

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 What is the name of your organisation?

The Danish Nature Agency (Tree Improvement Station)

1.2 What stakeholder group does your organisation belong to?

Breeder of S&PM; Supplier of S&PM; User of S&PM

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

Naturstyrelsen Nordsjælland Ostrupgård Gillelejevej 2B DK-3230 Græsted Phone: +45 7254 3000 E-mail: NSJ@nst.dk

2. PROBLEM IDENTIFICATION

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

No opinion

2.2 Have certain problems been overlooked?

No opinion

2.2.1 Please state which one(s)

2.3 Are certain problems underestimated or overly emphasized?

No opinion

2.3.1 Please indicate the problems that have not been estimated rightly

2.4 Other suggestions or remarks

The background of the current division in 12 basic Council Directives is not fully clarified. It is important that legitimate desire to harmonize not impair its ability to achieve the target within each sector. With interest of forestry, it seems appropriate to emphasize that the very long term use of the S & MP in the forestry sector makes a credible system essential. A credible system is also essential to the internal market

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 opinion

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 opinion

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

4

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

5

Empower users by informing them about seed and propagating material

1

Contribute to improve biodiversity, sustainability and favour innovation

3

Promote plant health and support agriculture, horticulture and forestry

2

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 opinion

4.2 Have certain scenarios been overlooked?

No opinion

4.2.1 Please state which one(s)

4.3 Are certain scenarios unrealistic?

No opinion

4.3.1 Please state which one(s) and why

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

It is described in Scenario 4 that Forest S&PM continues to be identified on the current criteria and in a separate chapter. A remark for specific regulation to Forest S&PM has relevance also in other scenarios, especially where transparency might be reduced.

5. ASSESSMENT OF OPTIONS

5.1 Are the impacts correctly analysed in the context of S&PM marketing?

No opinion

5.2 Have certain impacts been overlooked?

No opinion

5.2.1 Please state which one(s)

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

Fairly beneficial

Scenario 2

Rather negative

Scenario 3

Rather negative

Scenario 4

Don't know

Scenario 5

Don't know

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

Scenario 1 represents a harmonisation of implementation, where distortions in the internal market can be met. In Scenarion 2 - 3 the outsourcing of control and optional certification provide opportunities for transparency and credibility in the market to be reduced. In Scenario 4 -5 The possible impact on Forest S&PM is unknown

6. ASSESSMENT OF SCENARIOS

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

Scenario 1

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 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:

