

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 What is the name of your organisation?

Ministry of Agriculture, Natural Resources and Environment - Department of Agriculture,
Competent Authority for Certification, control and variety registration of Agricultural crops (except
seed potatoes) and Vegetables

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

Louki Akrita Avenue 1412 - NICOSIA CYPRUS EMAIL.: doagrg@da.moa.gov.cy
seedcontrol@da.moa.gov.cy Tel.: 00357 22 466249/51 Fax.: 00357 22 343419

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?

Rightly estimated

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?

Yes

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

3

Contribute to improve biodiversity, sustainability and favour innovation

4

Promote plant health and support agriculture, horticulture and forestry

5

3.6 Other suggestions and remarks

Regarding question 3.4 the regime of automatically registration of a variety at the same time with the protection should not be possible in case of species for which current legislation VCU testing is required. VCU should be conducted in addition in at least one of the Member States or by industry.

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 : There are technical provisions of the current legislation to be improved. It is impossible to apply mandatory fee system in all Member States due to different costs of registration and certification in each Member State. Scenario 4 : For varieties of Agricultural species certification should be an obligation for all seed lots. Also non tested varieties are not accepted for Agricultural species.

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?

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?

Rightly estimated

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)?

No opinion

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

Don't know

Scenario 2

Very beneficial

Scenario 3

Rather negative

Scenario 4

Rather negative

Scenario 5

Very beneficial

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

Scenario 2 : The plant health of seeds is ensured. The level of certification will not be decreased. No negative impact to small and medium size enterprises as official testing will be possible.
Scenario 5 : Centralization will not have any negative impact to the registration and it will contribute to a more harmonised implementation of the registration procedure. Certification will ensure better harmonisation and transparency will be improved.

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?

Combination of Scenarios 2 and 5: Registration : In order to reduce the administrative burden part of DUS conducted by industry (one year) could be recognised by CPVO which will have the responsibility of final decision for registration. In order to maintain the National Catalogues according to scenario 5 the VCU test could be conducted by industry as described in scenario 2.
Certification: We support certification as described in scenario 5.

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:

-

