

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 What is the name of your organisation?

A.O.H.E. - Association des Obtenteurs Horticoles Européens

1.2 What stakeholder group does your organisation belong to?

Breeder 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

Domaine de Saint-André La Cannel des Maures 83340 - Le Luc en Provence (France)

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)

What has been overlooked is the perennality of certain crops and particularly the fruit crops.

2.3 Are certain problems underestimated or overly emphasized?

Underestimated

2.3.1 Please indicate the problems that have not been estimated rightly

The scope of the certification process and the specificity of the fruit material.

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)

Innovation is not considered as being one priority objective to be favoured. Set a system in which both characterization and certification of materials be implemented by a neutral body in view of a certification of quality for perennial crops.

3.3 Are certain objectives inappropriate?

Yes

3.3.1 Please state which one(s)

Strengthen the EU's role influence on international standards

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

5

Empower users by informing them about seed and propagating material

4

Contribute to improve biodiversity, sustainability and favour innovation

2

Promote plant health and support agriculture, horticulture and forestry

3

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?

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

A realistic and reliable system must be based upon a certification of quality and not on a certification of companies, meaning that it must absolutely be implemented by a neutral body, a professional institution known for its competence and independence and ensuring a level of quality essential for perennial crops.

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 of the certification process being entrusted to the private sector, with the risk of loss of reliability and objectivity on the outcome of the process. The certifying body must have no

interest in the product.

5.3 Are certain impacts underestimated or overly emphasized?

Underestimated

5.3.1 Please provide evidence or data to support your assessment:

Impact on the reliability of the quality of vegetal material (fruit essentially) for circulation between member states.

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

Rather negative

Scenario 3

Rather negative

Scenario 4

Fairly beneficial

Scenario 5

Rather negative

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

No individual scenario allows a reliable and independent system with the objective of ensuring a sufficient level of quality for perennial crops.

6. ASSESSMENT OF SCENARIOS

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

A combination of scenarios

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

Scenario 1 is the best adapted to a reliable certification process and Scenario 4 to a good DUS.

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:

As far as the propagating material (fruit) is concerned, the need is for a system that ensures the technical quality of the certification, implemented by a professional institution, under the supervision of the Ministry of Agriculture. No private body is able to ensure the same neutrality and reliability, for crops that are perennial and for which the level of quality must be kept in time; particularly for material that is likely to circulate between member states.

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:

