

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 What is the name of your organisation?

Boreal Plant Breeding Ltd

1.2 What stakeholder group does your organisation belong to?

Breeder of S&PM; Supplier of S&PM; SME 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

Boreal Plant Breeding Ltd, Myllytie 10, FIN 31600 Jokioinen, Finland, markku.aijala@boreal.fi, tel. +358 400 837808, www.boreal.fi

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?

Overestimated

2.3.1 Please indicate the problems that have not been estimated rightly

The objective of harmonization is overestimated. In EU there are very different conditions for agricultural production, especially in the bordering areas like Finland. In the case of evaluation of biological material and processes these conditions shall be taken into account and there should be room for national legislation in very special areas.

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 opinion

3.2 Have certain objectives been overlooked?

No opinion

3.2.1 Please state which one(s)

3.3 Are certain objectives inappropriate?

No opinion

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

3

Contribute to improve biodiversity, sustainability and favour innovation

5

Promote plant health and support agriculture, horticulture and forestry

4

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?

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

Scenarios 1, 3, 4 and 5 are unrealistic. Scenario 1: this would shift of cost burden to stakeholders, but not increase flexibility of the system. Scenario 3 presents system where variety performance testing and official certification is optional. This would not ensure high quality seed production. VCU -tests are very important to users of seed especially in specific cultivation conditions like in Finland. Possibilities to DUS testing in regional level have to be maintained. The extended role of CPVO in variety registration would lead to very complicated and time consuming process. CPVO can manage the database of varieties but decision making on listing of varieties has to be maintained on national level. Scenario 4 would lead to very difficult and unharmonized system and this would cause confusion from the user's point also. Seed intended for export has to fulfill requirements of certification and testing. Scenario 5 is not applicable. There is danger that this would lead to disappearing of national testing stations. Centralisation would probably lead to higher registration costs and prolonged time is needed to get variety listed to EU-register.

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?

No

5.2 Have certain impacts been overlooked?

Yes

5.2.1 Please state which one(s)

Scenario 2: the estimated impact on administrative burden and costs for authorities is too positive. It is not possible for small companies perform registration tests and thus it is still needed tests performed by competent authority. Scenario 3: too positive impact presented on administrative burden and costs for private sector operators. If the VCU-tests would not any more be required this would lead VCU-tests made by private sector operators and would mean extra costs for them. Savings on VCU-tests and official certification do not automatically mean money directed to breeding programmes.

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)?

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

Rather negative

Scenario 2

Fairly beneficial

Scenario 3

Very negative

Scenario 4

Very 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:

Please see our answer in 6.1.1

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

2 scenario is closest to our approach added with elements of current regulations on certification and DUS and VCU-testing. In very special climatic areas like in Finland it is uttermost important to maintain VCU-testing. VCU tests serve valuable information to farmers and to users of seed. There should be flexibility in transferring tasks to industry. It is not possible for small companies to perform all tasks. CPVO could maintain Common catalogue as it now has the database on denominations but national catalogues have to be maintained. Decision making on listing of varieties have to be remained in national level. The information in national catalogue is in mother language and thus it serves users in better way. There are species which are not listed in Common catalogue or species which are only cultivated in very local area thus national catalogues are needed. One key several doors principle is highly recommended. Registration of operators and traceability are very important elements in future legislation. Risk-based monitoring is profitable. Legislation has to take account international rules and standards and international trade. Especially plant health requirements have to be align with new Plant Health law. Approach to conservation varieties should be revised. The limits in production areas have to be reasonable. Legislation should encourage the biodiversity not limit the biodiversity.

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:

