



TWO/39/3 Add.

ORIGINAL: English

DATE: August 28, 2006

INTERNATIONAL UNION FOR THE PROTECTION OF NEW VARIETIES OF PLANTS
GENEVA

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

Thirty-Ninth Session

Fortaleza, Ceará State, Brazil, August 28 to September 1, 2006

ADDENDUM TO TGP DOCUMENTS

Document prepared by the Office of the Union

The comments made on the TGP documents by the Technical Working Party for Fruits Crops (TWF), at its thirty-seventh session, held in Salvador, Bahia, Brazil, from August 21 to 25, 2006, are reported in the Annex to this document.

[Annex follows]

ANNEX

COMMENTS ON TGP DOCUMENTS MADE BY THE
TECHNICAL WORKING PARTY FOR FRUITS CROPS (TWF)
AT ITS THIRTY-SEVENTH SESSION

(a) TGP documents which the Technical Committee has given highest priority

TGP/4 Constitution and Management of Variety Collections

1. The TWF discussed document TGP/4/1 Draft 7 and agreed to propose the following:

2.1.1.2	With respect to the comments made by the TWA to clarify that variety collections include candidate varieties, the TWF considered that before taking decisions on including candidate varieties in a reference collection it was necessary to complete the examination of them to obtain the necessary background information to use the candidate variety as a comparator.
Title Section 3	The TWF considered that the term “Management” is more appropriate for the title of Section 3 because it reflects more accurately the content of the section, giving the idea that the variety collection evolves in time.

TGP/9 Examining Distinctness

2. The TWF discussed document TGP/9/1 Draft 7 and agreed to propose the following:

2.3 Title	The TWF proposed to reword the title as follows: “2.3 Grouping of varieties on the basis of grouping characteristics”. The TWF noted that there may be different criteria for the grouping of varieties (e.g. by breeder, year of breeding, etc.), therefore the TWF considered it important to clarify that, for the DUS examination, the grouping characteristics should be the basis for grouping.
2.3.3.2	In respect to the proposal for a revised text of this paragraph, the TWF agreed to maintain the text in conformity with the General Introduction, i.e. “as a general rule, qualitative characteristics are not influenced by the environment”. The TWF agreed with the comment made by the TWA.
2.3.4 Title	The expression “combining grouping characteristics” to be changed to make clear that it refers to the use of more than one grouping characteristic and not to the creation of a combined characteristic. To check throughout the document for the use of the terms “combining characteristics” or “combination of characteristics” and to reword them where necessary.
2.4.2	Section 2 deals with the selection of varieties for the growing trial and the last two sentences of paragraph 2.4.2 (i.e. the highlighted text) deals with the rejection of the application. The highlighted text should be deleted or reworded to put it in the context of Section 2.

3.2	To explain that, in perennial plants, the possibility of grouping is limited once the collection has been established.
5.2.1.1 (b)	The highlighted text could be interpreted in different ways, e.g. the value of the difference between several characteristics in a characteristic-by-characteristic approach; the use of combined characteristics like length/width ratio or the use of multivariate analysis. The TWF agreed with the reworded text proposed by the TWA (i.e. “Assessment by Notes / single variety records (“Notes”): the assessment of distinctness is based on the recorded state of expression of the characteristics of the variety”)
5.2.3.14	The TWF agreed with the rewording of the text proposed by the TWA (i.e. “However, in general, varieties with the same Note in the UPOV Test Guidelines would not normally be considered to be clearly distinguishable.”).
6.5 Title	To delete “panel of” because in some cases it was one expert who provided advice and not a panel of experts”.

TGP/10 Examining Uniformity

3. The TWF discussed document TGP/10/1 Draft 4 and agreed to propose the following:

2.3.1 (a)	To add apricot and avocado as examples of vegetatively propagated species.
4.2.3 and 4.2.4 and 4.2.5	The section should be restructured into only two sections, on the basis of plants which should not be considered off-types (section 4.2.3) and plants which should be considered as off-types (sections 4.2.4 and 4.2.5). Furthermore, the TWF considered that it is not possible to clearly separate between whole plant off-types (section 4.2.4) and plant-part off-types (section 4.2.5); off-types are considered on a characteristic-by-characteristic basis, in the same way as distinctness is assessed, as presented in section 4.2.2. The TWF considered that paragraph 4.2.4.2 should be deleted and that paragraph 4.2.4.3 should be moved to the section which should not be considered off-types (the present section 4.2.3). With respect to the two versions presented in paragraph 4.2.5.1, the TWF did not agree with version 1.
4.2.6.3	To be divided into two paragraphs, one dealing with growing of a further generation and another with the examination of new plant material.
4.3	There is no need to develop this section.
Adoption of TGP/10	The TWF considered that TGP/10 should be discussed by the Technical Working Parties again in 2007.

(b) Other TGP documents:

TGP/8 Trial Design and Techniques Used in the Examination of Distinctness, Uniformity and Stability

4. The TWF discussed document TGP/8/1 Draft 4 and requested that the drafters of TGP/8 take into account the comments the TWF had made, in particular with respect to PART II, Section 1: Methods for assessing uniformity on the basis of off-types.

TGP/12 Special Characteristics: Section 1: Development of Characteristics based on a Response to an External Factor

5. The TWF discussed document TGP/12 Section 1 Draft 3. In reply to the request of the expert from Israel to develop a section on chemical compounds and other special characteristics, the TWF recalled that this was the subject of Section 2 of TGP/12, which was under development by experts of the TWA.

TGP/13 Guidance for New Types and Species

6. The TWF discussed document TGP/13/1 Draft 6 and agreed to propose the following:

2.7	Even in the case of descriptions of a candidate variety of a new species, it was necessary to follow the UPOV format (i.e. a tabulated list of characteristics) as far as possible
-----	--

TGP/14 Section 2: Glossary of Technical, Botanical and Statistical Terms Used in UPOV Documents: Botanical Terms:

- Plant shapes (including hair types)

7. The TWF discussed document TGP/14.2.1(&.2) Draft 5 and agreed to propose the following:

	SECTION II: SHAPES
General	To have the drawings made in black color instead of green.
	The TWF considered the approach to shapes presented in the document to be useful, in particular for harmonization purposes. Furthermore, it did not consider it necessary to run a test in the TWF as the one agreed by the TWV.
1	To harmonize the use of the terms “widest point” and “broadest part” throughout the document
1.2 (a)	The TWF was more in favor of the use of “ratio length/width” as it was the normal practice, however, that should not be a fixed rule, to allow the use of ratio width/length in the particular situations where it was necessary. Furthermore, the TWF noted that the change in the ratio should not imply a change in the order of the drawings of the table on page 7; the order of the values of the scale at the top of the table should be changed instead.

1.3	Page 9, “Chart for Other Plane Shapes”: “oblique” is not a shape and should be moved to Section 3.3. “Clavate” is a three-dimensional shape (see Section 3.4)
2.3	To include in the table of page 18 the drawing of shape of the base; calcarate (4) from the draft Test Guidelines for Fig (TG/FIG(proj.1)) as another example of strongly reflexed angle of base. To have “weakly reflexed” and “strongly reflexed” instead of “weakly reflex” and “strongly reflex”
2.5	To clarify that the section deals with the shapes explained in the previous sections, i.e. full plane (Section 2.2); base shapes (Section 2.3) and apex shapes (Section 2.4)
	To clarify that the chart presented on page 22 is for illustration purposes and is not intended to show the way characteristics would be presented in a Test Guidelines document
2.6	In profile is one option of many other options to observe a shape in a two-dimensional way (e.g. from the top; from the base, etc.). It should be replaced by “in cross section”, which is more general.
	The drawing of the example for “strongly assymmetric
3.4	To improve the drawing of “cylindrical” which is confusing with cylindrical and to improve the drawing of “capitate”
	The term “spheric” to be replaced by “globose”
	To consider the possibility to add drawings of other angular shapes, e.g. pyramidal (Germany will provide)
	SECTION IV: DEFINITIONS
	Where more than one term exists for the same shape, to include all terms and to provide the definition in the one considered the most widely used. The definition of the alternative terms to make a cross-reference to the definition of most widely used (e.g. deltoid is broad conical, globose is spheric).

[End of Annex and of document]