

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

### **1.1 What is the name of your organisation?**

Forest Life SCA

### **1.2 What stakeholder group does your organisation belong to?**

User of S&PM

#### **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**

Rue Les Quartiers 5, 5330 Sart-Bernard, edesclée@skynet.be

## **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)**

Biodiversity is an absolute necessity for sustainable agriculture, horticulture and forestry. Besides developing new varieties, focus should be on (reintroducing and re-) developing old organic/natural varieties. Biodiversity through (reintroducing) old organic varieties and through the development of new natural varieties (not GMO) can be guaranteed in a maximum way by a local, national (not EU) listing, that takes into account the specificities of the soils and the characteristics of the surrounding environment, whereby the certification and registration is made by the (national or regional) public authorities, not by the industry or the private sector, of which it cannot be guaranteed that they (only) act on behalf of public interest. Putting the registration and certification on EU-level and involving the industry will not improve the sustainability of farming, quite the contrary, which is proven by the devastating consequences of the actions of the EU and the industry taken in the past (erosion, decrease of biodiversity, water and other pollution, ...). Forestry (Forest Reproductive Material - FRM), as opposed to agriculture, has two additional peculiarities: (i) it needs a long term (100 years) approach, since the effect of decisions taken now in respect of FRM will only manifest itself after several decades and (ii) FRM are almost impossible to identify through molecular tools, so it requires a control on the material's flux. Both particularities are best guaranteed through a follow-up by the local (national or regional) public authorities. This might be achieved in a more simple way by keeping the Directive on FRM (1999/105/EC) separate from the agricultural and horticultural Directives.

### **2.3 Are certain problems underestimated or overly emphasized?**

Underestimated

#### **2.3.1 Please indicate the problems that have not been estimated rightly**

See 2.2.1

#### **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

### **3.2 Have certain objectives been overlooked?**

Yes

**3.2.1 Please state which one(s)**

see 2.2.1

**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 opinion

**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

3

Secure the functioning of the internal market for seed and propagating material

1

Empower users by informing them about seed and propagating material

4

Contribute to improve biodiversity, sustainability and favour innovation

2

Promote plant health and support agriculture, horticulture and forestry

5

**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 opinion

**4.2 Have certain scenarios been overlooked?**

Yes

**4.2.1 Please state which one(s)**

See 2.2.1

**4.3 Are certain scenarios unrealistic?**

Yes

**4.3.1 Please state which one(s) and why**

See 2.2.1

**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**

Not convinced that the abolishment scenario leads to unfair competition between Member States, especially since the past has shown that preferential treatment has to be given to local production in order to limit the negative effects on the environment.

## **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)**

see 2.2.1 and 4.5

### **5.3 Are certain impacts underestimated or overly emphasized?**

Underestimated

#### **5.3.1 Please provide evidence or data to support your assessment:**

see 2.2.1 and 4.5

### **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**

Very negative

#### **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:**

see 2.2.1 and 4.5

## **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**

see 2.2.1 and 4.5

**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:**

