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2017 Work Programme

- Fact-finding missions in 6 MS (DE, NL, IT, SE, DK, PL)

- Commission report to EP and the Council

- Overview Report

- Guidance document on monitoring and surveying of impacts of pesticide use on human health and the environment
Other 2017 SUD related activities

- New **SUD Web-Portal**

- **SUD Working Group Meetings** (May & October 2017)

- **Letters to all MS on NAPs and SUD implementation** highlighting areas for improvement

- **Commission's response to European Citizens' Initiative** "Ban glyphosate and protect people and the environment from toxic pesticides"
Integrated Pest Management

IPM favours prevention and prioritises the use of low risk pesticides and non-chemical methods. It must be promoted by Member States and implemented by all professional users.

- **Cornerstone** of SUD
- **Specific provisions** on IPM
  - *IPM general principles to be implemented by all professional users by 1 January 2014*
- **IPM general principles** – Annex III of SUD
Commission Report: IPM implementation in Member States

- IPM remains underused by Member States
- Member States focus on promoting IPM rather than assessing compliance
- Still no clear criteria nor measurable targets to properly verify implementation
The Overview report
Key facts on IPM implementation

- Support tools for growers
- Pest monitoring networks and warning systems
- Advisory services
- Demonstration farms networks
GOOD PRACTICE: IPM - The Netherlands

- Plant protection monitors
- **Record keeping**, including all IPM measures taken
- **Evaluating** the success of actions taken

![Crop specific environment yardsticks](image)

**Environmental Impact (EIP)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water organ.</th>
<th>Soil organ.</th>
<th>Ground-water</th>
<th>Pollinators</th>
<th>Natural enemies</th>
<th>Operator Risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Crop specific environment yardsticks*
GOOD PRACTICE: IPM - Germany

- **The ISIP system**: collating official pest monitoring information;
- **ZEPP decision support system**, more than 40 models for pests and disease forecasting;
- **Integrated agricultural education, research and advisory services** applied in Rhineland Palatinate.
GOOD PRACTICE: IPM - Denmark

- **On-line tool** to assess the level of IPM implementation;
- **Smart phone application** for weed mapping;
- Since 2016, use of **webinars** to disseminate advisory information;
- **Videos** for additional training giving examples of good practice.

IPM-points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Have realised the potential benefits of pest control, and plant protection measures have been based on assessments of the need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>There is still potential for improvement of pest control and the needs assessment process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>There is potential for improvement of current pest control practices, particularly in areas with a low score.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Could be economically advantageous to realise the potential benefits of pest control and tailor treatment for weeds, fungi and diseases to specific needs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GOOD PRACTICE: IPM - Italy & Poland

- Italy has developed **IPM guidelines** for over 95% of the crops grown in the country;

- Poland has a **Web-portal** to make information on monitoring of harmful organisms available.
The Overview report: Obstacles to better IPM implementation (1)

- **Absence of clear criteria** for checking IPM compliance at farm level;

- **Possible conflicts** between IPM good practices and other statutory requirements e.g. minimum tillage;

- **Lack of** financially-viable, effective non-chemical **control techniques**, including lack of research into finding alternative controls;

- **Farmers reluctant to apply** alternative methods to chemical PPPs, if they face an unacceptably high risk to their economic viability.
The Overview report: Obstacles to better IPM implementation (2)

- Economic incentives may conflict with using all available tools;

- Lack of alternatives to cereal crops, or poorer financial returns from alternative crops;

- Lack of pesticides authorised for minor crops is a disincentive to use these in rotation-limits growers ability to implement good resistance management practices;

- Financial constraints on Advisory Services.
2018 SUD-related activities

- **Audits** in 4 Member States (ES, HU, FR, BG)

- Evaluation of **revised NAPs**

- **IPM enforcement**
  - Better Training for Safer Food
  - Establishment of criteria to assess implementation of the 8 IPM principles

- Establishment of **Harmonized Risk Indicator(s)** at EU level;
2019 and beyond

- Further **report** to the EP and Council

- Commission's communication *The future of food and farming - the Common Agricultural Policy post-2020*
Thank you for your attention!