1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 What is the name of your organisation?
Finnish Seed Traders Association (FSTA)

1.2 What stakeholder group does your organisation belong to?
Other

1.2.1 Please specify
National association of undertakings operating as seller of seed or breeding of plants

1.3 Please write down the address (postal, e-mail, telephone, fax and web page if available) of your organisation
Finnish Seed Traders Association Johannes Hahl (Secretary General) Koskenkatu 11 FI-15700 Lahti, Finland e-mail: johannes.hahl@chemind.fi, web-page www.siemenkauppiaat.fi

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
The objective of harmonization is somewhat overestimated. The circumstances in agric. production vary within the EU largely - e.g. Finland v`s central Europe. In evaluation of biological material and processes, the overall circumstances shall be taken into account. Therefore, national legislation in special areas should be possible, as well.

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 opinion

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?

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
2

Empower users by informing them about seed and propagating material
3

Contribute to improve biodiversity, sustainability and favour innovation
5

Promote plant health and support agriculture, horticulture and forestry
4

3.6 Other suggestions and remarks

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?
No opinion

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
Scenarios 1,3,4 and 5 are unrealistic. Scenario1: It would transfer the costs to the stakeholders without bringing any flexibility to the system. Scenario 3: In this scenario variety performance testing and official certification is just optional. It would jeopardize the high quality of seed. VCU-tests are essential information source to the users of seed. Also, the possibility for DUS-testing at regional level have to maintained. The extended role of CPVO in registration of varieties would lead to a more costly & complicated system. CPVO could manage the database of varieties, but approval & listing of varioeties should remain at national level. Scenario 4: This would lead to a difficult, unharmonized and confusing system - far from transparent and understandable. Seed for export must have passed certification and testing anyway. Scenario 5: This is not applicable. It is likely, that this would lead to disappearing of testing stations from many specific agricultural areas. It would also lead to higher registration costs. It would take longer time to get variety listed in the EU register.

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)
The Scenario 2: he estimted impact on admin. burden and costs to the authorities is too optimistic. For SME it is not possible to perform registration tests. Thefore, there must be an option to get these services purchased from the competent authority. A double system could not survive at reasonable cost level. Scenario 3: The impact on admin. burden & costs for the private sector is too optimistic. If the VCU-tests would no longer be required and carried out by the existing organizations, the private operators, who need the data, should solve the problem in a more costly way. VCU-tests and official certicifation are a relatively cost effective way to safeguard high quality seed and the necessary data on it.

5.3 Are certain impacts underestimated or overly emphasized?
No opinion

5.3.1 Please provide evidence or data to support your assessment:

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
Rather negative

Scenario 2
Fairly beneficial

Scenario 3
Very negative

Scenario 4
Very negative

Scenario 5
Very negative

5.5.1 Please state your reasons for your answers above, where possible providing evidence or data to support your assessment:
The reasons for the answer are presented in chapter 6.1.1.

6. ASSESSMENT OF SCENARIOS
6.1 Which scenario or combination of scenarios would best meet the objectives of the review of the legislation?
Scenario with new features

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
DUS-testing, VCU-testing and official certification are and remain the cornerstones in attempts to meet the key objectives of Seed Law. VCU-tests, conducted regionally, are the indispensable source of information to the user of seed. The scenario 2, with additions on DUS, VCU and official certfication is likely to be workable throuhgout the EU, also taking the requirements of export markets into account. There should be some flexibility in transferring tasks to the seed industry, but system should be reasonable also for the SME, and not only to big ones. Therefore, it should be in the interest of the EU and Member States to ensure, that the sercices are available for SME, too. The Common Catalogue and database managed by CPVO is of benefit for the whole seed sector in the EU, but national catalogues play an important role as well, and have to be maintained. Decision making on listing of varieties have to be maintained at national level. National catalogues are an important source of information to the user of seed. One key - several doors -principle is more than recommended. Traceability of seed & transparency of the process shall be the key elements of the EU Seed Law. We support registration of operators and monitoring activities which are based on risk assessment. The legislation has to take into account the requirements of international trade & standards. Plant health requirements have to be in alignment with the new Plant Health law. Approach to cionservation varieties should be revised. the limits in production area have to be reasonable. Legislation should support the means to maintain and re-establish biodiversity.

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:

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: