of the Subgroup and after that the improved version of the document would be sent to the Office of UPOV by the March 31, 2001, unless otherwise stated, for the preparation for the next session. It was stated that Quince and Raspberry would be sent to the Office of UPOV by late summer 2000 and Citrus Rootstocks, Grapefruit and Pummelo, Lemon and Lime, Mandarin, Orange, Prickly Pear (*Opuntia*) would be sent to the Office of UPOV by the end of 2000.

37. The Working Party noted the invitation from Argentina made by Mrs. Susana Cianis to hold its thirty-third session in that State in the year 2002.

Visits

38. Before the opening of the session on July 1, 2000, some experts from the Working Party together with their colleagues from the TWO participated in the technical visit. The Hegede Nursery, Helvecia, was visited first, where Mr. István Hegede showed ornamentals produced successfully on sandy soils by his nursery. The second visit was to the Testing Station of the National Institute for Agricultural Quality Control, Helvecia. Mr. Lajos Zubor, chief of the Station, gave a report on fruit varieties testing, and a special report on grape variety trials was given by Mr. György Pernesz.

39. In the morning of July 5, 2000, the Working Party visited the Testing Station of the National Institute for Agricultural Quality Control in Pölöske, where it received detailed and practical information from Dr. Kálmán Baka, Chief, on all aspects of the fruit (mostly berries) testing and production and visited its testing facilities.

40. In the afternoon of July 5, 2000, the Working Party visited the Research Station for Grapevine, Badacsony, where the Chief of the Station, Dr. János Mayer reported on research, extension service and propagation of grape varieties.

41. This report has been adopted by correspondence.

[Annex I follows]

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

I. MEMBER STATES

ARGENTINA

Susana CIANIS (Mrs.), Instituto Nacional de Semillas (INASE), Secretaría de Agricultura, Ganadería y Pesca, Avenida Paseo Colón 922, 3^{er} piso, 1063 Buenos Aires (tel.: +54 114 349 24 45, fax: +54-114 349 24 44, e-mail: mlabar@sagyp.mecon.gov.ar)

AUSTRALIA

Helen COSTA (Mrs.), Australian Plant Breeders Rights Office, Agriculture Fisheries Forestry Australia, P.O. Box 858, Canberra ACT 2601 (tel.: +61 2 62724228, fax: +61 2 62723650, e-mail: helen.costa@affa.gov.au)

CANADA

Sandy MARSHALL (Ms.), Examiner, Plant Breeders' Rights Office, Canadian Food Inspection Agency, 59 Camelot Drive, Nepean, Ontario KIA OY9 (tel.: +1-613 225 2342 ext. 4392, fax: +1-613 228 6629, e-mail: smarshall@em.agr.ca)

CZECH REPUBLIC

Libor DOKOUPRIL, ÚKZÚZ, Central Institute for Supervising and Testing in Agriculture, Plant Variety Testing Division, ul. 24. dubna 301, 664 43 Želešice (tel. : +420 5 47242949, fax : +420 5 47 21 45 64, e-mail: zelesice@ooz.zeus.cz)

Jiří SOUČEK, Head of Department, ÚKZÚZ - Central Institute for Supervising and Testing in Agriculture, Department of DUS Tests and Plant Variety Rights, Za opravnou 4, 150 06 Praha 5 – Motol (tel.: +420 2 57211755, fax: +420 2 57211752, e-mail: soucek@ooz.zeus.cz)

FRANCE

Raymond SAUNIER, Ingénieur de Recherches, Centre de Recherches de Bordeaux, Unité de recherches sur les espèces fruitières et la vigne, Institut national de la recherche agronomique – INRA, Ministère de l'agriculture, 71, avenue Edouard-Bourleaux, B.P. 81, F-33883 Villenave d'Ornon (tel.: +33-5 56 84 30 81, fax : +33-5) 56 84 30 83, e-mail: rsaunier@bordeaux.inra.fr)

