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agreed by the Council of UPOV, only documents that have been adopted by the Council of UPOV and that have not been superseded can represent UPOV policies or guidance.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

UPOV

TWO/24/12
ORIGINAL: English
DATE: September 27, 1991

INTERNATIONAL UNION FOR THE PROTECTION OF NEW VARIETIES OF PLANTS

GENEVA

TECHNICAL WORKING PARTY FOR ORNAMENTAL PLANTS AND FOREST TREES

Twenty - fourth Session

Cambridge, United Kingdom, June 24 to 28, 1991

REPORT

adopted by the Technical Working Party for Ornamental Plants and Forest Trees

Opening of the Session

1. The twenty-fourth session of the Technical Working Party for Ornamental Plants and Forest Trees (hereinafter referred to as "the Working Party") was held in Cambridge, United Kingdom, from June 24 to 28, 1991. The list of participants appears in Annex I to this report.

2. Mr. J. Ardley, Deputy Controller of the Plant Variety Rights Office and Mr. J. MacLeod, Director of the NIAB, welcomed the participants to the Plant Variety Rights Office and to the National Institute of Agricultural Botany in Cambridge, respectively. The session was opened by Mrs. E. Buitendag (South Africa), Chairman of the Working Party.

Adoption of the Agenda

3. The Working Party unanimously adopted the agenda for its twenty-fourth session as reproduced in document TWO/24/1, after having deleted subitems 9(i) Pyracanta, 9(viii) African Violet and 9(ix) Chrysanthemum, having inserted after item 8 two additional items on "Tissue Culture" and "Cooperation with Breeders in the Testing of Varieties", and having agreed to discuss under item 6 the subitems "International Access to Data," "Gazette Entries" and "Testing of Homogeneity."

Short Reports on Special Developments in Plant Variety Protection in Ornamental Plants and Forest Trees

4. The Working Party received short reports from some of the experts on further recent developments in their countries. The expert from Germany reported on the changes as a result of unification of her country and on the new draft Law for Plant Variety Protection which would abolish the list of species. The expert from the United Kingdom reported on the plans to establish a single computer data base combining technical and administrative matters. The expert from Italy reported on the difficulties in handling the backlog in applications for species in which testing facilities had only recently been set up. The expert from The Netherlands, unable to attend the session, informed the Working Party in writing of the extension of protection to the whole plant kingdom in The Netherlands. The expected increase in applications within new species would be partly dealt with through increased cooperation in testing with other countries and even regions.

5. The Working Party noted the information on organigrams of member States as reproduced in Circular U 1717. It asked the experts from the States that had not yet given their information to do so.

Important Decisions Taken During the Last Sessions of the Technical Working Party and the Technical Committee and during the Diplomatic Conference

6. Dr. M.-H. Thiele-Wittig gave a brief report on the main items discussed during the last session of the Technical Committee, referring for further details to the full report reproduced in document TC/26/5.

7. Amended Standard Technical Questionnaire and Variety Description Form. The Working Party noted document TC/26/6 reproducing the amended UPOV standard technical questionnaire and the UPOV Variety Description Form. It considered the latest change--a footnote reading: "In the case of identical states of expression of both varieties, please indicate the size of the difference"--to be unfortunate, as it might be difficult to understand for applicants who would then leave that part of the Technical Questionnaire blank.

8. Harmonization of States of Expression. The Working Party also noted the request of the Technical Committee to take the examples and rules in document TC/26/4 Rev. on the Harmonization of States of Expression and Notes of Characteristics into account when establishing or revising Test Guidelines.

9. Quantity of Plant Material to be Supplied by the Applicant. The Working Party noted paragraph 43 of document TC/26/5 on the differences in the indication in the Test Guidelines of the quantity of plant material to be supplied by the applicant. It saw no problem in these different approaches and no conflict in the fact that the first sample sent in by the applicant was the sample representing the variety. In its field of competence plants would normally be requested once only.

10. List of Reference Books and Documents. The Working Party noted document TC/27/4 reproducing an updated version of the list of reference books and documents for the testing of varieties. It finally agreed to request the countries which had prepared working papers for the drafting of Test Guidelines to verify the information for the ornamental species concerned. Any amendments, corrections, as well as proposals for deletion or inclusion of references, should reach the Office of UPOV before the end of August 1991.

11. Diplomatic Conference for the Revision of the UPOV Convention. Dr. M.-H. Thiele-Wittig informed the Working Party of the main results of the Diplomatic Conference for the Revision of the UPOV Convention which had taken place from March 4 to 19, 1991, and which on March 19, 1991, unanimously adopted a new text for the UPOV Convention. He highlighted the definition of variety, the increased scope of protection, the application after certain periods to all plant genera and species, the optional exception relating to farm saved seed, the possibility for intergovernmental organizations which have their own plant breeders' rights systems to become members, and the introduction of the system of dependency for essentially derived varieties. He closed with the remark that during the Diplomatic Conference a Resolution had been adopted requesting the Secretary-General of UPOV to set up guidelines on "essentially derived varieties."

12. Expression of the Characteristic. With respect to the definition of variety in the 1991 text of the UPOV Convention, the Working Party had difficulties with the words "defined by the expression of the characteristics ... resulting from a ... genotype ..." It wondered if they meant that two varieties which presented the same phenotype, but had a different genotype, would not be distinguishable and raised the question of how results from the use of RFLPs should be interpreted; did they indicate the expression of a genotype or the genotype itself? Several experts were of the opinion that RFLPs served to observe an expression of the genotype. The expert from Italy promised to prepare an explanation of that understanding.

13. At Least One Characteristic. The Working Party discussed at length whether the words "distinguished ... by ... at least one ... characteristic" included the application of multi-variate analysis. The majority took the position that it was impossible to exclude that method from distinctness testing as the testing authorities would otherwise lose touch with reality. The application to predefined or derived characteristics like shape, observed through measurement of length and width, was not expected to create problems. The application to all observed characteristics, however, would require further study. The question was raised whether small differences in a number of characteristics could be sufficient to establish distinctness in the absence of a large difference in one single characteristic. The Working Party agreed to continue the discussion on the basis of a document, to be prepared by experts from the United Kingdom (Mrs. Campbell), on varieties of chrysanthemum which would have been difficult to distinguish without multi-variate analysis, and of another document to be prepared by experts from Germany.

14. Essential Derivation. The Working Party had mixed feelings as to the practical application of the new criterion of essential derivation and wondered in how far the national offices would be involved in checking whether the criterion had been fulfilled. Several experts insisted that the new criterion should not affect the present minimum distance and in particular should not be allowed to reduce that distance.

Final Discussions on Draft Test Guidelines

Test Guidelines for Norway Spruce

15. The Working Party noted the problem of the numerous existing clones of Norway Spruce and the fact that the present draft Test Guidelines did not allow a separation of those clones. One of the reasons for the large number

of clones was the fact that legal requirements prescribed the use of many different clones for new forest plantings. Since only single clones were eligible for plant breeders' rights, the present draft document needed considerable amendments. The Working Party therefore decided to enquire of the forest sector which characteristics and methods they used to distinguish the numerous clones, it being understood that many of the characteristics indicated might not fulfil the present requirements for acceptance of new characteristics. Once the characteristics were known, it would have to be discussed within UPOV whether this particular case of numerous clones--which was not only limited to Norway Spruce, but concerned many other forest species--would justify a deviation from the present rules.

Test Guidelines for Dieffenbachia

16. The Working Party noted the draft Test Guidelines for Dieffenbachia, reproduced in documents TG/132/1(proj.) and TWO/24/5, as well as document TWO/24/11, distributed during the session. It finally made the following main changes in document TWO/24/5:

(i) Subject of these Test Guidelines: The Test Guidelines to apply to vegetatively propagated varieties. Mr. Brand (France) to check the Latin names.

(ii) Material Required: The material required to be "20 plants of commercial standard, 12 to 15 weeks old, excluding plants obtained directly through micropropagation"; the minimum plant height to be 25 cm.

(iii) Table of Characteristics:

Characteristics

7,9,13,21,23,24,26,27,49,50,51,52,54,57,58,60,61,64,66,67,70 to have the example varieties as indicated in document TWO/24/11

5,66 the second state to read: "light green"

12 to have the words "dominant color" replaced by "main color" and the third state to read: "green"

14 to apply to "Non-variegated varieties only"

20,28,37,46,48,59,63 to be deleted

22,50 to have the color read: "whitish green"

27,55 to have the color read: "yellowish green"

29 to have the example variety "Gitte" transferred to Note 2

29,38,47,57,67 to have the first and last states read: "whitish" and "yellowish" respectively

30 to have the example variety "Gitte" transferred to Note 9

38,47 to have the words "dominant white" replaced by "dominant green"

42 to have the example varieties deleted

49 to be placed after characteristic 20

60 to have the word "small" added before "spots"; after this characteristic a new characteristic to be inserted reading: "Varieties of type 4, 5 and 6 only: Leaf blade: density of small spots within band" with the states "sparse, medium, dense"

64 to read: "Petiole: length" with the states "short, medium, long"

68 to have the last state read: "speckled"

70 to read: "Plant: number of basal shoots" with the states from "absent or very few" to "very many"

The expert from France would be asked to indicate more characteristics which should have an asterisk.

Test Guidelines for Hydrangea

17. The Working Party noted the draft Test Guidelines for Hydrangea as reproduced in documents TG/133/1(proj.) and TWO/24/6 and comments reproduced in document TWO/24/8, as well as comments distributed during the session. It finally made the following main changes to document TWO/24/6:

(i) Subject of these Test Guidelines: The Test Guidelines to apply to vegetatively propagated varieties.

(ii) Material Required: To have the word "potted" deleted.

(iii) Conduct of Tests: Paragraph 3 to start as follows: "The test should be carried out in the open air or under glass under conditions ensuring normal growth. The growing conditions in the open air should be as follows:"; the soil to be "Acid peat"; the information on distance between plants and temperature and light to be deleted.

(iv) Methods and Observations: Paragraph 3 to read: "All observations on the leaf should be made on fully developed leaves on the third pair of leaves below the inflorescence"; before this paragraph, a new paragraph to be inserted reading: "All observations on the flower should be made on terminal inflorescences on one year old shoots"; after paragraph 4, a new paragraph to be inserted reading: "The variety description should indicate whether the test has been conducted in the open or under glass."

(v) Table of Characteristics:

Characteristics

1 the last state to read: "drooping"

2 the example variety for state 7 to read: "Hamburg"

3 to be deleted

4 the example variety for state 7 to read: "Merveille Sanguina"

10 the last state to read: "ovate"

11 to have the states "acuminate (1), acute (2) (Blue Wave), mucronate (3), rounded (4)"

13 "H. quercifolia" to be an example for Note 9

14 to have the word "dentations" replaced by "incisions"

16 to read: "Inflorescence: flowers with small calyx" with the states "inconspicuous (1) (Merveille), conspicuous (2) (Blue Wave, Mousmée)"

17 to be limited to "Only varieties with conspicuous flowers with small calyx," to have the words "in circle" deleted and an additional state "irregular (1)"

18 to be deleted

19 to have the limitation withdrawn

23 to have the states "3 and 4, always 4, 4 and 5, 3 to 7" to be checked

24 to be split into two characteristics: one with the states "absent, present" and the other on the degree with the states "weak, medium, strong"

25 to read: "Large calyx: incisions of margin of sepals" with the states "absent on all sepals (1), present on some sepals (2), present on all sepals (3)" and to receive drawings for explanation; after this characteristic a new characteristic to be inserted reading: "Large calyx: shape of incisions of margin of sepals" with the states "crenate (1), intermediate (2), serrate (3)" and drawings for explanation

26 to be deleted

27 to have the same limitations as characteristic 17; after this characteristic a new characteristic with the same limitations to be inserted reading: "Flower with large calyx: coloration of anthers" with the states "weak, medium, strong"

(vi) Technical Questionnaire: To have characteristic 22 inserted after 5.3.

Test Guidelines for Lily (Revision)

18. The Working Party noted document TG/59/4(proj.) with draft Test Guidelines for Lily (Revision) and comments on that document, reproduced in document TWO/24/10. It finally made the following main changes to document TG/59/4(proj.):

(i) Material Required: The material required to be "10 bulbs of commercial size." The sentence "The material should be especially free from virus disease" to be added if virus tests are made in The Netherlands.

(ii) Horticultural Classification of Lilies for Registration: To be amended according to the ninth Supplement to the International Lily Register with respect to divisions VI and IX.

0635

(iii) Table of Characteristics:

Characteristics

1 to have the state "aneuploid" added

12 to have the order of state 1 and 2 reversed

13 to have the example variety "Aristo" deleted

23 to have the addition "of inner tepal"

24 to have the word "Single" replaced by "Self"

28,33 to have the word "alveole" replaced by "nectar furrow"

35 to have the word "tepal" deleted

36 to have the last state reading: "fine and coarse"

44 to read: "Flower: position of stigma in relation to anthers"

(iv) Literature: To add the ninth edition.

(v) As the expert from The Netherlands had been unable to attend the session and as the document had been prepared and the central testing was done in The Netherlands, the Working Party asked for the document to be sent to The Netherlands for approval and further amendments. The experts from The Netherlands should also be asked why the characteristic on the bulblets (present characteristic 82) had been deleted and whether it could be included again.

Test Guidelines for Pot Azalea

19. The Working Party noted the draft Test Guidelines for Pot Azalea reproduced in document TG/104/1(proj.), as well as comments thereon reproduced in document TWO/24/10. It finally made the following main changes to document TG/104/1(proj.):

(i) Subject to these Test Guidelines: To have the words "resulting from hybridization" deleted.

(ii) Conduct of Tests: To have the word "or" inserted in paragraph 3 under temperature after "12°C."

(iii) Methods and Observations: To have in paragraph 2 the first number "10" deleted and in paragraph 5 the words "of a variety."

(iv) Table of Characteristics:

Characteristics

21 to have the states "spots not touching each other (1), spots touching each other (2), blotches surrounded by spots (3), one blotch only (4)"

23 to have the words "of upper side" placed after the word "middle"

24 to be placed after characteristic 19

(v) Explanations on the Table of Characteristics: To have the footnote on page 18 completed by "B.T. Batsford Ltd., London, and Timber Press Inc., Portland, Oregon."

(vi) Literature: To receive additional literature indications to be provided by the German expert.

Items for the Technical Working Party on Automation and Computer Programs

20. Report on the Last Session of the TWC. Dr. Thiele-Wittig reported on the last session of the Technical Working Party on Automation and Computer Programs, referring for further details to the full report on that session to be reproduced in document TWC/9/12 Prov.

21. International Access to Data. Mrs. Campbell (United Kingdom) introduced document TWC/9/4 Rev. on International Access to Data, which described the different sources of data, the methods of their transmission and experience within UPOV, closing with the statement that it might be simpler to consider a centralized data base for use by UPOV member States wishing to access data in other countries.

22. The Working Party had a long discussion on the usefulness of international access to data of member States. It realized that while the usefulness or need was less pronounced for other species, where varieties often had only national or limited regional importance, in the ornamental field this was different. Many ornamental varieties were grown and protected at the same time in many States. Therefore, a particular need was felt to have access to data of other member States.

23. Central Computerized Data Base. The Working Party proposed to the Technical Committee that UPOV should immediately start studying the usefulness of setting up a central computerized data base, as only such a central data base could overcome certain difficulties raised against direct access to individual national data bases. The study should include the questions of which savings such a data base could make, what other improvements it would bring, what kind of information it would have to store and whether an existing system could be adapted for use by that data base.

24. In view of the urgency of the matter, and in order to enable the Technical Committee to formulate during its October session a proposal to the Council --which would discuss the UPOV budget for the coming two years--the Working Party decided to prepare a technical questionnaire concerning a central computerized data base. The answers would be used to prepare a document for the Technical Committee, supporting the TWO's proposal. Mrs. Campbell (United Kingdom) offered to draft the final document on the basis of answers received to the questionnaire. The questionnaire is reproduced as Annex II to this report.

25. Gazettes in Electronic Form. As the study for a central computerized data base would take some time, the Working Party proposed, as an intermediate step, to invite member States to offer the information published in the national gazettes also in electronic form (on floppy disc for instance) and to invite UPOV to work on a standardized system of exchange.

26. Collection of Gazette Entries. The Working Party noted the efforts made by some member States in collecting all data relating to varieties of selected species. The main difficulties encountered at present were the fact that the information in question existed only on paper, that it was sometimes difficult to print out and sometimes difficult to obtain from certain UPOV member States. The experts therefore agreed to continue their efforts.

27. Homogeneity in Vegetatively Propagated Varieties. The Working Party noted document TWO/24/2 containing a collection of various documents on homogeneity in vegetatively propagated varieties issued some years ago. The Working Party noted the position taken in those documents that genetically related off-types and other ad-mixtures of pure error of the applicant might need to be dealt with separately and that the Technical Committee had refused such a separation already once in the past. The Working Party recognized that in certain species, as for example carnation, chrysanthemum, begonia and kalanchoe, the mutation rate was considerably higher than in others. The fact that the applicant could not separate sports from his variety at the time of providing plant material for testing, resulted for certain species like chrysanthemum in an increased risk of the applicant making mistakes in the preparation of the plant material. Should a good new variety be rejected only because the applicant had made a mistake in supplying his plant material or should he be allowed to correct his mistake? After some consideration, the Working Party finally agreed to apply those tables in document TC/XXV/8 that had higher population standards for species with higher mutation rates, which would allow for larger numbers of off-types. The decisions would be taken species by species at the time of revision of the Test Guidelines concerned.

Color Observations

28. The Working Party noted document TWO/24/7 containing the report from the subgroup meeting on color measurements held in Wageningen, the Netherlands on January 23 and 24, 1991. It agreed to distribute the report to the other Technical Working Parties, drawing their attention to the work being done and inviting experts interested in attending the next session of the subgroup (scheduled for January 1992 in Hanover, Germany) to contact the German expert.

New Methods, Techniques and Equipment in the Examination of Varieties

29. Image Analysis. The TWO noted that in the United Kingdom plans existed to study leaf shapes by means of image analysis. In The Netherlands, similar plans existed in connection with Gerbera and, in France, the plans concerned roses.

30. Tissue Culture. The Working Party noted paragraph 34 of document TC/26/5, and the request from the Technical Committee to report back to it on any problems involved with the different methods of propagation and their possible effect on testing. It noted that in the United Kingdom no variation was found in Chrysanthemum between plants from in-vitro culture and those from conventional propagation. Plants from tissue culture would only be used as mother plants for the production of plants for testing, however. So far, no rejuvenating effect had been observed.

31. The Working Party finally reconfirmed the position taken during its previous session to closely follow developments in this area. Whenever possible, it would ask the applicant to send in plant material which did not come from micropropagation and, in case of doubt, would have to do its own propagation.

Cooperation With Breeders in the Testing of Varieties

32. The Working Party noted paragraph 47 of document TC/26/5 on the last session of the Technical Committee and a short report on the discussions held in the Technical Working Party for Agricultural Crops on cooperation with breeders in the testing of varieties as practiced in the United States of America, New Zealand and France, and the plans in this respect in Canada.

33. The experts then shortly reported on cooperation with breeders in their respective countries. In Japan national breeding institutes accepted test data of two years of published data for the decision of distinctness; in other cases, an on-site inspection was made once a year, with the rest of the data being supplied by the applicant, in yet other cases, tests were laid out in governmental stations. In all other States represented at the session, growing tests were mainly done in government trials and only exceptionally on the premises of the breeder/applicant or in other collections of varieties. The observations of the plants were in almost all cases made by government offices, however.

34. The Working Party considered that at present there was no need for involving the applicant/breeder in the observations. Most breeders/applicants would be unable to perform the observations and the reliability and the high standards of the test results would suffer. Breeders tests, compared to the present situation, would in all likelihood lead to higher costs for overall testing. In the event of a further increase in the workload, centralization of the testing should be aimed at before involving the applicant/breeder. Only if that were not enough, should the possibility of involving applicants/breeders be considered, species by species and with extreme caution.

Discussion on Working Papers on Test Guidelines

Test Guidelines for Aster

35. The Working Party noted documents TWO/XXIII/11 and TWO/24/4. It finally made the following main changes to document TWO/24/4:

(i) Conduct of Tests: To have in paragraph 3 under "Rooting" the word "plugs" replaced by "cell trays" and the sentence under "Light addition" read: "From cutting down 16 hour days for 6 weeks."

(ii) Methods and Observations: To have in the second sentence of paragraph 2 the words "plants or" inserted before "parts."

(iii) Table of Characteristics:

Characteristics

7 to have the addition "of internodes"

13 to read: "Leaf: dentations" with the states "absent (1), on distal part of margin (2), on whole margin (3)"

14 to have the words "intensity of" deleted

41 To have the words "apex of" inserted before "corolla"

43 to have the order of the states reversed

The expert from Israel to indicate example varieties.

(iv) Literature: The expert from the United Kingdom to indicate literature.

Status of Test Guidelines

36. The Working Party agreed that the draft Test Guidelines for Dieffenbachia, Hydrangea, Lily (Revision) and Pot Azalea should be sent to the Technical Committee for final adoption. The draft Test Guidelines for Norway Spruce would be postponed for some time.

37. The Working Party agreed that the draft Test Guidelines for Aster should be sent to the professional organizations for comments.

38. Lack of time did not allow the Working Party to discuss the remaining working papers for Test Guidelines mentioned under item 9 of the Agenda.

Future Program, Date and Place of Next Session

39. At the invitation of the expert from South Africa, the Working Party agreed to hold its twenty-fifth session in Stellenbosch, from August 27 to September 7, 1992. The session will be held in conjunction with the twenty-third session of the Technical Working Party for Fruit Crops and will include visits to research, breeding and testing installations for fruit and ornamental varieties organized for both Working Parties from August 27 to September 2, 1992. It is planned that the following items will be discussed during the coming session of the Working Party:

(i) Short reports on special developments in plant variety protection for ornamental plants and forest trees;

(ii) Important decisions taken during the last sessions of the Technical Working Party and the Technical Committee;

(iii) Final discussions on Draft Test Guidelines for Aster (TG/141/1(proj.))

(iv) Items for the Technical Working Party on Automation and Computer Programs;

(v) Multi-variate analysis;

(vi) Central computerized data base;

(vii) Homogeneity of vegetatively propagated species;

(viii) Multi-clonal varieties;

(ix) Color observations;

(x) New methods, techniques and equipment in the examination of varieties;

(xi) Lists of species in which varieties are tested;

(xii) General Test Guidelines for ornamental species;

(xiii) Discussion on working papers on Test Guidelines for:

a) Weigela (TWO/XXIII/6)
b) Pyracantha (FR to prepare a working paper)
c) Iris (IL to improve Annex III to TWO/24/12 Prov.)
d) Kangaroo Paws (TWO/24/3)
e) Gentiana (TWO/24/9)
f) Limonium (IL to improve Annex IV to TWO/24/12 Prov.)
g) African Violet (Revision, TG/17/3, Germany to prepare a working paper)
h) Chrysanthemum (Revision, TG/26/4, United Kingdom to prepare a working paper)
i) Lavender (FR to prepare a working paper)
j) Lavendine (FR to prepare a working paper)

40. The Working Party already noted an invitation to hold its 1993 session in Antibes, France.

Visits

41. In the afternoon of June 24, the Working Party visited the DUS glasshouse trials for ornamental plants. In the afternoon of June 25, the experts had the opportunity to visit technical and trade demonstrations at the NIAB on the occasion of the NIAB Varieties and Seeds Day, and the computer facilities for DUS testing of ornamental varieties. In the afternoon of June 27, the Working Party visited the Bressingham Gardens in Diss, Norfolk.

42. This report has been adopted by correspondence.

[Four annexes follow]

ANNEX I

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS AT THE TWENTY-FOURTH SESSION OF THE TECHNICAL WORKING PARTY FOR ORNAMENTAL PLANTS AND FOREST TREES, CAMBRIDGE, UNITED KINGDOM, JUNE 24 to 28, 1991

I. MEMBER STATES

BELGIUM

Dr. J. HAEGEMAN, Rijksstation voor Sierplantenteelt, Caritasstraat 21, B-9090 Melle, (tel. 091-521052)

FRANCE

Mr. R. BRAND, GEVES, B.P. 1, Les Vignères, 84300 Cavaillon (tel. 90.71.26.85, fax 90780161)

GERMANY

Mrs. U. LOESCHER, Bundessortenamt, Osterfelddamm 80, 3000 Hannover 61 (tel. 0511/5704210, fax 0511/563362, telex 9 21 109 bsaha d)

ISRAEL

Mr. B. BAR-TEL, Plant Breeders' Rights Council, Agricultural Research Organization, Volcani Centre, P.O.B. 6, Bet Dagan 50250 (tel. 9683492, fax (3) 968 3492)

ITALY

Dr. T. SCHIVA, Istituto Sperimentale per la Floricoltura, Corso degli Inglesi 508, 18038 San Remo (Imperia) (tel. 0184 66 72 51, fax (0184) 658218)

JAPAN

Mr. K. KANAZAWA, Examiner, Seeds and Seedlings Division, Agricultural Production Bureau, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, 1-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo (tel. 03-591-0524, fax 03-503-3957)

SOUTH AFRICA

Mr. H.J. BREEDT, Citrus and Subtropical Fruit Research Institute, Private Bag X11208, Nelspruit 1200 (tel. 1311 52071, telex 335240 SA, fax 1311 23854)

Mrs. E. BUITENDAG, Citrus and Subtropical Fruit Research Institute, Private Bag X11208, Nelspruit 1200 (tel. 1311 52071, telex 335240 SA, fax 1311 23854)

SPAIN

Mr. J.M. ELENA ROSSELLO, Jefe de Area del Registro de Variedades, Instituto Nacional de Semillas y Plantas de Vivero, José Abascal 56, 28003 Madrid (tel. 34 1 3476900, telex 47698 INSM E, fax 34 1 4428264)

SWITZERLAND

Mr. M. LUTZ, Swiss Federal Research Station for Fruit-Growing, Viticulture and Horticulture, CH-8820 Wädenswil (tel. 01 783 6111)

UNITED KINGDOM

Mr. J. ARDLEY, Deputy Controller, Plant Variety Rights Office, White House Lane, Huntingdon Road, Cambridge CB3 OLF (tel. 0223/342312, telefax 0223/342386)

Dr. A. BOULD, Technical Adviser, Plant Variety Rights Office, White House Lane, Huntingdon Road, Cambridge CB3 OLF (tel. 0223/342384, telefax 0223/342386)

Mrs. A. CAMPBELL, National Institute of Agricultural Botany, Huntingdon Road, Cambridge CB3 0LE (tel. 0223 342256, telex 817455, telefax (0223) 277602)

Mr. A.J. GEORGE, Ornamental Plants Section, NIAB, Huntingdon Road, Cambridge CB3 0LE (tel. 0223/276381, direct dial 0223/342399, telex 817455 niab g, fax 0223/277602)

Miss E. SCOTT, Ornamental Plants Section, NIAB, Huntingdon Road, Cambridge CB3 0LE (tel. 0223/276381, direct dial 0223/342399, telex 817455 niab g, fax 0223/277602)

II. OFFICER

Mrs. E. BUITENDAG, Chairman

III. OFFICE OF UPOV

Dr. M.-H. THIELE-WITTIG, Senior Counsellor, 34, chemin des Colombettes, 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland (tel. 022 7309152, telex 412 912 ompi ch, fax (041-22) 7335428)

[Annex II follows]

ANNEX II

QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE USEFULNESS OF A CENTRAL COMPUTERISED DATABASE OF UPOV

1. Please state whether you would use such a facility

   1. to access information Yes/No
   2. to supply information Yes/No

2. Please state precisely what information you would find useful:-

   Species (please list) .....

   .....

   Administrative information .....

   .....

   Technical information .....

   .....

3. Quantify how you would use the information to make cost savings:

   Time savings per annum (rough costs) per species .....

   .....

   Elimination of retests caused by inadequate information .....

   .....

   Elimination of unnecessary parallel test .....

   .....

   Any other cost saving? Please specify .....

   .....

4. If such a system were to be provided, please state your preference:-

   Tick one box

   a) central computer system in Geneva ☐

   b) dispersed computer system with different countries holding different species ☐

   c) central computer system in one Member State ☐

At present some countries send and receive information about varieties on floppy disk. Please state if you already participate in such a scheme - and give details

Yes	No

Details (if yes) .....

.....

5. Please give rough estimates of the following costs:-

5.1 Development of appropriate software (this may be an adaptation of an existing system).

.....

5.2 Entry of back data (assuming that, at least 50% will be sent in electronic format).

.....

Annual maintenance charge for upkeep of database and maintenance of software.

.....

5.4 Cost of computer with appropriate links to international networks.

.....

6. Are there any other benefits of a central computerised system which have not been mentioned already? Please specify.

.....

[Annex III follows]

DRAFT UPOV VARIETY DESCRIPTION FORM

Botanical name of taxon :
Common name of taxon : IRIS

I Flower color group-
II Plant growth type-

1	Leaf	:color	-light green	1
			green	2
			dark green	3
			blue green	4
2		:width	-narrow	3
			medium	5
			broad	7
3		:cross section	-straight	1
			gutter-shaped	2
			V-shaped	3
4	Stem	:length	-short	3
			medium	5
			long	7
5		:thickness	-thin	3
			medium	5
			thick	7
6	Flower bud	:color	-white or near white	1
			yellow	2
			blue	3
7	Flower	:size	-small	3
			medium	5
			large	7
8		:fragrance	-weak	3
			medium	5
			strong	7
9	Outer tepal	:shape of blade	-circular	1
			elliptical	2
			ovate	3
			obovate	4
10		:width of blade	-narrow	3
			medium	5
			broad	7
11		:color of blade on upper side	-RHS	
12		:color of blade on lower side	-RHS	

page 2 - IRIS DRAFT UPOV VARIETY DESCRIPTION FORM

13	:color of veins at upper side	-white	1
		yellow	2
		blue	3
14	:color of veins at lower side	-white	1
		yellow	2
		blue	3
15	:hairiness of spot on blade	-absent	1
		present	9
16	:color of spot	-RHS	
17	:width of claw	-narrow	3
		medium	5
		broad	7
18	:color of claw on upper side	-RHS	
19	:color of claw on lower side	-RHS	
20 Inner tepal	:relative position	-free	1
		touching	2
		overlapping	3
21	:position relative to outer tepal	-free	1
		touching	2
		overlapping	3
22	:length	-short	3
		medium	5
		long	7
23	:width	-narrow	3
		medium	5
		broad	7
24	:color of upper side	-RHS	
25	:color of lower side	-RHS	
26 Filament	:color	-white	1
		yellowish	2
		bluish	3
27 Anther	:color	-creme	1
		yellow	2
		light brown	3
28 Pollen	:color	-light yellow	1
		dark yellow	2

page 3 - IRIS DRAFT UPOV VARIETY DESCRIPTION FORM

29 Style	:width	-narrow	3
		medium	5
		broad	7
30	:color of upper side	-RHS	
31	:color of lower side	-RHS	
32	:color ofupper side of extension	-RHS	
33	:color of lower side of extension	-RHS	
34	:color of veins of extension on its upper side	-white	1
		yellow	2
		blue	3
35	:color of veins of extension on its lower side	-white	1
		yellow	2
		blue	3
36 Stigma	:color	-white	1
		yellowish	2
		bluish	3
37 Under-soil part		-bulb	1
		corm	2

[Annex IV follows]

DRAFT UPOV VARIETY DESCRIPTION FORM

Botanical name of taxon: Limonium

Common name of taxon : Statice

I	Flower color group-			
II	Plant growth type-			
1	Plant	:height	-short	3
			medium	5
			tall	7
2	Plant	:attitude of branches	-erect	3
			semi-erect	5
			horizontal	7
3	Plant	:density of foliage	-sparse	3
			medium	5
			dense	7
4	Flowering stem	:thickness	-thin	3
			medium	5
			thick	7
5	Flowering stem	:wings	-absent	1
			present	9
6	Flowering stem	:pubescence	-absent/very weak	1
			weak	3
			medium	5
			strong	7
			very strong	9
7	Flowering stem	:anthocyanin coloration of internodes	-absent	1
			present	9
8	Flowering stem	:anthocyanin coloration in leaf axil	-absent	1
			present	9
9	Flowering stem	:leaves	-absent	1
			present	9
10	Leaf	:shape	-linear	1
			elliptic	2
			ovate	3
			obovate	4
11	Leaf	:length	-short	3
			medium	5
			long	7
12	Leaf	:width	-narrow	3
			medium	5
			broad	7

DRAFT UPOV VARIETY DESCRIPTION FORM

Botanical name of taxon: Limonium

Common name of taxon : Statice

13	Leaf	:margin	-entire	1
			dentate	2
			dentate at apex	3
14	Leaf	:undulation of margin	-weak	3
			medium	5
			strong	7
15	Leaf	:green color	-light	3
			medium	5
			dark	7
16	Leaf	:anthocyanin coloration	-absent	1
			present	9
17	Petiole	:anthocyanin coloration	-absent	1
			present	9
18	Flower	:size	-small	3
			medium	5
			large	7
19	Petal	:shape	-elliptic	1
			narrow obovate	2
20	Petal	:color of upper side	-white	1
			yellow	2
			orange	3
			pink	4
			red	5
			purple	6
			blue	7
21	Petal	:color of upper side	-RHS	
22	Sepal	:color	-white	1
			blue	2
23	Time of beginning of flowering		-early	3
			medium	5
			late	7

CHARACTERISTICS TABLE

Section of plants ; Flower plants

Kinds of plants ; Statis(Limonium)

Plant Character	Characteristics	Standerd variety	Note(Code)	Remarks
* 1. Growth habit	Only radical leaf		1	
	Both radical leaf and stem leaf	L. peregrinum	2	
* 2. Plant height	Extra short		1	
	Short	L. dumosum	3	
	Medium	Midnight Blue	5	
	Long	L. caspium	7	
	Extra long		9	
* 3. Tiller	None or few	Midnight Blue	3	
	Medium	L. dumosum	5	
	Many		7	
4. Stem:thickness	Fine		3	
	Fairly fine		4	
	Medium		5	
	Fairly thick	Midnight Blue	6	
	Thick		7	
5. Stem:color	Pale	L. bonduellii	3	
	Medium	Midnight Blue	5	
	Dark		7	
6. Stem:pubescence	None or extra few	L. bonduellii	1	
	Few	Rose light	3	
	Medium	Midnight Blue	5	
	Many		7	
	Extra many		9	

* 7. Stem:wing	None		1
	Small	L. altaica	3
	Medium	L. bonduellii	5
	Large	Midnight Blue	7
* 8. Stem:stipule	None		1
	Few		3
	Medium		5
	Many	L. caspium	7
* 9. Branch:number	Few		3
	Medium	Midnight Blue	5
	Many	L. caspium	7
* 10. Branch:length	Short		
	Medium	L. perezii	5
	Long	L. latifolium	7
* 11. Branch:type	I type	L. dumosum	1
	II type	Midnight Blue	2
	III type	L. perezii	3
	IV type	L. altaica	4
	V type	L. caspium	5
	VI type	L. suworowii	6
* 12. Leaf:shape	I type	Midnight Blue	1
	II type	L. dumosum	2
	III type	L. perezii	3
	IV type	L. altaica	4
	V type	L. minutum	5
* 13. Leaf:frill	None or Extra few	L. altaica	1
	Few	L. bonduellii	3
	Medium	Midnight Blue	5
	Many		7

* 14. Leaf:length	Extra short		1
	Short	L. sinensis	3
	Medium	Midnight Blue	5
	Long	L. perezii	7
	Extra long		9
* 15. Leaf:width	Extra narrow		1
	Narrow	L. dumosum	3
	Medium	Midnight Blue	5
	Wide	L. perezii	7
	Extra wide		9
* 16. Leaf:color	Pale green	L. bonduellii	3
	Green	L. perezii	5
	Dark green	L. dumosum	7
* 17. Leaf:luster	Weak	L. caspium	3
	Medium	L. perezii	5
	Strong	L. dumosum	7
* 18. Leaf:pubescence	None or extra few	L. altaica	1
	Few	L. bonduellii	3
	Medium	Midnight Blue	5
	Many		7
* 19. Petiole:length	Short		3
	Medium		5
	Long		7
* 20. Petiole:color	None or extra pale	Midnight Blue	1
	Pale	L. dumosum	3
	Medium	L. latifolium	5
	Dark	L. perezii	7
21. Stalk:angle	Erect	Midnight Blue	1
	Semi erect		2
	Horizontal	L. dumosum	3

* 22. Stalk:number	Few		3
	Medium		5
	Many		7
* 23. Numbers of flowers	Few	Gold coast	3
	Medium	Midnight Blue	5
	Many	L. latifolium	7
* 24. Corolla: direction	upturn	Midnight Blue	1
	others		2
* 25. Corolla:shape	I type	L. altaica	1
	II type	L. perezii	2
	III type	Midnight Blue	3
	IV type	L. dumosum	4
* 26. Corolla:number	Few	Midnight Blue	3
	Medium	L. perezii	5
	Many	L. altaica	7
* 27. Corolla: diameter	Small		3
	Fairly small		4
	Medium	L. altaica	5
	Fairly large		6
	large		7
28. Corolla:length	Short	L. caspium	3
	Fairly short	L. dumosum	4
	Medium	Rose light	5
	Fairly long	Midnight Blue	6
	Long		7
29. Corolla:color	J. H. S C. C		
30. Corolla:number of petal	Few		3
	Medium		5
	Many		7

31. Sepal: shape (front)	I type	L. altaica	1
	II type	Midnight Blue	2
	III type	L. dumosum	3
32. Sepal: shape (side)	I type	L. altaica	1
	II type	Midnight Blue	2
	III type	L. dumosum	3
* 33. Sepal: diameter	Short	L. caspium	3
	Fairly short		4
	Medium	Rose light	5
	Fairly long		6
	Long		7
34. Sepal: length	Short	L. caspium	3
	Fairly short	L. dumosum	4
	Medium	Rose light	5
	Fairly long		6
	Long		7
* 35. Sepal: color	J. H. S. C. C		
36. Flower: fragrance	None		1
	Possess		9
* 37. Flower: blooming period	Extra early		1
	Early	Early Blue	3
	Medium	L. dumosum	5
	Late	L. altaica	7
	Extra late		9
* 38. Flower: ever blooming	Not everblooming		1
	everblooming	L. perezii	2
39. Hardiness	Weak		3
	Medium		5
	Strong		7

40. Heat tolerance	Weak		3
	Medium		5
	Strong		7
41. Botrytis resistance	Weak	L. bonduellii	3
	Medium	Early Blue	5
	Strong	L. altaica	7
42. Insect resistance	Weak		3
	Medium		5
	Strong		7

[End of annex
and of document]