1. INTRODUCTION
1.1 What is the name of your organisation?
Ing. Szilárd Kása PhD.

1.2 What stakeholder group does your organisation belong to?
Consumer

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
Ing. Szilárd Kása PhD.

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)
There still is a problem with uneven economical power of individual member states

2.3 Are certain problems underestimated or overly emphasized?
Underestimated

2.3.1 Please indicate the problems that have not been estimated rightly
Overestimated: Sustainability issues; Underestimated: distortion of internal markets, which is related to my answer in point 1.2

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)
I think that the main objective should simplification of the regulation, not just redistribution of the same activities between other participants.

3.3 Are certain objectives inappropriate?
Yes

3.3.1 Please state which one(s)
reducing costs for public authorities

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

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)
Abolishing the EU legislation on S&PM marketing; No Change; Simplification of the whole legislation

4.3 Are certain scenarios unrealistic?
Yes

4.3.1 Please state which one(s) and why
Scenarios 2 and 3 favor large companies to a great extent. It is not realistic that smaller companies will be able to do the registration testing themselves. Under this scenario, EU would be left just with 4-5 multinational companies registering new varieties. This does certainly not foster innovation. Scenario 5 is ill minded, in the whole European community, there should be more deregulation, not centralization. Giving more power to one authority usually has bad impacts. CPVO has been established for the purpose of protecting intellectual property, not registering new varieties.

4.4 Do you agree with the reasoning leading to the discard of the "no-changes" and the "abolishment" scenarios?
No

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)
Regarding registration, scenario 3 will have the same adverse impacts as scenario 2. In spite of the argumentation saying that there will be some cost saving under scenario 5, we fear that the opposite will happen since the registration costs under CPVO will be surely more expensive than in most of the Member States.

5.3 Are certain impacts underestimated or overly emphasized?
Underestimated

5.3.1 Please provide evidence or data to support your assessment:
The negative impact of scenario 1, 2 and 3 on SMEs is underestimated.

5.4 How do you rate the proportionality of a generalised traceability/labelling and fit-for-purpose requirement (as set out in scenario 4)?
1 = very proportional

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
Very negative

Scenario 3
Very negative

Scenario 4
Fairly beneficial

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:
no answer

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
Scenario 4 should be more clarified in terms of the harmonized description in section 2 to see if it will be really simpler, than in section 1. Another clarification is also needed in scenario 4, to answer the question whether in section 1 the tested varieties will be tested officially OR under official supervision. If the varieties would be tested under official supervision, this scenario will have the same negative impacts, as scenarios 2 and 3.

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:
Scenarios 2, 3 will not bring more competitiveness since only bigger companies will able to afford to test new varieties themselves. Understanding of sustainability according to the paper on options and analysis of possible scenarios favours only large companies. Scenario 5 will also favour larger companies.

7. OTHER COMMENTS
7.1 Further written comments on the seeds and propagating material review:
The objectives of better regulation have been defined incorrectly. The key objective, reducing costs and administrative burden to public authorities is irrelevant. One must look at the cost of the companies, because they pay taxes, and the public authorities are financed through taxes.

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: