

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 What is the name of your organisation?

DE SANGOSSE

1.2 What stakeholder group does your organisation belong to?

SME company

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

ZA Bonnel BP 5 47 480 PONT DU CASSE FRANCE mail : moramatelp@desangosse.com web : www.desangosse.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)

Complexity and fragmentation of legislation Level of administrative burden Sustainability issues

2.3 Are certain problems underestimated or overly emphasized?

Underestimated

2.3.1 Please indicate the problems that have not been estimated rightly

Possibility to speed up the registration steps.

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?

Yes

3.2.1 Please state which one(s)

The new challenges for Food & feed industry in term of quality (security) and health. Be clearer on the objective: enhancing productivity cobined with a sustainable agriculture

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

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

Promote plant health and support agriculture, horticulture and forestry

1

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)

Scenario 2 and 5

4.3 Are certain scenarios unrealistic?

Yes

4.3.1 Please state which one(s) and why

Scenario 1, 3 and 4

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)

impacts on end-users (growers) impact on consumers

5.3 Are certain impacts underestimated or overly emphasized?

Overestimated

5.3.1 Please provide evidence or data to support your assessment:

impacts on environment and end-users (growers)

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

Rather negative

Scenario 2

Fairly beneficial

Scenario 3

Very negative

Scenario 4

Very negative

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 : no benefit por SME Scenario 2 : examination under official supervision is a very good idea Scenario 3/4 : VCU optional or light, there's no sense and very risky for the market.

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

We have to define deeply data for DUS and VCU including part of the environment and sustainable agriculture across Europe. It's not an option. What about varieties adapted to specific outlet/channel ?

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:

