

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



Chengjiang, Yunnan, P.R. China.

10 - 13 November 2004



1. Introduction

The Chengjiang Bi-Annual Regional Meeting was the Fourth regional meeting organised by the FAO Regional Vegetable IPM Programme in Asia during Phase II. Based on suggestions of participants in the last meeting in Hanoi, Vietnam, the duration of this meeting lasted for 4 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 and exchange experiences
- To plan future activities

3. Location, Dates and Participants

The Bi-Annual Regional Meeting on Vegetable IPM was held on 10-13 November 2004 in the Communication Hotel, Chengjiang, Yunnan Province, China. A total of 20 participants, including national experts, FAO and counterpart staff from five Mekong countries (Cambodia, Yunnan Province of China P.R., Lao PDR, Thailand, and Vietnam), took part in the meeting. A list of participants is provided in **Annex 2**.

4. Activities and results

Arrival Day (Tuesday, 9 Nov 04)

A welcome banquet was hosted by Yunnan Agricultural Bureau at 18.00 pm in Shui Yuan Hotel, Chengjiang. Key staff of the China National Agriculture Technology Extension Service Centre (NATESC) and Yunnan Plant Protection Station were introduced. An Address of Welcome was noted by Mr. Tang Keren, vice director of Yunnan Agricultural Bureau.

Day One (Wednesday, 10 Nov 04)

Jan Willem Ketelaar, Team Leader/IPM expert, welcomed all participants, introduced objectives and programme of the meeting, and introduced the newly appointed partners associated with the programme i.e. Mr. Sean Polly¹, Team Leader Vegetable IPM Project/Srer Kmer, Cambodia and Ms. Srun Khema, National Vegetable IPM Trainer, Cambodia.

The session was followed by country presentations by representatives of programme member countries (see **Annex 3** for a summary of country reports). After the presentations, some points and questions were raised and clarified among the participants.

China:

- Expansion of FFS in many provinces.
- Calculation of family member labour cost.

¹ Unfortunately, the Cambodia/Srer Khmer programme did not benefit much from the participation of Sean Polly in this meeting as he resigned from Srer Khmer towards the end of 2004. He is replaced by the new Srer Khmer Vegetable project coordinator, Ms. Khun Thea.

- Question on Data Summary.
- Follow up to PNOA.
- Setting up of curriculum between IPM and non-IPM farmers.
- Attendance of the farmers to the programme (satisfying, farmers are actively involved in the activities)

Vietnam:

- Funds available but not enough human resources. Facilitators' skills need to be improved.
- Linkage between farmer groups
- Intervention of pesticide company
- It's better to focus on the small group of farmers rather than the big group
- Safe Vegetables programme implemented and funded by local provincial government with technical support/guidance from central level
- Potentially contradictory objective between IPM approach and Safe Vegetables programme
- Related to the Safe Vegetables programme, linkages between consumers & producers needs to be strengthened
- Organic products are widely promoted
- There is a system of filing complaints if consumers find residues or are affected by it from the registered organics products.

Thailand:

- Incorporating of the lessons learned from the crucifer IPM study into FFS curriculum development was suggested
- Funds mainly come from government for the study.
- Still inadequate levels of knowledge of Bio-Control among extension workers and farmers. Extension on bio-control is still limited. Implementation of biocontrol by farmers was discussed. Transferring of such techniques needs to be through effective farmer education. The Thai Government has implemented ToTs in many areas during the last few years primarily with DANIDA IPM funding. Agricultural college teachers were invited to attend these ToTs.
- Policy for Safe Food. Thailand has proclaimed itself as the 'Kitchen of the World'!
- Thai National Public Health has played an active role in promoting Safe Food programmes
- Health concerns are not only for consumers but also for farmers. Many activities have been done on impact assessment, monitoring of pesticide residues, impact on environment and individual health. Coordination between FAO/UNESCO to promote rural education especially on school IPM.

Laos:

- Recent reduction in the number of provinces involved in IPM training work
- Soil ecology work was discussed, primarily that it was still to translate lessons learned of work in *rice* production systems to *vegetable* production systems
- There is still no standard practice to promote soil ecology.

Cambodia:

- Arrangements for FFS facilitator team formations were discussed. At the first stage, farmers and district trainers run FFS together; later involvement of district trainers is reduced and farmers take on the primary role of FFS trainer.
- A striking example of a misleading advertisement about pesticide products, totally contradictory to the Code of Conduct on the Distribution and Use of Pesticides, was

presented at the workshop. The meeting was encouraged to compile evidence of similar incidents in other countries as well.

Other topics discussed:

- Effective ways to make the transition from *government* trainers to *farmer* trainers based farmer training programmes
- Indicators that can be used to measure sustainability of IPM Programmes. – Each country should set up standards and indicators for impact assessment applicable to their own context, These indicators should be based on the regional framework for impact assessment as presented at this workshop
- There was a question about improved incomes of farmers as a result of participation in IPM farmer training- are farmers really better off after IPM implementation?
The evidence of success in terms of income improvement is still rather sketchy but more evident in the spheres of improvement of farmer health and well-being.
- Parallel comparisons between IPM and farmer practice should be conducted in FFS.
- How to help reduce wrong and misleading promotion of pesticides and fertilizers

After the country presentations, it was agreed that the focus of discussions among national representatives should be on: 1) Sharing of experiences, 2) Concepts & Approaches, 3) Networking & Capacity Development.

The FAO Programme Team Leader reported to the meeting participants on the future of the programme.

- Further funding from Norway for the regional programme 2005-2007 is about to be approved and forthcoming with expected starting time as of January² 2005.
- AusAID has agreed to allow FAO to add remaining interest funds (USD 428,265) to the ongoing Phase II Project GCP/RAS/191/AUL³. Parts of these funds will be used to finance a small System of Rice Intensification (SRI) project. Cambodia and Vietnam are to brainstorm on the implementing of such activities.
- There have been recent changes in programme development responsibilities among international staff assigned to the Programme. Mr. Randall Arnst, formerly in charge of overall coordination of programme development for Laos and Thailand, now takes responsibility for Laos and Cambodia. Mr. Jan Willem Ketelaar, formerly coordinating programme development for Cambodia, has now assumed programme development responsibilities for Thailand and other participating member countries (particularly Philippines and Bangladesh). Ms. Elske van de Fliert will continue to provide overall coordination for programme development for Vietnam, China (and Indonesia).
- The Programme is to conduct an external Mid-term Evaluation during the 2005 calendar year. At the meeting it was discussed that such a mission should present its draft findings and recommendations to programme staff and counterparts before finalization of the mission's report. The best possible time to do this would be in conjunction with a next Bi-Annual Regional Programme Meeting⁴.

² As of editing of this report, negotiations with the donor have not been completed and the Norway funded Programme Addendum is not expected to become operational by the earliest in early March 2005.

³ Formal AusAID approval was obtained on 15 February 2005 and the new NTE of the GCP/RAS/191/AUL project will be 31 December 2006

⁴ Although an initial timing of this MTR during April 2004, in conjunction with the Luang Phabang Bi-Annual Regional Meeting, was proposed at the meeting, it has now been decided that due to delays in operationalization of project GCP/RAS/209/NOR this MTR has to be delayed until September/October 2005.

In the last afternoon session, national experts and coordinators were asked to decide on matters of interest for discussion on the next day (day three & day four) based on the subjects guided by Ms. Elske van de Fliert. In this workshop it was agreed that there would not be any forming of sub groups but that topics were to be discussed in a plenary session. All national experts & coordinators would discuss all selected topics with Mr. Marut Jatiket being the discussion facilitator. After selecting and sorting out the order of the discussion topics, the following topics were to be discussed.

1. Follow up IPM FFS activities (Thursday a.m)
2. FFS Monitoring criteria and M&E system development (Thursday a.m)
3. Code of Conduct on the Distribution and Use of Pesticides / Safe Vegetable Programme (Friday a.m)
4. Networking/Capacity Development (Friday p.m)
5. Impact Assessment (Saturday a.m)

Day Two (Thursday, 11 November)

A.M Participants spent the morning discussing and sharing experiences about follow up activities after an IPM FFS as currently carried out in each country. FFS Monitoring and Evaluation criteria and M&E system development was also discussed.

Follow up activities after FFS

Cambodia : Vegetable FFSs have been conducted in 4 provinces. Budgets for farmers activities are supported by the FAO programme. Having started after the 1st -2nd season of FFS implementation, follow up activities are conducted. These activities included visits to the field by government facilitators, discussions and planning with FFS Alumni i.e on field experiment, fertilizer management, bio agent control, monthly meeting with facilitators on issues & problems. Some farmer groups have formed themselves into clubs and associations to serve their specific activities such as seed production, group savings, organic vegetable production, safe vegetable production etc. This work is support by the NGO, Srer Khmer under subcontract by FAO. Follow up activities also involve *farmer* trainers. The national programme selected top farmers of FFS and allowed these farmers to participate in a training course., The farmer trainers then conduct FFS with government facilitators. It does take time to train farmer trainers but IPM knowledge transferring from farmer to farmer is a much more effective working method. In some areas, farmers sustain the use of the IPM approach in their crop production but in some areas this still depends on how serious the project supports post FFS follow up activities.

Vietnam: FFSs have been conducted in 11 provinces. Follow up activities were widely and efficiently done. These included action research on soil management, compost method, organizing of training for communities on specific topics with local government support and some contributions from the farmers. District trainers visited farmers after FFS 2-3 times per season. With policy support from the government, safe vegetable farmers groups have been set up. In Vietnam, in addition to Vegetable farmer club, there are a lot more clubs in relation with rice activities which sustain their group learning activities very well. Some clubs were trained to produce good seeds, some focus on experiments with rearing fish in the rice field, some focus on development of management skill, field study design as well as formulating proposals to get projects funded .

