

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 What is the name of your organisation?

Technical Committee for Plant Breeding (CTPS : Comité Technique Permanent de la Selection des plantes cultivées) - Version 2 (version 1 incomplete - interrupted connection)

1.2 What stakeholder group does your organisation belong to?

Competent Authority (CA) involved in S&PM variety and material registration; Other

1.2.1 Please specify

CTPS is an advisory committee responsible for formulating and enforcing the varieties and seeds policy for the Ministry of Agriculture

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

GEVES - CTPS, Rue Georges Morel, BP 90024, 49071 Beaucouzé Cedex, France Chairman : Paul Vialle (paul@vialle.eu) / General secretary : Christian Leclerc (christian.leclerc@geves.fr) Tel : 33 (0) 2 41 22 85 90 / Fax : 33 (0) 2 41 22 86 01 <http://www.geves.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)

- The first global problem that shall be defined is the global food crisis and the climatic change and the role the EU agricultural and forestry productions can play to contribute in solving these issues. - The question of the genetic progress is fully missed. Many available references and data support the fact that absence of regulation oriented genetic progress drives to a dramatic decrease, in quantity and in quality, of the agricultural and forestry productions : Brisson & al 2010 for cereals, Fields Crops Research 119, 201-212 / Van der Heijden and Roulund, 2010 for forage crops, S.A.G. van der Heijden and N. Roulund, 2010. Genetic Gain in Agronomic Value of Forage Crops and Turf: A Review. In C. Huyghe (Ed) Sustainable Use of Genetic Diversity in Forage and Turf Breeding, p 247-260) - In the problems definition, the Commission argues that the main current focus of the regulation is only based on productivity. However, the current legislation allows member states to define specific national VCU criteria in the view of varieties registration. In France, VCU testing integrates the evaluation of varieties adaptation to agro environmental constraints and diversified cultural practices that favor the decrease of inputs use (testing without pesticide, without irrigation, diseases and pests genetic resistance characterization ...).

2.3 Are certain problems underestimated or overly emphasized?

Overestimated

2.3.1 Please indicate the problems that have not been estimated rightly

- Costs issue: overestimated. European Commission argues that the second of the 4 problems that shall be solved is related to the cost of the implementation of the regulation in the Member states. However at the French level, the implementation of the regulation (registration and certification) does not represent 3% of the value of the sector but about 0,3%. This data proves that the French system is more cost efficient than most of the other EU member states systems. This situation is partly due to the current implementation of the "under supervision controls" for VCU and certification. - 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 work's cost among the member states. - Other

point: the transfer of certain tasks performed by industry under official supervision don't reduce the total costs but transfer the public costs to the industry. This total cost would probably be higher in case of the DUS testing. - Trade distortion in the common market : the more stringent requirements implemented by a member state don't create distortion at the EU level because seeds and plant meeting the only community rules can be sold in the member state which implement stricter standard.

2.4 Other suggestions or remarks

- In the problems definition, the lack of efficiency of the current systems is not proved. As regard the current economic results, the systems are efficient (France is the 2d country for exportation of S&PM in the world and the 1st producer at the EU level). - In all the document of the Commission, the definition of the word "innovation" is mistaken for the word "creativity". The word "innovation" should be based on the definition given by Schumpeter as early as 1911 (in his first edition of Theory of economic development) and which is the basis of most innovation economists who consider that an innovation is a novelty which reaches the market and meets its expectations, thus contributing to an increase of the economic activity. - In the impact assessment document, there is confusion between the notion of biodiversity and genetic resources or genetic diversity. Biodiversity includes both the variation among species and the variation within-species. The variation among species may be measured at various scales, such as α , β and γ diversity considering both the within and between fields diversity (see de Bello et al, 2010 Journal of Vegetation Science 21, 992-1000). It may also be considered on the basis of the functional traits (functional biodiversity). Although there are some examples of relationship between species diversity and genetic diversity within species (Vellend and Geber, 2005, Ecology Letters 8, 767-781), both levels of diversity may be regarded independently. Plant breeding will mainly influence within-species genetic diversity (either through cultivated genetic diversity or ex situ genetic resources) while agronomic practices will have a crucial impact on the biodiversity in agricultural and forestry production systems.

