

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 What is the name of your organisation?

Ústredný kontrolný a skúšobný ústav poľnohospodársky (ÚKSÚP)

1.2 What stakeholder group does your organisation belong to?

Competent Authority (CA) involved in S&PM certification and control

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

ÚKSÚP Matúškova 21 833 16 Bratislava Slovakia

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?

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

3

Promote plant health and support agriculture, horticulture and forestry

2

3.6 Other suggestions and remarks

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, because there is too much freedom

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 opinion

5.2 Have certain impacts been overlooked?

No opinion

5.2.1 Please state which one(s)

5.3 Are certain impacts underestimated or overly emphasized?

Overestimated

5.3.1 Please provide evidence or data to support your assessment:

In all Scenarios will be reduce official body activities by certification.

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

Rather negative

Scenario 3

Very negative

Scenario 4

Rather negative

Scenario 5

Rather negative

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

In all Scenarios will be reduce official body activities by certification.

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 Scenario 2 (field crop seed) and Scenario 4 (vegetable and potato seed; propagating material of fruit, ornamental and vine) are more suitable

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:

We are responsible Official State Authority according to 66/401/EEC, 66/402/EEC, 2002/54/EC, 2002/55/EC, 2002/56/EC, 2002/57/EC, 68/193/EEC, 2008/72/EC, 92/34/EEC, 98/56/EC . As Official Authority we could support "no change" option (Scenario 0), Scenario 1 and Scenario 5 too.

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:

