



TWO/32/9

ORIGINAL: English

DATE: September 28, 1999

**INTERNATIONAL UNION FOR THE PROTECTION OF NEW VARIETIES OF PLANTS**

GENEVA

**TECHNICAL WORKING PARTY  
FOR  
ORNAMENTAL PLANTS AND FOREST TREES****Thirty-Second Session  
Průhonice, Czech Republic, September 13 to 18, 1999**

## REPORT

*adopted by the Technical Working Party for Ornamental Plants and Forest Trees*

Opening of the Session

1. The thirty-second session of the Technical Working Party for Ornamental Plants and Forest Trees (hereinafter referred to as “the Working Party”) was held in Průhonice, Czech Republic, from September 13 to 18, 1999. The list of participants is given in Annex I to this report.

2. Mr. Jan Weger, Head of the Scientific and Technical Department, Research Institute of Ornamental Gardening, Czech Republic, welcomed the participants to Průhonice. The session was opened by Mr. Joost Barendrecht (Netherlands), Chairman of the Working Party.

Adoption of the Agenda

3. The Working Party adopted the agenda for its thirty-second session, which is reproduced in document TWO/32/1, after having agreed to change slightly the order of the items for discussion and to delete *Celosia*, *Chrysanthemum*, *Eucalyptus gunnii*, *Impatiens*, *Leptospermum*, *Ornamental Apple* and *Pentas* from item 10. The Working Party decided to

include document TC/35/15 Prov. in item 9. The Subgroup for *Cupressus* and *Dendrobium* would hold discussions and then new documents would be prepared for the next meeting.

4. The expert from Australia informed the Working Party that the species *Telopia* was no longer important as had been decided during the meeting of Australian and New Zealand authorities. The Working Party decided to exclude *Telopia* from the list of species for which Test Guidelines should be prepared.

5. The Working Party noted the information from the UPOV Office concerning the importance of submitting documents in due time for final preparation and distribution to the experts. Only four documents had been received by the UPOV Office by the deadline which had been set at four weeks before the session. It could cause some difficulty of discussion if documents were received after the deadline or only distributed during the session.

6. The Working Party decided to improve the practice of distributing documents to the UPOV Office and stressed that only documents submitted in due time, i.e. at least four weeks before the session, would be discussed. Other documents would be deleted from the agenda.

#### Short Reports on Special Developments in Plant Variety Protection in Ornamental Plants and Forest Trees

7. The Working Party received short reports from a number of countries. Most of them reported that the number of applications had increased and that ornamentals were becoming a more and more important species for their Offices. At the same time that created new problems as the number of applications from the wild was growing, whereas the focus should be on genetic resources, common knowledge, State property, etc. Some States reported on the preparation or adoption of new legislation to introduce the 1991 Act of the UPOV Convention and on the opening up of the system to the whole plant kingdom. The Republic of Korea expressed its willingness to join the UPOV Convention in the year 2000. For almost all States cooperation in variety testing was highly important.

#### Image Analysis, the Rose Ring Test, FLORES™, Image Database for Ornamentals

8. The expert from the Netherlands reported the results of an experiment with the Rose Ring Test and the Image Database for Ornamentals. FLORES is an object-dependent system for image matching of ornamental varieties, where the feature extraction and matching depends on the type of object. It has user-driven segmentation tools in a cross-platform environment, using JAVA applets. Furthermore the system has provision for a direct link with a relational database. The eventual goal of FLORES is to serve as a digital reference collection, where varieties can be compared on the basis of visual information.

9. The system was started only recently and so far has needed a great many improvements. First of all it required a high level of standardization in all respects in order to achieve an adequate result for comparison. Even slight changes in the image capture system could lead to big differences in the final result. Standardization of the system in question was the first priority goal for the expert from the Netherlands.

10. Some experts expressed their doubts about introducing the system in practice for Offices for the time being, as it was quite understandable that the system worked better when

high-quality equipment (e.g. digital cameras, computers, monitors, etc.) was used, but such equipment was expensive. It still looked problematic (from a technical point of view) to produce comparable results in the case of color and shape, as only a limited number of objects per plant were used in the Database for comparison. For example, it was possible to find much more type or color of flowers on one bush than could be used in the Database. Of course the influence of environment should also be taken into consideration, but it was not possible for the system currently under discussion, apart from which the legal aspect of using images for the Database should be settled. The main idea for the decision to use or not to use the system was that misleading information was worse than no information at all.

11. Some experts saw good features in the system. It gave an opportunity within 20-30 minutes of making an online comparison on the Internet with the databases of other States in the region. In some species, e.g. pelargonium, it could be very useful as there was a very wide variety of colors and it was not possible to make a description, so image analysis would be very helpful. Offices could use the method for pre-screening to find similar images in digital reference collections, but pictures were only one part of the information used; other information should of course be used as well.

12. In conclusion, the Working Party decided that the level of reliability of the system of image analysis was not sufficient for the time being, as the possibility of errors was still too great. The method should be developed to eliminate that possibility and main efforts would be concentrated on the standardization of the means of submitting the image information. The trial would be continued on a bilateral agreement basis.

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

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

#### UPOV Documents in Electronic Form

14. 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 area and a restricted area on its home page for the reproduction of certain documents which would be available in 2000.

15. The expert from South Africa wondered if it was possible in a legal sense to use UPOV-ROM in a network or in contacts with private companies. The Working Party noted that it was legal as soon as UPOV-ROM was used by the national authorities. As for private companies, UPOV-ROM had been offered to subscribers at an annual subscription price of CHF 750 plus postage. For the year 1999 there were about 50 private subscribers.

#### Testing of Seed Propagated Varieties of Ornamental Species

16. The expert from Germany expressed the opinion that a key question in the above field was the relatively large difference of uniformity between seed propagation and vegetative propagation (cloning) within one and the same species. It needed further discussion and

development for the improvement of the current situation. Some experts confirmed that there were problems, as many specialists from the seed industry had asked Offices a great many questions concerning UPOV's attitude in certain special cases. The specialists had submitted their problems and were awaiting advice and possible solutions. For example, some flower mixtures contained about ten types of plant with different colorations. To ask for protection for all of them was too expensive. One possible solution might be to protect only two or three types with the most predominant coloration. In conclusion the Working Party decided to continue discussing the issue together with its discussion of document TC/35/15 Prov.

### Special Cases in New Species

17. The expert from South Africa pointed out that her country was in a special position as it had provided the world with many new species. South Africa had received some applications for varieties bred from plants taken from the wild, but it was very careful to grant rights in such cases as it wanted to protect its gene population. Information on where the plant was obtained was always requested in the application. Unfortunately the problem was that it was possible to pick a plant in one State and file an application in another. It was very important to South Africa that there should be as clear a definition as possible, commonly agreed to by all member States, of what was a discovery and what was developed. The Working Party decided to continue the discussion later, together with that on the definition of common knowledge.

### Final Discussion of Draft Test Guidelines

#### Test Guidelines for Gerbera (Revision)

18. The Working Party noted document TG/77/7(proj.) and made the following main changes to it:

- (i) Front page: To read "Cass." not in italics.
- (ii) Subject of these Guidelines: To read "Cass." not in italics.
- (iii) Conduct of tests: Paragraph 3, Temperature, to have the word "night" in brackets.
- (iv) Methods and Observations: Paragraph 4 to read "CIE" instead of "CEI."
- (v) Table of Characteristics: To have the "Stage" column deleted.

### Characteristics

- 5 To have "central" replaced by "middle"
- 19 To have the following states: "absent (1), present (9)"
- 24 To have state "moderately incurving (2)" instead of "incurving (2)" and "moderately reflexing (4)" instead of "reflexing (1)"
- 36 To read "at basal half" instead of "on basal half"

45 To read “Semi-double and double varieties only: Disc florets of outer rows: main color of perianth lobes”

(vi) Explanations on the Table of Characteristics

“Ad.25” to be replaced by “Ad.21: Outer ray floret: level of apex relative to top of involucre”

(vii) Technical Questionnaire: Chapter 1 to read “Cass.” and Chapter 4.2 to have “seed” deleted and “- other (state method)” added and placed after “*in vitro* propagation.”

19. The Netherlands would submit example varieties by the end of 1999.

#### Test Guidelines for Iris (bulbous)

20. The Working party noted document TG/174/1(proj.) and made the following main changes to it:

(i) Subject of these Guidelines: To read “*Iris bakeriana* M. Foster” instead of “*Iris Bakeriana* M. Foster.”

(ii) Methods and Observations:

Paragraph 1 to read: “All observations determined by measurement or counting should be made on 10 plants or parts taken from each of 10 plants”.

(iii) Technical Questionnaire: Chapter 4.2 to be deleted and the following chapters renumbered accordingly.

#### Test Guidelines for Kangaroo Paw

21. The Working Party noted document TG/175/1 (proj.) and made the following main changes in it:

(i) Grouping of Varieties: Paragraph 2, “(c) Flower: reflexing of perianth lobes” to refer to characteristic 23.

(ii) Table of Characteristics: To have in characteristic 18 the state “pink” placed after “red.”

(iii) Technical Questionnaire: Chapter 4.2 to read “Method of reproduction

*in vitro* [ ]

other (specify) [ ].”

Chapter 7.2 to read: “Special conditions for examination of the variety (temperature, humidity conditions in the open or under glass).”

Test Guidelines for *Osteospermum*

22. The Working Party noted document TG/176/1(proj.) and made the following main changes in it:

(i) Subject of these Guidelines: To read: “These Test Guidelines apply to all vegetatively propagated varieties of *Osteospermum ecklonis* (D.C.) Norl. of the family Compositae”.

(ii) Table of Characteristics

Characteristics

6 To have “of upper side” deleted

9 To read: “Inflorescence: presence of incomplete ray floret whorls,” to have Note 9 instead of 2 after “present” and to have example varieties “Sparkler” (1) and “Dakar” (9)

11 To read: “Inflorescence: shape of ray floret” with the following order of states: “elliptic only (1), spatulate only (2), elliptic and spatulate (3)”

18 Example variety to read “Swazi” instead of “Swasi”

(iii) Technical Questionnaire: Chapter 4.2 to have “seed” deleted, to have wording “-other (specify method)” added and to be placed after “*in vitro propagation*,” Chapter 5.3 to read: “Inflorescence: number of ray floret whorls” and Chapter 5.4 to read: “Inflorescence: shape of ray floret” with the states “elliptic only (1), spatulate only (2), elliptic and spatulate (3)”.

General Introduction

23. The Working Party discussed document TC/35/15 Prov. and made the following remarks or came to the following conclusions with respect to the complementing documents to be prepared:

Document:

TGP/3: It would prepare a paper on common knowledge on the basis of the draft presented by the experts from GB

- TGP/4: It would prepare a document on the taking of color pictures and their use for prescreening, e.g. photographs taken with a conventional camera or a video or digital camera (DE to prepare the document); the expert from GB to contact her colleague in the TWA, who would prepare a document for TGP/4 to ensure that the paper covered the TWO aspects as well
- TGP/6: The expert from AU would cooperate with her colleague in the TWA in the preparation of a joint document on DUS testing done by the applicant/breeder
- TGP/7: The expert from ZA, in cooperation with the Office of UPOV, would prepare an amended paper on the establishment of UPOV Test Guidelines on the basis of document TC/35/8 and some comments received
- TGP/8: The TWC would be asked to cover also simple methods for cases where the test was not laid out in a random way
- TGP/9: The document would have separate chapters for the assessment of distinctness with and without the application of statistics and would contain, next to the COYD analysis, simple statistical methods as t-test or LSD (DE + GB to prepare a paper)
- TGP/10: The document would have a chapter on visual assessment without the application of statistics (DE + GB)
- TGP/11: A paper would be written on the use of disease resistance characteristics (FR to prepare a paper); the expert from NL would prepare a short paper on image analysis
- TGP/12: A short paper would be written on new types of breeding systems (NL to describe a step-by-step approach)
- TGP/14: Would be incorporated in document TGP/17; the experts from TWF and TWO would prepare a combined document on possible inconsistencies arising from the application of the various recommended publications (TWF: GB + AU, HU, IL, NZ, ZA + TWO: GB, NL)
- TGP/15(a): Would include the HCC Color Chart, the recommendation not to use a colorimeter and the addition of color pictures, including recommendations on standardized pictures (EU to prepare a paper, JP to inform on the connection of the RHS with the JP color chart)
- TGP/16: Would contain a revised chapter 6, a standard question on the use of the variety, a remark and the requirement that the applicant submit color photos in a standardized form (EU to prepare); would also require full postal and e-mail addresses of the applicant
- TGP/17: It would extract from all Test Guidelines of the last few years the terms not yet covered and include them in the document. It would also give a definition of “state of expression” (NZ to prepare a paper)

- TGP/101: A paper would be written on the use of bulk samples in aromatic plants or essential oils (FR to prepare the paper)
- TGP/103: The expert from NZ to check whether a document could be prepared on the basis of plum-cot

24. On the basis of an introduction given by the expert from the United Kingdom, the Working Party discussed the meaning of common knowledge at some length. The following points establishing common knowledge were mentioned as proposals for further clarification:

- legal matters have to be solved in other UPOV bodies
- only varieties, not heterogeneous populations
- also unnamed material (sold under species name)
- only sold or marketed material
- failed applications if material is sold
- plant collections in botanical gardens, public parks
- also herbarium material if no more living material available?
- living material has to be available
- selling from breeder to propagator is sufficient
- knowledge to profession is sufficient, to consumer not necessary
- not only official register but also professional register, breeders' catalogues
- worldwide search, not only regional, national search
- selling via Internet
- does material have to have a description (sold material, material in botanical garden, public park)?
- material in parks comes from nurseries and therefore is always sold
- only reasonable effort is needed to obtain living material
- does description of wild forms establish common knowledge?
- What about laboratory collections or germ plasm in gene banks?



25. With respect to the individual paragraphs in document TC/35/15 Prov., the Working Party made the following remarks:

Paragraph(s)

- 5 To speak of genera and species, and paragraph 2 of several species.
- 11 To be placed in a different part of the document and to have a sentence added reading: "If necessary, for certain species the national authorities may make exceptions to that rule."
- 13 To limit the paragraph by adding "as far as possible and justified (or considered useful)."
- 18 To contain more information and an explanation of how to define "common knowledge." For that purpose all experts would send to the expert from the United Kingdom comments and proposed definitions on what they considered to be common knowledge for the preparation of a document by the end of January 1999. The Working Party was aware that legal aspects were involved and not too precise information might be given. It also referred to its discussion on the subject of new species. A similar question would arise when denominations had to be checked or reference varieties selected.
- 19 The first two sentences on EDV to be taken out of the paragraph and made into paragraph 18(a) before the heading "Envelope of protection," and the last part of the sentence before the last reference to EDV to be deleted. The TWO disagreed with the proposed wording of "envelope" and "sub-variety" and also with the concept: in ornamental species all obvious, visually assessable characteristics would be used for distinctness, whether they formed part of the Test Guidelines or not, so there would be no sub-varieties of ornamental varieties. If kept at all, the paragraph would require the addition of an example to be better understood, and would be better placed after paragraph 32.
- 21, 22 The Working Party noted the proposal from the Technical Working Party on Automation and Computer Programs (TWC).
- 33 To have the additional paragraphs 33(a), 33(b), and 33(c) as follows:
- 33(a) For comparison with a candidate variety only comparable other varieties need be considered, e.g. varieties for which the same uniformity standards are applicable. A vegetatively propagated variety therefore need not be compared with a cross-pollinated variety or vice versa.
- 33(b) For further information on comparable varieties see also document TGP/12.
- 33(c) With regard to the treatment of wild material as a source of variation for the creation of new varieties, it is important for the breeder to have done some breeding: the mere collection of plant material discovered in the wild is not enough; there must have been some further development. The decision on the extent of development required is left to the individual national authorities.

33 Explanation on paragraph 33

(i) It is generally acknowledged that seed taken from wild plants, sown by the breeder and used to select plants for the creation of a new variety would fulfill the requirement of sufficient development, and the resulting candidate variety could be protected if it fulfilled the normal DUS requirements and was sufficiently distinct from the wild material.

(ii) The fact of selecting a clone in the wild and working on it to make it into a vegetatively propagated variety is interpreted differently. Where the breeder can prove sufficient development, a number of national authorities would grant protection to the material, even if in an extreme case the plant material of the variety did not show morphological differences in relation to the material originally selected. Certain member States would however insist on some morphological differences before accepting such a variety for protection, and would only consider development sufficient if it led to a change in one of its characteristics.

34, 74 These paragraphs were discussed together in the course of the discussions on common knowledge. The Working Party considered that the explanations on paragraph 34 applied only to seed-propagated varieties and seed-propagated local populations or landraces and therefore proposed adding “seed-propagated” twice in the first line, before “local population” (landrace) and before “variety.” The handling of other candidate varieties gave rise to marked differences of opinion and protracted discussions, at the end of which the Working Party proposed for consideration that:

(i) “A candidate variety can only be compared with other varieties or plant material that fulfill the same uniformity requirements.” This would mean that a cross-pollinated candidate can only be compared with other cross-pollinated varieties or populations (landraces) that fulfill the same uniformity requirements. A vegetatively propagated candidate variety can only be compared with other vegetatively propagated varieties or material or with self-fertilized varieties for which the same uniformity requirements are applicable. It cannot be compared with cross-pollinated varieties or cross-pollinated populations or landraces.

(ii) A consequence of the above would be that:

- If a clone has been selected from another vegetatively propagated variety or plant grouping or from a self-fertilized variety, the original material from which it has been selected forms part of the varieties with which the candidate has to be compared.
- If a clone has been selected from a cross-pollinated variety, that cross-pollinated variety does not form part of the comparison in the test and the candidate can be declared distinct without having to be compared with the variety from which it was selected.
- If some plants have been selected from a cross-pollinated variety to form another cross-pollinated variety, the new candidate variety has to be compared with the variety from which it was selected. Only if the characteristic that is decisive for the assessment of distinctness is uniform in both varieties can the candidate be declared distinct, otherwise it has to be rejected. Different degrees of uniformity in cross-fertilized

varieties would not be an acceptable characteristic for distinctness. The Working Party could not come to a final conclusion on how to handle the selection of a clone from a self-fertilized landrace that would not fulfill the uniformity requirements for designation as a variety, or the selection of a clone from a vegetatively propagated landrace which, because of mutations, would normally be a mixture of several slightly different clones (e.g. in shallot, garlic or artichoke).

- The Working Party also failed to come to a final conclusion on how to handle the selection of a clone from a described form in the wild. In that case, however, it was a question not only of whether the described wild form would have to be part of the comparison but also of what was considered sufficient breeding or development. While some experts could in an extreme case accept a variety in which individual plants showed no morphological difference from the clone selected from the wild form, provided that the breeder could prove sufficient development, others would require some morphological change before the variety could be protected. For some, selection alone could constitute sufficient breeding, while others would require also the creation of the situation in which the selection took place, a condition that could not be fulfilled by mere selection in the wild.

- 34 To be enlarged for the case of hybrids not resulting from pure inbred lines but from still heterogeneous parent lines.
- 38 To reflect the new situation of more and more States offering the possibility of protection for varieties of the whole plant kingdom, and to cover cases where not only other States but also the applicant or botanical gardens, gene banks or specific institutes or regional groupings maintained part or all of the reference collection. One might also wish to cover more than seed or plant material (e.g. DNA). In that connection the Working Party agreed that the reference collection would require living material so that comparisons might be made with plant material. Material from a herbarium or a mere description or test report, however detailed, would not be sufficient. If there was no living material of an old variety left with which to produce it, that variety could no longer form part of the reference collection or common knowledge. Sometimes applications would be filed for mutants of old varieties and would have to be granted protection if no living material of the former variety could be obtained.
- 43 To be amended as proposed by the TWF (the penultimate sentence to have “verified by the national authority” added).
- 48 To reflect the new understanding of the role of example varieties.
- 49 To be amended as proposed by the TWF (to have another requirement added reading: “not lead to easy plagiaristic approaches”); to make it clear that a longer list of agreed characteristics from which each expert could choose those that suited him was preferable to a short list to which every expert would add characteristics, sometimes in parallel with another State, but with different states of expression; to include also a paragraph on the status of the Test Guidelines (Articles 1(vi), 5, 7, 8 and 9 of the Convention) and on cooperation in testing with other countries, institutes or the applicant.

- 51 To be amended according to the new Technical Questionnaire, with the new paragraph 6 reworded to ensure that it was better understood by the applicant. The new wording should include a line for an example after the heading and should read as follows:

“6. Similar varieties and differences in relation to these varieties

Denomination(s) of variety(ies) <u>similar</u> to your variety	Characteristic(s) in which your variety differs from the similar variety(ies)	Describe the expression of the characteristic(s) for the <u>similar</u> variety(ies)	Describe the expression of the characteristic(s) for your variety
Example: name of variety	Plant: height	short	tall”

The Working Party considered this wording to be more easily understood as, apart from the experts involved in the drafting and familiar with UPOV terminology, few would understand the term “state of expression.” The Working Party also proposed to delete the footnote, as it would not be understood at all by the applicant and would apply only in very rare cases. Even in those cases the applicant would not know the exact states of expression of the Test Guidelines, as he would not always have a copy of those Test Guidelines to hand and would not really give the same expression in both columns.

- 54a To be maintained unchanged
- 60b To have examples added in explanations (e.g. electrophoresis, resistance in part of the variety)
- 65 To have document TC/35/8 improved according to comments received (see TGP/7 above)
- 86 To have the following added: “In certain vegetatively propagated species consistency can be assumed and one growing cycle is therefore sufficient. The individual Test Guidelines will mention for which species this is applicable.”
- 93 To be amended as proposed by the TWF (to have “should” in the first sentence replaced by “could”). In ornamental species most if not all characteristics are observed visually, and no statistics are applied irrespective of whether the characteristic is qualitative or quantitative. Measurements are taken only in exceptional cases and only for the establishment of the variety description. The need to use measurements to assess distinctness is almost non-existent.
- 108 To receive an explanation of “relevant characteristic” after the first sentence as follows: “Relevant characteristics are all characteristics included in the variety description established on the date of the grant of protection. In most vegetatively propagated species any obvious characteristic is considered relevant, whether included in the Test Guidelines or not.”

170 To be amended as proposed by the TWF (the example order of states to be: from weak to strong, from small to large, from light to dark, from low to high, from narrow to broad).

### Phytoplasma in Euphorbia

26. The Working Party noted the report submitted by the experts from CIOPORA and discussed the possibility of granting breeders' rights, and if so, how it should be done technically.

27. The experts from CIOPORA informed the Working Party that phytoplasma was not transmitted by seed, so it needed to be introduced by some artificial method to propagate the living material. It was not possible to contaminate "phytoplasma-free" material through soil, for example. Phytoplasma could be nothing more than a "switch" turning the expression of a gene or group of genes on and off. Phytoplasma could be removed from the plant by heat treatment and meristem tissue culture or by other methods. It might soon be possible to patent phytoplasma as such.

28. It was mentioned that it would be possible to remove phytoplasma, do the DUS test, obtain plant variety protection and reintroduce the phytoplasma, but there were some doubts that the result would be the same at the beginning and at the end. So, to obtain true results, Offices would have to test both phytoplasma-free material and material with phytoplasma for a given variety.

29. In the case of the double test, several problems would have to be settled: it was more expensive; a double quantity of material for the DUS test would have to be provided (phytoplasma-free and with phytoplasma); what was to be done in a situation where the same variety was on the market but with different phytoplasma?

30. The Working Party agreed that it should deal only with phytoplasma-free material for the DUS test in general. Material with phytoplasma could also be presented in a reference collection, but only for the purpose of making a description of the marketed material. The description of the material with phytoplasma could be done by the testing station, but not compulsorily, and could be attached to the report. Only the phytoplasma-free variety would form the basis of protection. The description of the variety with phytoplasma would be done only as a service to avoid confusion in the market; it would not be part of the protection.

31. For a transitional period only, if the phytoplasma-free material were not available, it might be necessary to compare material with phytoplasma with other material with phytoplasma. If phytoplasma-free material were available, the DUS testing of phytoplasma-free material would have to be done with phytoplasma-free material.

32. The Working Party requested the Technical Committee's advice on the suggestions reported above; it would also need legal advice, especially for a transitional period.

Discussion on Working Papers on Test Guidelines

Test Guidelines for *Zantedeschia*

33. The Working Party noted documents TWO/31/11 and TWO/32/4 and made the following main changes in document TWO/32/4:

(i) Front page: To read “WORKING PAPER ON TEST GUIDELINES FOR ZANTEDESCHIA (*Zantedeschia* Spreng.).

(ii) Material Required: To read: “20 tubers/rhizomes of flowering size or 20 young plants.”

(iii) Methods and Observations: To have standard wording copied from the latest adopted Test Guidelines. Paragraph 4 to read: “All observations on the leaf should be made on fully developed leaves from flowering shoots. The width of the leaf blade should be measured at the broadest part, which would sometimes include the lobes.” To have a new paragraph added after paragraph 5 with the wording: “All observations of the fading, intensifying and greening of the flower color with age should be made two to three weeks after pollen shed.”

(iv) Table of Characteristics

Characteristics

2 To read: “Leaf blade: attitude” with the following states: “erect (1), semi-erect (2), horizontal (3)”

4 To read: “Deciduous varieties only: Plant: total number of shoots” with the following states: “few (3), medium (5), many (7)”

4.3 (b) and 4.3 (c) To be deleted

7 To have the states: “green (1), yellow-green (2), red-purple (3)”

14 To have drawings added

19 To have the states “very few (1)” and “very many (9)” added

20, 23, 46, 47, 48 To have the states “absent or very weakly expressed (1), weakly expressed (2), strongly expressed (3)”

25 To read: “Spathe: natural length (viewed from above)”

26 To read: “Spathe: natural width (viewed from above)”

30 To be deleted

31 To read: “Spathe: natural shape of distal part (excluding caudate tip)”

- 33 To have the full scale of colors instead of RHS Colour Chart as follows: “white (1), greenish-white (2), light yellow (3), medium yellow (4), yellow-orange (5), red (6), red-orange (7), red-pink (8), purple-pink (9), red-purple (10), brown-purple (11), purple (12)”
- 34 To read: “Spathe: shading off of color from base to apex (inner side, excluding varieties with throat spot.)” To have a new characteristic placed after 34: “Spathe: color intensifying gradually from base to apex (as for 34)” with the states: “absent or very weakly expressed (1), weakly expressed (2), strongly expressed (3)”
- 35 To read: “Spathe: size of unchanged color area at base (as for 34)”
- 36 To read: “Spathe: presence of throat spot”
- 38 To have color groups instead of RHS Colour Chart as follows” “pink (1), dark purple (2)”
- 39 To have the same states as characteristic 34
- 40 To be deleted
- 41 To read: “Spathe: recurving of margin”
- 44, 45 To be deleted
- 45 (a) To read: “Spadix: main color just before pollen shed.” The new state “yellow-orange” to be added after “yellow”
- 46 To have a bracketed phrase reading: “(greening varieties excluded)”
- 48 To be deleted
- (v) Literature: NZ to suggest further literature.

(vi) Technical Questionnaire: Chapter 1.1 to read: “ZANTEDESCHIA” instead of “CALLA LILLY.” Chapter 4.2 to read: “(c) Other (specify)” instead of “(c) seed.”

34. ZA would send the final draft to the Office of UPOV by the end of October, and it should be sent to professional organizations for comments.

#### Test Guidelines for Waxflower

35. The Working Party noted documents TWO/31/13 and TWO/32/6 and made the following main changes in document TWO/32/6:

- (i) Front page: To have “*Verticordia* DC.” deleted.
- (ii) Subject of these Guidelines: To read: “These Test Guidelines apply to all vegetatively propagated varieties of *Chamelaucium* Desf. of the family Myrtaceae and their hybrids.”

(iii) Material Required: Paragraph 1 to read: “10 young plants.”

(iv) Conduct of Tests: To have standard wording copied from the latest adopted Test Guidelines.

(v) Methods and Observations: To have standard wording copied from the latest adopted Test Guidelines. Paragraph 3 to read: “All observations on the fully developed leaf should be made on mature, non-axillary leaves.” To have a new paragraph added after paragraph 3 reading: “Unless otherwise indicated, all observations on the flower should be made at mid-maturity. All observations on the young flower should be made on the first day of opening. Mid-maturity is defined as 10 to 14 days after the flower first opens. All observations on the fully developed flower should be made 4 weeks after the first opening of the flower.”

(vi) Grouping of Varieties: Paragraph 2 characteristics to read as: “(i) Flower diameter (10), (ii) Petal: main color at mid-maturity (23), (iii) Time of beginning of flowering (27).”

(vii) Characteristics and Symbols: To have standard wording copied from the latest adopted Test Guidelines.

(viii) Table of Characteristics

#### Characteristics

- 1 To read: “Flowering branch: thickness (60 cm from apex, excluding pot plant varieties),” and to be placed after characteristic 6
- 2 To read: “Flowering branch: angle of lateral” with the states: “small (3), medium (5), large (7).” To have example variety “Jaspea” for state “small (3)” and “Eric John” for “medium (5),” and to have example varieties “White Spring” and “Alba” deleted. To be placed after the former characteristic 1
- 7 To read: “Flowering branch: predominant location of flowers” with the states: “distal (1), along flowering branch (2),” example varieties to be checked by AU
- 8 To have an asterisk added after characteristic 9
- 10 To have the example varieties “Walpole,” “Wax (= *C. floriferum*)” deleted
- 11 To have the states “spheroid, ovoid, pyriform” and to have a new characteristic placed after characteristic 11: “Bud: horns” with states and example varieties “none (1) Blandy, one (2) Madonna, two (3) Alban Perl”
- 12 To read: “Bud: main color when cap is shiny” and to have a first state “green” added. To have a new characteristic placed after characteristic 12: “Bud: main color when bud is papery” with the states: “light brown (1), red (2)”
- 13 To have the states “orange” and “brown” deleted



- 14 To read: “Young flower: main color of petal.” To have two new characteristics placed after characteristic 14: “Mid-maturity flower: main color of petal” and “Fully developed flower: main color of petal”
- 15 To have a new characteristic placed after characteristic 15: “Fully developed flower: color of waxy center” with the states: “yellow, green, red-brown”
- 16 To be deleted
- 17 To have the “(+)” deleted and to have the states “absent (1), present (9)”
- 18 To have the states “obconical, flared”
- 19 To have the “(+)” deleted
- 20 To have the states “yellow (1), green (2), brown (3)”
- 21 To have the states “green (1), red (2), brown (3)”
- 22, 23 To be deleted
- 24 To read: “Staminode: width at base”
- 25 To read: “Flower: color of collar,” to have state “red” placed after state “pink”
- 26 To have “red” placed after state “pink”
- 27 To have the example variety “Oneg” added for state “very late (9)”

(ix) Technical Questionnaire: Chapter 1 to have *Verticordia* DC deleted and in Chapter 4.2 to have “seed” deleted, to have “- other (specify)” added after “- *in vitro* propagation.” Chapter 5 to have characteristics 10, 23, 27 added.

#### Test Guidelines for Ling, Scotch Heather, *Calluna vulgaris*

36. The Working Party noted document TWO/32/2 and made the following main changes in it:

(i) Table of Contents: To have standard wording copied from the latest adopted Test Guidelines.

(ii) Conduct of Tests: Paragraph 3 to read: “Time of submission of plant material: second half of September”

(iii) Methods and Observations: Paragraph 1 to be placed after paragraph 2. Paragraph 2, first sentence, to read: “All observations should be made on 30 plants.” The second sentence to be copied from the latest adopted Test Guidelines, but figures should be kept unchanged. Paragraph 4 to read: “Unless otherwise specified, all observations on the flower should be made at the beginning of flowering when one-third of the flowers are flowering on 50% of the plants. The observation on the flower at the end of flowering should

be made when at least 10 flowers on 10% of the plants present brown coloration.” Paragraph 5 to have standard wording copied from the latest adopted Test Guidelines.

(iv) Table of Characteristics

Characteristics

- 1 To have the following order of states: “upright (1), narrow bushy (2), broad bushy (3), creeping (4)”
- 3 To have the state “tall (7)” instead of “high (7),” to have example varieties “Marleen” instead of “Darkness” and to have example variety “J.H. Hamilton” added for state “short (3)”
- 4 To read: “Shoot tip: anthocyanin coloration (during winter)”
- 5 To read: “Shoot tip: color of new growth (3cm-long shoot),” to have the state “medium green (4)” instead of “green (4)”
- 6 To read: “Shoot tip: anthocyanin coloration (in middle of summer)”
- 7 To have the following order of states: “orange (1), yellow-orange (2), yellow (3), yellow-green (4), light green (5), medium green (6), dark green (7), grey-green (8), grey-red (9), red (10)”
- 8 To have state “medium green (4)” instead of “green (4)”
- 9 To read: “Flowering shoot: length of current season growth,” to have example variety “Darkness” instead of “Marianne”
- 11 To read: “Inflorescence: density of flowers,” to have state “sparse (3)” instead of “loose (3),” to have example variety “Dark Beauty” instead of “Arabella”
- 12 To read: “Flower: opening of bud”
- 14 To have example variety “Dark Beauty” added for state “medium (5),” to have example variety “Kinlochruel” instead of “Red Pimpernel”
- 15 To read: “Varieties with opening of buds only: Flower: length of calyx relative to length of corolla”
- 16 To read: “Varieties with opening of buds only: Flower: color of outer side of sepal,” expert from DE to add drawing
- 17 To read: “Varieties with opening of buds only: Flower: color of outer side of petal at beginning of flowering” and to have a second characteristic reading: “Varieties with non-opening of buds only: Flower: main color at beginning of flowering”
- 18 To read: “Varieties with opening of buds only: Flower: color of outer side of petal at the end of flowering” and to have a second characteristic reading: “Varieties with non-opening of buds only: Flower: main color at end of flowering”

19 To read: “Time of beginning of flowering”

(v) Explanations on the Table of Characteristics: To have the order of states as in characteristic 1

(vi) Literature: The expert from DE to add more literature

(vii) Technical Questionnaire: Chapter 4.2 to have “- seed” deleted, to have “- other (specify method)” added. Chapter 5 to have relevant changes made.

### Test Guidelines for *Eustoma*

37. The Working Party noted document TWO/31/4 Rev. and made the following main changes in it:

(i) To have every mention of seed propagation deleted. Chapters I to VI to have standard wording copied from the latest adopted Test Guidelines.

(ii) Subject of these Guidelines: To read: “These Test Guidelines apply to all vegetatively propagated varieties of *Eustoma grandiflorum* (Raf.). Shinnors of the family Gentianaceae.”

(iii) Conduct of Tests: To have growing conditions added.

(iv) Methods and Observations: Paragraph 6 to read: “All observations on the flower and the pedicel should be made on the second flower to open. Color observation on the petal should be made on its inner side.”

(v) Table of Characteristics

### Characteristics

3, 7 To have the asterisk deleted

5 To have example varieties added by the expert from JP

8 To have the state “semi-drooping (3)” instead of “semi-pendulous (3)”

13 To read: “Leaf: green color of upper side (without bloom)”

14 To read: “Leaf: green color of lower side (without bloom)”

20 To be placed after characteristic 16

21 To be placed after characteristic 15

26 To read: “Petal: relative area of secondary color” with the states “small (3), medium (5), large (7)”

27 To have the states: “upper third (3), middle (5), lower third (7)”

- 28 To read: “Petal: color of base”
- 31 To have the state “adpressed (1)” instead of “accumbent (1),” the expert from JP to add drawings

(v) Technical Questionnaire: Chapter 4.1 “(d) Other (specify)” to be added, a new chapter “Method of reproduction” with states “cutting, *in vitro*, other (specify)” to be placed after chapter 4.1. Chapter 7.2 to be deleted. Chapter 8 “Authorization for release” with standard wording to be copied from the latest adopted Test Guidelines.

#### Test Guidelines for *Guzmania*

38. The Working Party noted documents TWO/29/9 and TWO/31/16 and made the following main changes in document TWO/31/16:

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

(ii) Material Required: Paragraph 1 to have word “seed” in the second line deleted, and to read: “50 young plants of commercial standard, picked out at least twice.”

(iii) Methods and Observations: To have an additional paragraph reading: “All observations on the bract should be made on the largest bract.”

(iv) Characteristics and Symbols: To have the standard paragraph on the indication of species instead of example varieties.

(v) Table of Characteristics

#### Characteristics

- 1 The expert from NL to add drawings
- 8 To read: “Leaf blade: shape of apex,” to have the state “medium acuminate (3)” instead of “acuminate (3)” and the state “medium acute (5)” instead of “acute (5)”
- 9, 11 To have the state “yellowish white (1)” instead of “cream (1)”, and the state “dark green” placed after state “medium green”
- 13 To read: “Leaf blade: distribution of anthocyanin coloration on lower side”
- 15 To read: “Varieties with inflorescence above highest leaves only: Inflorescence: height,” to have the states “tall (7)” instead of “long (7)” and “very tall (9)” instead of “very long (9),” and to have example “*G. variegata*” deleted
- 16 To have examples “*G. variegata*” and “*G. bismarckii*” deleted
- 18, 24, 25 The expert from NL to add drawings
- 19 To read: “Bract: length”

- 20 To read: “Bract: width,” and to have example “G. conifera” deleted
- 21 To read: “Bract: shape of tip,” to have state “medium acuminate (2)” instead of “acuminate (2),” and to have example “G. alba rosea” deleted
- 22 To read: “Bract: color of upper side”
- 23 To read: “Bract: color of lower side”
- 24 To read: “Inflorescence: number of flowers per bract,” to be placed after characteristic 18
- 25 To read: “Inflorescence: total number of flowers per bract,” to be placed after the former characteristic 24
- 27, 32 To have example “G. butcheri” deleted
- 33 To have state “medium green (4)” instead of “green (4),” and to have examples “G. jarmiloi” and “G. conifera” deleted

(vi) Explanations on the Table of Characteristics: The expert from NL to add drawings of bract.

(vii) Technical Questionnaire: Chapter 4.2 to read: “Method of Propagation,” Chapter 7, reading “A representative color photo of the variety should be added to the Technical Questionnaire,” placed after chapter 7.3, Chapter 8 “Authorization for release” with standard wording to be copied from the latest adopted Test Guidelines.

#### Test Guidelines for Amaryllis

39. The Working Party noted document TWO/30/6 and made the following main changes in it:

(i) Front page: To have the word “Hippeastrum” not in capitals and the word “Herb.” not in italics.

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

(iii) Table of Characteristics

#### Characteristics

- 2 To have note “9” for the state “present”
- 4 To read: “Peduncle: maximum width at middle third”
- 7, 8 To have the word “(filled)” deleted

- 8 The expert from NL to add drawings
- 11 To read: “Flower: shape in front view”
- 12 To read: “Flower: maximum length of perianth”
- 13 To read: “Flower: maximum width of perianth”
- 19 To read: “Tepals: degree of wrinkling”

(iv) Explanations on the Table of Characteristics: To have explanations added.

(v) Literature: To have literature added.

(vi) Technical Questionnaire: To have a Technical Questionnaire added with characteristics 7, 13 and 16 in paragraph 5.

#### Test Guidelines for Lavandula

40. The Working Party noted document TWO/29/14 and a photocopy distributed at the session by the expert from France and made the following main changes in the photocopy:

- (i) Front page: To have the word “Lavandula” instead of “Lavender.”
- (ii) Chapters I to VI to have standard wording copied from the latest adopted Test Guidelines.
- (iii) Material Required: Paragraph 1 to read: “minimum 8 young plants (less than one year old).”
- (iv) Grouping of Varieties: To have the following characteristics for grouping: 1, 7, 8, 27, 33, 35.
- (v) Table of Characteristics: To have two groups of example varieties: “Ptero- and Stoechas group” and “Spica group.”

#### Characteristics

- 1 To read: “Plant: size (in winter with flowering stems)”
- 5 To read: “Plant: attitude of outer flowering stems”
- 6 To have an asterisk added, to read: “Plant: density” and to have the state “open (3)” instead of “sparse (3)”
- 7 To have an asterisk added, to read: “Leaf: incision of margin,” to have the states “weakly expressed (2)” instead of “weakly present (1)” and “strongly expressed (3)”

- instead of “strongly present (3)” and to have examples “*L. dentata*” and “*Sidonie* (*L. canariensis*)” for the *Ptero-* and *Stoechas* group
- 8 To read: “Flowering stem: lateral branching,” to have a new characteristic: “Flowering stem: number of primary branches” with the states: “two (1), four (2)” and to be placed after characteristic 8
  - 9 To be deleted
  - 10 To be placed after characteristic 7
  - 11 To have an asterisk added, and to read “primary” instead of “lateral”
  - 13 The expert from NZ to add example varieties
  - 14 To read: “*Spica* group only: Flowering stem: rigidity of basal part”
  - 15 To read: “Flowering stem: intensity of pubescence”
  - 16 To read: “Spike: maximum width”
  - 17 To read: “Spike: total length from first whorl of flowers”
  - 18 To read: “*Spica* group only: Spike: length from second whorl of flowers”
  - 20 To have the state “truncate conical (2)” instead of “truncate (2),” the expert from NZ to add example varieties
  - 21 To have a “+” added, and the expert from NZ to add example varieties
  - 22 The expert from NZ to add example varieties
  - 23 To read: “*Spica* group only: width of bracts”
  - 24, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31 To read: “*Stoechas* group only:” at the beginning
  - 25 To read: “*Spica* group only: Spike: presence of bracteole when flowering,” and to have the example variety “Marshwood” deleted
  - 26, 32 To read: “*Spica* group only: Spike: length of bracteole”
  - 27, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44 To have a “+” added
  - 28, 29, 31, 33, 36 To have an asterisk added
  - 29, 31, 33, 34, 36 To have the “+” deleted
  - 33 To have the state “purplish (2)” instead of “violet (2)”
  - 35 To have the state “blue” placed after “violet” and the state “purple” after “pink”

37 The expert from NZ to add example varieties

(vi) Explanations on the Table of Characteristics: To have explanations added

(vii) Technical Questionnaire: To have a Technical Questionnaire added

#### Test Guidelines for Thyme

41. The Working Party noted documents TWO/31/8, TWO/32/8, and TWV/33/14 and made the following main changes in document TWO/32/8:

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

(ii) Subject of these Guidelines: To read: “These Test Guidelines apply to all vegetatively propagated varieties of *Thymus vulgaris* L. of the family Labiateae.”

(iii) Grouping of Varieties: To have characteristics 14a, 15, 18, 24 as grouping characteristics.

(iv) Table of Characteristics: Only two example varieties should be left for each state; if there is another variety, varieties with figures only should be deleted. The expert from GB to add characteristics for ornamental varieties.

#### Characteristics

2 To have the wording “(or prostrate)” to be deleted

5 To have the state “along whole stem (from base to tip) (4)” instead of “along all stem (from base to tip) (4)”

8 To have the order of states as: “concentrated at tip (1), along upper quarter (2), along upper half (3), along upper third (4), along whole stem (5)”

10, 14, 18, 19, 21, 23 The expert from FR to check the characteristics

11 To read: “Leaf: general shape,” with the states “elliptic (1), ovate (2), triangular (3)”

13 To have a new characteristic “Leaf: ratio length/width” with the states “small (3), medium (5), broad (7)” placed after characteristic 13

15 To read: “Leaf: main color”

16 To read: “Leaf: intensity of main color”

18 To have the states: “white or slightly pink, medium pink, purple, violet”

21 To have the state “purple” placed after “pink”

24 To read: “Plant male sterility,” with the states “absent (1), present (2)”



26-40 To be placed in an Annex to these Test Guidelines

(v) Explanations on the Table of Characteristics: To have explanations added.

(vi) Literature: To have literature added.

(vii) Technical Questionnaire: To have standard wording copied from the latest adopted Test Guidelines. Chapter 4.1 to have “seedlings” instead of “clones” and to have “Other (specify)” added after “Discovery.” Chapter 5.1, 5.3, 5.5, 5.8, 5.9, 5.12 to be deleted. Chapter 7.2 (i) to read “Main use,” with four choices: “ essential oil, ornamental, culinary, other.”

#### Test Guidelines for Cupressus

42. The Working Party noted document TWO/32/7 and Subgroup meetings which took place in the evenings. A new draft will be prepared by the expert from France for discussion at the next session.

#### Test Guidelines for Dendrobium

43. The Working Party noted document TWO/32/5 and Subgroup meetings which took place in the evenings. A new draft will be prepared by the expert from Japan for discussion at the next session.

#### Status of Test Guidelines

44. The Working Party agreed that the draft Test Guidelines for Gerbera (Revision), Iris, Kangaroo Paw and *Osteospermum* should be sent to the Technical Committee for final adoption. It also agreed that the draft Test Guidelines for *Calluna*, *Guzmania*, Amaryllis and *Zantedeschia* should be sent to the professional organizations for comments.

45. As time did not allow the Working Party to discuss the Working Papers on Test Guidelines for *Celosia*, Chrysanthemum (Revision), *Eucalyptus gunnii*, Impatiens, *Leptospermum*, *Nerium*, Ornamental Apple (Revision), Pentas, Petunia, *Poinsettia* (Revision) and Tagetes, 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 them. The new document on Thyme should also be sent to the Technical Working Party for Vegetables for comments.

#### Future Program, Date and Place of Next Session

46. On the basis of written information which was confirmed also by the experts from Hungary, the Working Party agreed to hold its thirty-third session in Budapest, Hungary, from June 26 to 30, 2000. It was planned that five full days would be devoted to the session,

including the afternoon of Friday, June 30. It was planned that the following items would be discussed at the session:

- (a) Short reports on special developments in plant variety protection in ornamental plants and forest trees
- (b) Important decisions taken during the last sessions of the Technical Working Party and Technical Committee
- (c) Special cases in new species
- (d) Revision of the General Introduction, including complementary documents (TC/35/15)
- (e) Final discussions on draft Test Guidelines for:
  - *Calluna*
  - *Guzmania*
  - *Amaryllis*
  - *Zantedeschia*
- (f) Discussion on Working Papers on Test Guidelines:
  - *Bracteantha* (Australia to prepare a document)
  - *Celosia* (Netherlands to prepare a new draft)
  - *Chrysanthemum* (Revision) (TG/26/4, TWO/30/8; United Kingdom to prepare a new draft)
  - *Clematis* (Canada to prepare a document)
  - *Cupressus* (TWO/32/7; France to prepare a new draft)
  - *Dendrobium* (TWO/32/5; Japan to prepare a new draft)
  - *Eucalyptus gunnii* (TWO/31/7, TWO/32/3; France to prepare a new draft)
  - *Eustoma* (TWO/31/4; Japan to prepare a new draft)
  - *Impatiens* (TWO/31/9; France to collect remarks)
  - *Lavandula* (TWO/29/14; France to prepare a new draft)
  - *Leptospermum* (Australia to prepare a document)
  - *Nerium* (TWO/31/15; France to collect remarks)

- Ornamental Apple (Revision) (TG/14/5, TWO/31/18; United Kingdom to prepare a new draft)
- Pentas (TWO/29/10; Netherlands to prepare a new draft)
- Petunia (Israel to prepare a document)
- *Poinsettia* (Revision) (TG/24/5; Denmark to prepare a new draft)
- Tagetes (TWO/31/9; France to prepare a new draft)
- Thyme (TWO/31/8, TWO/32/8, TWV/33/14; France to prepare a new draft)
- Waxflower (TWO/31/13, TWO/32/6; Australia to prepare a new draft)

47. In view of the long list of Test Guidelines to be dealt with, the Working Party agreed to nominate one leading expert in the above planned list and ask other interested experts to cooperate with the leading expert by correspondence in the preparation of a more advanced document. An amended list of species and their leading experts is reproduced in Annex II to this report. The leading experts will each prepare a new draft, unless otherwise stated, by March 1, 2000, for comments to be submitted to them. Depending on the comments, they will produce either a summary of comments or a new draft by May 1, 2000.

#### Visits

48. On September 14, 1999, the Working Party visited the Botanical Garden of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, Průhonice, where they were given a report by Mr. Jiří Burda on the Garden's collection of ornamental plants and forest trees.

49. On the afternoon of September 16, 1999, the Working Party visited the Research Institute of Ornamental Gardening, Průhonice, where they were given a report by Mrs. Plavcová on the breeding programs for ornamentals conducted at the Institute.

50. On September 17, 1999, the Working Party visited the Dendrological Garden of the Research Institute of Ornamental Gardening, Průhonice, where Mr. Kiesenbauer conducted a very informative and detailed excursion for the Working Party in the course of which all aspects of research programs of the Institute were explained.

*51. This report has been adopted by correspondence.*

[Two annexes follow]

TWO/32/9

ANNEX I

TECHNICAL WORKING PARTY  
FOR  
ORNAMENTAL PLANTS AND FOREST TREES

**Thirty-second Session**  
**Pruhonice, Czech Republic, September 13 to 18, 1999**

**PROVISIONAL 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

Ivan BRANŽOVSKÝ, Ministry of Agriculture of the Czech Republic, Těšnov 17, 117 05 Praha 1 (tel. (+420-2) 2181 2383, fax (+420-2) 2181 2989, e-mail: branzovsky@mze.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)

Renata KRMELOVÁ (Ms.), 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 94 210, fax (+420-2) 572 11 752)

Naděžda KRPEŠOVÁ (Ms.), ÚKZÚZ - Central Institute for Supervising and Testing in Agriculture, Testing Station, Dobříšice 252 29 (tel. (+420-2) 99 11 776)

DENMARK

Lars Henrik JACOBSEN, Kirstinebjergvej 10, P.O. 102, 5792 Aarslev (tel. +45 63 90 4343, fax +45 639 04392, e-mail: larsh.jacobsen@agrsci.dk)

