



**Pesticide
Action
Network**
Europe

ANNUAL REPORT 2010

JOIN US TOO



MESSAGE FROM HANS MUILERMAN AND HENRIETTE CHRISTENSEN, STAFF MEMBERS OF PAN EUROPE

Welcome to the 2010 activity report of PAN Europe.

2010 was again a successful year for PAN Europe. We succeeded in moving our office to Brussels. Together with our members we can continue working effectively on our mission. We feel we made our world a bit more healthier for our European citizens and the environment a bit more clean despite the tremendous pressure to increase profits at the costs of the scarce resources our planet has.

We were successful in obtaining additional funding, and were able to hire Hans who has an incredible knowledge not only about pesticides, but more importantly also having the knowledge regarding how to do without them.....

In 2010 we again become visible in the media by press releases and court cases. We have experienced a lot of renewed attention on our newsletter, and an increased number of visitors on our website, which we regularly try to renew.

In 2010, we believe to be able to say that we now have an established position in Brussels, starting with intensive contacts with Commission and Parliament. We have at the same time reinforcing collaboration with other groups.

In 2010 we also started a major funding program to keep PAN healthy for the coming years. We cross our fingers that we will be successful in up-keeping the fight which starts with implementation of IPM and criteria for endocrine disrupting pesticides.





TABLE OF CONTENTS



1. Index	page 4
1.1 Who is PAN Europe ?	
1.2 Our mission	
1.3 Our focal points	
1.4 PAN Europe's focal points in 2010	
1.5 What people said about PAN Europe in 2010	
2. Why the fight against pesticides and biocides is important	page 6
3. Why does PAN Europe keep on working on integrated production?	page 7
4. EU legislation in the implementation phase of relevance to pesticides	page 8
4.1 Implementation of EU legislation on autorisation of pesticides	
4.2 Implementation of EU legislation on use of pesticides	
5. EU legislation in preparation of relevance to pesticides	page 11
5.1 Revision of the EU legislation on biocides	
5.2 Revision of the EU legislation on plant health	
5.3 The Common Agricultural Policy towards 2020	
6.0 PAN Europe activities in 2010	page 15
6.1 PAN Europe's contribution to biodiversity-loss	
6.2 PAN Europe launch of a bee friendly competition	
6.3 European debate on the future of integrated production	

Please see our website at www.pan-europe.info for details if you are interested in contacting your national member or becoming a PAN Europe member, reading our research reports, receiving the newsletter or taking action!





1 . INDEX

1.1 - Who is PAN Europe ?

Pesticide Action Network (PAN) was founded in 1982 and is a network of over 600 non-governmental organizations, institutions and individuals in over 60 countries worldwide working to replace the use of harmful pesticides with ecologically sound alternatives. Its projects and campaigns are coordinated by five autonomous Regional Centers.

PAN Europe is the regional centre in Europe. It was founded in 1987, today bringing together 31 consumer, public health, and environmental organizations and other non-governmental groups in 19 countries.

PAN Europe is managed by a board of directors consisting of five board members while two staff members take care of the daily management.

1.2 - Our mission

PAN works to replace the use of harmful pesticides with ecologically sound alternatives (where possible practices but also products).

1.3 - Our focal points

NGO advocacy and public participation in EU pesticide policy, with activities including:

- being involved in the EU decision making process;
- disseminating information and raising awareness on pesticide problems, regulations and alternatives;
- organizing workshops and conferences and promoting dialogue for change between government, private sector and civil society stakeholders.
- Coordinate our network of members for joint action and policy interventions

1.4 - PAN Europe's focal points in 2010

In 2010 PAN Europe has increased its presence at the Brussels level. We have moved our office from London to Brussels to be closer to the majority of the EU institutions and have established ourselves as a not-for profit ASBL in Brussels.

We have increased our presence in public stakeholder meetings to make sure that the importance of sustainable agricultural practices is promoted more widely:

PAN Europe has long been an official member of the advisory group on biocides managed by DG Environment, though in 2010 we have increased our influence by being accepted as members of advisory groups on agriculture organized by both DG Agriculture and on plant health organized by DG Health and Consumer Affairs. The purpose of this increased participation is of course to increase awareness of pesticide problems, hoping to obtain increased attention at the EU level.



1.5 - What people said about PAN Europe in 2010

"The PAN network keeps alive the legacy of pioneering scientist, Rachel Carson, who first alerted the world to the harmful effects of pesticides on wildlife and human health almost 50 years ago. PAN Europe has played a hugely valuable role in recent years in getting EU policy to address this legacy too. As a national member, we rely on PAN Europe to help our advocacy by sharing good examples and providing a strong voice at European level".

Stephanie Williamson, International Project Officer, PAN UK, and PAN Europe Board Member

"PAN's efforts to inform the public about the health issues linked to the use of pesticides in agriculture and public health, and inform policies on their sale and use are very important to safeguard people, animals and the environment from their potentially serious deleterious effects. With the misguided promotion of insect resistance and herbicide tolerance of GM crops, agri-business is, in fact, not solving a problem at its roots, rather it is promoting the use of more chemicals as seen in most statistics, since the early effects on the pests tapers out quickly and farmers reach for more chemicals to compensate for their lower impact and resistance development. To avoid this treadmill, there is a need to promote both biological control and Integrated Pest Management in the framework of sound agronomic practices, such as agroecology and organic agriculture, and deal with the causes of the pest problems. This will further impact positively the role of agriculture as part of the climate change solution, using less fossil energy in form of pesticides and their application".

Hans R Herren, co-Chair, International assessment of Agricultural Knowledge, Science and Technology for Development (IAASTD) and President, Millennium Institute

"The work of PAN Europe is crucial for the future of our environment and provides important examples of how to promote a green Europe of tomorrow".

Dan Jørgensen, Member of the European Parliament and vice chair of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety

"I have been following the work of PAN and its campaigns against the unwise use of pesticides at global level since I was a student and they have motivated my professional choices. Today working in biological control allows me to work towards the reduction of pesticide dependency in our agricultural system".

Andrea Sala, working in Bioplanet and chairman of International Biocontrol Manufacturers Association (IBMA), Italy

"PAN Europe through its activities with other players, including IBMA, is helping to ensure innovative alternatives are being made available for use in sustainable agriculture".

David Cary, Executive Director of IBMA



2 · WHY THE FIGHT AGAINST PESTICIDES AND BIOCIDES IS IMPORTANT

All of us are exposed directly or indirectly to pesticides and other agrochemicals- farm workers and their families most of all, but every consumer will be exposed to dozens of different pesticides every day through food, which is especially worrying for the health of young children and the unborn.

Many pesticides are known for their risk to cause cancer, change DNA or harm reproduction¹. For many pesticides there is good evidence for endocrine disrupting properties. The health effects of these risks (cancer, cognitive and sexual disorders, mental disorders) are rising in society² and a contribution of pesticides to these effects is likely³. Pregnant women and children are especially vulnerable to pesticide effects.

Pesticides are products designed to kill or repel undesired living organisms. Although each pesticide is meant to target a certain pest, most can have negative side effects on non-target species, including humans. When used in agriculture, they often contaminate the air, water, sediments, wildlife and beneficial insects (e.g. bees and predators of insect pests), soil micro-organisms and end up in our food too.

Pesticide use is largely unnecessary because so many alternatives are available. Organic production shows we even can do without pesticides and Integrated crop management (IP) shows the majority of pesticides can be replaced by sustainable solutions.

Public opinion surveys reveal a continued high concern of European citizens about health impacts from pesticides in all aspects of their lives:

Europeans considers pesticide residues in food their number one concern for 72% of EU consumers, a higher percentage than when last surveyed 2005.

(Special Eurobarometer 354: Food-related risks, November 2010)

Europeans also is highly concerned with potential health impact from pesticides and herbicides for home use (in gardens and greenhouses)

(Eurobarometer 314: Europeans' attitudes toward chemicals in consumer products: risk perception of potential health hazards).



¹ European Parliament study PE 408.559 ,the benefits of strict cut of criteria on human health in relation to the proposal for a regulation concerning plant protection products (2008).

² Theo Colborn, *Environm. Health Perspect.* 112 (9):944, (2004).

³ Theo Colborn, *Environm. Health Perspect.* 114 (1): 10 (2006).

3 · WHY DOES PAN EUROPE UPKEEP ITS FIGHT ON INTEGRATED PRODUCTION ?



PAN Europe has traditionally focused on getting harmful pesticides banned. This is still essential as governments' pesticide evaluation lags product development by many years and Europe's pesticide approval process has yet to tackle new concerns like endocrine disruption and increased sensitivity among children and fetuses. We have also seen that the latest generation of pesticides marketed by chemical companies are not appreciably safer for the environment or our health. So replacing old pesticides with new won't do much to reduce risks.

