



*The Field Alliance*



**KEMI**  
Kemikalieinspektionen  
Swedish Chemicals Agency



Food and Agriculture  
Organization of the  
United Nations

**Regional Meeting on the Program “Towards a Non-toxic Southeast Asia”**



**21-23 September 2016  
Sukosol Hotel, Bangkok, Thailand**

## Executive summary

*The Regional Meeting on the Programme “Towards a Non-toxic Southeast Asia” was held in Bangkok, Thailand from 21-23 September 2016. The meeting was jointly organized by the FAO Asia IPM/Pesticide Risk Reduction Programme, Thai Education Foundation/The Field Alliance (TEF/TFA), Pesticide Action Network-Asia Pacific (PAN-AP) and the Swedish Chemicals Agency (KemI). Fifty participants (23 women) representing Regional Programme partners, governments, academe, private sector and CSO partners from six countries in the Greater Mekong Subregion participated in the meeting. The meeting coincided with the de-briefing of the Mid-term Review (MTR) Mission of the Phase II (2013-2018) Programme.*

*The activities included presentations and discussions on: (1) Regional Programme Overview of Community Education Pesticide Risk Reduction; (2) Awareness Raising, Health and Environmental Education, and Advocacy in Support of a Non-toxic Environment; (3) Other Plenary Presentations on Strengthening Regulatory Control of the Importation, Distribution and Use of Pesticides Capacity Building for Better Chemical Management in Southeast Asia; (4) Brief Introduction to Sida’s New Regional Strategy for Asia and the Pacific (2016-2021). Parallel sessions were held on the themes: Pesticide Risk Reduction; and Agroecology and Farmer Field Schools. A meeting of the regional partners with their country partners was held. Joint GO-NGO Country Presentations in the form of poster/photo exhibits replaced PowerPoint country presentations in plenary. The MTR gave a presentation on their preliminary findings. Country-level strategies and plans to improve reporting, sustainability and ideas for a possible programme beyond 2018 were identified.*

*The Regional Meeting aimed to review and summarize the accomplishments of community education programmes on pesticide risk reduction over the past three years (September 2013-August 2016), identify implementation challenges faced and define revised and new strategies to strengthen collaboration and explore/demonstrate the added value of working together to address pesticide risks in convergence areas, including possible linkages and collaboration among the various Programme Components working together to address pesticide and broader chemical risks.*

*Participants were asked to evaluate the workshop based on the facilities (meeting room, lodging and food); exhibitions/poster presentations (content, process and organization), plenary discussions and presentations (topics: plenary presentations, food-for-thought presentations and plenary/consultations with the MTR; overall meeting organization (scheduling of activities, facilitation and travel arrangements); and suggestions for the next meeting. Participants assessed how they had delivered on commitments made in 2013 and wrote down their renewed commitments and plans to move the regional programme “Towards a Non-toxic Southeast Asia” forward. These would be assessed in the next regional meeting most likely to be held in Myanmar prior to completion of Phase II of this Regional Program.*

## 1 Background

The Swedish-supported Programme “Towards a Non-toxic South-East Asia” aims to reduce health and environmental risks by monitoring, regulating and managing agricultural, industrial and consumer chemicals. The programme covers the Mekong Region countries: Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar, Thailand and Vietnam as well as the Yunnan, Guangxi and Hainan provinces in China PR.

Throughout Phase I (May 2007-June 2013) and first half of Phase II (September 2013-August 2016), regional meetings were organized by FAO, regional CSO partners Thai Education Foundation/The Field Alliance, Pesticide Action Network-Asia Pacific (PAN-AP) and their programme partners. These meetings served as a forum for review and planning of various community education initiatives and advocacy/awareness addressing pesticide risks. Whereas each of the regional and country programme partners have its own distinctive implementation role in this joint Programme, these meetings acted as a forum for exchange and facilitated a dialogue on GO-NGO collaboration and joint planning as to strengthen the impact and sustainability of community education for pesticide risk reduction programmes. Mid-way during the implementation of Phase II (July 2013-June 2018), there is a need to review and summarize

the accomplishments of community education programmes on pesticide risk reduction over the past three years (September 2013-August 2016), identify implementation challenges faced and define revised and new strategies to strengthen collaboration and explore/demonstrate the added value of working together to address pesticide risks in convergence areas. This time the meeting was somewhat different from previous ones as the meeting was combined with a possibility for the mid-term review team to meet with key stakeholders in the regional programme and the debriefing of the Mid-term Review Mission of the Phase II Programme. The regional meeting of the Swedish-supported Programme “*Towards a Non-toxic South-East Asia*” was held in Bangkok, Thailand on 21-23 September 2016.

## **Objectives**

The overall objectives of this meeting were to:

- share highlights of achievements and impact resulting from Community Education for Pesticide Risk Reduction work during the first half of Phase II, including follow up on pledges made for joint GO-NGO work in the 2013 meeting in Chiang Mai, Thailand;
- share highlights of achievements and impact of policy formulation, enforcement and implementation challenges with regards to reducing pesticide and chemical risks;
- present and discuss findings and recommendations of the Mid-term Review Mission for Phase II of the Swedish-supported Programme “Towards a Non-toxic Environment in Southeast Asia”;
- identify needs, opportunities and challenges for strengthening country and regional strategies for continued collaboration and sustainable impact of the Pesticide Risk Reduction Community Education initiatives and chemicals management, especially in pilot convergence areas as part of Phase II Programme implementation planning for the remaining years (2016-2018).

## **Participants**

A total of 50 people (23 women) attended the Regional Meeting including:

- 34 participants from five member countries (Cambodia, China PR, Lao PDR, MyanmarThailand and Vietnam) within the FAO-supported IPM Programme,
- 16 participants from partner regional CSOs (TEF/TFA and PAN-AP), donor organizations (Sida and KemI), resource persons and FAO

The List of Participants and Contact Details is attached to this report as [Appendix 3](#).

## **Day ONE: Wednesday, 21 September 2016**

### **Opening Session**

The Opening Session was chaired by Mr Ule Johansson, Senior Adviser Development Cooperation, Swedish Chemicals Agency (KemI). Heads of offices of the regional partners delivered opening remarks: Mr Piao Yongfang, Senior Plant Protection Officer, FAO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (FAO RAP); Mr Marut Jatiket, Executive Director, The Field Alliance/Thai Education Foundation; Ms Sarojeni Rengam, Executive Director, Pesticide Action Network – Asia Pacific (PAN-AP); and Ms Jenny Ronngren, Adviser/Programme Manager, Swedish Chemicals Agency (KemI). Country teams were introduced. The total number of participants was 51 (20 female) representing governments, academe, private sector and CSO partners from six countries in the Mekong Subregion, FAO, the regional civil society organization (CSO) partners TFA/TEF and PAN-AP and the Swedish Chemicals Agency (KemI). The objectives and agenda of the meeting were reviewed. (See [Appendix 1](#) for the objectives and [Appendix 2](#) for the detailed agenda of the meeting.)

### **Regional Partner Presentations**

Mr Jan Willem Ketelaar delivered a presentation on “*FAO’s integrated approach to Pesticide Risk Reduction*”. The presentation covered: pesticide risk reduction by reducing hazard and exposure; the use of Farmer Field School as an approach to educating farmers and communities to reduce pesticide risks; community education programmes on Integrated Pest Management (IPM) and pesticide risk reduction; results from the IPM and policy components implemented by FAO and examples of results of training on IPM/PRR from the long-term impact assessment studies carried out by external institutions/principal investigators.

The presentation from the Pesticide Action Network – Asia Pacific (PAN-AP) was delivered by Ms Sarojeni Rengam. PAN-AP and its local CSO partners apply the Theory of Change to address main concerns such as pesticide issues, impacts of pesticides on human health and the environment, and poverty and marginalization of women. Community empowerment is carried out through Community Pesticide Action Monitoring that lead to local and international level action and policy interventions and the promotion of agroecology. A mobile application for gathering information on pesticide use and health data is being piloted in four countries and the application will be available by the end of 2016. A summary of achievements of local partner CSOs supported by the regional programme “Towards a Non-toxic Southeast Asia” was presented.

Mr Marut Jatiket provided an overview and updates of TEF/TFA’s work in the programme countries. The regional CSO works with a network of local CSOs and governmental organizations to promote community education and development projects on ecological agriculture and the reduction of impacts from chemicals to health and environment. Under the Swedish-supported regional programme, TEF/TFA and its partners implement Rural Ecological Agriculture for Livelihood (REAL) activities to promote: awareness and sustainable conservation of agrobiodiversity for communities’ priorities; awareness on the impacts of pesticides to health and environment; build capacity for ecological agricultural practices i.e. IPM, SRI, organic and marketing, and gender, human rights, poverty, climate change, anti-corruption and private sector collaboration. The work of TEF/TFA includes studies on pesticide residues in school lunch, agrobiodiversity conservation and pesticide impact assessment.

## **Other Plenary Presentations**

Mr Piao Yongfan gave an update on the work of the Policy Component on Strengthening Regulatory Control of the Importation, Distribution and use of Pesticides. The main elements for the work plan under the 2<sup>nd</sup> phase of the Swedish-supported programme “Towards a Non-toxic Southeast Asia” includes: strengthening secondary pesticide legislation; strengthening inspection capacity; strengthening pesticide registration and encourage review of registered pesticides and phasing out of Highly Hazardous Pesticides; exploring, developing and supporting possibilities to enhance labelling in national language in Lao and Cambodia; and follow-up on implementation of the Rotterdam Convention. Regional collaboration is achieved in implementing activities together with the Asia Pacific Plant Protection Commission, for example: a regional workshop on practical aspects of pesticide registration and phasing out of HHPs held in Nanjing; and holding the first regional workshop (five countries) on use of the FAO Pesticide Registration ToolKit in Vietnam.

A presentation on Sound Management of Chemicals was delivered by Mr Ule Johansson. In 2002, at UN World Summit on Sustainable Development, Governments agreed to aim to achieve that, by 2020, chemicals are used and produced in ways that lead to the minimization of significant adverse effects on human health and the environment through the sound management of chemicals and waste. In 2006, that goal was adopted by the multiple stakeholders of the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM). In order to define Sound Management of Chemicals (SMC) in concrete elements, SAICM in 2015 endorsed the Overall Orientation and Guidance for Achieving the 2020 Goal (OOG) including 11 basic elements recognized as critical to attain sound chemicals and waste management. These include; Legal frameworks that address the life cycle of chemicals and waste; Relevant enforcement and compliance mechanisms; Strong institutional frameworks and coordination mechanisms among relevant stakeholders; Industry participation and defined responsibility across the life cycle, including cost recovery policies and systems as well as the incorporation of SMC into corporate policies and practices and; Inclusion of the SMC and waste in national health, labour, social, environment and economic budgeting processes and development plans. SMC is now being connected to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

## **Plenary Question and Answer**

Highlights of discussions include:

- The government’s primary responsibility in the control of pesticides.
- The need for more control and inspections at the borders to address illegal pesticide trade. It is difficult to involve customs in the regulation, but it is important to push towards this direction.
- Data reported by TEF/TFA on the amount of pesticide sprayed is in terms of volume and not active ingredient.
- The need to raise awareness and active advocacy at the government level as to encourage policy changes.

## **Official Opening and Viewing of Exhibits**

Ms Jenny Ronngren (KemI) officially opened the country exhibits. Posters/photo exhibits were prepared jointly by National IPM Programmes and TEF/TFA local partner CSOs. PAN-AP partners had their separate exhibits. The exhibits provided an overview of the scope and accomplishments of the country programmes, with special focus on collaborative GO-NGO pilot

initiatives on IPM and pesticide risk reduction. The exhibits replaced country presentations in a plenary session. The Bus Stop Method was used for the viewing of exhibits.

### **Day TWO: Thursday, 22 September 2016**

Two parallel sessions were held on the themes: (1) Pesticide Risk Reduction chaired by Mr Jayakumar Chealaton, Co-Director, PAN India/Thannal; and (2) Agroecology and Farmer Field Schools chaired by Mr Ngın Chhay, Director of Rice Department, GDA-MAFF, Cambodia. Presenters were encouraged to use methods other than PowerPoint (e.g., panel discussions) to deliver the topics.

Under the Pesticide Risk Reduction theme, presentations were delivered on the following topics: (1) Impact Assessment of the Swedish-supported IPM/Pesticide Risk Reduction Training: Results from the longer-term assessments in Cambodia and Vietnam, Principal Investigators from Cambodia (CENTDOR) and Vietnam (HAU); (2) Chemicals Management-Disposal of pesticide containers, PPD-Vietnam and KemI; (3) Regional studies on pesticide impacts to children and community, Marut Jatiket, TFA and Dr. Vanvimol Patarasiriwong, the Ministry of Natural Resource and Environment, Thailand; and (4) Community Pesticide Action Monitoring (CPAM), Ms Deeppa Ravindran, PAN-AP and Ms Pham Huong Thao, CGFED.

