E

TWF/33/22
ORIGINAL: English
DATE: May 5, 2003

UPOV

INTERNATIONAL UNION FOR THE PROTECTION OF NEW VARIETIES OF PLANTS

GENEVA

TECHNICAL WORKING PARTY FOR FRUIT CROPS

Thirty-Third Session
San Carlos de Bariloche, Argentina
November 25 to 29, 2002

REPORT

adopted by the Technical Working Party for Fruit Crops

Opening of the Session

*1. The Technical Working Party for Fruit Crops (hereinafter referred to as "the TWF") held its thirty-third session in San Carlos de Bariloche, Argentina, from November 25 to 29, 2002. The list of participants is reproduced in Annex I to this report.

*2. The TWF was welcomed by Mr. Marcelo Labarta from the *Secretaría de Agricultura, Ganadería, Pesca y Alimentación* (SAGPyA).

*3. The session was opened by Mr. József Harsányi (Hungary), Chairman of the TWF, who welcomed the participants, and in particular new participants, to the TWF.

* The asterisked paragraphs in this draft report are reproduced from document TWF/33/21 (Report on the Conclusions).

Adoption of the Agenda

4. The TWF adopted the agenda, as reproduced in document TWF/33/1 Rev. On the basis of the adopted agenda and the information received from experts, it was agreed to organize two subgroups to allow the experts to participate in discussions of the documents in which they had a particular interest. The composition of the subgroups was as follows :

(a) Subgroup I : Apricot (TWF/33/13), Quince (TWF/33/7), Raspberry (TWF/33/8), Apple (TWF/33/11) ;

(b) Subgroup II : Poncirus (TWF/33/6), Persimmon (TWF/33/14), Prickly Pear (TWF/33/9), Cherimoya (TWF/33/12), Avocado (TWF/33/10) and Mango (TWF/33/16).

Short Reports on Developments in Plant Variety Protection in Fruit Crops

(a) Reports from members and organizations

5. Mr. Marcelo Labarta (Argentina) provided a presentation on plant variety protection in Argentina. He reported that the Argentinean Seed Protection System was based on the 1973 Law for Seed and Plant Genetic Developments N° 20247. He indicated that its 1991 Regulatory Decree was in accordance with the 1978 Act of the UPOV Convention, which had been approved, in 1994, by the National Congress. He explained that the National Register of Property of Cultivars (RNPC) had been created in accordance with the Seeds Law. The RNPC was administered by the National Register Department – Seed Area of Secretariat of Agriculture, Livestock, Fisheries and Food. The RNPC covered different areas, dealing with administrative and technical matters, and was managed by eleven people. He reported that the technical areas were: cereals, oil seeds, forage, vegetables, fruits and ornamentals, and statistical and field trials. He also explained that the main objectives of the National Register Department were examination for the purposes of protection (which used specific application forms and tables of characteristics, and included all UPOV asterisked characteristics in the latter), control of denominations and distinctness requirements, management of the reference collection for some species (soybean, wheat, oilseed rape, rye, oats and some forage crops) and supervising the morphological and phenological characteristics in the breeder's field trials. So far, Argentina had granted protection to 1571 plant varieties. These were divided as follows: cereals (32%), oil seeds (27%), forage (21%), vegetables (10%), fruits (5%), ornamentals (3%), and industrial crops (2%). Sixty percent of the titles were granted to nationally bred varieties and the rest to foreign bred varieties. Fruit varieties accounted for 80 titles of protection. He reported that, since 1992, the number of the applications and titles granted had risen substantially and that the increase resulted from the review of their Law in 1991 to harmonize it with the 1978 Act of the UPOV Convention. He concluded by explaining that new technologies and the current breeding techniques would require a new legal framework to protect plant breeder's rights and, therefore, they had started to revise their Plant Breeders' Rights Legislation in order to bring it in line with the 1991 Act of the UPOV Convention.

6. The TWF received the following short reports from experts.

7. Mrs. Vera Lucia Dos Santos Machado (Brazil) reported that her Office had received more than 400 applications of which 45% had been for soyabean. Only 3 applications had been for fruit crops.

8. Mr. Manuel Toro Ugalde (Chile) reported that, of more than 500 applications received, around 100 were for ornamental, 200 for agricultural and 200 for fruit crops, and were mainly from Europe and the United States of America.

9. Mr. Richard Brand (France) explained that the *Groupe d'études et de contrôle des variétés et semences (GEVES)* was a technical institute acting on behalf of national and supra national committees in France and the European Union, respectively. It was responsible for: varietal studies for registration, plant breeders' rights and seed standards and certification controls; seed control as a national seed station (International Seed Testing Association (ISTA) representative); education and methodology research in the field of seed and varieties; and coordinator, or partner, of genetic resources management on behalf of French Genetic Resources Office. He explained that DUS and VCU tests were conducted by GEVES for field crops, vegetables and ornamental species – fruit and forest trees were mainly tested by contracts with the National Agronomic Research Institute (INRA) and foreign authorities (as for some ornamental species). DUS studies were conducted by GEVES on apple, pear, cydonia (Angers), apricot, peach (Avignon), *Castanea*, *Prunus genum*, cherry (Bordeaux), citrus (Corsica) and grapevine (Montpellier), including rootstocks. He reported that around 150 applications were received each year for these species at the national or European level. It was explained that France was offering facilities for DUS testing through bilateral or multilateral cooperation. The Plant Breeder's Right System had been in existence in France since 1970, a fruit registration system since 1950 and a certification scheme since 1960. Other species (almond, berries, nut, olive, etc.) were sent to foreign authorities, inside the European Union, for DUS testing.

10. Mr. Erik Schulte (Germany) reported on his work as Testing Station Manager and Head of the Sector for Fruit Crops in the *Bundessortenamt*. He noted that more than 3,000 plant breeders' rights had been granted, and that 2500 of the varieties were added to the National List. Sixty applications had been received in that year of which 60% were applications for Community Plant Variety Rights. He indicated that the number of applications for plant breeders' rights had decreased over the last 10 years.

11. Mr. József Harsányi (Hungary) reported that the Hungarian Government had submitted a draft patent law, in line with the 1991 Act of the UPOV Convention, and that his country was, at that moment, bound to the 1978 Act. He explained that the Hungarian Minister for Foreign Affairs had received authorization to sign the 1991 Act of UPOV Convention in the near future. He noted that Hungary, as well as nine other Eastern European countries, might be members to the European Union as of May 1, 2004. He reported on the existing cooperation with the German *Bundessortenamt* in the field of harmonization of laws and in the practice of DUS and VCU testing. He indicated that, in 2001, Hungary had received patent applications for 1 apple, 6 cherry, 1 plum, 2 strawberry varieties and that patents had been granted for 1 apple, 1 jostaberry, 1 cherry rootstock and 1 grapevine rootstock variety.

12. Mr. Baruch Bar-Tel (Israel) reported that he was working as part of the Plant Breeders' Rights Testing Unit, Agricultural Research Organization, The Volcani Center. That Unit was responsible for testing all species. He indicated that from 1973 to that moment, more than 3,500 applications had been received, of which 5% were for fruits crops, mainly, citrus, grapevine, Japanese plum, strawberry, passiflora, avocado, nectarine, mango and prickly pear. Furthermore, he reported a reduction in the number of applications.

13. Mr. Kenichi Atsuta (Japan) mentioned that, in 2001, 1,057 applications had been received, of which 58 were for fruit crops. He indicated that, at the end of July 2002, there had been 29 applications for fruit crops.

14. Mr. Jackson Shuma (Kenya) reported that the Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate Service (KEPHIS) was responsible for plant variety protection. He indicated that, in his country, there were more applications for plant variety protection in ornamental crops than for any other crop. He explained that legislation had been introduced in 1999 but, because of incomplete technical facilities, no tests had been completed and no grants for protection issued.

15. Mr. Alejandro Barrientos (Mexico) reported that many applications had been received from breeders originating in the United States of America. He anticipated that there could be up to 30 applications for Opuntia in the current year.

16. Mr. Gerard Bolscher (Netherlands) reported that he was working on the inspection of horticultural crops, but especially fruit crops. He explained that there was a strong cooperation of his country with the United Kingdom and the CPVO in the technical examination of new varieties of plants.

17. Mr. Chris Barnaby (New Zealand) reported that the number of applications for protection of fruit varieties in New Zealand had remained relatively constant, at around 10 to 25 per annum. There had been a resurgence of interest in Pepino (*Solanum muricatum*), Feijoa (*Acca sellowiana*) and Rubus species. New types of interspecific crossing were being developed in Rubus with mixing of loganberry, blackberry, etc. National test guidelines are being developed for the testing of all Rubus species to include these new hybrid varieties.

18. Mr. Pedro M. Chomé Fuster (Spain) explained that, in his country, all aspects concerning varieties (commercial list, protection, seed and seedling certification, etc.) were carried out by the Spanish Plant Variety Office, namely, *Ofcina Española de Variedades (OEVV).* He reported that, during 2002, the OEVV had received 25 new applications for fruit varieties, of which 14 were for peach and 7 for apple. Currently 215 varieties were under examination, mainly comprising mandarin, apple, peach and strawberry. He expressed an interest in the use of molecular techniques in DUS testing but noted that the OEVV had not yet started to develop this.

19. Mrs. Alison Smith Lean (United Kingdom) reported that she was working for the Imperial College at Wye, University of London, under a contract from the United Kingdom Government, Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA). She explained that she was responsible for testing all temperate fruit varieties, except strawberries and raspberries, which the United Kingdom sent to Germany for testing. Tests were conducted, at the DEFRA site for National Fruit Collections in Brogdale, for UK Plant Breeders' Rights, the CPVO and others countries, such as Belgium and the Netherlands, under bilateral agreements. She indicated that over 4,000 named varieties were grown in the collections, of which over 2,000 were apple varieties, 600 pears, 500 cherries, 300 plums and 300 currants and gooseberries. The number of applications for fruit remained small, reflecting the present state of the industry. The majority of varieties in testing were apples, just under half of which were mutation varieties. Also in testing were 2 pear varieties and 2 gooseberry varieties. All testing followed the UPOV Test Guidelines, using traditional methods.

20. Mr. Sergio Semon (Community Plant Variety Office (CPVO)), reported that, in 2001, 2,100 applications had been received by the CPVO, of which more than 100 applications were for fruit crops (i.e. 5%), but noted that the figure may be higher for 2002. He noted that the main fruit species were: apple, strawberry and peach/nectarine, accounting for two thirds of all fruit applications. Draft protocols had been developed in conjunction with national experts from France, Germany, Italy, Portugal, Spain and the United Kingdom for apple, pear, peach/nectarine and strawberry. He reported that testing of apple varieties, according to mutation groups, would probably be centralized in certain examination offices in 2003. He informed the TWF that the 10,000th grant of protection was awarded in September 2002.

(b) Report on developments within UPOV

*21. The TWF received an oral report from the Office of the Union on the latest developments on plant variety protection at the Council, the Administrative and Legal Committee (hereinafter referred to as "the CAJ"), the Technical Committee (hereinafter referred to as "the TC") and the Technical Working Parties (hereinafter referred to as "the TWPs").

Molecular Techniques

(a) Developments in UPOV concerning the use of molecular techniques in DUS Testing (document TC/38/14 Add. – CAJ/45/5 Add.)

22. Based on document TC/38/14 Add.-CAJ/45/5 Add., the TWF received an oral report from the Office of the Union on the latest developments at the BMT, the *Ad hoc* Crop Subgroups on Molecular Techniques (hereinafter referred to as "Crop Subgroups") and the *Ad hoc* Subgroup of Technical and Legal Experts on Biochemical and Molecular Techniques (hereinafter referred to as "the BMT Review Group").

