

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 What is the name of your organisation?

Ministry of Agriculture

1.2 What stakeholder group does your organisation belong to?

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

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

Lai street 39//41, Tallinn, Estonia

2. PROBLEM IDENTIFICATION

2.1 Are the problems defined correctly in the context of S&PM marketing?

Yes

2.2 Have certain problems been overlooked?

No

2.2.1 Please state which one(s)

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?

No

3.2.1 Please state which one(s)

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

1

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

2

Empower users by informing them about seed and propagating material

4

Contribute to improve biodiversity, sustainability and favour innovation

3

Promote plant health and support agriculture, horticulture and forestry

5

3.6 Other suggestions and remarks

In the case of placing on the market trials (DUS and VCU) aim is different from granting of PVR ((denomination + novelty + DUS)

4. OPTIONS FOR CHANGE

4.1 Are the scenarios defined correctly in the context of S&PM marketing?

Yes

4.2 Have certain scenarios been overlooked?

No

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

scenario 1

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?

Yes

5.2 Have certain impacts been overlooked?

No

5.2.1 Please state which one(s)

5.3 Are certain impacts underestimated or overly emphasized?

No opinion

5.3.1 Please provide evidence or data to support your assessment:

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

Neutral

Scenario 2

Very beneficial

Scenario 3

Rather negative

Scenario 4

Rather 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:

Scenario 1 if we have no changes then laws will be state the same. St . 2 in this case is possible solve problems with unclear places in marketing directives, will increase the responsibility of stakeholders, the cost of variety registration will reduce for government. st 3 for marketing due to our climate conditions is very important to carry out VCU tests in Estonia, the registration of breeders is additional administrative burden ; ST 4 leaving testing and certification on voluntary basis is cheaper for variety owners but quality is not granted St 5 is not suitable because we lose competence what we have in field of official trials

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?

Yes

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:

If it suits you than we have protocol with stackholders which I can submit