Instead, sustainable agricultural practices and solid pest management are fundamental to reduce future dependency on pesticides. Organic agricultural production is the best available practice, but we recognize that integrated production (IP) is often the most realistic short-term option for mainstream farmers to deliver more sustainable agricultural practices.

The International Organization for Biological control (IOBC) has been working on defining what integrated Production since the 70. Members of the International Biocontrol Manufacturers' Association (IBMA), are doing what they can to deliver the needed alternatives. Finally, and most important, the framework directive for Sustainable Use of Pesticides will make it mandatory for all EU farmers to apply Integrated Pest Management on their farm, starting with crop rotation, as from January 2014. Also, Member States - according to the same directive- has to assist farmers in this approach as well as offer the farmers incentives to go even further. So in short all the elements for success are there. Though, the benefit the environment and human health depends on if it is successfully implemented.

Problem is that many players are busy 'greenwashing' pesticide-intensive practices by passing them off as IP. But there can be no doubt, IP is a holistic approach, a step wise approach towards fully sustainable agriculture, beginning with prevention, embracing biological control, and only allowing chemicals as a last resort if non-chemical methods fail.

We are joining forces with everybody willing to help us win the argument for IP, ranging from researchers, manufacturer of alternatives, NGOs, supermarkets, to make sure that this becomes part of the Common Agricultural Policy towards 2020, and the first positive signs have arrived. For instance the consultation document for the impact assessment of the CAP¹ mentions the potential that IP has:

"Certain farming systems and practices are particularly favorable for the environment. These include extensive livestock and mixed systems, traditional permanent crop systems or organic farming. However, also modern farming systems have an important capacity to ensure good environmental outcomes. Integrated crop management (a whole farm management approach combining the ecological care with the economic demands) are of particular importance in this respect. Integrated farming systems, following defined codes of farming practices, are estimated to cover only about 3 % of the utilized agricultural area in the EU".

In 2011 we aim at continuing this fight, to make sure that EU policies give more room for the development of alternative production methods and alternative products.

¹ http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/cap-post-2013/consultation/consultation-document_en.pdf



4 · EU LEGISLATION IN THE IMPLEMENTATION PHASE OF RELEVANCE TO PESTICIDES

During 2009 the European Union approved four new piece of legislation directly related to pesticides

- REGULATION (EC) No 1107/2009 OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL of 21 October 2009 concerning the placing of plant protection products on the market and repealing Council Directives 79/117/EEC and 91/414/EEC
- DIRECTIVE 2009/128/EC OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL of 21 October 2009 establishing a framework for Community action to achieve the sustainable use of pesticides
- DIRECTIVE 2009/127/EC OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL of 21 October 2009 amending Directive 2006/42/EC with regard to machinery for pesticide application
- REGULATION (EC) No 1185/2009 OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL of 25 November 2009 concerning statistics on pesticides

4.1 - Implementation of Regulation 1107/2009

Many important elements of the published regulation need further detailing, guidelines and Commission regulations before being used in practice. For 2010 the main elements were the revision of the data requirements (tests industry needs to perform), uniform principles (risk assessment methodologies), use of science (European Food Safety Agency (EFSA) guideline) and the criteria for endocrine disrupting pesticides. Ongoing pesticide evaluation also got our attention. Some highlights are:

- **Use of science**

In the new pesticides Regulation one of the new elements is the "use of science" provision. Commission has to take into account all scientific literature (text says "scientific peer-reviewed open literature") in decision making. EFSA got the job of making a guideline how to do this in practice. The draft of EFSA was a big disappointment because EFSA wanted to stick to industry tests and deny the open academic independent literature and maintain their old practices. This use of science is a central element in decision making. If the decisions will only be based on industry tests, of which quality and reliability are unknown, industry will be able to get everything approved if they put a lot of energy in it. May-be even in case of the "cut-off" criteria pesticides.

We made a comment and started lobbying the European Commission, Directorate General for Health and Consumer Policy (DG SANCO), Members of the European Commission responsible for other topics within the European Commission, and Member States and made a press release. Additionally we asked for information (Arhus convention) to find out exactly who in EFSA and which external experts were involved in the development of the EFSA draft guidance and find out if there is any bias. EFSA refused to submit information and we will consider going to European court in 2011 (together with ClientEarth) if EFSA also refuses us to give the documents in appeal (confirmatory request). If the guideline is not changed, we will in 2011 lobby Commission and Parliament to interfere.



- **Report on derogations**

Given the massive amount of derogations granted by EU member states if illegal pesticides based on an emergency clause in Directive 91/414, we decided to make a report to show the derogations are unjustified, breaking the rules and in many cases not necessary. For four years we analyzed hundreds of derogations. Recommendations were made and countries ranked on the 'derogation-scale'. In 2011 we will release the report.

- **Successful ban on Dichloropropene**

Dichloropropene is a nasty soil fumigant, dangerous for those living in rural areas but also totally unnecessary in good agricultural management. Member States were divided and voting in the Standing Committee blocked. PAN Europe lobbied on all levels together with our members to stop the chemical. Council also didn't get to a majority and in the end Member of the European Commission responsible for health and consumer John Dalli had to decide and concluded to a no.

- **"Prolongation" of pesticides**

We discovered SANCO made a regulation behind the screens to prolong the use of 39 pesticides till 2015, while they were scheduled for re-assessment in 2011/2012. Moreover these chemicals will in 2015 only be assessed based on the old Directive 91/414. A serious undermining of the rules. PAN Europe and Greenpeace have been looking at this sneaky 'legislation' and decided to ask for documents and prepare a court case. This will be done in 2011.

4.2 - National implementation of EU law on pesticide use reductions

In November 2009, we saw the approval of the Framework Directive 2009/128/EC. Under this directive member states need to think about various elements relating to pesticides (how pesticides are sold, sprayed, rules for washing areas, handling and storage of pesticides, pesticide containers, etc.), but also that 'Member States as from 2012 shall adopt National Action Plans (NAP) to set up their quantitative objectives, targets, measures and timetables....' (article 4 of the Framework Directive).

During 2010 the discussion on implementation started in the majority of member states. In a number of member states, stakeholders were invited to join the debate but unfortunately not everywhere, even though the implementation is meant to happen soon.





Time table for implementation of the Sustainable Use Directive :

Overall implementation

26 November 2011, MS to convert Directive 2009/128/EC into **national law** (art. 23)
26 November 2012, MS shall **communicate NAP** to Commission and other MS (art. 4.2)

Monitoring and surveying health and environment impacts

26 November 2012 Commission in collaboration with MS make guidance document (art 7.3)

National penalties:

26 November 2012, MS to inform Commission about penalties for infringements (art. 17)

Evaluation:

26 November 2014, Commission submit report on NAP implementation to EP and Council (art. 4.3)
26 November 2018, Commission submit report on NAP implementation to EP and Council.

It may be accompanied, if necessary, by appropriate legislative proposals (art.4.4)

In 2010, with the new European Commission, the topic of pesticides and GMO moved from ENVI to SANCO. It has taken time before the unit of SANCO got restructured, making it difficult to identify who to speak to on implementation of the sustainable use directive, and responsibilities only in place by the end of the year.

We therefore focused our activities on assisting our members by giving good ideas. We elaborated a manual for best practice NAP (photo) showing that it is possible to reduce pesticide dependency, giving concrete examples on national and regional policies already in place, ranking them, guiding members on sustainable ways forward. On our homepage, we have collected more detailed examples, for instance regarding aerial spraying, and use of pesticides in public areas.

PAN Europe addressed several EU events again highlighting that it is possible to reduce use of pesticides, but this takes political will. As part of our general assembly in Brussels in October 2010 we organized a workshop for members and other interested parties to exchange information and experience with the national implementation.



We ended 2010 by writing to EU Health Commissioner Dalli, jointly with Health and Environment Alliance (HEAL), urging the European Commission to provide stronger guidance and inspiration for EU Member states and to collect and disseminate information on best practice and alternatives to pesticide dependency. Also PAN Europe wrote to all ministers responsible for SUD implementation, reminding them about the deadlines to be respected.

5 . EU LEGISLATION IN PREPARATION OF RELEVANCE TO PESTICIDES



5.1 - Revision of the EU legislation on biocides

Biocides are produced in order to deter, control or kill harmful and unwanted organisms. They are not used for plant protection (i.e. as agricultural pesticides). Wood preservatives, baits used against rats in waste pipes or antifouling agents belong to this large group of 23 different product types. Biocides are widely and sometimes casually applied in everyday life, such as agents for disinfection, the treatment of textiles or the elimination of household insects.

Biocide active substances can have toxic, carcinogenic or endocrine disrupting properties. They not only adversely affect harmful organisms but also humans and endangered species, such as red kites. Almost 400,000 tons of active substances are estimated being sold in the EU each year. Serious incidents on health and the environment (e.g. poisoning, water pollution) have also come to light. The current EU biocide legislation has failed in its purpose of establishing effective risk management also due to shortcomings in the enforcement phase.

In 2010 the European Parliament and the Council debated for the first time the Commission's draft biocide regulation published in June 2009, which is intended to replace the current EU Biocidal Products Directive of 1998. PAN Europe has been in regular contacts first of all with the European Commission, DG environment, and later with both member states representatives (for debate at Council level), and by having meetings with Members of the European Parliament. Furthermore, we organized workshops to assist our members and other groups, while also keeping the general public informed by issuing regularly press releases.

The result was that the European Parliament improved the Commission vote for the exclusion of environment-related, highly hazardous biocides (cut-off criteria regime) like highly persistent and bio-accumulative chemicals; on a specific need for the protection of vulnerable groups like children ; as well as innovative substitution plans that promote the dissemination of sound alternatives in pest management, and it adopted a binding EU-initiative for the sustainable use of biocides.

Though, these amendments are inadequate due to vaguely worded derogation options. As a consequence, highly hazardous biocides will still be able to obtain approval. Essential data requirements for identifying risks of biocides will be waived. Toxic biocidal products will be able to gain EU-wide authorisation and the weak labelling standards for biocide-treated articles won't ensure transparency and safety for consumers.

The Council's position partly addresses the shortcomings concerning the data requirements and also considers risks of chemical mixture effects, yet it fails to overcome the loopholes of the cut-off regime. As regards the substitution principle, it does not require the replacement of (developmental) immuno- and neuro-toxic substances. Products of high concern will therefore be able to gain authorisation for wholesale markets and there are no convincing efforts to minimise the use of biocides across Europe.



PAN Europe would like to thank PAN Germany, especially Christian Schweer and Susanne Smolka, for having done great work in following the Biocides revision through the first EP reading, while bringing together European environmental, consumer and health NGOs to share activities in supporting solutions for better protection of human health and environment from the adverse effects of biocides.

For details of the work
see: <http://www.pan-europe.info/Campaigns/biocides.html>

5.2 - Review of the Common Plant Health Regime

The review of the Common Plant Health Regime (CPHR) focus on making sure that exotic pests does not enter the EU; that these are detected as early as possible if they do enter; and then are kept isolated. Only very little attention, if any, is given to the importance of developing more robust and diverse agricultural systems in the EU to resist potential pest attack.

PAN Europe is the only NGO involved in the debate on the Review of the Common Plant Health Regime (CPHR). In 2010 we took part in meetings on CPHR evaluation; and have sent written contribution to the CPHR-public consultation highlighting the importance of prevention through application of sustainable agricultural practices

We -of course- understand we have to protect crops and ensure food supply and food safety, though, we oppose to short terms fix scarifying long term sustainability, and this is why we focus our arguments around the following points :

- **Harmful organisms treated according to the extent of settling in a country**

If a harmful invasive organism is not broadly established in a given country or region, the strategy could be the prevention of entrance, which could be in many cases eradication.

If a harmful organism is established (like Diabotrica beetle in Europe), we should try to control it via prevention of further spread and biological control management, not eradication anymore. If an exotic organism is established we should find its natural predators in its country of origin and introduce them to enhance the normal balance of natural control.

For Diabotrica this means the obligation for farmers to use wider crop rotations, to use less vulnerable crop varieties and the stimulation of Biological Control companies to find and put on the market natural predators. Biological Control companies should be helped financially.

- **Derogations of free trade**

Free trade is a main objective of WTO and also endorsed by Europe. We should however not use it as a dogma and forget about some very negative consequences for society. If for instance, we know about very dangerous products from global trade like Bamboo from China containing harmful organisms like the Tiger Mosquito, we should in the first place consider stopping this trade. Bamboo can be grown in



Europe and can be substituted by other products. The same goes for importing flowers from all over the world. If a country really enforces a zero-tolerance, we should consider stopping trading there. In WTO, Europe should start a discussion to allow for derogations in these cases.

- **Methods of eradication/prevention at import/export**

If there is a need for eradication/prevention, non-chemical methods and practices should be used as a priority. Use of highly toxic substances as methyl bromide and hydrogen fluoride can cause great damage, while alternatives like low-oxygen exposure, freezing or drying are at hand in most cases. Even for fresh products like flowers alternatives are present and more alternatives should be actively promoted and subsidized.

Only as a last resort, should chemicals be used. An EU-policy should be developed to achieve this and enforced via authorization policy.

- **Strengthening our agricultural system**

One of the reasons for rapid spread of harmful organisms is the vulnerability of our agricultural system. Monocultures like Maize or Sunflowers are all over Europe and have hardly any resistance to external influences because the normal ecosystem is lacking. Use of vulnerable, modern crop varieties only add to this vulnerability because many of the 'old' resistance features are lost in breeding for high yield. Additionally many landscape elements like ditches, hedges, trees and unused buffer zones have disappeared in intensive farming.

Any damage done by harmful organisms is prevented best in the end by making the system stronger. A prevention policy is the best cost-effective means for the Plant health Strategy, preventing environmental and public health degradation.

Making the system stronger can be done via existing alternatives, as in integrated crop management. Most of all we need the right incentives in both first and second pillars of the Common Agricultural Policy, setting good examples, creating the right extension services and using CAP money for rewarding the best farmers.





5.3 - The Common Agricultural Policy towards 2020

On 18 November 2010 the Commission published its Communication "The CAP towards 2020: Meeting the food, natural resources and territorial challenges of the future". This Communication launches the institutional debate and prepares the ground for the legal proposals to be adopted by the Commission during 2011.

The debate on which Common Agricultural Policy beyond 2013 started in 2010 including public consultation and conferences, in which we have taken part in all steps so far, starting contributing in early 2010.

Already in March we succeeded in organizing a poster exhibition in the European Economic and Social Committee as part of the week for alternative celebration, (see part 4) giving concrete examples on how the CAP beyond 2013 should look like:

See poster overview in English and French on
http://www.pan-europe.info/Resources/Briefings/SSP_EN.pdf
http://www.pan-europe.info/Resources/Briefings/SSP_FR.pdf

Later in the year we started close collaboration with a number of other NGOs calling for a serious greening of the first pillar through a mandatory package of good agronomic practices (crop rotation, soil cover, green infrastructure, and nutrient balance) linked with the basic income support and mandatory at farm level'.

PAN Europe's main focus is first of all crop rotation, which according to the new Framework directive on sustainable use of pesticides must become mandatory for all EU farmers to apply as from 2014.

For details see our agricultural work see :
<http://www.pan-europe.info/Campaigns/agriculture.html>



6 · PAN Europe activities in 2010



6.1 - PAN Europe's contribution to biodiversity-loss

As 2010 was the UN's International Year of Biodiversity, PAN Europe published a review on the impact pesticides are having on biodiversity and we launched a bee friendly competition.

You can download the report

"Pesticides and the loss of biodiversity : How intensive pesticide use affects wildlife populations and species diversity", in English and French from our homepage

6.2 - PAN Europe launch of a bee friendly competition

In 2010 PAN Europe and the European Beekeeping Coordination launched last year their initiative to identify conventional and integrated pest management-practice farmers who are making a difference for bees, coming up with solutions how to stop the bee decline.

Several factors act as driving forces for pollinator population instability, including habitat deterioration and pollution due to human activities, increased sensitivity of pollinators to diseases, and the intensive agricultural model based on monoculture and chemical utilization.

With this competition we aim to create a platform of discussion and constructive work among different actors through the building of a win-win relationship. The project brings together farmers, beekeepers, bee experts, environmental NGOs and organizations working on biological control, to propose concrete solutions on sustainable agricultural practices, proposing solution not only good for bees but good for our health, environment and biodiversity, and help combat climate change too.

The project was launched in the United Kingdom by distributing a questionnaire among farmers. In the future, this initiative will be developed in other countries.

6.3 - European debate on the future of integrated production

In Brussels, PAN Europe marked Alternatives to Pesticides Week with a series of events in association with the European Economic and Social Committee and French partner Generations Futures on 25 March 2010.

We organised a European debate on the theme of integrated production with contributions from European Commission, International Organisation for Biological Control (IOBC), and bee keepers.

For more détails, see :

http://www.pan-europe.info/Activities/Conferences/What_future_for_integrated_production.html

The debate was followed by a reception and launch a week-long exhibition of posters, in English and French, explaining the danger linked to pesticide exposure, exploring what Integrated Production mean, and giving a number of proposals for ways forward, especially in terms of which agricultural policies needed for the future.

You can find the posters on:

http://www.pan-europe.info/Resources/Briefings/SSP_EN.pdf



Pesticide Action Network Europe

Rue de la pépinière, 1 • B - 1000 Brussels
tel: + 32 2 503 08 37 • fax + 32 2 402 30 42

www.pan-europe.info



Pesticide
Action
Network
Europe