



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agreed by the Council of UPOV, only documents that have been adopted by the Council of UPOV and that have not been superseded can represent UPOV policies or guidance.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

TWV/32/9

ORIGINAL: English

DATE: December 14, 1998

**INTERNATIONAL UNION FOR THE PROTECTION OF NEW VARIETIES OF PLANTS**  
GENEVA

**TECHNICAL WORKING PARTY FOR VEGETABLES**

**Thirty-Second Session**

**Slupia Wielka, Poland, June 29 to July 3, 1998**

**REPORT**

*adopted by the Technical Working Party for Vegetables*

Opening of the Session

1. The thirty-second session of the Technical Working Party for Vegetables (hereinafter referred to as "the Working Party") was held in Slupia Wielka, Poland, from June 29 to July 3, 1998. The list of participants is reproduced as annex to this report.
2. Mr. Edward Gacek, Director of the Research Center for Cultivar Testing, welcomed the participants to Slupia Wielka. He provided participants with an overview of Polish agriculture and a brief introduction to variety testing, listing and protection systems in Poland. In addition, he explained future changes to the systems to adapt to the EU system. The session was opened by Mr. Baruch Bar-Tel (Israel), Chairman of the Working Party.

Adoption of the Agenda

3. The Working Party adopted the agenda of its thirty-second session, as reproduced in document TWV/32/1. It agreed to add to item 7, Cornsalad, Welsh Onion/Japanese Bunching Onion, Onion and Shallot and Rhubarb and to delete items 8(b) Celeriac and Celery, (f) Kohlrabi, (g) Lentil, (l) Horse Radish, (m) Rosemary and (n) Basil.

### Short Reports on Special Problems or Difficulties Encountered

4. Vegetatively propagated varieties of tomato: One expert from the Netherlands reported to the Working Party that there is a significant increase in applications for vegetatively propagated varieties of tomato and leek, which so far have been considered as seed propagated species. He expressed his concern that the vegetatively propagated varieties in these species need to fulfill higher standards, especially in terms of uniformity. The expert from Poland also suggested the necessity of modifying the Test Guidelines for Tomato.

5. Disease resistance characteristics: An expert from the Netherlands reported to the Working Party that the Netherlands General Inspection Service for Vegetable and Flower Seeds (NAKG) had started international cooperation projects to identify and publish (i) new strains of *Bremia lactucae* in lettuce in cooperation with France, and (ii) new strains of *Peronospora farinosa* in spinach in cooperation with the United States. He also informed the Working Parties that the NAKG has started a project for standardizing testing protocols for resistance characteristics.

6. Change in testing organization in the Netherlands: An expert informed the Working Party that the NAKG and NAKB were going to merge, and that seed inspection and trials for vegetable, flower and fruit species will in future be conducted by one organization. He reported to the Working Party that the national listing system does not cover flowers and fruits, but some kind of listing system is needed in order to check the stability of varieties of these crops.

7. Selection of example varieties: The expert from the United Kingdom explained the difficulties in selecting example varieties where the extreme states of expression were represented by hybrid parent lines. Although these lines were in the reference collection, they were not always available commercially.

8. Example varieties: An expert from the UPOV Office explained that a problem with example varieties arising from the world-wide expansion of UPOV was that the example varieties in the Test Guidelines are not suitable for every country. The Working Party noted that, in countries where example varieties in UPOV Test Guideline are not available or cannot grow in their environment, the example varieties may be substituted with other varieties having the corresponding expression.

9. Variety description: The expert from Spain asked the Working Party whether variety descriptions need to be revised after revision of Test Guidelines. An expert from the UPOV Office remarked that it is not obligatory to revise variety descriptions according to the Test Guidelines, and that each country must make its own decision. In some countries it is impossible to change the official variety description. The reference sample is always the basis for the identity of the variety.

### Resistance Tests Offered by Member States

10. The Working Party noted that the Technical Committee had been informed that Circular U 2666 containing a questionnaire on information on disease resistance tests used in national

examinations and on the willingness of national authorities to run such tests on behalf of third countries, had been distributed. The Working Party noted document TWV/32/4 prepared by experts from France summarizing the answers to the Questionnaire.

11. The Working Party made the following corrections to document TWV/32/4:

- (a) Page 3: to have the last line moved to "*Cucumis sativus* L.", "Cucumber/Gherkin."
- (b) Page 4: to add "NL" for *Pseudomonas solanacearum* and *Fusarium oxysporum* f. sp. *radicis lycopersici*.
- (c) Page 4: to combine "*Fulvia fulva*" and "*Pyrenochaeta lycopersici*"
- (d) Page 5 to add the Latin name for Pea, "*Pisum sativum*."
- (e) Page 5: to add "GB" for *Fusarium oxysporum* f. sp. *pisi*

12. Some experts argued that the table needed more detailed information, such as the stage of development of the disease resistance test and whether the test is open to third parties. In addition, they requested that more countries should answer the questionnaire. Finally, the Working Party agreed to continue to update the information by using the present questionnaire format. It also agreed to change the title of document TG/32/4 to "DISEASE RESISTANCE TESTS OFFERED TO THIRD PARTIES."

#### Report on the Last Session of the Technical Committee and Recommendations Resulting from That Session

13. Mr. 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 Rev.

#### Application of COYD and COYU Analysis

14. The Working Party noted that the Technical Committee, while agreeing that several experts had still to gain experience with 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 instead be made to apply the document. Where there were too few varieties, the document would offer an alternative in the long-term LSD criteria.

15. Most experts regretted that the Technical Committee had not listened to the opinion of the horticultural experts and had insisted that the application of COYU and COYD for cross-fertilized varieties was obligatory. One expert explained that the DUSTX program cannot be applied in countries where the testing institute is not equipped with corresponding computer facilities, and that the DUSTX program should be more developed. The expert from the UPOV Office explained that, while the use of COYU and COYD analyses for cross-fertilized species had become obligatory, the use of DUSTX program is only recommended. Some experts also insisted that decisions on uniformity and distinctness should be based not on the COYU and COYD result, but on the judgment of the testing expert. In most cases of

vegetables, testing experts can examine distinctness and uniformity without the use of COY analysis. The expert from the UPOV Office explained that the result of COYU and COYD does not automatically lead to a decision, and that if the expert has a reasonable justification, he may still reject the result of the COYU and COYD analysis. Many experts insisted that the use of COYU and COYD analysis should be not obligatory, but optional.

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

16. The Working Party noted that the Technical Committee finally approved document TC/34/5, which would replace the former document TWC/11/16 for the testing of the 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.

#### Population Standards for Hybrids of Open-Pollinated Species

17. The Working Party noted that the Technical Committee was in principle not opposed to the proposal that only relative uniformity standards should be applied in cases of single cross hybrids of open-pollinated species with high inbred depression or in cases of non-uniform parent lines of such species which are maintained vegetatively. Before being able to take a final decision on such an approach it needed more information, and especially an example setting out a specific case, mentioning the difficulties encountered and reporting on a study of the structure of the hybrid. It noted that the Technical Committee stressed, however, that where the parents did not show uniformity, the national authority would have to see them. If the applicant was not willing to submit the parents, the authority should refuse to call the candidate a hybrid. Several experts insisted that an authority doing official tests would always have to verify whether or not the candidate variety actually was a hybrid. In certain cases that might be obvious from other sources but, if there was no clear indication that the variety was a hybrid, the office should abstain from using the information submitted by the applicant. In the official variety description, only information that had been officially checked should be included.

#### Definition of Off-type, Admixture

18. The Working Party noted that the Technical Committee 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 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 followed the proposal of the TWA which 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 term “could be disregarded” the Technical Committee 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 just one single plant would interfere with the test and could not be disregarded.

#### Prescreening of Varieties

19. The Working Party noted that the Technical Committee had rediscussed the question of prescreening and noted the differing views of the Working Parties. In order to make progress in the discussions, the Technical Committee agreed that some concrete cases would have to be selected and the whole problem further investigated on the basis of them. It had proposed to ask all Technical Working Parties to rediscuss the question of prescreening and to cite examples that would support their position. The Working Party also noted that the Technical 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.

#### Status of the UPOV Test Guidelines

20. The Working Party noted that the Technical Committee had discussed the status of the UPOV Test Guidelines. It noted the only binding obligations on UPOV member States were those contained in the text of the Convention itself, and that 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 form as possible and that decisions were taken in a similar way leading to same or similar results.

#### Variety Denominations and Trademarks

21. 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

22. The Working Party noted that the Technical Committee reconfirmed, 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 information on the status referred to the status of the variety under the legislation on the protection of the environment and on human and animal health.

23. Some experts asked questions on the heading "Breeding method" in the Technical Questionnaire. Following the request of the Working Party, the expert from the Community Plant Variety Office explained the heading of the corresponding question in the Technical Questionnaire of the CPVO. Based on the Technical Questionnaire of the CPVO, the Working Party decided to replace the heading by "Authorization for release" and to place the question as an independent section after "4. Information on origin, maintenance and reproduction of the variety." The Working Party decided to consult the Technical Committee and to send the proposal of the TWV to the chairmen of the other Technical Working Parties.

Testing the First Variety in a Species, Applications for Breeders' Rights in a New Species

24. The Working Party noted that the Technical Committee had discussed the problems of finding varieties of common knowledge and of judging whether clonal material might no longer be new. The discussions mainly centered on the question of how much selection was necessary to enable plant material selected in the wild to be protected. Several experts agreed that this question also included politically sensitive subjects. The Committee therefore had to carefully study the technical and legal problems involved. All experts agreed that it was not possible to seek protection for material merely obtained from a gene bank unless a certain amount of selection work had been done. The intensity of this selection work would have to be judged differently depending on the species concerned.

Judgment of Vectors (Phytoplasma)

25. 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 epiphyte. 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 phytoplasma. However, as long as that fact was not known, there were no consequences. Should it become clear that the phytoplasma was the only difference, the protection of the variety would have to be withdrawn.

### UPOV-ROM Plant Variety Database

26. The Working Party noted updated information supplied by the Office of UPOV on the UPOV-ROM Plant Variety Database. In 1997, six issues of the UPOV-ROM had been issued at two-month intervals. In 1998 the first two UPOV-ROMs had already been distributed and data for the third had been sent to the French firm Jouve for incorporation in a disc. 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's Community Plant Variety Office (CPVO). Discussions were also underway to include the varieties contained in the European Union Catalogue. The UPOV-ROM has also been offered to the private sector since the beginning of the year at an annual subscription price of SF 750 plus postage.

### List of Varieties Under Test

27. The Working Party noted that the Technical Committee had approved the proposal from 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 and that it had proposed that the UPOV Office increase the number of copies given free of charge to each member States from five to seven.

### UPOV Documents in Electronic Form

28. The Working Party reaffirmed 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 a restricted area on its homepage for the reproduction of certain documents.

### Assessment of Distinctness in Species with Low Source of Genetic Variation

29. The Working Party noted with respect to the problem of garlic, in which sexual reproduction has so far seemed impossible that the Technical Committee had been informed by the Office of UPOV that garlic breeders from a firm in the Netherlands had been successful in obtaining some new varieties of garlic by crossing.

### Submission of Samples

30. The Working Party noted that the Technical Committee had rejected the request that the Test Guidelines should require in principle only one single submission of material by the applicant for DUS testing. The Technical Committee recalled that in the past it had decided to allow national authorities some option in deciding whether to require one or several samples, and that option should be maintained in all Test Guidelines, including those prepared by the TWV.



### Application of Recommendations on Variety Denominations

31. The Working Party noted that the Technical Committee had discussed the problem of some breeders applying 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 synonyms.

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

32. The Working Party noted that the Technical Committee had 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. It also noted that the new DUSTW version to run under Windows was expected to be available before the end of the current year.

### Telecommunications, Exchangeable Software and Contacts

33. The Working Party noted that the Technical Committee welcomed document TWC/15/9 containing information on the electronic 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. The Committee 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 that the above-mentioned information was also available on the Internet (<http://www.bioss.sari.ac.uk/links/upov/>).

34. It also noted that an electronic bulletin board for participants in Technical Working Groups will be established by the expert of the United Kingdom in order to facilitate discussion and information exchange on varieties.

### List of Species in Which Practical Technical Knowledge Has Been Acquired

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

### Extended Testing on the Initiative of the Testing Office

36. The Working Party noted that the Technical Committee had difficulty in accepting that it should be left to the testing expert to decide whether further tests should be made where the usual characteristics were not sufficient to establish distinctness, without a special request from the applicant. The Chairman of the Technical Committee finally proposed that the Test

Guidelines should be so well prepared that there should be no need to include new characteristics in the list. That list of characteristics should then be maintained 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 Guidelines would eventually lead.

37. The expert from Spain asked for the meaning of this conclusion in practice, especially, related with a newly developed method, such as electrophoresis. The expert from the UPOV Office explained briefly that the conclusion means that the testing expert should avoid adding or changing characteristics of the Test Guidelines once testing started. The expert from the United Kingdom insisted that, in theory, if the testing expert finds out new clearly distinct expressions in characteristics not included in the table of characteristics of the Test Guidelines, the testing expert cannot ignore those characteristics.

#### 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

38. The Working Party noted that the Technical Committee had noted with approval the report from the Chairman of the Working Group on Biochemical and Molecular Techniques and DNA Profiling in Particular (BMT), which had held its fourth session at Cambridge from March 11 to 13, 1997, as reported in document BMT/4/21. The fifth session of the BMT will take place in Beltsville, United States, from September 28 to 30, 1998. During that session, the BMT plans the following: (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 vis-à-vis 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; (j) Future program of the BMT (date and place of the next session, if any).

#### Chairmanship

39. The Working Party noted that in view of the expiration of the Chairmanship of the Technical Committee of Mr. Joël Guiard (France) with the closing of the forthcoming ordinary session of the Council in October 1998 the Technical Committee had proposed to the Council that it elects Mrs. Elise Buitendag (South Africa) as its new Chairman and Mr. Raimundo Lavignolle (Argentina) as its new Vice-Chairman.

#### Use of Electrophoresis in Cross-fertilized Varieties

40. The Working Party noted document TWA/27/11 reporting on the meeting of the TWA Subgroup on Electrophoresis held in Geneva on April 3, 1998. The Working Party noted that the main conclusion of the Subgroup was that electrophoretic characteristics should not have an independent function for cross-fertilized varieties in DUS testing; a difference in an electrophoretic characteristic alone should not be sufficient to establish distinctness. It should only have supportive function if the crop expert was convinced by other morphological or physiological characteristics that the variety was different. It also noted the request of the Subgroup to study the use of electrophoresis in cross-fertilized varieties in other Technical Working Parties.

41. An expert from the UPOV Office gave a brief report on the discussion of this issue in the meeting of the Technical Working Group for Agricultural Crops (TWA) held in Angers, France, from June 22 to 26, 1998. The TWA basically agreed with the conclusion of the Subgroup that electrophoretic characteristics can be admitted to establish distinctness only if there exists a clear correlation between the electrophoretic characteristics and morphological characteristics. In addition, the TWA concluded that, in the case of a candidate variety whose morphological characteristics are only slightly different, but not sufficiently clear, if the expert is convinced that the candidate is a separate variety, the electrophoretic characteristics can be used as supplemental evidence to establish distinctness.

42. The Working Party supported the conclusion of the TWA and its Subgroup. Some experts stated that the need for electrophoresis in vegetables has not yet arisen. Breeders have not pressed the plant variety protection offices to introduce electrophoresis.

#### General Presentation of Characteristics in Test Guidelines

43. The Working Party recalled the discussions during its last session on document TWF/28/7, prepared by experts from South Africa, and on a collection of certain rules provisionally agreed upon by the Editorial Committee as reproduced in document TWF/28/9. The Committee had asked the experts from the different Technical Working Parties to submit any comments on documents TWF/28/7 and TWF/28/9. Experts were thus invited to send their comments to the Office of UPOV.

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

44. Due to the lack of time, the Working Party did not discuss this item. The chairman asked the participants to check the document and to submit any comments to the Office of UPOV.

### GM Varieties

45. The Working Party recalled its decision to distribute a questionnaire on the release of GM varieties in member States. The chairman explained the draft questionnaire provided by Mr. Brand (France). Some experts questioned the need to ask a general question on national procedures to obtain legal authorization of GM release. Other experts argued that the questionnaire should be limited to questions relevant to DUS testing. The chairman concluded that the questionnaire should not cover the legal aspects of GM release, except for the identity of the competent authority, and should focus on special requirements for the DUS testing of GM varieties. The Working Party agreed that Mr. Brand and the chairman would prepare jointly a draft of the circular in cooperation with the Office of UPOV.

### Duration of Testing

46. The expert from Spain asked the Working Party whether tests in two different locations/environments in the same growing season can satisfy the minimum requirement for testing distinctness and uniformity. The expert from the UPOV Office answered that the phrase "The minimum duration of tests should normally be two similar growing periods," meant that the tests should be conducted in the corresponding growing periods of two different years. The expert from the Netherlands insisted that the words "two similar growing periods" could be interpreted as two tests in different locations/environments in the same growing period or as one test in the spring and another in the fall. He also insisted that, because the objective of repeating DUS tests was to check whether distinctness was influenced by the environment, two tests in different years at one place could be substituted by tests in the same year in different environments and planting times. The chairman also insisted that two tests in different environment in the same growing season should be allowed for certain species, especially for species which can be grown under controlled conditions. The testing expert should have a discretion to choose to conduct the tests in two different environments of one growing season.

47. The expert from the UPOV Office questioned the interpretation proposed. An expert from Poland made a comment from the viewpoint of a statistician that year interaction and environmental interaction should be differently treated in statistical analysis, such as COYU. The expert from Spain asked how the use of COYD analysis could be obligatory if it was not obligatory to conduct at least a second test at the same location.

48. He also suggested that if the tests in two different environments of one growing period were permitted, it should be clearly indicated in the Test Guidelines. Another expert from the UPOV Office expressed concerns that such a change in Test Guidelines would not only give member States a certain flexibility, but would act as a recommendation to member States to conduct tests differently from the current practice. The Working Party agreed to ask the Technical Committee and the other Technical Working Parties for advice.

Discussion of the Changes Decided upon by the Technical Committee to the Test Guidelines (Circular U2691)

49. Mr. Thiele-Wittig presented Circular U2691 on changes decided upon by the Technical Committee to the Test Guidelines for Cornsalad and Welsh Onion/Japanese Bunching Onion.

Cornsalad (TG/75/5 (proj.))

50. The Working Party accepted the decision of the Technical Committee, except for keeping the original number 200 for the minimum number of plants. One reason was that because of direct sowing an excess number of plant was necessary so as to obtain enough plants for observation. The expert from France agreed to provide a new drawing for characteristic 2.

Welsh Onion/Japanese Bunching Onion (TG/161/2 (proj.))

51. The Working Party decided to make the following changes, based on the decision of the Technical Committee and on the response to it from the expert from the United Kingdom:

- (a) to have the minimum number of 200 plants kept for the same reason as in the case of Cornsalad
- (b) to have “(iii) double hybrid” from subsection 4.1 of Technical Questionnaire deleted
- (c) to have characteristic 12 deleted from characteristics used for grouping varieties because of the lack of appropriate example varieties
- (d) to have for characteristics 14 example varieties added: “Rouge” for Note 3, “Spring Slim” for Note 5 and “Kaigaro” for Note 7

Final Discussions of Draft Test Guidelines

Onion and Shallot (Revision) (TG/46/4(proj.))

52. The Working Party noted document TG/46/4(proj.) and comments on that document submitted by the expert from the United Kingdom and made the following main changes to that document, prior to its submission to the Technical Committee for final adoption.

(i) Cover Page: To have the spelling of the Latin name corrected into “*Allium cepa* L., *Allium ascalonicum* L. throughout the document.

(ii) Material Required: In paragraph 1, to have the words “for each year of test.” deleted.

(iii) Methods and Observations: In the paragraph 3, to have the same wording as for document TG/161/2/(proj): Welsh Onion, Japanese Bunching Onion.

(iv) Grouping of Varieties: To have subparagraph (iv) deleted.

(v) Table of Characteristics:

Characteristics

- 3 To have the example variety “Prospero(O)” deleted
- 4 To read “Foliage: green color” and to have the example varieties “Brutus(O)” and “White Knight (O)” deleted
- 6.1 To have the example variety “Hyblenda(O)” deleted
- 9 To have the example variety “Brutus (O)” deleted
- 14.1 To have the example variety “Birnförmige (O)” deleted
- 18 To have the states of expression copied from document TG/46/3, with the example varieties submitted during the session
- 23 To receive the example varieties “La Reine (O)” for Note 1, “Griselle (S)” for Note 2, “Zittauer Gelbe (O)” for Note 4, “Babosa (O)” for Note 5 and “Braunschweig (O)” and “Red Baron (O)” for Note 7
- 25 To read “Bulb/Bulblet: hue of color of dry skin (in addition to basic color)” and to have the example variety “Greenella (O)” deleted
- 28 To have the spelling and the symbol of “Griselle (S)” corrected
- 34.2 To have “75%” replaced by “80%”
- 35 To have the states of expression, “very early” and “very late” deleted and to have the example variety “Sweet Sandwich” deleted

(vi) Explanations on the Table of Characteristics:

Ad. 16: To have the order of the drawings corrected

Ad.18, Ad. 20 To have new drawings

(vii) Technical Questionnaire:

Paragraph

4.1 To read as follows:

“Origin and breeding method

- |                                 |                          |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------|
| (i) Open-pollinated             | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (ii) Single hybrid              | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (iii) Three-way hybrid          | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (v) Clone                       | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (vi) Other (indicate what type) | <input type="checkbox"/> |

4.2 To have the “Authorization for release” included in a new section before paragraph 5 and not under paragraph 4. The Working Party asked the Technical Committee to agree to that for all Test Guidelines (see paragraph 23).

5.5 To be changed according to the changes in the Table of Characteristics.

Rhubarb (Revision), (TG/62/4(proj.))

53. The Working Party noted document TG/62/4(proj.) and comments on that document submitted by the expert from the United Kingdom, and made the following main changes to that document, prior to its submission to the Technical Committee for final adoption.

(i) Methods and Observations: In paragraph 2, to have the number of off-types corrected to “1.”

(ii) Grouping of Varieties: In paragraph 2, to have characteristic 15 added as grouping characteristic.

(iii) Table of Characteristics:

Characteristics

5 To have the order of states of expression reversed

15 To have the example variety “Royal Red” for Note 2 added

(iv) Technical Questionnaire: To have characteristic 15 added in Section 5.

Black Radish (Revision), (TG/63/4(proj.))

54. The Working Party noted document TG/63/4(proj.) and made the following main changes in that document:

(i) Methods and Observations: In paragraph 1, to have the words “in the glasshouse and on 60 plants or parts of 60 plants in the open” deleted.

(ii) Table of Characteristics:

Characteristics

- 1 To have the spelling of example variety “Unus Treib” corrected throughout the document
- 2 To have the spelling of “No. 3” in the example variety “Minowase Summer Cross No 3” replaced throughout the document by “Nr. 3”
- 3 To have the spelling of the example variety “Münchner Bier” corrected
- 4 To have the example variety “Minowase Summer Cross Nr. 3” replaced by “Salvator” and “Servatius” for Note 5
- 5 To be deleted
- 8 To receive the additional example variety “Runder schwarzer” for Note 7 and to have the word “Maraîcher” start with a small letter throughout the document
- 9 To have example variety “Rex” deleted and to have the spelling of example variety “Mantanghong” corrected
- 9a To have a new characteristic added to read: “Leaf blade: hue of green” with the states of expression “absent, yellowish, grayish” with Notes “1, 2, 3”, and with example varieties “Minowase Summer Cross Nr. 3”, “Rex” and “Silver Star” for Note 1, 2 and 3 respectively
- 10 To read “Leaf blade: intensity of green color”, and to receive example variety “Mino early” for Note 5
- 11 To have the example variety “Wiela” for Note 1 added
- 12 To have the example variety “Minowase Summer Cross Nr. 3” deleted
- 13 To receive the example varieties “Omny, Silverstar” for Note 3 and “Rose d'hiver de Chine” for Note 5
- 14a To have a new characteristic to read: “Petiole: anthocyanin coloration” with states “absent, present”, with the example varieties “Omny” and “Noir gros rond d'hiver” for Note 1 and “Rose d'hiver de Chine” and “Violet de Gournay” for Note 9
- 15 To have the spelling of example variety “Runder weißer” corrected and to have example varieties “Rex” and “Minowase Summer Cross Nr. 3” deleted
- 16 To receive the example varieties “Ostergroß rosa 2”, “Rex” and “Runder schwarzer” for Note 3, 5 and 7 respectively



- 17 To have the spelling of the example variety “Tsukushi Spring Cross” corrected
- 18 To have the example variety “Minowase Summer Cross Nr. 3” added for Note 1 and to have a plus sign
- 19 To have the states of expression to read “narrow acute, acute, obtuse, rounded, flat” with Note 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 and to receive the example varieties “Minowase Summer Cross Nr. 3”, “Münchner Bier”, “Tsukushi Spring Cross”, “Runder schwarzer” and “Jumbo Scharlet” for Note 1,2,3, 4 and 5 respectively
- 20 To have the example variety “Rose longue” deleted and to have the spelling of the example varieties “Ostergruß rosa 2” and “Violet de Gournay” corrected
- 21 To have the example varieties “Tsukushi Spring Cross” for Note 5 and “Münchner Bier” for Note 7
- 22 To have the spelling of “Neckarruhm weiß” corrected
- 23 To delete the word “concentrique”, and to add the example varieties “Minowase Summer Cross Nr. 3” for Note 1, “Unus Treib” for Note 5 and “Münchner Bier” for Note 7
- 24 To have the words “de Paris” at the end of the example variety for Note 2 added and to have the second word of the example variety “Green Meat” start by a capital letter
- 25 To add the example variety “Rex” for Note 3

(iii) Explanations on the Table of Characteristics

- Ad. 19 To receive an explanation on which part to be observed and to receive a drawing for Note 5.

Radish (Revision), (TG/64/4(proj.))

55. The Working Party noted document TG/64/4(proj.) and made the following main changes in that document:

(i) Cover Page: To have the Latin name of “*Raphanus sativus* L. var. *sativus* Pers.” corrected throughout the document.

(ii) Conduct of Tests: In the third sentence of the third paragraph, to have the words “in the open” deleted.

(iii) Table of Characteristics:

Characteristics

- 1 To have the spelling of the example variety “Arista” corrected
- 9 To have the asterisk deleted
- 10 To have the word “green” inserted between “of” and “color”
- 17 To have “2” added after “Gaudry” in the example variety for Note 3
- 21 To have states of expression copied from characteristic 19 for black radish and to receive the example variety “Flambo” for new Note 2
- 25 To have the example variety “Demi-long écarlate à très petit bout long 2” for Note 1 corrected
- 28 and 29 To have the order of character 28 and 29 reversed
- 29a Fusarium resistance, which was proposed by the expert from France as a characteristic, will be added with states of expression “absent, present” if a standardized method of examining resistance is submitted by the end of July 98, and if no objections are received in response to a circular on this method from the Office of the Union

(iv) Explanations on the Table of Characteristics

- Ad. 21 To have the states of expression changed according to the table of characteristics, and to have the drawings copied from black radish.

Okra (TG/167/1(proj.))

56. The Working Party noted document TG/167/1(proj) and made the following main changes in that document:

(i) Table of Characteristics: characteristic 19 to have the states “absent or very weakly expressed (1), weekly expressed (2), strongly expressed (3)”, and add a (+) sign.

(ii) Explanations on the Table of Characteristics:

- Ad. 1: To have the Notes corrected according to the Table of Characteristics.
- Ad. 17, 23, and 24: To have the indication of the part for measuring diameter modified so as to make it clear that measurement should be at the middle.

Opium/Seed Poppy (TG/166/1(proj.))

57. The Working Party noted document TG/166/1(proj) and made the following main

changes in that document:

(i) Material Required: The Working Party proposed changing the last two sentences of paragraph 1 in these and all other Test Guidelines where applicable as follows:

“The germination capacity of the seed should be as high as possible and the seed should at least meet the minimum requirements for germination capacity, moisture content and purity for marketing certified seed in the country in which the application is made of.

(ii) Methods and Observations : To have new paragraph 3a inserted to read:

“All observations of the stem should be made on the main stem on single spaced plants.”

(iii) Grouping of Varieties: The grouping characteristic (a) to read

“(a) Petal: color (characteristic 14).”

(iv) Table of Characteristics:

#### Characteristics

- |    |   |
|----|---|
| 2  | To have an asterisk added   |
| 3  | To have an asterisk added and to read “Rosette leaf: white spots”   |
| 4  | To be deleted   |
| 5  | To read “Plant: branching of stem” and to have the example variety “Santa flora” deleted  |
| 6  | To read “Stem: length”  |
| 7  | To read “Stem: anthocyanin coloration (between capsule and upper stem leaf)” and to have the example variety “Edel-Rot” deleted                                     |
| 8  | To have the words “of main stem” deleted, to receive a new state of expression “very strong” and to have the example variety “Edel-Rot” moved from Note 7 to Note 9 |
| 9  | To receive the example variety “Rosemarie” for Note 2   |
| 10 | To be deleted   |
| 11 | To have the example variety “Rosemarie” added for Note 3  |
| 12 | To be deleted   |

- 13 To have the states of expression “sinuate” and “lacerate” deleted
- 18 To have the example varieties “Keops” and “Libra” deleted, and to have the example variety “Kozzmosz” added for Note 3
- 19 To have the example variety “Libra” replaced by “Rosemarie”
- 21 To have the state of expression “biserrate” replaced by “serrate”
- 22 To have an asterisk added
- 23 To have the example variety “Libra” replaced by “Gemonia, Opal”
- 28 To have the example varieties “Gelach, Magik” added for Note 9
- 33 To have the states of expression “pointed to rounded” and “rounded to rectangular” deleted, and to have the spelling of the example variety “Magik” corrected

(iv) Explanations on the Table of Characteristics

- Ad 13: To have new drawings prepared.
- Ad. 17: To have new drawings prepared.
- Ad. 25 and 26: To have an indication of the part for measurement of the length added.
- Ad. 32 To have the size of picture adjusted so as to make the two drawings the same size.
- Ad. 36-39 In the section on Drying, to have the second sentence of the third paragraph deleted and to have a new summary table added before the section on Key for the growth stages.

(v) Literature: To have “Ecology 16 (2):171-178” added at the end of the first literature citation and to have the spelling of the word “Klassifikation” in the third literature corrected, to have journal number and pages for the fifth literature and to have the format of the sixth literature modified accordingly with the format of the other literature citations.

(vi) Technical Questionnaire: In section 4, to have the following subsections added:

“4.1 Origin and breeding method

- (i) open-pollinated [ ]
- (ii) other (please indicate) [ ]”

In the subsection 7.2 (i), to have the words “Use/” deleted. And, in the subsection 7.3, to have the words “(characteristics 36)” added, and to have the example varieties added according to the Table of Characteristics.

Leek (TG/85/4(proj.))

58. The Working Party noted document TG/85/4(proj) and made the following main changes in that document:

(i) Material Required: To have the last sentence of paragraph 1 deleted and to have the layout and wording adjusted to that for Onion and Artichoke.

(ii) Conduct of Tests: To have the words “in the open” deleted from the third sentence of the third paragraph.

(iii) Methods and Observations: The second sentence of the fourth paragraph to be deleted.

(iv) Table of Characteristics:

Characteristics

1 To have the state of expression “low” replaced by “short” and to have the example variety “De Verrieres” deleted

4a To have the characteristic “Leaf blade: length of longest blade” reinserted after characteristics 4 with states of expression “short, medium and long”, and to have the same example varieties and drawings as for characteristic 5 of the previous Test Guidelines for Leek

7 To have the word “weak” and “strong” replaced by “light” and “dark” respectively

13 To receive the example variety “D' Hiver de Saint Victor” for Note 3 and “Bulgaarse Reuzen” for Note 7

14 To have the state “very high” replaced by “very strong”

16 To have the limitations to clonally propagated varieties deleted

17 To have the example varieties deleted

(v) Explanation on the Table of Characteristics

Ad. 2, Ad 11: To have new drawings containing combined explanations for characteristics 2, 5 and 11

Ad. 3, Ad. 4: To have new drawings

(vi) Literature: If available, some literature to be given by the leading expert.

(vii) Technical Questionnaire: In subsection 4.1, to have wording “(based on at least

one clonal parent) added after the word “hybrid” and to have a new question, “(iv) others (please indicate)” added.

(viii) General: Interested experts should send their comments to the leading expert, Mr. Van Marrewijk, by the end of July.

#### Dill (TG/165/1(proj.))

59. The Working Party noted document TG/165/1(proj) and made the following main changes in that document:

(i) Conduct of Tests: In the third sentence of the third paragraph, to have the words “60 single plants” replaced “100 single-spaced plants.”

(ii) Methods and Observations: In the first paragraph, to have the number 20 replaced by 60, the second paragraph to be deleted and the third paragraph to read as follows:

“3. All observations on the leaf, excluding those of the young plant and on the density of the foliage should be made before the appearance of the main umbel. All observations on leaf characteristics should be made in the middle of the stem.”

(iii) Grouping of Varieties: No grouping of varieties is recommended. To have the second paragraph deleted.

(iv) Table of Characteristics:

#### Characteristics

- 1 To read “Young Plant: anthocyanin coloration”
- 2 To read “Young Plant (3 to 5 leaves stage): attitude of leaves”
- 3a To have a new characteristic added after characteristic 3 reading: “Stem: length of the main stem” with the states “short, medium, long”
- 4 To have a plus sign (+) and drawings added
- 5 To be placed after the new characteristic 3a
- 7 To have the word “green” inserted between “of “ and “color”
- 8 To have the states of expression “absent or very weak” and “very strong” added with the example varieties “Diwa” for Note 1 and “Sari” for Note 9
- 9 To be moved before characteristics 9, to read “Stem: diameter (at middle third)” and to receive drawings

- 11 To be deleted
- 12 To receive drawings
- 13 To read “Leaf: width of segments”, to have “thin” and “thick” replaced by “narrow” and “broad” respectively
- 14, 15 To have drawings prepared
- 16 To be checked whether this characteristic should be deleted as it is correlated with characteristic 6
- 17 To read “Leaf: intensity of green color” and to have the states “weak” and “strong” replaced by “light” and “dark”
- 20 To have a word “Main” inserted at the beginning and to receive drawings

(v) Explanation on the Table of Characteristics

- Ad. 1: To be deleted
- Ad. 22 To have the explanations transferred to page 4, “IV. Methods and Observations” and to read “The time of full flowering should be recorded when 80% of the main umbel is flowering”

(vi) Literature: The expert from Germany to supply some literature.

(vii) Technical Questionnaire: To have the section 4.1 to read as follows:

“4.1 Origin and breeding method

- (i) Open-pollinated [ ]
- (ii) Other (please indicate) [ ]

To have a new question “Use (Please indicate intended use)” inserted between 7.2 and 7.3.

(viii) General: The expert from Poland will provide more example varieties to the Office of the Union by the end of August.

Discussions of Working Papers on Test Guidelines

Globe Artichoke (new working paper to be prepared)

60. The Working Party noted documents TWV/32/2 and TWV/32/8 prepared by the expert from France and made the following main changes in document TWV/32/ 2:

- (i) Material Required: To have the fourth sentence to read “As a minimum, for each

year of test the following quantity of plant material or seed is recommended:

- (a) Seed propagated varieties: 100g of seed
- (b) Vegetatively propagated varieties: 60 plants

and to have the last two sentences of II (1) from the Test Guidelines for Rhubarb added at the end of the paragraph.

(ii) Methods and Observations: In the paragraph 1, to have the number of plants for observation increased to 20 and to have the first part of the paragraph after paragraph 1 corrected respectively and the second unnumbered paragraph deleted.

(iii) Table of Characteristics:

Characteristics

- 1 To read “Leaf: lobing” with the states “absent, present”
- 2 To have the Notes “1, 3, 5”
- 5 To read “Leaf blade: intensity of green color (upper side)” and to delete the asterisk
- 5a+b To have two new characteristics included after characteristic 5, 5a “Leaf blade: hue of green color” with the states “absent, yellowish, grayish.” with an asterisk, and 5b “Leaf blade: intensity of gray hue” with the states “light, medium, dark”
- 6 To have the new states of expression “absent or very weak” and “very strong” inserted with Note 1 and 9 respectively, and to have the state of expression “absent or weak” replaced by “weak.”, the example varieties “Verb Globe” to be attributed to Note 1

Due to the lack of time, the parts after characteristic 6 were not discussed.

Industrial Chicory (TWV/30/19)

61. The Working Party noted document prepared by the experts from the Netherlands and made the following main changes in that document

(i) Subject of these Guidelines: To have the word “type” replaced by “chicory” and to add the document number of the Test Guidelines for Leaf Chicory.

(ii) Methods and Observations: The second sentence of the second paragraph to read as follows:

“All observations on the root should be made immediately after harvesting; the assessment of inulin content within a week of harvesting the roots.”



(iii) Grouping of Varieties: No grouping of varieties is recommended. To have the second paragraph deleted.

(iv) Table of Characteristics:

Characteristics

- 1 To have the words “at the end of the first season” inserted and to have drawings added
- 3 To have drawings added
- 4 To have an asterisk
- 5 To be deleted
- 8 To have the asterisk deleted and to read “Leaf: shape in cross section”
- 10 To have an asterisk added
- 12 To read “Leaf: number of incisions of margin”, to have the word “weak” replaced by “low”, and “strong” by “high”
- 13 To be deleted unless more example varieties are given by the expert from the Netherlands
- 14 To have an asterisk added if one or more example varieties can be added
- 15 To have an asterisk added and to read “Root: maximum width” with states of expression “narrow, medium, broad”
- 16 To have an asterisk added, to read “Root: shape of shoulder” with the states of expression “flat, flat to rounded, rounded to conical” and with Note 1, 2, 3 and 4 respectively, and to have drawings added in the same manner as for the Test Guidelines for Carrot
- 17 To be deleted
- 20, 21, 22 To be deleted if no example varieties are given indicated by France

(v) Explanations on the Table of Characteristics

- Ad. 18: To have the explanation of the bulk sample deleted and more information given by the expert from the Netherlands on the measurement or literature cited for the measuring

(vi) Technical Questionnaire: To have the subsection 4.1 to read as follows:

“4.1 Origin and breeding method

- |       |                         |      |
|-------|-------------------------|------|
| (i)   | population              | [ ]  |
| (ii)  | hybrid                  | [ ]  |
| (iii) | synthetic varieties     | [ ]  |
| (iv)  | other (please indicate) | [ ]” |

and to have in the section 5, the characteristic 14 added.

(vii) General: Example varieties will be given to the Office of the Union by the end of September. Some experts remarked that characteristics 18 inulin content may be an important characteristic, but the characteristic is examined from bulk of sample to obtain enough amount of material. Therefore, it may cause doubt in examination of uniformity. The Working Party agreed that, if the Editorial Committee raised questions on the characteristic 18 of inulin content, the characteristic may be deleted. The experts from France and Poland will send comments to the leading expert. The leading expert should submit the revised draft Test Guidelines reflecting their comments by the end of 1998.

Witloof, Chicory (TWV/30/18)

62. The Working Party noted document TWV/30/18, prepared by the experts from the Netherlands and made the following main changes in that document:

(i) Cover Page: To have the spelling of “witloof” and the Latin name “*Cichorium intybus* L. *partim*” corrected.

(ii) Subject of these Guidelines: To have words “leaf chicory” inserted instead of the words “large-leaved”, to have the word “types” replaced by “chicory” and to have the document numbers of the Test Guidelines for Leaf Chicory and Industrial Chicory inserted after each name.

(iii) Conduct of Tests: In the paragraph 3, to have the forth sentence to read “ The same number should be used for forcing.”

(iv) Methods and Observations: In the second paragraph, to have the part of the sentence starting with words “before deterioration” deleted, and to have words “chicon(s)” replaced by “head(s).” To have the third paragraph deleted.

(v) Grouping of Varieties: In the second paragraph, to have the characteristic (ii) to read “(ii) Leaf: color (characteristic 8b)”, and to have the word “Chicon” replaced by “Head.”

(vi) Table of Characteristics:

Characteristics

1 To have the states of expression to read “white only, black only, white or black” and to

have the states of expression clarified by the expert from France with respect to variations in hybrids

- 4 To read "Plant: height at vegetative stage" and to have drawings
- 5a To have a new characteristic inserted to read "Leaf: attitude of tip" with states of expression "erect, semi-erect, horizontal" and with Notes "1, 3, 5"
- 7 To have an asterisk added
- 8 To be deleted
- 8a To read "Leaf: length/width ratio"
- 8b To have a new characteristic "Leaf: color" added with the states of expression "green, red, green and red" with Notes "1, 2, 3"
- 9 To read "Leaf: intensity of green color"
- 10 To have the first state of expression read "absent or very weak"
- 11 To read "Leaf: shape of cross section"
- 12 To have the first state of expression to read "absent or very weak"
- 13 To be deleted
- 14 To have an asterisk
- 15a To be deleted
- 15b To have the words "intensity of" deleted and to have words "absent or" added to the state of expression "very weak"
- 16 To read "Leaf: incision of margin of upper third"
- 17 To have "of upper third" added at the end of the characteristic
- 18 To have example varieties prepared
- 19 To have the states of expression read "strongly pointed, weakly pointed, rounded" and to have drawings
- 20 To have the state of expression "long" replaced by "large"
- 21 To have example varieties to be looked for by the expert from France
- 26 To have example varieties to be looked for by the expert from France

27-35 To have the word “Chicon” replaced by “Head”

28 To have an asterisk

29a To read “Head: length/diameter ratio” and to have the order of the example varieties corrected

29b To read “Head : shape in longitudinal section”

31a-c To have the following characteristics added:

31a “Head: color of midrib” with the states of expression “white (1), whitish (2)”

31b “Head: color of leaf blade” with the states of expression “yellowish (1), reddish (2)”

31c “Head: intensity of color of blade with the states of expression “light , medium, dark”.

32 To be deleted

34 To have the states of expression “open” and “intermediate” replaced by “fully open” and “half open” respectively and the Notes from 1 to 3

35 To have the state of expression “tight “ replaced by “firm”

36, 37 To be deleted

To have the characteristics on page 10 of document TWV/30/18 which relate to performance characteristics and resistance not included in the Table of Characteristics.

(vii) Explanations on the Table of Characteristics:

Ad 4, 6. To have drawings for characteristics 4 and 6

(viii) Literature: To have more literature cited.

(ix) Technical Questionnaire: To have the subsection 4.1 revised reading:

“4.1 Origin and breeding method

(i) Population [ ]

(ii) Hybrid [ ]

(iii) Other (Please specify) [ ]”

In the subsection 7.2, to have the question about “storage of root” deleted and to have the second question to read “period of forcing (state month).”

(x) General: The expert from the Netherlands will provide drawings to the UPOV

Office by the end of September. The revised draft reflecting comments from interested experts should be submitted to the UPOV Office by the end of year.

#### Species for Which National Test Guidelines Are Being Developed

63. No report has been given by the participants on additional species for which national Test Guidelines are being developed. The chairman requested all experts to submit updated information to document, TC/34/4 to the Office of the Union.

#### Status of Test Guidelines

64. The Working Party agreed that the Test Guidelines for Cornsalad (TG/75/5(proj.)) and Welsh Onion/Japanese Bunching Onion(TG/161/2(proj.)) have been approved by the Technical Committee and are, after some appropriate corrections, ready for publication.

65. The Working Party agreed that revised draft Test Guidelines for Black Radish, Leek, Okra, Onion and Shallot, Opium/Seed Poppy , Radish and Rhubarb should be sent to the Technical Committee for adoption.

