



TWF/29/14

ORIGINAL: English

DATE: March 22, 1999

INTERNATIONAL UNION FOR THE PROTECTION OF NEW VARIETIES OF PLANTS

GENEVA

**TECHNICAL WORKING PARTY
FOR
FRUIT CROPS****Twenty-Ninth Session
Caloundra, Australia, November 9 to 14, 1998**

REPORT

*adopted by the Technical Working Party for Fruit Crops*Opening of the Session

1. The twenty-ninth session of the Technical Working Party for Fruit Crops (hereinafter referred to as "the Working Party") was held at Caloundra, Australia, from November 9 to 14, 1998. The list of participants is presented in Annex I to this report.
2. Mr. Nik Hulse from the Plant Breeders' Rights Office in Canberra, Australia, welcomed the participants to Caloundra. The session was opened by Mr. Chris Barnaby (New Zealand), Chairman of the Working Party.

Adoption of the Agenda

3. The Working Party adopted the agenda for its twenty-ninth session, which is reproduced in document TWF/29/1 Rev., after having agreed to slightly change the order of the items for discussion and to delete European Plum in item 11.

Short Reports on New Developments in Member States in Plant Variety Protection for Fruit Species

4. The Working Party received short reports from some of the experts on recent developments in their countries. The experts reported that in several countries preparations for acceding to the 1991 Act of the UPOV Convention had been completed or were very close to completion. In some States, legislation on the certification of fruit varieties with compulsory DUS testing, also for non-protected varieties and partly even VCU tests for some species, had been introduced. Research into the identification of varieties with the help of DNA methods was intensified. In Australia, several testing services offered to do such tests to identify varieties in case of legal disputes. In some member States, the number of applications for varieties of fruit species had decreased while the CPVO registered a small increase in applications. As the expert from Kenya attended for the first time a session of the UPOV Working Parties, he gave short information on the legislation in his country dating back to 1972, but having been revised several times and leading in 1997 to a separate Plant Breeders' Rights Office in the Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate Service (KEPHIS). The largest number of applications so far received concerned ornamental species with roses as the first species, with 122 applications, followed by maize, alstroemeria, wheat, barley, etc.

5. The expert from the United Kingdom reported on the Third International Symposium on the Taxonomy of Cultivated Plants held in Edinburgh, United Kingdom. A summary report is reproduced in Annex III to this report.

Questions on the Testing of Varieties of Fruit Species

6. The Working Party had no special questions on the testing of varieties of fruit species.

Important Decisions Taken During the Last Sessions of the Working Party, the Technical Working Party on Automation and Computer Programs (TWC) and the Technical Committee

7. Mr. M.-H. Thiele-Wittig presented a brief report on the main items discussed during the previous session of the Technical Committee and referred participants needing further details to the full report reproduced in document TC/34/10.

Application of COYD and COYU Analysis

8. The Working Party noted that the Technical Committee, while agreeing that several experts had still to gain experience on the application of COYD and COYU analysis for further species, had insisted that the document as reproduced in TC/33/7 had been adopted for use for cross-fertilized species and that no alternative strategy should remain: efforts should rather be made to apply the document. Where there were too few varieties, the document would offer an alternative with the criteria of the long-term LSD. Moreover, if TWC experts were sent to sessions of other Technical Working Parties, the method would finally gain better acceptance by the various Technical Working Parties. After some discussion on the applicability of these methods to fruit testing, the Chairman indicated that he would contact

the Chairman of the TWC to discuss the possibility of UPOV approving a statistical method more appropriate for fruit crops testing.

Improvement of Document TWC/11/16 on the Testing of Uniformity of Self-fertilized and Vegetatively Propagated Species

9. The Working Party noted that the Technical Committee had finally approved document TC/34/5, which would replace the former document TWC/11/16 for the testing of uniformity of self-fertilized and vegetatively propagated species, subject to a few changes and corrections. The Working Party also noted the existence of an older document, TWC/14/4, which would provide additional explanations on the use of the former document TWC/11/16 that would themselves be applicable in the same way to document TC/34/5.

Definition of Off-type, Admixture

10. The Working Party noted that the Technical Committee had approved the following definition of off-type:

“Any plant is to be considered an off-type if it can be clearly distinguished from the variety in the expression of any characteristic of the whole plant or of part of the plant, used in the testing of distinctness, taking into consideration the particular species.”

With the adoption of this definition, the Technical Committee had wanted to make it clear that the same criteria would apply to the definition of off-types as to the testing of distinctness. With respect to the definition of admixtures, the Technical Committee had followed the proposal of the TWA which had tried to avoid the term admixture and therefore the need for further definition, and agreed to the following sentence:

“Plants that are very different from those of the variety could be disregarded as long as their number does not interfere with the test.”

In choosing the phrase “could be disregarded,” the Technical Committee had stressed that it would depend on the judgment of the crop expert whether they were disregarded or not. That would mean in practice that in horticultural crops with a low number of plants one single plant would already interfere with the test and could not be disregarded.

Prescreening of Varieties

11. The Working Party noted that the Committee had noted the report on the discussions that took place on prescreening in the various Technical Working Parties. It had noted that the TWF and TWO had taken a rather strict line agreeing that methods not included in the Test Guidelines should only be admitted for screening if a strong correlation existed between the characteristic in question and morphological or physiological characteristics used in the Test Guidelines. The experts from the TWA in particular had stressed that there was an urgent need to find a way of coping with the large number of possible example varieties in

order to reduce that number to a reasonable level, thereby striking a balance between the risk of not including a variety and the costs and workload involved in unnecessarily including it. The expert from France had introduced, in the TWA, document TWA/26/5, on a possible method for the setting-up and use of reference collections for DUS testing. The Committee had also noted that in document TWA/26/10 experiences were reported in the prescreening of varieties of *Poa pratensis* that could be regarded as vegetatively propagated.

12. In order to make progress in the discussions, the Committee had agreed that some concrete cases would have to be selected and the whole problem further investigated on the basis of them. It therefore eventually had proposed to ask all Technical Working Parties to re-discuss the question of prescreening and to cite examples that would support their position. For the TWA, the species *Poa* and potato were mentioned as possible examples, and for the TWO, roses. For roses there was already a good deal of additional information that would be helpful. In addition, it would underline the importance of ornamental varieties and the international trade in them. For the TWF, the species peach was mentioned. The Working Party agreed to that proposal. The expert from France will prepare a document on the research done in his institute on peach for the next session of the Working Party. He will take into account the correlation of the new methods with phenotypical characteristics.

13. The Committee had also agreed that, in addition to developing models for the prescreening of varieties, it was very important to have an intensive exchange of information between the testing stations and the offices of member States. Only if they were able to know what varieties were protected or tested in other member States would they be able to check a complete collection of varieties to find all similar varieties which should be compared with a candidate variety.

Status of the UPOV Test Guidelines and Extended Testing on the Initiative of the Testing Offices

14. The Working Party noted that the Technical Committee had discussed the status of the UPOV Test Guidelines. It had noted that the only binding obligations on UPOV member States were those contained in the text of the Convention itself. UPOV could moreover only make recommendations on that text or prepare guidelines for the interpretation of the legal obligations. The UPOV Test Guidelines were intended to give guidance for the interpretation of Articles 7, 8 and 9 of the 1991 Act of the Convention. Their purpose was to ensure that the Articles in question were applied in as harmonized a manner as possible and that decisions were taken in a similar way leading to the same or similar results.

15. How far the UPOV Test Guidelines were reflected in national practice or national law depended on the individual situation in each member State. In practice, the UPOV Test Guidelines were taken over in many member States entirely without any change (no deletion of characteristics, no addition). In other member States, all characteristics with an asterisk and a selection of those without an asterisk were taken over. As they were not exhaustive, further characteristics were added in still others. In principle the UPOV Test Guidelines were broadly accepted and guaranteed on account of the broad participation in their preparation and continuous updating, which also proved their quality. The use of the UPOV Test Guidelines was independent of whether a given State had a system of official tests done by government testing authorities or a breeder testing system. Applicants and breeders also used them.

16. The Working Party also noted that the Technical Committee had difficulty in accepting that it would be left to the testing expert to decide whether further tests should be made without a special request from the applicant where the usual characteristics were not sufficient to establish distinctness. After a detailed discussion, the Chairman of the Technical Committee had finally concluded by proposing that the Test Guidelines should be very well prepared so that the need to include new characteristics in the list might be avoided. That list of characteristics should then be kept for several years. If there was an obvious omission or a need to include further characteristics, the other offices should be informed of the inclusion, and it should be discussed in the Technical Working Party concerned. One should avoid searching for a difference for its own sake because, if one really looked for a difference, a small one would eventually be found. The whole question should be discussed further with breeders and other crop experts in the various Technical Working Parties. It was important to keep the spirit and the quality of the Test Guidelines in mind as, without that spirit and that quality, there was reason to wonder where unlimited deviation from the Test Guidelines would eventually lead.

17. The Working Party agreed on the recommendation character of the UPOV Test Guidelines, saw, however, a conflict with the rejection, by the Technical Committee, of extended testing on the initiative of national authorities. It took the position that the addition of characteristics to the Test Guidelines should always be admissible. National Offices should, however, carefully study the effect of such addition on the already existing varieties with respect to the diminishing of the scope of protection of those varieties. They should also contact experts from the Technical Working Party for Fruit Crops (TWF) from other member States testing varieties of the same species to inform them of their intention and try to reach a consensus in order to keep harmonization in the testing between member States. If necessary, they might also discuss the matter with breeders. At a later stage, such characteristics should be proposed for inclusion in the UPOV Test Guidelines.

Preference for a Long Table of Characteristics

18. The Working Party also discussed the question whether, when establishing Test Guidelines, it would not be better to aim right from the beginning for a larger number of characteristics to be included in the Test Guidelines without an asterisk, with a reinforcement of the use of the asterisk for those characteristics which should be used by all member States. From the larger number of non-asterisk characteristics, each State could then select those characteristics considered necessary. The majority of the experts considered it easier to select characteristics from a larger list of agreed characteristics for its national use than adding additional characteristics to a rather short list of UPOV Test Guidelines characteristics.

19. If everybody added new characteristics to a short list, different countries might add the same characteristics with slightly different wording and, even worse, with different states of expression. The Working Party therefore agreed to discontinue the practice of recent years of eliminating a large number of characteristics at the time of revision of Test Guidelines, mainly because some States had adapted the practice of using all characteristics of the UPOV Test Guidelines for testing irrespective of whether they carried an asterisk or not. That practice resulted in unnecessary costs with a large list of characteristics and the desire to reduce the

non-asterisk characteristics. Costs should not be a criterion for the inclusion of a non-asterisk characteristic in the UPOV Test Guidelines, but only the normal technical criteria such as usefulness for DUS testing, reliability and repeatability. Costs might only be a criterion for the inclusion of characteristics in national test guidelines. There might be also characteristics which were very important and useful in one region of the world but useless or impossible to be used in another, partly because of climatic conditions. Such characteristics should not be excluded from the UPOV Test Guidelines.

Variety Denominations and Trademarks

20. The Working Party noted that the Technical Committee had stressed the obligation under the UPOV Convention to use the denomination in relation to the selling and marketing of the variety. The Committee was of the view that any highlighting of the trademark in the Technical Questionnaire would only reduce the value of variety denominations. It was necessary to impose the use of the variety denomination, therefore no question on trademarks should be included in the Technical Questionnaires.

Question, in the Technical Questionnaire, on the Status of the Variety under the Legislation on the Protection of the Environment and on Human and Animal Health

21. The Working Party noted that the Technical Committee confirmed, as already mentioned in the report on the last session of the Committee, that all Test Guidelines would in future contain a question in the Technical Questionnaire requiring the information referring to the status of the variety under the legislation on the protection of the environment and on human and animal health (see also paragraph 57).

Judgment of Vectors (Phytoplasma)

22. The Working Party noted that the Technical Committee had discussed the effect of phytoplasma in varieties of *Euphorbia*. It was first clarified that the term “vector” was wrongly used and should be replaced by phytoplasma or endophyte. After having heard explanations on the details as reproduced in document TC/34/7, the Committee agreed quite rapidly that the inclusion of phytoplasma in a cell was an infection of the plant material which could be removed, and therefore should not be considered part of the cell DNA. A candidate variety that differed from another variety only in the cause of introduction of the phytoplasma was therefore not considered a new variety and would therefore not qualify for separate plant variety protection. The Technical Committee also noted that there might be many different varieties already given plant variety protection whose differences might be caused only by that phytoplasma. However, as long as that fact was not known, there was no consequence. Should it become clear the phytoplasma was the only difference, the protection of the variety would have to be withdrawn.

UPOV-ROM Plant Variety Database

23. The Working Party noted updated information supplied by the Office of UPOV on the UPOV-ROM Plant Variety Database. In 1997, six issues of UPOV-ROM had been issued at two-month intervals. In 1998, the first five UPOV-ROMs had already been distributed. The software used by the French firm was the same as that developed for the WIPO ROMARIN CD-ROM. As new improvements in the latter's software had been made, the UPOV-ROM would also contain several improvements in the near future, the main one being the possibility of using it in networks. The UPOV-ROM already contained the 1997 OECD List of Cultivars eligible for certification and, although at present available only in pdf format, the list of varieties protected through the European Union Community Plant Variety Office (CPVO). Discussions were also under way to include the varieties contained in the European Union Catalogue. The UPOV-ROM has also been offered to subscribers since the beginning of the year at an annual subscription price of CHF 750 plus postage.

24. The Working Party also noted that the TWC had requested that, in future, States should state for each record whether it was a new record (1), a modified record (2) or an unchanged record (3).

List of Varieties Under Test

25. The Working Party noted that the Technical Committee had approved the proposal by the TWO that the exchange of tables with lists of varieties under test in the individual member States be abolished as that information could be easily retrieved from the UPOV-ROM.

UPOV Documents in Electronic Form

26. The Working Party confirmed its interest in obtaining more documents in electronic form. It noted that the UPOV Test Guidelines might soon be available in electronic form, namely on a CD-ROM. It also noted that the Office of UPOV planned to set aside an open and a restricted area on its homepage for the reproduction of certain documents.

Application of Recommendations on Variety Denominations

27. The Working Party noted that the Technical Committee had discussed the problem of some breeders systematically applying for different variety denominations for the same variety in different countries. The only way to stop that practice would be a full exchange of information between the member States and the publication of the different synonyms.

Example Varieties

28. The Working Party noted that the Committee had approved the proposal to prepare separate lists of example varieties in the case of Test Guidelines with numerous subgroups like Citrus.

Testing Rootstocks

29. The Working Party noted that the Committee had approved the proposal to decide case by case whether, for a certain genus or species, separate Test Guidelines would be drawn up for fruit varieties and for rootstocks or one single document for both. It had also agreed that, where separate documents were prepared for the Test Guidelines for Rootstocks, the flower and fruit characteristics would not be repeated, but instead a reference would be made to the Test Guidelines for the fruit varieties.

A New Version of the DUSTX Package and a Prototype DUSTX for Windows

30. The Working Party noted that the Technical Committee welcomed the new version of the DUSTX package and the prototype produced for Windows. It recommended broader use of that freely available software which would ensure more harmonized evaluation of data. The new DUSTW version to run under Windows is expected to be available before the end of the current year.

Telecommunications, Exchangeable Software and Contacts

31. The Working Party noted that the Technical Committee welcomed document TWC/15/9 which contained information on the e-mail addresses of participants in UPOV Technical Working Parties, while information on database management systems in use in the UPOV member States was to be found in document TWC/15/8 and information on exchangeable software in document TWC/15/10. It supported the proposal by the TWC that more States should supply such information to the expert from the United Kingdom. The Working Party further noted with appreciation that the above information was also available on the Internet and would be regularly updated by experts from the United Kingdom (<http://www.bioss.sari.ac.uk/links/upov/upov/upov.html>).

