



IAPPS NEWSLETTER

Number III March, 2006

NOTE ON THE 16TH MEETING AND SCIENTIFIC CONFERENCE OF AAIS

CROPLIFE INTERNATIONAL STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOP ON STEWARDSHIP GOALS AND INDICATORS I had the opportunity to participate in the *CropLife International Stakeholder Workshop on Stewardship Goals and Indicators*, October 24-25, in Brussels Belgium. This report is based on a summary of the workshop provided by CropLife to all participants. The main purpose of the workshop was to review the plant science industry's stewardship activities with regard to crop protection products with an overall goal of assessing the current status and impact of these programs and identifying areas for improvement. The Workshop was represented by about 70 participants from a wide range of institutions throughout the world. They included representatives from inter-government organizations, government officials, non-governmental organizations, academics, development/aid agencies, regulators, farmers' organizations, food chain companies and the industry itself (company and association stewardship experts). They represented a diverse geographical spread from North America, Europe, Latin America, Africa and Asia.

To begin day 1, Ray Forney, Chair of the Sustainability and Stewardship Committee presented the purpose the workshop and Keith Jones provided an overview of current stewardship activities. Next, Gero Vaagt, FAO discussed the FAO Code of Conduct and its contribution to industry stewardship. Stephanie Williamson, PAN UK discussed the current agricultural and plant science industry stewardship programs from an NGO perspective. Two case studies were presented; Daniel Verbist, CEFIC, a case study on "Responsible Care- A Unique Initiative of the Global Chemical Industry" and Christof Walter, Unilever, "The Unilever Sustainable Agriculture Initiative." Day 1 ended with a panel discussion: "What are the key lessons for the plant science industry?"

Day 2 began with four breakout sessions:

- Sustainable Industrial Practices: R&D/Manufacturing/Distribution & Supply Chain Management Use. Chair: Ray Forney, Dupont
- Sustainable Use: IPM/Safe Use. Chair: Eva Erisgen, BASF
- Sustainable Consumption & Waste Disposal: Container Management/ Obstocks. Chair: Shannon Bass, Dow Agrosiences
- Verification, Auditing, Reporting and Communication. Chair: Paul Shelton, Monsanto

I participated in the Sustainable Use: IPM/Safe Use session. Dr. Braima James, IITA, IAPPS Governing Board member served as the rapporteur for the group. The following priorities selected by the group were: (1) Training, (2) Cooperation and partnerships, and (3) IPM. The following is a summary of the general consensus of the group.

- The CropLife definition/interpretation of IPM needs further clarification - there was concern that too much emphasis is currently placed on the use of chemicals. More should be done to promote the role of non-chemical pest management technologies in specific IPM programs. Biological technologies (e.g. parasitoids and predators) should be promoted together with good cultural practices (e.g. minimum tillage). Biotech options should also be included where appropriate.
- The focus should shift from IPM to ICM and that training programs should reflect this more holistic approach
- There is scope for a useful interchange of information between organic, integrated and conventional systems
- The removal of the more hazardous products (notably class 1 pesticides) from the market place would greatly enhance the effectiveness of IPM programs. CropLife could play a key role here in facilitating the removal of the more toxic chemicals from the market place
- There is an urgent need for more selective products to use in IPM programs. More effort should also be invested in improving application techniques to support impact reduction (humans and environment)
- CropLife could play a role alongside national associations in advising which products are most appropriate for use in IPM programs
- CropLife should build alliances with other partners to develop more effective and sustainable programs
- Proper training needs and impact assessments must be carried out
- Farmers require access to more IPM-compatible technologies that meet local needs and conditions as well as

better quality information, advice and technical support at grass roots level

- Take a proactive role in removing hazardous products from the market place

Recommendations for future activity:

Train retailers: CropLife should increase the focus on retailers, as they are the immediate contact groups for the industry.

Partnerships are vital: Training programs will be more effective and sustainable if conducted through partnerships e.g., with IGOs, GOs, and farmer associations.

Proper impact assessment: This can be designed to capture improvements in CropLife capacity to inform and motivate target groups and incapacity of target groups to perform/adopt IPM and Safe Use practices.