Highlights of discussions include the following:

- In Cambodia, the season-long training on IPM/PRR had a greater long-term impact on risk reduction as opposed to exposure/short-term programs or activities. IPM/PRR training reduced pesticide poisoning for applicator. The banning of WHO Class I pesticides contributed to the results on impact of PRR training.
- In Vietnam, the knowledge about pesticides policies decreased but knowledge of other risk reduction practices increased, e.g., mixing pesticides. The number of pesticide shops in the communes decreased and the number of licensed shops increased to 100%.
- In both Cambodia and Vietnam, the amount of pesticides used by farmers have reduced, farmers have shifted to less toxic pesticides and increased the use of alternatives and there has been a strong response to effect changes in policies, regulations and registration processes for pesticide shops.
- Farmers stopped using highly hazardous pesticides (HHPs) and shifted to the use of less toxic pesticides as well as biological control agents.
- Studies carried out on pesticide residue in blood samples of individuals in high-risk areas by The Field Alliance and the Thai Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment have been inconclusive due to multiple variables and external factors. Raw data has already proven a need for further study - which was the ultimate goal of the initial study - in order to extract more detailed information about exposure sources, multiple chemical families, and include stricter scientific protocol. This will, however, require greater financial and technical support.

Under the Agroecology and Farmer Field School theme, presentations were delivered on the following topics: (1) Introduction of the FAO FFS Guidance Document and Summary of FFS Institutionalization Workshop Results, Jan and Dada/FAO-RAP; (2) Agroecology and Farmers Field Schools, Mr Marut Jatiket, TFA; Ms Sarojeni Rengam, PAN-AP and Mr Jan Willem Ketelaar, FAO-RAP (Panel Discussion); (3) Country Case Studies on Agroecology and FFS (3.1.) Yunnan Experience on Agroecology, Mr Zhu Xiaoming, NATESC; (3.2.) Save and Grow-Sustainable Intensification of Rice Production FFS work: Experiences and

Results to date, Mr Phoukaothong Sykaisone, PPD, DOA Laos; (3.3.) Status of Brassica IPM and Biological Control Work in SEAsia, DoAE Thailand/PPD-Vietnam, Mr Ngo Tien Dung and (4) Country Case Studies on Private Sector Collaboration (4.1.) Kampong Cham Organic Chili Cooperative, Mr Chou Cheythyryth, GDA, Cambodia; and (4.2) Myanmar Mango IPM Case Study, Ms Sandar Myo, MFVP.

Highlights of discussions include the following:

- Agroecology is not a novel concept. It has been practiced in indigenous agricultural production systems for years and the indigenous knowledge exists. In many places, farmers do not have money for chemicals and seeds and continue to produce organically by default. Organic is not necessarily the way to go though. Growing organic vegetables in unnatural habitats for export markets does not mean that it is based on sound agroecology. It could contribute to an unbalanced ecosystem and encourage mono-cropping, land clearing as well as involve high energy food transports, etc. These issues were discussed in the development of the REAL curriculum.
- Agroecology should focus on major issues such as: (1) the impact of climate change on livelihoods of farmers (i.e., food security should be the priority, then income, and daily needs like traditional medicines, etc.) and (2) increasing income by diversifying/growing other crops or promoting other income generating activities.
- Agroecology requires a shift in mind set from being commercial farmers to rediscovering the benefits and associated good practices of highly-productive farming systems such as those practiced by subsistence farmers. Farmers are struggling, food security and improving farmers' livelihoods must be a priority.
- There is hardly any resilience in the intensification processes that are currently being promoted among conventional and industrialized farming systems around the world.
- The book "The Ecology of Sustainable Food Systems" by Stephan Gliessman is recommended and provides a good conceptual framework for approaching sustainable agriculture from an agroecology-based intensification process perspective. The book proposed several transition levels from conventional industrialized farming to agro-ecology based production and consumption systems, the first level being for farmers to become more efficient in the use of farming inputs, including chemicals. The second levels involves the transition to further reduced use of chemicals and replacement with more sustainable and agroecology based methods, such as the use of biological control. Step three in the transition process involves a complete redesign of the farming system, followed by several more progressive levels toward re-design of global food production and consumption systems and associated value chains. At the moment, much of global agriculture can be characterized as level one and level two. The transition to more advance levels must take place and the required change will take a major effort and time.
- Agroecology is social. It is about examining gender roles, health, community structures. It is about spirituality. It is about movement building.
- Many people recognize these issues but they think that they are the first to realize them and want to throw money at a problem. Explorations need to take place into what is already being done and then determine what there is still to do.
- Thailand faces major issues because it is an export driven economy. Thailand is focused on producing a certain product for export and careless about what it is providing its citizens.
- Government support is needed to move agroecology forward. CSOs and NGOs have the capacity to expose truths through scientific means (e.g., studies, etc.). Consumers need to be involved in the production in order to see the realities and take action to address concerns.
- Studies on brassica production in Thailand show that conventional farmers spray heavily (6-12 times per year). FAO working with DOAE introduced the parasitoid, *Diadegma*

*semiclausum*, to control the brassica pest, Diamond Back Moth way back in 2005 and recent (2015) field surveys show that the parasitoid is well established and provides effective biological control, allowing farmers to switch to biological control as the foundation for pest management. The same parasitoid was introduced in Dalat, Vietnam in 1995. The 2015 surveys show similar good results in terms of establishment, spread and effectiveness of the DBM biological control programmes, allowing farmers to eliminate the use of pesticides from their brassica production systems.

- For organic chili production, there is a need to ensure international market demand even if there is a domestic demand. The domestic demand is not enough to provide income. Work needs to be done on both fronts (supply and demand) to improve sustainability. The work in Cambodia was done in parallel to the creation of savings cooperatives in order to effectively track and encourage savings.
- The IPM work in mangoes in Myanmar brought about a significant reduction in loss of mangoes to pests. The increased quality of produce facilitated the achievement of the goal to export to Singapore. Myanmar now has the third highest quality of mango (Australia is first).

## Plenary and Consultations with Mid-Term Review Mission

In accordance with requirements from Sida, a Mid Term Review Mission was commissioned by the Swedish Chemicals Agency (KemI) to assess the accomplishments over the past three years (September 2013-August 2016) and define revised and new strategies for the remainder of the programme to address pesticide risks in convergence areas, including possible linkages and collaboration among the various Programme Components (i.e., Policy and Chemicals Management) working together to address pesticide and broader chemical risks. The Mid Term Review Mission of the Phase II Programme commenced with a review of documentation, followed by field visits to two programme countries, Cambodia and Vietnam, during the period 5-9 September.

The Mid Term Review Mission (Mr Klas Markensten, Team Leader and Andrew McNaughton, Team Member) presented their preliminary findings. Key points presented by the MTR follow:

- It is a highly relevant program that deals with challenges in the region and fits well with Swedish priorities.
- Farmers are motivated to change their current practices if they can clearly see benefits to themselves and their families.
- There is increasing awareness among households and communities about pesticide risks.
- The marketing potential of safe products is not realized and more effort should be exerted into assisting farmers in becoming GAP certified.
- Field activities are targeted at smallholders and the rural poor. There is a need to adjust this in order to deal with social and economic changes.
- Climate change is mentioned but not directly addressed in programme activities. Water management needs to be addressed as a critical issue in future programmes in order to directly address climate change.
- Composting is taught but the production of compost in large quantities is not put into practice.
- There is little coordination between partner projects in country on the ground, and in some cases there are actually conflicts between partners/activities.
- In Cambodia, the National IPM Program is strategically the most important point for reduction of toxic chemical use in agriculture.
- In many cases, in many countries there is data on pesticide/chemical use but is not being utilized to its full potential. There is a need to define the kind of data we are looking for.
- In Vietnam, the programme is functioning based on the goals and changes are occurring in behavior of target clientele and policy/ies. However, the collaboration among local partners is limited.
- The linkages between farmers, CSOs, GOs, and the private sector - especially between farmers and market enterprises - are not well developed.
- The involvement of other departments at national and local levels in implementation of new policies is limited.
- Communication of project results could be improved.
- Outcome/impact assessments are not being done sufficiently to guide the Programme.
- The overall level of funding of the programme is inadequate.
- The theory of change for the programme was reviewed and relative to the Terms of Reference of the MTR, the following were reported: effectiveness (most had been reached); cost-efficiency (seems OK); relevance (relevant; program design needs to be discussed); partner and regional collaboration (could be greatly increased); sustainability (China and Vietnam provide additional funding, all countries developed policies and regulations); cross-

cutting issues (partners have worked with gender for a long time; human rights are not being formulated; poverty is part of IPM work; corruption is a risk)

- There are issues around private sector collaboration. There is a risk of coercion by pesticide companies.

