

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

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

Bureau National Interprofessionnel du Cognac

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

Breeder of S&PM; Supplier of S&PM; User of S&PM; Professional user of raw material produced by agriculture, horticulture or forestry; Other

#### **1.2.1 Please specify**

Interprofessional organisation of Cognac producers and merchants

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

BNIC 23 allée du Champ de Mars 16 100 COGNAC www.cognac.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)**

Grape sanitary status (viruses), innovation linked to genetic progress is missing, food safety

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

No opinion

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

### **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)**

Innovation favouring and need for high level of traceability.

### **3.3 Are certain objectives inappropriate?**

Yes

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

Reduce administrative burden 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**

1

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

4

**Empower users by informing them about seed and propagating material**

5

**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 opinion

**4.2 Have certain scenarios been overlooked?**

No opinion

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

**4.3 Are certain scenarios unrealistic?**

Yes

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

3 & 4 no guarantee of plant quality and two levels system not realistic

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

No opinion

**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 opinion

**5.2 Have certain impacts been overlooked?**

Yes

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

Cost for end user

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

Underestimated

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

Agronomical and environmental impacts and research. Plant health and traceability.

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

4 = not 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**

Fairly beneficial

**Scenario 2**

Fairly beneficial

**Scenario 3**

Rather 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:**

Negative impacts of 3 and 4 scenarios on quality guarantees for users.

**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:**

Scenario one may guarantee plants health and quality and innovation

**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:**

