

Different strategies to implement IPM in practice

- about incentives and impact -

Frank Wijnands
Wageningen University and Research Centre



Road map

- IPM strategy
- The adoption challenge
- Incentives for adoption
- Stakeholder involvement
- Outlook / Perspectives

IPM strategy

- Strategic approach to crop protection
 - Based on prevention – justification of control – diversified control options
 - IPM integral part of farming system:
 - Taking into account and optimizing interactions
- Agro-ecological intelligence
 - To meet economic, ecological, environmental objectives
- Contributes to
 - Minimal use and impact of pesticides
 - Robust cropping systems

The adoption challenge

- Excellent IPM methods and tools available
 - Still always more, better and different needed

- Adoption rate often low – exceptions
 - Knowledge intensive - lack of incentives
 - Labour (monitoring) - lack of added value
 - Risk (perception)

- What are the incentives – when is added value created?
 - Actual developments
 - What can we learn?

Incentives for adoption / added value

- Financial – technical
 - individual farmers
- Commodity – community
 - agribusiness community
- Market options and demands
 - individual farmers /cooperatives
- Policy – regulation/stimulation
 - individual farmers, general or region specific

- 4 tracks to implementation

Financial technical incentives

- New techniques
 - Lower costs
 - Better performance, more robust, safeguarding quality and quantity
- Introduction relative easy
 - Sells itself
 - Comfortable message
- Fast track, short cut to successful adoption

Financial technical incentives

■ Examples

- Introduction of biological control when resistance development is occurring (spanish protected vegetable culture)
- Mating disruption fruit orchards
- Forecasting systems (DSS)
- Mechanical weed control as option when less and less herbicides are approved in the so called small crops

Commodity – community incentive

- Regions where dependency on a crop or commodity is high
 - Crop protection problems affects quality or quantity,
 - Or create environmental problems, water quality for instance
 - Problem is relevant for the whole agribusiness
- Strong incentive to find and implement together solutions
 - Everybody got something at stake
 - Often then communication and support to implement solutions by the partners in the chain (field man etc)

Commodity – community incentive

■ Examples

- Brazil: sugarcane borer *Diatrea Saccharalides*
- Sugar mills in Brazil (cane) promote biological control with *Cotesia Flavipes*: 2 milion ha
- 1980-2005: 65 million euro savings and 1.38 million liter of pesticide (product)

- Rice: Ebro delta 32.000 ha
- *Chilo suppressalis* (butterfly), insecticide use
- Ebro is fisheries, nature and agriculture
- Communities needed other solutions: pheromone mass trapping
- 65% reduction pesticide use

Market possibilities and demands

■ Market options

- (Cooperatives) produce under label
- Specific demands for IPM possible
- Niche markets?
- LIVE Oregon example

■ Market demands

- Increasing demands from retailers and global sourcers (more issues and themes - sustainability related)
- Protocols and increasingly also certified production
- Specific demands for IPM possible
- Tesco UK, Unilver, Albert Heijn NL, Coop Italy

EU Policy regulation & stimulation

■ Crop protection policy - SUD

- Basic level of IPM - For all farmers
- Mix of incentives

■ CAP

- Greening - Pillar I – direct payments
- Ecological infrastructures, rotation, soil cover, pasture maintenance
- Agri-environmental measures - Pillar II - payments
- Specific regions/crops – more advanced levels of IPM.

Work with variety - There is not one solution

- Still more IPM technology needed
 - Preferably with lower costs and better results (Track 1)
- Stakeholders should stimulate and communicate IPM
 - Track 2 shows that it can be done
- Markets can have a large influence
 - Open and continue the dialogue on the public challenges, role for NGO's (Track 3)
- Policy support
 - Minimum levels of IPM
 - and well chosen greening and additional options (track 4)
 - Increase basic level / create options and incentives

Stakeholder participation and involvement

- Stakeholders together constitute the agricultural network
 - They play a role in all tracks
 - Link interest of stakeholders to the sustainable use issues (see below)
 - Work together on innovation
- Farmers (union)
 - Producers of pesticides
 - Traders
 - Water boards,
 - Drinking water companies
 - Retailers
 - Sourcers
 - NGO's
 - Government

Ecological, environmental, health and economic issues

Communication uses these links

- Stakeholders crucial as communicators
 - Have many contacts, networks, and opportunities
 - Their communication puts new knowledge in a business perspective
- Communication more effective when stakeholder addresses
 - Interests –what is at stake – urgency – necessity
 - Direction –vision – strategy
 - New approaches and methods
 - Successes
- More convergence in messages
 - Effective and efficient

Outlook

- Excellent technology needed
- Developed and tested in practice
- Stakeholder participation in all phases
- Taking responsibility for the future
- Mix of instruments and incentives will always be needed

Critical succes factors – from experience

- Excellent knowledge
 - technology
- Road tested technology
 - in practice
- Linking (with) interests (of st.holders)
 - Whats to gain?
- Communication
 - By stakeholders network
- Involvement of stakeholders
 - In all phases