

Early Performance of a few Sri Lanka Clones in India

JOSEPH G MARATTUKALAM and D PREMAKUMARI
Rubber Research Institute of India, Kottayam - 686 009.

Introduction

Among the various methods adopted by the RRII for making available improved planting materials to the rubber planters of our country, introduction of clones from other countries is an important one. Clones reported to be better are regularly being imported to India from Malaysia, Indonesia, Thailand, Sri Lanka, China etc. Under this programme we had obtained 10 clones from Sri Lanka. In 1972 in exchange for seven RRII clones. Among these ten clones one could not be established in our country due to complete budding failure. Remaining nine clones were established and multiplied further. For assessing the performance of these clones under the agroclimatic conditions prevalent in our country they are now being evaluated in clone trials in different parts of this country. The observations recorded from the first trial during the first ten years of planting are presented in this paper.

Method of Study

The clones evaluated are RRIC 7, RRIC 36, RRIC 45, RRIC 52, RRIC 100, RRIC 102, RRIC 104, RRIC 105 and Nab 17. A Popular clone, GT 1 is used as control. Some of these clones are developed from estate selections (Anonymous 1970, De Silva 1960)

while others are produced by hybridisation (Fernando 1971 b). The details are given in table 1. The trial is being conducted at the Central Experiment Station of the RRII, which is situated in a typical rubber growing region of our country. Design adopted is randomised block with three replications. The number of plants per plot is 25 and the planting distance 5x5m (Anonymous 1980). Observations were carried out for ten years, seven years before tapping, and three years after opening for tapping. Growth vigour before and after tapping, thickness of virgin bark and renewed bark, latex vessel rings in the virgin bark, yield during the first three years of tapping, yield depression during summer, susceptibility to diseases and damages caused by wind were studied. Growth vigour has been assessed by measuring the girth of the trunk at a height of 150 cm above the bud union. The trees were tapped on S/2 d/2 system and the yield potential was recorded by cup coagulation technique. Yield depression during summer was assessed by computing the yield per tree per tap during the period. February to May as the percentage of the annual yield per tree per tap. Thickness of virgin bark was measured at the time of opening with a Schleipers gauge at a height of

150 cm. (Bhaskaran Nair and Joseph 1981). Thickness of renewed bark was measured after three years regeneration. The number of the latex vessel rings were counted by microscopical observations of thin sections of the bark samples, collected from a height of 150 cm, after appropriate staining. Diseases like pink, bark rot and brown bast as well as incidence of wind damage were recorded by counting the number of affected trees. Diseases such as secondary leaf fall and powdery mildew were assessed by visual observations.

Results and Discussion

The clones under evaluation showed very wide variation with regard to their various characteristics (table 2 A, 2B, 2C & 2D). While the clones like RRIC 104, RRIC 52 and RRIC 100 exhibited outstanding growth vigour during the immaturity period, growth of RRIC 36, RRIC 7 and RRIC 45 was very poor. Girth increment after commencement of tapping was high in RRIC 52 and RRIC 104, but low in RRIC 105. Reports from Sri Lanka indicate that the above three clones are vigorous in that country also (Fernando 1971 a, b; (Fernando and Wijesinghe 1970) RRIC 100 and RRIC 36 were found to be the highest yielders whereas the lowest yields were obtained from RRIC 52 and

RRIC 105. Similar performance is reported from Sri Lanka also (Chandrasekaran 1972, Fernando 1971 a). Yield drop during summer was very pronounced in RRIC 105. Clones like RRIC 52 did not show this trend. RRIC 102 surpassed all other clones with respect to the thickness of virgin bark, whereas RRIC 45 was found lagging behind all other clones in this aspect. The number of latex vessel rings present in the virgin bark also varied widely from clone to clone. High yielding clones like RRIC 36 and RRIC 100 recorded high numbers of latex vessel rows while their number was lowest in RRIC 52, the lowest yielder. The rate of bark renewal, as indicated by the thickness of renewed bark was found to be more in RRIC 104 while it was very low in the case of RRIC 45. Clone to clone variation was very evident regarding their tolerance to the various, maladies affecting them. Abnormal leaf fall due to *Phytophthora* spp. was high in a few clones like Nab 17, average in certain others such as RRIC 45 and RRIC 52 and comparatively low in the case of RRIC 100, RRIC 105 etc. Susceptibility of Nab 17 to this disease has been observed in other countries also (Anonymous 1971). All clones were found affected by pink disease to varying degrees, RRIC 36, RRIC 45 etc. being highly prone and clones like RRIC 102 being comparatively less affected. All the clones were found affected by powdery mildew also though their degree of susceptibility varied. While the clones like RRIC 105 and Nab 17 were highly susceptible it was low in RRIC 52, RRIC 102 etc. A few other clones like RRIC 7 showed average resistance to this disease. RRIC 52 and RRIC 102 are repor-

