

# Technical Working Party for Agricultural Crops

TWA/54/6

## Fifty-Fourth Session

Arusha, United Republic of Tanzania, May 19 to 22, 2025

Original: English

Date: May 13, 2025

## COMMENTS ON GUIDANCE AND INFORMATION MATERIALS

*Document prepared by the Office of the Union*

*Disclaimer: this document does not represent UPOV policies or guidance*

1. The purpose of this document is to report the comments on guidance and information materials made by the Technical Working Party for Ornamental Plants and Forest Trees (TWO)<sup>1</sup> and the Technical Working Party for Vegetables (TWV)<sup>2</sup>, at their sessions in 2025.

### DOCUMENT TGP/5 “EXPERIENCE AND COOPERATION IN DUS TESTING”, SECTION 6 “UPOV REPORT ON TECHNICAL EXAMINATION AND UPOV VARIETY DESCRIPTION” (REVISION)

2. The TWO and TWV agreed with the revision of document TGP/5 “Experience and Cooperation in DUS Testing”, Section 6 “UPOV Report on Technical Examination and UPOV Variety Description”, on the basis of document TGP/5, Section 6 (draft 1) (see documents TWO/57/10 “Report”, paragraphs 7 to 10, and TWV/59/19 “Report”, paragraph 5).

3. The TWO considered how to provide information in the “UPOV Report on Technical Examination” regarding the “Reporting Authority” and agreed that it should normally be the authority that had conducted the technical examination.

4. The TWO agreed to invite the European Union to consider whether to develop proposals to address situations when further information should be provided in the “UPOV Report on Technical Examination”, such as to indicate when the authority providing the report on technical examination was different than the authority that conducted the examination.

5. The TWO considered how to provide information on differences between the candidate and similar varieties when the difference was based on a characteristic that was only available in the “Reporting Authority’s test guidelines” and not in the UPOV Test Guidelines. The TWO recalled the requirements for characteristics to be used in DUS examination, set out in document TG/1 “General Introduction to DUS”, and agreed that it should be indicated when the characteristic in which the candidate differed from the similar variety was only included in the Reporting Authority’s test guidelines.

### DOCUMENT TGP/7: DEVELOPMENT OF TEST GUIDELINES (REVISION): GUIDANCE NOTE (GN) 28 “EXAMPLE VARIETIES” – EXAMPLE VARIETIES FOR ASTERISKED QUANTITATIVE CHARACTERISTICS WHEN ILLUSTRATIONS ARE PROVIDED

6. The TWO and TWV agreed with the proposal to amend document TGP/7, Guidance Note (GN) 28 “Example Varieties”, as provided in document TWP/9/5 and presented by an expert from Germany (see documents TWO/57/10 “Report”, paragraphs 11 to 13, and TWV/59/19 “Report”, paragraphs 6 and 7).

7. The TWO and TWV noted that example varieties would not be needed to clarify the states of expression when these were self-explanatory or could be effectively demonstrated by a diagram or illustration.

<sup>1</sup> TWO, fifty-seventh session, held in Roelofarendsveen, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), from March 31 to April 3, 2025.

<sup>2</sup> TWV, fifty-ninth session, organized by electronic means, from May 5 to 8, 2025.

8. The TWO thanked the expert from Germany for having developed the proposal to amend document TGP/7, GN 28, in collaboration with TWO experts.

[End of document]