Laos: FFS have been conducted in 6 provinces. Follow up activities after FFS are limited in number in Laos due to limited number of trainers. Follow up activities included action research i.e on soils, diseases, insects on vegetable & rice, trainings on specific subjects as identified and prioritized by government trainers and farmers.

China: Vegetable FFS activities only started up recently, therefore not many follow up activities were carried out so far. Some activities related to Vegetable IPM have been initiated by the government such as registration of IPM farmers (rice, fruits, vegetables). The registered farmers have to follow the quality products criteria and periodically have to submit their produce for sample tests from the concerned government office. Registration of their produce as 'IPM' produce helped them gain higher prices for their products on the market.

Summary :

- FFS follow up activities are important for keeping IPM activities alive. It is commendable to budget for follow up activities attached straight to the FFS in initial budgeting. It is advised to keep in mind that all kind of follow up activities cannot be totally covered by the government. As it can be seen that in some countries, follow up activities are mainly supported by the non-government units.
- Farmer trainers are an important resource for FFS process. Extension workers need to recognize the capabilities and capacity of farmers as IPM trainers. In case of shortage of human resources from government side, farmer trainers also help overcome this problem. Besides, farmer trainers can help maintain sustainability of IPM method in the field when the national/district trainers withdraw themselves. So it is worth thinking about building qualified *farmer* trainers.
- Scaling up of FFS activities to too many provinces would require more financial/personal resources for monitoring and follow up. Some countries would not be able to accommodate such a scaling up process with currently available resources. Scaling up should focus on developing quality training programmes at fewer locations rather than spreading out all over.
- Follow up activities after FFS should put emphasis on assisting the establishment of IPM farmers' network and clubs to continue to sustain IPM activities in the locations or communities. Farmers should be able to work by themselves and form clubs or associations. It is recommended that each country should collect and share information of successful IPM Networks and clubs/groups and their activities in the region for dissemination.

FFS Monitoring criteria and M&E system development

To develop monitoring criteria takes time. Each country may have different conditions which result in different set and structure of M&E criteria. Some country like Vietnam managed to develop own matrix for monitoring and evaluation. As there was not enough time during this meeting to go in details on the criteria, it was therefore agreed that each country would initiate discussions on country level at later occasions to share more details of each country example and that these examples/models would be presented for discussions at next Regional meeting.

Regarding monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems, what each country has in common is that monitoring comes from the central level down to provincial level then - to core team management – District trainers – Community (Farmer trainers & Local Leaders). In Cambodia, cross monitoring (peer review) by trainers themselves has been applied.

P.M. Field trip to Chinese cabbage FFS

The Meeting participants proceeded to Manjinpu Township, Chenggong County, to visit FFS activity, observed AESA process, visit vegetable fields together with some talking and

interviewing with farmers. Whereas the vegetable production systems in Yunnan are as intensified as rarely observed anywhere else in the Mekong Region, evidenced by the empty pesticide containers that littered the fields and ditches, it was clear that farmers were dealing with similar production constraints as experienced in other countries. The eagerness of farmers to learn about better and cleaner vegetable production with lesser inputs of pesticides and fertilizers was also evident from lively discussions among meeting participants and farmers in the field.

Day Three (Friday, 12 November)

A.M

Debriefing on FFS field visit and further discussion on selected topics

Meeting participants exchanged ideas and comments related to observations in the FFS as visited the previous day. The main discussion points related to the design of AESA, a better suggested comparison of farmer practice and IPM Plot and a better adapted curriculum to be used. It was recommended that the selection of experimentation topics should be included into curriculum development .

Then the participants continued with discussion on the scheduled topics:

Code of Conduct on the Distribution and use of Pesticides

Mr. Marut Jatiket, the meeting facilitator, made a presentation on the International Code of Conduct on the Distribution and Use of Pesticides, its purpose and articles.

Each country representative raised examples about regulations or studies being applied as guideline for appropriate pesticide use in their country but it was noticeable that none of them made use of the Code of Conduct information.

The problems that were commonly found in each country were:

- 1). Inadequate enforcement of regulations. Many rules and regulations proclaimed, but there was no sustainable follow up to implement and enforce policies and regulation.
- 2). Lack of collaboration among ministries. Many government ministries working on pesticide action, a lot of information available in each ministry but no sharing of information.

Safe Vegetable Policies, Programmes and Health Studies

Nowadays, consumers' health concern has been the emerging topic which can help building up safe product awareness among producers / consumers. Health assessment is a subject which should be integrated into FFS / ToT curriculum development.

Table below shows health concerns related action has been taken in each country.

<i>Activity</i>	<i>Cambodia</i>	<i>China</i>	<i>Laos</i>	<i>Thailand</i>	<i>Vietnam</i>
<i>Integration of health studies in ToT/FFS</i>	√	√		√	√
<i>Separate studies</i>					
<i>-Self Surveillance</i>		√			√
<i>-Community Survey</i>	√ (sida)	√		√	√
<i>Advertisement (poster, leaflet, radio, TV, direct sale)t</i>					
<i>Collaboration Meeting among stakeholders</i>	1 st Q of 2005		plan	√	plan

It was agreed that each county will be compiling information regarding separate studies to share before the next regional meeting. From the table, it shows that problems still exist with pesticide advertisement. There have been many wrong and misleading advertisements on pesticides made available to farmers.

