



## R & D Workshop Programme

13<sup>th</sup> January 2015  
Hotel Novotel, Poznań, Poland

- 9:00-10:00**                      **Registration**
- 10:00-10:20**                    **Welcome addresses by Danuta Sosnowska (Director IOR PIB) and Antoine Messéan, C-IPM coordinator**
- 10:20-12:20**                    **Plenary talks on IPM research organization in different Member States**  
(approx. 25 min. of talk + 5 min. of questions)
- ❖ Drivers and steps towards a more systemic approach of IPM research in Finland - where is IPM research now?  
*Irene Vänninen; Finland*
  - ❖ Ecophyto Research: organization and priorities in support of the French National Action Plan  
*Pierre Grenier; France*
  - ❖ How is research for IPM organized and conducted in Spain?  
*Antonieta De Cal; Spain*
  - ❖ Research and implementation of IPM in Turkey  
*Nursen Üstün; Turkey*
- 12:20-13:20**                    **Lunch**
- 13:20-16:05**                    **World Café workshop: Pros and Cons introduction and general discussion** (10 + 45 = 55 min./topic)
- Following a short introduction on the objectives of the World Café workshop participants will be divided into 3 groups. The groups will rotate and discuss the following 3 specific items at various tables. Each group will be headed by a group moderator. The ideas collected at each table will be presented by the respective moderator to the participants of the workshop.
- ❖ *IPM research: specific methods vs. holistic approaches*
  - ❖ *Role of infrastructures (long-term experiments, demo farms) on IPM implementation*
  - ❖ *Role of socio-economic drivers on IPM implementation in Europe*

<b>16:05-16:25</b>	<b>Coffee break</b>
<b>16:25-16:50</b>	<b>Presentations of the summary of discussions by each moderator (aprox. 8 min/topic)</b>
<b>16:50-17:00</b>	<b>Closing remarks and next steps</b>

## **Points to be addressed by each speaker during the morning session in their talk:**

1. How is IPM research organised in your country e.g. in the responsibility of different ministries environment, agriculture, economy or research/education?
2. How are IPM-related research objectives defined, organized and disseminated in your country?
3. How is IPM research and implementation addressed in your National Action Plan addressed and supported?
4. What is the role of stakeholders in the definition of IPM research objectives, the implementation and evaluation of research?
5. Is there a direct link between IPM research and extension in your country?
6. What are your expectations from transnational collaborations? How do you anticipate such collaboration to fit with your national research agenda?

## **Discussion of the afternoon session (World Café style):**

Following a short introduction on the objectives of the World Café workshop participants will be divided into 3 groups. The groups will rotate and discuss specific items at various tables. Each group will be headed by a group moderator. The ideas collected at each table will be presented by the respective moderator to the participants of the workshop.

### *1. IPM research: specific methods vs. holistic approaches*

One of the major conclusions among the participants of the first thematic workshop were that research is currently too much oriented on specific crop-pest relationships and that IPM implementation will benefit from a broader systems approach in agricultural research. For many crops, we already have substantial knowledge of the individual crop-pest relationships. However, it lacks the overall research to combine them into system guidelines and draw conclusions. What would be the cornerstones or criteria for the development of such guidelines? Can all cropping systems (annual vs. perennial for example) benefit from the guidelines? Will the adoption of holistic IPM research approach be helpful to provide effective solutions to farmers? Should we go beyond crop protection and IPM issues to address the resilience of farming systems at large to help implement IPM? If so, how research should be organized?

*Moderator and minute taker: Silke Dachbrodt-Saaydeh & Jay Ram Lamichhane*

## *2. Role of infrastructures (long-term experiments, demo farms) on IPM implementation*

Many participants of the first thematic workshop expressed the opinion that there is a lack of proper knowledge exchange between research and practical farming. The research should be driven by practical questions, not the other way around; research driven questions to initiate more research. In the implementation of IPM it is important to take into account the full picture of the production chain; from the producer to the consumers. If the knowledge transfer focused on the whole production chain the farmers would have a better basis for the implementation of IPM. For the farmer to gain knowledge about IPM it is important to ensure that interested farmers are able to access the available knowledge. In some countries this is not presently the case and the gap between research and practical management is large. A valuable tool in the knowledge exchange is the use of demonstration farms. The practical approach of demonstration farms is an important way of overcoming the gap and the advisory services have an important role in this process. If the knowledge exchange is not addressed properly the implementation of IPM will become very slow and difficult. Therefore, dissemination and moreover intensive collaboration with the end users of research results has to be integrated in research projects on IPM. Increased funding for this is needed. It is also important to incorporate IPM knowledge in the education system. Do countries equipped with a number of infrastructures have a higher level of IPM implementation? Are results obtained by long-term experiments and demo-farms promptly disseminated to farmers? Do farmers have a positive perception of those outcomes in terms of feasibility? Which added value one can gain from networking demonstration farms?

*Moderator and minute taker: Per Kudsk & Piet Boonekamp*

## *3. Role of socio-economic drivers on IPM implementation in Europe*

The socio-economical aspect of IPM implementation is poorly addressed in many research programmes but crucial to the farmer. If IPM is not cost-effective the farmer is not able to implement IPM as the farmer depends on a high productivity and surplus in the balance sheet. Benefits that can be obtained in the short term often influence farmer's choice to take decisions in practical management. However, there are choices which could be counterproductive in the short

term but could lead to increased benefit in the long term. More focus on the long term consequences, e.g. of resistance development, health problem due to exposure to pesticides etc. might benefit IPM solutions. How the benefits of IPM in the long term can be assessed and effectively communicated to the farmers? Can IPM projects and the cost–benefit–analyses sufficiently address and reproduce the multiple constraints farmers are challenged by? Some IPM solutions it might be necessary with financial support in the early phases, who should provide such subsidies? What are potential incentives to increase the level of IPM implementation based on the exploitation of all possible means, preferably prevention and non-chemical measures?

*Moderator and minute taker: Jozsef Kiss & Mette Sønderskov*