E

UPOV

TWF/30/14
ORIGINAL: English
DATE: September 11, 1999

INTERNATIONAL UNION FOR THE PROTECTION OF NEW VARIETIES OF PLANTS

GENEVA

TECHNICAL WORKING PARTY FOR FRUIT CROPS

Thirtieth Session
Nitra, Slovakia, September 6 to 10, 1999

REPORT

adopted by the Technical Working Party for Fruit Crops

Opening of the Session

1. The thirtieth session of the Technical Working Party for Fruit Crops (hereinafter referred to as "the Working Party") was held at Nitra, Slovakia, from September 6 to 10, 1999. The list of participants is presented in Annex I to this report.

2. Mr. Vladimir Sodoma, Deputy Director for Crop Production, from the Central Agricultural Control and Testing Institute in Bratislava, Slovakia, welcomed the participants to Nitra. The session was opened by Mr. Chris Barnaby (New Zealand), Chairman of the Working Party.

Adoption of the Agenda

3. The Working Party adopted the agenda for its thirtieth session, which is reproduced in document TWF/30/1 Rev., after having agreed to slightly change the order of the items for

discussion and to delete Walnut Rootstocks in item 8 and Passion Fruit, Apricot and Fig in item 12. The Working Party decided to include Document TC/35/15 Prov. in item 9 and to hold a joint discussion for items 9, 10 and 11. The Citrus subgroup was to meet and then a report would be made to the Working Party for general discussion.

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

4. The Working Party received short reports from some of the experts on recent developments in their countries. The experts reported that in many countries preparations for acceding to the 1991 Act of the UPOV Convention had been completed or were very close to completion. Romania has prepared the Law on depositing the instrument of accession to the UPOV Convention, which was waiting for final adoption by the Romanian Parliament. The Republic of Korea intended to become a member State in the year 2000. In some States, mostly in Eastern Europe, the process of establishing the system for cooperation in DUS testing was well underway. The expert from Israel mentioned a new plum-apricot hybrid for which some States would grant breeder's right in the very near future. Many experts from other States showed their interest in discussing the topic of interspecific hybrids. The expert from Germany reported on a new Law on Certification. Under that Law it was possible to include in the National List not only new varieties but also old varieties without granting breeder's rights, as these varieties were still important for the market. The expert from the CPVO reported that the Office had received its first application for a GM rootstock. The expert from Mexico, who was attending a session of the Working Party for the first time, reported that there were a lot of applications for breeder's right but no grants had been issued so far as Mexico had only very recently started the system in accordance with UPOV.

Questions on the Testing of Varieties of Fruit Species

5. The Working Party discussed the appropriateness of using the terms "maturity at harvest" and "maturity for consumption". The Chairman addressed a question to the Working Party asking whether it was a problem of appropriate understanding of the terminology in the English language or whether it was a general problem. The expert from Germany informed the participants that in Germany there were not any problems with understanding the terminology. The expert from Romania suggested that it could be divided into three categories: harvest maturity, consumption maturity and physiological maturity. Other experts suggested similar definitions too. Some experts said that a new possible terminology would depend on the future utilization of the crop in question (e.g. bananas are harvested when they are green, but sold when they are yellow). The expert from Israel pointed out that the discussion had shown that this topic was too complicated and subjective. There was no need to change the terminology in general as all Test Guidelines had their own understanding of maturity. If necessary, this understanding could be explained in each test guideline. The above discussion was summarized by the Chairman. The Chairman emphasized that the understanding and meaning of these terms was more important than the actual wording.

6. The Working Party noted that a new short and precise definition for "maturity" was needed, but that it was difficult to work it out for the time being. It was decided to leave it as it was until an appropriate suggestion could be made. In all individual Test Guidelines, the

characteristic marked with "+" (in the case of maturity) should have a clear definition of what it meant in practice.

7. The interest of many experts (CPVO, Israel, Japan, New Zealand, Romania) in new interspecific hybrids (e.g. "plum-cot"), as mentioned above, was discussed again. The Working Party decided to place this item on the agenda of the next session. Israel would take the lead in the preparation of an initial document by the end of 1999. Experts from interested States would send their comments to Israel by March 1, 2000. The final document would be submitted to the Office of UPOV by April 1, 2000.

8. The expert from South Africa suggested initiating discussions on the revision of the Test Guidelines for Mango. South Africa has already prepared some possible amendments for the document in question. The suggestions of South Africa for amendments to the Mango Test Guidelines are presented in Annex III to this report. The Working Party concluded that experts from Australia, Mexico, Italy and Israel would check the suggestions and make further proposals if so desired. On the basis of those additional proposals it would be decided whether a revision of TG/106/3 would be necessary or not for discussion by the Working Party.

9. The expert from Mexico informed the Working Party that his colleagues had found a possible mistake in the Test Guidelines for Avocado concerning polyembrionic seeds. It was concluded that suggestions from Mexico would be sent to the Office of UPOV shortly and included in this report as Annex IV. Mexico would collect any comments and report back at the next session.

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

10. Mr. M.-H. Thiele-Wittig presented a brief report on the main items discussed during the previous session of the Technical Committee and referred participants needing further details to the full report reproduced in document TC/35/12 Prov., which would be ready shortly.

UPOV Documents in Electronic Form

11. The Working Party confirmed its interest in obtaining more documents in electronic form. It noted that the Office of UPOV planned to set aside an open and restricted area on its homepage for the reproduction of certain documents. States having a web-site were invited to inform the Office of UPOV and provide it with authorization to establish direct links with them and the UPOV web-site.

Crop Inventory

12. In order to find out how far the number of characteristics actually used in each member State differed from the adopted UPOV Test Guidelines, how many and which of the non-asterisk characteristics had been selected and which additional characteristics had been used, the Working Party agreed to select the species apple and to ask all member States to submit to the Office of UPOV the list of characteristics they actually used for the testing,

including characteristics needed only once or a few times in special cases. The Office of UPOV was asked to prepare a circular for that purpose. This item should be included in the agenda of the next meeting. The deadline for comments to the Office of UPOV was fixed for March 1, 2000.

Taxon Code

13. The Working Party noted Circular U2829 and made no remarks on it except the expert from Australia who expressed some doubts as to the necessity of the Taxon Code in general. Australia declared itself quite satisfied with the system it had in use and did not want to change it. Australia would send its comments on the Taxon Code to the Office of UPOV.

Central Computerized Database

14. The Working Party noted updated information supplied by the Office of UPOV on the UPOV-ROM Plant Variety Database. In 1999, the practice of distributing the UPOV-ROM at two-monthly intervals was continued. Since the beginning of this year new improvements in the latter's software had been made, which rendered the UPOV-ROM much more valuable. The UPOV-ROM was also available to subscribers at an annual subscription price of CHF750 plus postage.

15. The Working Party noted Circular U2830 and discussed possibilities on how the UPOV-ROM could be further improved and what information could be added. From a purely technical point of view it would be ideal if the UPOV-ROM also contained as complete information as possible on the characteristics of the varieties, meaning the full test report. In several countries that would, however, create legal problems and might also undermine the payment for the purchase of test reports. A second possibility would be to include the full variety description. The description would not contain any secret or confidential element and would not pose any legal problems. Some States, however, provided variety descriptions only against payment of a certain fee. Some States also required proof of a certain interest. The next level below that would be the description with the characteristics contained in the Technical Questionnaire or, at a still lower level, with the characteristics used for grouping varieties. During the testing and before the Offices had their own results, the information provided by the applicant could be included with the reservation that it was information submitted by the applicant and not yet verified by the Office. Here some experts foresaw difficulties in including information not verified by the Office, while others envisaged legal difficulties as the information from the applicant had to be kept confidential. All experts agreed, however, that it would be useful to have some information already before the granting of rights to be able to know whether plant variety protection had been applied for a similar variety in another State; from the breeder's reference or the variety denomination alone it was not possible. The inclusion of a picture was also considered helpful.

16. The Working Party agreed in principle that all characteristics of the Technical Questionnaire including items 5 and 6 of the Technical Questionnaire, but excluding any confidential information, were the most appropriate to be included in the UPOV-ROM. A minority of countries did not support this Working Party proposal, mainly for administrative reasons.

Report from the Technical Working Party on Automation and Computer Programs

17. Mr. M.-H. Thiele-Wittig presented a brief report on the main items discussed during the last session of the TWC and referred participants who needed further details to the full report reproduced in document TWC/17/13 Prov. which would be ready shortly.

New Methods, Techniques and Equipment in the Examination of Varieties

18. The Working Party noted document TWF/30/6 on the "Identification of Molecular Markers for Peach Variety Distinctness" and document TWF/30/7 on the "Identification of Peach Varieties Using Molecular Markers" and recommended that the Chairman of the BMT include them in the agenda of the BMT for the next session in 2000.

Final Discussion on Draft Test Guidelines

Test Guidelines for European Pear

19. The Working Party noted document TWF/30/3 and made the following main changes in it:

(i) Material Required: To have the quantity of a minimum of plant material recommended in the case of dormant shoots for grafting to read as: "3 (from crossing) or 10 (from mutation) dormant shoots for grafting, sufficient to propagate 5 (10) trees."

(ii) In the second paragraph to have the word "contact" replaced by "ask".

(iii) Methods and Observation: In paragraph 2, after the word "probability" to add "at least".

(iv) Table of Characteristics

Characteristics

3 To have "columnar" deleted. To have "semi-upright" added before "spreading". To have the states "fastigate (1), upright (2), semi-upright (3), spreading (4), drooping (5), weeping (6)

30 To be placed before characteristic 32

31 To be placed before characteristic 29 and to read: "Flower: relative position of margins of petal"

35 To be placed before characteristic 29

36 To read "Immature fruit: color of sepals (early summer) with the states "green brown" and "red brown" with the states to be spelled without hyphen

46 To have the states “orange (1), orange red (2), pink red (3), light red (4), dark red (5) and the example variety for “light” to read Nordhäuser Winterforelle

50 To have the additional state “very short (1)” with the example variety “Passe Crassane”

60 To have the additional states “very fine (1)” with the example variety “Aurora” and “very coarse (9)” with the example variety “Old Home”

62 To have the example variety “Colorée de Juillet” deleted

65 To have the example varieties “Dessertnaja” and “Conference” deleted

(v) Explanations on the Table of Characteristics: To have in Ad 3 the states for the first three drawings read: fastigate (1), upright (2), semi-upright (3).

(vi) Literature: To have “Saitama-Ken, 1978: “The report on the characterization and classification of pear varieties”, Saitama Horticultural Experiment Station, JP” deleted.

(vii) Technical Questionnaire: To have 4.1 method of breeding deleted and to have the Technical Questionnaire reproduced in accordance with the latest adopted Test Guidelines.

(viii) The Working Party agreed that the expert from Germany would collect remarks, if any, from the experts within two weeks and send an amended version to the UPOV Office. Thereafter the document would be sent to the professional organizations for comments, and, if there were no serious comments, it would be presented to the Technical Committee for final adoption in March 2000.

Revision of the General Introduction, Standardization of Test Guidelines, Harmonization of Shapes

20. As was decided when the agenda was adopted, these three items were discussed together.

21. The Working Party noted documents TC/35/13 and TC/35/15 Prov. and made the following main remarks and proposals on document TC/35/15 Prov.:

(a) Common Knowledge (TGP/3)

22. The main criterion for whether a variety or plant material formed part of common knowledge was the availability of living material. The material had to be available at reasonable effort to the testing authority itself or the authority had to be able, in the case of import restrictions, to ask other authorities to do the test. The material had to be living to enable the authorities to grow it and compare it with the candidate variety. Thus if only dead herbarium material was available or only a variety description, detailed though it may be, that would not be enough to form part of common knowledge.

23. The material does not need to have a name. Unnamed clonal material or material sold under the species name forms part of common knowledge.

24. The material must be known, not just exist only. Thus material found only in a wild or remote place does not form part of common knowledge.

25. The probability of the existence of certain plant material is not enough to declare discovered plant material no longer new or forming part of common knowledge.

26. Discovered and developed: Connected with common knowledge is the question whether material discovered in the wild can be protected and how much breeding development is necessary. Two cases can be seen:

(i) Seed from plants discovered in the wild is collected by a breeder, is sown and plants are selected for the development of a new variety.

(ii) The breeder selects in the wild, plants or plant material from wild plants, grows the plants and develops a promising plant by vegetative propagation into a new variety without further crossing.

27. The Working Party agreed that in the first case there was no doubt that the resulting variety would qualify for protection if it fulfilled the DUS requirements. In the second case the situation was not so clear as, in the end, the variety developed normally contained plants with similarity to the plant selected in the wild. However, if the national authorities did not allow protection in the second case, that would mean that for all species which were vegetatively propagated new varieties originating from plants selected from the wild would be excluded from protection. This could not be the wish of the drafters of the UPOV Convention. The second case would thus also have to be accepted as a possible way to produce new protectable varieties.

(b) Reference collection (TGP/4)

28. Contrary to the situation for agricultural species in which most varieties are seed propagated, in most member States the reference collection grown for fruit species, especially those for fruit trees, would contain all protected varieties, all varieties on the National List (if existing), some of the varieties no longer growing and other nationally or regionally important varieties. The reference collection may be combined with material in gene banks or in other countries, thus the growing of a given variety was almost independent from a possible new candidate variety and a system of prescreening for the selection of varieties to be grown was not common in fruit species. There was also no reference collection existing only as meristem or tissue culture. Prescreening would only be done on paper or virtually in the head of the expert. Thus the criteria for prescreening are identical to the criteria for grouping.

29. For strawberries or raspberries the situation may be more comparable to that for seed propagated varieties. In this case there is a preselection of the varieties to be grown, which is partly done with the help of pictures of the varieties. However, prescreening in effect is grouping, as all varieties identified as being sufficiently distinct from the candidate are placed in a group which no longer needs to be compared with the candidate. Whether that other group is a group grown for other reasons (e.g. other candidates) or is not grown at all does not make any difference, the candidate only being compared with varieties in its group. In fruit trees the age of the tree may create problems as it may get infected by diseases or get too old and may need cleaning up or top work to enable comparison with new candidates.

(c) Shapes (TGP/14):

30. The document on shapes will need an addition to be prepared by the expert from United Kingdom to remove discrepancies between the different recommendations from the approved literature (e.g. for shapes: accuminate, cuspidate, etc.,) and thereafter should be included in document TGP/17 (Definitions).

(d) Technical Terms (TGP/17):

31. In a subgroup (Australia, Hungary, Israel, New Zealand, South Africa) under the leadership of the expert from the United Kingdom, a first draft for the definition of terms would be prepared by the end of January 2000 with the help of documents TWF/29/3, Annex, TC/35/9, Annex III, and TC/33/9.

(e) Multivariate analysis:

32. As in fruit varieties most characteristics are observed visually, the application of the multivariate analysis would not be applicable. The experts agreed that sometimes there was an overall impression of difference which could not be confirmed when going into detail. In apple the fruit could be slightly more reddish, have some more flecks, a greater blush, etc. It would however be dangerous to distinguish varieties without being able to state in which characteristics they are distinct. If one once opened that door, there would soon be problems defending the decision and many court cases would arise.

Discussions on Working Papers on Test Guidelines

Test Guidelines for Actinidia (Kiwifruit)

33. The Working Party noted documents TG/98/3, TWF/29/8 and TWF/30/11, and made the following main changes in document TWF/30/11:

(i) Methods and Observations: To have added paragraph 10 with the wording : “10. Internal fruit characteristics should be observed at maturity for consumption.”

(ii) Table of Characteristics:

Characteristics

6, 7, 13, 38, 49, 74 To have “hairiness” replaced by “hair”

17 To have the state “greyish white” replaced by “whitish”, the state “greyish yellow” replaced by “yellowish”, and the state “greyish brown” replaced by “brownish”

18 To read: “Stem: size of bud support”, and to be placed after characteristic 19

19 To read: “Stem: slope on distal face of bud support”

20 To read: “Stem: profile on distal face of bud support (if sloping)

22 To have the word “opening” deleted

26 To have the word “general” deleted

27 To be checked by NZ whether the expression “acute” or “apiculate” should be used

29 To have the word “surface” replaced by “side

30 To read “Leaf blade: hair on lower side”

35 To have the states “only white and green” and “white, green and red”

39 To read “Petiole: anthocyanin coloration on upper side”

40 to 53 To change the order of characteristics as follows: 40, 41, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 42, 43, 51, 53, 52

44 NZ would add explanations (+)

46, 50 To read ‘hair” instead of “hairs”

47 To read “Flower: number of sepals”

51 To have “(in longitudinal section)” deleted, to have note “9” instead of “2”

54 To read: “Single-colored varieties only: Petal: different shades of color”

55 To read: “Single-colored varieties only: Petal: distribution of color”, and to have the word “top” replaced by “apex”

56 To read: “Bicolored varieties only: Petal: secondary color”

57 To read: “Bicolored varieties only: Petal: distribution of secondary color”

66 To have the state “round” replaced by “rounded”

68 To have the words “on stalk end” replaced by “at stalk end”, to have the state “strongly sloping” replaced by “sloping”, to have a new characteristic included after characteristic 68 reading: “Fruit: length of stalk” with the states “short (3), medium (5), long (7)”

71 To read: “Fruit conspicuousness of lenticels on skin”, with the states “inconspicuous”, (Topstar Vantini (1)) “conspicuous (2)”

72 To read: “Fruit: color of skin”, to have the state “medium brown” placed after “reddish brown”

77 To have the state “yellow brown” placed after “reddish brown”

79 To be placed after characteristic 80

80 To read: "Fruit: color of skin at maturity for consumption", to have the state "medium brown" placed after "reddish brown"

81 To read: "Fruit: color of outer pericarp"

82 To read: "Fruit: color of inner pericarp (locules)"

83 To read: "Fruit: diameter of core relative to fruit"

84 To read : "Fruit: general core of shape (in cross section)"

85 To read: "Fruit: fluting of core (in cross section)"

86 To read: "Fruit: color of core"

87 To read: "Fruit: sweetness"

88 To read: "Fruit: acidity"

(iii) Literature: To have the citation of TG/98/3 deleted

(iv) Explanations on the Table of Characteristics: The explanations for "Fruit: sweetness (87)" should be replaced with the wording "Sweetness should be assessed by total solids content (TSC)"

(v) The expert from New Zealand would amend the document in accordance with the standard wording and layout of newly adopted Test Guidelines, would add the Technical Questionnaire where he would include information about pollenizers as in the Test Guideline for Apple and prepare the document for final discussion for the next session of the TWF.

Test Guidelines for European Plum (Revision)

34. The Working Party noted documents TG/41/4, TWF/25/6, TWF/27/8, and TWF/30/12, and made the following main changes in document TWF/30/12:

(i) Subject of these Guidelines: To read "These Guidelines apply to all vegetatively propagated varieties for fruit production of Prunus domestica L. including its subspecies insititia (L.) Schneid.

(ii) Material Required: To have in paragraph 1 the material required changed to: "5 trees (one-year old grafts)". To have in paragraph 2 the first sentence read "The plant material supplied should be visibly healthy, not lacking in vigor or affected by any important pest or diseases and should especially be free from viruses as required by competent authorities."

(iii) Conduct of Test: To have the wording standardized as in TG/14/8 (apple). In paragraph 3 a sentence should be added reading "All observations on the plant should be done on one-year old shoots."

(iv) Methods and Observations: To have paragraph 1 read: "Unless otherwise stated, all observations determined by measurement, weighing or counting should be made on 5 plants or 10 parts, 2 from each 5 plants. All observations on the fruit should be made on a minimum of 10 typical fruits, 2 from each fruit tree." To have a new paragraph inserted after paragraph 3 reading: "All observations on the vegetative bud should be made on one-year old shoots."

(v) Table of Characteristics

Characteristics

1 To correct the example variety "Victoria" (instead of "Queen Victoria") in this and all following characteristics and to have example variety "Reine Claude de Bavay" deleted

2 To have the asterisk deleted

3 To have the first two states read: "erect" and "semi-erect"

7 To have the example varieties "Quetsche commune" replaced by "Hauszwetsche"

10 To have state "round" replaced by "spheroid"

12 To read: "One year shoot: size of vegetative bud support" and to correct the spelling of the example variety "Belle de Louvein"

13 To read: "One year shoot: decurrence of vegetative bud support"

14 To read: "Young shoot: intensity of anthocyanin coloration of growing tip (during rapid growth)"

15 To read: "Leaf blade: attitude in relation to shoot" and to copy the corresponding explanations from the Test Guidelines for Pear

19 To have the order of states as "ovate (1), elliptic (2), obovate (3)"

22 To have the word "green" deleted in all states

24 To have word "lower" not underlined

25 To have the last example variety read as "Golden Bullate"

26 To have the name of the example variety "Graf Althans Reneklode" replaced by Reine Claude d'Althan

29 To read "Leaf: presence of nectaries", and to be placed after characteristic 14

30 To read "Leaf: position of nectaries" with the states "predominantly on base of blade, predominantly on petiole, on both base of blade and petiole", and to be placed after former characteristic 29

32 To read “Pedicel: length”, with the additional state “absent or very short (1)” with example varieties Elena, Čačanska najbolia

33 To have the following order of states: “adpressed to the petals (1), touching receptacle (2), touching neither petals nor receptacle (3)”

36 To have the following order of states: “elliptic (1), broad elliptic (2), circular (3), obovate (4)”, to have the example variety “Opal” replaced by “Czar, Reine Claude d’Althan”

37 To read: “Shoot: double flowers” with the states: “absent (1), present (9), and to be placed after characteristic 8

38 To read: “Single flowers only: Flower: position of margins of petals” with the first state “apart” instead of “free”, and to be placed after characteristic 31

39 To read: “Petal: undulation of margin”

40 To be deleted

42 To read: “Anthers: (colors just before dehiscence)

45 To have word “general” deleted, to have the states “narrow elliptic (1), elliptic (2), circular (3), transverse elliptic (4), and to have the example variety “Reine Claude d’Althan” and “Graf Althans Reneklode” deleted

46 To have the second state read “in middle”

47 To read: “Fruit: symmetry in ventral view”, and to have the spelling of the example variety “Angelina Burdett” corrected

48 To have the spelling of the example variety “Reine Claude tardive de Chambourcy”, corrected and to have the example variety “Čačannska najbolja” for state deep (7)

53 To have the example variety “Tipala” instead of “Ontario”

54 To be deleted

55 To have the following order of states: “whitish (1), green (2), yellowish green (3), yellow (4), orange (5), red (6)”

61 To have example variety “Tipala” instead of “Kirke’s”

62 To have state 2 read “in middle view”

65 To be deleted

69 To have the example variety “Bonne de Bry”

(vi) Technical Questionnaire: to have the standard form used in accordance with last adopted Test Guidelines.

Test Guidelines for Citrus (Revision)

35. The Working Party noted documents TG/83/3, TWF/27/14, TWF/30/2. A subgroup met in the evenings to discuss document TWF/30/2. The results were reported in the session. As a result of the discussion it was decided to prepare for discussion at the next session separate Test Guidelines for four groups: 1. Mandarins, 2. Oranges, 3. Lemons and Limes, 4. Grapefruit and Pummelos. The expert from South Africa would take the lead and would provide example varieties for Grapefruit and Pummelos. The expert from Spain would provide example varieties for Mandarins, Oranges, Lemons and Limes.

Test Guidelines for Persimmon

36. The expert from Japan gave an oral report. There had been two problems to be solved for the preparation of the document TWF/30/10. They concerned maturity as it was different in each given country and type of astringency. The Working Party noted documents TG/92/3 and TWF/30/10 and decided that the expert from Japan would prepare a new document for the discussion at the next session.

Test Guidelines for Prunus Rootstocks

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

(i) Subject of these Guidelines and Material Required: To apply to seed propagated and vegetatively propagated varieties. The Test Guidelines for Almond TG/56/3 to be added to the list. To have standard wording as in the latest adopted Test Guidelines.

(ii) Table of characteristics

Characteristics

1 To read: “Plant: vigor”

2 To read: “Plant: branching”

3 To read: “Plant: habit” with the following order of states: “upright (3), spreading (5), drooping (7)”

5 To read: “One-year old shoot: length of internode (middle third of shoot)”, to have the example variety “P. mahaleb” replaced by “SL 64” and consequently also in the characteristics following

8 To have the example variety “Gisela 5” deleted

9 To be deleted

10 To have the example variety “P. mariana” deleted

11 To have the following states: “conical (1), ovoid (2), spheroid (3)”, and to have example variety “P. pumila” deleted

12 To have example varieties “Fereley” and “P. tomentosa” deleted

13 To read: “One-year-old shoot: size of vegetative bud support”, and to have the example variety “Pixy” deleted

14 To read: “Young shoot: anthocyanin coloration of young leaf (during rapid growth)”, and to add a new state “absent or very weak (1)”, and to have the example variety “Pixy” deleted

15 To be deleted

16 To have the following order of states: “narrow elliptic (1), broad elliptic (2), circular (3), ovate (4), obovate (5)”, and to have all example varieties checked by DE

20 To read: “Leaf blade: angle of apex (excluding tip)”, and to have asterisk deleted

21 To read: “Leaf blade: length of tip “with the states “short, medium, long”

22 To have the states: “acute (1), obtuse (2), rounded (3)”, and to have example variety “Pixy” deleted

24 To have the example variety “Pixy” deleted

25 To have the example variety “Fereley” deleted

26 To have the example variety “Pixy” deleted and to have states 2 and 4 checked by DE

27 To have the example variety “Gisela 5” deleted

28 To be deleted

30 To read: “Stipule: length” with the states: “short (3), medium (5), long (7)”

31 To have “blade” deleted and to have the example variety “Gisela 5” deleted

32 To read: “Varieties with nectaries only: Leaf: most frequent number of nectaries” and to be checked whether the term “glands” would be more correct

33 To read: “Leaf: position of nectaries” with the states “only at base of blade, only on petiole, at base of blade and on petiole”

35 To have the last state read: “reniform”

36 To have F1211 deleted

39 To read: "Leaf: ratio length of blade/length of petiole"

40 To have "Pixy" deleted and "Myrobalan B" corrected

(iii) Explanations: To keep in the table of origin of varieties only the species name

(iv) Technical Questionnaire: To be adapted to that for Walnut

Status of Test Guidelines

38. The Working Party agreed that the draft Test Guidelines for European Pear should be sent to the professional organizations for comments and, in case no serious comments were received, the document should be sent to the Technical Committee for final adoption.

