

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

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

Plantum NL; the answers in this questionnaire relate specifically to ornamentals

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

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

#### **1.2.1 Please specify**

Plantum NL is the Dutch association representing the interests of companies who are active in breeding, tissue culture, the production and trade of seeds and young plants. Plantum NL has about 400 members with activities in agricultural, horticultural and ornamental species.

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

Vossenburchkade 68, Gouda, The Netherlands P.O. Box 462, 2800 AL Gouda The Netherlands  
Tel: 0031 182 688 668 Fax: 0031 182 688 667 info@plantum.nl www.plantum.nl

## **2. PROBLEM IDENTIFICATION**

### **2.1 Are the problems defined correctly in the context of S&PM marketing?**

No opinion

### **2.2 Have certain problems been overlooked?**

No opinion

#### **2.2.1 Please state which one(s)**

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

No opinion

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

### **2.4 Other suggestions or remarks**

The document does not really deal with ornamentals, therefore difficult to judge.

## **3. OBJECTIVES OF THE REVIEW**

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

No opinion

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

No opinion

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

### **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**

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

**Empower users by informing them about seed and propagating material**

**Contribute to improve biodiversity, sustainability and favour innovation**

**Promote plant health and support agriculture, horticulture and forestry**

**3.6 Other suggestions and remarks**

The document does not really deal with ornamentals, therefore difficult to judge. As to question 3.5: All the objectives listed in the table are important but we feel uncomfortable with this question as it might give a misperception of the priorities as understood by the industry.

**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)**

The optimal scenario is not included for the ornamental sector.

**4.3 Are certain scenarios unrealistic?**

Yes

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

In scenario 5 it does not become clear whether DUS and VCU also apply to ornamentals. If this would be the case, this would be completely unnecessary and even disastrous for the ornamentals sector.

**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**

To us the requirements for ornamentals do not become clear in every scenario. In scenario 1 and 2, there are no changes to the technical provisions, so we understand that the requirements for ornamentals will remain the same as they are under current legislation. Scenario 3 clearly excludes the ornamentals from legislation. Scenario 4 could impose stricter criteria on ornamentals, as they might have to be listed, although in principle this would only count for varieties covered by marketing directives with a closed list of species. Scenario 5 does not make clear at all what requirements for ornamentals would be. The scenario speaks of DUS and VCU, but does not state for which crops this would be applicable.

**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 impacts are filled in in a very subjective manner; with regard to ornamentals there is not much said.

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

Underestimated

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

The impacts are filled in in a very subjective manner; with regard to ornamentals there is not much said.

**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**

Don't know

**Scenario 2**

Don't know

**Scenario 3**

Fairly beneficial

**Scenario 4**

Don't know

**Scenario 5**

Don't know

**5.5.1 Please state your reasons for your answers above, where possible providing evidence or data to support your assessment:**

Scenario 1: no changes to the technical provisions could be acceptable for ornamentals Scenario 2: could work, provided that no DUS and registration is required for ornamentals. No changes to the technical provisions would be alright for ornamentals Scenario 3: fairly beneficial if there are no quality requirements; requirements on variety description and denomination should however remain. This scenario is closest to the needs of the ornamental sector. Scenario 4: could possibly work, provided that there is no listing obligations for ornamentals, otherwise very negative! Scenario 5: could work provided that no DUS test and VCU are required for ornamentals; otherwise very negative!

**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**

Scenario 3 is closest to the needs of the ornamental sector. There is no need for regulated quality requirements. Requirements for variety description by the supplier and denomination should however remain for the ornamentals.

**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:**

