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## SUMMARY - CONCLUSION

1. Considerable progress has been made in the Improvement Division, supervised by the Director, Dr. Wonkyi-Appiah, and headed by Messrs. Afrim and Aboagya.
2. This progress relates mainly to selection techniques:

- pollen preparation
- bunch analysis
- seed storage and germinator.

3. Some minor improvements should be made to record keeping procedures, to pollen control, upkeep and clearing.
4. Significant efforts should be made as regards bunch data analysis and data management.
5. For the trials, it is essential to complete bunch analyses and carry out statistical analyses.
6. For the breeding data, it is important to compile parent and progeny lists, draw up trial protocols and organize a practical and functional filing system.
7. The seed production programme will be continued, with few changes.
8. It is recommended that fields 851, 852 and 853 be abandoned, since they are far from OPRI and the University of Ghana has asked for the land.
9. A course lasting around a month is recommended for one of the breeders in 1990.
10. A minimum work programme has been proposed for 1990 , taking account of the various priorities.

We should like to thank Dr. Wonkyi-Appiah for his hospitality, help and interest in the summing-up of our visit. Particular thanks go to Messrs. Afrim and Aboagye for their readiness to help and the interest they showed during our visit.

The reasons for our visit were as follows:

- to look at the way the improvement service at OPRI KUSI is organized;
- to study progress made and developments in improvement programmes;
- updating of the seed production programme.

During our brief visit, we concentrated particularly on defining those aspects that constitute limiting factors for the programme, and which have to be be improved.

## I - THE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMME

The major outlines of the programme were described in IRHO document No. 1940, published in September 1985 (First visit of the plant breeder J.M. Noiret).

The strategy proposed breaks down as follows:

- The general improvement programme, based on reciprocal recurrent selection (RRS).

This involves:

1. Splitting material into two complementary groups, based on production components (bunch number and mean bunch weight)
2. comparative trials of hybrids between individuals from each of the two groups
3. selection of the best individuals from each group, based on the performance of their progeny in comparative trials
4. recombination of the best trees within each group to begin a new improvement cycle.

- Seed production, which consists in reproducing the best crosses from hybrid comparative trials.
- Complementary programmes, carried out in liaison with the main programme, in response to particular aims (disease resistance, interspecific hybridization, etc.).

In the medium term, the targets set for OPRI were:

- Exploitation of the material immediately available at the Centre,
- Introduction of new materials to broaden the available genetic base.


## I.1. The material available and its utilization

It is obvious that the first task consists in making use of the trials already set up at KUSI.

Previous reports (Docs. 1940, produced in 1985, and 1972, produced in 1986) gave a schedule of general observations to be made and trials to be analysed in more detail.

The observations are listed below:

Starting from the planting year (identified as 0), the following observations should be made systematically for the comparative trials:

1. Observation on and percentage of crown disease per cross (Years 1 and 2).
2. Varietal determination (number of dura, tenera, pisifera, abortive, indeterminate trees) per cross. This is carried out once the trees start bearing, and calls for two concordant observations per tree (a third is necessary if the two observations are contradictory).
3. Observation of bearing trees: this consists of the identification, in the field, of dead or replacement trees, typically abnormal trees (poor nursery culling), diseased or illegitimate trees, etc, in order to exclude them from the files. These trees are not taken into account in production summaries. This should be done during the first production year.
4. Production records (bunch number and. weight) for each tree (Years 3 to 9).
5. Bunch analyses: as a rule, 1 bunch is analysed from 40 trees in Year 5 and 1 bunch from the same trees in Year 6.
6. Height measurements: on all trees, the height (to the base of leaf 33) is measured in Years 6 and 10 .

## I.1.1. Trials analysed

The previous report gave details of the observations to be made and the production groupings and analyses to be carried out on trials K13-1, K13-2, K14-1 and K14-2 in particular.

The current situation is as follows for the parent tests. The trials planted between 1967 and 1977 (K1 to K12) are considered to be finished.

- Trial K2-1 was analysed (Doc. 1940, Annex V.1). It revealed the good performance of 3 Deli x Nigeria crosses.

|  |  |  | t/ha 6-9 Bunches | $\begin{gathered} \text { ears } \\ 0 i 1 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | O/M \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5.12D | x 14.892 T | DE $\mathrm{x} \cdot(\mathrm{AB} \mathrm{x}$ AN) | 19.6 | 3.61 | 18.4 |
| 5.1080D | x 15.4382 T | DE $x$ Ufuma | 17.7 | 3.54 | 20.0 |
| 14.525 T | x G145D | $(A B \times C A) \times D E$ | 16.2 | 3.44 | 21.2 |

However, these crosses have a low oil per bunch (milling) percentage. This seems to be widespread with this type of material, and is keenly felt on a commercial plantation level (see P. Vandebeeck, 1989, Large-scale oil palm development and management in Nigeria. Int. Conf. on palms and palm products, Benin City $21 s t-25 t h$ Nov. 1989).

- Trials K3-3 and K3-4 (1969), K4-1, K4-5 and K4-6 (1970) were also analysed (Doc. 1940). They do not reveal any progeny of interest for continued improvement or seed production (yields for $6-10$ years ranged from 1.26 to 2.84 tonnes of oil per hectare). These trials confirm the low industrial extraction rate of the material studied.


## I.1.2. Trials currently being analysed

- Trials K8-1 and K8-2 (1973) would appear to be difficult to exploit, due to missing data and unreliable records. It seems preferable not to waste time on these trials, from which certain crosses could be used to continue the programme.
- Trials K13-1 and K13-2 (1978) are currently being analysed by the Biometry Division. We should like to have the results as soon as possible, in order to modify the seed production programme, if necessary.
- Trial K14-1 (1979) was analysed for the period 83-87. Bunch production results are fairly poor (9 to 14 tonnes/ha), as forecast, since the pedigree of the parents was the same as that of individuals tested in $K 3$ and $K 4$ (Annex I).

Without bunch composition analyses, it is impossible to gain an accurate idea of the value of these crosses. These analyses should be carried out as soon as possible.
I.1.3. Trials since 1980

A list of these trials, with their composition, is given in Annex II.

K16: 1981. Agronomy trial, study of the effect of density, with 8 D x P crosses.

K17: 1984. Trial without replications. Of no interest. Could be cleared, except for $D$ x .

K18: 1983. Ditto.
K19-1: 1985. Agronomy trial: effect of polybag size in the nursery.

K19-2: 1985. Of no interest except for $D$ x $D$ crosses.
K20: 1986. Agronomy trial: intercropping.

|  | Comparative trial with $12 \mathrm{D} \quad \mathrm{X} \quad \mathrm{T}$ and D treatments, 5 replications of 10 trees/plot. |
| :---: | :---: |
| K21-2: 1987. | Comparative trial with 8 D $x \quad$ treatments, replications of 10 trees/plot. |
| K22-1: 1988. | Comparative trial with 7 D $X \quad T$ and $D \quad x$ treatments. |
| K22-2: 1988. Ditto, with 8 D x P treatments. |  |
| K22-3: 1988. Ditto with $8 \mathrm{D} \times \mathrm{T}$ treatments. |  |
| K22-4: 1988. | Comparative trial with 7 treatments, including commercial $D \times P$ treatments ( 1 OPRI +2 IRHO). |
| K23-1: 1989. Comparison of KUSI and IRHO materials. |  |
| K23-2: 1989. | Comparative trial with 10 D $X \quad P$ and $T \quad X$ treatments, 5 replications of 12 trees/plot. |
| Care will be taken with all the trials to carry out the observations recommended in section I.l., particularly the start of individual harvesting of trials $\mathrm{K} 21-1$ and 2 on January |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| 1st, 1991. |  |
| The number of trials and crosses set up in 1987-88-89 reveals the marked resumption of improvement research work at KUSI. |  |
|  |  |
| This positive appearance should not overshadow the considerable |  |
| organizational efforts yet to be made if the trials are to be |  |
|  |  |

## I.2. Future programmes

Developments in OPRI programmes, as described in previous reports, can be summarized as 3 major directions:

- the introduction of genetic material from other research centres, with a view to completing working collections and producing new, improved populations with a wider genetic base
- the use of Elaeis oleifera in interspecific hybridization programmes
- the integration into improvement programmes of vegetative propagation by in vitro tissue culture.

As regards the first field, OPRI has contacted several organizations:

| MARDI | Malaysia |
| :--- | :--- |
| NIFOR | Nigeria |
| LA ME | Côte d'Ivoire |
| MARIHAT | Indonesia |

For the moment, only $N I F O R$ and MARIHAT have replied positively, which means that exchanges with these organizations can be considered in the near future.

- As for Malaysia, we suggest making another request, this time to PORIM: Palm Oil Research Institute of Malaysia, P.0. Box 10620, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia MA 31609 (MARDI has not been involved in oil palm for several years).
- We also suggest contacting the Pobé Oil Palm Research Station, B.P. 1, POBE, People's Republic of Benin.

We feel it would be premature to look at the other two points now, and they will be studied in detail during a future visit.

## II - THE SEED PRODUCTION PROGRAMME

The seed production programme should be revised each year, taking account of trial results, so as to reproduce only those materials that perform best in comparative trials. This ongoing process leads to steady improvements in the quality of the seeds produced, whilst keeping to the same quantities, by eliminating the crosses considered outclassed and replacing them with crosses that perform better.

The trials currently under way have not yet been analysed sufficiently to enable this updating. We agreed to continue the present programme, with a few minor modifications (see Annex III).

- Elimination of the dura of the following progeny:

| 851 | (3a) | 5.368 D | x | G118D | ( 5 | ees) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 851 | ( 3 b ) | 5.642 D | x | 201.32D | ( 6 | trees) |
| 853 |  | 5.1080D | x | P522D | ( 21 | rees) |

This elimination is warranted by the fact that plots 851 and 853 are so far away, at the Agricultural Research Station of the University of Ghana at okumaning, making monitoring and supervision operations difficult (see below: organization). Furthermore, it only involves 32 out of 1017 trees.

- Elimination of the dura of the following progeny:

| 5.1080D ${ }^{\text {D P }}$ (22D | K1 | 19 | dura |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| P518D X D128D | K 6 | 8 | dura |
| P518D $\times$ D118D | K6 | 11 | " |
| P526D $\times$ D674D | K 6 | 8 | " |
| UR452.2 x UR424.7 | K8 | 7 | dura |
| UR424.12 X UR424.7 | K8 | 6 | \% |
| UR555.1545 x UR555.1301 | K8 | 5 | " |

for which numbers per progeny are insufficient.

- Add the following progeny:
851.215 D self ( 65 dura in K 14 and 56 in K 15 ), in addition to the same family planted in $K 4$ and $K 7$, to be used with the same pisifera from 32.3005 T self, 32.2612 T self and 32.3005 T x 32.2612 T, after checking legitimacy.
- the progeny:
1.2209D self (K1)
851.465 T self and $851.253 \mathrm{self}(\mathrm{K} 4)$
$851.168 \mathrm{D} \times 851.464 \mathrm{D}$ (K4)
should not be used, due to their illegitimacy.
Care should also be taken to eliminate the few illegitimate tenera from certain $D$ x $D$ progeny (K9 385, 389, 2022, etc.).

Potential seed production is around 1.5 million seeds per year.

- when a cross is reproduced, the pisifera sample used should be as representative as possible of the progeny used as a pollen source (at least 6 to 12 pisifera). Only 19 pisifera were used from March 1985 to November 1989 for all the families. Steps should be taken to make more balanced use of pisifera for seed production.
- code numbers have been given to each reproduction, making for easier seed management. However, care should be taken not to over-complicate coding, i.e. when the same cross is planted in several different plots, the same code number should apply to all the seeds produced by those mothertrees (e.g. 852.215 D self from K4 and K7 crossed with 32.3005 T self will have the same code).


## III - TECHNIQUES

It is essential to have reliable and standardized techniques when conducting improvement programmes. We noted considerable progress in this field, where the main selection techniques are generally mastered well and used effectively. Only a few small improvements remain to be made.

## III.1. Pollen processing

4 people are involved in bagging, and 2 in packing the pollen in the laboratory. The operation appears to be running smoothly, and the laboratory is fully equipped. A few improvements are still necessary:

- care should be taken to make sure the pollen harvest and preparation books are clear. All the necessary data should be kept in one book, from harvesting date to the number of units prepared. A special notebook should be
used for monitoring (relative humidity, vacuum, germination, etc.) and record sheets kept for each pisifera parent, to keep track of stock.
- the wooden isolation boxes, disinfected with formol, should be replaced as soon as possible with heat-sterilized metal boxes. It has been shown that residual formol vapours can lead to seed abnormalities. Kusi could order two boxes from the La Mé Station in Côte d'Ivoire, to use as models. Thereafter, boxes could be made locally.
- pollen viability and relative humidity should be checked after each batch of pollen is prepared. The equipment and products needed for these checks are already available. When using them, the vacuum in the bottles and viability should be checked if the pollen is more than 3 months old.

It should be remembered that pollens with a germination rate of less than $70 \%$ by the end of the preparation process are eliminated and that relative humidity during storage should be between 3 and $6 \%$.

- pollen that is too old should be discarded (we found pollen prepared in May 1978!). Attempts should be made to use pollen within 6 months and discard it after 1 year.


## III.2. Bunch analyses

The operation as a whole is running smoothly. The oil/mesocarp content is determined using the soxlhet method, in batches of 24. This method is accurate and produces good results. We should merely like to point out the risks of significant errors when attempting to measure small quantities accurately. It is particularly important that the laboratory be air conditioned and that the precision scale be kept clean, in a room at constant temperature and relative humidity. (A new oleometer is available; it would be worth carrying out a few analyses and comparing the results with those for the soxlhet method.

The bunch delivery and stripping area should be kept clean (fertilizer bags removed).

## III.3. Seed storage and germinator

The seeds are stored correctly in an air-conditioned room at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and at $70 \%$ relative humidity.

The germination method used is satisfactory, as shown by the results of the 1989 campaign, where the batches germinated at rates of between 70 and $90 \%$.

This method involves:

- soaking the seeds for 7 days, with the water renewed daily - air drying for 24 hours
- heating for 70 days at $39-40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in plastic bags holding 1000 seeds each
- $\quad 3$ days' re-soaking with a Dithane treatment (1.5 g/litre)
- $\quad 3$ hours' drying out of excess moisture and packing in bags kept at ambient temperature for 2 weeks. Weekly sorting for 10 weeks.


## III.4. Prenursery - nursery

There was little material to be seen during our visit. However, we did note a high number of dead plants (blast) and bags tipped over or poorly filled. We suggest greater care be taken with the setting up, upkeep and cleaning of nurseries and their surroundings, since their appearance always makes a lasting impression on visitors. Well organized nurseries also ensure more effective selection, hence more homogeneous plantings.

## IV - MANAGEMENT - ORGANIZATION

Despite the valiant efforts of Messrs. Afrim and Aboagye to ensure that the Breeding Service operates effectively, there is still room for improvement. We would attach particular importance to these organizational problems, which govern the effectiveness and sustainability of the work carried out by the service. We feel that priority should be given to solving them, before any other activities are started on.

## IV.1. Parent and progeny catalogues

It is currently difficult to obtain pedigree details quickly for a given tree or family.

For example: taking treatment 20 of trial $k 22-3$, it is very difficult to know to what the cross Kl 3905D x K3 735T corresponds. The map of trial Kl has to be consulted and tree No. 3905 found, to see which family it belongs to, then the same thing has to be done for trial K 3 , etc.

What is difficult now will become extremely complicated once the number of progeny and trees planted and the number of generations increase.

2 catalogues should be drawn up as soon as possible:

- a parent book: this will contain, in numerical order, all the trees chosen and used as parents (numbers are given in chronological order). Alongside the number, the number of the family the parent belongs to and the field identification number of the tree, and possibly its characteristics, are also given.
- the progeny book, in which all the progeny produced are also classified in chronological order. Each cross entry
also contains the male and female parent numbers, their identification numbers and the progeny the cross belongs to.

These two catalogues mean that the pedigree of any tree or progeny can be traced easily. Annexes IV.1. and IV.2. give an example of each catalogue used at La Mé, which could be used as models at KUSI (when the catalogues are drawn up, their future computerization should be borne in mind).

## IV.2. Protocols and files

Each trial planted should have an experimental protocol including: aims, planting material, planting design, map, planned observations and any information judged useful for conducting the trial.

Annex IV.3. gives an example of such a protocol, drawn up for a trial in Indonesia, which could be used as a model.

Particular efforts should be made as regards filing. In particular, we suggest that a complete file be produced for each genetic trial, including the protocol, various observations on varietal determination, crown disease, height, etc., leaf analyses and fertilizer details, year by year production results and groupings, bunch and oil analyses, end of campaign and end of trial reports, etc.

## IV.3. Observation programme

With a view to making work and coordination between the various units easier, it would be useful to draw up an observation programme before the start of each campaign.

- For bunch production: list of trials and number of individually harvested trees, list of trials to be halted, etc.
- For bunch analyses: list of crosses to be analysed, number of trees to be analysed, number of analyses per tree, etc. (this means that the progress made in the programmes can be checked regularly and adjustments made if necessary).

It would also be useful to give the Biometry Service a list of statistical analyses to be carried out, shortly before the end of each campaign.

## IV.4. Use of the okumaning fields

Trials 851-852-853 were planted on University of Ghana land between 1961 and 1966 . The fact that they are a long way from the KUSI Centre means they are difficult to monitor, and the University now wants to reclaim the land for other uses.

We feel that these trials could be halted, insofar as the various materials introduced into Ghana are well represented at KUSI (NIFOR material in Kl-K2-K3-K4, Deli and Chemara material in $\mathrm{K} 6-\mathrm{K} 8-\mathrm{K} 9$, etc.) and certain fields are entirely duplicated (Field 853 in Kl ).

## V - STAFF

Under the supervision of the Director of the Institute, the Improvement Division is headed by Messrs. K.B. Afrim (pollination, germination, nurseries, records) and L.M. Aboagye (bunch analyses, seed production), with assistance from technical officers Saban Arma and S.W. Ohene-Tutu.

Messrs. Afrim and Aboagye know their programmes well, and have shown enthusiasm for and interest in all aspects of oil palm improvement. The fact that the services are running smoothly is proof of their efficiency. They should be encouraged in this, and could usefully benefit from work carried out elsewhere, particularly as regards organizing and managing the improvement programme. We suggest that they make a certain number of visits outside Ghana, for example:

- a 15-day visit to NIFOR (Nigeria), 8 days at Pobé (Republic of Benin), 8 days at La Mé (Côte d'Ivoire), concentrating on improvement methods, trial and data management (Mr. Afrim in 1990?)
- a 15-day visit to MARIHAT (Indonesia), 15 days in Malaysia, concentrating on seed production and observation techniques (Mr. Aboagye in 1991?).

We were also impressed by Mr. Tweneboach, the biometrician, and it would also be a good idea for him to visit the IRHO Biometry Division in Montpellier to look at the types of processing and software used for oil palm trials.

We should also like to stress the necessity of installing air conditioning in Mr. Afrim's office.

## VI - WORK PROGRAMME

Significant progress has been made in organizing various sections involved in artificial pollination, bunch analyses, seed preparation, etc.

Major efforts should still be made, however, as regards conducting trials and data management and filing. We suggest the following work programme for 1990, in order of priority:

- complete the bunch analyses for trials K13 and K14 (draw up a special programme to catch up on the backlog), produce a summary of results
- finish off the statistical analysis of trials K13-1, K13-2 and K14-1 as regards the characters bunch number, mean bunch weight, total bunch weight and oil production per year and per group of years (means for 82 to 84,85 to 88 and 82 to 88 for $K 13$ and 83 to 85,86 to 89 and 83 to 89 for K14)
- set up parent and progeny catalogues, draw up trial protocols and set up a filing system for trials and files
- continue the seed production programme given in the annex
- re-launch contacts with foreign Research Centres for introducing new material
- plan for one of the two breeders to go on a course of around a month.

A N NEXES

FOR TRIAL K14-1 (1979)

## I.I - Number of bunches


I. 2 - FFB

|  | Progeny |  | 83 | 84 | 85 | 86 | 87 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Average } \\ & 83-87 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} T / \mathrm{ha} \\ 84-87 \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 3967D | x 851.805P | 24 | 61 | 78 | 103 | 99 | 12,0 | 12,6 |
| 2 | 4910 | x 851.106P | 18 | 41 | 72 | 95 | 89 | 10,4 | 11,0 |
| 3 | 937D | x 851.44P | 19 | 46 | 70 | 98 | 133 | 9,7 | 10,2 |
| 4 | 177D | x 853.912P | 19 | 21 | 80 | 83 | 81 | 9,4 | 9,9 |
| 5 | 739D | x 851.115P | 31 | 52 | 94 | 96 | 103 | 12,4 | 12,8 |
| 6 | 499D | x 853.912 P | 27 | 54 | 96 | 130 | 115 | 13,9 | 14,6 |
| 7 | 410D | x 851.805P | 21 | 48 | 64 | 79 | 82 | 9,6 | 10,1 |
| 8 | 757D | x 851.106P | 17 | 42 | 70 | 89 | 87 | 10,0 | 10,6 |
| 9 | 7010 | x 851.44P | 27 | 38 | 76 | 137 | 101 | 12,5 | 13,0 |
| 10 | 409D | $\times 851.805 \mathrm{P}$ | 23 | 48 | 72 | 77 | 87 | 10,1 | 10,5 |
| 11 | 875D | $\times 851.1151$ | 24 | 45 | 61 | 98 | 105 | 10,9 | 11,4 |
| 12 | 874D | $\times 851.805 p$ | 30 | 53 | 66 | 99 | 103 | 11,5 | 11,9 |
| 13 | 875D | $\times 851.1062$ | 22 | 42 | 59 | 71 | 95 | 9,5 | 9,9 |
| 14 | 660D | $\times 851.8051$ | 25 | 44 | 88 | 93 | 90 | 11,2 | 11,6 |
| 15 | 788D | $\times 851.805 \mathrm{P}$ | 24 | 55 | 72 | 105 | 106 | 11,9 | 12,6 |
| 16 | 7910 | $\times 851.115 \mathrm{P}$ | 30 | 65 | 98 | 111 | 106 | 13,4 | 14,0 |
|  |  |  | 24 | $\overline{47}$ | $\overline{76}$ | 98 | 99 | 11,1 |  |

## I. 3 - Bunch weight $84-87$ according to parental origin

| Origin | P parent | No. of crosses | Total weight T/ha | Rank | Dura origin |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| COLABAR | 805P | 1 | 12.6 | 5 | Serdang |
|  |  | 7 | 10.1 | 14 | Serdang x Deli |
|  |  | 10 | 10.5 | 11 | Serdang x U.B. |
|  |  | 12 | 11.9 | 7 |  |
|  |  | 14 | 11.6 | 8 | Serdang |
|  |  | 15 | 12.6 | 6 | Serdang x Deli |
|  | 106 P | 2 | 11.0 | 10 | Serdang |
|  |  | 8 | 10.6 | 12 |  |
|  |  | 13 | 9.9 | 15 | Deli |
|  | 44 P | 3 | $10.2$ | 13 | Deli |
|  |  | 9 | $13.0$ | 3 | Angola |
|  | 115P | 5 | 12.8 | 4 | Serdang |
|  |  | 11 | 11.4 \% | 9 | Deli |
|  |  | 16 | 14.0 | 2 | Nigeria |
| ABA | 912P | $\begin{aligned} & 4 \\ & 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 9.9 \\ 14.6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 16 \\ 1 \end{array}$ | Serdang |

Results are difficult to interpret unless specific combining ability is excellent (unlikely). For example, 912P, with 2 Serdang dura, produces both the first and the last-placed cross.
Progeny $\mathrm{n}^{\circ}$ Cross 오 source $\sigma^{7}$ source Origin

Field K17, 1984
Experiment Kl7. Unreplicated block (DxD only)

| 32 | 853.743AD $\times$ Kl. 3900 D | 1.2209AD self | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 5.2153 Deli } \\ & \times .5 .642 \mathrm{Deli} \end{aligned}$ | Angola x Deli |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 34 | K1.3905D x 853.743AD | $\begin{aligned} & 5.2153 \mathrm{Deli} \\ & \times 5.642 \mathrm{Deli} \end{aligned}$ | 1.2209D self | Deli x Angola |
| 40 | 851.163D $\times 851.163 \mathrm{D}$ | $201.32 \times \mathrm{G} 98$ | $201.32 \times \mathrm{G} 98$ | Deli x Deli |
| 37 | 851.429D self | $201.32 \times \mathrm{G98}$ | $201.32 \times \mathrm{G98}$ | Deli $\times$ Deli |
| 38 | 853.805AD $\times$ K1.2375D | 1.2209AD self | 5.37 Deli self | Angola x Deli |
| 33 | 853.803AD $\times$ Kl.3905D | 1.2209 AD self | $\begin{aligned} & 5.2153 \text { Deli } \\ & \times 5.642 \text { Deli } \end{aligned}$ | Angola x Deli |
| 35 | K1. $3749 \times 853.684 \mathrm{AD}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 5.2153 Deli } \\ & \times 5.642 \text { Deli } \end{aligned}$ | 1.2209 AD self | Deli x Angola |
| 36 | Kl. 3900D x 853.684AD | $\begin{aligned} & 5.2153 \text { Deli } \\ & \times 5.642 \text { Deli } \end{aligned}$ | 1.2209 AD self | Deli x Angola |
| 39 | K1.3747D $\times$ Kl.3747D | $\begin{aligned} & 5.2153 \text { Deli } \\ & \times 5.642 \text { Deli } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 5.2153 Deli } \\ & \times 5.642 \text { Deli } \end{aligned}$ | Deli x Deli |

Field K18, 1983
Experiment K18. Unreplicated block (DxD only)

| 1 | 853.743D $\times 853.743 \mathrm{D}$ | 5.2153 Deli | 5.2153 Deli | Deli x Deli |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 | 851.410D x 851.637D | $\times 5.642 \mathrm{Deli}$ | $\times 5.642 \mathrm{Deli}$ |  |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 5.642 \mathrm{D} \\ & \times 201.32 \mathrm{D} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.642 \text { Deli } \\ & \times \mathrm{G} 98 \mathrm{Deli} \end{aligned}$ | Deli x Deli |
| 4 | 851.637D x 851.637D | 5.642 Deli | 5.642 Deli | Deli x Deli |
|  |  | x G98 Deli | x G98 Deli |  |
| 5 | 851.410D $\times 851.410 \mathrm{D}$ | 5.642D | 5.642 D | Deli x Deli |
|  |  | $\times 201.32 \mathrm{D}$ | $\times 201.32 \mathrm{D}$ |  |
| 6 | 851.369D $\times 851.369 \mathrm{D}$ | 5.642 D | 5.642 D | Deli x Deli |
|  |  | $\times 201.32 \mathrm{D}$ | $\times 201.32 \mathrm{D}$ |  |
| 8 | K1.3753D $\times$ Kl.3753D | 5.2153 Deli | 5.2153 Deli | Deli x Deli |
|  |  | $\times 5.642$ Deli | $\times 5.642$ Deli |  |
| 12 | Kl.3753D x Kl.3753D | 5.2153 Deli | 5.2153 Deli | Deli x Deli |
|  |  | x 5.642 Deli | x 5.642 Deli |  |

Field K19-2, 1985
Experiment K19-2. Unreplicated block

| 8 | Kl.3747D $\times$ K1.3747D | Deli $\times$ Deli |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 9 | K4.621D $\times$ K4.621D | Deli $\times$ Deli |



Field K21-2, 1987
Experiment $\mathrm{K} 21-2$. Unreplicated block

| 11 | K4.41D x 851.805P | Deli xCal |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12 | K4.125D x 851.805P | Deli x Cal |
| 13 | K4.372D x 851.805P | Deli x Cal |
| 14 | K4.373D x 851.805p | Deli $\times$ Cal |
| 15 | K4.374D x 851.805P | Deli $\times$ Cal |
| 16 | K4.621D x 851.805P | Deli $\times$ Cal |
| 17 | K4.622D x 851.805P | Deli $\times$ Cal |
| 2 | K1.3747D $\times$ K3.880P SID Cross | Deli $\times$ Cal |

Field K21-1, 1987
Experiment $\mathrm{K} 21-1$. Unreplicated block

## Parents

| 1 | K1.3747D $\times$ K3.734T | Deli x Cal |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | K1.3747D $\times$ K3.880p Standard | Deli $x$ Cal |
| 3 | Kl.3749D $\times$ K3.782P | Deli $x$ Cal |
| 4 | K1.3905D $\times$ K3.735T | Deli $x$ Cal |
| 5 | 851.410D $\times$ K3.375T | Deli $x$ Cal |
| 6 | K2.1548D $\times$ K1.4591T | Deli x (Aba $\times$ Ang) |
| 7 | K1.3900D $\times \mathrm{Kl} .5051 \mathrm{P}$ | Deli x Aba |
| 8 | Kl.5041T $\times$ Kl.3749D | Aba $x$ Deli |
| 9 | K1.3202D $\times$ Kl.3360p | Deli x Aba |
| 10 | K1.2793T $\times$ 853.684D | Aba $x$ Ang. |
| 29 | K3.879T x K1.3749D | Cal $x$ Deli |
| 37 | K1.3905D $\times$ K3.831T | Deli $\times$ Cal |

Grand-parents

| 1 | (5.2153 Deli $x$ 5.642 Deli) $\times 32.2612 T$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | x |
| 3 | x |
| 4 | X " |
| 5 | x |
| 6 | 5.12 Deli self x l4.892T self |
| 7 | (5.2153 Deli $\times 5.642$ Deli) $\times 4.1823 T$ self |
| 8 | $4.1823 T$ self x (5.2153 Deli x 5.642 Deli$)$ |
| 9 | 5.37 Deli self $\times 4.17 \mathrm{~T}$ self |
| 10 | 4.17 T self $\times 1.2209 \mathrm{D}$ self |
| 29 | 32.2612T self x (5.2153 Deli x 5.642 Deli) |
| 37 | (5.2153 Deli x 5.642 Deli) $\times 32.2612 \mathrm{~T}$ self |

Field K22, 1988
Experiment K22. Unreplicated block
Parents

| 21 | K4.662D x 851.805P | Deli $\times$ Cal |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 25 | Kl.3749D self | Deli $\times$ Deli |
| 26 | Kl.3900D self | Deli x Deli |
| 27 | Kl.3202D $\times 853.743$ | Deli x Ang |
| 28 | Kl.3957D $\times$ Kl.3900D | Deli $x$ Deli |
| 29 | K1. 2375 self | Deli $x$ Deli |
| 30 | Kl.3905D self | Deli $\times$ Deli |
| 31 | 851.637D self | Deli $x$ Deli |
| 32 | K1.3749D $\times$ K3.782P | Deli x Cal |
| 33 | K4.372D x 851.805P | Deli $\times \mathrm{Cal}$ |
| 34 | K4.125D $\times$ 851.805P | Deli $\times$ Cal |

Field K22-1, 1988
Experiment K22-1. Unreplicated block

| 1 | K1.3291T $\times$ K2.1588D | (Aba $x$ Ang.) $x$ Deli |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | K1.3753D $\times$ K3.688P | Deli $\times$ Cal |
| 3 | K3.831T $\times$ Kl.3900D | Cal $\times$ Deli |
| 4 | K3.879T X K1.3749D | Cal $\times$ Deli |
| 5 | K1.3957D X K3.734T | Deli $\times$ Cal |
| 6 | Kl. $3747 \times \mathrm{K3} .880 \mathrm{P}$ Standard | Deli $x$ Cal |
| 7 | K1.3905D $\times$ K3.831T | Deli $\times$ Cal |

Field K22-2, 1988
Experiment K22-2. Unreplicated block
$8 \mathrm{~K} 4.41 \mathrm{D} \times 851.805 \mathrm{P}$
Deli $\times$ Cal
9 K4.206D $\times 851.107 \mathrm{P}$ Deli
10 K4.125D x 851.107P Deli
11 K4.374D $\times 851.805 \mathrm{P}$
12 K4.788D $\times 851.107 \mathrm{P}$
13 K4.538D $\times 851.805 \mathrm{P}$
Deli x Cal Deli
Deli $\times$ Cal
Deli
6 Kl.3747D x K3.880P Standard

Field K22-3, 1988
Experiment K22-3. Unreplicated block
$15 \mathrm{Kl} .3480 \mathrm{~T} \times \mathrm{Kl} .3905 \mathrm{D}$
$16 \mathrm{Kl} .3900 \mathrm{D} \times \mathrm{Kl} .2711 \mathrm{~T}$
$17 \mathrm{Kl} .3480 \mathrm{~T} \times \mathrm{Kl} .3202 \mathrm{D}$
$18 \mathrm{Kl} .2375 \mathrm{D} \times \mathrm{Kl} .2793 \mathrm{~T}$
$19 \mathrm{Kl} .2793 \mathrm{~T} \times 853.684 \mathrm{D}$
$20 \mathrm{Kl} .3905 \mathrm{D} \times \mathrm{K3} .735 \mathrm{~T}$
6 Kl.3747D x K3.880P Standard
(Aba $\times$ Ang) $\times$ Deli Deli $x$ Aba
(Aba $x$ Ang) $x$ Deli
Deli x Aba
Aba $x$ Ang Deli x Cal Deli x Cal

Field K22-4, 1988
Experiment K $22-4$. Unreplicated block
22 OPRC ( $\mathrm{D} \times \mathrm{P}$ mixed)
23 C7128 ( $\mathrm{D} \times \mathrm{P}$ IRHO)
24 C4301 ( $\mathrm{D} \times \mathrm{P}$ IRFO)
6 KL.3747D x K3.880P Standard
Deli x Cal
8 K4.41D x 851.805P
10 K4.125D x 851.107P
$2 \mathrm{Kl} .3753 \times \mathrm{K3} .688 \mathrm{P}$

ANNEX III
CROSSING PLAN FOR SEED PRODUCTION IN 1990 :


Sent by DSE/SEL 505 dated 27th October 1977
sheet $\mathrm{si}^{*} 101$
LA ME PARENT CATALOGUE

| family | Parent | I.D. Nb. | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{TO} \\ & \mathrm{~kg} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{PO} \\ & \mathrm{~kg} \end{aligned}$ | NB | FFB | MBW | Na | \%NF | * M | *K | $\% 0$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{l} \mathrm{No} \\ \mathrm{Oa} \end{array}\right\|$ | \%PO | 9'T0 | FW | KW | doserved |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| chro37 | L36500 | E.42.15.23 | 6,3 | 3.9 | 4.5 | 25 | 5.6 | 4 | 68.9 | 73, 3 | 4,4 | 46.5 | 4 | 23.5 | 25,0 | 12,3 | 0,5 | 6-7 yrs |
| , | L36510 | E.42.16.24 | 19,7 | 18,6 | 11.0 | 70 | 6.4 | 4 | 70.2 | 75.5 | 4,9 | - | 4 | 26,5 | 28.2 | 13.9 | 0.7 |  |
| ${ }_{5}$ | L3652D | E.42.33.6 | 13.0 | 11.9 | $\bigcirc, 0$ | 60 | 6,7 | 2 | 69,4 | 68.1 | 5.5 | 42,0 | 2 | 19,8 | 21.7 | 16,2 | 0,8 |  |
| $4 \times$ | L3653D | E.42.33.3 | 7,9 | 7,2 | 4,5 | 29 | 6,4 | 2 | 76,3 | 67,8 | 6,1 | 47.9 | 2 | 24,8 | 27.1 | 11,8 | 0,7 |  |
| flM1263 | L3654D | D.55.22.2 |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | . 8 | 70,9 | 5.3 | - | 2 | 25,1 | 27.0 | 14,1 | 0,8 | n |
|  | L3655D | 0.55.22.13 |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | . 0 | 63,2 | 7.4 | 48,2 | 2 | 23.2 | 26.0 | 12,7 | 0,9 |  |
|  | L3656D | D.53.23.2 | 4.4 | 4.1 | 2.8 | 15 | 3.9 | 3 | 2 | 69,5 | 5.7 | 53.1 | 3 | 27,0 | 29,1 | 13.1 | 0,7 |  |
|  | L3657D | D.55.23.7 | 1,7 | 1,5 | 2.3 | 8 | 3.5 | 3 | , 3 | 65.7 | 6.6 | 41.3 | 3 | 19.1 | 21.4 | 14.4 | 0,9 |  |
|  | L3658D | D.55.24.7 |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 65, 9 | 69,7 | 5.9 | 46.6 | 3 | 21,4 | 23:3 | 14,7 |  |  |
| - | L36590 | D. 55.26.24 | 9,2 | 8,4 | 0.5 | 4 | 8,0 | 3 | 72,3 | 1 | 5.6 | 44,7 | 2 | 21,0 | 23,0 | 10.3 | ,6 |  |
|  | L3660D | D.55.26.28 |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | , 0 | . 0 | 6.4 | - | 2 | . 4 | 25.7 | 13,6 | 0,9 |  |
|  | L3661D | D.55.27.17 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | . 0 | 61,3 | 8.9 | 52,8 | 1 | : 4 | 2,1 | 13,1 | , 2 |  |
| SOO 355 | L3662D | E.41.4.3 | 18,4 | 16.3 | 7.3 | 83 | 11.4 | 7 | , 9 | 67,4 | 8.3 | , 9 | 7 | 19.6 | 22,2 | 12,2 | , 0 | 6-8 yrs |
| 3 | L3663D | E.42.27.17 | 8.9 | 7.7 | 5.5 | 40 | 7.3 | 3 | 66.3 | 63.8 | 8,1 | 45.6 | 3 | 19,3 | 22,3 | 16,8 | 1,5 | 6-7 yrs |
| n | L3664D | E. | 6.8 | 5.7 | 3.0 | 36 | 12.0 | 5 | . 6 | 61.6 | 9.6 | 37.8 | 5 | 15,7 | 18.9 | 13,4 | 1.3 |  |
|  | L3665D | E.42.28.16 | 5.2 | 4,7 | 5,0 | 20 | 4,0 | 4 | , 4 | 65.9 | 6,7 | 52,9 | 4 | 23,5 | 25,8 | 17,4 | 1,2 |  |
| Po 437 | L3666D | F.51.11.17 | 7.0 | 6.3 | 6,7 | 26 | 3.9 | 2 | 66,7 | 66.8 | 7,2 | 54,8 | 2 | 24,4 | 26.8 | 16,6 | , 2 | V |
| \%1 10 | L3667T | E.40.22.01 | 29,9 | 27.7 | 5,3 | 119 | 7,8 | 8 | . 0 | 83.7 | 6,2 | 48,8 | 8 | 23.3 | 25.1 | 11,7 | 0,7 |  |
| n | L3668 | E.40.22.09 | 42,2 |  | 13.3 | 160 | 12,0 | 5 | , 3 | 87.4 | 6,0 | 48.4 | 5 | 24,7 | 26.4 | 15,6 | 0.9 |  |
| " | 13669 | .22.11 | 32,4 | 30.2 | 4,7 | 135 | 9.2 | 8 | 13 | 86.8 | 5,9 | 47.5 | 8 | 22,4 | 24.0 | 13,0 | 0,8 |  |
|  | L3670 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | E.40.22.20 | 37.2 | 35,6 | 16,0 | 132 | 8.3 | 7 | 65,9 | .3 | 3.7 | 45.4 | 7 | 27.0 | 28,2 | 15,9 | 0.6 |  |
|  | L3671T | E.40.23.4 | 38,6 | 35.2 | 17.0 | 153 | 9.0 | 10 | 58, | 84.4 | 7.4 | 46.6 | 10 | 23.0 | 25.2 | 7.9 | 0,6 |  |
| swa 11 | L3672T | E.40.18.7 | 33.1 | 29.0 | 15.7 | 123 | 7.8 | 9 |  | , 5 | . 3 |  | 9 | 23,6 | 26.9 | 10,5 | , 0 |  |
|  | L3673T | E.40.29.23 | 32,8 | 30.7 | 15.0 | 129 | 8,6 | 10 | , 9 | . 9 | 5.4 | 44,6 | 10 | 23.8 | 25.4 | 10,7 | 0,6 |  |
| 299 | L3674 | E.53.17.21 | 24,3 | ,2 | 21,3 | 111 |  | 4 |  | 71,8 | 12,7 |  | 4 | , 2 | 21,9 |  | 1,0 |  |
|  | L3675 | E.52.30.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | , 3 | 10,0 |  | 1 | , 0 | 27.3 | 6.9 | 0.7 |  |
| 5 | L3676D | E. | 15. | 13.6 | 10.5 | 77 |  | 8 |  |  | . 2 |  | 8 | . 6 | , 7 | 11,0 | , | 6-9 yrs |
|  | L3677D | E.50.21.11 | 11.9 | 10,3 | 4,8 | 44 |  | 2 | 71.4 | , 8 | 10,2 | 53.8 | 2 | 23.4 | 27,0 |  | 1,2 |  |
| ¢D 552 | L3678D | E.50.17.16 | 10.6 | 9,1 | 4.0 | 50 |  | 4 |  | 64,1 | , |  | 4 | , 2 |  | 9.3 | 0,9 |  |
|  | L3679D | E.50.17.22 | 9,3 | 8,0 | 4,5 | 44 |  | 2 |  | 63,4 | , 2 | 49.4 | 2 | , 2 | 1.2 | 2,5 | 1,3 |  |
| 564 | L36800 | E.50.21.26 | 11 | 10,1 | 4,8 | 43 |  | 2 |  | . 8 | 6,8 |  | 2 | 22,5 | , 7 | 10,6 | 0,7 |  |
| ¢DA 568 | L3681D | E.50.24.11 | 14,3 | 12,7 | . 0 | 53 |  | 2 | 72,6 | 66,3 | , 7 | - | 2 | . 1 | 26.9 | 10.9 | , 8 |  |
| ${ }^{\text {D }}$ DA 572 | L36820 | E.50.26.17 | 12.9 | 11.1 | 4,8 | 49 |  | 2 |  |  | 1 |  | 2 | 2.7 | 26,3 | 10,9 | 1.1 |  |
| , | L3683D | E.50.13.14 | 16.1 | 13.0 | 4.3 | 72 | 16,7 | 1 | 63.8 | 61.9 | 12,2 |  | 1 | 8,1 | 22.3 | 13.3 |  |  |
| DA 681 | L3684D | H.64.11.13 | 15, | 12,8 | 7.0 | 75 | 10,7 | 6 |  | 61.1 | 10.7 |  | 6 | 17,0 | 20.5 | 9.5 |  | 8 yrs |
| . 715 | L36850 | 11.64 .34 .6 | 34,5 | 28,5 | 10,5 | 147 | 14,0 | 3 | 66.4 | 53.7 | 12.3 | 49.9 | 3 | 19.4 |  |  |  |  |
| DA 737 | L36860 | 11.64.3.24 | 23,2 | 20,5 | 6.7 | 105 | 15.7 | 5 | 59.5 | 63.1 | 8,6 | 51,9 | 5 | 19.5 | 22,1 | 14.0 | 1,2 |  |
| A 79. | L36375 | E.50.28.26 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

