

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 What is the name of your organisation?

Czech Seed Trade Association (CMSSA)

1.2 What stakeholder group does your organisation belong to?

Breeder of S&PM; Supplier of S&PM; Other

1.2.1 Please specify

CMSSA is a union of private plant breeding and seed enterprises. Nowadays CMSSA represents 72 members

1.3 Please write down the address (postal, e-mail, telephone, fax and web page if available) of your organisation

CMSSA Zelený pruh 99, 140 02 Praha 4 phone +420-910110491 fax +420-910110504 e-mail: office@cmssa.cz

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)

Problem of the destabilization of the internal market in relation to the different charges and necessarily of its harmonization, arising from inhomogeneity of the European economy and the differences between member countries will persist in the future. The EU is economically "multispeed" and the harmonization eventually thoughtfully centralization will bring problems mainly in the new European countries Risk of food crisis

2.3 Are certain problems underestimated or overly emphasized?

Underestimated

2.3.1 Please indicate the problems that have not been estimated rightly

The registration system of varieties is sufficiently flexible (see the number of registered varieties in the EU), differences in registration and certification between MS are not significant and they are not remarkably to affect economic competition. Overestimated is the enhancement of the sustainability, the breeders work very intensively on this aim regardless of any EU direction and those varieties are preferred in registered trials. Under estimated is: the importance of the crop yield as complex character of the sustainability. Character of the seed production of the forest trees is significantly different and will complicate a new directive. Rules for forest tree seeds should be in an independent directive.

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)

Food security

3.3 Are certain objectives inappropriate?

Yes

3.3.1 Please state which one(s)

The idea about more wide utilization of the biodiversity by farmers and the importance of the conservation varieties

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

There is overestimated promotion of biodiversity. High or low number of marketed varieties does not have the effect on diversity. Innovation should be included in all scenarios as a positive element.

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?

Yes

4.2.1 Please state which one(s)

Suitable combination elements from different scenarios

4.3 Are certain scenarios unrealistic?

Yes

4.3.1 Please state which one(s) and why

Scenario 1 - full payment of the fees is not realistic. Scenario 3 should bring production risks for farmers and consumers. It would disturb the functioning of the internal market and would not contribute to stronger competitiveness of the EU and does not secure the end users. Scenario 4 is objectionable, as well as in Scenario 3. Scenario 5 - total centralization will be contributed to a significant DUS and VCU costs increasing in the new member states, listed varieties by CPVO will generate an increase of the production risks for farmers. The variety testing must represent and estimate variety performance in the individual regions, not only meet an opinion of CPVO. The small and medium enterprises would be damaged significantly by Scenario 5, because they

will not have opportunity to such extend to pre-test their candidate varieties for listing in the areas of the CPVO accredited testing stations . This fact leads to the rapid death of the breeding in the small and medium companies. The number of the accredited stations and their localization is unknown and most probably their reduction can be presupposed. It is possible that important local information for farmers are reduced from this reason. The role of marketing will strengthen at the expense of the real value of varieties for farmers Scenario 5 is very good scenario for strong multinational companies

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

The harmonization of prices and charges for the registration is currently unrealistic at all, maybe it will have been possible by 20 years.

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)

The EU is not in terms of performance of economy a homogeneous unit, it is necessary to analyze and take into consideration impacts on the new MS.

5.3 Are certain impacts underestimated or overly emphasized?

Underestimated

5.3.1 Please provide evidence or data to support your assessment:

Underestimated: The impact on small and medium enterprises (scenario 4 and 5) Plant health in scenarios 3 and 4 Overestimated: The impact of innovations in scenarios 3, 4, innovation will be positive in all scenarios

5.4 How do you rate the proportionality of a generalised traceability/labelling and fit-for-purpose requirement (as set out in scenario 4)?

5 = not proportional at all

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

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:

no answer

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

We support after certain revisions Scenario 2, to correspond to its name from the point of view supervision. We disagree with the transfer of responsibility for DUS and VCU to seed sector, and we demand an analogous system as authorization for the seed certification. This means the National Office authorizes private companies and those companies will perform the work under the supervision of the National office. For small and medium enterprises is necessary to maintain the DUS and VCU examination on a national level. Registration for agricultural crops, vegetables, fruits and wine will preserve on a national level. Forest reproductive material should not be included in this regulation.

6.2 Do you agree with the comparison of the scenarios in the light of the potential to achieve the objectives?

No

6.2.1 Please explain:

None of the scenarios do fulfil sufficiently goals. We disagree with the analysis and understanding of sustainability

7. OTHER COMMENTS

7.1 Further written comments on the seeds and propagating material review:

The scenarios are unbalanced, and not all relevant issues are considered in all scenarios (harmonization, common catalogue, cost). Difference in the social and economic development between MS is not considered in the scenarios.. Most of the "Scenarios" are advantageous for strong international companies. Their strong influence is evident in the text and also the EU administration efforts for centralization enhancements by force CPVO is visible. Czech Seed Trade Association express its complete disagreement with the ESA formulation of the proposal for variety listing in point 2.1. 2.1 The testing body can either be an official body or private body acting under official supervision. Both official and private bodies have to be accredited. For this purpose the Community Plant Variety Office (CPVO) sets standards, performs audits and accredits those private and public testing stations which meet the well-defined accreditation criteria based on quality. Proposal CMSSA 2.1. The testing stations are acting under official supervision. National Office has to be accredited by CPVO, authorized private bodies have to be accredited by accredited National Office and are acting under its supervision. For this purpose the Community Plant Variety Office (CPVO) sets standards.

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:

