Technical	Working	Party for	Vocatables
recillicat	WUIKIIIG	Faily IUI	vegelables

TWV/51/5

Fifty-First Session

Roelofarendsveen, Netherlands, July 3 to 7, 2017

Original: English Date: June 29, 2017

ASSESSING UNIFORMITY BY OFF-TYPES ON THE BASIS OF MORE THAN ONE GROWING CYCLE OR ON THE BASIS OF SUB-SAMPLES

Document prepared by the Office of the Union

Disclaimer: this document does not represent UPOV policies or guidance

The Annex to this document contains a copy of a presentation "Assessing Uniformity by Off-types on the Basis of More than One Growing Cycle: examples from NL" to be made by an expert from the Netherlands at the fifty-first session of the Technical Working Party for Vegetables.

[Annex follows]

TWV/51/5

ANNEX





TWV/51/5 Annex, page 2

~	Overview approaches
	Summary of the three approaches:Approach 1: Third growing cycle in case of inconsistent results
	 Approach 2: Combining the results of two growing cycles in the case of inconsistent results
	 Approach 3: Combining the results of two growing cycles
	 A variety may be rejected after a single growing cycle if the number of off- types exceeds the number of allowed offtypes for the combined sample (over two cycles)
3	 Approach 3: Combining the results of two growing cycles A variety may be rejected after a single growing cycle if the number of o types exceeds the number of allowed offtypes for the combined sample (over two cycles)

7	Case 1: Tomato Variety A						
	Crop: Tomato Variety A Population standard 1%, Acceptance Prob. ≥ 95% Sample size per growing cycle = 20 Maximum number of off-types per growing cycle = 1 Maximum number of off-types growing cycle 1 and 2 combined (n=40) = 2						
	Number of off-types per growing cycle			Decision			
	First	Second	Third	Approach 1	Approach 2	Approach 3	
	3	0	0	third cycle: => uniform	non-uniform	non-uniform*	
4	*With the current wording of document TWP/1/17 (particularly approach 3) the variety could/would have been rejected after 1st growing cycle!						

TWV/51/5 Annex, page 3

7	Case 2: Tomato Variety B						
	Crop: Tomato Variety B Population standard 1%, Acceptance Prob. ≥ 95% Sample size per growing cycle = 20 Maximum number of off-types per growing cycle = 1 Maximum number of off-types growing cycle 1 and 2 combined (n=40) = 2						
	Number of off-types per growing cycle			Decision			
	First	Second	Third	Approach 1	Approach 2	Approach 3	
	3	1	4	third cycle: => non-uniform	non-uniform	non-uniform	

7	Comparing Variety A and Variety B
	 Both in Variety A and in Variety B the number of off-types in the first growing cycle was 3 (non-uniform) In Variety A, approach 1 eventually lead to decision 'uniform' after 3 growing cycles, and in Variety B the final decision after 3 growing cycles was non-uniform In Variety A, the current wording of the document (TWP/1/17) could/would have resulted in a rejection after the first growing cycle. In retrospect a 'wrong' decision? Early decisions, based on small deviations from the allowable number of off-types, can be premature and are risky

TWV/51/5 Annex, page 4

~	Example from UPOV document TWP/1/17						
	Population standard 1%, Acceptance Prob. ≥ 95% Sample size per growing cycle = 50 Maximum number of offtypes per growing cycle = 2 Maximum number of offtypes growing cycle 1 and 2 combined (n=100) = 3						
	Number of offtypes per growing cycle			Decision			
	First	Second	Third	Approach 1	Approach 2	Approach 3	
	2	2	-	uniform	uniform	non-uniform	
	This example illustrates the nitfall of approach 3. It considers the variety						
	non-uniform, while it is considered uniform in both separate cycles!						
7					-	-	

7	Conclusions
	 The number of allowed off-types in a sample is sometimes small. This increases the risk of a 'wrong' decision: one off-type more or less could lead to a different decision In approach 3, the allowed number of off-types of the combined cycles can be smaller than the sum of allowed off-types of both cycles (see example previous slide). This may lead to a 'questionable' decision Decisions on non-uniformity should only be made when cases are <u>clear</u>. In case of doubt: the benefit should be for the applicant. Naktuinbouw has decided to use approach 1, as with this approach the chance of a 'wrong' decision seems smallest
8	