

OPTIONS AND ANALYSIS OF POSSIBLE SCENARIOS FOR THE REVIEW OF THE EU LEGISLATION ON THE MARKETING OF SEED AND PLANT PROPAGATING MATERIAL

**DG Health and Consumers
European Commission
Brussels**

Please return this questionnaire no later than **30.05.2011** by:

1.- mail to: SANCO-CONSULT-E7@ec.europa.eu

2.- or by post to the following address:

European Commission
Health & Consumers Directorate-General
Mr Walter De Backer
Office : F/101, 02/176
B-1049 Brussels

THE RESPONSES TO THIS QUESTIONNAIRE WILL BE MADE
AVAILABLE TO THE PUBLIC

NAME OF THE ORGANISATION	<i>AMSEM-Romanian Association of Breeders, Producers and Traders of Seeds and Propagating Material -</i>
STAKEHOLDER GROUP	<input type="checkbox"/> Competent Authority (CA) involved in S&PM certification and control <input type="checkbox"/> Competent Authority (CA) involved in S&PM variety and material registration <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Breeder of S&PM</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Supplier of S&PM</i> <input type="checkbox"/> User of S&PM <input type="checkbox"/> Professional user of raw material produced by agriculture, horticulture or forestry <input type="checkbox"/> Consumer <input type="checkbox"/> Other, please specify: <hr style="border-top: 1px dashed black;"/> <input type="checkbox"/> SME company <input type="checkbox"/> Company operating on national level <input type="checkbox"/> International company <hr style="border-top: 1px dashed black;"/>

	X <i>Organisation operating on national level</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>International organisation</i>
COUNTRY	ROMANIA
ADDRESS: (postal, e-mail address, telephone, fax and web page if available)	Gheorghe Hedesan AMSEM Executive President Bucharest, Str.Vasile Cristescu 7, sect.2, Postal Code 021984 Tel/fax +40213177291 e-mail office@amsem.ro web : www.amsem.ro

1. General questions

Question 1:

1.1 Are the problems defined correctly in the context of S&PM marketing?

Yes No

1.2 Have certain problems been overlooked?

Yes No

If _____ yes, _____ which _____ -

1.3 Are certain problems underestimated or overly emphasized?

Rightly estimated Underestimated Overestimated

Which ones: Overestimated: *Sustainability issues because sustainability goals are already taken care of, by breeders in their breeding programs; to much restrictions* **Underestimated:** *the bureaucracy and unflexibility management, to much implication of the state in the seeds market and to many restrictions on the free market*

1.4 Other suggestions and remarks:

Question 2:

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

Yes No

2.2 Have certain objectives been overlooked?

Yes No

If yes, which ones: *Ensuring non-discriminatory conditions for SME breeders*

2.3 Are certain objectives inappropriate?

Yes No

If yes, which ones: _____

2.4 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)

-4. 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.
2. 5 Other suggestions and remarks: *introduce in the first. rank "free internal market...."*

Question 3:

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

Yes No

3.2 Have certain scenarios been overlooked?

Yes No

If yes, which ones: *A combination of elements presented in the different scenarios might lead to a many better scenario*

3.3 Are certain scenarios unrealistic

Yes No

And, if so, why? =1: *because is not better regulations*

3.4 Do you agree with the reasoning leading to the discard of the "no-changes" and the "abolishment" scenarios?

Yes No

3.5 How do you rate the proportionality of a generalised traceability/labelling and fit-for-purpose requirement (as set out in scenario 4)? = 3

1 = very proportional, 2 = fairly proportional, 3 = *proportional*, 4 = not very proportional, 5 = not proportional at all.

3.6 Other suggestions and remarks:

Question 4:

4.1 Are the impacts correctly analysed in the context of S&PM marketing?

Yes No

4.2 Have certain impacts been overlooked?

Yes No

If yes, which ones: *the impact on SMEs having to perform registration themselves, this will have the same adverse impacts as in scenario 2.*

"Official label" is not necessary under accreditation in all scenario

4.3 Are certain impacts underestimated or overly emphasized?

Rightly estimated 4 Underestimated 1;2;3; Overestimated 5
In scenario 5 the registration costs under CPVO will be surely much more expensive than in most of the Member States

Please provide numeric data to support your comments wherever possible.

4.4 What are your views with regard to combining elements from the various scenarios into a new scenario?

New options needed New option not needed

Combination

Question 5:

5.1 Do you agree with the analysis of the potential of the various scenarios to attain the objectives?
 Yes No
 If _____ not, _____ please _____ justify _____

5.2 Which scenario or combination of scenarios would best meet the objectives of the review of the legislation? Please justify.
 Scenario 1 Scenario 2 Scenario 3 Scenario 4 Scenario 5 Other scenario
Scenario 4 will provide a choice for the operator, how costly he shall register and certify his varieties. Scenario 4 should be more clarified and elaborated in terms of the harmonized description. Also the term "official label" should be change with "EC supplier label"

If other please describe the main elements of that scenario:

5.3 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?
 Yes No

5.4 Other suggestions and remarks: *"EC supplier label" should be contain the mandatory requirements level (guarantee minimum germination or other important elements of standard)*

2. How do you assess the possible impact of the various scenarios on your organisation or on the stakeholders that your organisation represents

Type of impact	Not relevant	Very beneficial	Fairly beneficial	Neutral	Not very beneficial	Not at all beneficial	Don't know
Scenario 1: Cost recovery	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Scenario 2: Co-system	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Scenario 3: Reduced burden Co-system	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Scenario 4: Enhanced flexibility	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Scenario 5: Centralistion	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3. Written comments on the S&PM review

S&PM review is necessary into a single Reglament and also the simplification into flexibility for choise of breeders, suppliers and users of different member state. IS VERY IMPORTANT to have the rules for only one organisation of Competent Authority as public authority in each member state which represent the stakeholders in the first (operator and users) and the government as the second.

Also the governments representatives members in EC Standing committee of seeds tend to regulate the bureaucracy

We consider that the VCU criterias is better to remain on the breeders public recomandations.

4. Please make reference here to any available data/documents that support your answers, or indicate sources where such data/documents can be found

1.
2.