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 following objective has been missed: productivity, quality and regularity of the productions. This objective shall be placed in 1st position in the view to be consistent with the expected role of the EU agricultural and forestry productions in the global food security and thus in avoiding food crisis. This collective responsibility must still be considered as crucial. - The issue of the innovation is overlooked. It shall not be placed at the third place after biodiversity and sustainability. Indeed, innovation is the key issue that enables to reach the objectives of sustainability. - The issue of traceability shall be at the same level as the question "healthy high quality S&PM". Indeed, this issue is a component of the quality of the S&PM. - The general objectives address the question of the information to the users. This information shall be qualified as well as reliable, impartial, official and available for the whole chain of users (from the farmers to the consumers). - The specific objective based on the improvement of the competitiveness shall be clarified and not based only at the EU level. Indeed, in the frame of the international market / exchanged, based on equivalence systems, the role of official certification for S&PM and health is crucial especially for the EU whose agricultural economy is mostly based on exports to third countries.

3.3 Are certain objectives inappropriate?

Yes

3.3.1 Please state which one(s)

- The specific objective related to the costs and the administrative burden is not well defined. The objective is not to reduce these costs but to optimize, adapt and proportionate as regard the main objectives dealing with food and sanitary security, environmental risks, agricultural and forestry production sustainability, biodiversity protection... - The difference made between the global and the specific objectives is not appropriate. For example the question of competitiveness of the S&PM is not a specific objective but a general one in the frame of the common agricultural policy.

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

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

Empower users by informing them about seed and propagating material

Contribute to improve biodiversity, sustainability and favour innovation

1

Promote plant health and support agriculture, horticulture and forestry

3.6 Other suggestions and remarks

- As regard the question 3.4, it is not acceptable to consider a variety automatically registered as soon as it is protected by a PBR. Indeed, first, the registration is a public authorisation for marketing through a compulsory regime whereas the PBR is a private voluntary right. Second, PBR examination is only based on DUS testing and then, for agricultural crops, the proposed system would conduct to loosing benefit of VCU evaluation. This benefit is currently useful for the whole food supply chain. - As regard question 3.5, the first objective must be: "productivity, quality and regularity of agricultural and forestry productions". Consequently, this objective (not present in the picture above) is classified n°1 and then the others ranked from position n°2. - In the objective 4 (« contribute to improve biodiversity, sustainability and favour innovation ») innovation must be placed before sustainability and biodiversity which can not be promoted without innovation. On this basis we propose to rank this objective at the same level as "productivity, quality and regularity of agricultural and forestry productions".

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)

(a) : Miss a scenario that enables the improvement of the current system through technical and financial optimisation (and not reduction) to integrate to the objectives of the current legislation (innovation, productivity, quality and regularity of the production) the implementation of the environmental issues. This can be done through the official environmental evaluation of the varieties and their sustainable use. (b) The scenarios of evolution proposed by the Commission are exclusive and the most appropriate answer shall be based on the combination of different

aspects of each scenario. (c) In the scenarios, the integration of the plant health regime and the seed and plant marketing rules has not been taken into account.

