

Country Brief

International Workshop on IPM and Marketing

Country: Vietnam

IPM Programme active since: 1992

Estimated number of farmers trained: 1,132,654

Estimated number of trainers currently active: 2,546 Government Trainers; 3,585 Farmer Trainers

Main crops involved: Rice, Vegetables, Cotton, Maize, Sweet potato, Potato, Tea, Citrus, Soy bean

Main issues/problems encountered with respect to marketing of IPM produce:

- Lack of post-harvest methods and facilities to maintain the quality of products. The Government and some private sector enterprises have invested in pre-processing facilities and cold storage in some main vegetable areas. However, the capacity of these facilities are still very limited as to accommodate the volume of production.
- The certification system applied to the safe vegetable programmes and VietGAP/GAP has been initiated in the main vegetable provinces (e.g., Hanoi, Ho Chi Minh city, Lam Dong and Hai Phong). However, there are limited resources and staff to provide efficient enforcement of the existing requirements. Therefore, in reality, the efforts have been limited to verification of documents and issuance of certificates while there is lack of inspection and monitoring of the implementation of guidelines.
- Government's investments through extension has placed emphasis on large scale demonstration of production while very limited efforts have been given to the improvement of market access.
- Problems in traceability of farmers' products due to lack of skills in production records keeping as well as self monitoring skills.
- Some farmer groups have developed trade names for their products. However they are still confronted with lack of market access.
- Linkages between private sector enterprises and farmers have just been newly initiated in some places and need to be developed further.
- Lack of consumer awareness about food safety.
- Poor and inadequate schemes to disseminate information about IPM products.
- Farmers have limited access to market information and are therefore not able to adjust their production plans to meet market demands and are disadvantaged when it comes to pricing their products.
- The lack of pesticide management mechanisms at commune level destroys consumers' confidence in IPM products.

Brief description of marketing initiatives or strategies for IPM crops that have been developed and introduced (if any):

Development of legal frameworks:

- Government's Decision No107/2008/QĐ-TTg dated July 30th, 2008 on policies for development of production, processing, distribution for safe vegetable, fruit and tea to the year 2015. Under this Government Decision, the goals to the year 2015 are: a) At least a proportion of 20% vegetable-growing area, 20% of fruit-tree area and 25 % tea-growing area in concentrated, safe-producing areas should meet the production's requirements of VietGAP; b) At least 30% of the total produce of vegetables and fruits and 40% tea for domestic consumption and for export are certified, notified and processed in compliance with safe production procedures, namely, VIETGAP and HACCP.

This Government Decision also specifies that the scope and objectives of the policies should apply to: a) Basic surveying, investigation of the topology, determining the locations that meet the conditions for safe production; b) Investing in production of safe fruit, vegetable and tea; c) Investing in processing and selling of safe fruit, vegetable and tea; d) Certifying, declaring production and processing of safe fruit, vegetable and tea in compliance with VietGAP and HACCP; e) Organizations, persons and households investing in develop production, processing and selling safe fruit, vegetable and tea.

- Minister of Agriculture and Rural Development-MARD's Decision No 379/QĐ-BNN-KHCN dated 28/01/2008 on VietGAP Production Procedures for vegetables and fruits.
- MARD's Decision No 84/2008/QĐ-BNN dated 28 July 2008 on the Statutes for the certification of Good Agricultural Practices (VietGAP) for safe vegetables, fruits, and tea. The Statutes stipulate the certification procedures on production requirements in compliance with VietGAP.
- MARD's Decision 99/2008/QĐ-BNN dated 15 October 2008 issued Statutes for management of production and trading of safe vegetables, fruits, and tea.
- MARD is now working on the development of the strategy for agricultural production quality and food safety for the year 2010 – 2015.

Building facilities:

Using government budgets (at central and local levels) extension projects/programmes have supported farmers/producers setting up facilities for pre-processing, cold storages as well opening outlet and wholesale stops for selling products.

Initiating Certification systems:

Provincial Departments of Agriculture and Rural Development (DARD) are responsible for and authorized to issue the certification on the compliance of requirements for production and pre-processing (including appraisal of documents and inspection/checking of implementation of procedures).

- Provincial Department of Trade is responsible and authorized to issue the Certificate on compliance with business requirements (including appraisal of documents and inspection/checking of implementation of procedures).
- Identification of accredited Internal Organizations/Institutions and overseas organizations authorized for certification of VietGAP/GAP.
- Other events such as: Market-day fair; awareness raising on pesticide risks and food safety for consumers through public mass media; information dissemination through various forms of public mass media were supported by MARD, DARD, Centre for Extension, District People's Committee, etc.

Capacity building for farmers and stakeholders on market access

- Since 2005 with support from the National IPM Programme and FAO Regional Vegetable IPM Programme some main vegetable provinces (e.g. Hanoi, Ho Chi Minh, Hai Phong, Lam Dong, Vinh Phuc, etc.) have developed their five year strategy (2006 to 2010) for safe vegetable and fruit crops production. The strategies have focused on building infrastructures and processing facilities as well as farmer education.

- The National IPM Programme and the FAO Regional Vegetable IPM Programme have supported provincial programme's efforts in expanding the cadre of qualified trainers as well as strengthening the content and methodology of training using season-long IPM FFS approaches for farmer education model.

- Main activities are: a) Farmer Field Schools (FFS); b) Pilot Models such as: Model on Community Education Programme on Pesticide Risk Reduction and Safe Vegetable Production in compliance with VietGAP/GAP; Model on Safe Vegetable Production and Market Access; c) Various awareness raising activities for all stakeholders.

Pilot "Model on Community Education Programme on Pesticide Risk Reduction and Safe Vegetable Production in compliance with VietGAP/GAP and Market Access"

The model aims to demonstrate the partnership between GOs and NGOs as well as local groups and networks of small holder IPM farmers to address pesticide risk reduction and to implement safe vegetable production in compliance with GAP at the commune level and facilitate market access for farmer's products. This model has been tried out in Hanoi and Thai Binh since 2008 with support from the FAO Regional Vegetable IPM Programme.

Under this model, there are two main areas of concern: 1) Support the Government in enforcing regulations including strengthening pesticide management at commune level particularly in relation to food safety and the Safe Vegetable Programme; and 2) Develop safe vegetable plots where farmer groups are trained on IPM, EIQ, GAP principles and improve their IPM techniques through field studies, technical training and marketing.

Model on Safe Vegetable Production and Marketing

1st: Improve the knowledge and skills of the farmers, local authorities, representatives of mass organizations through training on IPM. In Hanoi the model aims by 2015 to train 30 - 40% of the vegetable farmer households in IPM.

2nd: Support vegetable-producing farmer groups to comply with the safe vegetable standards, improve their technical skills through farmer-led field studies and improve their management skills.

3rd: Support farmer groups to access markets: a) Provide training on marketing, pre-processing, packaging, techniques in food preservation, credit, promotion of products, safe vegetable standards, GAP (pre-harvest intervals, hygienic standards, traceability and records keeping), try out records keeping; b) Facilitate registration for certification on the fulfilment of production requirements in compliance with safe vegetable standards/VietGAP; c) Assist farmers' groups in development of trade names for their products: register for the trade name, maintain and improve the product quality, sales services, linkage with private sector enterprises.

How long has the above marketing initiative/strategy been operational: from 2006 - 2008

How many farmers participate:

Table 2. Certification system in Hanoi and Ho Chi Minh

Certification	Hanoi City	Ho Chi Minh City
<i>under Safe Vegetable Production</i>	22 groups/cooperatives	1 cooperative
Area (ha)	2,105 ha	34 ha
# Pre-processing facility	11	
Shop/store	122	
<i>Under VietGAP for Vegetables</i>		2
Area (ha)		8

Table 4. Specific training activities focusing on safe vegetable production (2006-2008)

Activities	Participants	Sources of Fund
TOT on IPM-safe vegetable production according to GAP	231 persons from 13 provinces	FAO Regional Vegetable IPM Programme, DANIDA, local governments
TOT on Pesticide Risk Reduction (PRR): 2 courses	60 persons from 10 provinces	FAO Regional Vegetable IPM Programme
FFS on IPM-safe vegetable production according to GAP: 588 FFS	19,500 persons from 22 provinces	FAO Regional Vegetable IPM Programme, DANIDA, local governments
FFSs on Pesticide Risk Reduction-IPM: 469 FFS	12,315 persons from 10 provinces	FAO Regional Vegetable IPM Programme, local governments
Training on awareness raising on the Safe Vegetables Programme, GAP, safe vegetable standards and marketing, (processing, business skills, taking orders, distribution, advertising, credit, etc.)	201 persons (farmer leaders, co-operative leaders, producers, dealers)	Government budget (Central and local levels) through PPSDs, extension, projects/programmes, International organizations, Institutes, private companies

How successful has it been (e.g. in terms of better prices for farmers, higher volumes sold, better market linkages, empowerment, etc):

- Reports from Hanoi have mentioned that farmers selling safe vegetable products can get 30–40% higher prices than farmers who use conventional production methods

- In 2007 and 2008, an IPM farmers' group from My Hoa Commune, Binh Minh District, Vinh Long province received GlobalGAP certification for their pomelo through Metro Supermarket. As a result, the farmers were able to sell over 200 tons of pomelo to Metro and were able to export to some European countries through companies engaged in the export industry such as Huyen Thoai Toan Cau Company, Dat Vinh Company and Metro Cash and Carry Company.

- From 2006–2009 agricultural units in Ho Chi Minh organized and facilitated the linkage of Safe Vegetable Cooperatives with private sector enterprises. As a result, safe vegetable products were

supplied to enterprises such as Metro, Saigon Coop, VF Company, Thuan Phat Processing Cooperative, Kim Son Cooperative. Some of these enterprises specialize in food processing and supply to factory workers and schools in Ho Chi Minh city.

What were the main obstacles, if any:

Government pesticide policies have been put in place and management mechanisms have been established. However, the PPD has limited resources and staff to efficiently enforce existing regulations. As such, pesticide advertising as well as aggressive marketing strategies of pesticide companies continue and farmers are sometimes convinced to go back to unnecessary use of pesticides. This also destroys consumers' confidence in IPM products.

Lessons learned from the marketing initiative/strategy and points that need further improvement:

- Farmers need better financial incentives to produce safe vegetables as well as market access. Some farmers individually and in cooperatives enter into contracts with companies and deliver products to safe vegetable outlets. In addition to developing more specific GAP standards compatible with international standards, market access can be improved by organizing training for farmer cooperatives on topics such as understanding traceability of products, the importance of pre-harvest intervals, hygienic concerns and food contamination, etc. Further expansion of the farmer training model is a challenge and training quality will be ensured when the pilot participatory monitoring and evaluation system already developed is finally established and implemented.

- Farmers' networks need to be strengthened through the organization of "interest groups" and by providing opportunities for follow-up activities like additional training on management (financial management, planning, etc.) as well as establishing an information system so that farmers can be advised on selling produce timely for better profits.

- The pressure from the agro-chemical industry is strong and pesticide companies also organize training and village meetings to promote what is referred to as "safe pesticides". Farmers should have access to information on the effects of the various pesticides to make better decisions in their crop management.

- The Government's pesticide policies have been promulgated and are being enforced. However, the PPD has limited resources and staff to provide efficient enforcement of the existing regulations.

- At the commune level, the People's Committee is authorized as the Pesticide Management Unit at grassroot level, although in fact the structure has not been active. There is a need to strengthen capacities and awareness of local organizations (People's Committees, mass social organizations, farmers, etc.) and mobilize their involvement in local Pesticide Risk Reduction Programmes and safe vegetable production in compliance with GAP as well as improve market access for farmers' groups. In this way, farmers' efforts will be more sustainable.

- It is easy to expand operations with FFS but quality of implementation may be at stake.

- The collaboration between government and non-governmental organizations should be further improved. For example, NGOs can give valuable feedback to GOs to enable them to make more effective policies that are economically and environmentally sustainable. Areas where collaboration between NGOs and GOs would be beneficial are: 1) Sharing of information through websites, conferences, workshops (e.g., "Women and Pesticide Risk Reduction, Safe Food and Food Security"), study tours, etc. 2) There should be NGO representation in pesticide risk reduction meetings, especially meetings to draft laws. 3) Training for farmers as well as leaders at local levels on IPM, pesticide risk reduction, marketing. 4) Campaign on "No Pesticide Use" at the commune level. 5) Giving talks on environmental issues (including pesticide risk reduction) at secondary and high school levels. 6) Working with mass media at grassroot level to address issues on pesticide risk reduction. 7) Feedback on the monitoring of pesticide use especially to government agencies for action. 8) Conduct of survey on the impact of pesticides on health and the environment (collaboration between the Ministry of Health, Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment, NGOs, universities)..