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Questions on infrastructures related to IPM:

- dedicated programmes or single projects for extension and advisory services and/or training programmes
- demonstration or reference farms
- long-term field experiments
- national monitoring or forecasting networks on disease and/or pests
- databases and platforms
- required initiatives for further implementation of IPM
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**Joint infrastructure and capacity building opportunities**

On IPM implementation

″

**Weaknesses**

- Lack of collaboration between funders of IPM research, limited transfer of research knowledge into practice and lack of communication and collaboration in IPM throughout the MS are current problems in Europe that hinder IPM adoption;
- Short term and project-based funding dominates and does not support the long-term development of IPM farming systems;
- The socio-economics of IPM implementation is yet poorly addressed.

″
Areas identified for cross-border co-operation based on activities in C-IPM:

- Demonstration farms
- Monitoring
- Forecast
- Decision support
- Long term Field experiments
Demonstration farms
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Farm-network
Demonstration farms – how can knowledge sharing help?

In the planning/development phase of demo-farm projects

- how to select the host-farmers
- how to make the framework around the demonstration farm network
- how to support the host-farmers with advice
- how and when to use economic subsidies
Demonstration farms – how can knowledge sharing help?

When the demo-farm projects are up and running

- how to motivate other farmers to follow the host-farmers
- how to disseminate information from demonstration farms
- how to collect research relevant data

So far no initiative to start a cross-border network on demonstration farms
Monitoring, forecasting and decision support systems
Monitoring, forecasting and decision support systems

- costly
- time consuming
- high demand of knowledge/data
- high demand for updating

Benefits of knowledge sharing among countries:

Save time and resources on development

Gain on data foundation based on a broader geographical basis
Example page – Basic attributes of the DSS

From Burkhard Golla
Long term field experiments

On-farm experiments
Dependent on economic output, limited innovation
May be difficult to maintain
Close to practice, increase dissemination to farming community

Not historic experiments
Highly innovative
Opportunities for high risk strategies, e.g. high tolerance thresholds
Crop rotations including crops without a local marked opportunity

Historic experiments
Prearranged management practice, limited innovation
Long term consequences, e.g. for nutrients and soil characteristics
Long term field experiments
—how can knowledge sharing help?

Planning of cropping system strategies
Data sampling
Analyses
Contribution to common databases
Pros and cons of experimental setup
Diversity of methodologies to experiment Integrated Pest Management in arable cropping systems: Analysis and reflections based on a European network
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Bridging the gap from research to practice

Requires willingness to produce results in English

Dependent on long term funding
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