The presentation was followed by country-group discussions on the draft findings by the Mid-Term Review Mission. Group discussions addressed questions raised by the MTR on: (1) how to improve Reporting; (2) how to improve Sustainability; and (3) future directions (for a possible programme beyond 2018).

### **Day THREE: Friday, 23 September 2016**

#### **Working Session: Way Forward for Remainder of Phase II**

Regional partners met with their national partners to discuss plans for the remainder of the programme, i.e., October 2016 to June 2018.

#### **FAO and National IPM Programmes**

- It was agreed that internal FAO reporting will be on a six-monthly basis, as practiced earlier.
- Budget allocations for each country will be reviewed and reallocation of remaining balance funds will be made based on the MTR recommendations.
- The focus of the rest of Phase 2:
  - Myanmar: pesticide risk assessment; geographical mapping study on pesticide use; IPM/PRR interventions in six crops (e.g., melon production in dry zone, mango in Shan State, tomato, etc.); community-based education on IPM/PRR; campaigns on PRR; etc.
  - Cambodia: market chains/links; GAP/organic standards.
  - Lao PDR: the same focus on Pesticide Risk Reduction Farmer Training activities but to expand geographically (i.e., to the south); curriculum design; phasing out of WHO Class I and HHP pesticides (i.e., paraquat in the north and methomyl in the south) and replacement with effective and less toxic and eco-friendly alternatives.
  - China PR: IPM and FFS capacity building in Hainan; training to focus on health of farmers, consumers and the environment; collaboration with S+CSOs in Yunnan, Guangxi, Hainan and Beijing.
  - Vietnam: under the 2015-2020 Government Directive, activities will focus on farmer training to reduce MRLs of produce for export; obtaining Ministry approval for biological control products; work on reducing the list of allowed pesticides.

The Field Alliance/Thai Education Foundation and partners: Agriculture Technology Services Association (ATSA), Rural Development Sole, Co., Ltd., Center for Initiatives on Community Empowerment and Rural Development (ICERD), Department of Environmental Quality Promotion, and Secretariat Unit for The National Committee on Strategy Development for Chemical Management

- Cambodia will focus more efforts on market linkages
- Many of the FFS are not full-FFS but are short-term courses of one or two topics. The curriculum needs to be modified to meet the needs of communities but must ensure that participants get “well-rounded”/relevant information
- Farmers do not have the money to pay for organic certification. This should be done by networks or large collectives/businesses

- Partners must explore the social markets in the community, e.g., schools and hospitals
- Reporting needs to directly relate to outcomes and impacts, e.g., comparative reports and studies
- In the next phase, gender data needs to be analyzed further and direct impacts should occur in the programmes; perhaps provide opportunities for women and men to exchange information and create action plans together
- There is a need to re-evaluate whether the Agro-Biodiversity environments are still appropriate
- A regional meeting towards the end of 2016 (i.e., November) in Hanoi is proposed

Pesticide Action Network – Asia Pacific and Cambodian Centre for Study and partners: Development in Agriculture (CEDAC), Research Centre for Rural Development, Institute for the Control of Agrochemicals, Pesticide Eco-Alternatives Center (PEAC), PAN India/Thannal, PAN Philippines, Sustainable Agriculture and Environment Development Association (SAEDA), Center for Gender, Family and Environment Development (CGFED), Centre for Sustainable Rural Development (SRD)

- In the next phase, Community based pesticides action monitoring (CPAM) mobile application will be utilized for quick data collection
- Focus of the campaigns will be the impacts of pesticides on children. Protect Our Children from Toxic Pesticides (POC) and the campaign will be commemorated on June 5<sup>th</sup> “ World Environment Day”, International Children’s Day Nov 20<sup>th</sup>, and No Pesticides Use Week Nov 20<sup>th</sup> to Dec 3<sup>rd</sup>, every year
- Strategize and plan for the future based on partner’s unique role as CSO’s in this project
- It is relevant to continuously engage governments on specific bans (of pesticides) and to advance agroecology as a viable solution
- Explore other certification for pesticide free products/organic with community based participatory guarantee systems (PGS) and expand partnerships with organic markets/producers
- Networking and fundraising strategies for long term sustainability was discussed
- Reporting will be based on the overall theory of change and achievements/outcome based approaches.

## **Plenary presentation and discussion: Way Forward for Remainder of Phase II and Beyond**

### **Sida’s new regional strategy for Asia and the Pacific (2016-2021)**

Ms Louise Herrmann, Programme Manager Environment and Energy, Development Cooperation Section, Embassy of Sweden in Bangkok gave a summary of the Strategy for Sweden’s regional development cooperation in Asia and the Pacific region for 2016-2021. Mentioned among other points are: the strategy will involve a regional expansion to Asia and the Pacific; it will require more money and although Sida provides a significant share of funding, individual organizations also need to be responsible for raising additional funds; the strategy will have a thematic focus (efficiency goals related to expansion); better and more sustainable results are aimed for; and new and upgraded work methods and integration of environment, gender and human rights into programmes from the formulation stage will be engaged.

## **Presentation on country-level consultations on findings and discussion questions of the Mid Term Review Mission and identification of needs/priorities for future Regional Collaboration**

Country groups shared the outputs from their small group discussions. The following section summarizes the outputs addressing questions raised by the MTR on: (1) how to improve Reporting; (2) how to improve Sustainability; and (3) future directions (for a possible programme beyond 2018).

### **Cambodia**

Reporting: Document successful cases and share the stories

Sustainability: Formalizing structure of IPM farmers at national level: establishment of a Federation of IPM Farmer Cooperatives; institutionalization of the PRR Programme by providing mandates for key responsible players in the Federation of IPM Farmers Cooperatives and local authorities; mainstreaming PRR Programme into national agriculture investment projects/programme to be part of national strategy for sustainable development; The priority is to document and analyze the successful stories of the project/programme for the communication with policy makers; All implementing partners already worked together but need to be closer and more effectively in order to generate synergic effects.

Beyond 2018: Building national and sustainable structure for addressing PRR toward safe food and healthy environment in Cambodia

What do we do? - Institutionalization of the good agriculture practices towards safe food and healthy environment

What do we deliver? - Laws and policy, professionals are trained; agricultural value chains systems are established and functional

Why do we do it? - Synergy needs to be improved, alignment with national sustainable

### **China**

Reporting: China will need to work based on long-term goals and objectives. At the end of the year with the participation of relevant partners, a review of achievements will be done highlighting key outcomes and impacts of programme activities.

Sustainability: The programme will be aligned with national policy/ies (like Vietnam) and the government's national five-year plan. The income of farmers should be increased. The programme will be expanded to include more stakeholders.

Beyond 2018: Children will be one of the key target groups in the future. PEAC will join Training of Trainers courses to be carried out by the government. Invitations to attend annual meetings, etc. will be sent to/between GO and CSO partners as to enhance training experience and take advantage of mutual leaning. Publicity materials will be shared with/between the partners in a more active sense and findings will be shared with/between each other to promote the management of HHPs. There will be greater effort towards enhanced consumer education.

### **Lao PDR**

Reporting: Each partner should revise the LFA. National partners need to meet every six months. Progress and activity reports must be shared with partners in a timely manner. The National Coordinator (from GDA-MAFF) should be responsible for communicating information with all partners and concerned agencies in a timely manner.

Sustainability: Laws and policies should be enforced and strengthened. Efforts must be exerted to seek continued financial support for activities. Cooperation between concerned agencies and ministries should be improved.

Beyond 2018: Banned pesticides should be phased out and laws must be in place. Agroecology activities should be promoted.

#### Myanmar

Reporting: Reporting is already strong vertically but needs to be strengthened horizontally in terms of scope and spread of information. Reports are requested but not utilized or sometimes not even read, therefore the approach to reporting is not taken so seriously. There should be a mandate to systematize reporting and use of information.

Sustainability: Reinforce the already existing laws. Resources and facilities to support IPM/pesticide risk reduction efforts should be strengthened. Agroecological farming should be empathized. There should be an integration of the National IPM Programme. National budgets should take into consideration supplemental funding for IPM/PRR. Through MOE, school curriculum should be developed to address IPM/PRR and agroecology and the integration of messages in Behavior Change Communication.

Beyond 2018: Towards a Non-toxic Myanmar. Reduce risk from chemical human health and the environment. Strengthen of regulatory framework is a priority. Strengthening public/private partnerships.

#### Thailand

Reporting: Data-tracking of impact from project implementation with clearly defined indicators.

Sustainability: Taking advantage of existing government policies. NGOs need additional financial support to continue to develop and expand programmes. Collaboration with other international partners to encourage policy formulation, networking, and support.

Beyond 2018: Strengthen the network. Engage chemical pesticide companies to take responsibility for the proper disposal of pesticide containers.

