



TWO/36/2

ORIGINAL: English

DATE: July 23, 2003

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

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

**Thirty-Sixth Session  
Niagara Falls, Canada, September 22 to 26, 2003**

PUBLICATION OF VARIETY DESCRIPTIONS

*Document prepared by the Office of the Union*

1. At its thirty-ninth session held in Geneva from April 7 to 9, 2003, the Technical Committee (TC) considered the proposals from the Technical Working Parties (TWPs) concerning the model study on the publication of variety descriptions. The purpose of this document is to explain the outcome of the discussions in the TC and to explain the program for the model study, which has been developed by the Office of the Union (Office) in conjunction with the coordinators for the species/crops included in the model study, the Chairman of the TC and the chairpersons of the TWPs. It also presents the recommendations and guidance of the Technical Working Party on Automation and Computer Programs (TWC), which were developed in conjunction with Mr. Gerhard Deneken (Denmark).
2. The discussions in the TC were based on document TC/39/9 and an oral report on the views of the *Ad hoc* Working Group on the Publication of Variety Descriptions (WG-PVD), which met on April 8, 2003. Document TC/39/9 and document CAJ/45/4-TC/38/10, which contains the original project proposal as an Annex, can be found on the UPOV Website.
3. The TC considered the proposal made by the TWC at its twentieth session, held in Mexico City, from June 17 to 20, 2002, that an expert from the TWC should attend the WG-PVD (see document TWC/20/7, paragraph 20). In response to this proposal, the TC agreed that the Chairman of the TWC should be invited to participate in the WG-PVD.

4. On the basis of the proposals from the TWPs, and the proposal made by the WG-PVD for a study on rose, the TC agreed that the model study for the project on the publication of variety descriptions should be based on the species identified below, with the coordinators and interested parties as shown:

<u>Species / Crop</u>	<u>Proposing TWP</u>	<u>Coordinator</u>	<u>Interested Parties</u> <sup>1</sup>
Apple	TWF	GB	AR, BE, CA, CZ, DE, FR, GB, HU, LV, NL, NZ, CPVO
Barley	TWA	DK	AT, AR, CA, CL, CZ, DE, DK, EE, ES, FI, FR, GB, HR, HU, NL, NZ, RO, RU, SE, ZA
Chinese Cabbage	TWV	JP	CN, DE, NL, JP, KR, PL, CPVO, ISF
Lettuce	TWV	NL	CZ, DE, FR, HU, NL, PL, ES, CPVO, ISF
Petunia	TWO	DE	AU, CA, DE, JP, NZ, KR, CPVO
Potato	TWA	NL / CPVO	AT, CA, CL, CZ, DE, EE, GB, IL, NL, NZ, ZA, CPVO
(Rose) <sup>2</sup>	(TWO)	(NL)	(CA, KE, NL, CPVO)
Strawberry	TWF	IL	AR, CA, DE, ES, FR, HU, IL, KE, NZ, CPVO

<sup>1</sup> The Office requested that any other interested parties should notify the Office of the Union by the end of April 2003 if they wished to be included in the study for any of the species. Such additional notifications have been included in this table.

<sup>2</sup> With regard to a possible study on rose, it was agreed that consideration should be given to including only one type of rose in any study and that the matter should be discussed further by the TWO.

5. On the basis of the lists of soybean varieties in different countries, and lack of varieties in common between different countries, the TC concluded that it would not be appropriate to conduct a model study involving this species.

6. The TC agreed the following basis on which a program of work should be developed:

(a) As a first step in the model study, the TC agreed that the coordinators, in conjunction with the Office, should obtain lists of varieties and identify those varieties which appeared in the lists of more than one country. The coordinator should then seek descriptions on a manageable number of varieties for comparison. The descriptions should be according to the characteristics in the latest version of the UPOV Test Guidelines and the location at which the descriptions were produced should be clearly identified.

(b) It was recommended that the TWC should be invited to review the work conducted previously by the expert from Denmark, as reported in document TWA/29/19 (available on UPOV Website under TWA/29), and give its advice on the management of the data. Furthermore, it was agreed that the delegate from Denmark, in conjunction with the Office, should develop some initial guidance for the coordinators to help in their planning and conduct of the study.

7. In accordance with the basis set out by the TC, the following program and initial guidance has been developed:

Step 1: Obtaining the lists of varieties (prior to each TWP meeting in 2003)

The Office, on behalf of the Coordinator, to request lists of varieties from the interested parties to be sent to the Coordinator, with copies to the Office. This request would be based on a standard format, with a deadline to be agreed with the Coordinator. After the deadline for replies, the Coordinator would identify those varieties which appeared in the lists of more than one country.

Step 2: Initial Guidance for conducting the study (prior to each TWP meeting in 2003)

The TWC, in conjunction with Mr. Gerhard Deneken, recommended that:

- (a) where practically possible, the study should be conducted on all characteristics included in the UPOV Test Guidelines;
- (b) contributors of variety descriptions should be requested to provide their “official” descriptions of the varieties concerned, i.e. the description resulting from the DUS examination of the variety. In making this recommendation, it noted that the description may have been re-calibrated in the meantime, but considered that if such changes could not be accommodated in the comparison of variety descriptions the aims of the project could not be met;
- (c) in the case of authorities wishing to contribute variety descriptions for which they did not have “official” descriptions, e.g. for varieties which had been acquired for their reference collections, the description to be provided should be that produced at the end of the first complete cycle of testing in which the variety was included;
- (d) contributors should be requested to specify the reference of the UPOV Test Guidelines on which the description had been developed; and
- (e) contributors should be requested to provide the variety denomination, breeder’s reference, breeder and applicant for each variety to verify, as far as possible, whether varieties were the same or different.

With regard to advice on the management of data, the TWC agreed that the Chairman of the TWC should, after consultation with the members of the TWC, develop guidance on how to present the variation in the states of expression between different descriptions of the same variety.

Step 3: Planning the study (prior to each TWP meeting in 2003)

On the basis of the lists of varieties received from step 1 and initial guidance provided in step 2, the Coordinator to establish the study plan for consideration at the relevant TWP meeting in 2003. The study plan, at this stage, would recommend the list of varieties, characteristics to be described, status of the description to be used and type of report to be produced.

Step 4: Presenting the study plan to the TWP meeting in 2003

The TWP to comment on the study plan developed by the Coordinator. Further interested parties may be identified at this stage.

Step 5: Starting the study

On the basis of the study plan, and subject to comments from the relevant TWP, the Office, on behalf of the Coordinator, to issue a request to all interested parties for variety descriptions in the agreed format. The information to be sent to the Coordinator, with a copy to the Office.

Step 6: Analyzing the results of the study

The Coordinator, with the assistance of Mr. Gerhard Deneken (Denmark) and the Office, if required, to analyze and prepare a report on the study on the basis of the guidance as set out in steps 2, 3 and 4.

Step 7: Presenting the results of the study

The Coordinator would be invited to present the results of the study to the relevant TWP in 2004 and, thereafter, to the *Ad hoc* Working Group on the Publication of Variety Descriptions and TC in 2005.

8. With regard to the model study on Petunia, Annex I to this document presents some data on variety descriptions which has already been obtained by the Coordinator and, in addition, Annex II includes pictures of the varieties concerned.

9. *The TWO is invited to consider:*

*(a) the program of work and guidance provided in this document;*

*(b) the information in Annexes I and II of this document and the study plan to be proposed by the Coordinator for the model study on Petunia;*

*(c) the proposal by the TC for a model study on Rose.*

[Annex I follows]

## TWO/36/2

## ANNEX II

## Data on Variety Descriptions

PETUNIA

Number of characteristics according to TG/PETUNI(proj.2)

Variety	Country	Year of testing	Char. 9 Leaf: variegation	Char. 18 Flower: type	Char. 19 Flower: diameter	Char. 22 Corolla lobe: number of colors of upper side	Char. 23 Corolla lobe: main color of upper side	Char. 27 Corolla lobe: conspicuousness of veins on upper side	Char. 30 Corolla tube: main color of inner side
Shihi Brilliant (Revolution Brilliant Pink)	DE	1994	1	1	6	1	RHS 74A (1986)	6	RHS 79C (1986)
	CA	2000	1	1	7	1	RHS 74A-B (1986)	7	RHS 79D (1986)
	NZ	VCK	1	1	7	1	RHS N74A (2001)	6	RHS N186A (2001)
Kesupite (Revolution White; Surfinia White)	DE	1995	1	1	4	1	RHS 155C (1986)	3	RHS 150C (1986)
	CA	2000	1	1	6	1	RHS 155D (1986)	3	RHS 155D (1986)
	NZ	1993/94	1	1	4	1	RHS 155C (1986)	2	RHS 155D (1986)
Sunsolos (Revolution Blue Vein; Surfinia Blue Vein)	DE	1994	1	1	2	1	RHS 69D (1986)	7	RHS 79D (1986)
	CA	2000	1	1	4	1	RHS 84B fading to 69D (1986)	7	RHS 88C-D (1986)
	NZ	1993/94	1	1	3	1	RHS 87D (1986)	7	RHS 83A (1986)

TWO/36/2  
page 2

Variety	Country	Year of testing	Char. 9 Leaf: variegation	Char. 18 Flower: type	Char. 19 Flower: diameter	Char. 22 Corolla lobe: number of colors of upper side	Char. 23 Corolla lobe: main color of upper side	Char. 27 Corolla lobe: conspicuousness of veins on upper side	Char. 30 Corolla tube: main color of inner side
Marrose (Surfinia Hot Pink)	DE	1994	1	1	6	1	RHS 66B (1986)	9	RHS 75A (1986)
	CA	2000	1	1	6	1	RHS 68A (1986)	9	RHS 78 C (1986)
Kerpril (Priscilla)	DE	1998	1	2	5	1	RHS 86A (1995)	8	RHS 87A (1995)
	CA	1999	1	2	5	1	RHS 87A fading to 85A (1986)	7	RHS 86A (1986)
	NZ	1998/99	1	2	5	1	RHS 80A (1995)	7	RHS 79A (1995)
Silk Road	DE	1998	1	2	2	1	RHS 155B (1995)	1	RHS 155A (1995)
	CA	2003							
	NZ	1998/99	1	2	4	1	RHS 155B (1995)	3	RHS 155B (1995)
Limelight	DE	1998	9	1	3	1	RHS 74A (1995)	3	RHS 79A (1995)
	CA	2000	9	1	3	1	RHS 74A (1986)	3	RHS 84A (1986)
Brevt (Evita)	DE	1998	1	1	3	2	RHS 83A (1995)	5	RHS 84A (1995)
	NZ	2000/01	1	1	5	2	RHS 83A (1995)	4	RHS 79A (1995)

[Annex II follows]



Shihi Brilliant (Revolution Brilliant Pink)



Kesupite (Revolution White)



Sunsolos (Revolution Blue Vein)



Marrose (Surfinia Hot Pink)



Kerpril (Priscilla)



Silk Road



Limelight



Brevt (Evita)