GERMANY

Erik SCHULTE, Bundessortenamt, Testing Station Wurzen, Torgauer Str. 100, 04808
Wurzen (tel.: +49 3425 9040 0, fax: +49 3425 90 40 20,
e-mail: erik.schulte@bundessortenamt.de)

HUNGARY

József HARSÁNYI, Head of Department, National Institute for Agricultural Quality Control,
Keleti Károly u. 24, H-1024 Budapest, P.O. Box 30.93, H-1525 Budapest 114
(tel.: +36-1 212 31 27, fax: +36-1 212 53 67, e-mail: harsanyij@ommi.hu)

Pál KLINCSEK, National Institute for Agricultural Quality Control, Keleti Károly u. 24, H-
1024 Budapest, P.O. Box 30.93, H-1525 Budapest 114 (tel.: +36-1 212 31 27,
fax: +36-1 212 53 67, e-mail: klincsekp@ommi.hu)

Szilvia MÁRK (Mrs.), National Institute for Agricultural Quality Control, Keleti Károly u.
24, H-1024 Budapest, P.O. Box 30.93, H-1525 Budapest 114 (tel.: +36-1 212 31 27,
fax: +36-1 212 53 67, e-mail: deaksz@ommi.hu)

György PERNESZ, National Institute for Agricultural Quality Control, Keleti Károly u. 24,
H-1024 Budapest, P.O. Box 30.93, H-1525 Budapest 114 (tel.: +36-1 212 31 27,
fax: +36-1 212 53 67, perneszgy@ommi.hu)

Rezső MÁDY, National Institute for Agricultural Quality Control, Keleti Károly u. 24, H-
1024 Budapest, P.O. Box 30.93, H-1525 Budapest 114 (tel.: +36-1 212 31 27,
fax: +36-1 212 53 67, e-mail: madyr@ommi.hu)

JAPAN

Katsumi YAMAGUCHI, Seeds and Seedlings Division, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and
Fisheries, 1-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 100-8950 (tel.: +81 3 3581 0518,
fax: +81 3 3502 6572, e-mail: katsumi_yamaguchi@nm.maff.go.jp)

MEXICO

Alejandro F. BARRIENTOS-PRIEGO, Servicio Nacional de Inspección y Certificación de
Semillas, SAGAR, Lope de Vega No. 125-2, Col. Chapultepec Morales, 11570 D.F. México.
(tel.: 52 5203 9427, fax: +52 5250 6483, fax +52 5954 8336,
e-mail: abarrien@taurus1.chapingo.mx, abarrien@altavista.net)

POLAND

Maria ZAŁĘSKA (Ms.), Research Centre for Cultivar Testing, 63-022 Slupia Wielka (tel.: +48 61 285 2341, fax: +48 61 285 5558, e-mail: coboru@bptnet.pl)

SOUTH AFRICA

Elise BUITENDAG (Mrs.), Directorate Genetic Resources, P.B. XII208, Nelspruit 1200 (tel.: +27 13 7532071, fax: +27 13 7523854, e-mail: elise@itsc.agric.za)

SPAIN

Pedro M. CHOMÉ FUSTER, Dirección General de Agricultura, Ministerio de Agricultura, Pesca y Alimentación, Avda. Ciudad de Barcelona no. 6, 28007 Madrid (tel.: +34 91 347 6913, fax: +34 91 347 8248, e-mail: pchomefu@mapya.es)

UNITED KINGDOM

Alison LEAN (Mrs.), Wye College, University of London, National Fruit Collections, Brogdale Road, Faversham, Kent ME13 8XZ (tel.: +44 1795 590272, fax: +44 1795 532271, e-mail: fruit@nfc.u-net.com)

II. OBSERVER STATES

REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Jeong-Hwan HWANG, National Horticultural Research Institute, 495 Imok-Dong, Changan-ku, Suwon, Kyunggi (tel.: + 82 31 240 3587, fax: +82 31 3681, e-mail: hwang0jh@nhri.go.kr)

Byung Gun BAE, Plant Variety Protection Division, National Seed Management Office, 303-209, Bu Ruego APT, Ryeo Deung-Do, Iksan-city, Cheol Ra Buk-Do, 5170-160 (tel.: + 82 63 834 1773)

ROMANIA

Despina IORDACHE (Mrs.), Substantive Examiner, "Agriculture" Division, State Office for Inventions and Trademarks, 5, Ion Ghica Str., Sector 3, P.O. Box 52, 70018 Bucharest (tel.: +401 315 90 66 / 40 1 315 5698 (direct), fax: +401 312 38 19, e-mail: office@osim.ro)

Adriana PARASCHIV (Mrs.), Head of "Agriculture" Division, State Office for Inventions and Trademarks, 5, Ion Ghica Str., Sector 3, P.O. Box 52, 70018 Bucharest (tel.: +401 315 90 66 / 40 1 315 5698 (direct), fax: +401 312 38 19, e-mail: adriana.paraschiv@osim.ro)

III. OBSERVER ORGANIZATION

Sergio SEMON, Community Plant Variety Office (CPVO). B.P. 2141, 49021 Angers Cedex 02 , France (tel.: +33 2 41 36 84 56, fax : +33 2 41 36 84 60, e-mail: semon@cpvo.fr)

IV. OFFICER

József HARSÁNYI, Chairman

V. OFFICE OF UPOV

Raimundo LAVIGNOLLE, Senior Counsellor, 34, chemin des Colombettes, 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland (tel.: +41-22-338 95 65, fax: +41-22-733 03 36, e-mail: lavignolle.upov@wipo.int, Web site: <http://www.upov.int>)

Evgeny SARANIN, Consultant, 34, chemin des Colombettes, 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland (tel.: +41-22-338 82 72, fax: +41-22-733 03 36, e-mail: saranin.upov@wipo.int, Web site: <http://www.upov.int>)

[Annex II follows]

ANNEX II

LIST OF LEADING EXPERTS

Species	Basic Document	Leading experts (for addresses see attached list)	Interested experts (countries) (for name of experts see List of Participants)
Annona Cherimola	New	Mr. Yamaguchi, JP and Mr. Barrientos-Priego, MX	AR, ES
Apricot	TWF/31/4	Mr. Harsányi, HU	AR, ES, FR, IL, IT, NZ, ZA
Avocado	TG/97/3, TWF/31/8	Mr. Barrientos-Priego, MX	AU, IL, ZA
Citrus Rootstocks	TWF/31/3	Mr. Chomé Fuster, ES and Mrs. Buitendag, ZA	AR, FR, IL, IT, MX, JP
Fig	TWF/30/4	Mr. Bar-Tel, IL	DE, ES, FR, IT, JP
Grapefruit and Pummelo	TWF/31/3	Mrs. Buitendag, ZA	AR, ES, FR, IL, IT, MX, JP
Lemon and Lime	TWF/31/3	Mr. Chomé Fuster, ES and Mrs. Buitendag, ZA	AR, FR, IL, IT, MX, JP
Mandarin	TWF/31/3	Mr. Chomé Fuster, ES and Mrs. Buitendag, ZA	AR, FR, IL, IT, MX, JP
Orange	TWF/31/3	Mr. Chomé Fuster, ES and Mrs. Buitendag, ZA	AR, FR, IL, IT, MX, JP
Prickly Pear (Opuntia)	TWF/31/7	Mr. Barrientos-Priego, MX	ES, IL, IT, ZA
Passion Fruit	New	Mr. Bar-Tel, IL	KE, ZA
Persimmon	TWF/31/9	Mr. Yamaguchi, JP	IL, IT, NZ, ZA
Quince	TWF/31/10	Mr. Schulte, DE	GB, FR, HU
Raspberry	TWF/31/11	Mr. Schulte, DE	CA, GB, HU, NZ
Yuzu	TWF/31/3	Mr. Yamaguchi, JP and Mrs. Buitendag, ZA	AR, ES, FR, IL, IT, MX

[End of Annex II and document]