



**Final conference**  
**6<sup>th</sup> December 2016**  
**Draft version 0.9**

## **Panel discussion “Added value of future networking on IPM in Europe”**

The Panel discussion aimed at providing feedback on the outcomes of C-IPM, to express views as for possible scenarios for the future of IPM research and development (R&D) in Europe and to indicate what could be the specific role of stakeholders to support transnational collaboration on IPM. Panelists were invited to openly express their views about what should/could be done to promote IPM and to align IPM-related rR&D in Europe.

**The discussion was moderated by** Per Kudsk (AU, Denmark), C-IPM ExCom member. The participants were:

- Jean-Philippe Azoulay (ECPA)
- David Cary (IBMA)
- Patrizia Eleonora Ganci (EC DG Agri)
- Marios-Nektarios Markakis (EC DG Research)
- Gerben Messelink (IOBC-WPRS)
- Dara O’Shea (EC DG Santé)
- Luc Peeters (COPA-COGECA)
- Andrej Simoncic (KIS, Slovenia)

After a short presentation of panelists by the moderator, two successive rounds were organized to discuss the following questions:

1. Looking back at the outputs of C-IPM: How do you see the outcomes of C-IPM, do you think that C-IPM achieved its key objectives initially planned in terms of transnational collaboration on IPM? Overall, how do you see the added value of C-IPM?
2. Looking forward at the future: Do you think that it is worth to continue IPM networking activities? If yes, for which priorities and how? Which role can your organisation play in the development of transnational IPM collaboration?

After each round, the audience was invited to comment and/or ask questions to the panel members.

### **Looking back at the outputs of C-IPM:**

Luc Peeters (COPA-COGECA) indicated that the outputs are useful but regretted that applied research organisations or some existing networks could not be more involved in the ERA-NET. He indicated that the main challenge is to put more effort on dissemination of already

existing information towards farmers rather than beginning once again development of new tools. Indeed, most of current knowledge is not available to farmers and it is the duty of the research system to make sure that knowledge is translated into ready-to-use and cost-beneficial tools for farmers. Stop saying “Farmers should do this” but “That’s what we are doing to support farmers and help them change their practices”. Finally, when it comes to dissemination, formulation and repetition of clear and simple messages is crucial.

David Cary (IBMA) also emphasized that working with farmers is critical and, for that, funding for extension might be a limiting factor. More specifically, it’s time to acknowledge that regulation presents barriers to bring IPM solutions to farmers and a paradigm shift in regulation is needed to enhance the holistic nature of IPM.

Jean-Philippe Azoulay (ECPA) considered that the emphasis from C-IPM on the necessary “systems” approach is welcome but an optimal use of resources is still to be made.

Gerben Messelink (IOBC) underlined that the C-IPM message on the holistic approach and the role of networking to foster implementation of IPM is very much in line with IOBC. While he acknowledged that implementation and dissemination of existing results are crucial, one should not forget that a lot of expertise are disappearing across Europe and that we still need to support innovation.

Andrej Simoncic (KIS) indicated that, although Slovenia was not part of C-IPM, the outcomes of C-IPM are useful and it is likely that Slovenia would like to contribute to the follow-up activities.

Marios Markakis (EC DG Research) stated that the evaluation of C-IPM by EC is still to come but bringing together so many Member States and launching two transnational calls within the 3-year period are already successful outcome.

Patrizia Ganci (EC DG Agri) Generally speaking in the Horizon 2020 philosophy there is increased emphasis in Societal Challenge 2 on applied research making the innovation component more prominent. Moreover stakeholder and societal involvement through the multi-actor approach can help to bridge the gap between research and innovation.

Dara O-Shea (EC DG Santé) considered that there was a clear added value in C-IPM as demonstrated through transnational projects already funded, which help to reduce duplication of research activities across member states. This has been engaged with the mutual recognition on minor uses and should be extended.

During the discussion with the audience, it was clarified that C-IPM was a network of research funders that focus on alignment of national research programmes and, as such, cannot act as a network of all concerned stakeholders.

## Looking forward at the future

Patrizia Ganci (EC DG Agri) indicated that amongst other strategic programming exercises DG AGRI published a strategic approach to agricultural research and innovation with two focuses: enhancing rural innovation – modernising rural territories and policies and creating value from land - sustainable primary production. The systems-based approach, interdisciplinarity and transdisciplinarity are amongst others cross-cutting issues. The headings cover various facets, including resource management, healthier plants and animals and integrated ecological approaches from farm to landscape level, new openings of rural growth and enhancing the human and social capital in rural areas. The preparation of the work programme for SC2 2018-2019 (2020) will start next year.

Marios Markakis (EC DG Research) made it clear that the effort towards integration and networking should continue, not only within Member States but across Europe at large. IPM is a key component of the FOOD 2030 initiative under discussion.

Dara O'Shea (EU DG Santé) also emphasized the need to continue EU co-operation in the area of IPM. In 2017, DG SANTE will organise two Commission Working Group meetings of MS experts on Sustainable Use of PPPs. It is planned to upgrade the current Commission website on Sustainable use, in particular by providing links to crop specific IPM guidelines, which should facilitate sharing of IPM good practices between MS. The current BTSF training course on PPP application equipment will be extended into 2017. A new BTSF course, focusing specifically on IPM, will be developed during 2017 and should launch in 2018. MS have been consulted on the development of this course. DG Santé has not yet considered alignment of IPM related research at EU level, since the transfer of responsibility for this dossier within Sante in recent months.

Jean-Philippe Azoulay (ECPA) stated that, from a research viewpoint, C-IPM should continue. IPM is a way to go towards more sustainable systems and ECPA support this. However, we should be aware that we still need new active ingredients to accompany IPM. The drastic reduction in the number of authorized active ingredients (only 4 registered since 2007). Dividing the EU into zones to account for geographical characteristics is advisable.

For David Cary (IBMA), IPM is a continuous process and it therefore never stops. Minor uses are one of the key challenges that need to be addressed.

Luc Peeters (COPA-COCEGA) stressed that bridging the gap between research and practice (farmers) should be the priority for future, no doubt about the future of C-IPM but maybe there exist different points of view in terms of how it should continue. Applied research and demonstration centres should be involved. How IPM influences the third country trend should be considered (out of Europe). We should not forget the

profit which directly affect sustainability of a given tool (because if a tool is not adopted it won't be sustainable). We need low-risk solutions. Overall, the legislation is crucial e.g. more use of mutual recognition.

Andrej Simoncic (KIS, Slovenia) emphasized the need for long-term cooperation and alignment as funding through individual projects is not optimal. Also, dissemination issues should be considered at a broader scale, as they are not specific to IPM.

Gerben Messelink (IOBC) called for more research and innovation on IPM. IOBC uses the availability of expertise to promote IPM through networking as C-IPM does and therefore it is important that C-IPM continues. IOBC is an existing platform that can be used to support knowledge sharing and networking activities that C-IPM has initiated.

The general discussion addressed various issues such as how infrastructures, e.g., databases of living organisms can be sustained beyond the research projects or how to ensure viability of business models for innovations that address long-term sustainability. Also the need to account for the forthcoming biotechnological innovations, e.g., RNAi and genome editing was highlighted. Also, there was an agreement to consider that resilience is crucial and is part of IPM.

The Minor Uses Coordination Facility is concerned that IPM research for Minor Uses could be completely discontinued and considered that it is important that C-IPM continues as it focused on MU research. MUCF supported the need to maintain the EU platform that has been set up over the last three years. In summary, there was a general consensus about the importance of continuing C-IPM.

Closing the panel discussion the moderator Per Kudsk concluded that although there were diverging opinions on the outcome and impact of C-IPM there were consensus that networking on IPM research and dissemination should continue and that the EU should continue to support these activities. Concerning the output of C-IPM, Per Kudsk reminded the participants that the full impact of C-IPM cannot be assessed until we know the outcome of the joint collaborative projects of which the last ones will be initiated in 2018.