



TWO/41/9

ORIGINAL: English

DATE: May 15, 2008

INTERNATIONAL UNION FOR THE PROTECTION OF NEW VARIETIES OF PLANTS
GENEVA

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

Forty-First Session
Wageningen, Netherlands, June 9 to 13, 2008

**MATTERS TO BE RESOLVED CONCERNING TEST GUIDELINES
ADOPTED BY THE TECHNICAL COMMITTEE AT ITS FORTY-FOURTH SESSION**

Document prepared by the Office of the Union

1. Document TGP/7/1 “Development of Test Guidelines”, Section 2.2.8.3, explains that “Where the Technical Committee adopts the Test Guidelines subject to further information being provided by the leading expert with the agreement of all interested experts and the Chairman of the [Technical Working Party (TWP)] concerned (see 2.2.7.3(b)), the necessary information, agreed with all interested experts, should be provided to the Office of the Union within three months of the Technical Committee meeting, or before the subsequent session of the TWP concerned, whichever is the sooner. In those cases where the necessary information is not provided within this time, the Test Guidelines concerned will not be adopted and will be re-presented at the TWP concerned (Step 4).”.
2. In the case of the following Test Guidelines, which were adopted by the Technical Committee (TC) at its forty-fourth session, held in Geneva from April 7 to 9, 2008, certain information needs to be agreed by all interested experts. In accordance with the timing set out in document TGP/7/1 (see above), those matters are presented for consideration by the Technical Working Party for Ornamental Plants and Forest Trees (TWO) at its forty-first session, to be held in Wageningen, Netherlands, from June 9 to 13, 2008.

Test Guidelines for Poinsettia

3. The Technical Committee agreed the Test Guidelines for Poinsettia on the basis of document TC/24/6(proj.3) (http://www.upov.int/export/sites/upov/restrict/en/tc/44/tg_24_6_proj_3.pdf), subject to any changes to the example varieties being agreed by the TWO, either by correspondence or at its forty-first session (see document TC/44/12 “Report on the Conclusions”. The Leading Expert (Denmark) has made the following proposals concerning example varieties and certain other changes in response to the Technical Committee:

5.3 (c) (d) (e)	to check whether in all color groupings (also in TQ) pink should come before red <i>Leading Expert: agreed</i>
Example varieties	(a) to check whether “Fisson Piz” is widely available and, if necessary, to be replaced <i>Leading Expert:</i> <i>to replace “Fisson Piz” with :</i> <i>“Fisdra” (Char. 18, state medium (2))</i> <i>“Duemerlot” (Char. 19, state deep (7))</i> <i>“Lazzporega” (Char. 27, state strong (3))</i> (b) to check whether “Fismars White” was finally registered as “Fismars Crème” <i>Leading Expert</i> <i>to amend “Fismars White” to “Fismars Crème”</i>
Char. 6	to specify “anthocyanin” coloration, or to provide explanation on how this characteristic differs from Char. 5 <i>Leading Expert:</i> <i>to amend to read “Stem: intensity of anthocyanin coloration of middle third”</i>
Char. 18	to change state 1 to “none or few” or state 2 to “intermediate” <i>Leading Expert:</i> <i>to change state 1 to “none or few”</i>
Chars. 20	to check whether to add note (a) and/or review the wording of note (a) to read “... which should...” <i>Leading Expert: to add note (a)</i>
Chars. 25-28	to provide an explanation of transitional leaves <i>Leading Expert:</i> <i>to add note (c) to read “Transitional leaves are leaves with partly bract-colored or fully bract-colored leaf blades”</i>
Char. 25, 26	to check whether to read “Plant: number of partly bract-colored transitional leaf blades” <i>Leading Expert: no change</i>
Char. 27	to check whether to delete note (a), or add note (a) to Chars. 25 and 26 <i>Leading Expert: note (a) to be deleted</i>
Char. 32	example variety “Dueavant” to be indicated for only one state and new example variety to be provided for state 4 or 5, as appropriate <i>Leading Expert:</i> <i>“Dueavant” to be indicated as example variety for oblanceolate (4). (No example variety provided for obovate (5)).</i>
Char. 32, Ad. 32	example variety and illustration / photograph to be provided for state 3 “lanceolate”

	<p><u>Leading Expert:</u> <i>I have not received any example variety or photograph for the state 'lanceolate'. My suggestion is to delete state 3.</i></p>
Char. 35	<p>to check the example varieties (i.e. to check whether Marblestar has no marbling) <u>Leading Expert:</u> <i>"Marblestar" is the example variety for "present" and "Monet" for "absent"</i></p>
Char. 46	<p>- to check whether to read "Bract: folding" - to check if QL, or if should be changed to QN with three states <u>Leading Expert:</u> <i>no change</i></p>
Chars. 49, 50-52	<p>to check whether the terms "Cyme" and "Cyathium" are correct <u>Leading Expert:</u> <i>"Cyathium" and "Cyme" are correct according to the "Dictionary of Gardening"</i></p>
Ad. 25, 26, 29	<p>to check whether to delete Ad. 29 and photographs for state 1, 2, 3 <u>Leading Expert:</u> <i>The photographs for state 1, 2 and 3 should not be deleted. However, the explanations to the photos are wrong. The draft presented in China last year has the right explanations. First of all the three photos do not represent states, so 1, 2 and 3 should be deleted. The explanation for the left photo should be: 'partly bract-colored leaf blade'. The explanation for number 2 photo should be: 'fully bract-colored leaf blade'. The explanation for the right photo should be: 'bract'. So it is the same explanations as on the photo of the plant below. The three photos are a supplement to the photo of the whole plant. With the new explanations I think it make sense. I think the photos are important because they explain what is meant by 'partly bract-colored leaf blade' , 'fully bract-colored leaf blade' and 'bract'. In the poinsettia business 'fully bract-colored leaf blade' are called 'bracts' but they are not bracts in botanical terms.</i></p>
Ad. 32	<p>photograph for state 3 to be provided <u>Leading Expert:</u> <i>(see Char. 32)</i></p>
Ad. 35	<p>to check if present and absent are indicated correctly <u>Leading Expert:</u> <i>photographs to be reversed</i></p>
Ad. 46	<p>to replace photograph for state 9 with a leaf which is not curved along the vein, or with an illustration <u>Leading Expert:</u> <i>to replace with following (left = absent; right = present)</i></p> <div data-bbox="631 1512 1195 1890" data-label="Image"> </div>

Ad. 49

to add line to indicate width
provided by Leading Expert:



[End of document]