

**Report of the Bi-Annual Meeting
FAO Vegetable IPM Programme in Asia
Haiphong, Vietnam
23-25 April 2007**

1. INTRODUCTION

Since the beginning of phase II in 2002, the FAO Regional Vegetable IPM Programme has organized a meeting twice a year for representatives of the member countries, organizations involved or linked to the programme activities and project staff. Each of the member countries has been hosting the event on rotational basis. The objectives of the recently-held meeting in Hai Phong, Vietnam were as follows;

1. To provide orientation and exchange experiences regarding the ongoing FAO supported IPM work by National IPM Programmes in the Greater Mekong Sub-Region;
2. To strengthen regional networking among nationals, partner organization representatives and FAO staff involved in implementation of the FAO Regional Programme;
3. To discuss strategies for implementation of Community Education initiatives of the new GMS Pesticide Risk Reduction Programme.

This time the meeting was organized in Hai Phong, Northern Vietnam, in collaboration between FAO staff and the Plant Protection Department of the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development.

There were 36 participants who attended the meeting including 12 representatives from country programmes (Cambodia, China, Laos, Thailand and Vietnam), 9 representatives from civil society organizations and NGOs (Field Alliance, Pesticide Action Network-Asia Pacific, Srer Khmer, CEDAC, PEAC, CDEA and Thai Education Foundation) and 5 resource persons (representatives of the donors and Bioforsk/NIAER) in addition to FAO staff. The schedule of the meeting is attached in **Annex 1** and the list of participants in **Annex 2**.

2. MAIN ACTIVITIES

2.1 Opening Remarks

Mr. Dam Quoc Tru, Vice Director General of the Plant Protection Department (PPD), opened the meeting. He expressed a concern regarding the continuous misuse of pesticides in crop cultivation throughout the region, and acknowledged FAOs accomplishments and continuous support to change this development through IPM farmer education and policy support. On behalf of the Government of Vietnam, he welcomed all participants and wished them success with the meeting and future programme activities.

Following these opening remarks, Mr. Jan Willem Ketelaar, the Chief Technical Adviser of the FAO Regional Vegetable IPM Programme, also welcomed the participants on behalf of FAO and gave an overview of the objectives and schedule of the meeting.

2.2 Presentations and discussion on country specific activities

Each of the member countries gave a brief overview of their national IPM programmes and a presentation on specific activities, innovations or particular challenges as part of the exchange sharing of experiences. The special topics presented by country were the following:

1. Cambodia (presented by Mr. Nghin Chhay): The use of EIQ in impact assessment.
2. Yunnan Province, China (presented by Mr. Yang Puyung): Farmer-centered vegetable IPM hamlets
3. Lao PDR (presented by Mr. Soukhavong Khodsimuong): Lao National Vegetable IPM Programme
4. Thailand (presented by Ms. Areepan Upanisakorn): Cooperation among governmental agencies to promote IPM
5. Vietnam (presented by Mr. Ngo Tien Dung): National IPM Program linked Farmer Education initiatives in Vietnam (e.g. BUCAP, SRI).

After the country presentations, NIAER/Bioforsk gave a brief overview of their contributions and achievements of the five research components implemented in Vietnam under the sub-contract with FAO. Following this, Ms. Marjon Fredrix from the Global IPM Facility, gave a presentation on her work with community-level management of brown plant hopper and associated virus diseases in Vietnam. Mr. Tru presented supplementary information from the Vietnamese government on past and present outbreak situations as well as current actions taken to reduce similar scenarios in the future. All the presentations were followed by additional comments, questions and discussion among the meeting attendants.

After Cambodia's presentation, main discussion topic was on challenges with implementation such as weak governmental support financially and on policy, in particular enforcement of pesticide laws and regulation. Decentralization with workplan and budget for provincial funds has been the approach to improve this situation. Cambodia has also started top-level discussions on the possibility of moving towards organic production. For China, the discussion focused on details on the certification system developed by both farmer associations and the government including process of standard criteria development, organization and management arrangements. Thailand's presentation was followed by comments on a potential role for FAO technical support for strengthening national GAP programmes in member countries. Mechanisms to stop clear violations on pesticide advertisement, and how to strengthen the authority of pesticide inspectors were also mentioned. To Vietnam, there were questions related to the registration of farmer breeding varieties and about the results and effects of linking up FAO IPM FFS with the governmental Safe Vegetable Programme. Lastly, there were discussions on sustainability in terms of what self-funding mechanisms are in place for FFS follow up activities. NIAER was requested to explain how the results of their

research can be used and what their plans are for further technical support to the local researchers involved. For BPH work, questions were raised on what subsidizing mechanisms are in place to help farmers affected. There were also questions on technical matters such as characteristics of the two outbreaks in time and how IPM field study results may be used as an entry point to policy change.

2.3 Field visit

A field visit was made on the morning of the second day to Tan Tien village in An Duong district located about 10 km. from Hai Phong City. Meeting attendees were invited to the village hall to listen to a presentation prepared by ten invited farmers. The farmers had been involved in EIQ-related farmer education activities initiated by Bioforsk in collaboration with PPD. The farmers presented results of a survey undertaken in 2006 that compared cultivation practices by IPM trained farmers and conventional farmers on pesticide use, EIQ field values, fertilizer use and economic analysis. From the presentations it was clear that the IPM farmers used less toxic pesticides, more organic fertilizers and had higher economic returns due to lower input costs. The farmer presentations were followed by an exchange of questions between the meeting attendees and the farmers.

After the field visit the participants were asked to share their impression on what they had observed. Some of the main concerns raised were on the apparent reliance on pesticides to control pests and the limited awareness of health risks as a result of pesticide applications. In the feedback session, Mr. Gerd Walter-Echols, FAO consultant, gave a presentation on the outputs of the international workshop on EIQ that was organized the week before the Bi-Annual meeting. Potential uses and limitations of the EIQ model were explained followed by the main conclusions and recommendations of applying the EIQ model in IPM programme activities.

2.4 Orientation on the Pesticide Risk Reduction Programme

In February 2007, FAO signed a contract with the Swedish Chemical Agency (KemI) with regards to its participation in a multi-stakeholder programme on Pesticide Risk Reduction in the Greater Mekong Sub-region. This collaboration will align with a possible Phase III of the FAO Regional Vegetable IPM Programme. The member countries were given an orientation of the project profile to provide feedback and express interest for continued participation in the proposed Pesticide Risk Reduction project. Involved agencies and organizations in this PRR programme include: KEMI, PAN-AP, Field Alliance (with partner organizations in each of the member countries) and the Global IPM Facility. Programme objectives, timeframe, activities and scope of proposed work (including country focus) were presented by a representative of KemI. The NGOs will mainly contribute with advocacy work and awareness raising, while FAO will focus on two main components; IPM in field and policy support. Following these presentations,

Mr. Ketelaar gave a presentation on the project outline for the IPM component. This would serve as input for group discussions the following day.

2.5 Group discussion and presentations

The last day of the meeting, the participants representing national programmes were asked to work in groups to discuss inputs for country strategy papers for the Pesticide Risk Reduction Programme based on the following;

1. relevance of the project concept
2. scope of activities (geographic area..)
3. possible linkages/partnerships
4. challenges
5. opportunities
6. input needs from the regional programme

In a separate group, participants from CSOs and NGOs discussed how they, with their area of expertise, could best contribute in reaching the goal of reduced pesticide risk in the region. Both groups shared the outputs from the discussions. A summary of the group presentations is enclosed in **Annex 3**. Representatives from NGOs and national counterparts sat in country-level groups for some minutes to explore possible linkages and plan for follow-up action on national level after the regional meeting.

2.6 Wrap-up and evaluation

Finally, the participants were asked to provide feedback on their overall opinion of the organization and content of the meeting. A written evaluation form was distributed to assess strengths, weaknesses and suggestions to improvement for the next bi-annual meeting. A summary of the evaluation results are enclosed in **Annex 4**. Closing remarks were by Mr. Ketelaar on behalf of FAO and by Mr. Dung as a representative of the Vietnamese government. They gave thanks for active participation and wishes for continued success with the linkages created during the meeting.

