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2017 Work Programme

- **Fact-finding missions** in 6 MS (DE, NL, IT, SE, DK, PL)

- **Commission report to EP and the Council**

- **Overview Report**

- **Guidance document on monitoring and surveying of impacts of pesticide use on human health and the environment**
Other 2017 SUD related activities

- New **SUD Web-Portal**

- **SUD Working Group Meetings** *(May & October 2017)*

- **Letters to all MS on NAPs and SUD implementation** highlighting areas for improvement

- **Commission's response to European Citizens' Initiative** "Ban glyphosate and protect people and the environment from toxic pesticides"
Integrated Pest Management

IPM favours prevention and prioritises the use of low risk pesticides and non-chemical methods. It must be promoted by Member States and implemented by all professional users.

• **Cornerstone** of SUD

• **Specific provisions** on IPM

• *IPM general principles to be implemented by all professional users by 1 January 2014*

• **IPM general principles** – Annex III of SUD
Commission Report: IPM implementation in Member States

- **IPM remains underused** by Member States
- Member States **focus on promoting IPM rather than assessing compliance**
- Still **no clear criteria** nor measurable **targets** to properly **verify** implementation
The Overview report
Key facts on IPM implementation

- Support tools for growers
- Pest monitoring networks and warning systems
- Advisory services
- Demonstration farms networks
GOOD PRACTICE: IPM - The Netherlands

- **Plant protection monitors**
- **Record keeping**, including all IPM measures taken
- **Evaluating** the success of actions taken
GOOD PRACTICE: IPM - Germany

- The ISIP system: collating official **pest monitoring** information;

- ZEPP decision support system, more than **40 models** for pests and disease forecasting;

- Integrated agricultural education, research and advisory services applied in Rhineland Palatinate.
Have realised the potential benefits of pest control, and plant protection measures have been based on assessments of the need. Could be economically advantageous to realise the potential benefits of pest control and tailor treatment for weeds, fungi and diseases to specific needs. There is still potential for improvement of pest control and the needs assessment process. There is potential for improvement of current pest control practices, particularly in areas with a low score.

GOOD PRACTICE: IPM - Denmark

- **On-line tool** to assess the level of IPM implementation;

- **Smart phone application** for weed mapping;

- Since 2016, use of **webinars** to disseminate advisory information;

- **Videos** for additional training giving examples of good practice.
GOOD PRACTICE: IPM - Italy & Poland

- Italy has developed **IPM guidelines** for over 95% of the crops grown in the country;
- Poland has a **Web-portal** to make information on monitoring of harmful organisms available.
The Overview report: Obstacles to better IPM implementation (1)

- **Absence of clear criteria** for checking IPM compliance at farm level;

- **Possible conflicts** between IPM good practices and other statutory requirements e.g. minimum tillage;

- **Lack of** financially-viable, effective non-chemical **control techniques**, including lack of research into finding alternative controls;

- **Farmers reluctant to apply** alternative methods to chemical PPPs, if they face an unacceptably high risk to their economic viability.
The Overview report: Obstacles to better IPM implementation (2)

- Economic incentives **may conflict** with using all available tools;

- **Lack of alternatives** to cereal crops, or poorer financial returns from alternative crops;

- **Lack of pesticides authorised** for minor crops is a disincentive to use these in rotation-limits growers ability to implement good resistance management practices;

- **Financial constraints** on Advisory Services.
2018 SUD-related activities

- **Audits** in 4 Member States (ES, HU, FR, BG)
- Evaluation of **revised NAPs**
- **IPM enforcement**
  - Better Training for Safer Food
  - Establishment of criteria to assess implementation of the 8 IPM principles
- Establishment of **Harmonized Risk Indicator(s)** at EU level;
2019 and beyond

- Further **report** to the EP and Council

- Commission's communication *The future of food and farming - the Common Agricultural Policy post-2020*
Thank you for your attention!