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Matters to be resolved concerning Test Guidelines adopted by the Technical Committee: Brown Mustard (*Brassica juncea* (L.) Czern.)

Document prepared by an expert from Japan

Disclaimer: this document does not represent UPOV policies or guidance

The Enlarged Editorial Committee (TC-EDC), at its meeting held in Geneva, from March 26  to 27, 2018, considered document [TG/BRASS\_JUN(PROJ.6)](http://upov.int/meetings/en/doc_details.jsp?meeting_id=46070&doc_id=399758) and agreed that the technical issues raised on the draft Test Guidelines for Brown Mustard should be addressed by the TWV (see document TC‑ECD/MAR18/11 “Report”, paragraph 56).

The following table presents all the comments made by the TC-EDC on the draft Test Guidelines for Brown Mustard (document TG/BRASS\_JUN(PROJ.6)), including the technical issues, with the proposed responses by the Leading Expert, Mr. Takayuki Nishikawa (Japan).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 2.3 | - to read “drilled plots” (see 3.4.2)  - to clarify whether the two different seed samples are alternatives (add “or”?)  *Leading Expert: Yes, please add “or” between the rows.* |
| 3.4.2 | to indicate 200 plants (as in proj.5, to be corrected) |
| 5.3 | - Definition of types is confusing and should not be used. The drawings clearly show 3 leaf types: entire (unlobed?) / lobed / divided (pinnate?). “Leaf: type” should be added to the table of characteristic. Drawings can be used in 8.2.  *Leading Expert: We had added the definition of types as a result of discussion on TG/BRASS\_JUN(proj.2) at the TWV/47 meeting because there is clear distinctness between these types and the definition of types is useful for the TQ.*  *But I would like to esteem the comment of TC-EDC, because the approach, to add “Leaf: type”, is same as TG/BRASS\_JUN(proj.2) and it is simple approach.*  *Please delete the table in 5.3 and move the figures to 8.2 for “Leaf: type” and combine the figure of Type 3 and Type 4 as below fig1 in this document.*  *Please add “Leaf: type” after Char. 4 as follows:*   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **5.** | **(\*)** | **PQ** | **VG** | **(+)** | **(a)** | **19** | | | | |  |  | **Leaf: type** | | **Feuille : type** | | **Blatt: Lappung** | **Hoja: tipo** |  |  | |  |  | entire | | entière | | ungelappt | entera | Hagarashina, Kigarashina,  Terrafit | 1 | |  |  | lobed | | lobée | | gelappt | lobulada | Akariasu,  Flaming Frills, Riasu Karashina,  Scarlet Frills | 2 | |  |  | divided | | découpés | | eingeschnitten | dividido | Akaoba Takana,  Sagami Green,  Kekkyu Takana,  Miike Takana,  Shinkoku Seisai | 3 |   Ad. 5: “Leaf: type”   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | |  | 葉タイプ１ | 葉タイプ２の2 | | 1 | 2 | 3 | | entire | lobed | divided |   - “Leaf: type” and “Leaf blade: width of midrib” should be added for grouping.  *Leading Expert: agreed*  - Definition of type 1 to 4 is redundant as it results from leaf type and head formation, if necessary in combination with midrib width.  *Leading Expert: agreed the avoid to use the definition of types*  The TQ 5. should be amended accordingly. TQ 7.3 (b) should be deleted.  *Leading Expert: agreed to add “Leaf: type” and “Leaf blade: width of midrib” to TQ 5* |
| Char. 6 | to delete (a) because leaf attitude is observed on more than one single leaf (see Ad. 6). |
| Char. 11 | - see proposal under 5.3.  - to read “Only varieties with Leaf: type lobed or divided: ….”  *Leading Expert: agreed* |
| Char. 12 | to add example varieties for state 1 (type entire)  *Leading Expert: Please add “Akaoba Takana” and ”Sagami Green” for state 1.* |
| Char. 17 | - see proposal under 5.3.  - to read “Only varieties with Leaf: type entire or lobed: ….”  *Leading Expert: agreed* |
| Char. 18 | - see proposal under 5.3.  - to read “Only varieties with Leaf: type entire or lobed: ….”  *Leading Expert: agreed* |
| Char. 19 | - see proposal under 5.3.  - to read “Only varieties with Leaf: type entire: ….”  *Leading Expert: agreed* |
| Char. 28 to 32 | - to delete “Only varieties with head formation: absent:” and move it to a new explanation 8.1 (b)  - to check growth stage (stage 65-79 is too early, to check if 75-89 is appropriate)  *Leading Expert: to be confirmed with Interested Experts* |
| Char. 28 | to check whether “Plant: length” should be replaced by "Plant: height" (explanation of this characteristic indicates to observe the total plant height in Ad. 28)  *Leading Expert: to read "Plant: height"* |
| Char. 33 | to move “in the year of sowing under long day conditions” to the explanation  *Leading Expert: agreed* |
| 8.1 (a) | to read “Observations should be made on the largest fully developed leaf.”  *Leading Expert: agreed* |
| Ad. 3 | to replace “measurement” by “observation”  *Leading Expert: agreed* |
| Ad. 5 | to delete reference to ratio from the grid (in legend)  *Leading Expert: agreed* |
| Ad. 11 | See proposal under 5.3.  “… In case of divided leaves ~~Type 2 leaf~~, the shape of the terminal lobe …”  To replace Type 1 by lobed and type 2 by divided.  *Leading Expert: agreed*  - to review wording for sentence: Type 2 leaf, the shape of terminal lobes is similar to shape of near other lobes)  *Leading Expert: I propose to delete this sentence, if we can agree that it is enough to explain the terminal lobe by the first sentence.*  - to read the following sentence “the lateral lobes are the lobes excluding the terminal lobe (No 2,3,4…. in following figures)  *Leading Expert: agreed* |
| Ad. 16 | to check whether to be deleted (Drawing not useful. Reference to type 2 redundant (see proposal under 5.3)).  *Leading Expert: I would like to replace the illustration by the photos below. It is difficult to observe Char.16 on Type 2 ”divided”. Please add “Only varieties with Leaf: entire or lobed” to the top of the characteristic name.*   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | |  | | | | 2 | 3 | 4 | | weak | medium | strong | |
| Ad. 17 | see proposal under 5.3.  to read “Observations should be made on the distal part of the leaves~~, excluding type 2.~~”  *Leading Expert: agreed* |
| Ad. 18 | to delete sentence  *Leading Expert: agreed* |
| Ad. 28 | to be deleted, if the correct stage of development is indicated (see comment on Char. 28)  *Leading Expert: agreed* |
| Ad. 29 | to check whether to read “Observations on the silique should be made on the middle third of the inflorescence of the main stem.”  *Leading Expert: agreed* |
| Ad. 33 | to read “The tendency to form inflorescences in the year of sowing should be observed in late summer sown trials. The observation of the growth stage reached should be made in autumn, when the development stagnates (proportion of plants before bud stage, in bud stage, in flowering stage, in stage of silique formation).”  - to check whether to delete reference to season (“autumn” and “summer”)  *Leading Expert: I think we need the reference to season to clear the condition for this Char.*  - to check whether and whether to add “Time of flowering (under long day conditions)” as a new characteristic (observation of flowering date cannot be considered as alternative method. Both characteristics would need different scales)  *Leading Expert: I think Char. 27 is same as “Time of flowering (under long day conditions)”. We need to discuss whether we add the words “(under long day conditions)” to the end of Char. 27’s name.* |
| 8.3 | - other names of the example varieties should become 8.4  - Principal growth stage 5: to correct spelling of “Opening”  *Leading Expert: agreed* |
| 9. | last reference to read “Meier, U.:…” and moved up according to alphabetical order |
| TQ | See above. The TQ 5. should be amended according to proposed grouping characteristics. TQ 7.3 (b) should be deleted.  *Leading Expert: agreed* |
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