ANNEXES:

Annex 1. Bi-annual meeting programme

Annex 2. List of participants

**Annex 3. Development of strategies for IPM and advocacy components of the
Pesticide Risk Reduction Programme**

Annex 4. Results of evaluation

Annex 1. Bi-annual meeting programme

Regional Vegetable IPM Programme Bi-Annual Meeting Hai Phong, Vietnam 23-25 April 2007

Date	Time	Activity
Sunday 22 Apr.	AM PM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arrival of participants • Overnight at Huu Nghi Hotel, Hai Phong City
Monday 23 Apr.	AM PM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opening/Introductory notes • Country Presentations: Overview of ongoing National IPM Programmes in the GMS and selected innovative activities • Lunch • Country Presentations (<i>continued</i>) • Presentation by Bioforsk/NIAER • Presentation/discussion on Community-level Management of BPH and Associated Virus Diseases • Welcome dinner hosted by the Plant Protection Department
Tuesday 24 Apr.	AM PM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Field visits (see options below): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Field visit to vegetable IPM follow-up activities (for participants to Bi-Annual Meeting) ○ Discussion on outputs Int. EIQ workshop • Visit to Ha Long Bay (for participants who attended International EIQ Meeting) • Lunch • Orientation on the Swedish programme on Pesticide Risk Reduction in the Greater Mekong Sub-region including presentations by PAN-AP, Field Alliance, Global IPM Facility and KEMI • Working Group Discussion guidelines • Dinner
Wednesday 25 Apr.	AM PM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Working Group Discussions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ National Programmes: Implementation strategies for IPM component Pesticide Risk Reduction Programme ○ NGO Programmes: Discussions with partners on implementation strategies for Community Education activities • Lunch • Presentations on Working Group Discussions • Synthesis: Exploring Linkages and Collaboration with New Partners • (Informal) Wrap up and Closing notes • Farewell Dinner hosted by FAO-IPM
Thursday 26 Apr.	AM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Travel to Hanoi and return back home • Free time in Hanoi (optional) • Overnight at Army Hotel, Hanoi (optional)
Friday 27 Apr.	AM PM	Departure of remaining participants from Hanoi

Annex 2. List of participants

List of Participants Bi-Annual Regional Meeting for FAO Vegetable IPM Programme Hai Phong, Vietnam, 23-25 April 2007

Participants	Name/Designation	Organisation	Email Address
Cambodia	1. Mr. Ngin Chhay, Deputy Director/ IPM Coordinator 2. Ms. Srun Khema, National IPM Official 3. Mr. Chou Cheythyrieth, Vegetable IPM Coordinator 4. Mr. Pou Sovann, Director 5. Mr. Keam Makarady, Programme Officer	DAALI, MAFF DAALI, MAFF National IPM Programme Srer Khmer CEDAC	Chhay.ipm@online.com.kh faoiipm.natstaff@online.com.kh svrrprp@seila.gov.kh Srerkhmer@online.com.kh makarady@online.com.kh
China	6. Mr. Yang Puyun, Director 7. Mr. Dai Weidong, Programme Officer 8. Ms. Sun Jing, Deputy Director	Nat. Agro Tech, Ext & Service Centre FAO Representation, China PEAC	yangpy@agri.gov.cn Weidong.Dai@fao.org Peac.office@gmail.com
Laos	9. Mr. Thongsavanh Taipangnavong, Nat IPM Expert 10. Mr. Soukhavong Khodsimumong, Deputy Director 11. Mr. Khanthone Phamuang, President	FAO Vegetable IPM, Lao PDR Plant Protection Centre, MoAF CDEA	faoiipm@laotel.com soukhavong2000@yahoo.com pkhanthone@yahoo.com
Vietnam	12. Mr. Dam Quoc Tru, Deputy Director General 13. Mr. Ngo Tien Dung, National IPM Prog Coordinator 14. Mr. Vu Ngoc Tien, Assistant FAOR Rep (programme) 15. Mr. Vu Minh Duc, Senior Program Officer 16. Ms. Phung Thi Nguyet-Hong, Project Coordinator	Plant Protection Dept. MARD Plant Protection Dept. MARD FAO Representation, Vietnam IUCN, Vietnam CTU-MSU Center, Cantho Univ.	trudq@fpt.vn ipmppd@fpt.vn tien@fao.org.vn duc@iucn.org.vn hong_ptn@ctu.edu.vn
Thailand	17. Ms. Areepan Upanisakorn, Entomologist 18. Ms. Tattanakorn Moekchantuk, IPM Training Expert 19. Mr. Mongkon Tienponkrang, Training Coordinator	Pest Mgnt. Div, MoAE FAO Regional Vegetable IPM Thai Education Foundation	Areepan03@yahoo.com tattanakorn@gmail.com tmongkhol@hotmail.com

	Name/Designation	Organisation	Email Address
Regional Civil Society	20. Mr. Marut Jatiket, Director 21. Ms.Jennifer Mourin, Coordinator, Pesticide Programme	Field Alliance PANAP, Malaysia	jatiketm@inet.co.th panap@panap.net
Resource Persons	22.Ms. Karin Hanze, Senior Scientific Officer 23. Ms. Trine Ronning Mathisen, Second Secretary 24. Ms. Ngo Minh Huong, Development Advisor 25. Mr. Trond Hofsvang, Research Director 26. Mr. Ole Martin Eklo , Research Officer	Swedish Chemical Inspectorate (KEMI) Royal Norwegian Embassy, Vietnam Royal Norwegian Embassy, Vietnam Bioforsk Bioforsk	karin.hanze@kemi.se trm@mfa.no nmho@mfa.no trond.hofsvang@bioforsk.no ole-martin.eklo@bioforsk.no
FAO	27. Mr.Harry van der Wulp, Senior Policy Officer 28. Mr.Jan Willem Ketelaar, Team Leader 29. Ms.Dada Abubakar, Programme Development Officer 30. Mr. Yongfan Piao, Plant Protection Officer 31. Ms. Marjon Fredrix, IPM Technical Officer 32. Ms.Kristine Stubberud, APO	FAO Rome FAO Regional Vegetable IPM FAO Regional Vegetable IPM FAO Regional Office Asia –Pacific FAO Rome FAO Regional Vegetable IPM	Harry.Vanderwulp@fao.org Johannes.Ketelaar@fao.org AlmaLinda.Abubakar@fao.org Yongfan.Piao@fao.org Marjon.Fredrix@fao.org kristineipm@vnn.vn
Organizers	33. Mr. Le Tien Binh, Vegetable IPM coordinator 34. Mr. Tran Van Hieu, Programme Office Manager 35. Ms.Tran Thi Minh Loan, Programme Assistant 36. Ms. Nawarat Phayungkij, Admin Assistant	Plant Protection Dept. MARD FAO Vegetable IPM, Vietnam FAO Vegetable IPM, Vietnam FAO Regional Vegetable IPM	binhipm@yahoo.com tvhieuiipm@vnn.vn loanipm@vnn.vn Nawarat.Phayungkij@fao.org

Annex 3 Development of strategies for IPM and advocacy components of the Pesticide Risk Reduction Programme

Annex 4. Results of evaluation

Evaluation of the Bi-Annual Meeting

Hai Phong, Vietnam

23-25 April 2007

Out of 24 participants, 19 felt that the facilities (hotel, food, etc.) for the workshop were good and five indicated that it was average. One participant indicated that the food needed improvement as it was boring and almost the same everyday. The following remarks were given about the facilities:

- hotel was okay
- hotel is situated in town, easy to go out by one's self after class
- easy to go around
- free internet
- food should have been more varied; too much of the same things

21 participants indicated that the content (topics, issues, etc.) was good while two felt it was average. Remarks on the content include the following:

- very interesting, especially sharing from different sectors invited
- new initiatives and partners
- stronger networking
- interesting cooperation of IPM Programme and Education
- interesting, not too hard to discuss
- lots of presentations
- schedules are too tight

Out of 24 participants, 22 felt that the organization (process, scheduling, etc.) of the workshop was good and two felt that it was very good. The remarks on this aspect included:

- process was fairly participatory, open and consultative even if there were time constraints
- well organized
- relaxed atmosphere
- support staff were very supportive and helpful

17 participants indicated that the field visit was good while four felt that it was average. One participant said that improvement could be made along visiting the field to see the situation. Remarks given on the field visit were:

- interesting to see EIQ done by farmers
- farmers themselves did not talk very much except farmer trainers
- would be nice to see field crops but it was not possible now because it was off-season
- would have liked to actually visit farms where IPM is being applied
- would have like to see the field and what exactly is done by farmers in the community
- it would have been better if we could visit the field and see how and what farmers are doing on IPM

Suggestions for the next workshop include the following points:

- discussion on impact assessment
- training curriculum on pesticide risk reduction
- non-chemical pest management
- should discuss more on EIQ and how farmers can apply it
- should be organized like this workshop
- a timed agenda may be considered
- identify special theme, e.g., innovations
- topic on IPM in schools
- indicators for IPM impact assessment
- next workshop should be held in Lao
- full report once a year; mid-year meeting to focus on specific issues and training
- field visit to activities
- would be good to see the real field
- spare more time for NGOs especially new participants to introduce their organizations
- will have to think of that and come up with a suggestion

The following other comments and suggestions were given:

- bring in some researchers (field) to share results with them
- provide a contact list of participants to all
- allow for more discussions on next steps
- produce more training materials related to pesticide risk reduction
- provide update of issues related to KEMI and partners rather than general IPM progress reports
- allow more time for NGOs to share their work experiences with all participants and help NGOs and Government officials to chart and share opinions
- well done; thank you
- follow up this cooperation
- provide different food for each day
- prefer hotel in town
- it is important to try to make the cooperation between country activities known by the public, when the time is ripe

Aspect	Good	Average	Needs Improvement	Remarks
Facilities (hotel, food, etc.)	xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx	xxxxx	- food was boring, almost the same everyday	- hotel was okay - food should have been more varied; too much of the same things - hotel is situated in town, easy to go out by one's self after class - but there should be more variety (the same everyday) - easy to go around - free internet
Content (topics, issues, etc.)	xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx	xx		- but a lot of presentations - very interesting, especially sharing from different sectors invited - new initiatives and partners - stronger networking - interesting cooperation of IPM Programme and Education - but the schedules are too tight - interesting, not too hard to discuss
Organization (process, scheduling, etc.)	xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx		- please provide drinking water during meeting	- very good - process was fairly participatory, open and consultative even if at times there were time constraints - well organized - relaxed atmosphere of meeting - support staff were very supportive and helpful
Field visit	xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx	xxxx	- should visit the field to see situation	- it is interesting field visit to see EIQ done by farmers - farmers themselves did not talk very much except farmer trainers - would be nice to see field crops, now not possible because out of season - good but would have liked to actually visit farms practicing IPM - could we see the field, what exactly is done by farmers in the

				community - if we could visit field and see how and what farmers are doing for IPM, that will be better
Suggestions for next workshop	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - discussion on impact assessment - training curriculum on pesticide risk reduction - non-chemical pest management - should discuss more on EIQ; how farmers can apply it - should be organized like this workshop - a timed agenda may be considered - identify special theme, e.g., innovations - topic on IPM in schools - indicators for IPM impact assessment - the next workshop should be held in Lao - full report once a year; mid-year focus on specific issues and training - field visit to activities - would be good to see the real field - spare more time for NGOs especially new participants to introduce their organization - will have to think of that and come up with a suggestion 			
Other comments and/or suggestions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - bring some researcher (field) to share results - contact list of participants delivered to all - more discussions on next steps - please produce more training materials related to pesticide risk reduction - update of issues related to KEMI and partners rather than general IPM progress reports - well done; thank you - follow up this cooperation - prefer hotel in town - different food for each day - more time for NGOs to share their work experiences with all participants and help NGOs and Government officials to chart and share opinions - it is important to try to make the cooperation between country activities known by the public, when the time is ripe 			