23. The TWF noted that BMT had held its seventh session in Hanover, Germany, from November 21 to 23, 2001, under the Chairmanship of Mr. Michael Camlin (United Kingdom). It was reported that much of the meeting had focussed on the reports from the Crop Subgroups, which had been initiated at the previous BMT session and managed through the relevant TWPs. The future role of the BMT was also discussed. The TWF noted that the BMT had considered it important for the BMT Review Group to consider models for the use of biochemical and molecular techniques in DUS testing, and make recommendations on the acceptability of the following models, before further consideration of the technical aspects:

Option 1: Molecular characteristics as a predictor of traditional characteristics (Proposal 1):

(a) use of molecular characteristics which are directly linked to traditional characteristics (gene specific markers);

(b) use of a set of molecular characteristics which can be used reliably to estimate traditional characteristics; e.g. quantitative trait loci.

Option 2: Calibration of threshold levels for molecular characteristics against the minimum distance in traditional characteristics (Proposals 2 to 4).

Option 3: Development of a new system (Proposals 5 and 6).

24. It was reported to the TWF that the following recommendations were made by the BMT Review Group:

> Option 1(a) (Proposal 1): For a gene specific marker of a phenotypic characteristic. This proposal was, on the basis of the assumptions in the proposal, acceptable within the terms of the UPOV Convention and would not undermine the effectiveness of protection offered under the UPOV system;
>
> Option 2 (Proposals 2, 3 and 4): Calibration of threshold levels for molecular characteristics against the minimum distance in traditional characteristics for Maize, Oilseed Rape and Rose, respectively, where used for the management of reference collections, were, on the basis of the assumptions in the proposals, acceptable within the terms of the UPOV Convention and would not undermine the effectiveness of protection offered under the UPOV system; and
>
> Option 3 (Proposals 5 (Rose) and 6 (Wheat)): It noted there was no consensus on the acceptability of these proposals within the terms of the UPOV Convention and no consensus on whether they would undermine the effectiveness of protection offered under the UPOV system. Concerns were raised that, in those proposals, using that approach, it might be possible to use a limitless number of markers to find differences between varieties. The concern was also raised that differences would be found at the genetic level which were not reflected in morphological characteristics.

The TC agreed with the conclusions that proposals 1, 2, 3 and 4 could be pursued on the basis of the assumptions, whilst recognizing the need for further work to examine these assumptions and, in the case of option 2, to improve the relationship between morphological and molecular distances. The TC had noted the divergence of views expressed regarding proposals 5 and 6. The CAJ agreed with the conclusions of the BMT Review Group and endorsed the opinion of the TC.

*25. It was agreed to propose that the Office of the Union produce a document for interested parties, and in particular breeders, clearly explaining the current UPOV position on the possible use of molecular characteristics in DUS examination. This should explain the possible approaches set out in options 1, 2 and 3 and the view within UPOV on each of these options. It should also explain the current situation regarding developments in the Crop Subgroups and explain how work on other crops could be initiated. It was emphasized that this document should make clear that it did not address the possible use of molecular characteristics in other areas, such as variety identification or judgment of essential derivation. The Office of the Union suggested that it could draft such a document in consultation with the Chairpersons of the TC, CAJ and BMT, but nevertheless considered that it might be appropriate to submit the draft for approval to the TC and CAJ before it was more widely circulated.

(b) Ad hoc Crop Subgroups

*26. Mr. Erik Schulte (Germany) reported on the discussions in the BMT regarding the possible establishment of a Crop Subgroup for Peach and/or Citrus. It had been agreed that, at that time, there was not a clear basis to justify the establishment of a crop subgroup.

27. Mr. Schulte presented a review of current work on molecular techniques in peach and citrus (full references are provided in Annex II). He indicated that model crops were chosen

by the Technical Working Parties to see which of the models explained above (see paragraph 22, options 1 to 3) could be fulfilled. He recalled that the TWF, knowing that some work on peach had so far been carried out in France and also in Italy, decided to take this species as a model crop for the BMT. In order to provide the participants of the TWF with certain background knowledge to allow them to judge properly about further procedures, a short survey on recent publications dealing with molecular techniques in connection with fruit species had been requested. As a result, Mr. Schulte reported that a modified technique of the PCR method, using randomly amplified polymorphic DNA markers (RAPD-analysis) to show genetic linkage was used in blueberry (Burgher et al., 2002; Pelashock et al. 2002), melon (Levi et al., 2001) and pear (Teng et al., 2002). This method was also used for cultivar identification in apple (Stark-Urnau, 2002) and olive (Besnard et al., 2001). In Michigan, United States of America, restriction fragment-length polymorphisms (RFLP profiles) were used to identify self-incompatibility alleles in sweet cherry (Hauck et al. 2001). In work on Asian pear, in Japan, a modified technique, the simple sequence repeat (SSR) analysis, was used to identify different varieties (Yamamoto et al., 2002). He explained that this method was also used to show genetic linkage between varieties of grapefruit (Corazza-Nunes et al., 2002), apple (Banson et al., 2001), pear (Yamamoto et al., 2002), grapevine (Schütz, 2001) and peach (Quarta, 2001). He indicated that this latter experiment had been presented at the BMT meeting in November 2001 in Hanover, and that this work had been taken into consideration by the TWF when deciding to propose for peach as a model crop. The author had worked with both RAPD and SSR analysis. The resultant dendrograms allowed an analysis of the pedigree of the accessions tested. In her lecture at the BMT, Dr. Quarta had pointed out that the methods used might be considered helpful to examine uniformity, but would probably fail to prove distinctness, as mutant varieties were not properly discriminated by these methods. Nevertheless, she considered molecular marker techniques to be helpful for the management of reference collections. She explained that SSR, or microsatellite analysis, was considered to be the most precise and reproducible method, but the development of SSR markers was time-consuming and expensive. Where it was sufficient, the less expensive RAPD analysis was chosen. Besides screening of genotype material in gene banks or other collections, these methods were often used in breeding work, in a so-called "marker-assisted selection."

28. Mr. Schulte explained that the major problem to be confronted with when testing varieties in growing trials was the decreasing minimum distances resulting from an increasing amount of mutation varieties. None of the techniques mentioned above had so far managed to distinguish mutations successfully. For the time being, molecular marker techniques were far from being able to replace the conventional assessment of morphological or phenological characteristics in connection with DUS testing of fruit varieties. However, with increasing sensitivity, the methods would increasingly gain interest as a tool to provide further information on tested varieties, in addition to the results of comparative growing trials.

*29. The expert from France reported that the use of molecular characteristics for variety identification was being investigated in apple, apricot, grapevine and peach. However, he noted that there were no plans to extend this work to the examination of DUS, firstly, because it was not necessary for the examination of distinctness and, secondly, because it was not possible to distinguish varieties resulting from mutation.

*30. The expert from the CPVO reported on work being conducted on peach in Spain.

*31. The TWF concluded that it would not be appropriate to propose the establishment of a crop subgroup at this time. However, it welcomed the proposal from the expert from France to prepare a summary of work on molecular characteristics in fruit crops for review at the next

TWF meeting. This summary would explain the technical progress, but would also consider whether there were plans for this work to be applied for the examination of DUS and, therefore, provide support for the establishment of a crop subgroup.

Project to Consider the Publication of Variety Descriptions (Document TC/38/10 Add.)

*32. The TWF proposed that the following species be suggested for consideration by the TC as models for the project on the publication of variety descriptions:

(a) Apple

The coordinating member would be the United Kingdom. The other interested parties would be: Argentina, France, Germany, Hungary, Netherlands, New Zealand and CPVO.

(b) Strawberry

The coordinating member would be Israel. The other interested parties would be: Argentina; France, Germany, Hungary, Kenya, New Zealand, Spain and CPVO.

*33. It noted that the Test Guidelines for Apple were currently under revision and that a survey of the descriptions of varieties for the characteristics in the Test Guidelines would help in the selection of asterisked and grouping characteristics and might indicate if certain characteristics were not described in a clear way. Furthermore, it noted that it was very difficult to maintain a living collection of all varieties of common knowledge, because of the global nature of the crop. It heard that a survey of variety descriptions had been undertaken within the International Plant Genetic Resources Institute (IPGRI) and that this had shown a high degree of variation in variety descriptions. It further noted that it would be necessary to consider the regional distribution of apple varieties.

*34. The TWF considered that strawberry would also be a good basis for a model study because there were a number of varieties which were grown on a global basis and that most members of the Union would have an interest. Furthermore, there would not be a problem of mutation in this crop.

35. It was noted that the CPVO was planning to undertake an exchange of variety descriptions for apple and strawberry in order that variety collections within the European Union were up-to-date.

UPOV Databases

*36. The TWF received an oral report from the Office of the Union on the latest developments in the UPOV databases.

TGP Documents

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

TGP/7.1 Draft 1 "Guidance for Drafters of Test Guidelines"

*37. The Office of the Union introduced document TGP/7.1 Draft 1.

*38. The TWF made the following recommendations:

ASW 3 The TWF agreed with the proposal from the TWO that additional standard wording and/or guidance notes should be developed to explain the nature of the growing cycle in section 3.3, where this was not obvious. For example, in the case of fruit trees it should explain that the growing cycle should relate to the production of fruit. It may also be necessary to indicate that the first fruit cycle should not be counted.

ASW 3(a) It agreed with the TWO proposal that the word "note" should be replaced by "key" to avoid confusion with the use of the term notes in the Table of Characteristics.

ASW 3(b) The TWF proposed that the title of this section should read "Stage of development for the assessment."

ASW 5(c) It agreed with the TWO that this wording did not cover all the options possible in Test Guidelines where there were both seed propagated and vegetatively propagated varieties, e.g. where there were self-pollinated varieties. It proposed that this section should be moved to the end of ASW 5 and various options developed to cover all the combinations of (a), (b), (d) and (e) and, furthermore, that these options should not be restricted to ornamental varieties.

ASW 7 It was agreed that the phrase "Variety resulting from" at the beginning of section 4.1.1 also related to sections 4.1.2, 4.1.3 and 4.1.4 and the text should be amended accordingly.

ASW 9 It was agreed that the title should be amended by insertion of the words "of seed propagated" before "hybrid varieties."

ASW 10 The TWF noted the concerns from the International Seed Federation (ISF) regarding the requirement for color photographs but, as for the TWO, requested ISF to explain its particular concerns.

GN 6 The TWF expressed its support of the view of the TWA that option 2, rather option 1, should be presented in GN 6.

GN 10(a)/(b) The TWF expressed its support of the current draft of GN 10.

GN 10(c) The TWF agreed with the TWO proposal that, in addition to availability, the guidance notes should request that drafters of Test Guidelines take into account the expected life-time of varieties when selecting example varieties. For example, if a variety had proved to be commercially viable over a very long period it might be expected to have a longer future life expectancy than some newer varieties where experience showed that the commercial viability of such newer varieties was, in general, quite short.

GN 10(d) The TWF proposed that this section should explain where such fluctuations could arise, for example if a variety had a particular interaction with the photoperiod

GN 10(h)(i) The TWF proposed that the first paragraph should be elaborated to explain that if the same example varieties are not used it is not possible to be sure that the range in one territory is the same as that in another territory since the range of varieties and consequently the range of states of expression may be different.

The TWF did not agree with the proposal from the TWO to remove the list of example varieties to an annex in all Test Guidelines since it considered that it was important to have the example varieties in the place where most convenient for users. It also emphasized that the use of different sets of example varieties should be minimized. Thus, it did not consider that factors such as phytosanitary requirements were necessarily a basis for developing different sets of example varieties since these could be overcome with reasonable effort.

It proposed that, for a situation where multiple sets of example varieties were unavoidable, the different sets of example varieties should be presented in an annex in the same structure as the Table of Characteristics, such that the appropriate set could be easily copied and pasted into the Table of Characteristics. Furthermore, it proposed that this needs only to be done for selected characteristics if the universally accepted varieties could be accepted for the other characteristics.

GN 10(h)(ii) The TWF agreed with the TWO that the guidance notes should clarify that example varieties from different countries should not be provided for the same characteristic unless it was known that they represented the same scale. In cases where this was not the case the sets of example varieties from different countries should be provided as separate lists.

GN 14 The TWF proposed that further measures were not necessary since the asterisked characteristics clearly identified those characteristics which should be examined in all countries. However, it noted that it may not always be necessary to include all those characteristics fulfilling the requirements for inclusion in the Table of Characteristics if there was a clear consensus within all interested parties to omit certain of these characteristics.

GN 15 The TWF agreed with the TWO that this information should be presented in a table to make it easier to follow.

GN 19 The TWF agreed with the TWO that the title of this should be “Recommendations for conducting the examination.”

GN 21(a) The TWF agreed with the TWO that guidance was needed for the use of the underlined wording to indicate where a characteristic only applied to certain types of varieties.

GN 22(c) The expert from IPGRI explained that IPGRI had a different approach to the order of states of expression for growth habit and shapes of the apex. The Technical Director of UPOV agreed that, in the interests of harmonization of

describing characteristics, UPOV could consider changing its approach if there was a technical reason for doing so. Indeed, the process of developing TGP/7 "Development of Test Guidelines" was intended to offer an opportunity for all interested parties to comment in this way and welcomed such comments. The expert from IPGRI also agreed that, in the interests of harmonization of describing characteristics, IPGRI could consider changing its approach if there was a technical reason for doing so. With regard to the growth habit characteristic it was agreed that the only fixed state for all versions of this characteristic was "erect", since the other end of the scale might end with "prostrate", "reflexed," etc. according to the individual circumstances. It was for this reason that "erect" was attributed state 1 since it would always be state 1 in all characteristics. With regard to the shape of the apex it was agreed that, at first sight, there did not appear to be any clear reason for the order going from "pointed" to "rounded" and it was agreed to check if there was a particular reason.

GN 23 The TWF noted that this section would be reviewed in discussions on TGP/7.3.1.

GN 24 The TWF agreed that the second sentence should be re-worded as proposed by the TWA. It further proposed that the final sentence should read as follows: "Where necessary, characteristics in the Test Guidelines can be simplified (e.g. color groups can be created rather then requesting an RHS Colour Chart reference) for inclusion in the Technical Questionnaire (TQ), if this would be of assistance for the breeder completing the TQ. Furthermore, the characteristics contained in the Test Guidelines can be combined or formulated in a way which is more easily recognizable to breeders when presented in the TQ. For example, the TQ for peach may request information on whether the variety is a "melting" or "non-melting" type, which although not a characteristic in the Table of Characteristics would provide information on the states of expression of certain characteristics included in the Table of Characteristics.

TGP/7.2 Draft 1 "TG Template"

39. The Office of the Union introduced document TGP/7.2 Draft 1.

*40. The TWF made the following recommendations:

3.5 Number of Plants / Parts of Plants to be Examined

It agreed with the TWA and TWO respectively that "on single plants" should be inserted after the word observations and that the following sentence be introduced to clarify that other types of observation, in particular visual observation, were also possible.
"Unless otherwise indicated, all observations determined by means other than measuring or counting should be made on all plants in the test."

6.5 Legend

The TWF strongly supported the retention of an indication of the type of expression (qualitative characteristic (QL), quantitative characteristic (QN), pseudo-qualitative

characteristic (PQ)) in all Test Guidelines and did not consider that this should be optional. It noted that where the expression of an individual characteristic was unknown, the indication for that characteristic could be omitted, but emphasized the importance of providing information to users of Test Guidelines where at all possible.

7. Table of Characteristics

It agreed with the TWO that the title of GN 19 should be changed to "Recommendations for conducting the examination."

9. (New) Information on plant material to be examined

9.1 The expression of a characteristic or several characteristics of a variety may be affected by factors, such as pests and disease, chemical treatment (e.g. growth retardants or pesticides), effects of tissue culture, different rootstocks, scions taken from different growth phases of a tree, etc.

9.2 To the best of your knowledge, will the plant material to be examined be affected by the following factors in a way which may affect the expression of the characteristics of the variety?

(a) Pests Yes [ ] No [ ]

(b) Disease Yes [ ] No [ ]

(c) Micro-organisms (e.g. virus, bacteria, phytoplasma) Yes [ ] No [ ]

(d) Chemical treatment (e.g. growth retardant or pesticide) Yes [ ] No [ ]

(e) Other factors Yes [ ] No [ ]

Please provide details of any factors where you have indicated "yes".

9.3 Has the plant material to be examined been subjected to:

(a) Tissue culture Yes [ ] No [ ]

(b) Different rootstock from that to be used in the examination (if appropriate) Yes [ ] No [ ]

(c) Other Yes [ ] No [ ]

Please provide details of where you have indicated "yes".

[ASW 9.4 Has the plant material to be examined been tested for the presence of virus or other disease?

Yes [ ] (please provide details)
No [ ]]

10. Technical Questionnaire

10.6 Similar varieties and differences from these varieties

The TWF agreed with the recommendation from the Technical Working Party for Agriculture (TWA), that a suitable example should be provided for the individual Test Guidelines. It also agreed with the TWO recommendation that a brief explanation should be provided for the applicants to ensure that they would understand how to complete this section.

11. Annex to the Technical Questionnaire

The TWF agreed with the TWO that it was important for the information requested in this annex to be provided at the time of the application and that this section should be included within the Technical Questionnaire. To improve the clarity for users who might be more familiar with applications for the patent system it proposed that the word "plant" should be inserted before "material." It was undecided whether the heading should be changed to "Information on Material to be Submitted for Examination" and noted that it would be necessary to see if this change would be acceptable to members using a breeder-based testing approach. On this basis it proposed that it should read as follows:

TGP/7.4 Draft 1 "Procedures for the Introduction and Revision of Test Guidelines"

41. The Office of the Union introduced document TGP/7.4 Draft 1.

*42. The TWF made the following recommendations:

1.2.1 The TWF proposed that this section should explain that the main international non-governmental organizations in the field of plant breeding and genetic resource management were invited to be observer organizations and would thereby be involved in the drafting of Test Guidelines.

2.3 The TWF requested that, at each meeting of a TWP, the Office of the Union reports on proposals from other TWPs for the drafting of Test Guidelines, to allow them to consider if they would wish to be involved in, or perhaps be responsible for, the drafting of particular Test Guidelines.

2.4.2 It was agreed that this section should be modified to make it clearer that work on the drafting of Test Guidelines could start before formal approval by the TC.

5.3 The TWF agreed with the approach for referencing Test Guidelines as set out in Option 3.

TGP/7.3.1 Draft 1 "Standardized UPOV Terms and Explanations: Types of Expression of Characteristics"

43. The Office of the Union introduced the document TGP/7.3.1 Draft 1.

*44. The TWF made the following recommendations:

2.3.2.2 Further consideration should be given to whether states 1 and 9 should continue to be used for absent and present. The TWF noted that there were two reasons to consider changing from the present 1 and 9 states. Firstly, it could lead to harmonization with the IPGRI system of descriptors, where the states 0 and 1 are used for absent and present respectively. Secondly, the current approach could be misleading since it implied that there were states in between 1 and 9. Some participants also thought that the 0 and 1 states were more logical since 0 corresponded to absence. It was noted that a change to a new approach might cause some additional work and that in some systems the figure "0" was used to indicate that no data was available.

3.4.2.2.1(first) It was noted that the heading should read "Wording of uneven states"
3.4.3.2.1(second) It was noted that this should be amended to read 3.4.2.2.2

3.5.1 The TWF agreed with the TWO recommendation that the condensed range should be limited to those characteristics which are visually observed. In the case of characteristics which are measured or counted the normal scale should be used.

3.5.1 Condensed Range 2: The TWF recommended that state 2 should be termed "medium" or "moderate."

TGP/7.3.2 Draft 1 "Standardized UPOV Terms and Explanations: Harmonized States of Expression of Characteristics"

45. The Office of the Union introduced document TGP/7.3.2 Draft 1.

*46. The TWF welcomed the development of the document and agreed with the proposed approach.

TGP/4.1 Draft 2 "General Guidance for the Management of Variety Collections" and TGP/9 "Examining Distinctness"

*47. The TWF endorsed the recommendation of the TWO that TGP/4 should be restricted to the practical management of variety collections and should not seek to establish guidelines for deciding which varieties should be included, since this should be addressed in TGP/9. It considered that the elaboration of varieties of common knowledge should be covered by TGP/3. The TWF considered that, within the scope of the management of variety collections, the document should address the management of collections of both living plant material and the management of information, such as that contained in databases or catalogues. With regard to TGP/9.1 "General Procedures for Examining Distinctness" the TWF endorsed the approach proposed by the TWA, namely to provide examples of different approaches to examining distinctness used by UPOV members. It recommended that this should have an introduction to explain the nature of the document and this introduction should clarify that there was only one system for examination of distinctness, but that different approaches could be developed within this single system. It also noted that the current draft of TGP/4 contained overlaps with the examination of distinctness.

*48. The expert from New Zealand introduced a preliminary version of a draft for a section of TGP/4.2 on "Variety Collections for Tree and Perennial Species." It was agreed that this covered the important aspects of dealing with variety collections of such species.

TGP/9.4.2 Draft 1 "Examining Distinctness in Different Types of Variety: Rootstocks"

*49. The document was introduced by the expert from Germany.

*50. The TWF proposed that the word "preferably" should be changed to "often" in the first line of paragraph 3. It also proposed that a new section should be introduced to address seed propagated rootstock varieties.

(b) Other TGP documents

TGP/13 Draft 1 "Guidance for New Types and Species"

*51. The document was introduced by the expert from New Zealand. It was agreed that the document should clarify that it was intended to refer to species and types which were new in terms of applications of varieties for protection, rather than new to nature.

TGP/14.2.1 Draft 1 "Glossary of Technical, Botanical and Statistical Terms Used in UPOV Documents: Botanical Terms: Plant Shapes"

52. Document TGP/14.2 was introduced by the expert from the United Kingdom.

53. The TWF welcomed the document and agreed that the document would be even more useful if it was re-structured into three sections, in recognition of the fact that the drafters of the Test Guidelines would use the illustrations as the first point of reference: the first section should provide the definition of apex, tip and base; the second section should contain the illustrations for the shapes; and the final section should contain the detailed glossary linked to the illustrations. It was recommended that the illustrations section should contain a sufficient number of illustrations for each type of shape and/or possible states of expression, to be clear to the user. The TWF proposed that a sub-section should be included on full plane shapes to explain how to describe fruit shape and, in particular, how to orientate the fruit, i.e. stalk end up or down, according to the norm in each species.

*54. It was agreed that the document should be extended to include leaf margins and leaf divisions.

*55. The TWF proposed that a similar document should be prepared on hair types, by the expert from New Zealand, for its next session.

Other TGP Documents

*56. The TWF did not have time to consider the other TGP documents at the meeting and requested that written comments on the following documents be sent to the Office of the Union by December 6, 2002:

TGP/3.2 Draft 1	Developments and Explanations Regarding Varieties of Common Knowledge
TGP/6.1.2 Draft 1	Examples of Arrangements for DUS Testing
TGP/8.4 Draft 1	Types of Characteristics and Their Scale Levels
TGP/8.6 Draft 1	Examining DUS in Bulk Samples
TGP/9.1.1 Draft 1	General Procedures for Determining Distinctness: Official Testing
TGP/9.1.2.1 Draft 1	General Procedures for Determining Distinctness: Breeder Testing (Australia)
TGP/9.1.2.2 Draft 1	General Procedures for Determining Distinctness: With the Participation of Breeders (France)
TGP/9.1.3 Draft 1	General Procedures for Determining Distinctness: General
TGP/9.3.1 Draft 1	Consideration of All Varieties of Common Knowledge in the Examination of Distinctness
TGP/9.3.2 Draft 1	TGP/9.3.2 Draft 1 Consideration of All Varieties of Common Knowledge in the Examination of Distinctness: The Use of 'Phenotypic Distance' for Examining Distinctness
TGP/9.4.1 Draft 1	Examining Distinctness in Different Types of Variety: General
TGP/10.2 Draft 1	Assessing Uniformity According to the Features of Propagation
TGP/12.1.1 Draft 1	Characteristics Expressed in Response to External Factors: Disease Resistance

Discussion on Draft Test Guidelines (Plenary)

Citrus

*57. The expert from Spain introduced the following documents:

Grapefruit and Pummelos (Revision)	(TWF/33/2) (TG/GRA-PUM(proj.1))
Lemons and Limes (Revision)	(TWF/33/3) (TG/LEM-LIM(proj.1))
Mandarin (Revision)	(TWF/33/4) (TG/MANDA(proj.1))
Oranges (Revision)	(TWF/33/5) (TG/ORANG(proj.1))

*58. The TWF agreed the following changes:

Title page: Spanish column: Toronjo to be deleted and Pampelmusa to be replaced by Pummelo (document TWF/33/2)

Other associated documents: to read: "… Group 3: TG/LEM-LIM(proj.1)-(TWF/33/3)

6.5 *[#]* to be deleted

7. Table of Characteristics

Characteristics 33 and 34 (document TWF/33/2): Delete Example variety "Oran Red."