ted to be resistant to this disease in Sri Lanka also (Chandrasekara 1972, Fernando 1971 a). Bark rot was noticed only in RRIC 7, RRIC 36 and RRIC 104 and the infection was less than two percent of the trees. Reports from Sri Lanka also confirm the susceptibility of RRIC 36 to this disease (Chandrasekara 1972). Trees of five clones were found developing symptoms of brown bast during this short period of exploitation. However their number was less than two percent in all, without much variation among the different clones. All clones were found affected by wind to varying extent. The damage was highest in RRIC 45 and lowest in RRIC 7. Eventhough all three major types of damage occurred uprooting and trunk breaking were most common.

The Sri Lanka clones imported to India were found to possess some good secondary characters like vigorous growth and tolerance to certain diseases. Their yield during the first three years of exploitation was found promising compared to GT 1.

Acknowledgements

The authors are very much thankful to Dr. A.O.N, Pani-

ckar (Deputy Director, Botany Division) for the highly valuable suggestions and encouragements rendered in the conducting of the trial as well as the preparation of this paper. They are also thankful to Dr. M.R, Sethuraj (Director) and Mr. P. N. Radhakrishna Pillai (Joint Director) for providing the facilities to conduct this trial. The sincere assistance rendered by the supporting staff of Botany Division in the collection of data is gratefully acknowledged.

References

- ANONYMOUS, 1970. Review of Modern *Hevea* clones: 2, Clone GT 1. Plrs. Bull. Rubb. Res. Inst. Malaya No. 109: 113-134.
- ANONYMOUS, 1971. Planting Recommendations, 1971-72. Plrs. Bull. Rubb. Res. Inst. Malaya No. 112: 3-18.
- ANONYMOUS, 1980. Guide to the Central Experiment Station, Chethackal, Ranni. 56.
- BHASKARAN NAIR V. K. and JOSEPH G. MARATTUKALAM, 1981. Performance of some RRIM clones in India. Proc. Placrosym IV 262-269.

Table-1. Parentage of clones in the trial

| Clone | Parentage |
|----------|------------------|
| RRIC 7 | Primary |
| RRIC 36 | PB 86 x PR 107 |
| RRIC 45 | RRIC 8 x Tjir 1 |
| RRIC 52 | Primary |
| RRIC 100 | RRIC 52 x PB 86 |
| RRIC 102 | RRIC 52 x RRIC 7 |
| RRIC 104 | RRIC 52 x Tjir 1 |
| RRIC 105 | RRIC 52 x Tjir 1 |
| Nab 17 | Primary |
| GT 1 | Primary |

CHANDRASEKERA, L.B., 1971. Developments in *Hevea* Planting Material in Ceylon. Q. J1. Rubb. Res. Inst. Ceylon 48: 7-18.

CHANDRASEKERA, L.B. 1972. Recommended Planting Materials 1972. RRIC Bull. 7: 39-47.

DE SILVA, C.A., 1960. The

performance of RRIC clones under Ceylon conditions. Proc. Nat. Rubb. Res. Conf. KL. 378-381.

FERNANDO D.M., 1971 a. The yields and secondary characters of clone RRIC 102. Q. J1. Rubb. Res. Inst. Ceylon 48:56-65.

FERNANDO D. M., 1971 b.

Review of the Genetics and Plant Breeding Department. The Rubb. Res. Inst. of Ceylon, Annual Review for 1971: 34-50.

