

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 What is the name of your organisation?

Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development

1.2 What stakeholder group does your organisation belong to?

Other

1.2.1 Please specify

Public administration

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

00-930 Warsaw, Wspólna Street No. 30, Phone: +48 22 623 10 00 kancelaria@minrol.gov.pl
www.minrol.gov.pl

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?

Underestimated

2.3.1 Please indicate the problems that have not been estimated rightly

high level of administrative burden

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

2

Empower users by informing them about seed and propagating material

4

Contribute to improve biodiversity, sustainability and favour innovation

3

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?

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 1 - too costly for the industry, especially small and medium enterprises scenario 5 - DUS and VCU tests should be carried out on MSs level or on the basis of bilateral agreements

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?

Yes

5.2 Have certain impacts been overlooked?

No

5.2.1 Please state which one(s)

5.3 Are certain impacts underestimated or overly emphasized?

Rightly estimated

5.3.1 Please provide evidence or data to support your assessment:

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

4 = not very proportional

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

Very negative

Scenario 2

Fairly beneficial

Scenario 3

Fairly beneficial

Scenario 4

Rather 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:

scenario 1 - too costly for the industry, especially small and medium enterprises, scenario 2 and 3 - possibility of reduction of administrative burdens, scenario 4 - this scenario is suitable for big enterprises but is unfavourable for small and medium enterprises, scenario 5 - DUS and VCU tests should be carried out on the level of MSs or on the basis of bilateral agreements.

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?

scenario 2 and 3 To take over whole scenario 2 and in the case of propagating material (fruit, vegetable, ornamental) adopt certification/inspection S&PM from scenario 3

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 recommend to use scenario 2 with some elements of scenario 3. DUS and VCU test should be carried out on MSs level or on the basis of bilateral agreements. As regards conservation varieties and niche production provisions should be less strict.

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:

