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Competent authority in the Czech Republic is ÚKZÚZ - Central Institute for Supervising and Testing in Agriculture, Brno

- not for forest reproductive material
History

- 1856 - first agriculture testing station in Moravia (manor house of Hugo Salm in Rajec)
- 1877 – Institute for examination of seed in Prague
- 1890 - breeding of barley started in Moravia
- 1899 - Moravian agriculture experimental station founded in Brno
- 1919 - Moravian research institute for plant production in Brno
- 1951 - Central institute for supervision and testing in agriculture (ÚKZÚZ)
1989 Velvet Revolution

- variety listing and seed certification open for everybody

1993 Dissolution of Czechoslovakia

- establishment of the complete body

2004 Accession to the EU

- less stringent requirements
- free movement of the variety and seed
- competent and competitive authorities of EU
- CZ recommended list of varieties
Activities 2008 - varieties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Applications</th>
<th>Accepted on list</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National listing</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>2929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National PBR</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>679</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Activities 2008 – certification of seed

- Entered propagating areas were 131,371 ha
Current distribution of work

- **National listing**
  - VCU testing - 10% under official supervision (up to 80 %, depends on crops)
  - DUS testing – bilateral agreements (AT, DK, HU, PL, SK)

- **Seed certification**
  - 40 % under official supervision.

- **Recommended list of varieties**
  - 40 % trials under official supervision (up to 80 %, depends on crops)
Future needs

- **Better harmonization**
  - of *work* - comparative trials,
  - of *requirements* (coexistence – GMO, VCU),
  - of *definitions* (in CZ one seed act and troubles with explanations of common terms from different EC legislation).

- Prompt **conformity** with international standards and guidelines (OECD, ISTA, UNECEF...).

- Exchange **information systems** between authorities, incl. EC.
Future needs

- **Meaningful authorizations**
  - safe money, but supervision must be effective, otherwise is more expensive in principle.

- Splitting **technical** aspects **from** the more horizontal **legal** provisions (easy and quick implementation).

- The establishment of the minimum **threshold** for adventitious presence of **GMO** in no GM seed.
Future needs

• Distinguish between **target of legislation**
  - Seed certification – user of the variety (evaluation 17 % of answers).
  - PBR – author of the variety.

• Take into account **regional principles**
  - E.g. centralized testing of DUS – but:
    • slight differences in description of variety,
    • for certification we need to keep DUS knowledge and set of varieties.
  - VCU is based on regions.

• Keep genetic **diversity on field**
  - System must be open for smaller players (not overpriced, not V.I.P. club).
Conclusion

- We agree with principles of current seed legislation, however we support a lot of changes proposed in evaluation outcomes.

- We believe, that upgrade of seed legislation is possible task, not Sisyphus hill.

- We need permanent and live contact with stakeholders – we are only insurance policy between seed and plant.

- Thanks for hard evaluation work.
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