

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 What is the name of your organisation?

FranceAgriMer - CTPS vine section (Permanent comitee of selection)

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

12 rue Henri Rol-Tanguy TSA 20002 93555 MONTREUIL-SOUS-BOIS CEDEX
www.franceagrimer.fr

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)

The question of the genetic progress is fully missed. Many available references and data support the fact that absence of regulation oriented genetic progress drives to a dramatic decrease, in quantity and in quality, of the agricultural and forestry productions : Brisson & al 2010 for cereals, Fields Crops Research 119, 201-212 / Van der Heijden and Roulund, 2010 for forage crops, S.A.G. van der Heijden and N. Roulund, 2010. Genetic Gain in Agronomic Value of Forage Crops and Turf: A Review. In C. Huyghe (Ed) Sustainable Use of Genetic Diversity in Forage and Turf Breeding, p 247-260) - In the problems definition, the Commission argues that the main current focus of the regulation is only based on productivity. However, the current legislation allows member states to define specific national VCU criteria in the view of varieties registration. In France, VCU testing integrates the evaluation of varieties adaptation to agro environmental constraints and diversified cultural practices that favor the decrease of inputs use (testing without pesticide, without irrigation, diseases and pests genetic resistance characterization ...).

2.3 Are certain problems underestimated or overly emphasized?

Overestimated

2.3.1 Please indicate the problems that have not been estimated rightly

- Costs issue: overestimated. European Commission argues that the second of the 4 problems that shall be solved is related to the cost of the implementation of the regulation in the Member states. However at the French level, the implementation of the regulation (registration and certification) does not represent 3% of the value of the sector but about 0,3%. This data proves that the French system is more cost efficient that most of the other EU member states systems. This situation is partly due to the current implementation of the "under supervision controls" for VCU and certification. - Other point : the transfer of certain tasks performed by industry under official supervision don't reduce the total costs but transfer the public costs to the industry. This total cost would probably be higher in case of the DUS testing.

2.4 Other suggestions or remarks

- In the problems definition, the lack of efficiency of the current systems is not proved. As regard the current economic results, the systems are efficient (France is the 2d country for exportation of S&PM in the world and the 1st producer at the EU level). - In the impact assessment document,

there is confusion between the notion of biodiversity and genetic resources or genetic diversity. Biodiversity includes both the variation among species and the variation within-species. The variation among species may be measured at various scales, such as α , β and γ diversity considering both the within and between fields diversity (see de Bello et al, 2010 Journal of Vegetation Science 21, 992-1000). It may also be considered on the basis of the functional traits (functional biodiversity). Although there are some examples of relationship between species diversity and genetic diversity within species (Vellend and Geber, 2005, Ecology Letters 8, 767-781), both levels of diversity may be regarded independently. Plant breeding will mainly influence within-species genetic diversity (either through cultivated genetic diversity or ex situ genetic resources) while agronomic practices will have a crucial impact on the biodiversity in agricultural and forestry production systems.

3. OBJECTIVES OF THE REVIEW

3.1 Are the objectives defined correctly in the context of S&PM marketing?

No

3.2 Have certain objectives been overlooked?

Yes

3.2.1 Please state which one(s)

The following objective has been missed: productivity, quality and regularity of the productions. This objective shall be placed in 1st position in the view to be consistent with the expected role of the EU agricultural and forestry productions in the global food security and thus in avoiding food crisis. This collective responsibility must still be considered as crucial. - The issue of the innovation is overlooked. It shall not be placed at the third place after biodiversity and sustainability. Indeed, innovation is the key issue that enables to reach the objectives of sustainability. - The issue of traceability shall be at the same level as the question "healthy high quality S&PM". Indeed, this issue is a component of the quality of the S&PM. - The general objectives address the question of the information to the users. This information shall be qualified as well as reliable, impartial, official and available for the whole chain of users (from the farmers to the consumers). - The specific objective based on the improvement of the competitiveness shall be clarified and not based only at the EU level. Indeed, in the frame of the international market / exchanged, based on equivalence systems, the role of official certification for S&PM and health is crucial especially for the EU whose agricultural economy is mostly based on exports to third countries.

3.3 Are certain objectives inappropriate?

Yes

3.3.1 Please state which one(s)

The specific objective related to the costs and the administrative burden is not well defined. The objective is not to reduce these costs but to optimize, adapt and proportionate as regard the main objectives dealing with food and sanitary security, environmental risks, agricultural and forestry production sustainability, biodiversity protection... - The difference made between the global and the specific objectives is not appropriate. For example the question of competitiveness of the S&PM is not a specific objective but a general one in the frame of the common agricultural policy.

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

2

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

1

Promote plant health and support agriculture, horticulture and forestry

3

3.6 Other suggestions and remarks

- As regard the question 3.4, it is not acceptable to consider a variety automatically registered as soon as it is protected by a PBR. Indeed, first, the registration is a public authorisation for marketing through a compulsory regime whereas the PBR is a private voluntary right. Second, PBR examination is only based on DUS testing and then, for agricultural crops, the proposed system would conduct to loosing benefit of VCU evaluation. This benefit is currently useful for the whole food supply chain. - As regard question 3.5, the first objective must be: productivity, quality and regularity of agricultural and forestry productions. Consequently, this objective is classified n°1.

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)

Miss a scenario that enables the improvement of the current system through technical and financial optimisation (and not reduction). Combination of different aspects of each scenario is preferred.

4.3 Are certain scenarios unrealistic?

Yes

4.3.1 Please state which one(s) and why

Scenario 3, 4 and 5 are not compatible with the main objectives of the legislation on marketing of seed and plant propagating material.

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 issue of innovation shall not be mistaken with the notion of creativity. The increase of the varietal flow through the increase in the number of varieties available for the users does not guarantee the actual diversity of the offer. Indeed this offer shall be officially characterized in conformity with the objective of the users' protection.

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)

- Weakening of the suppliers, operators position on national, EU and international levels. - Impact on food security, - Impact on environmental aspects as regard sustainable genetic resistance against diseases and pests, - Agronomical impact and impact of the evolutions on the production systems

5.3 Are certain impacts underestimated or overly emphasized?

Underestimated

5.3.1 Please provide evidence or data to support your assessment:

- The loose of mandatory certification for agricultural crops could lead to the reinforcement of phytosanitary and sanitary (at human level) problems. - The positive impact on continuous and officially recognized genetic improvement is supported by Brisson & al.,2010. - Alhemeyer et al, 2008, Options Méditerranéennes 81, 43-47 (Evaluation of the evolution of the yield of barley in Germany since 40 years in 13 locations of trials showing that the genetic progress represent approximately 50 % of the increase of the yield. This study shows also, based on SSR's molecular markers analysis, that the genetic diversity decreased slightly for "4 rows barleys" but increased strongly for "2 row barleys". Reference : Ahlemeyer J.; Aykut F.; Kohler W.; Friedt, W. ; Ordon, F., 2008 .Genetic gain and genetic diversity in German winter barley cultivars. Options Méditerranéennes. Série A, 81, 43-47

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

Fairly beneficial

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:

Impact of scenario 3,4 and 5 could be very negative. They represent a negation of many years of organisation and improvement aiming at providing to professionals a high quality in propagating material, on the aspects of genetic selection, sanitary questions, true to type varieties.

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?

A good scenario for the vine propagating material sector would maintain compulsory VCU and DUS carried out by public qualified organisms as in scenario 1 for registration. Certification should remain compulsory, with current requirements, as indicated in scenario 1 or 2. Registration of specific suppliers (producers of initial and base material) should remain compulsory as in scenario 1 or 2. For conservation varieties, the scenario 4 could be appropriate, at registration and certification level.

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

6.2.1 Please explain:

- On the basis of the previous answers as regard the missing or misdefined objectives (innovation, productivity, quality, regularity of the productions) and the overlooked scenario based on the current technically and financially optimised (current objectives completed by the environmental issues) the comparison of the scenarios in the light of the objectives is hedged. - On the basis of the analysis of the Commission, scenario 4 appears to be the most positive whereas on the basis of our arguments, the scenario 4 does not best enable to achieve the objectives as we propose them. -It's why an alternate scenario is proposed and evaluated in regards the objectives defined and misdefined by the Commission.

7. OTHER COMMENTS

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

For the vine sector, the basis of the current system of registration and certification should be kept, because the main objectives of the regulation have been fulfilled. The system is globally good and could be improved by some light adaptations. There is no need of a major review of the system.

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:

