

Report of the Bi-Annual Meeting

FAO Regional Vegetable IPM Programme in Asia

(GCP/RAS/209/NOR)



Kanchanaburi, Thailand
15-17 November 2005



**Summary Report on the Bi-Annual Meeting
FAO Regional Vegetable IPM Programme in Asia
Kanchanaburi, Thailand
15-17 November 2005**

Introduction

Throughout Phase II of the FAO Regional Vegetable IPM Programme in Asia, bi-annual regional meetings among project staff, national counterparts, and staff of related organizations have been held in different member countries. Thailand hosted the 6th such meeting at the Felix River Kwai Resort in Kanchanaburi, some 3 hour drive to the west of Bangkok. Whereas the objectives of this bi-annual meeting were similar to those of previous such meetings, this gathering focused on debriefing of the findings and recommendations of the Mid Term Evaluation of the FAO Regional Vegetable IPM Programme Phase II, which toured the Region from 26 October-18 November 2006.

The overall *objectives* of this meeting were:

1. To share and exchange progress and experiences among member countries and to plan for future activities;
2. To discuss findings and recommendations of the forthcoming Mid Term Evaluation; and,
3. To discuss various themes/topics as per participants' interests.

The meeting was organized by staff of the FAO Vegetable IPM Programme in collaboration with staff of the Pest Management Division of the Department of Agricultural Extension, Royal Thai Government. A schedule of meeting activities is attached in *annex 1* and idem for a list of participants (*annex 2*)

Main Activities

Country Presentations and Discussions

Country presentations started with Bangladesh, Indonesia and Philippines in which summaries were provided of the status of IPM and selected FAO supported activities in these countries. These presentations were then followed by topic-specific presentations, delivered by key Programme counterparts from each of the 5 Greater Mekong Subregion countries. These topics included Brassica Biocontrol Initiatives (Thailand), Coconut Brontispa beetle Biocontrol Initiatives (Lao PDR), Monitoring & Evaluation System Design (China PR), Pest and Pesticide Management Conference (Cambodia) and Safe Vegetable Programme (Vietnam). The new format for such *topic-specific* country presentations was appreciated by workshop participants and lively discussions followed these presentations.

Mid Term Review Mission Presentations and Discussions

The FAO Phase II Vegetable IPM Programme underwent an external evaluation during the period 26 October-18 November 2006. Draft findings and recommendations (generic and country specific) were presented by the Mid Term Evaluation Team during the 2nd day of this Bi-Annual Meeting. The resulting feedback from participants allowed the MTR team to refine and finalize their findings & recommendations. This overall exercise was deemed both by the MTR team and participants as highly useful. The MTR report was subsequently finalized and the Programme Management, in discussion with key government counterparts, was tasked with formulation of a Management Response on key findings and recommendations. Both reports have now been formally submitted to both donors and all member countries for comments and follow up action on recommendations.

Theme-specific Presentations and Discussions

Mini-workshops were held at the 3rd day of the Bi-Annual Meeting. A plenary session at the final meeting day allowed for plenary exchange of key workshop conclusions and recommendations. Discussions focused on the following three themes:

- *Disease Diagnosis, Ecology and Novel Options for Management*

Key workshop conclusions and recommendations included the need for better capacity building within national IPM programmes in member countries to diagnose and manage diseases (most notably those caused by viruses) in vegetables. All country programmes are encouraged to develop appropriate strategies and indicate needs for assistance to the Regional Programme, if any.

- *Good Agricultural Practices and implication for IPM training*

The ‘jungle of GAP’ is truly mesmerizing and discussions held during the mini-workshop on GAP helped shed some light on current local and international GAP schemes affecting farmers in Asia and implications for IPM training programmes. Some initial suggestions for addressing GAP within the context of the work of the FAO Vegetable IPM Programme included lobby efforts to ensure that IPM and FFS principles are included in local GAP schemes and efforts to link up IPM FFS groups with GAP marketing schemes as well as exploring potential for assistance to export contract farming companies for inclusions of IPM and FFS into their production activities. The IPM training curriculum could also benefit from more attention to GAP and food safety issues.

- *Sustained IPM Learning, Problem Solving and Collective Action*

Presentations and discussions during this mini-workshop focused on ongoing work and experiences with regards to sustained IPM learning, problem solving and collective action beyond an initial FFS. Various models for such sustained IPM learning are currently being piloted within the context of field programmes. Some generic recommendations for continued action included establishment of quality monitoring and evaluation systems and further exchange and regional networking on what works and what does not within the diverse community of national IPM programmes associated with this FAO Programme.

Other presentations during the Bi-Annual meeting included Campbell Soup’s IPM experiences in processing tomato, Thai Education Foundation’s and World Education Philippines work on school IPM and vocational training for rural youth, NCRI research work in Vietnam and a review of the newly published Sweet Potato Diagnostics tool kit.

Field Trips

Field trips, organized on the 4th day of the meeting were optional and included a visit to field operations of the River Kwai Company in Kanchanaburi. Although a visit to the processing plant was not possible, the field visits to contract farmers growing asparagus, okra and babycorn for export markets in Europe and Japan did demonstrate how this export company is successfully negotiating the ‘jungle tracks’ of Good Agricultural Practices.

Evaluation, Plans and Follow Up

This Bi-Annual Meeting was positively evaluated by participants in terms of content, process and logistical arrangements. A detailed evaluation plus suggestion notes for the next regional meeting (Shihanoukville, Cambodia 5-7 April 2006) is attached in *annex 3*.

Annexes

Annex 1: Program of Activities

Annex 2: List of Participants

Annex 3: Evaluation

**Annex 1: Program of Activities of the Bi-Annual Regional Meeting for FAO Vegetable
IPM Programme**
15-17 November 2005
Felix River Kwai Resort Hotel, Kanchanaburi, Thailand

SCHEDULE

<i>Date</i>	<i>Time</i>	<i>Activity</i>
Monday, 14/11/05	am-pm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participants' arrival in Bangkok and onwards travel to Kanchanaburi
	18:30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Welcome Cocktails, followed by dinner at Felix River Kwai Resort
Tuesday, 15/11/05	08:00- 12:00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opening remarks: Opening notes: Regional IPM Programme Country presentations: Bangladesh, Indonesia, Philippines Presentation & discussion on Country specific topics & activities (45 minutes per country): Thailand
	12:00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lunch at the Felix Hotel
	13:30- 16:30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presentation & discussion on Country specific topics & activities (45 minutes per country): Laos, Vietnam, Cambodia, China PR
	18:30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Welcome Dinner hosted by Thai Government
Wednesday, 16 /11/05	08:00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Debriefing with Mid Term Evaluation Mission
	12:00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lunch at Felix Hotel
	13:00- 15.00 15.15- 16.00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Debriefing with Mid Term Evaluation Mission (Continued, if needed) Presentation Norwegian Crop Research Institute/PlanteForsk Presentation School IPPM work Philippines (Mario) Agreement on discussion topics & schedule for Thurs/Friday Free (optional tours to nearby tourist sites)
	18:00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dinner & Loy Krathong celebrations at Felix Hotel
Thursday, 17/11/05	08.00- 08.45 08:45- 12:00	Plenary Presentations (<i>continued</i>) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Campbell's IPM for Processing Tomatoes experience (Hasan) Sweet Potato Diagnostics demo (Huong) Topic/theme-specific discussions (3 sub-groups) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disease Diagnosis, Ecology and Novel Options for Management Good Agricultural Practices and implication for IPM training Sustained IPM Learning, Problem Solving and Collective Action
	12:00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lunch at the Felix Hotel
	13:00- 17:00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plenary meeting on outcomes group discussions Wrap-up & forward planning
	18:30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Farewell Dinner hosted by FAO-IPM

<i>Date</i>	<i>Time</i>	<i>Activity</i>
Friday, 18/11/05	am pm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local visit/study tours or free time/Return to Bangkok • For MidTerm Review mission, formal debriefing at FAO Regional Office in Bangkok (Room B-207, 14.30h) • Return travel home or (optional) overnight stay in Bangkok
Saturday, 19/11/05	am	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Return travel home (remaining participants)

**Annex 2: List of participants for bi-annual regional meeting
Felix River Kwai Resort, Kanchanaburi, 15 -17 November 2005**

Country Rep/Nat. Expert	Name	Position
Cambodia	1. Mr. Ngin Chhay 2. Mr. Neak Thon 3. Mr. Koung Sokunthea	National Program Dev Consultant National IPM Official Project Team Leader, Srer Khmer
China	4. Mr. Zhong Tianrun 5. Ms. Li Ping 6. Ms. Hu Xinmei	National IPM Coordinator, NATESC VegIPM Programme Coordinator, NATESC FAO-IPM Programme Assistant, Kunming
Lao PDR	7. Mr. Thongsavanh Taipangnavong 8. Mr. Soukkhavong Khodsimumang	FAO National IPM Expert National IPM Coordinator, DoAG
Thailand	9. Ms. Lawan Jeerapong 10. Ms. Areepan Upanisakorn 11. Mr. Marut Jatiket	Director, Biocontrol Group, DoAE Entomologist, Pest Mngt Div, DoAE Director, Thai Education Foundation
Vietnam	12. Mr. Ngo Tien Dung 13. Mr. Le Minh Dung 14. Ms. Le Thi Thu Huong	National IPM Coordinator Vice Director , PPSD, Ho Chi Minh City FAO National IPM Expert
Philippines	15. Mr. Jesie Binamira 16. Ms. Vale Justo 17. Mr. Mario Corado	National IPM Coordinator Entomologist, NCPC Country Director, World Education
Indonesia	18. Mr Nugroho Wienarto 19. Mr Nanang Budiyanto	Director, FIELD Indonesia IPM Coordinator/Prov. gov. Yogyakarta
Bangladesh	20. Mr. M.S. Alam	Assistant Senior Advisor, SPSS- DANIDA
FAO staff/Resource person	Name	Position
Vegetable IPM staff	21. Mr. Jan Willem Ketelaar 22. Mr. Randy Arnst 23. Ms. Elske van de Fliert 24. Ms. Kristine Stubberud 25. Mr. Damien Cupitt 26. Ms. Nawarat Phayungkij	Team Leader Programme Development Officer Programme Development Officer Associate Professional Officer Australian Youth Ambassador/Researcher Administrative Assistant
Others	27. Ms. Tattanakorn Moekchantuk 28. Mr. Trond Hofsvang 29. Mr. Ivar Jorgensen 30. Mr. Harry van der Wulp 31. Mr. Lim Guan Soon 32. Mr. Prabhat Kumar	Resource person, Thailand Research Director, NCRI (Norway) NORAD Advisor, Oslo Sr. Policy Officer, AGPP, Rome Resource Person/ Biocontrol Specialist Resource Person/ Researcher

Annex 3: RESULTS OF EVALUATION
FAO-Vegetable IPM Programme Bi-Annual Workshop
Kanchanaburi, Thailand 15-17 November, 2004

- | | | | |
|--|----------------------------|------------|-------|
| 1. Facilities (hotel, food, etc.) | Good--20
improvement--0 | Average--3 | Needs |
| 2. Content (topics, issues, etc.) | Good--23
improvement--0 | Average--0 | Needs |
| 3. Organisation (process, scheduling, etc.) | Good--20
improvement--0 | Average--3 | Needs |
| 4. Reports from and Feedback to the Mid-Term Review Mission | Good--18
improvement--3 | Average--3 | Needs |
- Good opportunity for MTR team to have clarification of actual situations in respective countries.
 - I like the idea of mission presenting their findings and recommendations. Each country representative were able to comment/add/explain/correct the findings of the mission. This gives them the chance to depend their output/activities.
 - Ability to ask/answer questions/concerns and offer feedback to review committee gave greater clarity and understanding of what they “concluded” from their visits to each country. Helps their ability to review in country programs.
 - It’s good to hear what RTM summary. We can all share and give comments and feedback.
 - Excellent idea
 - In Indonesia, although at the national level IPM training program has been “forgotten,” it is not the case at the field level. A lot of IPM Farmer Associations led by IPM farmer trainers still exist with small scale activities. Some are receiving support from local governments and NGOs. IPM in Indonesia resulted from a lot of struggle at the national policy level. Then when FAO pulled out its support from Indonesia’s IPM, it was easier for “other forces” to control the turf.
 - Something which should consider before take action should let people read before, so there is time to think for example the feedback for mid-term evaluation.
- 5. Suggestions for next Workshop**
- March/April 2006
 - If possible, participants should go to visit IPM activity in the country.
 - Should be field visit during the meeting.
 - See the farmers’ FFS or situation in field.

- Field trip to visit field or company should be schedule during workshop days, not the last day.
- Study tours should be during the day of meeting, not the last day.
- Next meeting should be in Cambodia.
- Discuss more about inter-country linkage to share information and experiences.
- Presentation of specific studies/activities from the representatives of each member country.
- Further discussions on actions to be taken from each country.
- Report on impact data by each country.
- From technical point of view, providing analysis of experiments or TOT/FFS success and failures and giving examples or scenarios to support efforts (without making it priority /+ boring) but highlighting valuable lessons learned.
- More focus on specific topics, less time spent on country presentations.

6. Other Comments and/or Suggestions

- From non-GMS countries, at least two persons may be invited from each of the countries.
- Overall, it was highly satisfactory.
- Provision may be made for the inter-country study tour for the exposure with their good activities.
- The meeting is successful. Congratulations and thank your for inviting.
- Well done. Communication, networking and interacting with each country's participants is very valuable.
- It's always good to meet with all faces for stronger IPM networking and to meet with new folks.
- Very interesting with the variety of subjects/topics presented and discussed.