Table below shows safe vegetable policy being applied in each country

<i>Organization/ Policy</i>	<i>Cambodia</i>	<i>China</i>	<i>Laos</i>	<i>Thailand</i>	<i>Vietna m</i>
<i>National Policy (Funding for programme</i>	<i>Support statement</i>	√		√	√
<i>- Min of Agriculture</i>		√	√	√	√
<i>- Min of Public Health</i>		√	√	√	
<i>- Local Level</i>		√		√	
<i>Ministry of Environment, (National policy & funding for pilot project & inspect location for production (soil , water, residue test), trainings of farmers</i>	√	√	√	√	√
<i>Int'l agencies (NGOs, committees)</i>	√			√	√
<i>Ministry of commerce (financial support)</i>				√	
<i>Food safety initiatives(FAO/WHO)</i>	√		√		√
<i>Private Company</i>		√		√	√

It can be said that many agencies have been promoting safe vegetable production/consumption and support for production and training for farmers is substantial but lack of effective training process and other factors hamper the full adoption by consumers and producers of clean and safe vegetables. As much as resources allow, IPM programmes should collaborate with concerned agencies to promote IPM training through FFS and strengthen their capacity and support IPM activities i.e residue testing, soil testing as well as support for marketing.

Table below shows registration and standard in relation with safe food policy being applied in each country

<i>Registration/Standardization</i>	<i>Cambodia</i>	<i>China</i>	<i>Laos</i>	<i>Thailand</i>	<i>Vietnam</i>
<i>Organic Food</i>		√		√	√
<i>Green Food</i>		√		√	√
<i>Safe Food</i>		√		√	√

<i>Standard</i>	<i>Cambodia</i>	<i>China</i>	<i>Laos</i>	<i>Thailand</i>	<i>Vietnam</i>
<i>-Ministry of Agriculture</i>		√		√	√
<i>-Ministry of Public Health</i>		√		√	
<i>Sanitary, Pollution, residue testing</i>		√		√	√
<i>Labelling</i>		√		√	√

The terms and qualifications required for each food category (organic food, green food, safe food) were clarified.

The issues of concern was the effectiveness of the registration process. National agencies can certainly not cover all those actions. It is better that national organizations let the external agencies come in and maintain action in long term. However, there were questions about reliability of labelling. Cases of false labelling or cheated labelling were found.

The process and knowledge for organic farming are also an obstacle for the further promotion and adoption of organic farming.. Organic farming requires certain understanding, knowledge and practice and requires sufficient transition time for farmers to move from chemical intensive to organic production. It is national organization's task to help extending correct advice for farmers to follow to keep organic farming long lasted.

Presently, data and knowledge relating to safe food or organic products are widely spread and shared especially through websites. The meeting group suggested that the FAO regional programme office should take action in collecting and gathering those internet data and further distribute these to each participating country.

P.M Networking/Capacity Development

The session on Networking/Capacity Development started with voting for the crop diseases, disorders or technologies which need to be included in regional training (if any) for the next 6 months. Meeting participants came up with various names of crop diseases of their interest. The vegetable pest and disease problems which received the highest vote seemed to be Club root, flea beetles, DBM and Tomato leaf curl. However, some countries are in the process of organizing internal training/ study in the coming weeks i.e. Vietnam is conducting *Diadegma insulare* rearing and field introduction studies for DBM management in Hanoi and Mekong Delta, Thailand is conducting a field survey to monitor for the possible but unlikely presence/establishment of *D. semiclausum* in highland brassica production systems, China is conducting a study on *Diadegma semiclausum*, Cambodia is discussing the formulation of workplans for consolidated work on trainers' skill development on disease ecology and management & bio control training for district trainers. Therefore, the regional workshop may be set as a forum for discussion and sharing of experiences of the study results and consolidation of planning for future studies and regional training work.

At the end of the session the meeting participants summarized supports and inputs they deemed necessary to work at regional level which are listed below :

- Compiling of successful cases of the after FFS activities i.e farmer club, farmer groups, organic/safe vegetables, saving groups (*all countries*)
- Resources for compiling and translating of documents (*all countries*)
- Compiling information & cases of pesticide impact from each country (*all countries*)
- Supports for national dissemination & collaboration meetings (*for Cambodia, Vietnam, Laos*)
- Support for materials for pest and disease ecology and management studies (DBM, club roots) combine with trainings for interested countries (*Thailand, Vietnam, China*)
- Supports for National Disease Ecology and management & bio-control workshops (*for Cambodia*)
- Supports for in-country exchange visits among vegetable & other IPM programme (*for China*)
- Exploring visit at organic vegetable production/marketing together with training on bio-agent rearing in Thailand (*for Cambodia & China*)

P.M. Plenary session:

A reporter of each sub-group (FAO Int. staff team/national representatives & project experts/consultants) reported to the whole group the brief outcomes of their group discussions.

The FAO Programme Team Leader briefed the group on the outcomes of the FAO Int. Staff Team discussions as follows:

- *System of Rice Intensification follow up.* The SRI report, commissioned by the FAO Programme, was distributed at the meeting and its main conclusions and recommendations summarized at the meeting. Participants of the countries of Cambodia, Vietnam (and Laos) were requested to carefully read the report and formulate ideas for SRI work in each of these countries. This will be further discussed at the next Bi-Annual meeting.
- *Programme Mid-term Evaluation mission.* The Programme is to conduct an external Mid-term Evaluation during the 2005 calendar year. At the meeting it was discussed that such a mission should present its draft findings and recommendations to programme staff and counterparts before finalization of the mission's report. The best possible time to do this would be in conjunction with a next Bi-Annual Regional Programme Meeting (*for further details on timing, see also footnote 4 above.*)

- *Associate Professional Officers assignments.* FAO will likely field APOs (2 -3 years contract duration) to work in Cambodia, Vietnam and possibly Bangkok. TORs for these positions will be developed and forwarded to FAO and possible donors (e.g. DANIDA, Norway, Netherlands)
- *Training materials.* A lot of training materials are already –or about to become- available, e.g. tomato ecological guide (Lao version), field schools guides (being developed in Laos, Cambodia and Vietnam), Cabbage Ecological guide (Thai version), Sugar Pea Ecological guide (under development in China), French bean/cucumber guide (under development in Vietnam), Potato Ecological guide (available in Bahasa Indonesia, being translated into English), Okra Ecological Guide (production still under discussions with Philippines counterparts. These training materials provide for important resource documents and should be widely shared among IPM practitioners in member countries and beyond. The meeting is encouraged to take along examples of such training documents to the next Bi-Annual Regional Meeting.
- *Funding mobilization.* In addition to assigned duties as per current TORs, the new TORs for all international experts as presented in the Programme Addendum include the task to assist each country to actively search for local donors to support each country programme. Albeit time consuming and ‘not the most fun part of the job’, this task will need particular attention, particularly in those countries where substantial IPM programme potential is present and potential donors can be consulted to participate in programme implementation.
- *Impact Assessment.* A regional framework for the design of Impact Assessment was presented at the meeting. It was decided that this regional framework will provide the necessary guidance for design of locally adapted IA studies. Due to limitations of resources available to the Programme for work on IA, it was decided that IA studies will only be done in Cambodia and China. Plans and initial field work have been formulated and initial study work is ongoing in these countries.
- *Subcontracts for research work by NCRI/Planteforsk.* In line with agreements with the Norwegian Government, the Programme Addendum provides for funding support for subcontracts for the Norwegian Crop Research Institute/PlanteForsk. Research work to be supported under these subcontracts will likely be focused on vegetable pest and disease ecology and biocontrol research work in Vietnam. Work on Environmental Impact Quotient (EIQ) is also foreseen. Discussions on these subcontracts with NCRI/PlanteForsk staff are ongoing but contracts can only be issued when project GCP/RAS/209/NOR becomes operational. Results from research work conducted under these subcontracts will be publicized and become available to other members countries as well.
- *Programme website.* Ms. Elske van de Fliert will develop terms of reference for the programme website for discussion at the next Bi-Annual Regional Meeting.
- *Next Bi-Annual Regional Meeting.* Upon suggestions by the representatives of the Lao Government, the next regional meeting will take place in Luang Prabang, Lao PDR during the period 27-29 April 2005.

Day Four (Saturday, 13 November)

A.M. Impact Assessment Workshop

Participants were asked to write down on pieces of paper what did they think about impact assessment, for whom this impact assessment would be useful. Then, Elske presented to the group the draft Impact Assessment conceptual framework, indicators and domains. Participants were divided into 3 groups to review the IA documents and provide response to Ms. Elske.

At the end of the Saturday morning session, Mr. Jan Willem Ketelaar, Team Leader of the FAO Regional Vegetable IPM Programme made some closing remarks and distributed the evaluation forms of which results were compiled and are presented in the **annex 4**.

Documents distributed at the meeting

1. *Assuring food safety and quality: Guidelines for strengthening national food control systems, FAO Food and Nutrition Paper*
2. *Farmers' Life School Manual, January 2004*, A joint publication of UNDP, FAO and World Education
3. *Study on the System of Rice Intensification (SRI) activities in Southeast Asia and to make recommendations to FAO about future training and Participatory Action Research relating to SRI, 30 March-16 April 2004*, by Dr Max Whitten and Dr John Schiller
4. *National Integrated Pest Management Policy*, by Ministry of Agriculture, Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh
5. *Draft: conceptual framework for impact assessment of the FAO regional vegetable IPM programme in Asia* by Ms. Elske van de Fliert
6. *Overview of vegetable IPM activities in Vietnam, 1995-2003* by Ms. Elske van de Fliert
7. *Summary Proceedings of the Garbsen III Workshop on "Impact Assessment of Farmer Field Schools"*. Garbsen, Germany, July 21-23, 2004
8. *Non-chemical control options for flea beetle (*Phyllotreta striolata*) in field cabbage (*Brassica juncea*) in Hai Phong (April –July 2004)*, by Matthew Scot Rodda, Australian Youth Ambassador, University of Adelaide, Australia

Annex 1

**Schedule Bi-annual regional meeting on Vegetable IPM
Chengjiang, Yunnan P.R. China
10-13 November 2004**

Tuesday , 9 November

Time	Activity
18.00	Welcome banquet by Yunnan Agricultural Bureau

Wednesday , 10 November

Time	Activity
08:00-08:30	Welcome and introduction to meeting
08:30-12.00	Introductions by country representatives and discussions on progress and issues Lunch
14.00-16.30	Introductions by country representatives and discussions on progress and issues (continued)
16.30	Discussion on workshop programme for the following days
18.30	Dinner

Thursday, 11 November

Time	Activity
08:00-12.00	Group discussions on issues (continued)
12.00	Lunch
13.00	Introduction to field visit
13.30	Departure for Chengong
14.30	Visit and observation of FFS activities in the village
16.00	Departure for Kunming
16.30	Free time in Kunming
19.00	Banquet in Guo Qiao Yuan restaurant, Kunming, hosted by NATESC and Yunnan PPS

Friday , 12 November

Time	Activity
08:00-12.00	Group discussions on issues (continued)
12.00	Lunch
14.00	Presentations and plenary discussions, conclusions
18.30	Dinner

Saturday, 13 November

Time	Activity
08:00-12.00	Impact Assessment workshop/ Conclusions of the meeting Workshop closure
12.00	Lunch
13.30	Departure of participants

Annex 2

List of participants

Country	Name	Position
Cambodia	1. Mr. Ngin Chhay 2. Mr. Pou Sovann 3. Mr. Sean Polly 4. Ms. Srun Khema,	National Expert/IPM Coordinator Director, Srer Khmer Team Leader Vegetable IPM Project/Srer Kmer National Vegetable IPM Trainer
China	5. Ms. Yan Su 6. Mr. Shi Shangbai 7. Mr. Yang Puyun, 8. Mr. Lu Jianping,	Vegetable IPM Programme Official National IPM Expert NATESC IPM Coordinator Yunnan PPS Vegetable IPM Coordinator
Lao PDR	9. Mr. Randall Arnst 10. Mr. Thongsavanh Taipangnavong 11. Mr. Somnuck Thirasack	Vegetable IPM Programme Dev't Officer National IPM Expert Deputy Director General, NAFES and National IPM Project Director
Thailand	12. Ms. Areepun Upanisakorn 13. Mr. Marut Jatiket 14. Mr. Jan Willem Ketelaar	Entomologist, Pest Management Director, Thai Education Team Leader/IPM Expert
Vietnam	15. Mr. Ngo Tien Dung 16. Ms. Le Thi Thu Huong 17. Ms. Elske Van de Fliert	National IPM Coordinator National IPM Expert Vegetable IPM Programme Dev't Officer
Support Staff	18. Ms. Hu Xinmei 19. Ms. Nawarat Phayungkij 20. Mr. Li Xuecai 21. Local PPS staff	Admin Assistant Admin Assistant Driver Logistics

Annex 3

Summary of Country reports

Country	Progress	Problems/Issues	Action taken to resolve them
P.R. China	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • March-July, 2004: Training of trainers(TOT) for 35 technicians from 4 provinces. (24 of them from Yunnan Province, 8 from Sichuan, 2 from Shandong province and 1 from Hebei province. • March to July, 2004: four pilot FFSs applying Multiple Learning Cycle(MTC) approach in Chuxiong and Kunming. • Participatory needs and opportunity assessment (PNOA) is being conducted in six prefectures by master trainers and their local teams. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PNOA village data analysis meeting workshop was held in Chengjiang in Sep. 2004 attended by master trainers, NATESC and Yunnan PPS representatives and FAO project team - Pilot FFS evaluation and monitoring and evaluation system development workshop was held in Nov. 2004 attended by master trainers, Yunnan PPS representatives and FAO project team • Development of vegetable ecological production guides and manuals in Chinese • Vegetable IPM FFS implementation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Programme management in Yunnan province is not so strong 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussions were held with NATESC to support Yunnan PPS with establishing or strengthening a stronger management team
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some TOMT/TOT graduates were transferred to other jobs and are no longer available to the vegetable IPM programme 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Future TOT participant must sign a contract before attending a training course, committing to at least work as vegetable IPM facilitator for 3 years after the TOT
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fund disbursement has been slow at all levels, partly due to the many steps that need to be taken with regard to LOA development, approval and implementation and to late reporting by NATESC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timely reporting will be aspired in the future • NATESC will directly disburse funds to the county PPSs where field activities are implemented

