



TWO/33/17

ORIGINAL: English

DATE: December 1, 2000

INTERNATIONAL UNION FOR THE PROTECTION OF NEW VARIETIES OF PLANTS
GENEVA

**TECHNICAL WORKING PARTY
FOR
ORNAMENTAL PLANTS AND FOREST TREES**

**Thirty-Third Session
Budapest, June 26 to 30, 2000**

REPORT

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

Opening of the Session

1. The thirty-third session of the Technical Working Party for Ornamental Plants and Forest Trees (hereinafter referred to as “the Working Party”) was held in Budapest, from June 26 to 30, 2000. The list of participants is given in Annex I to this report.
2. Dr. Károly Neszmélyi, General Director, National Institute for Agricultural Quality Control, Hungary, welcomed the participants to Budapest. The session was opened by Miss Elizabeth Scott (United Kingdom), Chair of the Working Party.

Adoption of the Agenda

3. The Working Party adopted the agenda for its thirty-third session, which is reproduced in document TWO/33/1 Rev., after having agreed to change slightly the order of the items for discussion and to delete item 6 – Special cases in new species, and Chrysanthemum, *Cupressus*, *Nerium* and Petunia from item 9. The Subgroup for Clematis, *Eucalyptus gunnii*, Impatiens, *Poinsettia*, Tagetes and Waxflower would hold discussions and new documents would be prepared for the next meeting.

4. The Working Party reviewed the information from the Office of UPOV concerning the radical improvement in submitting documents in due time for final preparation and distribution to the experts. Only four documents were received by the Office of UPOV by the deadline in the year 1999 but fourteen documents were received by the year 2000 deadline.

5. The Working Party decided to continue to improve the distribution of documents by the Office of UPOV to the experts. In some cases distribution by ordinary mail has been rather slow, and the Working Party supported the suggestion made by the Office to send the documents by e-mail also.

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

7. The Chair suggested that the Working Party should elaborate the standardized layout for new Test Guidelines preparation. It was agreed that experts from AU, DE, GB and ZA would prepare a document, with model wording for chapters I to VI of the Test Guidelines and a template for the Guidelines structure, by the end of August 2000 for circulation to all experts of the Working Party. Once agreed, any changes in standard wording could be entered in the document which would then always be an up-to-date reference. If accepted by the Editorial Committee, the document would form part of an expanded TGP/17 (Model TQ); if not, it would be a TWO document.

8. The Working Party discussed the proposal sent by the expert from New Zealand, that the wider use of the RHS Colour Chart should be limited in the Technical Questionnaire of Test Guidelines because experience had shown that only a few applicants had access to, or any knowledge of, the Chart. If flower color was used as a grouping character the use of color groups was preferable and these supplied the necessary information at the initial stage of testing. The Working Party agreed with the proposal to return to the former system of presenting the two alternatives, either the RHS Colour Chart or color group.

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

9. The Working Party received short reports from a number of countries. Most of them reported that the number of new species, as well as the number of applications, had increased and that ornamentals were an increasingly important group for their Offices. Some States reported on the preparation or adoption of new legislation to introduce the 1991 Act of the UPOV Convention and in particular on the opening up of the system to the whole plant kingdom. The CPVO had adopted a new document for variety denomination. The ASSINSEL representative reported on attempts to encourage the use of PBR in seed propagated varieties of ornamentals.

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

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

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

12. The Working Party discussed the proposal, by the Working Group on Biochemical and Molecular Techniques and DNA Profiling in Particular (BMT), which had been approved by the Technical Committee, to establish *ad hoc* crop subgroups on molecular techniques for five selected crops. Rose was the species of relevance to the TWO. The Working Party agreed with the proposal and nominated Mr. Joost Barendrecht (Netherlands) as Chair of the Subgroup for Rose.

13. The Working Party stressed its interest in cooperating with BMT experts to ensure there would not be a misunderstanding of the TWO position by the experts from other Working Parties. The TWO strongly supported further investigation of the new techniques.

UPOV Documents in Electronic Form

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

Testing of Seed Raised Ornamentals

15. The Working Party reviewed document TWO/33/16 prepared by the Chair as a summary of the meeting with ASSINSEL and a group of TWO experts. It would need further discussion and development for the improvement of the current situation as breeders of such varieties were not always familiar with the workings of the DUS-trials system. A number of applications were anticipated for Seed Raised Ornamentals and as UPOV was revising the General Introduction it would be a good moment to improve the understanding.

16. Breeders of Seed Raised Ornamentals felt they could be faced with DUS testing procedures which would be more appropriate to vegetatively propagated plants, and that the requirements would be too rigid. It should be stressed that all varieties must be tested according to their method of breeding and propagation, and Seed Raised Ornamentals would be tested in an appropriate way and not according to the standard for vegetatively propagated material.

17. It was very important for the applicants to supply full details of the breeding system and propagation method for their varieties, and for UPOV Technical Working Parties to ensure that consistent methods and standards were developed and applied for different types. The Technical Questionnaire of the Test Guidelines concerning TGP documents should be improved accordingly.

18. Common practice in Seed Raised Ornamentals has been to continue to reselect and improve varieties after their commercial launch. It had to be pointed out that clonal material was also subject to constant reselection, but that there was a difference between selection for maintenance and selection to improve and change the variety. If the variety was moved too far from its original description it became a new variety and separate protection had to be applied for – that was also the situation with clonally propagated material.

19. The problem of the quantity of seed needed for DUS-Tests was also discussed. Offices needed to be realistic here because in some cases the seeds in the 2 or 3 grams required for the test could produce hundreds or even thousands of plants.

20. The Working Party concluded that the meeting with ASSINSEL, and the discussion continued by the Working Party, had been very useful in clarifying a number of issues and establishing channels of communication for the discussion of technical matters. The ASSINSEL representative would make a presentation on the results of the discussion to their meeting in August 2000 in Copenhagen. The experts of the Working Party would continue their exchange of information on these matters via e-mail. Some practical points were to be discussed later in the meeting during the discussion on the General Introduction.

Final Discussion of Draft Test Guidelines

Test Guidelines for Amaryllis

21. The Working Party reviewed document TG/181/1(proj.) and made the following main changes to it:

(i) Methods and Observations: Paragraph 1 to add first sentence “All observations should be made on 20 plants.”

(ii) Table of Characteristics

Characteristics

4 To have the state “narrow (3)” instead of “small (3)” and “broad (7)” instead of “large (7)”

14, 15, 19 To read “tepal” instead of “tepals”

16 To have “of tepals” deleted

17 To read “Flower: color pattern”

18 To read “Flower: overlapping of tepals”, to be placed after characteristic 13

(iii) Technical Questionnaire: Chapter 4.2 to read “by incisions” instead of “cuttings”, Chapter 5.3: Color group to be added in addition to RHS Colour Chart, with appropriate wording.

Test Guidelines for *Calluna* (Revision)

22. The Working party reviewed document TG/94/4(proj.) and made the following main changes to it:

(i) Front page: To read “SCOTS” instead of “SCOTCH” and to have brackets in correct place “(*Calluna vulgaris* (L.) Hull)”.

(ii) Table of Characteristics

Characteristics

1, 4-15, 17-22 Asterisk to be added, characteristic 1 to have example variety “Marleen” for state (3) and “Long White” for state (2)

7 To have the following order of example varieties: “Sandy” (3), “Melanie” (4), “Long White” (5), “Amethyst” (9), “Marleen” (10)

11 To read: “Flowering shoot: color of tip at beginning of flowering”

16-21 To have “of” deleted in “Varieties with opening (non-opening) buds only:”

20 To be placed after characteristic 18

(iii) Technical Questionnaire: Chapters 5.4 and 5.5: Color group to be added in addition to RHS Colour Chart, with appropriate wording.

Test Guidelines for *Guzmania*

23. The Working Party reviewed document TG/182/1(proj.) and made the following main changes to it:

(i) Conduct of Tests: Paragraph 3, Flower induction, to read “treated” instead of “created”.

(ii) Method and Observations: Paragraph 2 to have new wording of the first sentence “For the assessment of uniformity in case of vegetatively propagated *Guzmania*, a population standard of 2% and an acceptance probability of at least 95% should be applied”, to have new last sentence added “In case of seed propagated *Guzmania*, the rules as given in TG/1/2 should be followed.”. Paragraph 3, first sentence: to have “at least” deleted, to have 50 plants instead of 10 plants, and the sentence to be placed as the first sentence of paragraph 1.

(iii) Table of Characteristics

Characteristics

1 To read: “Plant: height (inflorescence excluded)”, NL to change diagram and example varieties

- 8 To have the state “narrow acuminate (1)” instead of “narrow (1)” and “acuminate (2)”, to have other states re-numbered
- 10, 12 To read “of” instead of “on”
- 13 To read “of” instead of “at”
- 15 To have “Varieties with inflorescence below highest leaves only:” deleted, NL to change example varieties
- 18 To have the states as “very few (1)”, “few (3)”, “medium (5)”, “many (7)”, “very many (9)”
- 20 To read: “Inflorescence: varieties with more than one flower per bract: total number of flowers per bract”

(iv) Explanations on the Table of Characteristics: Ad. 15: Varieties with inflorescence below highest leaves only: inflorescence: length: diagram to be corrected.

(v) Technical Questionnaire: Chapter 5.3: Color group to be added in addition to the RHS Colour Chart, with appropriate wording.

Test Guidelines for *Zantedeschia*

24. The Working Party reviewed document TG/177/1(proj.) and made the following main changes to it:

(i) Table of Characteristics

Characteristics

- 2 To be placed after characteristic 7
- 12 To add “(+)”
- 30 To read example variety for state “weakly expressed (2)” as “Elmaro”
- 40,41 Proposal to combine: ZA to check with subgroup

(ii) Explanations on the Table of Characteristics: Ad. 22: Spathe: natural height (in line with scape): diagram to be corrected.

(iii) Literature: Halevy, A.H. to be amended.

(iv) Technical Questionnaire: Chapter 5.5: Color group to be added in addition to the RHS Colour Chart, with appropriate wording.

General Introduction

25. The Working Party discussed documents TC/36/5, TC/36/7, TC/36/8, the Annex to Circular U 2976 and made the following remarks or came to the following conclusions:

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

Add. 31 The Working Party disagreed with the Office proposal. Phytoplasma was already covered by “foreign factors” and there was no need to further specify it. The Working Party proposed not to mention phytoplasma at all and to have a more general wording.

Add. 32 The Working Party proposed to delete the whole non-numbered paragraph after paragraph 32 as both sentences were not completely correct and could be misleading. The Working Party considered that experts should be referred to the complete explanations in document TGP/3.

Add. 40 The Working Party proposed a new wording for the paragraph: “The material to be submitted for the assessment of DUS for seed propagated varieties and especially for cross-fertilized varieties must be representative of the candidate variety as it would be marketed; that means that the material tested should be of the same generation level as that later placed on the market”. The Working Party proposed to delete the last sentence of paragraph 40 unless there was a valid reason to keep it as it was.

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

Add. 115 The Working Party wanted more clarification on that paragraph: specifically it wanted to know if fixed frequencies were considered (a) sufficiently uniform or (b) non-uniform but acceptable for certain species. If (a) was the case the paragraph was acceptable, if (b) was the case the paragraph needed re-drafting.

Add. 144 The Working Party proposed to change the wording to that suggested for paragraph 40.

The expert from France expressed his opinion that the wording of the Explanation for paragraph 89 concerning ornamental varieties did not seem correct. The Working Party proposed that the second sentence of Explanation should read “For vegetatively propagated and self-pollinated ornamental varieties one growing cycle may be sufficient”.

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

1.1 Definition of Variety and Common Knowledge: The Working Party decided to discuss this later when considering the TGP/3 document.

1.2 Hybrid Parentage: The Working Party decided that the question was important for the TWO but for the time being the number of applications for such varieties was small. The Working Party would like to participate in the preparation of documents to be sure the opinion of the TWO was taken into consideration.

1.3 Selection from within a Protected Variety: The Working Party expressed its opinion that it was impossible to stop selection from within a protected variety. It would be necessary

to amend paragraphs 58, 78, 82, 86 to 95 before final clarification. The expert from Australia expressed the official point of view of that member State: “We will not accept that new varieties cannot be selected from existing (and even protected) varieties. We do acknowledge that there are specific circumstances where new varieties selected from existing varieties will not be allowed PBR protection. However a blanket ban, as anticipated by paragraph 78 is not accepted nor is it scientifically supportable or in accordance with the Diplomatic Conference establishing UPOV in 1961.” Australia reserved a right to vote on it for final approval. The Working Party proposed to take out all references to it in the above mentioned paragraphs, since it was not in conflict with the notion of breeder and selection from within an existing variety, and then discuss it on the basis of opinions of other Working Parties. Only after that would the TGP document be prepared.

1.4 Reference Collection: The Working Party decided that there was a different understanding of what “reference collection” meant in each given case. The expressions “Working reference collection”, “World reference collection”, “Crop reference collection” etc. were used by experts. The Working Party proposed that the whole text of the General Introduction document should be clarified for proper use of the term. The Working Party also wanted to have an input in the document TGP/4 (4.(a)(iii)) – The Management of Reference Collections in Cross-fertilized Species, because, in its current form, the Working Party could not accept the document. The Working Party wanted to cooperate via the Chairperson with other authors of the document in question to prepare a more appropriate version.

1.5 Application of Quantitative Data: The Working Party disagreed with the statement concerning ornamentals as it was expressed in the last sentence of paragraph 1.5 in the Annex to Circular U 2976. Experts in ornamental species looked at the whole plant but the decision was based on characteristics observed. The Working Party reserved a right to express its view in future when it had more experience.

1.6 Useful Additional Information: The Working Party concluded that supporting evidence was not very often used in ornamentals. The Working Party would like to have clarification on what should be discussed there.

1.7 Example Varieties: The Working Party stressed that Example Varieties were guides only. It also agreed that it was possible to have a second set of Example Varieties, and that it could support the replacement of example varieties by diagrams where possible as the high turnover of varieties made the current lists obsolete very quickly. The Working Party discussed the proposals “About Example Varieties” prepared by the expert from France (Mr. Jöel Guiard) and concluded that the document on that matter should be promoted.

Annex to Circular U2976: Comments on TC/36/5: The Working Party decided not to make any comments on the document as it had already been discussed and would wait until other Working Parties had expressed their opinion on it.

Annex to Circular U2976: Comments on document TC/36/7: The Working Party decided not to discuss all the comments on that document as presented in the Annex to Circular U 2976 but to concentrate on the TGP documents which the Working Party was supposed to prepare or help to prepare.

General Comments on TGP Documents: The Working Party strongly supported the idea that TGP documents should be practical in their approach, and applicable internationally as well as for all Working Parties. It was suggested that documents of a philosophical kind should not be included in the list of TGP documents, at least at that stage of development, and that it should only contain documents at a stage to be adopted by the Technical Committee.

TGP/3 (A) (here and below as numbered in document TC/36/7): The Concept of Varieties of Common Knowledge: The Working Party did not discuss this document at length as it had already done so at the previous meeting and was now waiting for the comments of the other Working Parties. However, it disagreed with the comment in the Annex to Circular U 2976 on this document. A variety might fail to be protected for a number of reasons but could still be of Common Knowledge if it was on the market and met the basic definition of “variety”.

TGP/6 (B): DUS Testing by or on Behalf of the Breeder: Extensive discussion revealed there was still a certain amount of confusion about methods of arranging DUS tests, and the Working Party finally proposed that it would be helpful to extend the TGP document to include an explanation of the three main testing systems: all work by officials, trials grown by the applicant but all other work done by officials, and all work done by the applicant. The Working Party decided that experts from AU, CA, DE, EU, FR, IL, JP and NZ would submit the information to the expert from Australia who, on the basis of the information collected, would prepare the document in cooperation with their TWA expert. The document should be sent to the Office of UPOV by the coordinator from Australia by the end of June 2001.

TGP/13 (A): Relative Uniformity, Comparable Varieties and Guidance for New Types: The Working Party decided that most experts did not have enough experience to contribute to a document but it would like to be involved in the preparation and development via the Chairperson.

TGP/13 (B): DUS Testing of New Species: The Working Party discussed the document and concluded that it was in agreement with the position in the document. Information from breeders was however rather limited and national authorities of the country indicated as country of origin should be asked for information as well. Information would still be limited. The Working Party suggested deleting the wording “which are in the (national or UPOV) guideline” at the very end of paragraph 6.

TGP/17: Model Technical Questionnaire: The Working Party considered that more than one model might be necessary, the following proposals made by the Working Party related to a model for Ornamentals:

Item 1: To read “Genus or Species”; if a genus is indicated it should be followed by “Indicate species” if appropriate.

Item 2: Phone number, fax number and e-mail to be added

Item 4: Example should cover other Working Parties as well: for Ornamentals it should include the standard wording (seedling, mutation, discovery) and then add under 4.2 “Method of reproduction: cuttings, in vitro, other (specify method)” all as indicated in the latest Gerbera document.

Item 5: To use Color groups as an alternative to the RHS Colour Chart, with appropriate wording.

Item 6: The Working Party continued to put forward its existing proposal for the rewording of this item.

Item 7.2: For the Working Party concerned, to be added:

“(a) Does the variety need special conditions for cultivation”

No []
Yes (specify) []

(b) Use of the variety

cut flower []
pot plant []
garden plant []
other (specify) []

Discussion on Working Papers on Test Guidelines

Test Guidelines for *Celosia*

26. The Working Party reviewed document TWO/33/3 and made the following main changes in it:

(i) Subject of these Guidelines: To have “vegetatively and seed propagated” deleted.

(ii) Material Required: To have 2 grams instead of 5 grams.

(iii) Conduct of Tests: Paragraph 3 to add after “Sowing method” the following new wording: “For germination seeds should be covered lightly with vermiculite” and after “preferably direct seeding” to read: “because of taproot”. To have for “Temperature directly after sowing” “22-24 °C” instead of “24-26 °C”. To read: “Until the flowers appear, irrigation should be given by sprinkling” instead of “Until the flowers appear, sprinkling should be given from above.” To read: “After appearance of the flowers, the soil should be kept more dry and sprinkling should not be given from above because of the chance of botrytis infection” instead of “After appearance of the flowers, the soil should be kept more dry and sprinkling should not be given from above because of the chance of a botrytis infestation.” To read: “Base fertilization: – none”, Fertilization during growth: - none”, “Substrate: - poor substrate, well drained”, Shading: - none, *Celosia* is very photosensitive”.

(iv) Methods and Observations: Paragraph 2 add before the first sentence: “As *Celosia* is a self-pollinator, the rules for the assessment of uniformity in seed propagated varieties are the same as for vegetatively propagated varieties”. Paragraph 3 the comments about the leaf should precede those about the flower.

(v) Table of Characteristics

Characteristics

- 3 To read: “Stem: anthocyanin coloration at base”
- 4 To read: “Stem: intensity of anthocyanin coloration at base” with the following states: “very weak (1), weak (3), medium (5), strong (7), very strong (9)”
- 3, 4 NL to check the revised wording was correct vis-a-vis the plants
- 5 To read: “Stem: color of basal part ” with the following states: “yellow (1), orange (2), light green (3), green (4), dark green (5), pinkish red (6), purple red (7)”
- 6 To read: “Stem: color of upper part” with states as for characteristic 5
- 9 To read: “Stem: flowering laterals”
- 16 To have the states “light green (1), medium green (2), dark green (3), greenish red (4)”
- 21 To have the state “paniculate (2)” instead of “panicle (2)”, to have the state “plumose (4)” instead of “other (4)”, to be checked by NL
- 25 To read: “Cristate group only: Inflorescence: color of prophylls on edge of top”
- 26 To read: “Cristate group only: Inflorescence: color of prophylls on distal part (excluding edge of top)”
- 27 To read: “Cristate group only: Inflorescence: degree of undulation (viewed from above)”

(vi) Explanations on the Table of Characteristics: NL to add diagram for “edge of top”.

(vii) Technical Questionnaire: Chapter 7.2 to be added:

cut flower	[]
pot plant	[]
bedding plant	[]
other (specify)	[]

27. NL would send the missing information and example varieties to the Office of UPOV by the November 1, 2000, and the final draft should be sent to professional organizations for comments.

Test Guidelines for Lavandula

28. The Working Party reviewed documents TWO/29/14, TWO/32/9 and TWO/33/9 and made the following main changes in document TWO/33/9:

(i) Subject of these Guidelines: To read: “These Test Guidelines apply to all vegetatively propagated varieties of lavender in the spica, stoechas and pterostoechas groups, but they may be applied to all vegetatively propagated varieties of *Lavandula* (L.) of the family Labiatae (Lamiaceae).” In Stoechas group to read “-*L. viridis* L’Herit.” instead of “-*L. viridis* L’Her”.

(ii) Table of Characteristics

Characteristics To have the allocation of all example varieties to their correct group (spica, stoechas) checked, and all the names realigned with the states.

- 2 To have the states “narrow bushy (1), medium bushy (2), round (3), flat bushy (4)”, to be placed before characteristic 1, diagram to be improved by FR
- 20 To have state “medium conical (2)” instead of “conical (2)”, subgroup to check the states “fusiform (5)” and “narrow trullate (6)”
- 25 France and New Zealand to check the state “red purple (4)” in English and “violet (4)” in French and expand the number of groups if necessary
- 28 To read: “Spike: presence of infertile bracts”
- 30 To have the states: “elliptic (1), oblong (2), oblanceolate (3), obovate (4)”
- 31 To be placed after characteristic 32
- 33 To have the state “violet blue (2)” instead of “purplish (2)”
- 35 To have the state “violet” placed after “purple”
- 36 To be deleted

(iii) Explanations on the Table of Characteristics: Ad. 2: Plant growth habit; Ad. 25: Spike: color of fertile bracts; Ad. 26: Spike: presence of bracteole; Ad. 33: Calyx: color; Ad. 35: Corolla: color to be improved by France, with titles to be added, France to check the possibility of settling the copyright problem.

(iv) Literature: To be checked by France, in particular the spelling of “Herbaceous” in item 1 and the authors of item 6.

(v) Technical Questionnaire: Item 1 to read “Genus” instead of “Species”, “Indicate species” to be added, item 4.2 to read “(specify)” instead of “(state method)”, item 7.2 new wording to be added: “main use

- garden plant []
- dried flowers []
- essential oil []
- other (specify) []”

(vi) Annex to be deleted.

29. The Subgroup would check the document carefully once again, especially for the order of example varieties and all aspects concerning color. France would send the final version to the Office of UPOV by June 1, 2001, and it should be sent to professional organizations for comments.

Test Guidelines for Ornamental Apple (Revision)

30. The Working Party reviewed documents TG/14/5, TWO/31/18, TWO/33/15 and made the following main changes in document TWO/33/15:

(i) Methods and Observations: Paragraph 1 “weighing” to be deleted. Paragraph 4 “an average of 10” to be deleted.

(ii) Characteristics and Symbols: Paragraph 1: to read “uniformity” instead of “homogeneity”. Chapters I to VI to be checked for standard wording.

(iii) Table of Characteristics

Characteristics

5a To have the states “purple red (6)” and “purple (7)” added. Germany to add example varieties

10 To read: “Flower: shape”, to have asterisk deleted

11 To have the following order of states: “oblong (1), narrow elliptic (2), elliptic (3), broad elliptic (4), circular (5), narrow ovate (6), ovate (7)”

12 To have the following order of states “free (1), touching (2), overlapping (3)”

18 To read: “Leaf blade: lobes”, to be placed before characteristic 22

19 To read: “Leaf blade: length”

19a To read: “Petiole: length”, to be placed after characteristic 21

20 To read: ”Leaf blade: width”

23 To have asterisk deleted

30 To read: “Fruit: shape”, to have the states “flat obloid (4)” instead of “compressed (4)” and “obloid (5)” instead of “flat globose (obloid) (5)”

40 To read: “Fruit: predominant color”

41, 42 To be deleted

(iv) Explanations on the Table of Characteristics: Ad. 30: Fruit form: GB to improve diagram for “globose (1)”.

- (v) Technical Questionnaire: Chapter 5.2: GB to add Color group in addition to the RHS Colour Chart with appropriate wording.

31. The expert from the United Kingdom would submit the missing information to the Office of UPOV, and it should be sent to professional organizations for comments.

Test Guidelines for Pentas

32. The Working Party reviewed documents TWO/29/10, TWO/33/4 and made the following main changes in document TWO/33/4:

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

(ii) Subject of these Guidelines: To have “vegetatively propagated” deleted.

(iii) Conduct of Tests: Paragraph 3 to have under seed propagated material: “Growing medium:” instead of “Soil:”, and to read for “Growing medium”: “well-drained; the seeds are covered with a very thin layer of sand, and with a thin layer of transparent PVC and cloth until germination”. For “Temperature:” to read: “germination will occur after 2-3 weeks at a temperature of 18-20 °C”. To have under vegetatively propagated material: “Growing medium:” instead of “Soil:” and to read for “Growing medium”: well-drained, fertile, with a high content of organic matter or organic substrate”. In the last non-numbered paragraph of paragraph 3 to have “as a minimum” deleted in first sentence.

(iv) Methods and Observations: Paragraph 2 after “TG/1/2” new wording to be added: “for cross-pollinated varieties”.

(v) Grouping of Varieties: Paragraph 2: number of characteristic to be added for characteristic “(b) Corolla lobe: main color on upper side”.

(vi) Table of Characteristics

Characteristics

- 1 To have the states “upright (1), semi-upright (2), spreading (3)”
- 14 To read: “Inflorescence: height”, NL to improve diagram
- 15 To read: “Inflorescence: shape of upper side”
- 17 To read: “Corolla tube: length”
- 18 To read: “Corolla tube: color”
- 19 To read: “Corolla limb: length”, diagram to be added by NL, to have the states “short (3), medium (5), long (7)”

- 20 To read: “Corolla limb: color of distal part of hairs on inner side”, to have the following order of the states: “whitish (1), pink (2), red (3), red purple (4), blue purple (5), grey purple (6)”
- 21 To have the states “short (3), medium (5), long (7)”
- 27 To read: “Corolla lobe: Varieties with more than one color on upper side: secondary color”, to have the following order of states: ”white (1), pink (2), red (3), red purple (4), blue purple (5)”
- 28 To read: “Corolla lobe: Varieties with more than one color on upper side: secondary color”
- 29 To read: “Anthers: level in relation to top of limb”
- 33 To have the following order of the states: “white (1), yellow green (2), pink (3), red (4), red purple (5), blue purple (6), greyish (7)”

(vii) Explanations on the Table of Characteristics: Diagrams from document TWO/29/10 to be scanned and inserted into document TWO/33/4.

(viii) Literature: To be checked by NL.

(ix) Technical Questionnaire: Chapter 4.2 “- seeds” to be added after “- *in vitro* propagation“. Chapter 5.1 NL to add Color group in addition to the RHS Colour Chart, with appropriate wording.

33. The expert from the Netherlands would submit the missing information as well as example varieties to the Office of UPOV by the end of November 2000, and it should be sent to professional organizations for comments.

Test Guidelines for Thyme

34. The Working Party reviewed documents TWO/31/8, TWO/32/8, TWV/33/14 and TWO/33/11 and made the following main changes to document TWO/33/11:

- (i) Front page: To read: “(*Thymus vulgaris* L.)”.
- (ii) Chapters I to VI to have standard wording copied from the latest adopted Test Guidelines.
- (iii) Conduct of Tests: Paragraph 3 to be deleted.
- (iv) Table of Characteristics

Characteristics

2 To read: “Plant: growth habit”, to have the following order of the states: “upright (1), semi-upright (2), prostrate (3)”, to be placed before characteristic 1

- 3 To read: “Plant diameter”, all example varieties to be deleted
- 11 To read: “Leaf: overall shape”, to have the state “deltoid (3)” instead of “triangular (3)”
- 15 To read: “Leaf: prominence of veins on lower side”
- 16 To have asterisk instead of diagram indication “(+)”
- 17 To have example variety “Aureus” for the state “yellow green (1)”
- 21 To be deleted
- 23 To read: “Flower: color of style at tip”, to have the following order of the states: “white (1), pink (2), light violet (3), medium violet (4)”
- 24 To read: “Flower: color of style at middle part”, to have the following order of the states: “white (1), pink (2), light violet (3), medium violet (4)”
- 22 To add the state “very long (9) with example varieties “Ygor” and “Pegase”
- 25 To be deleted
- 26 To read: “Time of beginning of flowering”
- 27 To have the first two example varieties for each state as indicated in the TQ
- (v) Technical Questionnaire: Chapter 4.2 to read: “- other (specify)”.
- (vi) Annex: to be deleted.
35. The expert from France would prepare a new draft for the thirty-fourth session of the Technical Working Party for Vegetables (TWV), Angers, France, September 11 to 15, 2000. The Working Party concerned would send the document to the professional organizations for comments depending on the decision taken by the TWV.

Test Guidelines for *Bracteantha*

36. The Working Party reviewed document TWO/33/12 and made the following main changes to it:
- (i) Material Required: Paragraph 1 to read: “25 non-budded rooted cuttings.”
- (ii) Conduct of Tests: Paragraph 3 to have word “growth” added at the very end of the first sentence.

(iii) Table of Characteristics

Characteristics

- 1 The expert from Australia to add diagram
- 4, 12, 13 To have the state “absent or very slightly hairy (1)” instead of “absent (1)”, to have the notes as (1), (2), (3)
- 7 To read: “Leaf: ratio length/width”
- 8 To read: “Leaf: position of broadest part”, to have the following order of the states bottom third (1), middle third (2), top third (3)
- 12,13 To have the state “absent or very slightly hairy (1)”, to have the order of notes as (1), (2), (3)
- 19, 20, 21, 22, 23 To read: “Flower head” instead of “Inflorescence”
- 21, 22 To have the notes as (1), (2), (3)
- 34 To be deleted

(iv) Explanations on the Table of Characteristics: Table to be checked by the expert from Australia.

(v) Technical Questionnaire: Chapter 1 to read “Genus” instead of “Species”, to add “Indicate species” in standard wording. Chapter 4.2 “- other (specify)” to be added. Chapter 7.2 “- pot plant”, “- garden plant”, “cut flower”, “dried flower” to be added.

37. The expert from Australia would prepare a new draft for the next session of the Working Party.

Test Guidelines for *Eustoma*

38. The Working Party reviewed documents TWO/31/4, TWO/33/2 and a photocopy of document TWO/33/2 with handwritten notes prepared by the expert from Japan and made the following main changes to the photocopy:

- (i) Front page: To have the word “(LISIANTHUS)” added after “EUSTOMA”.
- (ii) Chapters I to VI to have standard wording copied from the latest adopted Test Guidelines.
- (iii) Material Required: Paragraph 1 to read: “(a) seed propagated varieties: 1000 seeds”.
- (iv) Conduct of Tests: At the end of paragraph 2 to add the sentence: “The test should be carried out in the greenhouse under conditions ensuring normal growth.” This

sentence to be deleted in paragraph 3. For seed propagated varieties to read “sowing medium:” instead of “soil” and to read for sowing medium: “moisture holding, well-drained, pH 6.0 to 6.5”. To read “bench irrigation” instead of “subirrigation”.

(v) Table of Characteristics:

Characteristics

- 8 To read: “Leaf: attitude relative to stem”
- 18 To have the states: “campanulate (1), narrow funnel-shaped (2), wide funnel-shaped (3), saucer-shaped (4)”
- 22 To read: “Petal: number of colors” and to have the states “self-colored (1), bi-colored (2)”. To have a new characteristic added after characteristic 22: “Bi-colored varieties only: Petal: color pattern” and the states: “picotee (1), shaded (2), splashed (3)”
- 27 To be deleted
- 28 To have the following order of the states: “green (1), violet (2), brown (3)”
- 31 To read: “Sepal: attitude relative to petal”

(vi) Technical Questionnaire: Chapter 1 to have “(LISIANTHUS)” added. Chapter 5.4, 5.5, 5.6 to have Color group instead of RHS Colour Chart supplied by the expert from Japan. Chapter 7.2 to be added the wording: “- cut flower”, “- pot plant”, “- other (specify)”.

39. The expert from Japan would prepare a new draft for the next session of the Working Party.

Test Guidelines for *Leptospermum*

40. The Working Party reviewed document TWO/33/13 and made the following main changes to it:

- (i) Subject of the Guidelines: Wording “and their hybrids” to be deleted
- (ii) Material Required: Paragraph 1 to read: “10 rooted cuttings” instead of “10 plants”.
- (iii) Conduct of Test: Paragraph 1, at the very end of first sentence to be added: “after establishment”.
- (iv) Methods and Observations: Paragraph 1 to read: “All observations determined by measurement or counting should be made on 10 plants or parts of plants taken from 10 plants at least 2 years old.”

(v) Table of Characteristics:

Characteristics

- 1 Diagram to be added by the expert from Australia
- 4 To have the state “open (3)” instead of “sparse (3)”
- 5 To read “reddish green (4)” instead of “red green (4)”
- 7 To read: “Plant: attitude of branches”, to be placed after characteristic 2; diagram to be added by the expert from Australia
- 8 To read: “Branch: texture of bark”. To have the state “papery (2)” instead of “papyraceous (2)”
- 9 Diagram to be added by the expert from Australia, to have the notes as (1), (2), (3)
- 12 To read: “Leaf: shape”
- 13 Diagram to be added by the expert from Australia. To have the following order of states: “infolded (1), incurved (2), flat (3), recurved (4)”
- 14 To have the notes as (1), (2), (3)
- 15 To read: “Young leaf: general color”
- 17 To read: “Leaf: main color of upper side (excluding pubescence)”
- 20 To have the state “absent or very slightly hairy (1)” instead of “absent (1)”, to have the notes as (1), (2), (3)
- 21 To read: “Inflorescence: arrangement of flowers”, to have the state “in clusters (2)” instead of “clusters (2)”, to be placed after characteristic 22
- 22 To have the state “only in leaf axils (1)” instead of “in leaf axils (1)”, the to be checked by subgroup
- 23 To read: “Bud: ratio length/width”, to have the notes as (1), (2), (3)
- 26 To have the state “absent or very slightly hairy (1)” instead of “absent (1)”, the expert from Australia to check
- 29, 30, 31 To be deleted
- 32 To read: “Sepal: length in relation to length of petal”, to have the states: “less than one third (1), one third to two thirds (2), more than two thirds (3)”
- 33, 34 Expert from South Africa to check the order

- 34 To have the states “white (1), yellow green (2), medium green (3), pink (5), “red (6)”, to be placed after characteristic 32
- 35 To have the state “absent or very slightly hairy (1)” instead of “absent (1)”
- 37 To read: “Petal: ratio length/width”, to have the notes as (1), (2), (3)
- 38 To read: “Petal: number of colors visible on upper side”
- 39 To have the state “marginal (1)” instead of “edged (1)”
- 41 To read: “Petal: main color at first opening”
- 43 To read: “Petal: main color when aged”
- 45, 46 The expert from South Africa to check the order
- 49 To have the states “greenish (1), brownish (2)”
- 50 To read: “Stamen: length relative to length of petal”
- 52 To have the following order of the states: “non-woody (1), woody (2)”
- 55 To read: “Duration of flowering”, to have the following order of the states: “short (3), medium (5), long (7)”

(vi) Explanations on the Table of Characteristics: The expert from Australia to add headings for characteristics.

(vii) Literature: To have standardized view.

(viii) Technical Questionnaire: Chapter 1 to read: “*Leptospermum* J.R. Forst. and G. Forst.”. To have Genus as above, then “Species, indicate” in standard wording' Chapter 4.2 wording “- other (specify)” to be added.

41. The expert from Australia would prepare a new draft for the next session of the Working Party.

Test Guidelines for Clematis

42. The Working Party reviewed document TWO/33/5 and comments from the Subgroup meeting held in the evening. A new draft will be prepared by the expert from Canada for discussion at the next session.

Test Guidelines for Impatiens

43. The Working Party reviewed documents TWO/31/9, TWO/33/8 and comments from the Subgroup meeting which took place between technical visits. A new draft will be prepared by the expert from France for discussion at the next session.