4.3 Are certain scenarios unrealistic?

Yes

4.3.1 Please state which one(s) and why

Scenario 2 : -DUS : technical and legal impossibility for each breeding company to develop a reference collection. Consequently, the registration would not concern any more the DISTINCTION ("DUS" would be reduced to "US") but only based on a description (uncertain distinction thus impossibility to identify and to recognize, distortions between breeding companies using their own reference collections and the others using the official reference collection of the competent authorities). Scenario 3 : Incompatible with the objectives of harmonization, innovation, equality of access to the market and the competitiveness of the seed and agriculture sectors, sanitary security and protection of the users - DUS : same remarks than scenario 2 -VCU : (a) Impossibly to orientate the genetic progress towards the requests of the farmers, the consumers and the public policies (transfer this orientation to the processing industries with the risk of homogenization of the production in front of the reality of a strong segmentation). (b) : Introduction of a distortion of competition between breeding companies according to their capacity to finance their own VCU, loss of the official comparison between varieties and the reliable information for the users. - Certification : not any more required for seeds and plants marketed in the European Union with a labeling not harmonized, this scenario is incompatible with the objectives of transparency, protection of the users and loyalty of the transactions. Scenario 4 : - incompatible with the objective of harmonization and simplification, introduce the confusion -DUS: section 1: the same inconveniences as the scenario 3 / section 2: absence of guarantee of traceability for the user of seeds as for the end users -VCU: section 1: substitution of the compulsory criteria of productivity, quality and regularity of the production ("yield and value for use") by only environmental criteria ("health and physical environment") / section 2: the same inconveniences as the scenario 3 Scénario 5 : Incompatible with the objective of orientation of the genetic progress according to the specific agro climatic and economic conditions of every member state, incompatible with the objectives of harmonization , simplification and reduction of the administrative load. -DUS : very heavy administrative and economic load for CPVO - VCU : There is no more national catalog with their specific agro climatic and economic criteria (but certainly a development of recommended lists in each member state in addition of the evaluation realized by CPVO) and consequently a development of a "competition" between member state, economically heavy and technically more complicate for all the users and the administrative authorities.

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

- The issue of innovation shall not be mistaken with the notion of creativity. The increase of the varietal flow through the increase in the number of varieties available for the users does not guarantee the actual diversity of the offer. Indeed this offer shall be officially characterized in conformity with the objective of the users' protection.

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)

- Weakening of the suppliers, operators position on national, EU and international levels. - Impact on food security, - Impact on environmental aspects as regard sustainable genetic resistance against diseases and pests, - Agronomical impact and impact of the evolutions on the production systems. - 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 right: it would be necessary to decide, at the sowing time the field which need to be inspected for shipping, which is not possible. In 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 doesn't do it. Probably the ODCE seed scheme world is threatened.

5.3 Are certain impacts underestimated or overly emphasized?

Underestimated

5.3.1 Please provide evidence or data to support your assessment:

- The loose of mandatory certification for agricultural crops could lead to the reinforcement of phytosanitary and sanitary (at human level) problems. It would no longer be possible to require compulsory certification for the imported products. EU could face serious phytosanitary problems.
 - The positive impact on continuous and officially recognized genetic improvement is supported by Brisson & al.,2010. - Alhemeyer et al, 2008, Options Méditerranéennes 81, 43-47 (Evaluation of the evolution of the yield of barley in Germany since 40 years in 13 locations of trials showing that the genetic progress represent approximately 50 % of the increase of the yield. This study shows also, based on SSR's molecular markers analysis, that the genetic diversity decreased slightly for "4 rows barleys" but increased strongly for "2 row barleys". Reference : Ahlemeyer J.; Aykut F.; Kohler W.; Friedt, W. ; Ordon, F., 2008 .Genetic gain and genetic diversity in German winter barley cultivars. Options Méditerranéennes. Série A, 81, 43-47

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

Fairly beneficial

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 answer given above does not enable to take into account the possibility to propose a combinatory scenario.

6. ASSESSMENT OF SCENARIOS

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

VVV	VVV	VV	XXX	XX	VV Innovation
VVV	VV	V	XXX	XXX	- Creativity
V	V	V	VVV	V	V Improve competitiveness
VVV	V	V	XX	XX	- Simplification
VVV	-	V	X	X	V Optimisation of the means
VVV	-	VV	X	X	V Harmonisation
VV	-	-	XX	XX	VV Flexibility
VV	-	VV	VV	VV	X Consistence with other EU
policies		VVV	-	V	X X V

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:

