

# Report of the Bi-Annual Meeting FAO Regional Vegetable IPM Programme in Asia



**Hanoi, Vietnam, 31 March - 2 April 2004**





## 1. Introduction

The Hanoi Bi-Annual Regional Meeting was the third regional meeting organised by the FAO Regional Vegetable IPM Programme in Asia. Based on suggestions of participants in the last meeting in Cha-am, Thailand, the duration of this meeting lasted for 3 days including a field visit. The detailed schedule of the meeting is shown in **Annex 1**.

## 2. Objectives

- To discuss progress of Programme implementation in member countries
- To plan for future activities

## 3. Location, Date and Participants

The Bi-Annual Regional Meeting on Vegetable IPM was held on 31 March - 1 April 2004 in Tay Ho Hotel, Hanoi, Vietnam. A total of 30 participants, including national experts, FAO and counterpart staff from five Mekong countries (Cambodia, Yunnan Province of China P.R., Lao PDR, Thailand, and Vietnam) and consultants from other countries, took part in the meeting. A list of participants is provided in **Annex 2**.

## 4. Activities

### 4.1 Day One (31 March)

The meeting began with a welcome letter by Mr. Nguyen Quang Minh, the director of the Plant Protection Department (PPD) of Vietnam, to all meeting participants. As Mr. Minh was not able to attend the meeting, Mr. Ngo Tien Dung, the PPD National IPM Coordinator, read the letter on behalf of him.

Jan Willem Ketelaar, Team Leader/IPM expert, introduced objectives and process of the meeting. He also suggested participants make introductions all round, because although some of them had known and worked with each other for a long time, there were also some new faces in the meeting.

The participants were informed by Elske van de Fliert, FAO Programme Development Officer for Vietnam and China, that this meeting was organised as an informative forum for FAO staff and counterparts to discuss regional matters, share experiences, and raise points of interests. It would therefore be appreciated if as of this meeting the national partners would take initiative in reporting on and planning the regional meetings. It was agreed that the country hosting the meeting would also organise the programme and compile a report at the end of the meeting.

The rest of the morning session and the first half of the afternoon session were provided for brief country reports' presentation by representatives of programme member countries (see **Annex 3**), followed by many discussions. Yan Su was the facilitator of this session. Vietnam, being the host of the meeting, gave a more elaborate presentation on the whole National IPM Programme.

After that, Jan Willem Ketelaar informed everybody that the previous day a successful meeting had been held in the Hanoi FAO-IPM office with a representative from the Norwegian Embassy regarding continued funding of the regional vegetable IPM programme. The Norwegian Government has expressed a commitment to contribute funds for three

years starting early 2005. Part of the funds would be sub-contracted to the Norwegian Crop Research Institute (Planteforsk) for intensive collaboration on vegetable IPM. The programme hoped to have Myanmar as its sixth Greater Mekong Subregion (GMS) member country in the not too distant future.

In the last afternoon session, participants were asked to discuss what they would like to do on the third day (Friday). Three small groups of management team, technical experts and national coordinators, and administrative staff were formed. The group of national experts and coordinators decided to discuss the following topics on the third day:

1. Bio-control, facilitated by Areepan Upanisakorn
2. Monitoring and evaluation, facilitated by Ngo Tien Dung
3. Pesticide policy, facilitated by Harry van der Wulp and Ngin Chhay
4. Vegetable IPM in schools, facilitated by Marut Jatiket

As this was the first meeting of administrative staff from all five GMS programme member countries, they decided to make their parallel meeting on the third day as a simple discussion to know each other's responsibilities, and share difficulties in their jobs as well as experiences. Vorn Chanthavong, on behalf of the administrative staff, reported to the whole group.

#### **4.2 Day two (1 April)**

The meeting participants welcomed Dr. Max Whitten, who joined in the meeting as a resource person on System of Rice Intensification (SRI). Another round of introductions was made for him.

Participants spent the morning listening to presentations on the following topics:

##### ***A. Comparative analysis of Impact Assessment Studies (by Harry van der Wulp)***

The presentation provided a brief introduction on why IPM impact assessment is important, what impact should be measured, and how to measure impact. A study had been done by the Global IPM Facility synthesising and comparing 25 IPM impact evaluation initiatives from around the world. The study identified three levels of evaluation:

1. Self-evaluation by farmers: to decide on adoption of new approaches, and to identify needs and opportunities
2. Self-evaluation by the project: to improve project performance.
3. External evaluation for government and donors: to determine the output in relation to the level of investment

Based on the synthesis, it was recommended that IPM impact assessment studies:

- Combine diverse perspectives
- Link economic and social disciplines
- Regarding fiscal sustainability questions, also consider benefits beyond the agricultural sector

##### ***B. EIQ (by Ole Martin Eklo from Planteforsk, Norway)***

The EIQ (Environmental Impact Quotient) indicator model has been introduced as a tool to reduce environmental load in vegetable production systems in three provinces in Vietnam (Hanoi, Hatay and Dalat) since September 2002. These activities involved sixty farmers growing vegetable as a follow-up activity of an IPM Farmer Field School (FFS). Responsible for these activities were PPD (Plant Protection Dept.) assisted by IPM trainers. Introduction

of IPM with EIQ in beans and cabbage resulted in increased yield of 138.5 kg/ha and an increased income of 1,224,340 VND/ha. It has given farmers a new understanding of pesticide use in vegetable production. In addition, management based on EIQ lead to reduced environmental load compared to farmer plots with conventional practice.

### ***C. Impact assessment in Cambodia (by Bert van Duuren)***

The FAO Regional Programme has initiated work on impact assessment of vegetable IPM farmer training interventions, which is being piloted in Cambodia. The methodology and some results of the baseline study for impact assessment done in Cambodia in 2003-04 were presented. The full baseline survey document can be made available upon request.

### ***D. PNOA in Vietnam and China (by Elske van de Fliert, Nguyen Van Son of Hanoi Agriculture University and Shi Shangbai)***

Participatory needs and opportunity assessment (PNOA) with overall goals to identify need and opportunities for IPM training; to induce farmer involvement in and ownership over IPM planning process; and establish a baseline for impact assessment. The programme implement in Vietnam in collaboration with DANIDA rice IPM programme in six provinces that are key rice-vegetable IPM locations, they are: Hatay, Haiduong, Danang, Lamdong, Hochiminh City, Tiengiang. In China PNOA sites are in selected target counties in six prefectures that are key vegetable IPM locations, including: Kunming, Chuxiong, Dali, Lijiang, Yuxi, and Qujing. The data collection methods: analysis of secondary data, village profiling using PRA methods, season-long record keeping by farmer, individual interviews, field observation and analysis workshop. The data was being collected by farmers, farmer coordinators, district/county IPM trainers with supervision of consultant and master trainers.

### ***E. PNOA analysis workshop in Chuong Duong village, Hatay province***

In the afternoon, participants went to Chuong Duong village, Ha Tay province to observe a village analysis meeting of the PNOA process. Purpose of the farmer meeting was to analysis the data of season-long record keeping by farmer on rice and vegetable from spring 2002 to summer 2003.

The discussion focused on the analysis of data recorded by farmers throughout the season on inputs of fertilizer, pesticides, seed, and labour (both hired and family). Total harvest (both marketable and unmarketable) and product price and opportunity value were considered, and an economic analysis was reviewed for each participating farmer. This helped the farmers to identify favourable and unfavourable aspects of vegetable and rice production.

Farmers identified and prioritised their production constraints based on the data, such as: increased in the price of labour, fertilizer, and seed. Due to unfavourable proportions of income versus expenses, some households had experienced a negative net income.

Needs and opportunities identified by the group to solve these problems included:

- Clean the field and treat the soil to prevent pest and disease problems
- Use manure and phosphorus fertilizers for basal application
- Nitrogen is used for top dressing
- Grow adapted varieties
- Transplanting in appropriate density
- Manage water well
- Visit the field regularly and protect natural enemies (following IPM guide)

### 4.3 Day three (2 April)

In the morning, participants divided into small groups to discuss on points of interest raised on 1<sup>st</sup> meeting day.

#### A. *Technicians' meetings*

##### a. *Biological control (Resource persons: Areepan, Lim Guan Soon and Max Whitten)*

Each country shared with the group their major pest problems, which was followed by a brainstorming of solutions that worked in their countries. Some control methods discussed are:

##### *Flea Beetle (Phyllotreta):*

- cultivation of field before establishing the crop, and leaving the soil exposed to the sun for a few days to dry out (Laos)
- neem seed, Bt spray, entomopathogenic nematode *Steinernema carpocapsae*, fungus *Beauveria bassiana* (Thailand)
- field trials in China have found straw ash to work very well in controlling flea beetle
- protecting seedlings in nursery beds with mesh netting; conducting a research on non-chemical control options for flea beetle with assistance of an intern from Australia
- sticky traps (stationary and moveable as to disturb plants to cause flea beetle to jump and stick to the traps); trials of burning crop residues on the field after harvest (but they turned out not effective) (Cambodia)

##### *Diamond Back Moth (DBM):*

- Bt spray, applied late-afternoon/evening
- parasitoids, *Diadegma semiclausum* (temperate zones/highlands) and *D. insulare* (more adapted to tropical conditions, i.e. lowlands)  
Dr. Lim Quan Soon shared with the group some of his knowledge about parasitoids of DBM and other important pest species, particularly about suitability of parasitoids to different climatic conditions.
- VOOM: Volatile Oils of Mustard  
Dr. Max Whitten introduced VOOM to the participants. That was a product in which the glucosinolates of brassica tissues has been converted to isothiocyanates (ITCs). This has the potential to be a deterrent or control method for soil-borne diseases in various vegetable crops. In the near future, VOOM will be trialled in Viet Nam and China (Yunnan), also for use as a soil fumigant. There has been experience (e.g. TOT experiences in Cambodia, Vietnam and Yunnan) to show that ITCs can be locally produced by combining crushed crucifer leaves with water and alcohol (for the natural conversion to ITCs).

##### *Bacterial and Fusarium wilt:*

- managing soil pH, >6 (adding lime)
- field sanitation, avoid contamination
- resistant/tolerant varieties seem to be the only option in some countries
- VOOM/ITC

##### *Clubroot (Plasmodiophora):*

- crop rotation
- using VOOM/ITC as a soil fumigant
- removing inoculums from field

*b. Monitoring and evaluation (Resource Persons: Ngo Tien Dung and Ngin Chhay)*

The country representative of Vietnam and Cambodia shared the experiences about monitoring and evaluation of IPM programmes. For example, in Vietnam the national programme has set up an IPM group at central level which connects to provincial groups (3 - 4 provinces/group). The provincial groups work closely and support each other through monthly meetings among members and with trainers. They do cross-checks and establish co-trainer groups in each province. The lesson from Cambodia was how to build up a monitoring and evaluation system at different management levels. However, these systems are adapted to certain issues and structures in specific countries and may not be directly transferable to other countries of the programme.

Country representatives of Cambodia, China, Lao, and Vietnam agreed to develop a new monitoring and evaluation system for each country. This system has flexible indicators and should involve the participation of farmers in order to avoid top-down control. In addition, a network among countries through internet and annual meetings for sharing the experiences and information should be established. Further on, the general monitoring and evaluation system will be established for all country members.

*c. Pesticide policy (Resource Person: Harry van der Wulp)*

Harry van der Wulp gave a presentation on the IPM Policy Framework and the work of the Global IPM Facility in that respect. Discussion after the presentation of the policy framework indicated that:

- Food safety has become an important driver for pest and pesticide management reform;
- The Ministry of Health is often the main driver for changes in pesticide registration;
- Strengthening of the policy environment for IPM requires a multi-sector approach;
- Preparation of Policy Briefs about the experience of IPM programs in maintaining production without the use of controversial pesticides may leverage calls by ministries of health or trade for phasing out of certain pesticides.

*d. Vegetable IPM in school (Resource Person: Marut Jatiket)*

This topic was cancelled because all participants were interested in joining the biocontrol session and no more time was available for an additional session.

**B. Parallel meeting of FAO administrative staff**

In an open-hearted atmosphere, the administrative staff discussed various issues. They introduced their own responsibilities, shared difficulties and experiences in their day to day jobs i.e. vehicle management, communication systems, field guide translation, travel arrangement, etc. They drew a picture of how FAO funds go to the fields and how the receipts turn back to the FAO offices. Each country faced a certain amount of difficulties in these matters. For example, the movement of fund for field training in Vietnam and Cambodia is done in a timely manner if compared to Laos. In Laos the fund transfer is time consuming as it needs to go through government channels (from FAO to National, Provincial and subsequently District government levels), which causes a delay of the field activities as the money reaches the field trainers late. This difficulty also causes delays in financial reporting and affects the accuracy and quality. These problems can not be improved without a stronger cooperation from counterpart sides.

The administrative staff agreed to communicate to each other more directly and openly to obtain better results in their jobs. They also suggested another FAO staff meeting to discuss further on country specific issues.

### **C. Afternoon - whole group meeting**

A representative of each group reported to the whole group the outcomes of their discussions. This was followed by a presentation by Max Whitten on his SRI consultancy. SRI is a novel methodology for increasing the productivity of irrigated rice by changing the management of plants, soil, water and nutrients. These practices contribute to both healthier soil and plants through greater root growth and the nurturing of soil microbial diversity. SRI does not require the purchase of new seeds or use of new high-yielding varieties, although some of the highest yields with SRI have been obtained from "improved" varieties, including 'hybrid' rice. SRI also discourages the application of agrochemicals such as inorganic fertilizer or chemical pesticides. However, increased weeding is often required, because rice fields are not kept continuously flooded. SRI does require skilful management of the factors of production and, at least initially, additional labour input -- between 25 and 50%, particularly for careful transplanting and for weeding. But since yield increases are reportedly 50 to 100% higher,, returns to labour are considerable since no purchased inputs are needed. As farmers gain skills and confidence in the application of SRI methods, labour input decreases and can eventually become nearly the same or less compared with conventional rice-growing methods. Recently, small-scale farmers and trainers in Asian countries (especially Vietnam, the Philippines, Indonesia, Laos and Cambodia) are implementing field trials to explore the potential of SRI and adapt its philosophy to local conditions. Max Whitten's mission was to evaluate the SRI benefits for small-scale rice farmers in South and Southeast Asia, and to provide recommendations to FAO and its member countries with regards to any action to be taken to further evaluate, research and promote adapting and adoption of SRI by small-scale rice farmers.

At the end of the meeting, the participants agreed that the next regional meeting will be held in Kunming of China P.R. An evaluation form was distributed and filled out by participants, a compilation of which is provided in Annex 4.

### **Documents distributed in the meeting**

*IPM Farmer Field Schools: A synthesis of 25 impact evaluation*, by Global IPM Facility  
*Report on Monitoring and Evaluation Workshop, 8-12 September 2003, Battambang*, by  
Cambodia National IPM Programme & FAO Vegetable IPM Project  
*Did you take your poison today?* by Thailand IPM-DANIDA project  
*Eggplant Ecological Field Guide*, by Regional FAO Vegetable IPM Programme

Annex 1  
**Schedule Bi-annual regional meeting on Vegetable IPM**  
**Tay Ho Hotel, Hanoi**  
**31/3 – 2/4, 2004**

**Wednesday, 31 March**

Time	Activity
08:30-10:00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcome by Vietnam national counterpart (Dung)</li> <li>• Introduction: programme status, meeting objectives and process (Jan)</li> <li>• Introduction of participants</li> <li>• Assignment of report writing and next meeting planning committees (Elske)</li> <li>• Arrangements for Thursday evening (Hieu)</li> </ul>
10:30-12:00	Country status reports: presentations and discussion
13:30-15:00	The Vietnam National IPM Programme: presentation and discussion
15:30-17:00	Separate/parallel discussions (Elske): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• National staff &amp; National IPM Experts</li> <li>• Administrative staff</li> <li>• Management team</li> </ul>
19:15	Depart from hotel for Vietnamese cultural night

**Thursday, 1 April**

Time	Activity
08:00-08:30	Comparative analysis of impact assessment studies (Harry)
08:30-09:00	EIQ (Ole Martin Eklo)
09:00-10:00	Impact assessment study in Cambodia (Bert): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Methodology</li> <li>• Tentative results</li> <li>• Discussion</li> </ul>
10:30-12:00	Participatory Needs and Opportunity Assessment (Vietnam/China): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Methodology, hands-on exercises (Elske)</li> <li>• Tentative results of village profiling (Son, Shi Shangbai)</li> <li>• Discussion</li> </ul>
13:30-17:00	Field visit to Chuong Duong village, Ha Tay province to participate in PNOA village level analysis workshop
18:00-18:45	Water puppet show or free time
19:00	Dinner in Hanoi
	Shopping or free time in Hanoi (until 9 pm)

**Friday, 2 April**

Time	Activity
08:00-10:00	Potential topics:
10:30-12:00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monitoring &amp; Evaluation</li> </ul>
13:30-15:00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Biocontrol matters</li> </ul>
15:30-17:00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pesticide policy matters/GIF with briefing on Laos Pesticide study</li> </ul> <p>Parallel meeting for administrative staff on day 3</p>
19:00	Farewell party

## Annex 2

**List of participants**

<b>Country</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Position</b>
Cambodia	1. Mr. Ngin Chhay 2. Mr. Pou Sovann 3. Ms. Yim Vuthang 4. Mr. Ven Ratana 5. Mr. Bert van Duuren	FAO National Expert/ National IPM Coordinator Director, Srer Khmer Vegetable IPM Coordinator, Srer FAO Accountant FAO Impact Assessment Consultant
China	6. Ms. Yan Su 7. Mr. Shi Shangbai 8. Ms. Hu Xinmei	Vegetable IPM Programme Official/NATESC FAO National IPM Expert FAO Admin Assistant
Lao PDR	9. Mr. Thongsavanh Taipangnavong 10. Mr. Somnuck Thirasack 11. Mr. Randall Arnst 12. Ms. Vorn Chanthavong	FAO National Expert  Deputy Director General, NAFES FAO Programme Development Officer FAO Senior Admin Assistant
Thailand	13. Ms. Orasa Dissataporn 14. Ms. Areepan Upanisakorn 15. Mr. Marut Jatiket 16. Mr. Jan Willem Ketelaar 17. Ms. Nawarat Phayungkij	Director, Vegetable Sub-Division, DoAE Entomologist, Pest Management Div, DoAE Director, Thai Education Foundation FAO Team Leader/IPM Expert FAO Administrative Assistant
Vietnam	18. Mr. Ngo Tien Dung 19. Ms. Do Thi Hien 20. Ms. Le Thi Thu Huong 21. Ms. Elske van de Fliert 22. Mr. Tran Van Hieu 23. Ms. Nguyen Bich Thuy 24. Ms. Ngo Thi Hoang Lam 25. Mr. Matthew Rodda	National IPM Coordinator Director Hung Yen RCPC FAO National IPM Expert FAO IPM Programme Dev't Officer FAO Account Assistant FAO Admin Assistant FAO Admin Assistant FAO Program Assistant IPM Intern
Others	26. Mr. Trond Hofsvang 27. Mr. Ole Martin Eklo 28. Mr. Harry van der Wulp 29. Mr. Lim Guan Soon 30. Mr. Maxwell Whitten	Research Director, Planteforsk, Norway Professor, Planteforsk, Norway IPM Expert, FAO Global IPM Facility FAO Bio Control Specialist FAO Resource Person

Annex 3

**Summary of Country Reports**

Country	Progress	Problems/Issues	Action taken to resolve them
<b>Yunnan of China P.R.</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sep.-Dec. 2003: Training of master trainers (TOMT) for technicians from 10 prefecture level &amp; 1 provincial level PPS</li> <li>• Nov.2003: Targeting workshop with 28 prefecture leaders, and NATESC and Yunnan PPS representatives</li> <li>• Participatory needs and opportunity assessment (PNOA) in six selected prefectures of Yunnan province, conducted by master trainers and their local teams</li> <li>• Preparations for vegetable IPM training of trainers- I (TOT-I), involving 25 participants from Yunnan and 11 participants from other 3 provinces</li> <li>• Support vegetable IPM development in World Bank funded Anning Valley project in Sichuan province:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Technical backstopping visits by FAO national expert to project areas</li> <li>- Selection of 4 project staff for TOT-I</li> <li>- Host of study tour for project leaders to Yunnan TOT</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TOMT trainers have both totally or for the greater part been reallocated other duties.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NATESC has been requested to resolve this issue and monitor the situation.</li> </ul>
<b>Cambodia</b>	<p><i>Activities by National IPM Programme</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nov. 2003: Review, Refresher and Planning Workshop for 41 District IPM Trainers from programme target provinces</li> <li>• Feb. 2004: Refresher Training Workshop on M&amp;E of FFS activities for 13 provincial coordinators and district trainers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some district trainers still lack the necessary facilitation skills required to run a high quality FFS.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Refresher courses on facilitation skills were organized for all district trainers and more training is foreseen for the next reporting period.</li> </ul>

Country	Progress	Problems/Issues	Action taken to resolve them
Cambodia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vegetable Farmer Field Schools on cabbage, tomato, cauliflower, Chinese kale, and yard long bean in 4 provinces <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 2003 wet season: 22 FFSs, 580 farmers</li> <li>- 2004 dry season: 30 FFSs (on-going), 768 farmers</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Field experiments to strengthen technical crop production and protection skills to solve field problems faced by farmers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 2003 wet season: 25 field experiments</li> <li>- 2004 dry season: 8 field experiments (on-going)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Nov. 2003: 4 Provincial Planning Meetings on detailed workplans for field training activities, and 12 District Trainers' Meetings on provincial progress report and evaluation were held.</li> <li>• Development of Training and Ecological Production Guiders and Upgrading Pesticide Book</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Counterparts and key IPM trainers still lack technical knowledge, particularly on disease ecology &amp; management</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Short duration courses and on the job training should be provided to improve skills of DTs. A Disease Ecology &amp; Management workshop is scheduled for the 2004 wet season</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• National Counterparts have limited knowledge on computers and English language skills. This slows effective communication and report writing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allowing national counterparts to participate in computer and English training courses will help overcome this problem. Such training is already underway.</li> </ul>
Cambodia	<p><i>Activities by NGO Srer Khmer under sub-contract with FAO</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jul. 2003-May2004: Support 4 vegetable FFS (91 participants) and 56 Farmer Field Action Researches by Farmer Trainers in 4 provinces</li> <li>• Providing training and support to farmers trainers on topics related to FFS and post-FFS activities by farmers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 4 training courses on soil ecology, 74 participants</li> <li>- 4 farmer-to-farmer studies on "health and pesticides" were developed and incorporated in the curriculum of the standard vegetable IPM FFS</li> <li>- IPM Farmer Club's field studies on biocontrol methods and pest insect/disease tolerant varieties of vegetables</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Strengthening Farmer and Farmer Trainer Networks by Means of Training Cross Visits and Meetings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 28 farmer clubs in 4 provinces</li> <li>- pilot training courses on self-sustained IPM farmer clubs</li> <li>- exchange visits among organic vegetable farmers</li> <li>- 2 farmer club meeting on concept of self-sustained IPM Farmer Club</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Development of farmers-based Pesticide Free Vegetable Production and Marketing Associations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Trainings on organic vegetable production</li> </ul> </li> <li>• An organic farmers' meeting was held to find the strengths and weakness of the organic vegetable production and marketing, and to share experiences with each other.</li> </ul>		

Country	Progress	Problems/Issues	Action taken to resolve them
<b>Lao PDR</b>	<p><i>Wet season 2003</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 23 Vegetable FFS in tomatoes, yard-long beans, and cucumbers in 5 provinces</li> <li>• 7 post-FFS studies in varietal testing for Bacterial wilt tolerance in 2 provinces</li> <li>• 2 off-season rice FFSs in Vientiane</li> <li>• Economic trails with 23 farm families in 2 provinces</li> <li>• 2 Review and Exchange Workshops held for all IPM trainers</li> </ul> <p><i>Dry season 2004</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 15 yard-long beans, and cucumbers in 4 provinces</li> <li>• Preparation and pilot Post-FFS Soil Ecology activities</li> <li>• Study tour of 5 government officials to Thailand on use and production of biological control agents with Oxfam-Belgium funds; followed with initial testing of selected biocontrol agents at Plant Protection Center and participation of small number of farmers in this activity</li> <li>• Case study on pesticide use</li> <li>• FAO-IPM National Expert was contracted for an initial 3-month period</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Severe lack of capacity at central level</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• National IPM Expert hired (but partial and temporary measure only)</li> <li>• National IPM Project Director taking on more direct role (but need full-time staff)</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insufficient awareness of program and policy support</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continued efforts are improving situation somewhat, but need more ability at central level</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Delays in financial disbursements, as well as quality and accuracy of financial reporting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Efforts to improve planning, disbursement and reporting procedures (but most depends on intra-governmental channels)</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Weak village and participant selection, resulting in less-than-ideal training quality</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some training and increased backstopping, but limited by above lack of central level capacity</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Small vegetable markets, with relatively few full-time vegetable farmers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More focus on post-FFS and continuing activities</li> <li>• (Possibly) evolve approach for new and smaller-scale vegetable farmers</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Currently, DoAE policy supports the implementation of IPM-FFS approach.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Possibly organize short courses or even TOTs with selected provinces, using local resource persons.</li> </ul>

Country	Progress	Problems/Issues	Action taken to resolve them
Thailand	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Activities run by Division of Pest Management DOAE</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Jul. 2003: 160 FFSs in rice and vegetables</li> <li>- Sep. 2003: completed Vegetable IPM TOT for 31 DOAE, DOA and DNFE participants</li> <li>- Some of 170 FFS in rice, vegetables and fruit planned for 2003/04 fiscal year presently have begun in the Northern Region</li> <li>- A draft report <i>Baseline Survey on Okra Export Production in Thailand</i> provides input into development of an <i>Okra Ecological Guide</i> by FAO Vegetable IPM Programme</li> <li>- Late Nov. 2003: hosted a study tour on use and production of biological control agents for 5 Lao Government officials</li> <li>- Preliminary works on introducing and ensuring establishment of the parasitoid <i>Diadegma semiclausum</i> for bio-control of Diamond Back Moth DBM in the Northern Highland Region</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uncertainty surrounding availability, amount and timing of Government budgets.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This situation might be eased in the near future by changed government policies.</li> <li>• In the interim, limit future FAO Vegetable IPM Programme plans to initiatives that do not directly depend on these budgets, or can be organised quickly in response to requests.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Activities by Department of Non-Formal Education/Thai Education Foundation (DNFE/TEF)</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Jun-Jul. 2003: provided technical and organisational support to a Training of Farmer Trainers' Course (TOFT)</li> <li>- Jan-Feb 2004: 2 workshops on reviewing progress and exploring possibilities for future activity</li> <li>- TEF conducted a survey of all DNEF TOT graduates to gather information on their current working status and ability to conduct further IPM training activities</li> <li>- March 2004: DNFE vegetable TOT began with funds from TEF and DANIDA IPM project</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More intensive interactions were needed between the national counterparts and the FAO vegetable IPM office, whilst the counterparts would have more ownership over programme planning and implementation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nov. 2003: A national expert was assigned.</li> </ul>

Country	Progress	Problems/Issues	Action taken to resolve them
Vietnam	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participatory Needs and Opportunity Assessment (PNOA): 1<sup>st</sup> season (Jul-Oct 2003) took place in 6 provinces. 2<sup>nd</sup> season (Nov.2003-Mar.2004) is being done in 5 provinces</li> <li>• Sep.2003-Jan2004: Training of Trainers (TOT) for 30 PPSD staff from 14 provinces with 5 associated-FFSs and 150 farmers.</li> <li>• Oct.2003: hosted a study tour for Chinese TOMT participants and facilitators</li> <li>• Spring 2004: 33 FAO-funded FFSs, involving around 990 vegetable farmers, are being conducted by TOT graduates in 11 provinces.</li> <li>• Participatory Action Researches (PAR): 4 sites in 2 provinces on long bean and cabbages</li> <li>• Dec.2003-Feb.2004: Preparation for Pilot FFS applying a multiple learning cycle approach in 2 provinces</li> <li>• Feb.2004: Published 1<sup>st</sup> issue of Vietnam vegetable IPM programme newsletter.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More intensive interactions were needed between the national counterparts and the FAO vegetable IPM office, whilst the counterparts would have more ownership over programme planning and implementation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nov. 2003: A national expert was assigned.</li> </ul>

## Annex 4

### ***Evaluation of the meeting***

#### **Facilities (hotel, food, etc.)**

- Food: - OK: 9  
- Satisfy: 1  
- Breakfast should be improved: 1  
- OK, but could be somewhat more variation: 1  
- Excellent: 1

- Hotel: - Too quiet: 1  
- Too far from town: 3  
- Many mosquitoes: 1  
- Air conditioning was not working: 1

#### **Content (topic, issues, etc.)**

- OK: 3
- Useful: 2
- Discussion should be longer: 2
- Adequate: 1
- Interesting: 2
- Good: 2
- Consistent with real need of member countries: 1
- Session on biocontrol was very good: 1
- Seems relevant to country programme; very good inputs from Global IPM perspective on Pesticides policy: 1
- Time limited for technical issues: 1
- Should have discussed about PNOA with management team: 1

#### **Organisation (process, scheduling, etc.)**

- Good: 7
- Excellent: 1
- Very good: 1
- Time was not well managed: 2
- Well organized; timing reasonable: 1

#### **Field visit**

- A bit complicated, difficult to follow if Elske did not explain in the morning: 1
- Better to do it in the field: 1
- Should be more practical work visiting: 1
- Should have a chance to visit vegetable fields: 1
- Not clear: 2
- Should let farmers to discuss ideas and more interactions: 1
- Good: 2
- Not very well-organized: 1
- Too much time for travelling: 1
- Translation was not very good, we only heard half of it: 1
- Hot walk: 1

- Language barrier, can not get whole ideas of PNOA there: 1
- Too crowded, difficult to understand due to translation: 1
- Good walk; should have discussion with farmers in the fields and visit some vegetable farmers in the field: 1
- Good to see field meeting was not rehearsed; Excellent to note farmers appreciated the value of impact assessments: 1

### **Suggestion for next workshop**

- Next meeting in China: 4
- More resource persons and topics: 1
- More time for discussion: 1
- Invite representatives of pesticide companies if pesticide issue will be discussed: 1
- One day field visit and come up with discussion and recommendations if possible for improvement: 1
- Discuss more in details about disease management, monitoring and evaluation system that can be applied for all member countries: 1
- More discussions and update on impact assessment: 1

### **Other comments and suggestions**

- Informal workshop: 1
- Field visit should be well organized: 1
- Organize Workshop on Monitoring and Evaluation sometimes this year or next year: 1
- Explore progress on health impact assessment to integrate for programme impacts, national policy influential support and linkage to Global efforts; same support should be made to link the development of School IPM in the region: 1
- Visit field in small groups and each group should have a translator: 1