Test Guidelines for Poinsettia (Revision)

44. The Working Party reviewed documents TG/24/5, TWO/33/6 and comments from the Subgroup meeting which took place in the evening. A new draft will be prepared by the expert from Denmark for discussion at the next session.

Test Guidelines for Tagetes

45. The Working Party reviewed document TWO/33/10 and comments from the Subgroup meeting which took place in between the technical visits. A new draft will be prepared by the expert from France for discussion at the next session.

Test Guidelines for Waxflower

46. The Working Party reviewed documents TWO/31/13, TWO/32/6, TWO/33/14 and comments from the Subgroup meeting which took place in the evening. General discussion of document TWO/33/14 took place at the session as well. A new draft will be prepared by the expert from Australia for discussion at the next session.

Status of Test Guidelines

47. The Working Party agreed that the draft Test Guidelines for *Calluna* (Revision), *Guzmania*, *Amaryllis* and *Zantedeschia* should be sent to the Technical Committee for final adoption. It also agreed that the draft Test Guidelines for *Celosia*, *Lavandula*, *Ornamental Apple* (Revision), *Pentas* should be sent to the professional organizations for comments. The draft Test Guidelines for *Thyme* would be sent to the professional organizations for comments depending on the decision taken by the Technical Working Party for Vegetables (TWV) to be held in Angers, France, September 11 to 15, 2000.

48. The Working Party decided to postpone the preparation of documents for *Cupressus* and *Eucalyptus gunii* to give the experts from France time to concentrate on the other documents they were responsible for.

Future Program, Date and Place of Next Session

49. On the basis of written information, confirmed by the expert from Japan, the Working Party agreed to hold its thirty-fourth session in Nagano, Japan, from September 24 to 28, 2001. It was planned that five full days would be devoted to the session, including the afternoon of Friday, September 28. 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) Photodata Project (report from the Netherlands)
- (c) Important decisions taken during the last sessions of the Technical Working Party and Technical Committee (TWO/33/17)
- (d) Testing of Seed Raised Ornamentals
- (e) Complementary documents to the General Introduction
- (f) Final discussions on draft Test Guidelines for:
 - *Celosia*
 - Lavandula
 - Ornamental Apple (Revision)
 - Pentas
 - Thyme (depending on the TWV decision)
- (g) Discussion on Working Papers on Test Guidelines:
 - Brachycome (Australia to prepare a Working Paper)
 - *Bracteantha* (TWO/33/12; Australia to prepare a new Working Paper)
 - Chrysanthemum (Revision) (TG/26/4, TWO/30/8; United Kingdom to prepare a new Working Paper)
 - Clematis (TWO/33/5; Canada to prepare a new Working Paper)
 - Dahlia (United Kingdom to prepare a Working Paper)
 - *Dendrobium* (TWO/32/5; Japan to prepare a new Working Paper)
 - *Eustoma* (TWO/31/4, TWO/33/2; Japan to prepare a new Working Paper)
 - Impatiens (TWO/31/9, TWO/33/8; France to prepare a new Working Paper)
 - *Leptospermum* (TWO/33/13; Australia to prepare a new Working Paper)
 - *Nerium* (TWO/31/15; France to prepare a new Working Paper)
 - New Guinea Impatiens (Revision) (TG/102/3; Germany to prepare a new Working Paper)
 - Petunia (Israel to prepare a Working Paper)

- Phalaenopsis (Netherlands and Japan to prepare a Working Paper)
- *Poinsettia* (Revision) (TG/24/5, TWO/33/6; Denmark to prepare a new Working Paper)
- Rose (cut flower only) (TG/11/7; CPVO and Netherlands to prepare a new Working Paper)
- *Salix* (Revision) (TG/72/4; Germany to prepare a new Working Paper)
- Tagetes (TWO/31/9, TWO/33/10; France to prepare a new Working Paper)
- Waxflower (TWO/31/13, TWO/32/6, TWO/33/14; Australia to prepare a new Working Paper)

50. In view of the long list of Test Guidelines to be dealt with, the Working Party agreed to nominate one leading expert for each of the Guidelines listed above and ask other interested experts to cooperate with that 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 for comments to be submitted to them. The leading experts will produce a new final draft, unless otherwise stated, by the middle of January 2001, to be submitted to the Office of UPOV for final preparation. The *Poinsettia* document should be prepared by the end of March 2001. The documents for Brachycome, Dahlia, New Guinea Impatiens, Phalanopsis, Rose, *Salix* should be prepared by the end of June 2001.

Visits

51. On June 28, 2000, the Working Party visited the Experimental Station of the Research Institute for Fruit and Ornamentals, Érd, where they were given a report on the activities at the Station by Professor, Dr. Zoltán Kováts.

52. Later the same day, the Working Party visited the Central Cultivar Evaluation Station, Tordas, where they were given a report by Mr. István Somogyi, on the DUS-Testing carried out there. Part of the Reference collection of ornamentals was shown.

53. In the afternoon the Working Party visited the Alsótekeres nursery, where Mr. Elemér Barabits, the owner of the nursery, conducted a very interesting excursion for the Working Party.

54. After the closing of the session on July 1, 2000, some experts from the Working Party, together with their colleagues from the TWF, participated in the technical visit. The Hegede Nursery, Helvetia, was visited first, where Mr. István Hegede showed ornamentals produced successfully on sandy soils by his nursery. The second visit was to the Cultivar Evaluation Station, Helvetia. Mr. Lajos Zubor, chief of the Station, gave a report on fruit varieties testing, and a special report on grape variety trials was given by Mr. György Pernesz.

55. This report has been adopted by correspondence.

[Annex I follows]

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 62724228, fax +61 2 62723650, e-mail: helen.costa@affa.gov.au)

CANADA

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

CZECH REPUBLIC

Naděžda KRPEŠOVÁ (Ms.), ÚKZÚZ - Central Institute for Supervising and Testing in Agriculture, Testing Station, Dobříchovice 252 29 (tel. (+420-2) 99 11 760, fax (+420-2) 99 11 756)

DENMARK

Lars Henrik JACOBSEN, Department of Horticulture, 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 90 20 60 40, 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)

HUNGARY

István BACH, Országos Mezőgazdasági Minősítő Intézet, National Institute for Agricultural Quality Control, H-1024 Budapest, Keleti Károly u. 24, H-1024 Budapest, P.O. Box 30.93, H-1525 Budapest 114 (tel. and fax: +36-1 212 53 67)

Eszter BATIZ (Ms.), Szent István University Department of Floriculture and Dendrology, H-1118 Budapest Villányi út 35-43 (tel.: +36 1 372 6270)

Julianna CSIKOR (Ms.), Országos Mezőgazdasági Minősítő Intézet, National Institute for Agricultural Quality Control, H-1024 Budapest, Keleti Károly u. 24, H-1024 Budapest, P.O. Box 30.93, H-1525 Budapest 114 (tel. and fax: +36-1 212 53 67)

József HARSÁNYI, Head of Department, Országos Mezőgazdasági Minősítő Intézet, National Institute for Agricultural Quality Control, Keleti Károly u. 24, H-1024 Budapest, P.O. Box 30.93, H-1525 Budapest 114 (Tel.: (0036-1) 212 31 27, fax: +36-1 212 53 67, e-mail: harsanyij@ommi.hu)

Gabriella PÓPITY (Mrs.), Országos Mezőgazdasági Minősítő Intézet, National Institute for Agricultural Quality Control, H-1024 Budapest, Keleti Károly u. 24, H-1024 Budapest, P.O. Box 30.93, H-1525 Budapest 114 (tel. and fax: +36-1 212 53 67)

Gyözöné SZENCI (Mrs.), Ministry of Agriculture and Regional Development, Kossuth tér, H-1055 Budapest, Kossuth tér 11, P.O. Box 1, H-1860 Budapest (tel.: +36 1 301 4308, fax: +36 1 301 46 68)

Ágnes TANTOS (Ms.), Szent István University Department of Molecular Plant Biology, H-1118 Budapest Villányi út 35-43 (tel.: +36 1 372 6333)

Gizella VINIS (Mrs.), Országos Mezőgazdasági Minősítő Intézet, National Institute for Agricultural Quality Control, H-1024 Budapest, Keleti Károly u. 24, H-1024 Budapest, P.O. Box 30.93, H-1525 Budapest 114 (tel. and fax: +36-1 212 53 67)

JAPAN

Kimiko ISHIKAWA (Mrs.), Examiner for Ornamental Plants, Seeds and Seedlings Division, MAFF, 1-2-1, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo, 100-8950 (tel.: +81 3 3581 0518, fax: +81 3 3502 6572, e-mail: kimiko_ishikawa@nm.maff.go.jp)

MEXICO

Luis Miguel VÁZQUEZ GARCÍA, Lope de Vega No.125-2, Chapultepec Morales, 11570 MexicoD.F.(tel. +52 52039427, fax +52 52506483, e-mail: enriqueta-molina@sagar.gob.mx)

NETHERLANDS

Joost BARENDRECHT, Plant Research International, Postbox 16, 6700 AA Wageningen (tel. +31 317 476 893, fax +31 317 418 094, e-mail: c.j.barendrecht@plant.wag-ur.nl)

POLAND

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

SOUTH AFRICA

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

UNITED KINGDOM

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

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

Mi-Hee YANG (Ms.), National Seed Management Office, 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 ORGANIZATIONS

EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Marcantonio VALVASSORI, Administrateur principal, Direction generale de la santé et de la protection des consommateurs, Commission européenne, Loi 84 1/7, 200, rue de la Loi, B-1049 Bruxelles (tel.: +32-2 295 69 71 / 296 12 26, fax: +32-2 296 10 97 / 296 93 99, e-mail: marcantonio.valvassori@cec.eu.int)

COMMUNITY PLANT VARIETY OFFICE

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)

ASSINSEL

M.J. BARTELS, Fleuroselect, Parallel Boulevard 214 d, 2202 HT Noordwijk
(tel: +31 71 364 9101, fax: +31 71 364 9102, e-mail: post@fleuroselect.com)

IV. OFFICER

Elizabeth SCOTT, Chairman

V. OFFICE OF UPOV

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

[Annex II follows]

ANNEX II

LIST OF LEADING EXPERTS

Species	Basic Document	Leading experts (for addresses see Annex I)	Interested experts (countries) (for name of experts see Annex I)
Brachycome	New	Mrs. Costa, AU	DE, GB, JP
<i>Bracteantha</i>	TWO/33/12	Mrs. Costa, AU	DE, GB, IL, NL, NZ, ZA
Chrysanthemum	TWO/30/8	Miss Scott, GB	CA, CZ, DE, EU, FR, IL, JP, PL, KE, KR, NL
Clematis	TWO/33/5	Ms. Marshall, CA	AU, DE, EU, FR, GB, JP, NL, NZ
Dahlia	New	Miss Scott, GB	CA, CZ, EU, MX, NZ, PL
<i>Dendrobium</i>	TWO/32/5	Mr. Saito, JP	KR, NL, ZA
<i>Eustoma</i>	TWO/33/2	Mrs. Ishikawa, JP	DE, IL, NL, ZA
Impatiens	TWO/33/8	Mr. Brand, FR	AU, CA, CZ, DE, ZA
<i>Leptospermum</i>	TWO/33/13	Mrs. Costa, AU	IL, NZ
<i>Nerium</i>	TWO/31/15	Ms. Gandelin, FR	DK, NL
New Guinea Impatiens	TG/102/3	Ms. Menne, DE	AU, CA, CZ, PL
Petunia	New	Mr. Bar-Tel, IL	AU, CA, DE, FR, GB, JP, NZ, PL, ZA
Phalaenopsis	New	Mr. Barendrecht NL and Mrs. Ishikawa, JP	EU
<i>Poinsettia</i>	TWO/33/6	Mr. Jacobsen, DK	AU, CA, EU, DE, MX, NL
Rose (cut flower only)	TG/11/7	Mr. Kwakkenbos EU and Mr. Barendrecht NL	FR, ZA
<i>Salix</i>	TG/72/4	Mr. Spellerberg, DE	GB
Tagetes	TWO/33/10	Mr. Brand, FR	DE, MX, NL, PL
Waxflower	TWO/33/14	Mrs. Costa, AU	IL, ZA

[End of Annex II and of document]