1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 What is the name of your organisation?
GROUPE EURALIS

1.2 What stakeholder group does your organisation belong to?
Breeder of S&PM; Supplier of S&PM; User of S&PM; SME company

1.2.1 Please specify

1.3 Please write down the address (postal, e-mail, telephone, fax and web page if available) of your organisation
GROUPE EURALIS Avenue Gaston Phoebus F 64231 LESCAR Tel 05 59 92 38 38 Web www.euralis.fr

2. PROBLEM IDENTIFICATION

2.1 Are the problems defined correctly in the context of S&PM marketing?
No

2.2 Have certain problems been overlooked?
Yes

2.2.1 Please state which one(s)
- Impact on SMEs of transferring burdens from public authorities to private sector. If international companies would easily mobilize resources, for SMEs this transfer could affect their ability to perform innovation. - Complexity of legislation is closely related to the biological reality of species involved. A good balance has to be found between necessary segmentation (according to species) and an overall harmonization of the implementation. - Impact of new legislation on marketing S&PM outside the UE (certification, OECD regulation,..).

2.3 Are certain problems underestimated or overly emphasized?
Underestimated

2.3.1 Please indicate the problems that have not been estimated rightly
- Opportunity for a scenario improving harmonization in implementing the current system in all MS without a complete change of the system. - Sustainability is already taken into consideration in the current system (registration process includes environmental criteria as per ex. Resistance to diseases). - Possibility to speed up the registration process is not mentioned although some examples already exist.

2.4 Other suggestions or remarks

3. OBJECTIVES OF THE REVIEW

3.1 Are the objectives defined correctly in the context of S&PM marketing?
Yes

3.2 Have certain objectives been overlooked?
Yes

3.2.1 Please state which one(s)
Europe is the first exporter of seeds and compliance with international rules of trade is a necessity to maintain this activity.

3.3 Are certain objectives inappropriate?

No

3.3.1 Please state which one(s)

3.4 Is it possible to have a regime whereby a variety is considered as being automatically registered in an EU catalogue as soon as a variety protection title is granted by CPVO?
No

3.5 If there is a need to prioritise the objectives, which should be the most important ones? (Please rank 1 to 5, 1 being first priority)
Ensure availability of healthy high quality seed and propagating material
1

Secure the functioning of the internal market for seed and propagating material
3

Empower users by informing them about seed and propagating material
4

Contribute to improve biodiversity, sustainability and favour innovation
2

Promote plant health and support agriculture, horticulture and forestry
5

3.6 Other suggestions and remarks
All the items have a great and equal importance and our wish was ti=o put priority N°1 to all of them

4. OPTIONS FOR CHANGE
4.1 Are the scenarios defined correctly in the context of S&PM marketing?
No

4.2 Have certain scenarios been overlooked?
Yes

4.2.1 Please state which one(s)
Scenario 2

4.3 Are certain scenarios unrealistic?
Yes

4.3.1 Please state which one(s) and why
Scenario 1 - Technical provisions remain unchanged and no harmonisation is proposed - Impact of transferring burdens from public authorities to private sector is not taken into account. Scenario 3 - Suppression of VCU and certification being optional introduce market distortions and will concentrate private sector - Reduction of the diversity of an innovative offer due to the increase of Marketing power versus R&D investment. Scenario 4 - Due to lack of impartial and reliable information, serious risk to users? ability to make an informed choice - Risks of degrading the quality of the varieties (performance, seed quality and identity). - Due to the importance of UE in international trade of S&PM, risk of a negative impact on that business at the international level.

4.4 Do you agree with the reasoning leading to the discard of the "no-changes" and the "abolishment" scenarios?

Yes

4.5 Other suggestions and remarks

5. ASSESSMENT OF OPTIONS
5.1 Are the impacts correctly analysed in the context of S&PM marketing?
No

5.2 Have certain impacts been overlooked?
Yes

5.2.1 Please state which one(s)
- Impact on independency of food and feed supplying in EU - Impact on end users

5.3 Are certain impacts underestimated or overly emphasized?
Overestimated

5.3.1 Please provide evidence or data to support your assessment:
Areas Scenario 1 Scenario 2 Scenario 3 Scenario 4 Scenario 5 Impact on plant health and quality of S&PM - - x x xx x -? Impact on employment and jobs in the public sector - - xx xx - Impact on administrative burden and costs for authorities ???? ???? ???? ????? ??? Impact on administrative burden and costs for private sector operators xxx x ?? ??? x Impact on competitiveness, markets, trade and investments flows - ?? ?- xx - Impact on innovation and research xx - xx xxx ?? Environmental impact - - x xx - Impact on users - - xx xxx ??

5.4 How do you rate the proportionality of a generalised traceability/labelling and fit-for-purpose requirement (as set out in scenario 4)?
5 = not proportional at all

5.5 How do you assess the possible impact of the various scenarios on your organisation or on the stakeholders that your organisation represents?
Scenario 1
Rather negative

Scenario 2
Fairly beneficial

Scenario 3
Very negative

Scenario 4
Very negative

Scenario 5
Neutral

5.5.1 Please state your reasons for your answers above, where possible providing evidence or data to support your assessment:
Scenario 1: rather negative Transfer of costs to the private sector has an impact on SMEs and their capacity for innovation and research without any new advantage (on harmonisation, transparency,..). Scenario 2: fairly beneficial - Delegation under official supervision to the private sector. Scenario 3: very negative - Innovation will be affected as investment flows will be targeted to marketing more than R&D. Scenario 4: very negative - Lack of transparency for the end user - Diminution of global quality and risks on plant health (possible introduction of low-quality lots marketed without strict phytosanitary controls). - Reduction of R&D investments

which rapidly will affect innovation. Scenario 5: Pro: - More harmonized procedures among MS. - High transparency and quality of information on varieties available for end users. Cons: -Lack of detailed provisions on some key points (management of a harmonised and centralised VCU?) - Possible negative impact on biodiversity, capacity to provide varieties for specific (small, locally adapted) markets,...

6. ASSESSMENT OF SCENARIOS

6.1 Which scenario or combination of scenarios would best meet the objectives of the review of the legislation?

A combination of scenarios

6.1.1 What are your views with regards to combining elements from the various scenarios into a new scenario?

Combination of scenarii 2 and 5 for a robust and harmonised regulation. - Confirmation of the Common European Catalogue and the centralized mission of CPVO (denomination, DUS,..) - Harmonized DUS system with the “one key several doors” principle - For agricultural crops VCU as in scenario 2 with progressive introduction of new criteria linked to sustainability and environmental issues. - Harmonised provisions for certification and delegation to the private sector under official supervision. - Improved traceability of new varieties and better transparency for end users.

6.1.1 Please explain the new scenario in terms of key features

6.2 Do you agree with the comparison of the scenarios in the light of the potential to achieve the objectives?

No opinion

6.2.1 Please explain:

7. OTHER COMMENTS

7.1 Further written comments on the seeds and propagating material review:

The productivity of European agriculture, the constant improvement of varieties, or the capacity of EU to export worldwide seeds and plants for a large number of species have been built under the current regulatory context. Numerous SMEs are still working in the S&PM sector which is a unique situation in the world and can explain the diversity of innovative and valuable products offered to the end users (farmers, processors, consumers). Introducing a new regulatory environment has to taken into account that specificity and keeps intact that source of wealth by giving priority to transparent and harmonised rules.

7.2 Please make reference here to any available data/documents that support your answer, or indicate sources where such data/documents can be found: