



Disclaimer: unless otherwise agreed by the Council of UPOV, only documents that have been adopted by the Council of UPOV and that have not been superseded can represent UPOV policies or guidance.

This document has been scanned from a paper copy and may have some discrepancies from the original document.

---

Avertissement: sauf si le Conseil de l'UPOV en décide autrement, seuls les documents adoptés par le Conseil de l'UPOV n'ayant pas été remplacés peuvent représenter les principes ou les orientations de l'UPOV.

Ce document a été numérisé à partir d'une copie papier et peut contenir des différences avec le document original.

---

Allgemeiner Haftungsausschluß: Sofern nicht anders vom Rat der UPOV vereinbart, geben nur Dokumente, die vom Rat der UPOV angenommen und nicht ersetzt wurden, Grundsätze oder eine Anleitung der UPOV wieder.

Dieses Dokument wurde von einer Papierkopie gescannt und könnte Abweichungen vom Originaldokument aufweisen.

---

Descargo de responsabilidad: salvo que el Consejo de la UPOV decida de otro modo, solo se considerarán documentos de políticas u orientaciones de la UPOV los que hayan sido aprobados por el Consejo de la UPOV y no hayan sido reemplazados.

Este documento ha sido escaneado a partir de una copia en papel y puede que existan divergencias en relación con el documento original.

## INTERNATIONAL UNION FOR THE PROTECTION OF NEW VARIETIES OF PLANTS

GENEVA

## ADMINISTRATIVE AND LEGAL COMMITTEE

## Thirty-first Session

Geneva, October 26 and 27, 1992

## REPORT

adopted by the CommitteeOpening of the Session

1. The Administrative and Legal Committee (hereinafter referred to as "the Committee") held its thirty-first session on October 26, 1992, under the chairmanship of Mr. J.-F. Prevel (France). The list of participants is given at annex hereto.

2. The session was opened by the Chairman, who welcomed the participants.

Adoption of the Agenda

3. The agenda was adopted as given in document CAJ/31/1.

4. The Delegation of Germany noted that matters concerning the interpretation of the 1991 Act of the Convention had been submitted to the Technical Committee and that the question of holding a possible joint meeting had been raised. The Chairman agreed that the matter was relevant; however, it was not discussed by the Committee, but by the Council.

Conditions for the Examination of a Variety by the Breeder

5. Discussions were based on document CAJ/31/2.

6. The Committee adopted the draft declaration annexed to the above-mentioned document, for presentation to the Council, with the following provisos:

(i) the title was to become: "Declaration on the Conditions for the Examination of a Variety Based Upon Tests Carried out by the Breeder";

(ii) the words "or accepted" were to be added to item 1 of the enacting terms following "established";

(iii) the words "if requested to do so" were to be replaced by "when requested to do so" in item 4 of the enacting terms.

The amended wording was published in document C/26/9 Add.

7. During discussion on that declaration, the Delegation of the Netherlands called into question the claim made in paragraph 1(i) of document CAJ/31/2 according to which "it is not always possible ... to require the deposit of a sample" and requested that "... at the time of application" be added. The Delegations of Australia and of New Zealand referred in that context to phytosanitary quarantine measures and the Office of the Union to the case of "recalcitrant" species (of which seed could only be kept for a short lapse of time).

#### UPOV Model Administrative Agreement for International Cooperation in the Testing of Varieties

8. Discussions were based on document CAJ/31/3.

9. The Committee decided not to limit revision of the Model Agreement to adjustment to the prior decisions taken on fees connected with cooperation in examination. The discussions led to the following decisions and suggestions:

(i) Scope of the bilateral agreements and the Model Agreement.- The Model Agreement was currently limited to those cases where variety testing was carried out by an official service. It would be desirable to include provisions on other forms of testing, for example on cooperation in inspection of growing trials carried out by breeders.

(ii) Articles 2 and 6.- The Committee was informed of the fact that Article 2 of the Model Agreement - laying down, in particular, that examination carried out under cooperation should be conducted according to the guidelines, if any, adopted by the UPOV Council - would tempt the Technical Working Parties to limit the number of characteristics bearing an asterisk in the guidelines - meaning that the characteristic would have to be examined for all varieties and would be shown in all variety descriptions - in order to limit the obligations deriving from a cooperation agreement. It was suggested that "except where otherwise agreed by the authorities under Article 6" be added to the end of the first sentence of Article 2. That proposal met with objections of various types: the role and significance of the guidelines should not be weakened, but, on the contrary, strengthened; Article 6 already provided a possibility of detailing or redefining the scope of trials; the proposed addition, just as an extension of Article 6 through a reference to the characteristics to be examined, did not resolve the problem. It was finally decided to resume examination of the matter at a later date in a joint meeting with the Technical Committee.

(iii) Article 3.- On a proposal by the Delegation of the Netherlands, the Committee agreed to add the following provision:

"The authority requesting examination shall decide on the application, in principle, on the basis of the final report with respect

to the conditions of distinctness, homogeneity and stability. Where exceptional circumstances require, it may carry out supplementary trials. If it chooses to do so, it shall inform the authority carrying out the examination thereof."

(iv) Article 4.- It was agreed to amend paragraph (2) as follows: "Except with the specific authorization of the requesting authority and [or] the applicant..." and the first indent of paragraph (3) as follows: "... and any person duly authorized by both [either] of them."

(v) Article 5.- The Committee decided to amend paragraph (2) as follows: "If the prior application is rejected or withdrawn [If the prior application ceases to exist]..." It further decided to reword paragraph (4) as follows: "This Article applies to varieties of the genera and species listed in Annex III" (the present wording makes it possible to draw up a list of the genera and species excluded from the agreement). It was further suggested that the principle underlying the article be set out in Article 1.

(vi)(a) Article 7.- The delegation of Hungary observed that the National Office of Inventions was not the examining authority, that the national examination fee was equivalent to some 30 Swiss francs and that currency could not be freely transferred. Cooperation in examination, therefore, could not be adopted by that country unless payments were made by the applicant. The Delegation of Romania went along with those observations. The Delegation of the Netherlands stressed that the payment procedure could be defined under Article 6. The Delegations of Germany and Belgium pointed out that the schedule of fees could be adjusted to cooperation in examination by stipulating, for example, a fee equivalent to the payment due for taking over examination results.

(b) The Delegation of Germany proposed that the 350 Swiss franc fee referred to in paragraph (3) should be increased to 500 Swiss francs. Several delegations were opposed, particularly in view of the matter raised by the Delegations of Hungary and Romania and the fact that most authorities had now to cover their expenditure by means of the fees and that the fee concerned served solely to cover the administrative cost involved in transmitting an examination report.

(c) Several delegations emphasized the need to promote the financial rules on which the Model Agreement was based to ensure that all the member States compensated the authority that had carried out the examination in those cases where they took over examination results.

(d) With regard to paragraph (2), the Committee decided to adopt a wording such as: "... the amount payable shall be equal to the additional cost resulting from pursuit of the examination."

10. The Committee decided to continue examination of the Model Agreement at its next session, in a joint meeting with the Technical Committee.

#### Harmonization of Legislation and Implementation of the 1991 Act

11. Discussions were based on document CAJ/31/4.

12. Several delegations regretted that they had only received the above-mentioned document at a very late date and could do no more than make preliminary observations.

13. Novelty.-- Paragraph 4 of document CAJ/31/4 gave rise to a brief discussion on relations between hybrids and lines from the point of view of novelty. It was emphasized that handing seed of a line to another person for production of hybrid seed was an act carried out with a view to exploiting the line. However, a more important question was whether exploitation of the hybrid by means of sale or disposal to others amounted to exploitation of the lines included in its formula where those lines were not handed to another person. The Delegations of the United States of America and of France had no trouble in accepting that F<sub>1</sub> hybrid seed be the harvested material of the female line in view of the biological link between the two; they felt, on the other hand, that the case of the male line--for which an economic link could be envisaged (its purpose was to produce pollen and, thereby, hybrid seed)--should be subjected to more ample thinking. The Delegation of the United States of America pointed out that if the F<sub>1</sub> hybrid seed was not held to be the harvested material of the male line, then the legal outcome would be that exploitation of the hybrid would cause the female line to lose its novelty, but not the male line. The Delegation of Australia suggested that the matter be examined together with the professional organizations.

14. With respect to paragraph 5 of document CAJ/31/4, the Delegation of Japan expressed a doubt as to the sale of the by-products of experimental use. The Delegation of the United Kingdom felt that sale or disposal to others should be subject, as appropriate, to the condition that there was no subsequent transaction and that the variety was not identified. Moreover, the list of cases could be supplemented by sale or disposal to others of material shown within an exhibition. Finally, the Delegation of the United States of America felt that sale should not be excluded in those cases where it was mentioned in brackets in the above-mentioned paragraph: firstly, prohibition would lead solely to adjustment of the price of material returned to the breeder or the price of the service requested and, secondly, sale provided the breeder with a degree of protection where the contract was not executed.

15. With regard to paragraph 6 of document CAJ/31/4, the Delegations of France and the Netherlands felt that an attempt should not be made to draw up a full list or a concerted interpretation; on the contrary, some room should be left to the courts since the discussions in the Committee could only provide elements of doctrine or a common basis for interpreting Article 6 of the 1991 Act of the Convention.

16. Exploitation of a variety prior to filing an application and provisional protection.-- The Delegation of the United States of America shared the view sketched out in paragraph 11 of document CAJ/31/4 according to which Article 16 of the 1991 Act of the Convention (exhaustion of the breeder's right) applied to materials sold or otherwise marketed prior to filing of the application. The Delegation of New Zealand tended towards the same interpretation.

#### Closing of the Session

17. At the end of the afternoon meeting on October 26, the Committee decided, on a proposal by the Delegation of the Netherlands, seconded by the Delegations of Germany and France, to suspend its discussions until the next session.

18. The Committee thanked Mr. Prevel, at the end of his term of office as Chairman of the Committee, for his work.

19. This report has been adopted by correspondence.

[Annex follows]

## ANNEXE/ANNEX/ANLAGE

LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS/  
LIST OF PARTICIPANTS/  
TEILNEHMERLISTE

(dans l'ordre alphabétique des noms français des Etats/  
in the alphabetical order of the names in French of the States/  
in alphabetischer Reihenfolge der französischen Namen der Staaten)

## I. ETATS MEMBRES/MEMBER STATES/VERBANDSSTAATEN

AFRIQUE DU SUD/SOUTH AFRICA/SUEDAFRIKA

David P. KEETCH, Director, Plant and Quality Control, Department of Agriculture, Private Bag X258, Pretoria 0001

ALLEMAGNE/GERMANY/DEUTSCHLAND

Hans-Walter RUTZ, Regierungsdirektor, Bundessortenamt, Osterfelddamm 80, Postfach 61 04 40, 3000 Hannover 61

Michael KÖLLER, Assessor, Bundessortenamt, Osterfelddamm 80, Postfach 61 04 40, 3000 Hannover 61

AUSTRALIE/AUSTRALIA/AUSTRALIEN

Henry L. LLOYD, Director, Plant Variety Rights Office, Department of Primary Industries and Energy, P.O. Box 858, Canberra, A.C.T. 2604

BELGIQUE/BELGIUM/BELGIEN

Roger PISCAGLIA, Inspecteur général, Administration de l'agriculture et de l'horticulture, Ministère de l'agriculture, Manhattan Center, Office Tower, 21, avenue du Boulevard, 1210 Bruxelles

Walter J.G. VAN ORMELINGEN, Ingénieur principal, Service de la protection des obtentions végétales, Ministère de l'agriculture, Manhattan Center, Office Tower, 21, avenue du Boulevard, 1210 Bruxelles

CANADA/KANADA

Reg GREENE, Commissioner, Plant Breeders' Rights; Director, Plant Products Division, Agriculture Canada, K.W. Neatby Building, 960 Carling Avenue, Ottawa, Ontario, K1A 0C6

Valerie SISSON (Ms.), Chief, Plant Breeders' Rights Office, Plant Products Division, Agriculture Canada, K.W. Neatby Building, 960 Carling Avenue, Ottawa, Ontario, K1A 0C6

DANEMARK/DENMARK/DAENEMARK

Flemming ESPENHAIN, Chairman, Plant Novelty Board, Plant Directorate, Skovbrynet 20, 2800 Lyngby

ESPAGNE/SPAIN/SPANIEN

Ricardo LOPEZ DE HARO, Director Técnico de Certificación y Registro de Variedades, Instituto Nacional de Semillas y Plantas de Vivero, José Abascal, 56, 28003 Madrid

José M. ELENA ROSSELLO, Jefe de Area del Registro de Variedades, Instituto Nacional de Semillas y Plantas de Vivero, José Abascal 56, 28003 Madrid

ETATS-UNIS D'AMERIQUE/UNITED STATES OF AMERICA/VEREINIGTE STAATEN VON AMERIKA

H. Dieter HOINKES, Senior Counsel, Office of Legislation and International Affairs, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Washington, D.C. 20231

Kenneth H. EVANS, Commissioner, Plant Variety Protection Office, National Agricultural Library Building, Beltsville, Maryland 20705

Edward ROBINSON, American Seed Trade Association, Chairman, Intellectual Property Rights Committee, The J.C. Robinson Seed Co., 100 J.C. Robinson Blvd., Waterloo, Nebraska 68069

Michael J. ROTH, Corporate Patent Counsel, Pioneer Hi-Bred International Inc., 700 Capital Square, 400 Locust Street, Des Moines, Iowa 50265

FRANCE/FRANKREICH

Jean-François PREVEL, Ingénieur en chef d'agronomie, Chef du Service officiel de contrôle et certification, Groupement national interprofessionnel des semences et plants (GNIS), 44, rue du Louvre, 75001 Paris

Nicole BUSTIN (Mlle), Secrétaire général, Comité de la protection des obtentions végétales, Ministère de l'agriculture, 11, rue Jean Nicot, 75007 Paris

HONGRIE/HUNGARY/UNGARN

Károly NESZMELYI, Director General, Institute for Agricultural Quality Control, P.O. 30.93, 1525 Budapest 114

Ernö SZARKA, Head, Patent Section for Biotechnology and Agriculture, National Office of Inventions, Garibaldi u. 2, 1054 Budapest

IRLANDE/IRELAND/IRLAND

John V. CARVILL, Controller, Plant Breeders' Rights, Department of Agriculture and Food, Agriculture House, Kildare Street, Dublin 2

ISRAEL

Menahem ZUR, Chairman, Plant Breeders' Rights Council, Agricultural Research Organization, Volcani Center, P.O. Box 6, Bet-Dagan 50250

Shalom BERLAND, Legal Adviser, Registrar of Plant Breeders' Rights, Ministry of Agriculture, Arania St. 8, Hakiria, Tel Aviv 61070

Tamar MORE (Mrs.), Legal Adviser, Ministry of Agriculture, Arania St. 8, Hakiria, Tel Aviv 61070

ITALIE/ITALY/ITALIEN

Pasquale IANNANTUONO, Conseiller juridique, Office des accords de propriété intellectuelle, Ministère des affaires étrangères, Palazzo Farnesina, 00100 Rome

JAPON/JAPAN

Yasuhiro HAYAKAWA, Deputy Director, Seeds and Seedlings Division, Agricultural Production Bureau, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, 1-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo

Taiichiro MAEKAWA, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, 3, chemin des Fins, 1211 Geneva 19, Switzerland

Yoshiyuki TAKAGI, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, 3, chemin des Fins, 1211 Geneva 19, Switzerland

NOUVELLE-ZELANDE/NEW ZEALAND/NEUSEELAND

Frank W. WHITMORE, Commissioner of Plant Variety Rights, Plant Variety Rights Office, P.O. Box 24, Lincoln

PAYS-BAS/NETHERLANDS/NIEDERLANDE

Barteld P. KIEWIET, Chairman, Board for Plant Breeders' Rights, P.O. Box 104, 6700 AC Wageningen

Hans WOLFF, Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries, Bezuidenhoutseweg 73, The Hague

Paul H.M. VAN BEUKERING, Secretary, Board for Plant Breeders' Rights, P.O. Box 104, 6700 AC Wageningen

ROYAUME-UNI/UNITED KINGDOM/VEREINIGTES KOENIGREICH

John ARDLEY, Deputy Controller, Plant Variety Rights Office, White House Lane, Huntingdon Road, Cambridge CB3 0LF

Richard J. STAWARD, Senior Executive Officer, Plant Variety Rights Office, White House Lane, Huntingdon Road, Cambridge CB3 0LF



SUEDE/SWEDEN/SCHWEDEN

Evan WESTERLIND, Head of Office, Statens Växsortsnämnd, Box 1247, 171 24 Solna

SUISSE/SWITZERLAND/SCHWEIZ

Maria JENNI (Frau), Leiterin des Büros für Sortenschutz, Bundesamt für Landwirtschaft, Mattenhofstrasse 5, 3003 Bern

TCHECOSLOVAQUIE/CZECHOSLOVAKIA/TSCHECHOSLOWAKEI

Valéria RYBÁŘOVÁ (Mrs.), Head, Plant Breeders' Rights Department, UKSUP, Matúshova 21, 83316 Bratislava

Josef TICHÝ, Specialist for Plant Breeding, Ministry of Agriculture, Tesnov 17, 170 00 Prague 1

## II. ETATS OBSERVATEURS/OBSERVER STATES/BEOBACHTERSTAATEN

ARGENTINE/ARGENTINA/ARGENTINIEN

Luis A. QUINTERO, Asesor de Presidencia, Instituto Nacional de Semillas, Secretaría de Agricultura, Ganadería y Pesca, Ministerio de Economía, Paseo Colón 922, 3° piso, 1063 Capital Federal

Antonio G. TROMBETTA, Premier secrétaire, Mission permanente, Route de l'aéroport, 10, 1215 Genève 15, Suisse

COLOMBIE/COLOMBIA/KOLUMBIEN

Juan C. ESPINOSA, Premier secrétaire, Mission permanente, 17, chemin du Champ-d'Anier, 1209 Genève, Suisse

FINLANDE/FINLAND/FINNLAND

Arto VUORI, Plant Variety Board, Head of Office, Department of Agriculture, Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, Hallituskatu 3A, 00170 Helsinki

Silja RUOKOLA, Second Secretary, Permanent Mission, 1, rue Pré-de-la-Bichette, 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland

GRECE/GREECE/GRIECHENLAND

Gerasimos APOSTOLATOS, Responsible for Plant Breeders' Rights, Ministry of Agriculture, 2 Acharnon Street, 101-76 Athens

NORVEGE/NORWAY/NORWEGEN

Nordahl ROALDSØY, Adviser, Ministry of Agriculture, P.b. 8007 Dep.,  
Akersgt. 42, 0030 Oslo 1

REPUBLIQUE DE COREE/REPUBLIC OF KOREA/REPUBLIK KOREA

Nam H. PAIK, Director, Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries Division, Korean  
Industrial Property Office (KIPO), 823, Yeoksam-dong, Kangnam-ku, Seoul 135-784

Joon K. KIM, Attaché, Permanent Mission, 20, route de Pré-Bois, 1215 Geneva 15,  
Switzerland

ROUMANIE/ROMANIA/RUMAENIEN

Gheorghe DRAGOMIR, Directeur, Direction de l'inspection d'Etat, Ministère de  
l'agriculture et de l'alimentation, Boulevard Carol I No 24, Bucarest

Adriana PARASCHIV (Mrs.), Head, Examination Department, State Office for  
Inventions and Trademarks, Str. Jon Ghice 445, Sector 3, 70018 Bucharest

Mihaela-Rodica CIORA (Mme), Ingénieur, C.S.I.O.S., Ministère de l'agriculture,  
Bd. Marasti Nr. 61, 71329 Bucarest

Valeriu ERHAN, Head, Patent Examination Department, State Office for Inventions  
and Trademarks, Str. Sipotul Fintinilor 7, Ap. 11, Sector 1, Bucharest

III. BUREAU/OFFICER/VORSITZ

Jean-François PREVEL, Président

IV. BUREAU DE L'UPOV/OFFICE OF UPOV/BUERO DER UPOV

Barry GREENGRASS, Vice Secretary-General  
André HEITZ, Director-Counsellor  
Max-Heinrich THIELE-WITTIG, Senior Counsellor  
Makoto TABATA, Senior Program Officer

[Fin du document/  
End of document/  
Ende des Dokuments]