
PROJECT: **Commercialisation of New *Euphorbia* Hybrids**

Project Officers: **D. Marcsik, M. Hoult, M. Connelly and R. Aiton**

Location: **BARC**

Objective:

Facilitate the introduction and release of new and diverse *Euphorbia milii* hybrids to benefit the nursery industry of the NT

Method:

Over a three-year period several accessions were sourced from suppliers in Thailand and brought through post-entry quarantine. On release, accessions were grown at the BARC nursery and evaluated for horticultural potential. Desirable traits were ranked by three experienced horticulturists, concurrent with industry screening and release of propagules of interest (see Table 1 and Figures 2 and 3).

Results:

Results are presented in Table 1.

Discussion:

The Thai hybrids of *Euphorbia milii* represent a new product for the local nursery industry. Prospects are encouraging for developing a range of cultivars for marketing interstate. The total number of accessions so far introduced is only a fifth of the known cultivars available in Thailand, where over 200 have been bred and selected. The variation in commercial traits is large (see Table 1) and local nurseries will need to determine what traits are of importance for their given markets and select cultivars accordingly. Interestingly, the most favoured accessions, as determined by industry demand for propagules, were predominantly red-flowered and with large bracts (see Table 1).

Table 1: Ranking of *Euphorbia x milii* accessions for horticultural traits (score per trait is average for three assessors where 1=poor and 5=excellent)

Accession No.	Branching suckers	Flower intensity	Compact	Bract size	Exposed flowers	Size of thorns	Grand score	Ranking	^a Industry ranking	Bract colour
EU1	3.3	3.7	4.3	1.0	3.3	2.3	18	5	3	Red
EU2(=EU43)										Pale pink bands w/h dark bands
EU3									4	Pale lemon w/h pink tinge
EU4									6	Blotchy pink
EU5(=EU22)	4.0	4.7	4.7	2.7	4.7	2.7	23	1	6	Pale lemon w/h green band
EU6	2.0	3.0	2.7	3.7	3.3	2.7	17	6		Blotchy pink w/h green band
EU7	2.0	3.3	1.7	2.7	3.7	2.3	16	7		Apricot w/h blotchy pink
EU8(=EU14)	1.7	3.7	2.0	3.0	4.0	2.0	16	7	7	Veined apricot
EU9(=EU20)	3.0	2.7	3.3	2.3	2.7	2.3	16	7		Scarlet pink
EU10	2.0	3.3	2.0	3.3	4.0	2.3	17	6		Red
EU11-dead										
EU12	1.7	3.3	3.0	4.3	3.7	2.0	18	5	1	Red
EU13	2.0	4.0	2.7	3.3	4.3	2.3	19	4	5	Red pink over lemon
EU14(=EU8)										
EU15	2.3	3.3	3.3	4.0	3.3	2.7	19	4	7	Pink blotching w/h age
EU16	2.0	3.3	2.3	3.7	3.7	2.7	18	5	7	Powdery red
EU17(=EU18)	1.7	3.0	2.7	3.7	2.7	2.3	16	7	4	Pale yellow w/h pink tinge
EU18(=EU17)										
EU19	3.0	2.3	2.7	1.0	3.7	2.0	15	8		Pink red
EU20(=EU9)										
EU21	2.7	3.7	3.0	4.3	4.0	2.7	20	3	3	Red
EU22(=EU 5)										
EU23(=EU46)	2.0	3.3	2.3	3.7	3.7	2.0	17	6	7	Red w/h green band
EU24	3.0	4.3	3.7	2.0	4.3	3.3	21	2	3	Lime lemon
EU25	3.0	3.0	2.7	3.0	3.0	2.7	17	6	3	Cream
EU26	2.3	3.3	2.3	3.3	3.3	2.3	17	6		Cream w/h peachy tinge
EU27 dead										
EU28	2.7	2.7	3.0	3.0	3.7	2.0	17	6	3	Pale pink w/h darker blush
EU29	2.0	2.7	2.7	3.3	3.7	2.0	16	7	5	Lemon with pink vein
EU30	3.0	2.3	3.3	2.3	3.0	2.3	16	7	4	Lemon lime
EU31										
EU32	2.7	2.3	3.7	2.3	2.7	2.7	16	7	4	Pink w/h green band

Accession No.	Branching suckers	Flower intensity	Compact	Bract size	Exposed flowers	Size of thorns	Grand score	Ranking	^a Industry ranking	Bract colour
EU33(=EU42)	3.7	4.3	3.3	4.0	4.0	2.0	21	2	5	Dark pink w/h green
EU34	1.7	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.7	2.7	18	5		Red
EU35	2.3	3.7	2.7	2.3	3.0	2.0	16	7	2	Pink with darker veins
EU36	3.0	3.7	3.3	2.7	3.3	2.7	19	4	2	Red
EU37	1.7	3.0	2.7	2.7	3.7	2.0	16	7	2	Red
EU38	2.0	3.0	2.7	3.3	3.3	2.3	17	6	2	Scarlet red
EU39	2.7	3.3	3.0	2.7	3.3	2.7	18	5		Pink w/h pale centre
EU40	2.7	3.3	3.7	2.3	3.0	2.3	17	6		Peach
EU41=dead										
EU42(=EU33)										
EU43(=EU2)	2.7	3.0	3.0	2.3	3.7	2.3	17	6	5	Cream w/h pink
EU44	2.7	2.7	3.7	2.0	2.3	2.7	16	7		Cream w/h thin maroon band
EU45	2.3	2.7	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	16	7	7	Red
EU46(=EU23)										
EU47									7	Dark pink
Mean for all accessions.	2.5	3.3	3.0	2.9	3.5	2.4	17			

^aIndustry ranking determined by the number of propagules/accession ordered by NGINT members. Note where no scores/rankings are given, plants were too young for meaningful evaluation