

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

### **1.1 What is the name of your organisation?**

Felleskjøpet Agri

### **1.2 What stakeholder group does your organisation belong to?**

Supplier of S&PM; Professional user of raw material produced by agriculture, horticulture or forestry; Company operating on national level; Other

#### **1.2.1 Please specify**

Felleskjøpet Agri is a cooperative, owned by approximately 43,000 farmers. The parent company's core business includes the buying and selling of grain, fodder concentrate, fertilizer, seed and machinery. In addition to selling agricultural consumables, our shops have successfully focused on attracting other groups of consumers.

### **1.3 Please write down the address (postal, e-mail, telephone, fax and web page if available) of your organisation**

Felleskjøpet Agri SA Flyporten N- 2060 Gardermoen e-mail: firmapost@felleskjopet.no Att: Arnfinn Sjøseth www.felleskjopet.no

## **2. PROBLEM IDENTIFICATION**

### **2.1 Are the problems defined correctly in the context of S&PM marketing?**

Yes

### **2.2 Have certain problems been overlooked?**

No

#### **2.2.1 Please state which one(s)**

### **2.3 Are certain problems underestimated or overly emphasized?**

Overestimated

#### **2.3.1 Please indicate the problems that have not been estimated rightly**

We think sustainability and local varieties is a bit overestimated.

#### **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?**

No

#### **3.2.1 Please state which one(s)**

### **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?

Yes

**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**

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

4

**Empower users by informing them about seed and propagating material**

**Contribute to improve biodiversity, sustainability and favour innovation**

3

**Promote plant health and support agriculture, horticulture and forestry**

1

**3.6 Other suggestions and remarks**

#### **4. OPTIONS FOR CHANGE**

**4.1 Are the scenarios defined correctly in the context of S&PM marketing?**

Yes

**4.2 Have certain scenarios been overlooked?**

No

**4.2.1 Please state which one(s)**

**4.3 Are certain scenarios unrealistic?**

Yes

**4.3.1 Please state which one(s) and why**

1 and 5

**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?**

Yes

**5.2 Have certain impacts been overlooked?**

No

**5.2.1 Please state which one(s)**

**5.3 Are certain impacts underestimated or overly emphasized?**

Overestimated

**5.3.1 Please provide evidence or data to support your assessment:**

sustaninability

**5.4 How do you rate the proportionality of a generalised traceability/labelling and fit-for-purpose requirement (as set out in scenario 4)?**

No opinion

**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**

Very negative

**Scenario 2**

Neutral

**Scenario 3**

Very beneficial

**Scenario 4**

Rather negative

**Scenario 5**

Not relevant

**5.5.1 Please state your reasons for your answers above, where possible providing evidence or data to support your assessment:**

Norway is not an UPOV member and if you not buy certified seed in Norway you do not have a breeder tax.

**6. ASSESSMENT OF SCENARIOS**

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

Scenario 3

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

**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

**6.2.1 Please explain:**

we can not find negativ consequences in scenario 3 for information of users, the same for health and quality of S&PM. We recomend scenario 3 for sustainability and breeding. Scenario 4 is overestimated to improve farmers choice. Scenario 4 is negativ for development in the breeding program in Norway and inovation in the seed company. You need quantity to invest in "new" technology such as termoseed.

**7. OTHER COMMENTS**

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

**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:**