39. As lack of time did not allow the Working Party to also discuss the Working Papers on Test Guidelines for Walnut Rootstocks, Apricot, Fig, Passion Fruit, all experts were asked to send their comments to the leading expert. Depending on the comments received, the leading expert would prepare a collection of comments or a new document incorporating those comments by the end of 1999.

Future Program, Date and Place of Next Session

40. On the basis of written information, which had been confirmed also by Mr. Harsányi, the Working Party agreed to hold its thirty-first session in Budapest, Hungary, from July 3 to 7, 2000. It was planned to have five full days for the session including the afternoon of Friday, July 7, 2000. It was planned that the following items would be discussed during the forthcoming session:

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

(b) Questions on the testing of varieties of fruit species;

(c) Important decisions taken during the previous sessions of the Working Party and the Technical Committee (oral reports);

(d) Discussion on new multi and interspecific hybrids (Israel to prepare a new Working Paper);

(e) Crop inventory on Apple (UPOV to collect information)

(f) New methods, techniques and equipment in the examination of varieties;

(g) Final discussion on draft Test Guidelines for Actinidia (Revision) (TG/98/4(proj.)) (and if necessary European Pear (TG/15/2(proj.))

(h) Testing of rootstocks

– Prunus Rootstocks (TWF/25/4, TWF/27/6 TWF/30/5; Germany to prepare a Working Paper)

– Walnut Rootstocks (TWF/26/8; France to prepare a new Working Paper)

(i) Revision of the General Introduction including complementary documents (TC/35/15)

(j) Discussions on working papers on Test Guidelines for

– Apricot (TG/70/3, TWF/30/8; Hungary to prepare a Working Paper)

– Avocado (TG/97/3; Mexico to prepare a new Working Paper, if considered necessary)

– Citrus (Revision) (TG/83/3, TWF/27/14, TWF/30/2; South Africa to prepare new Working Paper)

– European Plum (Revision) (TG/41/4, TWF/25/6, TWF/27/8, TWF/30/12; Germany to prepare Working Paper)

– Fig (Ficus carica) (TWF/30/4; Israel to collect remarks)

– Mango (TG/106/3; Annex III of TWF/30/14; any possible additional proposals)

– Prickly Pear (Opuntia) (Mexico to prepare a new Working Paper)

– Passion Fruit (Israel to prepare a new Working Paper)

– Persimmon (TG/92/3, TWF/30/10; Japan to prepare a Working Paper)

– Quince (Revision) (TG/100/3: Germany to prepare a new Working Paper)

– Raspberry (Revision) (TG/43/6; Germany to prepare a new Working Paper)

41. In view of the long list of Test Guidelines planned, the Working Party agreed to nominate in the above planned list one leading expert and ask other experts interested to cooperate with the leading expert by correspondence in the preparation of a more advanced document. An amended list of species and their leading experts is reproduced in Annex II to this report. The leading experts will prepare a new draft by the end of December 1999 for comments to be submitted to them. Depending on the comments, either a summary of comments or a new draft will be prepared by them before April 1, 2000.

42. The Working Party noted the invitation from Spain made by Mr. Chomé to hold its thirty-fourth session in that State in the year 2001.

Visits

43. On September 8, 1999, the Working Party visited the Research Institute for Breeding of Fruit and Ornamental Plants in Bojnice, where it received reports by Mrs. Irena Cagáňová, Director and by Mr. Miroslav Gross on the breeding of different fruits, such as apple, plum, small berries as well as ornamental plants.

44. In the afternoon of September 10, 1999, the Working Party visited the fruit firm FRUCTop in Ostratice where it received detailed and practical information from Messrs. Miloš Šebo, Pavel Žatko and Ivan Dzubák on all aspects of their fruit (mostly apple) and nursery production and visited their large apple industrial garden.

45. This report has been adopted by correspondence.

[Four annexes follow]

ANNEX I

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

I. MEMBER STATES

AUSTRALIA

Helen COSTA (Mrs.), Australian Plant Breeders Rights Office, Agriculture Fisheries Forestry Australia, P.O. Box 858, Canberra ACT 2601 (tel. +61 2 62724272, fax +61 2 62723650, e-mail: helen.costa@affa.gov.au)

CANADA

Brenda COLE (Mrs.), Canadian Food Inspection Agency, 59 Camelot Dr., Nepean, Ontario KIA OY9 (tel. +1 613 225 2342, fax +1 613 228 6629, e-mail: bcole@em.agr.ca)

CZECH REPUBLIC

Libor DOKOUPRIL, ÚKZÚZ, Central Institute for Supervising and Testing in Agriculture, Plant Variety Testing Division, ul. 24. dubna 301, 664 43 Želešice (tel. +420 5 47217564, e-mail: zelesice@ooz.zeus.cz)

Jiří SOUČEK, Head of Department, ÚKZÚZ - Central Institute for Supervising and Testing in Agriculture, Department of DUS Tests and Plant Variety Rights, Za opravnou 4, 150 06 Praha 5 – Motol (tel. +420 2 572 11 755, fax +420 2 572 11 752, e-mail: soucek@ooz.zeus.cz)

FRANCE

Raymond SAUNIER, INRA – Unité de Recherches sur les Espèces Fruitières et la Vigne, Centre de Recherches de Bordeaux, BP 81, 33883 Villenave d'Ornon (tel. +33 5 56843081, fax +33 5 5684 3083, e-mail: rsaunier@bordeaux.inra.fr)

GERMANY

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

HUNGARY

József HARSÁNYI, Keleti Károly utca 24, 1525 Budapest (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, P.O.B.6, Bet Dagan 50 250 (tel./fax +972 3 9683 669, e-mail: ilpbr_tu@netvision.net.il, mobile phone +972 52 343 813)

JAPAN

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

MEXICO

Alejandro F. BARRIENTOS-PRIEGO, Servicio Nacional de Inspección y Certificación de Semillas, SAGAR, Lope de Vega No. 125-2, Col. Chapultepec Morales, 11570 D.F. México. (tel. 52 5203 9427, fax +52 5250 6483, fax +595 4 83 36, e-mail: abarrien@taurus1.chapingo.mx, abarrien@altavista.net)

NEW ZEALAND

Chris BARNABY, Plant Variety Rights Office, P.O. Box 130, Lincoln, Canterbury (tel. 64 3 325 6355, fax +64 3 325 2946, e-mail: barnaby@pvr.govt.nz)

POLAND

Julia BORYS (Mrs.), The Research Centre for Cultivar Testing, DUS Testing Department, 63-022 Słupia Wielka (tel. +48 61 285 2341, fax + 48 61 28 53558, e-mail: coboni@bptnet.pl)

Józef PERCZAK, The Research Centre for Cultivar Testing, DUS Testing Department, 63-022 Słupia Wielka (tel. +48 61 285 2341, fax + 48 61 28 53558, e-mail: coboni@bptnet.pl)

SLOVAKIA

Bronislava BÁTOROVÁ (Mrs.), Head, Central Agricultural Control and Testing Institute, ÜKSÜP, Vel'ké Ripňany 956 07 (tel. +421 815 9223 11, fax +421 815 9225 97, e-mail: uksup@internet.sk)

Martin GROSMANN, Central Agricultural Control and Testing Institute, ÜKSÜP, Vel'ké Ripňany 956 07 (tel. +421 815 9223 11, fax +421 9225 97)

Samuel MICHÁLEK, Central Agricultural Control and Testing Institute, ÜKSÜP, Vel'ké Ripňany 956 07 (tel. +421 815 9223 11, fax +421 9225 97)

Anna ONDREJÍČKOVA (Mrs.), Central Agricultural Control and Testing Institute, ÜKSÜP, Vel'ké Ripňany 956 07 (tel. +421 815 9223 11, fax +421 9225 97)

SOUTH AFRICA

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

SPAIN

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

UNITED KINGDOM

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

II. OBSERVER STATES

REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Yong-Uk SHIN, National Hort. Res. Inst. Fruit Breeding Division, 475 Imok (tel. 0331 240 3586, fax 0331 240 3556, e-mail: shinoyo@nhri.go.kr)

Suk-Jung HWANG, National Seed Management Office, Plant Variety Test Division, 233-1 Mangpo-Dong Paldal-gu Suwon Kyonggi-do 442-400 (tel. +82 331 205 9193, fax +82 331 203 7431, web site: www.seed.go.kr)

ROMANIA

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

III. OBSERVER ORGANIZATION

Sergio SEMON, Community Plant Variety Office. B.P. 2141, 49100 Angers Cedex 02 , France (tel. +33 2 41 36 84 56, +33 2 41 36 84 60, e-mail: semon@cpvo.fr)

IV. OFFICER

Chris BARNABY, Chairman

V. OFFICE OF UPOV

Evgeny SARANIN, Consultant, 34, chemin des Colombettes, 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland (tel. +41 22 338 8272, fax +41 22 733 54 28, e-mail: saranin.upov@wipo.int, Web site: http://www.upov.int)

Max-Heinrich THIELE-WITTIG, Senior Counsellor, 34, chemin des Colombettes, 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland (tel. +41 22 338 9152, fax +41 22 733 54 28, e-mail: thiele.upov@wipo.int, Web site: http://www.upov.int)

[Annex II follows]

ANNEX II

LIST OF LEADING EXPERTS

Species	Basic Document	Leading experts (for addresses see attached list)	Interested experts (countries) (for name of experts see List of Participants)
Apricot	TWF/30/8	Mr. Harsányi, HU	ES, FR, IL, IT, NZ, ZA
Avocado	TG/97/3	Mr. Barrientos-Priego, MX	
Citrus	TWF/30/2	Mrs. Buitendag, ZA	AU, ES, IL, IT, MX, JP
European Plum	TWF/30/12	Mr. Schulte, DE	FR, GB, IT, JP, HU, SK, ZA
Fig	TWF/30/4	Mr. Bar-Tel, IL	DE, ES, FR, IT, JP
Kiwifruit	TWF/30/11	Mr. Barnaby, NZ	IL, IT
Mango	TG/106/3	Mrs. Buitendag, ZA	AU, IL, IT, MX
Prickly Pear		Mr. Barrientos-Priego, MX	ES, IL, IT, ZA
Passion Fruit	New	Mr. Bar-Tel, IL	AU, KE, ZA,
Pear	TWF/30/3	Mr. Schulte, DE	
Persimmon	TWF/30/10	Mr. Yamaguchi, JP	IL, IT, NZ
Prunus Rootstocks	TWF/30/5	Mr. Schulte, DE	AU, GB, FR, IT, NZ, SK
Quince	TG/100/3	Mr. Schulte, DE	GB, FR, HU
Raspberry	TG/43/6	Mr. Schulte, DE	CA, GB, HU, NZ
Walnut Rootstocks	TWF/26/8	Mr. Saunier, FR	IT

[Annex III follows]

ANNEX III

South African Proposals for Amendment of the Mango Guidelines, document TG/112/3

Char. 9-11: To add “of blade”

Char. 12: State 1: “lanceolate to ovate”

Char. 14:” “Fully developed leaf: twisting of blade: absent or very weakly expressed (1), weakly expressed (2), strongly expressed (3)”

Char. 15: “straight (1), slightly concave (2), strongly concave (3)”

Char. 17: “absent or very weakly expressed (1), weakly expressed (2), strongly expressed (3)”

Char. 18: “apical (1), basal (2), along whole length (3)”

Char. 19: “smooth (1), slightly …..(2), strongly ….. (3)”

Char. 21: “…. reticulate veins …: smooth (1), slightly …. (2), strongly …. (3)”

Char. 22: “absent or very weakly expressed (1), weakly expressed (2), strongly expressed (3)”

Char. 36: “absent (1), weakly expressed (2), strongly expressed (3)”

New char. 45a: “Mature fruit: position of broadest part: at middle (1), slightly below middle (2), far below middle (3)”

Char. 46: replace with “Mature fruit: thickness: thin (1), medium (2), thick (3)”.

New char. 46a: “Mature fruit: ratio width/thickness: very low (1) ….. very high (9)”

New char. 46b: “Mature fruit: width at base: narrow (3), medium (5), broad (7)”. To measure the width at $1/8^{th}$ of the fruit length from the basal point at the stalk attachment.

New char. 46c: “Mature fruit: ratio width/width at base: small (3), medium (5), large (7)”.

New char. 46d: “Mature fruit: width at apex”. Measure at $1/8^{th}$ of fruit length from apical point. Longitudinal axis goes from the stalk attachment through the furthest point.

New char. 46e: “Mature fruit: ratio width/width at apex. States as 46c

New char. 46f: “Mature fruit: thickness at base”. Also at $1/8^{th}$ of length from basal point

New char. 46g: “Mature fruit: ratio thickness/thickness at apex”. States as 46c

New char. 46h: “Mature fruit: thickness at apex”. Also at $1/8^{th}$ of length from apex

New char. 46i: "Mature fruit: ration thickness/thickness at apex". States as 46c

Char. 48: Add state 6: "purple"

Char. 49: "absent to weakly expressed (1), weakly expressed (2), strongly expressed (3)".

Char. 51: Change to: "difference in color between skin and lenticels"

Char. 52: "size of largest lenticels"

Char. 53: "absent (1), weakly expressed (2), strongly expressed (3)"

Char. 57: "prominence of neck" change to "length of neck"

Char. 63: "absent (1), weakly expressed (2), strongly expressed (3)"

Char. 65: Change "prominence" to "depth"

Char.69: Change "diameter" to "thickness"

New char. 70a: Infructescence: total length: short (3), medium (5), long (7)"

Char. 72: "absent (1), weakly expressed (2), strongly expressed (3)". We find this difficult to observe

Char. 73: "pattern of skin color excluding lenticels: even (1), speckled (2), blotchy (3)"

Char. 74: "degree of speckling or blotchiness of skin color"

Char. 77: State 3: "medium yellow", state 5: "medium orange"

Char. 81: "amount of non-fleshy fibre in flesh", state 1: "absent or very low"

Char. 86: "absent (1), weakly expressed (2), strongly expressed (3)"

Char. 91: "Seed: filling of stone: low (3), medium (5), high (7)"

[Annex IV follows]

ANNEX IV

Suggestion from Mexico for the revision of the Test Guidelines for Avocado

The expert from Mexico, Dr. Alejandro F. Barrientos-Priego, Coordinator of the Technical Working Party for Fruit, Servicio Nacional de Inspección y Certificación de Semillas (SNICS), sent the following proposal for revision of the Test Guidelines for Avocado, in which he requires:

"to make a change in TG/97/3, Test Guidelines for Avocado, in the Table of Characteristics; character number 68, Seed: Polyembryony. It should be changed to multiple sprouting that it is confused with polyembryony (Traub and Autcher, 1933, Proc. Amer. Soc. Hort. Sci.; Salazar and Borys, 1983. California Avocado Society Yearbook) that is a rare phenomenon in avocado (see Schroeder, C.A., 1944. Multiple embryos in the avocado. Journal of Heredity 35(1): 208-210; annex copy).

[End of Annex IV and document]