Country	Progress	Problems/Issues	Action taken to resolve them
Cambodia	<p><i>Activities carried out primarily by the national IPM program</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • June 28-July 2, 2004: district trainers' review, refresher and planning workshop attended by 36 districts IPM trainers from programme target provinces • March 2004: training workshop on monitoring and evaluation of FFS activities attended by 20 participants (district trainers, National vegetable IPM team and Srer Khmer) • July 19 to August 7, 2004: IPM farmer trainers orientation course (FTOC) on vegetable for 31 farmers from 4 target provinces. • Coordination meeting of the FAO vegetable IPM project for national IPM team, Ste Khmer staff, provincial coordinators and vegetable IPM team leaders. • Field experiments to strengthen the capability of trainers for response to constrains faced by farmers. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 2004 dry season: 8 field experiments - 2004 wet season: 14 field experiments • 2004 dry season: 4 provincial planning and evaluation meeting were organized in the 4 target provinces. • Vegetable FFSs on cabbage, tomato, cauliflower, yard long bean, Chinese kale. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 2004 dry season: 30 FFSs, 696 farmers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some specific field problems with diseases: Bacterial soft rot, leaf curl, damping off, and bottom end-rot fruit, etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some solutions taken when the problems occurred were to destroy the infected plants for bacterial and virus diseases, and Mancozeb was sprayed in some fields to control fungous diseases. In addition, the preventive management methods were discussed with farmers to tackle with these diseases for the next seasons.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some specific field problems with insect pests: flea beetles, fruit borer, DBM, webworm, and white fly, etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrated control methods were applied, such as using nets, sticky glue traps, hand picking, botanical insecticides, BT and Sypermethrin
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some District Trainers still lack the necessary facilitation skills required to run a high quality FFS. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A refresher course on facilitation skills was organized for all District Trainers and more training is foreseen for the next reporting period.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Counterparts and key IPM trainers still lack technical knowledge, particularly on disease ecology & management. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Short duration courses and on the job training in the field should be provided to improve skills of District Trainers. A Disease Ecology & Management workshop is scheduled for the 2004 wet season

Country	Progress	Problems/Issues	Action taken to resolve them
Cambodia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 2004 wet season: 29 FFSs, 697 farmers • June 2004: 11 farmer congresses were organized, 50-60 people for each congress. • Development of Training and Ecological Production Guides and updating of Pesticide Book. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National counterparts have limited knowledge on computers and English language skills. This slows effective communication and report writing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allowing national counterparts to participate in computer and English training courses will help overcome these problems. Such training courses are already underway.
Cambodia	<p>Activities carried out by NGO Srer Khmer under sub-contract with FAO:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for government IPM training activities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 2004 dry season: supported the 42 trainers from 4 provinces participated in refresher course. - Supported monitoring and evaluation workshop. - Supported Farmer Trainer Orientation Course(FTOC) - Supported training on self-sustained IPM Farmer Clubs, 45 district trainers involved. • Support for Organic vegetable production and marketing initiatives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 2 exchange meetings among 12 organic farmers - Two trainings on hot and liquid compost, 20 farmer participants - Two trainings on “living soils” for organic farmers • Support for farmer networking <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Exchange visits among Farmer Clubs and organic farmers - Meetings with the Farmer clubs - 4 farmer meetings with local authorities at the district level • 303 farmers were involved in experiments conducted to support for farmer action research 		

Country	Progress	Problems/Issues	Action taken to resolve them
Lao PDR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Twenty Vegetable IPM Farmer Field Schools in tomatoes, yard-long beans, cucumbers, Chinese Kale, and cabbages in six provinces. • Two pilot Post-FFSs on Soil Ecology and Nutrient Management in yard-long beans and cucumbers in Vientiane Capital. • In late March of 2004, a workshop was held to work on a curriculum for yard-long beans. • In May 2004, two refresher workshops were conducted by FAO-IPM staff, with one workshop including all IPM trainers in three northern provinces, and the other held for IPM trainers in three southern provinces. These workshops served as refresher trainings. • Various field visits were made to provide technical backstopping and keep a check on the quality of training processes. • Some IPM trainers have conducted experiments with farmers on selected biological control agents in controlling major pests of cabbages and rice. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weak capacity at central level still remains 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to employ National IPM Expert • National IPM Project Director must take more direct role on guidance and supervision • Appointment of formal National IPM Coordinator with full time staff as soon as possible
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of FFS trainers as well as trainers on Soil Ecology and Nutrient Management in Vegetables 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refresher training on Vegetable FFSs for former rice IPM trainers • Integration of 1 vegetable trainer with 1 rice trainer to facilitate an FFS
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weak coordination with and among government staff at central provincial and district levels 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal outstanding for nearly a year for coordination workshops to foster their support and efficient program implementation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vegetable production villages remain limited in targeted program areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More focus on Post-FFSs and continuing activities and off-season production • Expansion to other vegetable production areas/districts

Country	Progress	Problems/Issues	Action taken to resolve them
Thailand	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • July-end of 2004: first step of overall strategy for “<i>Crucifer IPM for the Northern Highlands of Thailand.</i>” Conducted an initial survey of highland crucifer crop production, including the identification of any possible indigenous biological control organisms for DBM control. • August 30th to September 3rd 2004: a workshop was held to plan for the survey and provide hands-on training on identification and rearing techniques for parasitoids of the DBM. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Currently no regular Farmer Field Schools to conduct survey • Uncertainty regarding future Farmer Field Schools for (possible) future integration of DBM biological control measures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Special field schools funded by Danida IPM Programme • Likely that support for such activities will depend primarily on individual provinces in the future
Vietnam	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Farmer field school (FFS): around 30 farmers were engaged in for a whole season (14 weeks). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 2004 spring season: 33 vegetable IPM FFS were organised in 11 provinces/cities. - 2004 autumn-winter season: another 33 FFS will be organised. • Participatory action research (PAR): PAR activities were conducted in two sites during the 2004 summer season (May-July 2004). This activity was led by a volunteer student from Australia. • 4 pilot farmer field schools applying multiple learning cycle approach were established in two provinces. • Rearing and release of <i>Diadegma insulare</i>: continued trials on biological control of diamond back moth (DBM) in lowland areas, About 10,000 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No major problems were encountered 	

Country	Progress	Problems/Issues	Action taken to resolve them
Vietnam	<p>cocoons of <i>Diadegma insulare</i> will be imported from Florida (USA) during October-December 2004.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meetings and workshops <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Aug. – Sep. 2004: provincial planning meetings were organised in eleven target provinces. - 14-15 October 2004: a planning workshop was organised with representatives from 7 target provinces with large safe vegetable production programme. • Other activities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A simple pot trial was conducted by the Hanoi Plant Protection Sub-Department on the effect of biofumigation on a soil-borne disease (bacterial wilt) in tomato. - Nationwide inventory of vegetable IPM capacity building and activities was conducted and reported. - Nationwide inventory on provincial Safe vegetable programmes was conducted, as a basis for future programme planning 		

Evaluation of the meeting

Facilities (hotel, food, etc.)

- Hotel: - Excellent: 3
 - Very good: 12
- Pleasing and conducive for productive meeting: 1
- Too far from the town: 1
- Food: - Very good: 7
 - Fine: 2
 - Real coffee would be good: 1
 - Meals could have been a bit relaxed plus social: 1
 - Food is a bit oily: 1
 - Food is a bit hot for somebody: 1
 - Too much food that couldn't be finished.

Content (topics, issues, etc.)

- Excellent: 1
- good: 10
- Constructive: 1
- Clear with all topics and issues raised: 1
- The method and process applied to the meeting is very effective: 1
- All our participants should share more experiences and ore documents that related to field production (translated in English)

Organization (process, scheduling)

- Excellent: 2
- Good: 6
- Acceptable: 1
- Good participation of everyone: 1
- Marut's facilitation was vital to process of discussion on issues :1
- Good balance of meeting activities and relaxation: 1
- The revised schedule is good, participants had some time in Kunming after meeting.: 1
- Good mix of structure/clarity with informality/participation
- Feedback to the facilitator would be good: 1

Field visit

- Good: 9
- Particularly useful for non-Chinese to experience intensified vegetable production in Yunnan and exchange ideas with local farmers: 1
- Introductions could have been more elaborate: 1
- Good that there was time to discuss with farmers groups with guidance: 2
- Need to be changed, let farmers learn more about research participation: 1
- Give some new idea on 1st and 2nd cycle of FFS: 1
- Should have more farmer's discussion: 1
- Should have more time to interview farmers: 2

Suggestions for next workshop

- More time on impact assessment and training technological issues: 1
- Discuss fewer topics but more in-depth: 1
- Keep number of participants (invited again to people who are directly involved): 1
- Should not far from the town or should have time in town: 1

- Link with mid-term evaluation and give one and a half days to evaluation team to get further inputs and feedback: 1
- Don't add any more content
- To have more hours in field visit to get more information related not only to IPM but also to living conditions: 1
- Focus more on impact assessment and monitoring system: 1
- Setting agenda prior to the workshop via e-mail helps fine tune the details: 1
- More discussion on successful IPM cases from experienced countries: 2
- Better to make people's assignment clear in advance (i.e. report writing): 1
- More technical materials can be shared: 1
- More resource person on specialist topic (i.e. impact assessment, bio-control)
- FAO should follow up the activities need to be done before the meeting: 1
- Outline for presentation should be developed in advance similar to this meeting: 1
- Participants should talk more clearly in English in order to be more understandable. Some participants talked fast and unclearly.

Other comments and suggestions

- Express thanks to the Chinese for excellent organization of this meeting: 2
- Having a smaller group with people who are directly involved has been positive for the process : 1
- Pick up some good experiences to share in the meeting by resource person.: 1
- Interaction with other program, FFS visit could broaden perceptions:1
- Meeting place to be closer to the city: 1
- Should be nicer if more friendly and relaxing environment could be built during the meeting: 1
- More group discussion instead of plenary discussion: 1
- Could FAO deliver ecological guide on yard long bean crop to national team?