66. The Working Party agreed that the revised draft Test Guideline for Dill should be sent to the professional organization for comments. If no comments were received from the professional organization, it should be sent to the Technical Committee for adoption. In view of the tight schedule for adoption, the leading expert should submit the revised guideline containing the result of discussions in the subgroup by the first of September to the Office of the Union.

67. The Working Party agreed that the draft Test Guidelines for Industrial Chicory and Witloof should be sent to the professional organization for comments. The leading expert agreed to prepare the revised draft guidelines by the end of 1998.

#### Chairmanship

68. The Working Party noted that the last session of the Technical Committee before the ordinary session of the council in 1999 would take place before its next session. It therefore already now agreed to recommend to the Technical Committee to propose to the Council to elect in 1999 Mrs. Julia Borys (Poland) as new chairman for the TWV.

#### Future Program, Date and Place of Next Session

69. At the invitation of the expert from Germany, the Working Party agreed to hold its thirty- third session at Hanover, Germany, from July 5 to 9, 1999. The Working Party agreed to discuss the following items at that session:

- (a) Short reports on special problems or difficulties encountered.

- (b) Updating of lists of:
  - resistance tests offered by member States (TWV/32/4)
  - species in which technical knowledge has been acquired (TC/34/4)
  - e-mail addresses
- (c) Report on the last session of the Technical Committee and recommendations resulting from that session.
- (d) GM varieties.
- (e) Final Discussions of the draft Test Guidelines for:
  - (i) Garlic (TG/162/1 (proj.))
  - (ii) Industrial Chicory
  - (iii) Witloof
- (f) Discussion of Working Papers on Test Guidelines for:
  - (i) Basil (working paper to be prepared by Mr. Brand (FR))
  - (ii) Broad Bean (Revision) (TG/8/4, TWV32/6) Mr. Green (GB) + subgroup)
  - (iii) Celeriac and Celery (Revision) (TG74/3, TG/82/3; TWV/30/3, working paper to be prepared by Mr. Pfülb (DE))
  - (iv) Curly Kale (Revision) (TG/90/3, TWV/31/7) (Mr. Green (GB))
  - (v) Fennel (TWV/30/6, new working paper to be prepared by Mr. van Ettekoven (NL))
  - (vi) Globe Artichoke (TWV/32/2, TWV/32/8) (Mr. Boulineau (FR))
  - (vii) Horse Radish (working paper to be prepared by Ms. Kristóf (HU))
  - (viii) Kohlrabi (Revision) (TG/65/3; working paper to be prepared by Mr. Pfülb (DE))
  - (ix) Lentil (working paper to be prepared by Mr. Brand (FR))
  - (x) Lettuce (Revision) (TG/13/7; working paper to be prepared by Mr. van Marrewijk (NL))
  - (xi) Rosemary (working paper to be prepared by Mr. Bar-Tel (IL))
  - (xii) Swede (Revision) (TG/89/3, TWV/31/4, TWV/32/5, Mr. Green, (GB))
  - (xiii) Tomato (Revision) (TG/44/7; working paper prepared by Mr. van Ettekoven (NL))
  - (xiv) Turnip (Revision) (TG/37/7, TWV/32/3, Mr. Green, (GB))
- (g) Species for which national Test Guidelines are being developed
- (h) Future program, date and place of next session

70. Several experts proposed that, at its next session, the Working Party should decide on the order of Test Guidelines under discussion at the beginning of the session. The experts from the Netherlands agreed to prepare working papers of the Test Guidelines for Tomato and Lettuce.

71. The request from IPGRI to revise the Test Guidelines for Carrot was not followed, because of the already full agenda with new or revised Test Guidelines for other species.

### Preparation of Documents

72. The representative of the Office of UPOV reminded the Technical Working Party of the agreement to prepare documents for sessions at least one month before the session, and if possible even two months before the session. The chairman also stressed that leading experts should provide documents to the UPOV Office immediately after finishing discussion with the interested experts. In addition, the expert from the UPOV Office requested leading experts to prepare Test Guidelines according to the standardized format. The Working Group asked the UPOV Office to distribute to all leading experts a floppy disk containing the standardized format for Test Guidelines.

73. The experts from the Office of UPOV informed the Working Party that in several cases it was difficult for the Office to receive a file or document by e-mail. They requested that, if the document was sent by e-mail, the sender should write a cover page, including on it information on the content of the attached file and on the computer program and its version used, and should send a hard copy separately by mail or by fax. The expert from the Netherlands suggested the Office of UPOV should distribute a circular about the rules for sending a file/document by e-mail.

74. The Office of UPOV was asked to prepare a Circular inviting experts from States which had not participated in the session to express their interest and send comments and remarks to the leading experts.

75. Finally, the Working Party agreed that documents for the next session should be submitted to the Office of UPOV by March 1, 1999, or in the event of a subgroup by April 1, 1999. It meant that (apart from subgroups) if the Office of UPOV received documents after the first of March, the documents would not be discussed in the next session.

### Presentation from the Expert of Poland and Visits

76. The Working Group was given a lecture on General Information on DUS testing in Poland with special reference to vegetable variety testing. It noted that testing for DUS or national registration covered more than 300 taxa in agricultural crops, vegetables, ornamentals and fruits. In Poland, DUS testing for the purpose of national listing and plant breeders' rights was obligatory, even in the case of varieties for which tests have been conducted in the other countries.

77. The Working Party was also given a lecture by Professor W. Pilarczyk on the use of incomplete blocks designs in trials. He emphasized that, especially in VCU trials when the trial field was not uniform, there was a need for the application of incomplete blocks to increase effectiveness and reduce variance.

78. On Monday, June 29, the Working Party visited the DUS field trials of the Experimental Station for Cultivar Testing at Słupia Wielka.

79. On Tuesday, June 30, the Working Party visited a breeding and seed production company, one of the leading companies in cucumber seed, and was shown breeding, testing

and production fields. The same day, the Working Party visited the Experimental Station for Cultivar Testing in Srem to see the trial fields for the DUS testing of tomato.

80. On Wednesday, July 1, the Working Party visited the laboratory for conducting quality and biochemical tests for VCU, and was given a lecture on the application of electrophoresis for DUS testing of wheat, barely and rye.

81. On Thursday, July 2, the Working Party visited the Department of Information to see the data processing system used for variety testing.

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

[Annex follows]



## ANNEX

## LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

I. MEMBER STATESBULGARIA

Dilian RUSSEV DIMITROV, State Variety Testing Commission, Trial Station Negovan, 1758 Sofia, Tschepinsko schosse 41 (tel.: ++359 2 393 325, fax: ++359 2 393 208)

CZECH REPUBLIC

Radmila SAFARIKOVÁ (Mrs.), ÚKZÚZ, Plant Variety Testing Branch, Hroznova 2, Brno 65606 (tel.: +420-5-4332 1304, fax: +420-5-4321 2440, e-mail: safariko@ooz.zeus.cz)

FRANCE

François BOULINEAU, GEVES, Groupe d'Etude et de Controle des Varietes et des Semences, Domaine de la Boisseliere, 49250 BRION (tel.: +33 (0) 2 4157 2322, fax: +33 (0) 2 4157 4619)

GERMANY

Elmar PFÜLB, BSA, Bundessortenamt, Prüfstelle Rethmar, Hauptstr. 1, D-31319 Sehnde (tel.: +49-5138-60860, fax: +49-5138-608670)

Reinhold BAUER, Bundessortenamt, Prüfstelle Bamberg, Am Sendelbach 15, 96050 Bamberg (tel.: ++49 951 916020, fax: ++49 951 9160230)

HUNGARY

Elisabeth KRISTÓF (Mrs.), National Institute for Agricultural Quality Control, Keleti Károly, u. 24, 1024 Budapest (tel.: +36-1-212 5620, fax: +36-1-212 5800/2122-673)

Marianna FEHER (Mrs.), National Institute for Agricultural Quality Control, Keleti Károly, u. 24, 1024 Budapest (tel.: +36-1-212 5620, fax: +36-1-212 5800)

ISRAEL

Baruch BAR-TEL, PBR Testing Unit, Agricultural Research Organization, P.O.Box 6, Bet Dagan 50250 (tel.: ++972 3 968 3669, fax: ++972 3 968 3669, mobile phone: +972 52 343813)

JAPAN

Keiji TANAKA, Seeds and Seedlings Division, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, 1-2-1, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-Ku, Tokyo 100-8950 (tel.: +81-3-3591-0524, fax: +81-3-3502-6572)

NETHERLANDS

Nico van MARREWIJK, CPRO-DLO, P.O.Box 16, 6700 AA Wageningen  
(tel.: +31-317-476880, fax: +31-317-418094, e-mail: n.p.a.vanmarrewijk@cpro.dlo.nl)

C. Kees van ETTEKOVEN, NAKG, P.O. Box 27, 2370 AA Roelofarendsveen  
(tel.: +31-71-3319102, fax: +31-71-3316256, e-mail: info@nakgrav.nl)

Marian A. van LEEUWEN (Mrs.), NAKG, P.O. Box 27, 2370 AA Roelofarendsveen  
(tel.: +31-71-3319102, fax: +31-71-3316256, e-mail: info@nakgrav.nl)

POLAND

Edward GACEK, COBORU, Research Centre for Cultivar Testing, 63-022 Slupia Wielka (tel.: ++48-061-28 523 41, fax: ++48-061-28 535 58 e-mail: coboru@bptnet.pl)

Stanislaw MUCHA, COBORU, Research Centre for Cultivar Testing, 63-022 Slupia Wielka  
(tel.: ++48-061-28 523 41, fax: ++48-061-28 535 58 e-mail: coboru@bptnet.pl)

Julia BORYS (Mrs.), COBORU, Research Centre for Cultivar Testing, 63-022 Slupia Wielka  
(tel.: ++48-061-28 523 41, fax: ++48-061-28 535 58 e-mail: coboru@bptnet.pl)

Irena MUCHA (Mrs.), COBORU, Research Centre for Cultivar Testing, 63-022 Slupia Wielka  
(tel.: ++48-061-28 523 41, fax: ++48-061-28 535 58 e-mail: coboru@bptnet.pl)

Bogna KOWALCZYK (Mrs.), COBORU, Research Centre for Cultivar Testing, 63-022 Slupia Wielka  
(tel.: ++48-061-28 523 41, fax: ++48-061-28 535 58 e-mail: coboru@bptnet.pl)

Wieslaw PILARCZYK COBORU, Research Centre for Cultivar Testing, 63-022 Slupia Wielka  
(tel.: ++48-061-28 523 41, fax: ++48-061-28 535 58 e-mail: coboru@bptnet.pl)

Elzbieta RADOMSKA (Mrs.), COBORU, Research Centre for Cultivar Testing, 63-022 Slupia Wielka  
(tel.: ++48-061-28 523 41, fax: ++48-061-28 535 58 e-mail: coboru@bptnet.pl)

Danuta WIDLARZ (Mrs.), COBORU, Research Centre for Cultivar Testing, 63-022 Slupia Wielka  
(tel.: ++48-061-28 523-07, fax: ++48-061-28 535 58 e-mail: coboru@bptnet.pl)

Jolanta URBANIAK (Mrs.), COBORU, Experimental Station for Cultivar Testing, 63-022 Slupia Wielka  
(tel.: ++48-061-28 523 07, fax: ++48-061-28 535 58)

SLOVAKIA

Bronislava BÁTOROVÁ (Mrs.), ÚKSÚP, Ústredný kontrolný a skúšobný ústav poľnohospodársky, Matúškova 21, 833 16 Bratislava (tel.: ++42 17 375 454, fax: ++42 17 375 454)

Marcela NOVÁCKOVÁ (Mrs.), Ústredný kontrolný a skúšobný ústav pol'nohospodársky, Matúškova 21, 833 16 Bratislava (tel.: ++42 17 375 454, fax: ++42 17 375 454)

Maria HRIVNÁKOVÁ (Mrs.), Ústredný kontrolný a skúšobný ústav pol'nohospodársky, Matúškova 21, 833 16 Bratislava (tel.: ++42 17 375 454, fax: ++42 17 375 454)

#### SPAIN

David CALVACHE , Ministerio Agricultura, Joaquin Ballester 39, 46009 Valencia (tel.: ++34-96-388 1086, fax: ++34-96-388 1046, ++34-96-388 1003)

#### UNITED KINGDOM

Niall GREEN, Scottish Agricultural Science Agency, East Craigs, Edinburgh, EH12 8NJ (tel.: ++44-131-244-8853, fax: ++44-131-244-8939/8940, e-mail: green@sasa.gov.uk)

### II. NON-MEMBER STATES

#### REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Tae-Jin JANG, National Alpine Agricultural Experiment Station, RDA, Hoengei Doam, Pyoungchang, Kangwondo, 232-950 (tel.: +82 374 35 0641, fax: +82 374 36 5316, e-mail: tjyang@chollian.net)

Jong Soo SHIN, National Seed Management Office, 433 Anyang, Kyunggi-do, 430-016 (tel.: +82 331 40 3675, fax: +82 331 40 3677, e-mail: mrshinjs@ifree.net)

#### ROMANIA

Adriana PARASCHIV (Mrs.), State Office for Inventions and Trademarks, 5, Ion Ghica Street, Sector 3, PO Box 52, 70018 Bucharest (tel.: ++40 (1) 315 90 66, fax: ++40 (1) 312 38 19)

Dana BURCA (Mrs.), State Office for Inventions and Trademarks, 5, Ion Ghica Street, Sector 3, PO Box 52, 70018 Bucharest (tel.: ++40 (1) 315 9066, fax: ++40 (1) 312 3819)

### III. OBSERVER ORGANIZATION

#### COMMUNITY PLANT VARIETY OFFICE

Sergio SEMON, Community Plant Variety Office, European Union, B.P.2141, 49021 Angers Cedex 02, France, F-49021 (tel.: ++33-2-4136 8456, fax: ++33-2-4136 8460, e-mail: semon@cpvo.fr)

IV. OFFICER

Baruch BAR-TEL, Chairman

V. OFFICE OF UPOV

Max-Heinrich THIELE-WITTIG, UPOV, Senior Counsellor, 34, chemin des Colombettes, CH-1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland (tel.: ++41-22 338 9152, fax: ++41-22 733 0336, e-mail: [thiele.upov@wipo.int](mailto:thiele.upov@wipo.int), Web Site: <http://www.upov.int>)

Sumito YASUOKA, UPOV, Associate Officer, 34, chemin des Colombettes, CH-1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland (tel.: ++41 22 338 9030, fax: ++41 22 733 0336, e-mail: [yasuoka.upov@wipo.int](mailto:yasuoka.upov@wipo.int))

[End of document]