8. Explanations on the Table of Characteristics

Missing explanations to be provided

10. Technical Questionnaire

10.1 Latin names to be linked to the appropriate common names

10.5 Characteristics to be updated in line with changes in the Table of Characteristics. In document TWF/33/2 Oran Red to be deleted in Sections 5.1 and 5.2.

10.6 Suitable examples to be provided

10.7 ASW 10 to be inserted

*59. The expert from Spain introduced the following document:

Citrus L.: Overall Table of Characteristics (TWF/33/2 Add. - TWF/33/3 Add. - TWF/33/4 Add. - TWF/33/5 Add. - TWF/33/6 Add.)

*60. The TWF agreed that the experts from Germany and France would provide corrections for the German and French translations, respectively, to the Office of the Union. It agreed the following changes:

Page 1, 2 Group 1:
Common Spanish name for *C. clementina* to read: Clementina
Common English name for *C. deliciosa* to read: Mandarina comun
Common English name for *C. reticulata* to read: Tangerine
Common Spanish name for *C. reticulata* to read: Mandarina Ponkan

Group 2:
Common Spanish name for *C. aurantium* to read: Naranjo amargo o agrio

Group 3:
First species to read: *C. aurantifolia* with Spanish common name: Lima Mexicana and Limón Mexicano

C. latifolia: common Spanish name: Lima acida
C. limettioides: common Spanish name: Lima dulce
C. jambhiri: common Spanish name: Limon rugoso

Group 4:
Spanish translation to read: "Pomelo y Pummelo y sus híbridos"
C.grandis: common Spanish name: Pummelo
C. paradisi: common Spanish name: Pomelo o Toronja

Group 5:
Poncirus x Grapefruit; *Poncirus x* Lemons; *Poncirus x* Mandarin; *Poncirus x* Sweet orange: the stated common names for each hybrid to apply for all languages.

7. Table of Characteristics

Column 1 (Original*) to be deleted.

Columns 3 to 7: "y" to be replaced by number when Test Guidelines for Group 5 complete

Char. 2 To read "erguido" in Spanish (state 1) and "abierto" (state 2)
Char. 20 To add abullonado o ampollado in Spanish
Char. 24 State 1 to read: absent
Char. 29 To read "Varieties with petiole wings present only: Petiole: …"
Char. 42 State 7 to read "sinuoso" in Spanish
Char. 49 "transversal" to be amended to "transverse." State 1 to read: circular.
Char. 51 To read "Varieties with fruit neck absent only: Fruit: presence of depression at stalk end"
Char. 52 To read "Varieties with fruit neck absent only: Fruit: depth of depression at stalk end"
Char. 65 To add "… el mamelón o pezón, el …" in Spanish
Chars. 69 and 70 In Spanish to add "o pezón"
Char. 82 To read "Fruit: color variegation." In French translation "variation" to be amended to "panachure"
Char. 85 state 7 to read "Fuerte" in Spanish
Char. 92, 94 In Spanish version to replace "laxa" with "dispersa"
Char. 109 In Spanish translation "acritud" to be amended to "amargor"
Char. 112 To read "Fruit: presence of rudimentary segments" and wording of states to be checked to see if it should be absent or few (1); … many (3)
Char. 120 Remove underlining of word "internally"
Chars. 120 and 121 In Spanish translation "desde dentro" to be amended to "internamente"
Char. 122 To check if "juice content" should be replaced by "juiciness"
Char. 123 In Spanish translation "totales" to be added to end of characteristic title and "s" removed from the end of "bajo," "mediano," "alto."
Char. 126 "del" to be deleted from column 2
Char. 128 In French translation to read "… polyembryoniques"
Char. 134 In Spanish translation to read "Semilla: color de la cubierta interna"
Char. 135 To insert "Polyembryonic varieties only: …"
Char. 138 In Spanish translation to read "Fruto: partenocárpia"

Qualitative characteristics: 1, 6, 26, 28, 30, 37, 38, 40, 43, 44, 51, 53, 56, 61, 66, 69, 71, 72, 80, 82, 104, 106, 107, 109, 128, 131, 136, 138, 139.

Quantitative characteristics: 3, 4, 5, 7, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 27, 29, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 41, 45, 46, 47, 48, 52, 54, 55, 57, 58, 59, 60, 62, 63, 64, 65, 67, 68, 70, 73, 74, 75, 78, 79, 81, 84, 85, 86, 87, 89, 90, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 102, 103, 105, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 129, 130, 132, 137.

Pseudo-qualitative characteristics 2, 8, 9, 24, 25, 39, 42, 49, 50, 76, 77, 83, 88, 91, 101, 108, 120, 133, 134, 135.

Discussions on Draft Test Guidelines (Subgroups):

(a) Subgroup discussions on final draft Test Guidelines

Cherimoya, TWF/33/12(TG/CHERIM(proj.1))

*61. The experts from Japan and Mexico introduced document TWF/33/12 (TG/CHERIM (proj.1)).

*62. The Subgroup agreed the following changes:

The Latin name to be amended to *Annona cherimola* Mill. on title page (twice) and sections 1, 2.2, 2.3 and 10.1.1.1.

Title page Spanish common name: "Anona del Peru" to be deleted and "Cherimoya" added.

2.3 To read "eight" plants instead of "five"

3.3.2 (a) To read "One-year-old shoot: Unless otherwise stated, all observations on the one-year-old shoot should be made on the middle third during dormant season."

3.3.2 (b) To be deleted

5.3 (b) To read "Fruit: segmentation of surface" (to be checked)

5.3 (c) Space needed between "surface" and "(...)"

6.5 To read "(a) to (d)"

7. Table of Characteristics

Key (b) To be deleted
Key (c) To be renumbered (b)
Key (d) To be renumbered (c)
Key (e) To be renumbered (d)

Old characteristic numbers shown as "[…]" or "new" to be deleted

Chars. 2, 12, 19, Example variety to read "Fino de Jete"
Chars. 16, 22, 31, 34, 35, 36, 38, 39, 41, 43, 44, 52 Example variety to read "El Bumpo"

Char. 1 To be indicated as QN. To read "Shoot: length of internode"
Char. 2 To be indicated as PQ
Char. 3 To be indicated as QL. To read "pubescence."
Char. 4 To be indicated as QN. Example variety to read "African Pride"
Char. 5 To be indicated as QN
Char. 6 To be indicated as QN
Char. 7 To be indicated as PQ. State 2 to read "oblate," state 3 to read "broad lanceolate" and state 4 to read "narrow lanceolate"
Char. 8 To be indicated as QN. To read "Leaf blade: green color (upper side)" with states: light (1), medium (2), dark (3).
Char. 9 To be indicated as PQ. To read "Leaf blade: green color (lower side)"
Char. 10 To be indicated as QL. To read "Leaf blade: pubescence (upper side)"
Char. 11 To be indicated as QL. To read "Leaf blade: pubescence (lower side)"
Char. 12 To be indicated as QN
Char. 13 To be indicated as QN
Char. 14 To be indicated as QN. To read "Leaf blade: undulation of margin." State 1 to read "absent or very weak."
Char. 15 To be indicated as QN. To read "Shoot: density of flowers"
Char. 16 To be indicated as QN. "Outer" to be deleted from heading
Char. 17 To be indicated as QN. "Outer" to be deleted from heading
Char. 18 To be indicated as QN. "Outer" to be deleted from heading
Char. 19 To be indicated as QN. "Outer" to be deleted from heading
Char. 20 To be indicated as PQ. "Outer" to be deleted from heading
Char. 21 To be deleted
Char. 22 To be indicated as QN
Char. 23 To be indicated as QN
Char. 24 To be indicated as QN
Char. 25 To be deleted
Char. 26 To be indicated as PQ. Insert space between ":" and "shape"
Char. 27 To be indicated as QN
Char. 28 To be indicated as QN
Char. 29 To be indicated as QN
Char. 30 To be indicated as QN
Char. 31 To be indicated as PQ. State 5 to read "trapezoidal"
Char. 32 To be indicated as QL
Char. 33 To be indicated as PQ
Char. 34 To be indicated as QN
Char. 35 To be indicated as QL. To read "Fruit: segmentation of surface" with states: reticulate (1); overlapping segments (2). (To be checked)
Char. 36 To be indicated as QN. State 1 to read "absent or very small"
Char. 37 To be indicated as PQ
Char. 38 To be indicated as QN
Char. 39 To be indicated as QN
Char. 40 To be indicated as QN
Char. 41 To be indicated as QN
Char. 42 To be indicated as QN. "(sweetness)" to be deleted

Char. 43 To be indicated as QN
Char. 44 To be indicated as QN. To have the states: weak (3), medium (5), strong (7)
Char. 45 To be indicated as QN
Char. 46 To be indicated as QN
Char. 47 To be indicated as QN
Char. 48 To be indicated as QN. To read "Seed: ratio length/width". Example varieties: Oakwood (state 3); El Bumpo (state 5); Bay Off (state 7)
Char. 49 To be indicated as QN
Char. 50 To be indicated as QL
Char. 51 To be indicated as QN
Char. 52 To be indicated as QN

8. Explanations on the Table of Characteristics

Ad. 7 State 2 to read "oblate," state 3 to read "broad lanceolate" and state 4 to read "narrow lanceolate"
Ad. 31 State 5 to read "trapezoidal"
Ad. 35 To read "Fruit: segmentation of surface" with states: reticulate (1); overlapping segments (2). (To be checked)
Ad. 36 State 1 to read "absent or very small"

9. Literature

To be put in alphabetical order

10. Technical Questionnaire

5.1 State 5 to read "trapezoidal"
5.2 To read "Fruit: segmentation of surface" with states: reticulate (1); overlapping segments (2). (To be checked)
5.3 State 1 to read "absent or very small"

6 Example to be provided

7.3 ASW 10 to be added

Persimmon (Revision), TWF/33/14(TG/92/4(proj.1))

*63. The expert from Japan introduced document TWF/33/14(TG/92/4(proj.1)).

*64. The Subgroup agreed the following changes:

Title page spelling of Spanish common name "Caqui" to be checked

5.3 (g) To be deleted (characteristic 47)

7. Table of Characteristics

Old characteristic numbers shown as […] to be deleted

Characteristics to be renumbered without lettering suffix (e.g. 37.a and 37.b become 37 and 38).