FRANCE

Richard BRAND, INRA Geves, B.P. 1, Les Vignères, 84300 (tel. +33 4 90786663, fax +33 4 90 78 01 61, e-mail: richard.brand@geves.fr)

Marie-Hélène GANDELIN (Ms.), GIP – GEVES Sophia Antipolis, Route des Colles, 06410 Biot (tel. +33 492 965560, fax +33 4 92 965569, e-mail: marie-helene.gandelin@geves.fr)

GERMANY

Andrea MENNE (Ms.), Bundessortenamt, Osterfelddamm 80, 30627 Hannover (tel. +49-511 9566 723, fax: +49-511 9566 719, e-mail: andrea.menne@Bundessortenamt.de)

Burkhard SPELLERBERG, Bundessortenamt, Osterfelddamm 80, 30627 Hannover (tel. +49-51 38 608640, fax: +49-5138 60 86 70, e-mail: burkhard.spellerberg@bundessortenamt.de)

HUNGARY

Julianna CSIKOR (Ms.), National Institute for Agricultural Quality Control, Keleti k.u. 24, 1024 Budapest (tel. +361 212 31 27, fax +361 212 5367)

Gizella VINIS (Ms.), National Institute for Agricultural Quality Control, Keleti k.u. 24, 1024 Budapest (tel. +361 212 31 27, fax +361 212 5367, e-mail: vinisg@ommi.hu website: <http://www.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

Kaoru SAITO, National Center for Seeds and Seedlings, MAFF 2-2, Fujimoto, Tsukuba, Ibaraki, 305-0852 (tel. +81 298 38 6589, fax +81 298 38 6583, e-mail: saito@ncss.go.jp)

MEXICO

Luis Miguel VÁZQUEZ GARCÍA, Lope de Vega No. 125-2, Chapultepec Morales, 11570 Mexico D.F. (tel. 52 5203 9427, fax +52 5250 6483, e-mail: molina@sagar.gob.mx)

NETHERLANDS

Joost BARENDRECHT, CPRO-DLO, Postbus 16, 6700 AA Wageningen (tel. +31 317 476 893, fax +31 317 418 094, e-mail: c.j.barendrecht@cpro.wag-ur.nl)

Gerie VAN DER HEIJDEN, CPRO-DLO, Postbus 16, 6700 AA Wageningen (tel. +31 317 47 6841, fax +31 317 418 094, e-mail: g.w.a.m.vanderheijden@cpro.wag-ur.nl)

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

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

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

SOUTH AFRICA

Elise BUITENDAG (Mrs.), Directorate Genetic Resources, P.B. X11208, Nelspruit 1200 (tel. +427 13 7532071, fax +27 13 7523854, e-mail: elise@itsc.agric.za)

UNITED KINGDOM

Elizabeth SCOTT (Miss), Ornamental Plants Section, National Institute of Agricultural Botany (NIAB), Huntingdon Road, Cambridge CB3 0LE (tel. +1223 342399, fax +1223 342229, e-mail: elizabeth.scott@niab.com)

## II. OBSERVER STATE

### REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Dong-Gwang JO, P.O. Box 24, Suwon 441-350 (tel. +82 33 290 1142, fax +82 331 292 8468)

Hyeon-Jae PARK, Government Complex Daejon, 920 Dusan-Dong, Seo-Ky, Daejon City 302 701 (tel. +82 42 481 4156, fax +82 4814169, e-mail: yuklim@chollian.net)

Mi-Hee YANG (Ms.), 433 Anyang 6-dong, Anyang, Kyonggi-do 430-016 (tel. 82 343 446 2432, fax +82 343 448 1216, e-mail: mh730@seed.go.kr)

## III. OBSERVER ORGANIZATION

Ton KWAKKENBOS, Community Plant Variety Office, B.P. 2141, 49100 Angers Cedex 02 (tel. +33 2 41 36 84 58, +33 2 41 36 84 60, e-mail: kwakkenbos@cpvo.fr)

Jean MAISON, Community Plant Variety Office, B.P. 2141, 49100 Angers Cedex 02 (tel. +33 2 41 36 84 75, +33 2 41 36 84 60, e-mail: maison@cpvo.fr)

## IV. EXPERTS

Ron CRAMER, CIOPORA USA, PLA<sup>(R)</sup> Poinsettia International ApS, Postboks 95, 3400 Hilleroed, Denmark (e-mail: rcramer@connectnet.com)

Lars HENRIKSEN, CIOPORA Nord, PLA<sup>(R)</sup> Poinsettia International ApS, Postboks 95, 3400 Hilleroed, Denmark (e-mail: plalars@IBM.net)

## V. OFFICER

Joost BARENDRECHT, Chairman

## VI. 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, website: <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, website: <http://www.upov.int>)

[Annex II follows]

## ANNEX II

## LIST OF LEADING EXPERTS

<b>Species</b>	<b>Basic Document (comments to be sent to leading experts before the dates shown)</b>	<b>Leading experts (for addresses see Annex I)</b>	<b>Interested experts (countries) (for name of experts see Annex I)</b>
<i>Bracteantha</i>	New, March 1, 2000	Mrs. Costa, AU	DE, GB, IL, NL, NZ, ZA
<i>Celosia</i>	New, end of March 2000	Mr. Barendrecht, NL	AU, DE, IL
Chrysanthemum	TWO/30/8, March 1, 2000	Miss Scott, GB	CA, DE, EU, FR, IL, JP, PL, KE, KR, NL
Clematis	New, March 1, 2000	Mrs. Cole, CA	AU, DE, EU, FR, GB, JP, NL, NZ
<i>Cupressus</i>	TWO/32/7, March 1, 2000	Ms. Gandelin, FR	DE, DK, EU, GB, NZ, PL, ZA
<i>Dendrobium</i>	TWO/32/5, March 1, 2000	Mr. Saito, JP	KR, NL, ZA
<i>Eucalyptus gunnii</i>	TWO/32/3, March 1, 2000	Mr. Brand, FR	AU, IL
<i>Eustoma</i>	TWO/31/4, March 1, 2000	Mr. Saito, JP	DE, IL, NL, ZA
Impatiens	TWO/31/9, March 1, 2000	Mr. Brand, FR	AU, CA, DE, ZA
Lavandula	TWO/29/14, end of March 2000	Mr. Brand, FR	AU, GB, NZ
<i>Leptospermum</i>	New, March 1, 2000	Mrs. Costa, AU	IL, NZ
<i>Nerium</i>	TWO/31/15, March 1, 2000	Ms. Gandelin, FR	DK, NL
Ornamental Apple	TWO/31/18, March 1, 2000	Miss Scott, GB	CA, DE, FR, NL, NZ, PL
Pentas	TWO/29/10, end of 1999	Mr. Barendrecht, NL	DE, IL
Petunia	New, March 1, 2000	Mr. Bar-Tel, IL	AU, DE, FR, GB, JP, NZ, PL, ZA
<i>Poinsettia</i>	TG/24/5, March 1, 2000	Mr. Jacobsen, DK	AU, CA, EU, DE, MX, NL
Tagetes	TWO/31/9, March 1, 2000	Mr. Brand, FR	DE, MX, NL, PL
Thyme	TWO/32/8, March 1, 2000	Mr. Brand, FR	DE, TWV
Waxflower	TWO/32/6, end of November 1999	Mrs. Costa, AU	IL, ZA

[End of Annex II and of document]