I.R.H.O.

LA ME Station
19 - 19 Campaign


## $A K-G P 3$



Protocol
$I-O B J E C T$
To look for hybrids outyielding D115D $\times$ L2T, L2T $\times$ L404D and L2T $\times$ D10D. These hybrids are obtained according to the following schema :


II - BREEDING MATERIAL
II. 1 - PARENTS
II. 1.1-Duras (see annex 1 for list and characteristi

22 duras were chosen from 3 progenies planted at
La Mé :


$\frac{\text { AK-GP }}{1975}$

II.1.2-Pisiferas (see annex 2)

13 pisiferas belonging to LM 495, LM 722 and LM 848 (L2T selfed).
II. 1.3 -
(see annex 2)
II. 2 CROSSES

24 D $\times$ P progenies (see annex 3 for crossing plan and the control L2T $\times$ D1OD.

## III - PLANTING

III. 1 - LOCATION AND DATE
$\therefore \quad$ Aek Kwasan (Sumatra), Bloc 490 rows 76 to 93, Block 491 rows 1 to 32 , Block 540 rows 84 to 93 and Block 541 rows 1 to 32 .

Blocks 490 and 491 are subdivisions of Block 49 (more than 99 rows) and rows with 43 or 44 trees ; Blocks 540 and 541 are subdivisions of Block 54 S , rows have 9 or 10 trees.

Planting : October 1975.
III. 2 - PLANTED PROGENIES

| Order. number | Progenies | Parents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D115D AF $\times$ L2T AF |  |  |
| 4 | LM 5372 | L3005D $\times$ L1594P |
| 6 | LM 5374 | L3394D $\times$ L2250P |
| 7 | LM 5375 | L2346D $\times$ L1587P |
| 9 | LM 5371 | L2507D $\times \mathrm{L} 1607 \mathrm{P}$ |
| 11 | LM 5376 | L2531D $\times$ L2255P |
| 12 | LM 5354 | $\mathrm{L} 2346 \mathrm{D} \times \mathrm{L} 1600 \mathrm{P}$ |
| 14 | LM 5373 | L2345D $\times$ L1571P |
| 25 | LM 5397 | L2526D $\times$ L1601P |
| L404D AF $\times$ L2T AF |  |  |
| 2 | LM 5403 | L3512D $\times$ L1596P |
| 5 | LM 5404 | L3262D $\times$ L2466P |
| 13 | LM 5405 | L3455D $\times$ L1571P |
| 17 | LM 5407 | L3261D $\times$ L1576P |
| 18 | LM 5401 | L3446D $\times$ L1607P |


| Order number | Progenies | Parents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20 | LM 5398 | L3261D $\times$ L1600p |
| 23 | LM 5406 | L3349D $\times$ L1594P |
| 24 | LM 5399 | L3360D $\times$ L1574P |
| (L404D $\times$ D10D) $\times$ L2T AF |  |  |
| 3 | LM 5415 | L2941D $\times$ L1601P |
| 8 | LM 5411 | L3309D $\times$ L1596P |
| 10 | LM 5410 | L2946D $\times$ L1587P |
| 15 | LM 5414 | L2932D $\times$ L1589P |
| 16 | LM 5408 | L2938D $\times$ L1607P |
| 19 | LM 5412 | L2935D $\times$ L1594P |
| 21 | LM 5409 | L2912D $\times$ L1574P |
| 22 | LM 5413 | L3101D $\times$ L2255P |
| Témoin |  |  |
| 1 | LM 4947 | L2T $\times$ D10D |

## III. 3 - EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN

- Balanced, $5 \times 5$ square lattice, 6 replications
- Treatments : 25 progenies
- Elementary plot : 2 rows, of 6 trees $=12$ palms
- Per cross : $6 \times 12=72$ trees.
III. 4 - PLANTING PLAN (see annex 4 )
III. 5 - TREE NUMBER AND ACREAGE

> 25 progenies $\times 72$ palms $=1800$ trees $=12,6$ ha $(31,3$ acres $)(143$ trees $/$ ha $)$

## IV - OBSERVATIONS (according to IGK)

- Varietal determinations
- FFB yield
- Bunch and fruit quality
- Fatty acid composition
- Growth.


| DA | 507 | Dil5D |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| LM | 1037 | L404D |
| L.M | 1053 | 1.40111 |

## ANNEX 2

## PARENT PEDIGREE

DURA

re.
LM 495
L1571P
L1574P
L1576P
L1587 P
L1589P
L1594P
L1596P
L1600P
L1601P
L1607P

## PISIFERA



LM 848
L2466F



