

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

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

SOC France - Service Officiel de Contrôle et de certification des semences et plants

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

Competent Authority (CA) involved in S&PM certification and control

#### **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**

GNIS-Service Officiel de Contrôle et de Certification 44, rue du Louvre F - 75001 PARIS Tél : + 33 (0) 1 42 33 76 93 Fax : + 33 (0) 1 40 28 40 16 Courriel : marie-france.cazalere@gnis.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)**

Increasing global demand for food products and the need to ensure food independence of the European Union, according to the founding documents of the CAP have not been taken into account.

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

Overestimated

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

Some problems are overstated: - The issue of administrative burden and costs: in fact, current legislation already allows for lower costs and administrative burdens by delegating tasks to operators under official supervision. - The difference of costs between member states cannot be linked with the lack of harmonization concerning the implementation of the seed and plant regulations. Indeed, the difference is mainly due to the difference of labour's cost among the member states. - Trade distortion in the common market : the more stringent requirements implemented by a member state do not create distortion at the EU level because seeds and plant meeting only the communitary rules can be sold in the member state which implements stricter standards.

#### **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?**

No

### **3.2 Have certain objectives been overlooked?**

Yes

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

The objective of responding to increasing global demand for food and ensuring food self-sufficiency in the European Union is missing. Improving productivity and competitiveness of producers and seed companies must remain a major objective of the European Union seed

policy.

**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**

4

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

5

**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?**

Yes

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

In the scenarios 3 and 4, the integration of the plant health regime and the seed and plant marketing rules has not been taken into account. Similarly, the specificity of certain species or species groups was not taken into account : we cannot make the same scenarios for seed potatoes on one hand and other vegetable species on the other hand. The writing of scenarios is sometimes imprecise and leaves room for interpretations.

**4.3 Are certain scenarios unrealistic?**

Yes

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

The scenarios 3 and 4 are unrealistic in that they do not take into account the specificity of certain species or species group. Moreover, the scenarios 3 and 4 that open up the possibility of a voluntary certification are not realistic. So to foresee that certification will be performed on the batches intended for export is not realistic: it would be necessary for the producer to decide, at the sowing time, which fields, whose production is intended for shipping, are need to be inspected, which is not possible.

**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 impact assessment on the certification has not been correctly analysed : for scenario 3 and 4, it's specified that 30 % of the exported seed and plant will be certified. This analysis is not correct : it would be necessary for the producer to decide, at the sowing time, which fields, whose production is intended for shipping, are need to be inspected, which is not possible. On the other hand, if the EU deletes the compulsory certification, imported seed and plant will no longer be obliged to be certified, according to the equivalence regime. Third countries would no longer impose the compulsory certification if EU does not do it. Probably the OECD seed scheme would be threatened. This could result in significant costs to fight against certain pathogens.

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

Underestimated

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

In the 3 and 4 scenarios, the loss of mandatory certification for agricultural crops could lead to the reinforcement of phytosanitary and human health problems. It would no longer be possible to require compulsory certification for the imported products. EU could face serious phytosanitary problems and the increase of costs to face the phytosanitary problems.

**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**

Neutral

**Scenario 2**

Very beneficial

**Scenario 3**

Rather 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 2 preserves the two pillars of European legislation (registration and certification) while introducing more flexibility in the application of the regulations. Scenarios 3 and 4 provide an optional certification, which lead to a decline in the quality of seeds and seedlings, to serious disease problems and therefore a significant increase in expenses of member states and the European Union.

**6. ASSESSMENT OF SCENARIOS**

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

Scenario 2

**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:**

The objective of responding to increasing global demand for food and ensuring food self-sufficiency in the European Union is missing. Improving productivity and competitiveness of producers and seed companies must remain a major objective of the European Union seed policy.

**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:**