List of Species in Which Practical Technical Knowledge Has Been Acquired

32. The Working Party noted that the Technical Committee welcomed document TC/34/4, which contained an updated version of the list of species in which practical technical knowledge had been acquired. It asked all member States to provide the Office of UPOV with any new information for the updating of that document.

Chairmanship

33. The Working Party noted that the Technical Committee had proposed to the Council, in view of the expiration of the chairmanship of Mr. Joël Guiard (France) with the closing of the ordinary session of the Council in October 1998, that it elect Mrs. Elise Buitendag (South Africa) as new chairman and Mr. Raimundo Lavignolle (Argentina) as new vice-chairman of the Technical Committee. It further noted that the Council had elected Mrs. E. Buitendag as chairman of the Technical Committee and Mr. M. Camlin (United Kingdom) as vice-chairman because Mr. Raimundo Lavignolle had taken a post with the Office of UPOV in October 1998.

Updated Report From the Technical Working Party on Automation and Computer Programs (TWC) on Uniformity

34. The Working Party noted document TWC/16/14, being the draft report on the last session of the TWC. The Chairman recalled the existing bulletin board on varieties set up on the Internet by experts from Scotland in the Technical Working Party on Automation and Computer Programs (TWC), and the existence of the possibility of presenting information on the work of this Working Party in a similar way as had already been done for the TWC. He invited all experts to send him any comments or suggestions on how the Internet could be validly used for or by the Working Party.

New Methods, Techniques and Equipment in the Examination of Varieties, Including the Progress Report on the Work of the Working Group on Biochemical and Molecular Techniques and DNA Profiling in Particular (BMT)

35. The Working Party noted document C/32/10 Add. specifying that the Working Group on Biochemical and Molecular Techniques and DNA Profiling in Particular (BMT) had held its fifth session in Beltsville, United States of America, from September 28 to 30, 1998. At that session, discussions had taken place on the following subjects: (a) Short presentation of research results or their follow-up on different species; (b) Assessment of variability within varieties; (c) Assessment of variability between varieties; (d) Statistical methods: Confidence intervals and accuracy of distance estimates; Alternative to dendrograms; Refinement of the analysis of molecular variance (AMOVA) for distinctness studies and as a tool to assess uniformity; Combination of information from diverse data types (AFLP, SSR, morphological data, etc.); (e) Position of the breeders on DNA profiling; (f) Use of DNA profiling methods by expert witnesses in disputes concerning essential derivation; (g) The use of DNA profiling for prescreening as a possible tool in DUS testing; (h) Possibilities and consequences of the introduction of DNA profiling methods for DUS testing; (i) Definition of the variety. The next session of the BMT is scheduled for February or March 2000, two to three weeks before the session of the Technical Committee.

36. The Chairman informed the Working Party of the documents BMT/5/9 and BMT/5/10 on strawberry and BMT/5/8 on the "Standardization of Molecular Marker Systems for Variety Testing" for further study. He also pointed to a publication on image analysis prepared by Mr. Van der Heijden (Netherlands).

37. As the BMT had asked for the specification of one or two species of fruit varieties on which research could be concentrated in future, the Working Party selected peach and citrus for that purpose. The expert from France will prepare a document on peach for that purpose by the end of this year, and the expert from Australia will prepare a document on citrus. Several experts recalled the position of the Working Party, which should not be lost sight of, that only those DNA markers could be used for DUS testing which showed a strong correlation with morphological expressions.

Testing of Rootstocks

Walnut Rootstocks

38. The Working Party noted document TWF/26/8 and agreed to the proposal of the expert from France to prepare a new document before starting discussions again during its next session.

Prunus Rootstocks

39. The Working Party noted documents TWF/25/4 and TWF/27/6 and noted that an informal subgroup had met during two evenings to advance a new draft prepared by experts from Germany. The expert from Germany will prepare a new draft for the coming session which will first be commented again by correspondence.

Standardization of Test Guidelines

Revision of the General Introduction to Test Guidelines, Harmonization of States of Expression and Their Notes

40. The Working Party noted that the Technical Committee had approved a report on the results of a meeting of the Editorial Committee, the Chairmen of the various Technical Working Parties and the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Committee, in which a general discussion on the revision of the General Introduction to Test Guidelines and on the harmonization of the states of expression and the Notes in the Test Guidelines had taken place. The Editorial Committee and the Chairmen considered that the main purpose of the General Introduction was to lay down the basic principles according to which the Test Guidelines were established and should be applied and which should themselves be applied together with the individual Test Guidelines. In addition, the document should provide new experts with information on the basic principles for the testing of varieties. The document should not be too long: its size should be about what it was at present. Its presentation should be improved, however, and the Editorial Committee could imagine it being presented in a form similar to the booklet containing the UPOV Convention. The Editorial Committee considered that the General Introduction should not be changed too often, and therefore should really contain only basic principles and not details, which might change more frequently. There should be reference only to another document which would contain a collection of detailed rules, such as the methods of COYD and COYU analysis or the document on the testing of uniformity in vegetatively propagated and self-propagated varieties

(documents TC/33/7 and TC/34/5), as well as lists of definitions of certain statistical terms (e.g. population standard) to facilitate understanding by crop experts and of certain botanical terms (e.g. epiphyte) to facilitate understanding by TWC experts when they were approached for statistical help.

41. The Editorial Committee then went through document TG/1/2 and discussed and decided where changes in the present text were needed and who would have to draft the new wording. It entrusted parts for revision to the various Technical Working Parties or to individual experts, for instance the harmonization of states of expression to the expert from South Africa, the part on reference collections to the expert from France and the statistical parts to the TWC. It proposed to split paragraph 28 and prepare separate paragraphs for vegetatively propagated varieties and for truly self-pollinated varieties. It also proposed to change Part C of the document according to the new layout of the Test Guidelines and to copy certain rules from document TWF/28/9 separately into each of the individual sections of the Test Guidelines. It considered removing the information on the order of characteristics and including it in a separate document as apparently it was not all that basic and in practice was not applied very strictly. After paragraph 49 on characteristics, a new paragraph would be included to take care of the special Annex to a certain Test Guidelines document that included electrophoretic characteristics as a third category. The part on the Technical Questionnaire would have to be adapted to the new layout and the whole document would have to be adjusted to the 1991 Act of the UPOV Convention. The members of the Editorial Committee and the Chairmen agreed to prepare comments and proposals in response to those comments, and also proposals already received as well as further comments, with the drafting of certain parts. The results would then be submitted to the various Technical Working Parties at their sessions, with a request for their comments which in turn would be submitted to the Technical Committee at its next session. The Committee asked the experts to submit any comments on documents TWF/28/7 and TWF/28/9 to the Office of UPOV.

42. The Working Party noted document TWF/29/3. It agreed to ask all member States to submit to the Office of UPOV the relevant pages of their preferred documents for the observation of simple plane shapes and for solid shapes in a similar way as in document TWF/29/3. On the basis of the collected information, one or two of the existing documents could be chosen as UPOV standard documents for the observation of shapes.

43. The Working Party referred to documents TWF/28/7 and TWF/28/9 on the standardization and harmonization of states of expression in Test Guidelines discussed during the last session. It noted document TWF/29/7 giving some answers, by the expert from South Africa, to questions raised or comments made. The three documents gave rise to detailed discussions on some specific aspects, mainly on the characteristics of attitude and on the definition of non-true qualitative characteristics and true quantitative characteristics with only the medium state fixed. Some concern was raised that, depending on the presentation as qualitative or quantitative characteristic, a variety might be declared distinct or not, especially in cases where it was predefined that in quantitative expressions a difference of two states was considered sufficient for distinctness or a difference of even one state only in a qualitative expression.

44. The Working Party considered that it was wrong to try to take decisions on distinctness on the basis of Notes in the Test Guidelines. The Test Guidelines did not provide sufficient means that would allow a final decision. They were only one step on the way to examining

distinctness (and uniformity and stability). Their main aim was to facilitate the establishing of a description of the variety. The comparison of two descriptions would not enable an expert to take a decision. This frequent misinterpretation stemmed from the title of the Test Guidelines. There should be a clearer explanation of the function of the Test Guidelines to avoid experts mixing up the description and distinction of a variety. It was possible that two varieties had identical descriptions but were nevertheless sufficiently distinct, and that two samples of plant material could have different descriptions but were not sufficiently distinct to be two varieties eligible for protection.

45. The Working Party was concerned about recent decisions which had started from a proposal from the Technical Working Party for Vegetables (TWV) which had been accepted by the Technical Committee in its session in 1996 to allow the use for the attitude of the states: erect (1), erect to semi-erect (2), semi-erect (3), semi-erect to horizontal (4), horizontal (5). That presentation followed completely the former presentation of a quantitative characteristic and therefore vegetable experts considered such a characteristic a quantitative characteristic in which only half of the scale was presented on paper. Other experts, however, considered that the Technical Committee had only accepted that presentation because it considered it a qualitative characteristic. That, however, meant that for the time being it was no longer possible to identify, with absolute certainty, from the presentation of a characteristic whether it was a quantitative or a qualitative characteristic. It was therefore of utmost importance to aim at an unambiguous definition of a non-true qualitative characteristic.

Final Discussion on Draft Test Guidelines

Test Guidelines for Walnut

46. The Working Party noted documents TG/125/4(proj.) and TWF/29/8, and incorporated the proposals made in document TWF/29/8 into document TG/125/4(proj.) with the following exceptions:

(i) Material Required: To keep the request for bud sticks but to place it after the request for dormant shoots.

(ii) Table of Characteristics

Characteristics

2 To have the Notes: “1, 2, 3”

10, 11 To have the word “trapezoid” replaced by “trapezium” and the example variety “Sorrento” corrected

25 To keep “ease”

30 To keep the characteristic

31 To keep the characteristic, but without an asterisk

34, 35 To have “Sorrento” corrected.

(iii) Explanations on the Table of Characteristics: To have no changes to Add. 13 to 20.

(iv) Technical Questionnaire: To have in 4.3 “Pollinator” replaced by “Pollenizer” and to add in 5 the combined characteristic replacing characteristics 4 and 5 and to add characteristic 31.

(v) Grouping Characteristics Without Asterisk: In connection with the discussions on the draft Test Guidelines for Walnut, the Working Party discussed how to proceed in the case of grouping characteristics, to which the majority of experts would like to attribute an asterisk (*) but which for climatic reasons, could not be observed in one State (persistence of rachis cannot be observed in some countries due to early frosts). As it was needed for grouping, a way out of the normal rule should be found. The Working Party finally decided to use the characteristic for grouping where possible, but to not give it an asterisk and ask the Technical Committee for its advice.

Test Guidelines for Grapevine

47. The Working Party noted documents TG/50/6(proj.), TWF/29/12 and TWF/29/13, and made the following main changes in document TG/50/6(proj.):

(i) Methods and Observations: The first paragraph to start with the words: “All observations comprising measurements or counting should”

(ii) Characteristics and Symbols: To have in paragraph 5 the reference to the extended BBCH scale read: “ ... at the end of Chapter VIII” and to have in the last line of paragraph 6 the word “each” replaced by “a.”

(iii) Table of Characteristics

Characteristics

1 To clarify in general for all Test Guidelines whether the growth stage code stated should be the code of the time when the event of the characteristic in question happens (in this case 50% bud burst) or the time when the expert has to be in the field in order not to miss the event (in this case before the bud burst starts up to 50% bud burst).

3 To have the word “shape” replaced by “openness”

5 To be placed before characteristic 4 and to have the word “prostrate hairs on” deleted

6 To have the species “*Vitis cinerea*” added as example for state 9

7 To have the number of states and their wording agreed upon by correspondence

- 9 To have the codes “0-56, I-6.1.20” and the additional examples “Riesling B (5)” and “*Vitis cinerea* (9)”
- 10 To have the additional example “Mourvedre N (1)”
- 13, 14 To have the same states “completely red (3)” for both characteristics, to have all indicated examples deleted and to be limited to “only varieties not for fruit production”; state 3 of characteristic 13 to have the example variety “Kober 5 BB”
- 15 To have the words “on internodes” added
- 17 To be observed at stages “60-73”
- 18 To read: “Flower: sexual organs” with the states “only stamens (1), fully developed stamens with reduced ovary (2), fully developed ovary with erect stamens (3), fully developed ovary with reflexed stamens (4)”
- 20 To have the states “cordate, deltoid, pentagonal, orbicular, reniform” and to have the abstract drawings deleted
- 24, 39 To have no OIV code
- 25, 26 To have “shape of” replaced by “arrangement of lobes at” and to have the additional example variety “Folle blanche B (1)” in characteristic 25
- 27 To receive an improved drawing
- 28 To have the states “very short, very long” deleted
- 31 To have the additional example variety “Flame Seedless Rg (9)”
- 34 To have the example variety for state 5 checked
- 36 To have the example variety “Nehelescol B (9)” instead of “Ugni blanc B”
- 37 To have the additional example variety “Cardinal Rg (3)”
- 40 To have the states “oblong (1), elliptic (2), broad elliptic (3), round (4), oblate (5), ovate (6), obtuse ovate (7), obovate (8), corniform (9),” with a new drawing for state 3 and the correction of “Rg” of state 7 to “Rs”
- 41 To have the IPGRI code “I-6.2.8,” to have the last two states read “dark red violet (5), blue black,” to have the additional example variety “Moulinera gorda Rg (3)” and to have “Cardinal N” corrected to “Cardinal Rg”
- 45 To have the additional example variety “Olivette noire N (3)”
- 46 To have “Isabelle N” corrected to “Isabella N”

- 47 To have the last state read “other than muscat, foxy or herbaceous”
- 48 To have “Sultana B” corrected to “Sultanina B”
- 49 To have the bracketed addition “without glaucosity”
- 50 To have “structure” replaced by “relief,” state 2 placed at the end and to receive new drawings.

(iv) Synonyms: to have the lines with synonyms for Chardonnay B, Cot N and Teleki 5 C deleted, “Garnacha tinta” corrected, “Riesling Silvaner” added as a synonym for “Müller Thurgau B” and “Sultanine” as synonym for “Sultanina B.”

(v) BBCH Scale: To have the missing footnote for code 60 checked reading: “The five petals forming the corolla separate and are rejected as a flowerhood.”

(vi) The expert from Germany will try to obtain agreement by correspondence on the points left open with respect to characteristics 1, 3, 7 and 34 before the end of the year. Thereafter the document will be presented to the Technical Committee for adoption.

Test Guidelines for Apple Rootstocks

48. The Working Party noted documents TG/163/1(proj.), TWF/29/5, TWF/29/11 and TWF/29/12, and made the following main changes in document TG/163/1(proj.):

(i) Material Required: To have the following words added at the end of paragraph 1: “... in case characteristics of the adult tree are needed for the establishment of distinctness.”

(ii) Methods and Observations: To have in paragraph 4 the words “at the central third” replaced by “on the middle third” and in paragraph 5 “central” by “middle.”

(iii) Grouping of Varieties: To have the new characteristic on the habit of the shoot and characteristics 3, 17 and 31 as grouping characteristics and also to have only these mentioned in the Technical Questionnaire.

(iv) Table of Characteristics

Characteristics

- 1 To have in this and all other characteristics the example varieties amended according to document TWF/29/3 but to have all “J-TE-...” example varieties deleted; to have before this characteristic a new characteristic with an asterisk included reading: “Plant: habit of shoot” with the states “upright (M 4) (1), spreading (Cepiland) (2), drooping (Marubakaido) (3)”
- 2 To have the asterisk and the word “basal” deleted

- 3 To receive an asterisk, to have the drawings deleted and states 2 and 3 combined into “wavy or zigzag”
 - 19 To read: “Leaf blade: attitude in relation to shoot”
 - 21 To have the example variety for state 7 corrected into “P 14”
 - 23 To have “shape” replaced by “profile”
 - 29 To read: “Leaf: ratio length of blade/length of petiole”
- (v) Literature: To have the literature copied from document TWF/29/5.

Test Guidelines for *Pyrus* Rootstocks

49. The Working Party noted documents TG/169/1(proj.), TWF/29/4, TWF/29/9 and TWF/29/12, and made the following main changes in document TWF/29/9:

(i) Subject of these Guidelines: To be amended as in the Test Guidelines for Apple Rootstocks according to paragraph III (4).

(ii) Material Required: to have paragraph 1 amended in a similar way as in the Test Guidelines for Apple Rootstocks.

(iii) Methods and Observations: To have paragraphs 1 to 3 deleted and replaced by paragraphs IV (1) and (2) of the Test Guidelines for Apple Rootstocks; to have paragraph 4 deleted except for the last sentence in which “measured” was to be replaced by “observed” and to have in paragraph 6 the words “at the central” replaced by “from the middle.”

(iv) Grouping of Varieties: To have the characteristics on the habit of the plant, on the shoot growth and on the bud burst as grouping characteristics, and to have these also in the Technical Questionnaire after deletion of the other characteristics listed.

(v) Table of Characteristics

Characteristics

- 1 To have a new characteristic included before characteristic 1 reading: “Plant: habit of shoot” with the states “upright (1), spreading (Supporter 2) (2), drooping (3)”
- 2 To have “basal” deleted
- 4 To read: “Young shoot: intensity of pubescence (upper third)”
- 7 To have “absent” replaced by “none”
- 16 To have the states “acute (1), obtuse (2), rounded (3)”

- 23 To have “shape” replaced by “profile” and “flat” by “straight”
- 24 To receive a new drawing for state 3
- 26 To be deleted
- 27 To have “pointed” added before “tip”
- 28 To read: “incisions of margin (upper half)” with the states “entire, crenate, blunt serrate, sharply serrate” and to be checked whether the depth of margin should be added
- 29 To read: “Leaf blade: curvature of longitudinal axis”
- 31 To read: “Leaf blade: intensity of anthocyanin coloration of main veins”
- 32 To read: “Leaf blade: color of main veins in comparison with leaf blade”
- 34 To have the second “leaf” deleted
- 35 To read: “Petiole: presence of stipules”
- 36 To have the states “small (3), medium (5), large (7)”
- 38 To read: “Petiole: distance of stipules from basal attachment of petiole” and to have the states “short, medium, long”; after this characteristic, to have a new characteristic with an asterisk inserted reading: “Time of beginning of bud burst” with the states “early, medium, late” and possibly another characteristic reading: “Leaf: color at leaf fall” with further information to be submitted by experts from Italy.

Drafting of Clearly Understood Characteristics and States of Expression

50. In connection with the discussions on the Draft Test Guidelines for *Pyrus* Rootstocks the Working Party discussed at length the difficulties connected with the expression of a characteristic in which absences and different degrees of presences were combined. Should or could words like intensity, degree, density or number be used in the wording of the characteristic. From the point of pure linguistics, a combination with absent was not possible. Without such word, the characteristic was, however, not clearly understood without the expressions. In the sense of better understanding or avoiding misunderstanding, the Working Party would in future therefore aim at making each characteristic clearly understood, irrespective of whether the word “absent” appeared in the states of expression.

51. In the same way, in order to improve clarity and avoid misunderstanding, it would aim at making each state of expression self-understood without knowledge of the complete wording of the characteristic. As examples, were mentioned: number of thorns: (absent) none or very few, few, medium, many, very many; density of hairs: absent or very sparse, sparse, medium, dense, very dense; intensity of pubescence: absent or very weak, weak, medium, strong, very strong; intensity of anthocyanin coloration: absent or very weak, weak, medium, strong, very strong.

Discussions on Working Papers on Test Guidelines

Test Guidelines for Citrus (Revision)

52. The Working Party noted documents TG/83/3, TWF/27/14 and TWF/29/6, and that an *ad hoc* subgroup had met to discuss the approach for the establishing of revised Test Guidelines for Citrus. The subgroup was enlarged by experts from Japan. The Working Party agreed to the plan to ask the expert from the International Plant Genetic Resources Institute (IPGRI) to submit data from the IPGRI Descriptor for Citrus and from updates to that descriptor to the members of the subgroup. From those data and those in the present UPOV document, a list of characteristics would be established which would be applicable to all groups of species. The present number of groups would be reduced to a smaller number of main groups. All those characteristics which were applicable only to some groups would be collected in a separate annex. In a further annex, a list of example varieties would be given for each group as far as possible.

53. In each group a given quantitative characteristic would have the same wording as in the other groups but may have a different scale and therefore the same word may represent a different dimension. As a further possibility was mentioned the idea of collecting all characteristics which could not be included in the main Table of Characteristics or in the first annex for information purposes. However, the feasibility of this idea inside UPOV will first have to be explored. The collected data from IPGRI should be circulated to the Subgroup by the end of the year for comments to be sent to the leading expert by the end of February 1999. The question of whether it was possible to prepare one single document or several documents and whether to include ornamental varieties was postponed.

Test Guidelines for European Plum (Revision)

54. The Working Party noted that a Subgroup had met in the evenings to advance the preparation of a revised draft for the next session.

Test Guidelines for Kiwifruit

55. The Working Party noted documents TG/98/3, TWF/28/5 and TWF/29/2, and made the following main changes in document TWF/29/2:

(i) Subject of the Guidelines: To have on the title page the word “Kiwifruit” replaced by “*Actinidia*” and to state under I (1) that the Test Guidelines have primarily been prepared for vegetatively propagated varieties of kiwifruit, but that they may be applied to all vegetatively propagated female, male and hermaphrodite varieties of the genus *Actinidia* Lindl.

(ii) Conduct of Tests: To have the sentence “Hand-pollination is recommended” added at the end of paragraph 2 and to have the comparable sentence in II (2) deleted.

(iii) Methods and Observations: To have in paragraph 8 the word “red” replaced by “anthocyanin,” to have in paragraph 9 the word “recently” added before “fully opened” and the last sentence deleted and to have in paragraph 10 the words “minimum” and “of 6.2 Brix” deleted.

(iv) Grouping of Varieties: To have the order of grouping characteristics for male varieties reversed.

(v) Table of Characteristics

Characteristics

- 1 To have state 3 placed at the beginning
- 3 To receive explanations to be prepared by experts from New Zealand
- 5 To have “hairs” in this and the following characteristics replaced by “hairiness”
- 8, 39, 40 To have “red coloration” replaced by “anthocyanin coloration”; the Working Party had a long discussion on whether it was correct to talk always of anthocyanin in case of red color or whether it had to be proven in each case beforehand. It finally decided to ask the advice of the Technical Committee as the same question arose in all Technical Working Parties
- 15,17 To have “lenticel” put in the plural
- 21 To have two new characteristics inserted reading:
 (a) “Stem: pith” with the states “absent, present” and
 (b) “Stem: amount of pith” with the states “very sparse, sparse, medium, dense, very dense”
- 23, 24 To have the states “apiculate, acuminate, rounded” checked by experts from New Zealand and the drawings improved
- 25 To read: “Leaf blade: arrangement of basal lobes (if base is cordate)” and to have the Notes “1, 2, 3, 4, 5”
- 26, 27 To have the words “density of” deleted
- 37 To be deleted and to have a new characteristic inserted reading: “Leaf: ratio petiole length/blade length” with the states “small (Gracie), medium (Hayword), long”
- 38, 39 To have the characteristic start “Petiole ...”
- 38 To have an additional state “absent or very sparse”
- 41 To have the first state read: “two to five”

- 43 To be checked whether the states should be changed to “absent or very sparse (1), sparse (2), dense (3)”
- 44 To have the word “predominant” added before “number”
- 45 46, 37, 38 To have the characteristics start “Sepal: ...”
- 51-57 To have the characteristics start: “Petal: ...”
- 51 To have the states: “absent (1), present (9)”
- 58 To have the characteristic start: Filament: ...”
- 59 To have the characteristic start: “Anther: ...”
- 60-62 To have the characteristics start: “Styles: ...”
- 64 To have the states “fusiform (1), ellipsoid (2), cylindric (3), ovoid (4), obovoid (5), globose (6), obloide (7)”
- 65 To read: “Fruit: shape in cross section” with the states “circular, broad elliptic, elliptic”
- 66 To have the states “deeply depressed (1), slightly depressed (2), flat (3), slightly blunt protruding (4), strongly blunt protruding (5), slightly pointed protruding (6), strongly pointed protruding (7) and with new drawings to be prepared by experts from Japan
- 67 To have the drawing for state 3 improved; after this characteristic two new characteristics to be included: (a) “Fruit: length of stalk” with the states “short, medium, long” and (b) “Fruit: ratio stalk length/fruit length” with the states “small (Bruno), medium (Allison), large (Hayword)”
- 68 To be recorded “at maturity for consumption” and to be placed after characteristic 82
- 73 To be deleted
- 74 To be placed after characteristic 82
- 78 To read: “Fruit: distribution of hair”
- 83, 84, 85 To be placed before characteristic 81 and to receive explanations on the pericarp and core
- 86 to have “Brix level” deleted and to receive explanations on how to be observed
- 87 To have “titratable” and “(as citric acid)” deleted and to receive explanations on how to be observed
- 88 To be deleted

89 To have “bud break” replaced by “bud burst.”

Presentation and Order of Characteristics of Organs Belonging to a Higher Organ

56. In connection with the discussions on the Test Guidelines for Kiwifruit (*Actinidia*) the Working Party discussed how to present and order the characteristics of different organs of a higher organ (in the given example those of the flower). It finally agreed that it would have each characteristic start with the lower organ, e.g. sepal, petal, filament, anther, style, etc. If all of those organs were concerned, which would in reality mean a characteristic of the whole flower (e.g. Flower: arrangement of petals; flower: number of styles), which normally would be placed before the characteristics of suborgans of the flower, it would remain together with the characteristics of the suborgan concerned (e.g.: “Flower: arrangement of petals” would remain together with the other characteristics on the petal and “Flower: number of styles” would remain together with the other characteristics on the styles).

Release Paragraph in the Technical Questionnaire

57. In connection with the discussions on the Technical Questionnaire for kiwifruit, the Working Party noted the proposal from the Technical Working Party for Vegetables (TWV) to have the request for information on authorization for release separated under a new item. The Working Party agreed that the request was not in the right place. Separating it from item 4 in a new item should be considered. The proposal of the TWV would, however, change the numbering of all subsequent sections and therefore the possibility of placing it after Section 7 as new Section 8 should be considered or of leaving it under Section 4 and enlarging the title of that section to cover the release.

Test Guidelines for Pear

58. The Working Party noted documents TG/15/1 and Corr., TWF/27/9, TWF/28/2 and TWF/29/10, and made the following main changes in document TWF/29/10:

(i) Material Required: To have the minimum quantity of material and the rest of the paragraph 1 amended to: “5 trees for varieties resulting from crossing, 10 trees for varieties obtained from mutation or 3 budsticks or 3 dormant shoots for grafting, sufficient to propagate 5 (10) trees.” It is recommended that the competent authorities prescribe either the quince rootstock variety East Malling A and the intergrafting Beurre Hardy or Doyenne du Comice or another rootstock variety. If the applicant intends to use another rootstock he should contact the competent authority”; in paragraph 2 to have the words “virus free and” inserted before “visibly healthy.”

(ii) Conduct of Tests: To have the figures “6” and “12” replaced by “5” and “10” and to have the words “being mutants” replaced by “obtained from mutation.”

(iii) Methods and Observations: To have the order of paragraphs 1 and 2 reversed, the figures “6” and “17” amended to “5” and “10” with no off-types allowed and to have “in the case of mutants” replaced by “obtained from mutation”; to have the end of paragraph 5 read:

“... from the middle third of a well developed current season’s shoot”; paragraph 6 to read: “6. All observations on the fruit should be made at the time of maturity for consumption.”

(iv) Grouping of Varieties: To have characteristics 37, 38, 41, 57 and 58 shown as grouping characteristics and also only those characteristics included in the Technical Questionnaire.

(v) Characteristics and Symbols: To have the new wording as in other Test Guidelines.

(vi) Table of Characteristics:

Characteristics

- 1 To have the example variety “Clapp’s Favourite” deleted
- 3 To have a new state “Columnar (Nain vert) (1)” with a drawing to be prepared by experts from Germany and the Notes “1, 2, 3, 4, 5”
- 6 To have the states put into a new order as follows: “1, 4, 5, 6, 2, 3, 7”
- 9 To have the states “acute (1), obtuse (2), rounded (3)” and to have “Epine du Marc” deleted
- 11 To have the words “intensity of” added
- 12 To read: “Young shoot: intensity of pubescence (upper third)”
- 13 To have the second state read “outwards”
- 17 To receive a new drawing for state 3
- 19 To have the example variety “William’s Bon Chrétien” deleted
- 20 To read: “Leaf blade: incisions of margin (upper half)”
- 22 To read: “Leaf blade: curvature of longitudinal axis”
- 24 To read: “Petiole: presence of stipules”
- 25 To read: “Petiole: distance of stipules from basal attachment of petiole”
- 27 To read: “Shoot: location of flower bud” and to be placed before characteristic 26
- 29 To have the state “horizontal” replaced by “spreading”
- 30 To have a new characteristic included after characteristic 30 reading: “Petal: size” with the states “small, medium, large”

- 32 To have the first state read “circular”
- 34 To be placed after characteristic 37
- 36 To read: “Fruit diameter” with the states “small, medium, large”
- 37, 38 To have “width” replaced by “diameter”
- 39 To have “Belle de Bruxelles” replaced by “Passe Crassane”
- 40 To read: “Fruit: profile of sides” and to have the drawing amended
- 41 To read: “Fruit: ground color” with the first state “not visible (Uta) (1)”
- 42 To read: “Fruit: relative area of over color” with the states from “absent or very small” to “very large”
- 44, 45, 46 To have “amount” replaced by “relative area”
- 46 To read: “Fruit: relative area of stalk end”
- 50 To read: “Fruit: attitude of stalk in relation to axis of fruit” with the states “straight (1), oblique (2), right-angled (3)”
- 51 To have the example variety “Cure” replaced by “Louise Bonne d’Avranche”
- 52 To have the state “horizontal” replaced by “spreading”
- 54 To have the first state read “very narrow”
- 55 To read: “Fruit: relief of area around eye” with the first state “smooth” instead of “even”
- 56 To have the states “roundish (1), ovate (2), elliptic (3), narrow elliptic (Dr. Jules Guyot, Cure) (4)”
- 58, 59 To be checked whether one characteristic could be deleted
- 59 To have three new characteristics included after characteristic 59, the third (firmness) only provisionally reading: (i) “Fruit: texture of flesh” (to be copied from characteristic 70 from the adopted Test Guidelines); (ii) “Fruit: juiciness of flesh” (to be copied from characteristic 71 of the adopted Test Guidelines); (iii) “Fruit: firmness of flesh” with the states “soft (3), medium (5), firm (7).”
- (vii) Synonyms: To have the table of synonyms amended as for Grapevine with two columns, one for the original denomination used in the Table of Characteristics and another with all synonyms.

Total Order of Characteristics in Test Guidelines

59. In connection with the discussion on revised Test Guidelines for Pear, the Working Party discussed at length the different possibilities for the order of characteristics. It noted that there are in principle two possibilities:

(a) To choose the botanical order in which first characteristics of the whole plant would be observed followed by characteristics of the stem, the leaf, the flower, the fruit and physiological characteristics, or

(b) To choose the chronological order of appearance or recording, following a growth stage code if available as in grapevine.

60. The Working Party reflected on whether the order should be selected in a way to facilitate the use of the Table of Characteristics to the examiner of the variety or to the final user of the description of the variety. It finally considered that it served more the user of the description as the examiner normally knew the species very well, while the user of a description might not know the species at all. It therefore agreed that it would be preferable to have one single order only for all species which therefore could only be the botanical order which it would use for all future Test Guidelines.

Numbering of Characteristics During Drafting Period

61. The Working Party also discussed the best way of numbering characteristics during the different drafting stages in the preparation of a new or revised Test Guidelines document. It noted the recommendation to stick to the number of the last adopted version in case of revisions until the adoption of a new version. It considered it, however, inconvenient to keep a number if the old order were to be completely revised. Instead, it would renumber the characteristics in each new draft but would add in brackets the number in the last adopted version. In the case of drafts for Test Guidelines for new species, it would renumber the characteristics in each new draft but add in brackets the number of the characteristic in the first draft prepared.

State “Absent or Very Weak” Connected with Another Characteristic of the Same Organ

62. In connection with the discussions on the Test Guidelines on Pear, the Working Party discussed how to proceed in the case where a second characteristic on an organ followed a characteristic for which there was no request to state whether that organ was absent or present but only whether the organ was absent or very weakly present, as a clear absence could not always be seen. How should experts proceed if Note 1 was given? Did that mean the organ was absent and the second characteristic would not be observed, or did that mean that the organ was very weakly present and the characteristic was to be observed? Would the second characteristic only be observed if in the first characteristic the Note 2 or Note 3 was observed? The question arose for the example “Fruit: depth of eye basin” with the states “absent or very shallow (1), shallow (3), etc.” and the second characteristic “Fruit: width of eye basin” with the states “very narrow (1), narrow (3), etc.” In which cases would the width be observed? Would it vary from variety to variety, sometimes already with Note 1 of the first

characteristic, if the eye basin could be seen to be present as very shallow, and for another variety only as from Note 2 if in Note 1 its presence was not visible? A similar case was mentioned “Anthocyanin coloration: absent or very weak” and secondly “hue of anthocyanin coloration.”

Status of Test Guidelines

63. The Working Party agreed that the draft Test Guidelines for Apple Rootstocks, Grapevine, *Pyrus* Rootstocks and Walnut should be sent to the Technical Committee for final adoption. It agreed that the Working Papers on Test Guidelines for the other species mentioned on the agenda should be (re)discussed at its next session.

Chairmanship

64. The Working Party noted that the chairmanship of Mr. Chris Barnaby will expire with the ordinary session of the Council in 1999. As the last session of the Technical Committee before that session of the Council will be held before the next session of the Working Party it was necessary to already now make a proposal for a candidate for chairmanship for that session. The Working Party suggested to the Technical Committee that it proposed to the Council to elect Mr. Josef Harsanyi (Hungary) as chairman to succeed Mr. Chris Barnaby as of October 1999.

Future Program, Date and Place of Next Session

65. At the written invitation of Slovakia, the Working Party agreed to hold its thirtieth session in Nitra, Slovakia, from September 6 to 10, 1999. It was planned that the following items would be discussed during the forthcoming session:

- (a) Short reports on new developments in member States in plant variety protection in fruit species (oral reports);
- (b) Questions on the testing of varieties of fruit species;
- (c) Important decisions taken during the previous sessions of the Working Party and the Technical Committee (oral reports);
- (d) Updated report from the Technical Working Party on Automation and Computer Programs (TWC);
- (e) New methods, techniques and equipment in the examination of varieties;
- (f) Testing of rootstocks
 - *Prunus* Rootstocks (TWF/25/4, TWF/ 27/6; Germany to prepare a new Working Paper)

- Walnut Rootstocks (TWF/26/8; France to prepare a new Working Paper)
- (g) Revision of the General Introduction (the Office of UPOV to prepare a new Working Paper)
- (h) Standardization of Test Guidelines (TWF/27/16; South Africa to prepare a new Working Paper)
- (i) Harmonization of Shapes (TWF/29/3; the Office of UPOV to prepare a new Working Paper)
- (j) Final discussion on draft Test Guidelines for Pear (Revision) (TG/15/2(proj.))
- (k) Discussions on working papers on Test Guidelines for
 - Apricot (Italy to prepare a new Working Paper for the revision of TG/70/3)
 - Citrus (Revision) (TG/83/3, TWF/27/14, South Africa to prepare a new Working Paper)
 - European Plum (Revision) (TG/41/4, TWF/25/6, TWF/27/8; Germany to prepare a new Working Paper)
 - Fig (*Ficus carica*) (Italy to prepare a new Working Paper)
 - Kiwifruit (TG/98/3, TWF/29/8; New Zealand to prepare a new Working Paper)
 - Passion fruit (Israel to prepare a new Working Paper)
 - Persimmon (Japan to prepare a new Working Paper for the revision of TG/92/3)

Visits

66. In the afternoon of November 10, 1998, the Working Party visited the Maroochy Research Station of the Department of Primary Industries (DPI), and the Subtropical Fruit Center of the Queensland Horticulture Institute, where it received reports on the breeding of pineapple stone fruits with low chilling requirements, on citrus and on strawberries and on research on tissue culture for banana, pineapple and ginger. It visited the laboratory of applied biotechnology and the trial fields for pineapple, mango, macadamia, litchi, coffee, custard apple and persimmon.

67. In the afternoon of November 12, 1998, the Working Party visited the Hidden Valley Plantation where it received detailed and practical information from Henry and David Bell on all aspects of their macadamia breeding and macadamia production and visited their large collections of selected material of macadamia or material still under selection.

68. *This report has been adopted by correspondence.*

[Three annexes follow]

ANNEX I

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

I. MEMBER STATES

AUSTRALIA

Nik HULSE, Plant Breeders' Rights Office, P.O. GPO Box 858, Canberra, ACT 2601 (tel. +61-2-6272 6476, fax +61-2-6272 3650, e-mail: nik.hulse@affa.gov.au)

Katte PRAKASH, Plant Variety Rights Office, P.O. GPO Box 858, Canberra, ACT 2601 (tel. +61-2-6272 4478, fax +61-2-6272 3650, e-mail: k.prakash@affa.gov.au)

Helen COSTA (Mrs.), Plant Variety Rights Office, P.O. GPO Box 858, Canberra, ACT 2601 (tel. +61-2-6272 4272, fax +61-2-6272 3650, e-mail: helen.costa@affa.gov.au)

Kathryn DAWES-READ (Mrs.), Plant Variety Rights Office, Department of Primary Industries and Energy, P.O. GPO Box 858, Canberra, ACT 2601 (tel. +61-2-6272 4228, fax +61-2-6272 3650, e-mail: kathryn@affa.gov.au)

CANADA

Christine IRVING (Mrs.), Plant Breeders' Rights Office, Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA), 59 Camelot Drive, Nepean, Ontario, K1A 0Y9 (tel. +1-613-225 2342, fax +1-613-228 6629, e-mail: cirving@em.arg.ca)

FRANCE

Raymond SAUNIER, INRA - Centre de Bordeaux, Unité de Recherches sur les espèces fruitières et la vigne, Domaine de la Grande Ferrade, B.P. 81, 33883 Villenave d'Ornon (tel. +33-5-56 84 30 81, fax +33-5-56 84 30 83, e-mail: rsaunier@bordeaux.inra.fr)

Erik SCHULTE, Bundessortenamt, Prüfstelle Wurzen, Torgauer Str. 100, 04808 Wurzen (tel. +49-34-25 90 400, fax +49-34-25 90 40 20, e-mail: erik.schulte@bundessortenamt.de)

HUNGARY

József HARSANYI, National Institute for Agricultural Quality Control, Budapest II, Keleti K. u. 24, P.O. Box 30,93 1525 Budapest 114 (tel. +36-1-212-3127, ext. 2342, fax + 36-1-212-5367)

ISRAEL

Baruch BAR-TEL, Plant Breeders' Rights Testing Unit, Agricultural Research Organization, POB 6, Bet Dagan 50 250 (tel. +972-3-968 3458, fax +972-3-968 3669, mobile phone: +972-52-343 813, e-mail: ilpbr_tu@netvision.net.il)

ITALY

A. BERGAMINI, Istituto Sperimentale per la Frutticoltura, Via Della Val, 2, 38057 Pergine Valsugana, TN (tel. +39-461 461-533 000, fax +39-461-532 775, e-mail: ifssoptn@valsugana.com)

JAPAN

Katsumi YAMAGUCHI, Seed and Seedlings Division, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, 1-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 100 (tel. +81-3-3591-0524, fax: 81-3-3502-6572, e-mail: yamaguti@ncss.go.jp)

NEW ZEALAND

Chris BARNABY, Plant Variety Rights Office, P.O. Box 130, Lincoln (tel. 64-3-325 6355, fax 64-3-325 2946, e-mail: barnaby@pvr.govt.nz)

Mike MALONE, Hort. Research, Private Bag 1401, Havelock North (tel. +64-6-877 8196, fax: +64 6 877 1761)

Marck MCNEILAGE, Hort. Research, Private Bag 92169, Auckland (tel.: +64-9-815 4200, fax: + 64-9-815 4201, e-mail: mmcneilage@hort.cr.nz)

SOUTH AFRICA

Elise BUITENDAG (Mrs.), Plant and Quality Control, Private Bag X11208, Nelspruit 1200 (tel. +27-13 753 2071, fax +27 13 752 3854, e-mail: elise@itsc.agric.za)

SPAIN

Pedro CHOME FUSTER, Instituto Nacional de Semillas y Plantas de Vivero, José Abascal 4, 28003 Madrid (tel. +34-91-347 6913, telex 47698 INSM E, fax +34-91-594 27 68, e-mai: pedrochome@mapa.es)

UNITED KINGDOM

Alison LEAN (Mrs.), Wye College, National Fruit Collections, Brogdale Road, Faversham, Kent ME13 8XZ (tel/fax +44-1795-590 272, e-mail: nfc@wye.ac.uk)

II. OBSERVER COUNTRIES

KENYA

Evans O. SIKINYI, Plant Breeders' Rights Office, Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate Service (KEPHIS), P.O. Box 49592, Nairobi, tel. +254-2-440 087, fax: +254-2-448 940, e-mail: kephis@nbnet.co.ke)

KOREA

Yong-Uk SHIN, National Horticultural Research Institute, 415 Imokdong, Suwon (tel. +82-331-240 3586, fax +82-331 240 3556, e-mail: shinØyo@nmri.cyo.kr)

Eung-Bon KIM, National Seed Management Office, 433 Anyang 6-dong, Anyang, Kyunggi-do 430-016 (tel. +82-343 446 2432, fax +82-343-448 1216, e-mail: ebkim@hanmail.net)

III. OBSERVER ORGANIZATIONS

EUROPEAN UNION

Sergio SEMON, Office communautaire des variétés végétales, P.O. Box 2141, 49021 Angers Cedex 02, France (tel.: +33-2-41 36 84 56, telefax: + 33-2-41 36 84 60, e-mail: semon@cpvo.fr)

INTERNATIONAL PLANT GENETIC RESOURCES INSTITUTE (IPGRI)

Adriana ALERCIA (Mrs.), Via delle Sette Chiese 142, 00145 Rome, Italy (tel. +39-06-5189 2410, fax +39-06 575 0309, e-mail: a.alercia@cgnet.com)

IV. OFFICER

Chris BARNABY, Chairman

V. OFFICE OF UPOV

Max-Heinrich THIELE-WITTIG, Senior Counsellor, 34, chemin des Colombettes, 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland (tel. +41-22-338 9152, telex 412 912 ompi ch, fax +41-22-733 5428, e-mail: thiele.upov@wipo.int, Web site: <http://www.upov.int>)

[Annex II follows]

ANNEX II

LIST OF LEADING EXPERTS

Species	Basic Document	Leading experts (for addresses see attached list)	Interested experts (countries) (for name of experts see List of Participants)
Apricot	TG/70/3+Corr.	Mr. Bergamini, IT	ES, FR, HU, NZ, ZA
Citrus	TWF/29/6	Mrs. Buitendag, ZA	AU, ES, IL, IT, JP
European Plum	TWF/27/8	Mr. Schulte, DE	FR, GB, IT, JP, HU, SK, ZA
Fig	new	Mr. Bergamini, IT	DE, ES, IL, JP
Kiwifruit	TWF/29/2	Mr. Barnaby, NZ	CA, IL, IT
Passion fruit	new	Mr. Bar-Tel, IL	AU, ZA, KE
Pear	TWF/29/10	Mr. Schulte, DE	GB, IL, IT, NZ, SK, ZA
Persimmon	new	Mr. Yamaguchi, JP	IL, IT, NZ
<i>Prunus</i> Rootstocks	TWF/27/6	Mr. Schulte, DE	AU, GB, FR, IT, NZ, SK
Walnut Rootstocks	TWF/26/8	Mr. Saunier, FR	IT

Species	Document to be sent to interested experts by	Comments to be sent to leading expert by	Amended document to be sent to UPOV by
Apricot	end of March 1999	June 15, 1999	July 15, 1999
Citrus	(IPGRI), end of 1998	End of February 1999	end of May 1999
European Plum	end of March 1999	end of May 1999	end of June 1999
Fig	end of April 1999	end of May 1999	end of June 1999
Kiwifruit	June 15, 1999	July 15, 1999	end of July 1999
Passion fruit	end of March 1999	June 15, 1999	July 15, 1999
Pear	end of 1998	end of January 1999	end of February 1999 (to professional organizations)
<i>Prunus</i> Rootstocks	end of February 1999	end of May 1999	end of June 1999
Walnut Rootstocks	end of January 1999	March 15, 1999	April 15, 1999

Harmonization of Shapes (TWF/29/3)	Comments to be sent to UPOV by February 15, 1999	Comments to be sent to UPOV by May 15, 1999
---------------------------------------	--	---

[Annex III follows]

TWF/29/14

ANNEX III

SUMMARY REPORT ON THE
THIRD INTERNATIONAL SYMPOSIUM ON
THE TAXONOMY OF CULTIVATED PLANTS

held in Edinburgh, United Kingdom, in July 1998

(by Dr. Alison Lean, United Kingdom)

In July, I attended the Third International Symposium on the Taxonomy of Cultivated Plants in Edinburgh. Taxonomy and Nomenclature were the main topics of the conference. Fruit crops were a neglected area with only one speaker and that was on a study of the taxonomy of bananas in the East African Highlands, and only two posters, one from New Zealand on kiwifruit and the other from Russia on *Prunus cerasifera* and *salicina*.

However, the subject on intellectual property rights and plants was extremely well covered by a number of excellent speakers. These included André Heitz from UPOV, Janice Strachan from the American PVRO, where they grant rights only to seed propagated species and tubers, and Miss Elizabeth Scott from the United Kingdom, who talked about the testing of ornamental species with special reference to the naming of varieties. Joan Sadie explained the PVR and national listing system and registration systems in South Africa and Julia Borys described DUS testing in Poland. Trademarks were the subject of two speakers from the USA.

In the session of molecular methods, Dr. Bernard Baum from Canada outlined the potential use of DNA fingerprinting of cereal crops for PVR. His theme was that as more varieties were produced it became more difficult to separate on morphological characters. In barley they can identify 128 cultivars from a single seed using genetic fingerprinting.

The full report will be published as a volume of Acta Horticulturae.

[End of document]