

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 What is the name of your organisation?

IFV - French Vine and Wine Institute

1.2 What stakeholder group does your organisation belong to?

Competent Authority (CA) involved in S&PM variety and material registration; Breeder of S&PM; Supplier of S&PM; User of S&PM; Company operating on national level; International 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

Domaine de l'Espiguette 30240 Le Grau du Roi, 33 4 66 51 40 45 - 33 4 66 53 29 16 -

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)

Sanitary status , No existence of European Catalogue for grapes

2.3 Are certain problems underestimated or overly emphasized?

Underestimated

2.3.1 Please indicate the problems that have not been estimated rightly

Non homogeneous degree of control in the States members

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)

Lack of traceability

3.3 Are certain objectives inappropriate?

Yes

3.3.1 Please state which one(s)

Reduce of burden of administrative control

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

5

Contribute to improve biodiversity, sustainability and favour innovation

3

Promote plant health and support agriculture, horticulture and forestry

4

3.6 Other suggestions and remarks

Health and Quality of the performance must remain the key points

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 3 : performance and tests optional : unrealistic

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?

Yes

5.2.1 Please state which one(s)

Viticultural requests seem to be less considered than breeder's and industry's. Quality and Health have to be for each scenario, the first concern.

5.3 Are certain impacts underestimated or overly emphasized?

Underestimated

5.3.1 Please provide evidence or data to support your assessment:

Quality and costs for the final user

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

Very beneficial

Scenario 2

Fairly beneficial

Scenario 3

Rather negative

Scenario 4

Rather negative

Scenario 5

Neutral

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

Scenario 1 : better guarantee to provide efficient and homogeneous (on an EU scale) services,

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?

Main elements taken from Scenario 1 plus some prerogatives given to national competent organizations

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 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:

Reference to the french selection and certification system and IFV's 50 years of experience.

