



## NATIONAL WORKSHOPS REPORT TEMPLATE

---

### IPMWORKS National Workshop *Netherlands*

Date: 28-3-2024

Place: Online

Type: face-to-face or videoconference: Videoconference

National Focal Point for *Netherlands*: Harm Brinks

Reporting person for this meeting: Harm Brinks

---

#### **Participants:**

*List with Name, position and affiliation of each participant*

- A. Brak, LTO/Farmers organisation.
- A. Middag, VAVI, branche organisation of the potato industry
- B. Bergman, WDO Delta, waterboard
- B. van Moorsel, Provincie Gelderland, regional policy officer
- A. Vonk, Aa en Maas
- M. Veenbos, CLM, project manager
- N. Doelman, project manager at Delphy
- G. Kessel, researcher at Wageningen Research
- H. Brinks, Delphy, organiser of the meeting

Invited but with apologies/ did not join:

- F. Vaessen, WPL, drinking water company. Funding project on water quality
- M. Hoorweg, Provincie Flevoland, regional policy, funding projects with CAP en regional money

- I. Warmelts, Provincie Drenthe, regional policy officer, funding regional projects with CAP and regional money.
- P. van der Laag, SNN, innovation broker, funding innovation and knowledge sharing projects
- F. van Herpen, Waterschap Aa en Maas (Waterboard), funding projects for water quality
- H. Overbeek, Stimulus, innovation broker, funding innovation and knowledge sharing projects
- G. Schriever, Arvalis, advisory organisation and innovation broker
- Lidders, BOA, branche organisation Dutch arable farming sector, organiser and co-funder of the Sustainable Practice network Arable farming
- S. Verheijden, Brabant Water, Drinking water company, funding projects for water quality
- R. Lenders, Waterschap Limburg, water board, funding projects for water quality
- M. van Dongen, Hunze en Aas, waterboard, funding projects for water quality
- M. Schijns, RVO, national organisation, responsible and control of funding several projects funded by national and European money.

Around 30 people are invited for the meeting, but only 9 people, including three representatives of the IPMWORKS consortium, joined the workshop. This was disappointing. But although the group was small, we had a good discussion and could address all the necessary points.

## 1. Agenda

### **Introduction of IPMWORKS network and methodology.**

The IPMWORKS project is presented based on the sheets provided by the project. We started with an explanation of national AKIS. We asked the participants if they know the term AKIS, and the answer for most of them was no! Apparently this is EU jargon for them. All the people that joined the meeting are, direct or indirect, part of the Dutch AKIS, as they represent regional governments (funding projects with CAP budget), the biggest Dutch farmers organisation, waterboards and drinking water companies (funding knowledge and innovation projects). They all know and are part of the network of organisations that share information and initiate and fund innovations.

The agenda of the meeting:

1. Explanation of the project background and some results
2. Validation of the IPMWORKS recommendations for scaling IPM adoption through IPM demo networks in the AKIS
3. IPMWORKS strategy for the long term sustainability of the network, including the question if it is interesting for NL to part of this EU wide network of hubs and demonstrations on the farms of hub members.

### **1. Explanation**

We started with the introduction of the IPMWORKS project, as most of the participants were not familiar with the project. Participants recognize the environmental, societal and political pressure on agriculture to reduce the negative impact of pesticide use. And as the organic sector in The Netherlands is relatively small, there is a strong need to reduce pesticide use in the conventional sectors.

In the second place we explained the IPMWORKS methodology, working on (the five pillars of) holistic IPM strategies, in hubs, groups of 10-15 farmers, the role of the hub coaches in facilitating knowledge exchange in the group and the implementation of holistic IPM strategies on the farms, the critical success factors for a strong hub and the need for the right competences of the hub coach to facilitate this process.

In the third place we explained the crucial role of demonstrations for knowledge sharing based on interactive methods for peer-to-peer learning, and the need for good preparation and planning of demonstrations for having successful demonstrations.

After this part we presented two slides from the results of the first survey, 1) about the objectives and motivation and 2) about the self-evaluation concerning the perceived workload, equipment costs and gross margin in relation to IPM.

At the end of this, we presented the IPMWORKS recommendations for establishing a hub effectively, recommendations for a successful demonstration event, recommendations to boost IPM adoption through knowledge exchange and the identified barriers affecting functioning of a hub.

And at last we shortly introduced the IPM Toolbox and the IPM Decisions platform, two interesting results for the Dutch AKIS network.

## **2. Validation of the IPMWORKS recommendations for scaling IPM adoption through IPM demo networks in the AKIS.**

The validation of IPMWORKS recommendations is discussed based on the questions developed by the consortium. We used Mentimeter for the questions. We used the following categories in the AKIS:

- Research institutes
- Cooperations (for NL this are product cooperations)
- Advisory org
- Supply chain actors (seeds, fertilizers, pesticides)
- Innovation groups
- NGO's

We asked the participants to score these organisations for several aspects:

1. What is the experience different stakeholders have with IPM
2. Which stakeholders have more interaction and knowledge exchange with practice about IPM
3. How difficult is the implementation of landscapes with semi-natural habitats
4. How difficult is it to adapt the cropping system for the control of pests, diseases and weeds

5. How difficult is it to optimize decision making for operational and strategic measures
6. How difficult is it to apply/introduce non-chemical control measures
7. How difficult is it to increase the efficacy of applications

The scores, in percentages per question are presented in the tables below. For some of the questions, part of the participants didn't answer because they didn't know.

#### Question 1, experience stakeholders with IPM

	Experience with IPM, 1 = little, 5 = much				
	5	4	3	2	1
Research	0	25	50	0	25
Cooperatives	0		33	50	17
Advisory organisation	0	33	50	17	0
Supply chain companies	0	20		60	20
Innovation groups	0	50	17	33	0
NGO's	12	0	13	50	25

#### Question 2, Which stakeholders have more interaction and knowledge exchange with practice about IPM

	Interaction with practice about IPM, 1 = little, 5 = much				
	5	4	3	2	1
Research	0	0	33	50	17
Cooperatives	0	17	50	17	16
Advisory organisation	0	34	33	33	0
Supply chain companies	0	0	33	50	17
Innovation groups	0	33	17	50	0
NGO's	0	0	0	50	50

#### Question 3. How difficult is the implementation of landscapes with semi-natural habitats

	Landscape with semi-natural habitats, 1 = easy, 5 = difficult				
	5	4	3	2	1
All stakeholders	50	14	13	13	0

#### Question 4. How difficult is it to adapt the cropping system for the control of pests, diseases and weeds

	Adapt cropping system, 1 = easy, 5 = difficult				
	5	4	3	2	1
All stakeholders	0	50	33	17	0

Question 5. How difficult is it to optimize decision making for operational and strategic measures

	Optimize decision making, 1 = easy, 5 = difficult				
	5	4	3	2	1
All stakeholders	0	50	33	17	0

Question 6. How difficult is it to apply/introduce non-chemical control measures

	Include non-chemical control measures, 1 = easy, 5 = difficult				
	5	4	3	2	1
All stakeholders	16	17	33	33	0

Question 7. How difficult is it to increase the efficacy of applications

	Increase efficacy of applications, 1 = easy, 5 = difficult				
	5	4	3	2	1
All stakeholders	0	0	20	80	20

### 3. IPMWORKS strategy for Long Term Sustainability.

Recommendations for scaling IPM adoption through IPM demo networks in the AKIS. The aim of this session is to refine the strategies for expanding the adoption of IPM within IPM demonstration networks operating within the AKIS. This session was introduced by presenting the strategy for Long Term Sustainability of the network. The discussion was based on 5 questions related to the long term strategy:

1. Is the IPMWORKS approach effective for scaling holistic IPM in The Netherlands
2. Is it fruitful for The Netherlands to stay connected to this EU wide network with demonstrations and (international) knowledge exchange
3. Are demonstrations and hubs good instruments for the adoption of IPM
4. How could this be done best
5. What are most important barriers for scaling op IPM
6. What are the most important barriers for scaling of the IPMWORKS method
7. What funding opportunities do you see

Again Mentimeter was used for answering the questions. The results for the question, in percentages of answers.

Question 1. Is the IPMWORKS approach effective for scaling holistic IPM in The Netherlands

	IPMWORKS Approach for scaling IPM. 1 = little, 10 is highly effective									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
All stakeholders	0	28	0	28	28	16	0	0	0	0

Question 2. Is it fruitful for The Netherlands to stay connected to this EU wide network with demonstrations and (international) knowledge exchange

	Stay connected	
	Yes	No
All stakeholders	85	15

Question 3. Are demonstrations and hubs good instruments for the adoption of IPM

	Can demonstrations support adoption of IPM			
	Not	A little	Good	Very good
All stakeholders	0	0	100	0

Question 4. How could this be done best, Word cloud, reactions:

- Demonstrate Best Practices
- Use webinars for knowledge sharing
- Use existing networks for knowledge sharing and demonstrations
- Organise demonstrations at research locations
- Increase the outreach, project is rather unknown
- Present pro's and con's of solutions

Question 5. What are most important barriers for scaling op IPM, Word cloud reactions:

- Economic perspective
- Risk perception
- Risks for failure
- No financial reward
- No appreciation in the value chain
- Market demand
- No appreciation from the government
- Chemical still is the standard approach
- New and unknown
- Presented as difficult to implement
- Banning of pesticides as important element in IPM strategy
- No clear 'action perspective', frequent changing of policies
- Not easy to change behaviour/do what I always did

Question 6. What are the most important barriers for scaling of the IPMWORKS method:

- IPMWORKS is rather unknown
- Future perspective unclear
- Costs of IPM
- Capacity of coaches limited
- Rather stay conventional
- Network is missing
- All pioneer farmers are already engaged in projects, hard to find new ones
- Concept is too vague
- Funding for the coaches
- Costs of the network
- Too many, not connected, initiatives
- Competition with other initiatives
- Too little incentives

Question 7. What funding opportunities do you see:

- Funding from the value chain
- National funding
- CAP money
- The sector itself
- Value chain partners
- Through labels/certification

#### **4. Outcomes on Session 2: IPMWORKS strategy for Long Term Sustainability**

IPMWORKS was unknown for most of the participants. And after explaining the project and the approach the common opinion was that the project does not add much to what already is going on in the Netherlands in other projects. In the Netherlands there is a long standing practice of farmer study groups, exchanging information with experts and among the members. Every province in the Netherlands has a separate innovation policy for agriculture, and making agriculture more sustainable is an important topic in these programs. These programs are funded for 50% with CAP budget and the other 50% with national budgets. Important activities in these programs are 1) innovation projects, where farmers together with advisors, researchers and other stakeholders develop and test innovations, 2) projects in which small groups of farmers work together with an advisor and/or a researcher work on a certain topic, testing and implementing innovations are the main issues (Dutch version of Operational Groups and quite similar to IPMWORKS hubs) and 3) knowledge sharing projects, dissemination of results to the wider agricultural community. Demonstrations and training are important activities in such projects. Another aspect in this discussion is the recent establishment of a 'Sustainable Practice Network Arable farming'. This network is dedicated to knowledge creation and sharing between farmers and stakeholders. Every group determines their own agenda and farmers pay a contribution for participation. And the topics are not only IPM, also other actual topics like soil management, biodiversity and precision farming get attention in these farmer groups. The conclusion is that there is a lot of activity going on and therefore competition for funding.

In the discussion about funding opportunities, the obvious suggestions were mentioned: CAP money, national and regional funding. Additional suggestion for funding were money from the sector, farmers and value chain partners, but this is not an easy way to go. There is no national program for

support of IPM. The Dutch government is aiming for the development of resilient cropping systems, promotes regenerative and circular agriculture. After transition to such cropping systems it is assumed that the dependency and use of pesticides will be reduced. Holistic IPM fits into such an approach. Part of the national research budget is spent at Wageningen Research, for the development and testing of strategies in practice. Funds for dissemination activities is in the hands of the 12 Dutch provinces. They all have a specific program and region specific topics. Mostly twice a year there is a tender on specific topics, where interested organisations can apply for projects. The chances for funding a national network, based on the IPMWORKS approach seem to be small.

In all provinces there are projects with groups of farmers, working on sustainability issues. To such an extent that it becomes difficult to find new farmers to participate in new groups. And it also becomes difficult to attract farmers to visit demonstrations, as there are so many activities going on. The conclusion of the participants was that demonstrations are an important activity for sharing innovation in agriculture and that it is good to be connected to an European network. They agree our approach towards how to organise a hub and about the role of the hub coach. But they don't think the IPMWORKS approach is very different from what goes on in several Dutch projects already and there is little support for a focus on funding of specific IPMWORKS hubs.

## **5. Outcomes on open discussion**

*The NFPs will reflect in this section the issues raised during the open forum for questions and discussion.*

### Topic 1 – Added value of the IPMWORKS approach.

#### Conclusion:

The conclusion is that there is a lot of activity going on in many different projects and therefore also strong competition for funding. The Sustainable Practice Network Arable farming has a very similar approach as IPMWORKS, IPM is a topic in some of the groups in this network.

### Topic 2 – Funding opportunities

#### Conclusion:

Best opportunity is to aim for regional funding, as far as the ideas fit into the regional programs. This can differ from province to province. A national fund for the hubs is not a realistic option.

### Topic 3 – Added value of the IPMWORKS approach and opportunities for continuation of the hubs

#### Conclusion:

Many projects, organised by all kinds of organisation in the Netherlands, search for pioneer farmers to join. And these pioneer farmers are asked again and again to join projects. It gets difficult to find new farmers to participate in new groups. And it also becomes difficult to attract farmers to visit demonstrations, as there are so many activities going on.

The participants will be invited for a demonstration that will be organised at a hub member farm later this year. We did not yet decide what demonstration and when.

**Save the date – IPM Conference 2024, Holistic IPM: Reducing Pesticide Use.**



The IPM Conference 2024, jointly organised by IPMWORKS and IPM Decisions in Brussels, 14<sup>th</sup> May 2024 is presented. Participants are invited to join the conference. We appointed that the information and the registration link will be included in the report of the meeting.

**Farm visit to an IPM Decisions hub member.**

The Dutch stakeholders will be invited for a farm visit to a hub farm early September 2024.