Set indicators to measure: Collect data to show how training has changed pesticide use problems?

Follow up program for trainees: Training should not only be about numbers; follow up is required and longer-term contact is needed to effect real change. **Information materials:** Make available IPM materials that are end-user friendly. Training should be practical; learning by doing is essential.


Dr. E.A. "Short" Heinrichs

Secretary General, IAPPS

IPM CRSP Consultant

E-mail: ehinric@unlnotes.unl.edu

IPM RESEARCH BRIEF NO.3

 The IPM Research Brief series is part of the SP-IPM's strategy for promoting information exchange among stakeholders. Its purpose is to build public awareness and understanding of the benefits of integrated pest management (IPM) and to encourage the full integration of this approach into mainstream agriculture.

The briefs are primarily intended for agricultural research managers, policy makers and the development partners with whom governments plan IPM inputs into agricultural and rural development activities. The briefs analyze the biological and ecological bases of IPM-related food security issues across different agroecosystems and regions. They also synthesize research results and advise on opportunities for scaling up the benefits achieved in pilot studies.

This brief examines the different ways that farmers can participate in the research for development process as it relates to IPM. It lays out the nature of the various participatory approaches to both research and learning and traces their history. There is a discussion of the SP-IPM's efforts to marry farmer participatory research (FPR) to IPM and the effectiveness and usefulness of farmer participation in IPM research and outreach. Putting this knowledge into practice at farm level is, as ever, the crucial element, and there are plenty of current case studies of FPR in IPM from around the world summarized in the brief. Most importantly, this brief draws out the lessons on how best to manage farmer research and learning activities, bearing in mind concerns about the funding environment.

This brief was prepared by the SP-IPM Secretariat in collaboration with Green Ink Publishing Services Ltd (UK). It is based on materials provided by scientists and development workers at the Investigacion Participativa en Centroamerica (IPCA), Honduras; the Fundación para Promoción e la Investigación de Productos Andinos (PROINPA), Bolivia; the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) community IPM and science projects in Vietnam; User's Perspectives With Agricultural Research for Development (UPWARD), the Philippines; CGIAR Program on Participatory Research and Gender Analysis (PRGA); the Institute of Agricultural Research of Ahmadu Bello University (IAR/ABU) in Nigeria; the Agricultural Research Centre (ARC) in Egypt; the Institut National de la Recherche Agronomique (INRA) in Morocco; and the Kenya Agricultural Research Institute (KARI), Kenya. SP-IPM contributing partner organizations were CABI Bioscience, the Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical (CIAT), the Centro Internacional de la Papa (CIP), the FAO Global IPM Facility (GIPMF), the Centro Internacional de Mejoramiento de Maíz y Trigo (CIMMYT), the International Center for Agricultural Research in the Dry Areas (ICARDA), the International Centre of Insect Physiology and Ecology (ICIPE), and the International Institute of Tropical Agriculture (IITA). Many thanks to all concerned who helped with advice, information and revision of the text.

Dr. Braima James

Coordinator, Systemwide Program on Integrated Pest Management (SP-IPM)

IITA, Cotonou, Benin

E-mail: b.james@cgiar.org

www.spipm.cgiar.org

The IAPPS Newsletter is published by the International Association for the Plant Protection Sciences and distributed in *Crop Protection* to members and other subscribers. *Crop Protection*, published by Elsevier, is the Official Journal of IAPPS.

IAPPS Mission: to provide a global forum for the purpose of identifying, evaluating, integrating, and promoting plant

protection concepts, technologies, and policies that are economically, environmentally, and socially acceptable.

It seeks to provide a global umbrella for the plant protection sciences to facilitate and promote the application of the Integrated Pest Management (IPM) approach to a the world's crop and forest ecosystems.

Membership Information: IAPPS has four classes of membership (individual, affiliate, associate, and corporate) which are described [here](#).

The *IAPPS Newsletter* welcomes news, letters, and other items of interest from individuals and organizations. Address correspondence and information to:

Dr. Manuele Tamo, Editor
IAPPS Newsletter
Biological Control Center for Africa, IITA-Benin
08 B.P. 0932 Tri Postal, Cotonou, Republic of Benin
E-mail: m.tamo@cgiar.org