Char. 1 To be indicated as QN
Char. 2 To be indicated as PQ
Char. 3 To be indicated as QN
Char. 4 To be indicated as QN
Char. 5 To be indicated as QN
Char. 6 To be indicated as QN
Char. 7 To be indicated as QN
Char. 8 To be indicated as PQ
Char. 9 To be indicated as PQ.
Char. 10 To be indicated as PQ. State 2 to read “oblate”
Char. 11 To be indicated as QN
Char. 12 To be indicated as QN
Char. 13 To be indicated as PQ
Char. 14 To be indicated as PQ
Char. 15 To be indicated as PQ
Char. 16 To be indicated as QL
Char. 17 To be indicated as QN
Char. 18 To be indicated as PQ. To read “Female flower: shape of calyx viewed from above”
Char. 19 To be indicated as QL
Char. 20 To be indicated as QN
Char. 21 To be indicated as PQ
Char. 22 To be indicated as PQ. State 2 to read “irregular rounded”
Char. 23 To be indicated as PQ
Char. 24 To be indicated as QN. State 2 to read “moderate”
Char. 25 To be indicated as QN. State 2 to read “moderate”
Char. 26 To be indicated as QN. State 2 to read “moderate”
Char. 27 To be indicated as QN. To read “Fruit: longitudinal grooving”
Char. 28 To be indicated as QN
Char. 29 To be indicated as QN. State 1 to read “level”
Char. 30 To be indicated as QL
Char. 31 To be indicated as QN. State 2 to read “moderate”
Char. 32 To be indicated as QN
Char. 33 To be indicated as QN
Char. 34 To be indicated as QN
Char. 35 To be indicated as QN
Char. 36 To be indicated as QN
Char. 37.a To be indicated as PQ
Char. 37.b To be indicated as PQ
Char. 38.a To be indicated as PQ
Char. 38.b To be indicated as PQ
New Char. (after 38.b) To be indicated as QL. To read “Fruit: presence of brown specks in flesh. To have the states: absent (1); present (9). Example varieties: Atago, Saijo (state 1); Zenjimaru (state 9)
Char. 39 To be indicated as QN. State 1 to be deleted
Char. 40 To be indicated as QN
Char. 41 To be indicated as PQ. To read “Seed: shape in lateral view”
Char. 42 To be indicated as PQ

Char. 43 To be indicated as QN. To read "Female flower only: Time of flowering of female flower (80% open)"
Char. 44 To be indicated as QN
Char. 45.a To be indicated as QN
Char. 45.b To be indicated as QN
Char. 46 To be indicated as QL
Char. 47 To be indicated as QL

8. Explanations on the Table of Characteristics

Ad. 18 To read "Female flower: shape of calyx viewed from above"
Ad. 22 State 2 to read "irregular rounded"
Ad. 24 State 2 to read "moderate"
Ad. 25 State 2 to read "moderate"
Ad. 26 State 2 to read "moderate"
Ad. 27 To read "Fruit: longitudinal grooving"
Ad. 29 State 1 to read "level"
Ad. 41 To read "Seed: shape in lateral view"
Ad. 54 To read "Ad. 47"

9. Literature

List to be alphabetic. Further reference for Bellini to be added.

10. Technical Questionnaire

5.7 To be deleted

6. Example: Fruit: general shape in lateral view e.g. elliptic / e.g. circular

7.3 ASW 10 to be added

Poncirus, TWF/33/6(TG/PONCIR(proj.1))

*65. The expert from Spain introduced document TWF/33/6(TG/PONCIR(proj.1)).

*66. The Subgroup agreed the following changes:

On page 1 :

To delete *Poncirus*, under alternative names, everywhere, except under Latin. In other associated documents, write Citrus L. as follows : "*Citrus* L."

1.3 To write FRUIT and ALL in small letters as follows : "fruit" and "all"

4.3.1 To change "for many types of variety" in "for many types of varieties", on the 3rd line.

6.5 *[#]* to be deleted
to redraft the "Notes for observing characteristics" as follows:

"a to i: See section 3.3.3.1"

7. Table of Characteristics

Char.1 to redraft the example variety as follows: *Poncirus trifoliata*
To repeat this in the whole document
Char. 7 (*) To be added
Char. 8 (*) To be added
Char. 17 To be deleted
Char. 19 To correct only in Spanish as follows: "abullonado or ampollado"
Char. 23 To change "entire" by "absent". (*) to be added
Char. 24 (*) To be added
Char. 27 (*) To be added
Char. 28: To add "(Varieties with petiole wings present only)"
Char. 41 (*) To be deleted
Char. 42 (*) To be deleted
Char. 43 (*) To be deleted
Char. 44 (*) To be deleted
Char. 46 (*) To be deleted
Char. 47 (*) To be deleted
Char. 49 (*) To be deleted
Char. 59 (*) To be deleted
Char. 60 (*) To be deleted
Char. 62 (*) To be deleted
Char. 64 (*) To be deleted
Char. 71 (*) To be deleted
Char. 72 (*) To be added
Char. 73 To receive (*)
Char. 83 (*) To be deleted
Char. 84 (*) To be deleted
Char. 92 (*) To be deleted
Char. 93 To remove "New"
Char. 98 (*) To be deleted
Char. 110 (*) To be deleted

It was noted that the overall Citrus Table of Characteristics would need to be updated according to the changes above.

8. Explanations on the Table of Characteristics

Ad. 45 (c49.): Fruit: circumference in transversal section :
to replace "round" by "circular"

List of Example Varieties for *Poncirus*:

To redraft the name of varieties under "Variety denomination", in small letters, except for "CPB 4475", as follows:

Carrizo
Cunningham,
Forner Alcaide 13

Poncirus trifoliata

10. Technical Questionnaire

To draft the Latin name and the common name as follows :

Poncirus Raf./Trifoliata Orange, Golden Apple – PON
Poncirus x Grapefruit /Citrumelo – CML
Poncirus x Lemons/Citremon – CTL
Poncirus x Mandarin/Citrandarin – CTI
Poncirus x Sweet Orange/Citrange – CTG

7.3 To add "A representative color photograph of the variety should accompany the Technical Questionnaire."

Quince (Revision), (TWF/33/7(TG/100/4(proj.1))

*67. The expert from Germany introduced document TWF/33/7(TG/100/4(proj.1)).

*68. The Subgroup agreed the following changes:

7. Table of Characteristics

All notes at the end of the characteristics (e.g. at the end of characteristic 3) to be deleted.

Char. 1 To be indicated as QN
Char. 2 To be indicated as PQ. "Upright" to be put in normal font.
Char. 3 To be indicated as PQ. To have the notes 1, 2, 3. Example variety Hov. No. 2 to be deleted
Char. 4 To be indicated as QN
Char. 5 To be indicated as QN
Char. 6 To be indicated as PQ
Char. 7 To be indicated as QN
Char. 8 To be indicated as QN. State 3 to read "strongly held out"
Char. 9 (+) to be added. To be indicated as QN. To read "Leaf blade: attitude" with the states: upright (1); horizontal (2); downwards (3)
Char. 10 To be indicated as QN
Char. 11 To be indicated as QN
Char. 12 To be indicated as PQ
Char. 13 To be indicated as PQ
Char. 14 To be indicated as QN. Example variety for state 2 to read "Mezötúri"
Char. 15 To be indicated as QN. Example variety "Triumph" to be put into correct font size
Char. 16 To be indicated as PQ
Char. 17 To be indicated as QN
Char. 18 To be indicated as QN
Char. 19 To be indicated as QN
Char. 20 To be indicated as QN
Char. 21 To be indicated as PQ

Char. 22 To be indicated as QN. To check if state 4: "irregular" needed. to delete "s" in arrangements
Char. 23 To be indicated as PQ
Char. 24 To be indicated as QN. To have the notes 3, 5, 7
Char. 25 To be indicated as QN. To read "…relative to anthers ..."
Char. 26 To be indicated as QN
Char. 27 To be indicated as PQ. Example variety "Fruits Ronds" to be put in normal font. Notes to be corrected to 1, 2, 3, 4, 5
Char. 28 To be indicated as PQ. State 1 to read "asymmetric" in English and "asymmetrisch" in German
Char. 29 To be indicated as PQ. Asterisk to be deleted
Char. 30 (+) to be added. To be indicated as QL. To read "Fruit: presence of neck"
Char. 31 (+) to be added. To be indicated as QN. To read "Fruit: length of neck"
Char. 32 To be deleted
Char. 33 To be indicated as QN
Char. 34 To be indicated as QN
Char. 35 To be deleted
Char. 36 To be indicated as QN. To read "Fruit: stalk cavity" with the states: absent or very small (1), small (3), medium (5), large (7). Example variety for state 1 to be Bereczki
Char. 37 To be indicated as QN
Char. 38 To be indicated as PQ
Char. 39 To be indicated as QN. Example variety "Champion" to be deleted and new variety provided for state 7
Char. 40 To be indicated as QN. Word "(changed)" to be deleted from heading
Char. 41 To be indicated as QN

8. Explanations on the Table of Characteristics

Ad. 8 State 3 to read "strongly held out"
Ad. 9 Explain that the characteristic is to be observed on erect shoots
Illustration to be provided
Ad 15 Illustration to be improved
Ad. 21 To read "The color of the flower should be observed on the first day on which it opens"
Ad. 22 To check if state 4: "irregular" needed
Ad.27 Illustrations to be rotated 180 degrees
Ad. 30 / 31 Illustration to be provided showing both characteristics
Ad. 32 To be deleted

9. Literature

Popow reference to read: Popov, E. ; "B"Lgarska Pomologiya". D"rzhavno Izdatelstvb za Selskostopanska Literatura, Sofiya. English version to be deleted

10. Technical Questionnaire

5.3 Notes to be corrected to 1, 2, 3, 4, 5

6 Example to be: Leaf blade: shape e.g. circular / e.g. obovate

7.3 ASW 10 to be added

Raspberry (Revision), TWF/33/8(TG/43/7(proj.1))

*69. The expert from Germany introduced document TWF/33/8(TG/43/7(proj.1)).

*70. The Subgroup agreed to work on the version of the document which presented the keys (a) to (h) in section 3.3.3. It then agreed the following changes:

3.3.3 (f) "shoot" to be replaced by "cane"

3.3.3 (h) First sentence to read "… summer harvest at the fruiting laterals only except for varieties …"

5.3 (a) To read "Very young shoot: anthocyanin coloration of apex during rapid growth (characteristic 3) "

5.3 new (after 5.3 (b) Characteristic 33 (Fruit: color) to be included as a grouping characteristic

5.3 (d) To replace underlined part of characteristic heading with "Varieties which fruit on previous year's cane in summer: …"

5.3 (e) To replace underlined part of characteristic heading with "Varieties which fruit on current year's cane in autumn: …"

7. Table of Characteristics

Characteristics to be renumbered without lettering suffix (e.g. 9a and 9b become 9 and 10).

Char. 1 To be indicated as PQ

Char. 2 To be indicated as QN

Char. 3 To be indicated as QL. To read "Very young shoot: anthocyanin coloration of apex during rapid growth"

Char. 4 To be indicated as QN. To read "Very young shoot: intensity of anthocyanin coloration of apex during rapid growth"

Char. 5 To be indicated as QN. Delete "intensity of" from heading

Char. 6 To be indicated as QN. Delete "intensity of" from heading

Char. 7 To be indicated as QN. States 3 and 5 to have the existing example varieties deleted and replaced by: Zefa 3 (3), Zefa 2, Rusilva (5)

Char. 8 To be indicated as QN. Example variety "Malling Admiral" to be replaced by "Veten"

Char. 9a, 9b, 10 To read "Varieties which fruit on previous year's cane in summer: …"

Char. 9a To be indicated as QN

Char. 9b To be indicated as QN

Char. 10 To be indicated as PQ. Example variety "Malling Orion" to be added for state 2. Example variety "Glen Clova" to replace "Rusilva" for state 3. Example variety "Malling Landmark" to have "," deleted between these two words. Example varieties to be presented in normal font. Example variety for state 4 to read "Festival"

Char. 11 To be indicated as QL

Chars. 12 to 15 To read "Varieties with spines present only: …"

Char. 12 To be indicated as QN

Char. 13 To be indicated as QN

Char. 14 To be indicated as QN. Example variety "Rucami" to be replaced by "Gigant"

Char. 15 To be indicated as PQ. Example variety "Rode Radboud" to be added for state 3. Example variety "Pechts Herbstfreude" to be replaced by "Sirius"

Char. 16 To be indicated as QN

Char. 17 To be indicated as PQ. Spelling of "equally" in state 2 to be corrected

Char. 18 To be indicated as QN

Char. 19 To be indicated as QN. To read "Leaf: rugosity." Footnote to be deleted

Char. 20 To be indicated as QN

Char. 21 To be indicated as QN

New Char. (after 21) To Read "Terminal leaflet: width" with states: narrow (1), medium (3), broad (5). To be indicated as QN. Example varieties to be provided

Char. 22 To be indicated as QN. Amend "vew" to be "few" in states 1 and 2. Example variety "Golden Bliss" to be added for state 9

Char. 23 To be indicated as QL. To have "Pedicel" replaced by "Peduncle." Example variety "Golden Bliss" to be added for state 1

Char. 24 To be indicated as QN. To read "Varieties with peduncle present only: Peduncle: intensity of anthocyanin." Example variety "Schönemann" to be replaced by Julia

Char. 25 To be indicated as QN. Example variety "Schönemann" to be replaced by Isabel

Char. 26 To be indicated as QN. State 3 to read "horizontal to drooping"

Char. 27 To be indicated as QN. Example variety "Malling Orion" to be replaced by "Multiraspa"

Char. 28 To be indicated as QN. Example variety "Malling Promise" to be added for state 3. Example varieties to be presented in normal format

Char. 29 To be indicated as QN. Example variety "Meeker" to be added for state 5. Example varieties to be presented in normal format

Char. 30 To be indicated as QN. Example variety "Rafzeter" to be added for state 5. Example varieties to be presented in normal format. Footnote to be deleted

Char. 31 To be indicated as PQ. State 2 to read "broad conical" and state 4 to read "trapezoidal." Footnote to be deleted

Char. 32 To be indicated as QN. Spelling of "Malling Orion" to be corrected.

Char. 33 To be indicated as PQ. To receive (*). State 7 to read "dark purple"

Char. 34 To be indicated as QN

Char. 35 To be indicated as QN

Char. 36 To be indicated as QN. Example variety "Jochems Roem" to be replaced by "Malling Landmark"

Char. 37 To be indicated as PQ. To have the states: on previous year's cane in summer (1); both on previous year's cane in summer and on current year's cane in autumn (2); on current year's cane in autumn (3) Example varieties to be: Malling Promise (1); Isabel (2); Autumn Bliss (3)

Chars. 38, 40a, 41a, 42a To replace underlined part of characteristic heading with "Varieties which fruit on previous year's cane in summer: …"

Chars. 39, 40b, 41b, 42b To replace underlined part of characteristic heading with "Varieties which fruit on current year's cane in autumn: …"

Char. 38 To be indicated as QN. Example variety "Delmes" to be added for state 5

Char. 39 To be indicated as QN. (+) to be added

Char. 40a To be indicated as QN

Char. 40b To be indicated as QN

Char. 41a To be indicated as QN. Example variety "Vene" to be added for state 1

Char. 41b To be indicated as QN

Char. 42a To be indicated as QN

Char. 42b To be indicated as QN. Example variety "Zefa 3" to be replaced by "Boheme." Example variety "Autumn Bliss" to be added for state 5. Example variety "Korbfüller" to be replaced by "Polana"

8. Explanations on the Table of Characteristics

Ad. 31 State 2 to read "broad conical" and state 4 to read "trapezoidal." Attachment to be shown on illustration

Ads. 38, 40a, 41a, 42a To explain that this applies to varieties with state 1 or 2 for characteristic 37

Ads. 39, 40b, 41b, 42b To explain that this applies to varieties with state 2 or 3 for characteristic 37

10. Technical Questionnaire

5.2 To read "Very young shoot: anthocyanin coloration of apex during rapid growth."

5.3 To replace underlined part of characteristic heading with "Varieties which fruit on previous year's cane in summer: …"

5.5 State 2 to read "broad conical" and state 4 to read "trapezoidal."

5.7 State 7 to read "dark purple."

5.9 To replace underlined part of characteristic heading with "Varieties which fruit on previous year's cane in summer: …"

5.10 To replace underlined part of characteristic heading with "Varieties which fruit on current year's cane in autumn: …"

6 Example to be "Fruit: color" with, e.g., dark red / purple

(b) Subgroup discussions on other draft Test Guidelines

Apricot (Revision), (TWF/33/13(TG/70/4(proj.1))

*71. The expert from Hungary introduced document TWF/33/13(TG/70/4(proj.1)).

*72. The Subgroup agreed the following changes:

Title page "Marille" to be added to German common names

2.2 To read “The material is to be supplied in the form of one-year old grafts, budsticks or dormant shoots for grafting.”

5.3 Characteristic 52 to be deleted. Characteristic 46 to be added.

6.4 Different sets of example varieties to be developed for Mediterranean and Continental types of varieties and an explanation provided on how these types can be clearly differentiated.

7. Table of Characteristics

Example varieties to be moved to annex and presented in two sets.

Footnote proposals to be deleted.

All references to former characteristic numbers in the headings of the characteristics (e.g. (formerly No. 2)) or to a characteristic being “new” to be removed.

Char. 1 To be indicated as QN
Char. 2 To be indicated as PQ. States to be numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5
Char. 3 To be indicated as QN. To read “Tree: branching.”
Char. 4 To be indicated as QN. State 2 to be swapped with state 3
Char. 5 To be indicated as QN
Char. 6 To be indicated as PQ. State 3 to read: purple brown
Char. 7 To be indicated as QN
Char. 8 To be indicated as QN
Char. 9 To be indicated as QN
Char. 10 To be indicated as QN
Char. 11 To be indicated as QN
Char. 12 To be indicated as PQ
Char. 13 To be indicated as QN
Char. 14 To be indicated as QN
Char. 15 To be indicated as PQ
Char. 16 To be indicated as QN
Char. 17 To be indicated as QN. To have the states: straight or weakly concave (1), moderately concave (2),strongly concave (3)
Char. 18 To be indicated as QN
Char. 19 To be indicated as QN
Char. 20 To be indicated as QN
Char. 21 To be indicated as QN
Char. 22 To be indicated as PQ
Char. 23 To be indicated as QN
Char. 24 To be indicated as QN
Char. 25 To be indicated as QN. To read “Flower: position of stigma relative to anthers”
Char. 26 To be indicated as PQ. State 3 to read “oblate”
Char. 27 To be indicated as PQ
Char. 28 To be indicated as QN. Missing note 3 to be inserted
Char. 29 To be indicated as QN. Word “both” to be deleted from the Spanish column.

Char. 30 To be indicated as PQ. State 4 to read “oblong.” State 8 to be checked. example variety to read “Bergeron.”
Char. 31 To be indicated as PQ. State 4 to read “oblong.” State 8 to be added.
Char. 32 To be indicated as QN
Char. 33 To be indicated as QN
Char. 34 To be indicated as PQ. To read “Fruit: symmetry in ventral view,” with states 1, 2, 3
Char. 35 To be indicated as QN
Char. 36 To be indicated as QN
Char. 37 To be indicated as PQ. State 4 to read “retuse.”
Char. 38 To be indicated as QL. “Mucon” to be amended to “Mucron.”
Char. 39 To be indicated as QL
Char. 40 To be indicated as QL
Char. 41 To be indicated as QN. To have the states: absent or weak (1); moderate (2); strong (3)
Char. 42 To be indicated as PQ
Char. 43 To be indicated as QN. To receive (*)
Char. 44 To be indicated as PQ
Char. 45 To be indicated as QN
Char. 46 To be indicated as PQ. Example variety “China n.1” to be checked.
Char. 47 To be indicated as QN
Char. 48 To be indicated as QN
Char. 49 To be indicated as QN
Char. 50 To be indicated as QN
Char. 51 To be indicated as PQ
Char. 52 To be indicated as QN. (*) to be deleted.
Char. 53 To be indicated as QN
Char. 54 To be indicated as QN.

8. Explanations on the Table of Characteristics

Ad. 13 “Dot mark” sign for right-angle to be added to state 2
Ad. 15 Illustration to be improved
Ad. 26 State 3 to read “oblate”
Ad. 30 to 33 Heading to be provided for “lateral view” and “ventral view.” Lateral view to show position of suture with dotted line
Ad. 30 to 33 and Ad. 30 to 31 Introductory text to be deleted and fruit shown with stalk at the bottom
Ad. 54 Explanation from European Plum to be provided

10. Technical Questionnaire

10.5 Characteristic 52 to be deleted. Characteristic 46 to be added

10.6 Suitable example to be provided.

10.7.3 ASW 10 to be added.

Apple (Revision), TWF/33/11(TG/14/9(proj.1))

*73. The expert from the United Kingdom introduced document TWF/33/11 (TG/14/9(proj.1)).

*74. The Subgroup agreed the followschanges :

2.2.1.1.1 To insert between trees and budwood: "on a rootstock specified by the competent authority"

3.3.3.1.1 To insert: "Information on examining particular characteristics"

3.3.3.1 To insert: "The Table of Characteristics provides notes which indicate the recommendations for observing characteristics as follows:"

3.5.1 To add after …made on 5 plants "or 2 parts taken from each of the 5 plants"

3.5.2 To delete after made on 10 plants "(2 parts taken from each of 5 plants)"

4.2.1 To change the statement for 4.2.1 and 4.2.2 as follows: "The acceptable number of off-types tolerated in a sample size of 5 plants is none on the basis of a population standard of 1% and an acceptance probability of 95%. The acceptable number of off-types tolerated in a sample size of 10 plants is 1 on the basis of a population standard of 1% and an acceptance probability of 95%."

7. Table of Characteristics

Char. 1 To be indicated as QN
To add "very weak" and "very strong"
To add example variety
To add note 9
Char. 2 To be indicated as PQ
Char. 3 To be indicated as PQ
To change in Spanish "erecto" to "erguido" and "rastreto" to "avierto"
notes 1, 2, 3, 4, 5
Char. 4 To be indicated as PQ. To put "on spurs" in lower case
Char. 5 To be indicated as QN. To change notes to 3, 5, 7 and 9
To check the spelling of "Telemon"
Char. 6 To be indicated as QN. To add some example varieties: Florina 3, Redaphough 5
Char. 7 To be indicated as PQ. To add "dark brown" after "medium brown" and to add the note "4"
Char. 8 To be indicated as QN
Char. 9 To be indicated as QN
Char. 10 To be deleted
Char. 11 To be indicated as QN. To read: "Leaf blade: attitude" and to change notes to 1, 2 and 3
Char. 12 To be indicated as QN
Char. 13 To be indicated as QN
Char. 14 To be indicated as QN
Char. 15 To be deleted
Char. 16 To be indicated as QN. To read: "Leaf blade: green color" and delete green from the states of expression

Char. 17 To be indicated as PQ. To have the states: crenate (1), bicrenate (2), bluntly serrate (3), serrate (4) and biserrate (5)
Char. 18 To be deleted
Char. 19 To be indicated as QN
Char. 20 To be indicated as QN
Char. 21 To be indicated as QN. To read "Petiole: anthocyanin coloration"
Char. 22 To be deleted
Char. 23 To be indicated as PQ. To include Norhey as example variety for 1
Char. 24 To be indicated as QN. To change "size" to "diameter"
Char. 25 To be indicated as QN or PQ. To amend the heading to "arrangement of petals" and to check wording
Char. 26 To be deleted
Char. 27 To be deleted
Char. 28 To be indicated as QN. To read "Flower: position of stigma relative to anthers" below (1), same level (2), above (3)
Char. 29 Add "anthocyanin" before "overcolor"
Char. 30 Add "anthocyanin" before "overcolor
Char. 31 To be indicated as QN. To amend "length" to "height"
Char. 32 To be indicated as QN. To read: "Fruit: width"
and to replace small by "narrow" and large by "broad"
Char. 33 To be indicated as QN. To read: "ratio height/width"
Char. 34 To be indicated as QN. To replace the example variety "Empire"
Char. 35 To be indicated as QN
Char. 36 To be indicated as PQ
Char. 37 To be deleted
Char. 38 To be indicated as QN. To have the states: absent or weak (1), moderate (2) and strong (3)
Char. 39 To be indicated as QN. To have the states: absent or weak (1), moderate (2) and strong (3)
Char. 40 To be indicated as QN
Char. 41 To be deleted
Char. 42 To be indicated as QN
Char. 43 To be deleted
Char. 44 To be indicated as QN. To have the states: absent or weak (1), moderate (2) and strong (3)
Char. 45 To be indicated as QN. To have the states: absent or weak (1), moderate (2) and strong (3)
Char. 46 To be indicated as PQ
Char. 47 To be indicated as QN
Char. 48 To be indicated as PQ. To have the states: orange red (1), pink red (2), red (3), purple red (4) and brown red (5)
Char. 49 To be indicated as QN. To delete the examples varieties
Char. 50 To be checked (comments to be sent to the United Kingdom expert)
Char. 51 To be checked (comments to be sent to the United Kingdom expert)
Char. 52 To be indicated as QN. To delete (*)

8. Explanation in the Table of Characteristics

Ad. 23: To read: "Balloon stage is the phenological stage in the course of flower development when the calyx is fully expanded and the petals are recognizable, having partially expanded and inflated but are closed, covering the internal flower organs. Balloon stage is usually 1-2 days before the petals unfold."

Avocado (Revision), TWF/33/10(TG/97/4(proj.1))

*75. The expert from Mexico discussed document TWF/33/10(TG/97/4(proj.1)) with the other interested experts.

Cactus Pear (Opuntia) TWF/33/9(TG/C-PEAR(proj.1))

*76. The expert from Mexico introduced document TWF/33/9(TG/C-PEAR(proj.1)).

*77. The Subgroup agreed the follows changes:

Cover page: To write "ssp." in normal font (not italics)

1. To delete the name of author and write spp. in normal font (not italics)

5. To review the grouping of varieties (experts from Mexico and Israel)

7. Table of Characteristics

Char. 1 To be indicated as PQ. To amend "erecto" to "erguido" in Spanish
Char. 2 To be indicated as QN. To redraft "alto" in lower case in Spanish
Char. 3 To be indicated as QN
Char. 4 To be indicated as QN
Char. 5 To be indicated as QN. To put a space after "," and before "Montesa"
Char. 6 To be indicated as QN. To amend "Large" to "large"
Char. 7 To be indicated as PQ
Char. 8 To be indicated as QN
Char. 9 To be indicated as PQ
Char. 10 To be indicated as QN. To have the states: very weak (1), weak (2) and strong (3)
Char. 11 To be indicated as QL. To read "Cladode: pubescence of surface" and change notes to 1 and 2
Char. 12 To be indicated as QL. To change note 9 to 2
Char. 13 To be indicated as QN
Char. 14 To be indicated as PQ
Char. 15 To be indicated as QN
Char. 16 To be indicated as PQ
Char. 17 To be indicated as QL. To read "Cladode: number of colors on spine" with the states one (1) and two (2). To check the Spanish translation
Char. 18 To be indicated as QN. To delete "the" before longest spine
Char. 19 To be indicated as QN. To replace "the center" by "central spine" and to amend "erectas" to "erecta" and "horizontales" to "horizontale"
Char. 20 To be indicated as QL. To amend "grooves" to "grooved"
Char. 22 To be indicated as QL. To replace "straight" by "absent" (1) and "curved" by "present" (9). To check the Spanish translation
Char. 23 To be indicated as QL
Char. 24 To be indicated as PQ
Char. 25 To be indicated as PQ
Char. 25 To be indicated as QN

Char. 26 To be indicated as PQ
Char. 27 To be indicated as QN
Char. 28 To be indicated as QN. To read “Cladode: number of cladodes”
Char. 29 To be indicated as QN
Char. 30 To be indicated as PQ
Char. 31 To be indicated as PQ
Char. 32 To be indicated as QN
Char. 33 To be indicated as PQ
Char. 34 To be indicated as QN
Char. 35 To be indicated as QN. To amend “width” to “maximum diameter”
Char. 36 To be indicated as QN. To replace “diameter” by “maximum diameter”ssp.
Char. 37 To be indicated as PQ and redraft example variety “COPENA 17” in upper case
Char. 38 To be indicated as QN
Char. 39 To be indicated as QN
Char. 40 To be indicated as PQ
Char. 41 To be indicated as QN
Char. 42 To be indicated as QN
Char. 43 To be indicated as QN
Char. 44 To be indicated as QN
Char. 45 To be indicated as QN
Char. 46 To be indicated as QN
Char. 47 To be indicated as QN
Char. 48 To be indicated as QL. To amend “surfaces” to “surface” and note 9 to 2
Char. 49 To be indicated as PQ
Char. 50 To be indicated as PQ
Char. 51 To be indicated as QN
Char. 52 To be indicated as QN
Char. 53 To be indicated as QN
Char. 54 To be deleted
Char. 55 To be indicated as QN
Char. 56 To be indicated as QN
Char. 57 To be indicated as QN
Char. 59 To be indicated as QN
Char. 60 To be indicated as QN
Char. 61 To be indicated as QN and delete (*)
Char. 62 To be indicated as QN
Char. 63 To be deleted
Char. 64 To be deleted

Ad. 7: Cladode : shape: To be improved

Ad. 29: Flower: length: To be deleted

Ad. 42: Fruit: depression of receptacle scar: To delete the first photograph from each of the states 3, 5 and 7

10. Technical Questionnaire

1.2 “spp.” To be written in normal font (not italics)

5.1 to 5.17: To update according to changes to the Table of Characteristics

6. Suitable example varieties to be provided

Mango (Revision) TWF/33/16(TG/112/4(proj.1))

*78. Document TWF/33/16(TG/112/4(proj.1)) was not discussed at the meeting due to lack of time.

Recommendations on Draft Test Guidelines (Plenary)

*79. The TWF agreed that the following draft Test Guidelines would be sent to the professional organizations and then submitted to the TC for approval in April 2003, on the basis of the amendments presented in "(a) Discussion on draft Test Guidelines (Plenary)" and "(b) Subgroup discussions on final draft Test Guidelines." The Office of the Union advised that the necessary amendments would be introduced by the Office with information provided by the leading expert:

Citrus: Grapefruit and Pummelos (Revision)
Lemons and Limes (Revision)
Mandarin (Revision)
Oranges (Revision)
Poncirus

Cherimoya
Persimmon (Revision)
Quince (Revision)
Raspberry (Revision)

*80. The TWF decided to discuss further the following draft Test Guidelines at its next session:

Apple (Revision)
Apricot (Revision)
Avocado (Revision)
Cactus Pear (Opuntia)
Mango (Revision)

*81. The TWF decided to discuss the following new draft Test Guidelines at its next session:

Banana (*Musa* spp.) (Revision)
Blackberry and Hybrid berries (Revision)
Coffee: The TWF proposed to the TC that it should be the leading Technical Working Party for the Test Guidelines.
Fig
Passion Fruit (edible species)
Pecan nut (*Carya illinoensis*)
Pineapple

*82. The leading experts and interested experts for the draft Test Guidelines to be discussed at the next session are presented in Annex III.

*83. The TWF proposed to consider a revision to the Test Guidelines for Blackcurrant, to start in 2004.

Future Program, Date and Place of the Next Session

*84. At the invitation from Canada, the TWF agreed to hold its thirty-fourth session in Niagara Falls, Canada, from September 29 to October 3, 2003. During the thirty-fourth session, the TWF plans to discuss or rediscuss the following items:

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 (brief oral reports by the participants)
   (b) report on developments within UPOV (oral report by the Office of the Union)
4. Molecular techniques
5. Project to consider the Publication of Variety Descriptions
6. UPOV Databases
7. Standardized explanation for “Maturity of Fruit” characteristics
8. TGP documents
9. Discussions on draft Test Guidelines (Subgroups):
10. Recommendations on draft Test Guidelines (plenary)
11. Date and place of the next session
12. Future program
13. Report on the conclusions of the session (if time permits)
14. Closing of the session

Special Awards

85. Mr. József Harsányi (Hungary) and Mr. Chris Barnaby (New Zealand) were awarded UPOV bronze medals in recognition of their chairmanship of the TWF for the period of 2000 to 2002 and 1997 to 1999, respectively.

Technical Visit

86. On Wednesday, November 27, 2002, the participants at the TWF made a technical visit to the regional station of the National Agricultural Research Institute *(Instituto Nacional de Tecnología Agropecuaria (INTA)).* The participants received brief presentations on the research activities from the Director of the Experimental Station, INTA, Dr. Fermin Olaechea, and his colleagues. The activities of the Station were focused on three sectors: natural resources management, animal production and forestry. A visit was also made to the agrobiological farm "La Alpina."

87. This report has been adopted by correspondence.

[Annex I follows]

ANNEX I

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

I. MEMBERS

ARGENTINA

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

Fernanda DALMAU, Statistics – Field Trials, Registro de Variedades, ex-Instituto Nacional de Semillas, Secretaría de Agricultura, Ganadería, Pesca y Alimentación (SAGPyA), Paseo Colón 922, 3 piso, of. 347, 1063 Buenos Aires (tel.: +54 11 4349 2445, fax: +54 11 4349 2444, e-mail: mlabar@sagyp.mecon.gov.ar)

Guadalupe MONTES,(Mrs.), Examiner for Fruit Crops, Registro de Variedades, ex-Instituto Nacional de Semillas, Secretaría de Agricultura, Ganadería, Pesca y Alimentación (SAGPyA), Paseo Colón 922, 3 piso, of. 347, 1063 Buenos Aires (tel.: +54 11 4349 2445, fax: +54 11 4349 2444, e-mail: mlabar@sagyp.mecon.gov.ar)

Alberto BALLESTEROS, Examiner for Cereal and Forage Crops, Registro de Variedades, ex-Instituto Nacional de Semillas, Secretaría de Agricultura, Ganadería, Pesca y Alimentación (SAGPyA), Paseo Colón 922, 3 piso, of. 347, 1063 Buenos Aires (tel.: +54 11 4349 2445, fax: +54 11 4349 2444, e-mail: mlabar@sagyp.mecon.gov.ar)

Paula CALVO (Mrs.), Instituto National de Tecnologia Agropecuaria (INTA), Estacion Experimental Alto Valle (EEA), CC 782 (8332) General Roca, Rio Negro (tel.: +54 11 2941 453501/03, fax: +51 11 2941 453500, e-mail: pcalvo@correo.inta.gov.ar)

BRAZIL

Vera Lúcia Dos Santos MACHADO (Mrs.), Serviço Nacional de Proteçao de Cultivares – Ministerio de Agricultura e do Abastecimento. Cep: 70043-900 Esplanada dos Ministerios, Bloco D, Anexo A, sala 2 (tel.: + 55 61 218 2557 / 2163, fax: + 55 61 224 5647, e-mail: veramachado@agricultura.gov.br)

CHILE

Manuel TORO UGALDE, Servicio Agricola y Ganadero, Departamento de Semillas, Encargado de Registro de Variedades Protegidas en Especies Frutales. Bulnes 140, 2° Piso, Santiago (tel.: +56 2 696 2996, fax: +56 2 697 2179, e-mail: manuel.toro@sag.gob.cl)

FRANCE

Richard BRAND, GEVES Cavaillon, B.P. 1, 84300 Les Vignères (tel.: +33 4 9078 6660, fax: +33 4 9078 0161, e-mail: richard.brand@geves.fr)

GERMANY

Erik SCHULTE, Bundessortenamt, Prüfstelle Wurzen, Torgauerstr. 100, 04808 Wurzen (tel.: +49 3425 9040 24, fax: +49 3425 9040 20, e-mail: erik.schulte@bundessortenamt.de)

HUNGARY

József HARSÁNYI, Head of Department, Department for Fruit and Grapevine, Variety Testing Division, National Institute for Agricultural Quality Control (NIAQC), 1525 Budapest 114 (tel.: +36 1 212 3127, fax: +36 1 212 5367, e-mail: harsanyij@ommi.hu)

ISRAEL

Baruch BAR-TEL, Plant Breeders' Rights Testing Unit, Agricultural Research Organization, The Volcani Center, P.O. Box 6, Bet-Dagan 50250 (tel.: +972 3 968 3458, fax: +972 3 968 3669, e-mail: ilpbr-tu@int.gov.il)

JAPAN

Kenichi ATSUTA, Examiner, Plant Variety Examination Office, Seeds & Seedlings Division, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry & Fisheries (MAFF), 1-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, 100-8950 Tokyo (tel.: +81 3 3581 0518, fax: +81 3 3502 6572, e-mail: kenichi_atsuta@nm.maff.go.jp)

KENYA

Jackson SHUMA, Examiner, Plant Variety Protection Office, Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate Service (KEPHIS), Waiyaki Way, P.O. Box 49592, Nairobi (tel.: +254 2 444 0087, fax: +254 2 444 8940; e-mail: kephis@nbnet.co.ke or jackshuma@yahoo.com)

MEXICO

Alejandro F. BARRIENTOS-PRIEGO, Sistema Nacional de Inspección y Certificación de Semillas (SNICS), SAGARPA, Lope de Vega No. 125-2, Col. Chapultepec Morales, 11570 D.F. México (tel.: 52 55 5203 9427, fax: +52 55 5250 64 83, fax: +52 55 595483 36, e-mail: abarrien@altavista.net, abarrien@taurus1.chapingo.mx and abarrien@esmas.com)

NETHERLANDS

Gerard BOLSCHER, Naktuinbouw, P.B. 40, Sotaweg22, AA 2370 Roelofarendsveen (tel.: +31 71 332 6262, fax: +31 71 332 6363, e-mail: g.bolscher@naktuinbouw.nl)

NEW ZEALAND

Chris BARNABY, Examiner of Fruit and Ornamental Varieties, Plant Variety Rights Office (PVRO), P.O. Box 130, Lincoln, Canterbury (tel.: +64 3 325 6355, fax: +64 3 983 3946, e-mail: chris.barnaby@pvr.govt.nz)

SPAIN

Pedro M. CHOMÉ FUSTER, Oficina Española de Variedades Vegetales (OEVV), Ministerio de Agricultura, Pesca y Alimentacion (MAPA), Avda. Ciudad de Barcelona 6, 28007 Madrid (tel.: +34 91 347 6593, fax: +34 91 347 6703, e-mail: pchomefu@mapya.es)

UNITED KINGDOM

Alison Smith LEAN (Mrs.), Imperial College at Wye, National Fruit Collections, Brogdale Road, Faversham, Kent ME13 8XZ (tel.: +44 1795 590272, fax: +44 1795 532271, e-mail: nfc@ic.ac.uk)

II. ORGANIZATIONS

Sergio SEMON, Community Plant Variety Office (CPVO), 3 boulevard du Maréchal Foch, B.P. 2141, 49021 Angers Cedex 02, France (tel.: +33 2 4125 6434, fax: +33 2 4125 6410, e-mail: semon@cpvo.eu.int)

Adriana Raquel ALERCIA (Mrs.), Germplasm Information Specialist, Documentation, Information and Training Group, International Plant Genetic Resources Institute (IPGRI), Via dei Tre Denari 472/a, Maccarese (Fiumicino), 00057 Rome (tel.: +39 06 611 8410, fax: +39 06 619 7661, e-mail: a.alercia@cgiar.org)

III. OFFICER

József HARSÁNYI, Chairman

IV. OFFICE OF UPOV

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

Paul SENGHOR, Senior Program Officer, 34, chemin des Colombettes, 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland (tel.: +41 22 338 8562, fax: +41 22 733 0336, e-mail: paul.senghor@upov.int, Website: http://www.upov.int)

[Annex II follows]

ANNEX II

LITERATURE

Benson L.L.; W.L. Lamboy; R.H. Zimmerman; 2001. Molecular identification of *Malus hupehensis* (Tea Crabapple) accessions using simple sequence repeats. HortScience 36 (5): 961-966.

Besnard, G.; C. Breton; P. Bradat; B. Khadari; A. Bervillé; 2001. Cultivar identification in olive based on RAPD markers. J. Amer. Soc. Hort. Soc. 126(6): 668-675.

Burgher, K.L.; A.R. Jamieson; X. Lu; 2002. Genetic relationships among lowbush blueberry genotypes as determined by randomly amplified polymorphic DNA analysis. J. Amer. Soc. Hort. Soc. 127(1): 98-103.

Coazza-Nunes, M.J.; M.A. Machado; W.M.C. Nunes; M. Cristofani; M.L.P.N. Targon; 2002. Assessment of genetic variability in grapefruit (*Citrus paradisi* Macf.) and pummelos (*C. maxima* (Burm.) Merr.) using RAPD and SSR markers. Euphytica 126: 169-176.

Finn, C.E.; 2001. Molecular genetics: application in small and tree fruits: where is it working? Introduction to the workshop. HortScience 36(5): 854-858.

Frey, J.E.; E. Bosshard; J. Gafner; W. Heller; M. Hilber; M. Kellerhals; J. Ladner; H.-J. Schärer; R. Theiler; 2002. Molekulare Diagnostik in der Landwirtschaft. Schweiz. Z. Obst-Weinbau 137(18): 469-473.

Hauck, N.R.; A.F. Iezzoni; H. Yamane; R. Tao; 2001. Revisiting the S-allele nomenclature in sweet cherry (*Prunus avium*) using RFLP profiles. J. Amer. Soc. Hort. Soc. 126(6), 654-660.
Hokanson, S.C. (2001): SniPs, Chips, BACs, and YACs: are small fruits part of the party mix? HortScience 36(5): 859-871.

Herrera, R,; V. Cares; M.J. Wilkinson; P.D.S. Caligari; 2002. Characterization of genetic variation between *Vitis vinifera* cultivars from central Chile using RAPD and inter simple sequence repeat markers. Euphytica 124: 139-145.

Huang, H.; L. Zuozhou; L.. Jianqiang; T.L. Kubisiak; D.R. Layne; 2002. Phylogenetic relationships in *Actinidia* as revealed by RAPD analysis. J. Amer. Soc. Hort. Soc. 127(5): 759-766.

Kimura, T.; T. Yamamoto; Y. Ban; 2001. Development of SSR markers and identification of pears. UPOV, Geneva - document BMT/7/11: 7p.

Levi, A.; C.E. Thomas; X. Zhang; T. Joobeur; R.A. Dean; T.C. Wehner; B.R. Carle; 2001. A genetic linkage map for watermelon based on randomly amplified polymorphic DNA markers. J. Amer. Soc. Hort. Soc. 126(6): 730-737.

Luby, J.J.; Shaw, D.V.; 2001. Does marker-assisted selection make Dollars and sense in a fruit breeding program? HortScience 36(5): 872-879.

Mekuria, G.T.; M. Sedgley; Collins, G.; Lavee, S.; 2002. Development of a sequence-tagged site for the RAPD marker linked to leaf spot resistance in olive. J. Amer. Soc. Hort. Soc. 127(4): 673-676.

Polashock, J.J.; N. Vorsa; 2002. Development of SCAR markers for DNA fingerprinting and germplasm analysis of american cranberry. J. Amer. Soc. Hort. Soc. 127(4): 677-684.

Potter, D.; F. Gao; G. Aiello; C. Leslie; G. McGranahan; 2002. Intersimple sequence repeat markers for fingerprinting and determining genetic relationship of walnut (*Juglans regia*) cultivars. J. Amer. Soc. Hort. Soc. 127(1): 75-81.

Quarta, R.; M.T. Dettori; I. Verde; 2001. Fingerprinting peach varieties using molecular markers. UPOV, Geneva - document BMT/7/17: 4p.

Rout, G.R.; S. Samai; S. Nayak; R.M. Nanda; P.C. Lenka; P. Das; 2002. An alternative method of plant DNA extraction of Cashew (Anacardium occidentale L.) for randomly amplified polymorphic DNA (RAPD) analysis. Gartenbauwissenschaft 67(3): 114-118.

Schütz, M.; 2001. Molekularbiologie in der Weinforschung. Schweiz. Z. Obst-Weinbau 137(4): 74-77.

Stark-Urnau, M.; 2002. RAPD-Marker bei *Malus* x *domestica* (Apfel) und *Pyrus communis* (Birne) als Mittel zur Sortenidentifizierung – Teil I: *Malus* x *domestica* (Apfel) (Use of RAPD-Markers in *Malus* x *domestica* (apple) und *Pyrus communis* (pear) for cultivar identification – Part I: *Malus* x *domestica* (apple)). Erwerbsobstbau 44: 139-144.

Teng, Y; K. Tanabe; F. Tamura; A. Itai; 2002. Genetic relationships of *Pyrus* species and cultivars native to East Asia revealed by Randomly Amplified Polymorphic DNA markers. J. Amer. Soc. Hort. Soc. 127(2): 262-270.

Tyrka, M.; P. Dziadczyk; J.A. Hortynski; 2002. Simplified AFLP procedure as a tool for identification of strawberry cultivars and advanced breeding lines. Euphytica 125: 273-280.

Yamamoto, T.; T. Kimura; M. Shoda; Y. Ban; T. Hayashi; N. Matsuta; 2002. Development of microsatellite markers in the Japanese pear (*Pyrus pyrifolia* Nakai). Molecular Ecology Notes 2: 14-16.

Yamamoto, T.; T. Kimura; Y sawamura; T. Manabe; K. Kotobuki; T. Hayashi; Y. Ban; N. Matsuta; 2002. Simple sequence repeats for genetic analysis in pear. Euphytica 124: 129-137.

Yamamoto, T.; T. Kimura; Y. Sawamura; K. Kotobuki; Y. Ban; T. Hayashi; N. Matsuta; 2001. SSRs isolated from apple can identify polymorphism and genetic diversity in pear. Theor. Appl. Genet. 102: 865-870.

Zhou, L.; F. Kappel; C. Hampson; P.A. Wiersma; G. Bakkeren; 2002. Genetic analysis and discrimination of sweet cherry cultivars and selections using amplified fragment length polymorphism fingerprints. J. Amer. Soc. Hort. Soc. 127(5): 786-792.

[Annex III follows]

ANNEX III

LIST OF LEADING AND INTERESTED EXPERTS

Species	Basic document(s)	Leading expert(s)	Interested experts (countries) (for name of experts see List of Participants, Annex I)
Apple (revision) *Malus* Mill	TWF/33/11 TG/14/8	Mrs. Alison Lean, GB	AR, AU, CZ, DE, ES, FR, HU, JP, MX, NZ, NL, PO, PT, RO, ZA, CPVO, IPGRI
Apricot (revision) (*Prunus armeniaca* L.)	TWF/31/8, TWF/32/15 TWF/33/13, TG/70/3	Mr. Harsányi, HU	AR, AU, ES, FR, IL, IT, NZ, RO, ZA, CPVO, IPGRI
Avocado (revision) (*Persea americana* Mill.)	TWF/30/8, TWF/31/4 TWF/33/10, TG/97/3	Mr. Barrientos-Priego, MX	AU, BR, ES, FR, IL, NZ, ZA, IPGRI
Banana (revision) (*Musa spp*)	TG/123/3	Mrs. Machado, BR	BR, ES, FR, IL, KE, SD, IPGRI
Blackberry and hybrid berries (revision)	TG/73/6	Mr. Barnaby, NZ Mr. Schulte, DE	HU, UK, IPGRI
Cactus Pear (*Opuntia, ssp*)	TWF/31/7, TWF/32/7, TWF/33/9	Mr. Barrientos-Priego, MX	ES, IL, IT, ZA, IPGRI
Coffee and their interspecific hybrids	TWA/31/11	Mrs. Machado, BR	IL, BR, FR, KY, MX, IPGRI
Fig (*Ficus carica)*	TWF/30/4	Mr. Bar-Tel, IL and Mr. Bergamini, IT	AR, DE, ES, FR, JP, PT, IPGRI
Mango (revision) (*Mangifera indica* L.)	TWF/33/16, TG/112/3	Mrs. Costa, AU and Mrs. Buitendag, ZA	BR, ES, IL, MX, IPGRI
Passion Fruit (fruit species)	New	Mr. Bar-Tel, IL and Mrs. Buitendag, ZA	BR, KE, ZA, MX, JP, IPGRI
Pecan nut	New	Mrs. Montes, AR	IL, BR, MX, IPGRI
Pineapple *(Ananas comosus*)	New	Mr. Brand, FR and Mr. Salaices, ES	BR, FR, KE, MX, PT, ZA, JP, IPGRI

[End of Annex III and of document]