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Why IPM, why to compare NAPs?

- EU Policy on sustainable use of pesticides ....>
- Directive 2009/128/EY >
- NAP: IPM principles 2014 in every MS
- Other directives: water_ 2008/105/EY and strategies: soil (25.9.2006) etc. ....
- PPP residues have been detected in water systems !
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Almost Every country has had plans to minimize the USE of pesticides

- **In Denmark:** NAPs on pesticides for decades, starting in 1986:

- **In Sweden:** Sweden: First National Action Plan 1986, A new reduction goal was decided 1990 – continued goal another 50% reduction until 1996.
  - 2nd program 1997-2001
  - 3rd program 2001-2006, was prolonged until 2009.
  - 4th program 2010-2013. "Hållbar användning av växtskyddsmedel".

- **In Finland:** Tasapainoinen kasvinsuojelu ("Balanced plant protection") 2000 –

- **The politicians of Latvia are not actively working on programmes to minimise pesticide use, as the public debate has been minimal** (Weed Research 48, 201–214)

- DK: The Agreement on Green Growth **The government** (Venstre and De Konservative [Venstre, the Danish Liberal Party and The Danish Conservative Party]) and Dansk Folkeparti [The Danish Peoples’ Party] have **signed**
NAP Coordination and stakeholders used

• DK: Governmental process led to the Green Growth policy
• SE: The Swedish Board of Agriculture coordinates, many stakeholders including The Federation of Swedish Farmers
• FI: Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry: a committee made the proposal for NAP,
• EE: Ministry of Agriculture: in progress, a draft will be circulated among IPM experts (Jõgeva Plant Breeding Institute, Estonian Research Institute of Agriculture and Estonian University of Life Sciences).
• LV: Ministry of Agriculture (Plant Protection Department, Integrated Plant Protection Division)
• LT: Ministry of Agriculture: Committee, consists of many stakeholders
NAP snapshot?

• SE: A report with proposed measures was presented in 2010. These measures are still being processed.
• FI, A recommendation for the NAP done, will be published by the Ministry of Ag. soon?
• EE: The work recently started.
• LV: “writing in progress” training projects coordinated by the Cabinet of Ministers, Plant Protection Service specialists coordinate networking among stakeholders.
• LT: A committee is processing a recommendation for the NAP, a working group established 2010.
NAP goal setting... qualitative

- **DK**: Reduction in the pesticide impact > Environment and health burdens from use of pesticides in horticultural and fruit growing sectors must be reduced maximally
  - Pesticide residues in Danish-produced food must be reduced to a minimum.
  - Approved pesticides must not leach into the groundwater at levels above the maximum limit value.
  - The current indicator (treatment frequency) is to be replaced > The “pesticide impact index” shall be reduced to 1.4 by the end of 2013.
- **SE**: Reduced risk, measured by risk indicators, almost no residues in water, low residue levels in domestic vegetable crops.
- **FI**: Reduction in the pesticide impact on Environment and health, decrease dependence on chemical pesticides, residue levels below acceptable values, increased IPM training and a common IPM understanding, environmental risks monitored
- **EE**: the plan not ready
- **LV**: the plan not ready
- **LT**: the plan not ready
Actions

- **DK:** Introduction of a new *indicator* for the “pesticide impact index, re-structuring of the *pesticide tax*, Warning system for pesticides found in groundwater, Continuation of pesticide control which includes control of *illegal imports*
- *extension service* on IPM will be nearly fully financed.
- Information campaigns for *consumers* and garden owners
- **FI:** *training* programs for farmers, retailers and users, IPM information services, monitoring of residues (water systems), research focused on biological control
- **SE:** Training, extension services and information. Research, development and trials, Legislation, Monitoring, *Follow-up*,
- **EE:** the plan not ready
- **LV:** the plan not ready
- **LT:** IPM development, *training*, handling, application, equipment, information to the public, *indicators*
Resources?

- DK: +4.8 m€/6 years for IPM advice systems +1.6 m€ warnings, thresholds etc.

- SE: 1.65 m€ /2011 to implement the directive including IPM + 1.3 m€ for research and development

- FI: TUKES (Finnish Safety and Chemical Agency) two persons to coordinate the IPM implementation! Institutes should allocate resources, not assured! projects? National, regional money? Farmers training -Chargeable or free?

- EE: the plan not ready

- LV: the plan not ready?

- LT: Need of funds listed: research, monitoring, training of farmer?
### Difference of the Research Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Use of alternative weed control</th>
<th>Research in alternative weed control</th>
<th>Technological Innovation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Common</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Common</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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- **Organic farming related research ? IPM technologies?**
Indicators – a difficult issue

• EU
• HAIR project ?? Harmonized risk indicator ?
• SYNOPS/Endure, GIS based analysis and warnings?
• DK indicators 2011 ? national?
• Sweden will continue with the national indicators until there are indicators for Europe available.
• Collaboration needed !
• Comparable on EU level
Consumption of pesticides - DATA

- **DK**: will store the consumption data reported by farmers per crop per farm
- **SE**: the farmer has to keep records over the use of pesticides, data collection not decided
- **FI**: the farmer has to keep records over the use of pesticides, data collection not decided
- **EE**: the plan not ready
- **LV**: the plan not ready?
- **LT**: the plan not ready
Communication to consumers

• DG Environment > DG Sanco (Directorate General for Health and Consumer Affairs)!

• IPM …Difficult to understand
• Too many labels and ”health messages”

• Hard DATA to support the dialog!
• Vertical & Horizontal
Papers (NAP) and/or measurable progress?

- Resources to act if a national plan .....??
- Lower dependence on synthetic chemicals >= global warming and higher plant health risks and as well as leaching risks (pesticides and nutrients)
- Alternative control techniques ?? Without resources ???
- DATA /pesticide consumption ?
- Innovative driven Learning !
- Economical–environmental impact, the socioeconomic?
- Horizontal/vertical impacts
- Indicators ?????
Networking > resources to ensure a non-stop IPM progress and understanding

- ENDURE (http://www.endure-network.eu/what_is_endure)

- NJF IMP workshop after this session!

- PesticideLife project: idea to establish a permanent IPM group and link to the ENDURE
“We all have to work together”, Claire Lamine, ENDURE Project achievements

The possible role of civil society

Finally, civil society has today a key role to play through the construction of the environmental impact of agriculture as a public issue. In recent years, the public debate evolved from concerns about the environmental impacts of pesticides to concerns about the cumulative impacts of pesticides on human health, which has influenced changes in pesticide risk regulation. On the other hand, transitions towards IPM have not been put forward mainly because the civil society’s main spokesmen (NGOs, medical doctors or scientists) mostly think in terms of zero-pesticide rather than low-input practices.

Obstacles and opportunities for robust transitions

Our sociological studies show that reducing the dependence on pesticides is not only a matter of changes at the farmer level. Whereas many actors stress the reluctance of farmers to consider non-chemical alternatives, we show that market conditions, governance of extension and research and public debates are framing stakeholder perceptions and actions and impeding change. Where farmers themselves talk, often in a rather fatalistic way, of market and legislation as the most if not only factors determining (or preventing) change, we
Thank you!

and well come to the IPM workshop after this session