FERNANDO, D.M. and WIJESINGHE, W.C., 1970. Some features of the Growth and Yield of RRIC 100. Q. J1. Rubb. Res. Inst. Ceylon 46: 78-87.

Table 2 A. Performance of clones in the trial

| Clone | Mean yield over three years (g/tree/tap) | Yield depression during summer as percentage of mean yield | Mean girth at opening (cm) | Mean annual girth increment after opening (cm) |
|----------|--|--|----------------------------|--|
| RRIC 7 | 28.79 | 33 | 47.04 | 4.42 |
| RRIC 36 | 34.99 | 14 | 45.21 | 3.96 |
| RRIC 45 | 29.32 | 39 | 48.98 | 4.06 |
| RRIC 52 | 21.34 | 32 | 58.31 ✓ | 5.63 |
| RRIC 100 | 37.41 | 31 | 57.48 | 3.85 |
| RRIC 102 | 33.94 | 44 | 54.56 | 3.66 |
| RRIC 104 | 32.05 | 28 | 64.49 | 4.52 |
| RRIC 105 | 26.00 | 49 | 56.49 | 3.03 |
| Nab 17 | 34.00 | 36 | 51.01 | 3.32 |
| GT 1 | 28.12 | 42 | 52.48 | 3.74 |

Table-2. B. Performance of clones in the trial

| Clone | Mean thickness of virgin bark (mm) | Latex vessel rings in virgin bark | Mean thickness of three year renewed bark (mm) | Abnormal leaf fall |
|----------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--------------------|
| RRIC 7 | 6.75 | 10.00 | 7.65 | Severe |
| RRIC 36 | 7.28 | 100.78 | 7.71 | Severe |
| RRIC 45 | 6.60 | 7.28 | 5.02 | Moderate |
| RRIC 52 | 9.03 | 6.04 | 7.72 ✓ | Moderate |
| RRIC 100 | 9.01 | 7.98 | 7.43 | Light |
| RRIC 102 | 8.14 | 10.00 | 7.14 | Light |
| RRIC 104 | 9.26 | 9.52 | 8.29 | Light |
| RRIC 105 | 8.15 | 7.15 | 7.34 | Light |
| Nab 17 | 7.46 | 8.50 | 8.13 | Severe |
| GT 1 | 7.81 | 8.30 | 6.88 | Moderate |

Table-2 C. Performance of clones in the trial

| Clone | Pink disease percentage incidence | Brown bast percentage incidence | Bark rot percentage incidence | Powdery mildew |
|----------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------|
| RRIC 7 | 4.69 | Nil | 1.56 | Moderate |
| RRIC 36 | 17.74 | Nil | 1.61 | Light |
| RRIC 45 | 15.79 | 1.75 | Nil | Light |
| RRIC 52 | 9.84 | Nil | Nil | Light |
| RRIC 100 | 14.75 | 1.65 | Nil | Light |
| RRIC 102 | 1.75 | Nil | Nil | Light |
| RRIC 104 | 12.90 | 1.61 | 1.61 | Moderate |
| RRIC 105 | 8.82 | 1.47 | Nil | Severe |
| Nab 17 | 8.20 | 1.64 | Nil | Severe |
| GT 1 | 6.90 | Nil | Nil | Severe |

Table 2 D. Performance of clones in the trial

| Clone | Uprooting percentage incidence | Trunk snap percentage incidence | Branch snap percentage incidence | Total wind damage percentage incidence |
|----------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| RRIC 7 | 3.13 | 1.56 | Nil | 4.69 |
| RRIC 36 | 3.23 | 3.23 | Nil | 6.46 |
| RRIC 45 | 10.53 | 10.53 | Nil | 21.06 |
| RRIC 52 | 8.20 | Nil | Nil | 8.20 |
| RRIC 100 | 9.84 | 3.28 | 1.64 | 14.76 |
| RRIC 102 | 1.75 | 8.77 | Nil | 10.52 |
| RRIC 104 | 6.45 | 4.84 | 3.23 | 14.52 |
| RRIC 105 | 2.94 | 41.4 | Nil | 7.35 |
| Nab 17 | 8.20 | 3.28 | 1.64 | 13.12 |
| GT 1 | Nil | 5.17 | 5.17 | 10.34 |