#### Vietnam

Reporting: Explained the structure of collaboration between GO-CSOs. Indicated the need for suggestions from the MTR report to help in improving reporting. Communicate results in international workshops. Increase communication efforts at the national level.

Sustainability: Develop agroecology models and involvement of private sectors. Collaboration with MARD to disseminate legal documents and community education on IPM/PRR.

Beyond 2018: Extension phase to 2020 developed. Develop more materials on success cases, e.g., food safety and organic farming. Increase activities relative to the collection and disposal of pesticide containers.

#### Regional partners

Reporting: (1) Formal reporting; (2) reporting to country partners, and general communication approaches: define who should be receiving what information and what specific purpose should it serve; do a better job reporting to partners about what is happening in the countries; there is a need for cohesion in some capacities but in other ways it is beneficial for partners to maintain individual identities; FAO could provide a good inlet to the government in order to arrange meetings with government officials and organizations; draw more attention to the Theory of Change and long-term impacts **and** that we need to reframe to results/outcomes based as opposed to being more activities based – this could be done by going back to the onset of the project and comparing data from 2007 to 2015 to see overall impacts and/or reframe the data captured from individual organizations revolving around a certain theme (like the current gender case narrative publication)

Sustainability: The idea of sustainability can be approached in two ways: (1) theoretical and programmatic sustainability in regards to policy-level and financial support (sustainability of

institutions and exchange at regional level); and (2) environmental sustainability (program content). This could be improved by building momentum from the ground-up: begin by improving individual capacity; encouraging formation of small groups (Women's Groups, Saving Groups, Farmer Field School classes, etc.); providing ample training so that local and regional organizations can take over responsibility for programs and funding; keeping in mind that organizations and in-country partners need to not only ensure that people are capable of taking on a project, but that they are able to continue to develop it and handle any potential backlash from government or other private sector corporations. It will be easier to achieve sustainability where there are already strong groups that exist, but we cannot neglect under-represented or otherwise disadvantaged populations; and before the issues of market linkages are dealt with, individual capacity needs to be developed, local food security ensured- building a self-sufficient and resilient community.

Beyond 2018: In many ways, are already working towards the 2018 and beyond - climate change, urban migration, market connections, impacts to health and society - but of course we need to go further. A lot of data has been collected covering a wide variety of subjects. Moving forward in a responsive and responsible way should identify resounding needs, incorporate the human rights perspective, impact of industrial and "common" chemicals on public health - like the use of chemicals to control mosquito, etc. A suggestion is to reframe with a thematic focus on children-chemical impacts to children. This approach directly aligns with Swedish goals and address issues of public health, sustainability, and the future of farming. Other subjects could include agroecology, climate change resilience and food security, biological control methods. There should be greater attention to involving government organizations and partners to achieve sustainability. Collaboration with FAO and KemI should provide smaller NGO's and CSO's with access to GO's as defined in the project outline and outcomes.

### **Wrap up, Evaluation and Closing Notes**

The Evaluation Questionnaire was accomplished by 38 participants. Under the section on Facilities, the meeting room, lodging and food were evaluated. The participants rated the meeting room either excellent (42%) or very good (50%). The lodging was rated excellent (34%), very good (37%) and good (21%). The food was rated excellent (45%), very good (34%) or good (21%). Only one participant rated the meeting room as fair (3%) while 3 respondents, not staying in the hotel indicated that this item was not applicable to them. Comments on the facilities included that the hotel room was too cold and there was limited access to *wifi* facilities in the meeting room.

The second section evaluated the content, process and organization of Exhibitions/Poster Presentations. Majority of the participants rated the content either excellent (37%) or very good (58%). Only two participants (15%) gave a rating of good to the content of Exhibitions/Poster Presentations. The process was rated as excellent (32%), very good (47%) or good (21%). The organization was rated as excellent (34%), very good (50%) and good (13%). One participant did not rate the organization of the Exhibitions/Poster Presentations. There was a comment that the information sent out to participants about the space available for the exhibit was not clear enough.

The Plenary discussions/presentations were evaluated. Participants rated the Plenary Presentations excellent (24%), very good (58%) and good (15%). The Food-for-Thought Presentations were rated excellent (34%), very good (37%) and good (26%). The Plenary and consultations with the Mid-Term Review Mission were rated excellent (24%), very good (37%) and good (34%). One participant did not evaluate the plenary presentations and Food-for-Thought presentations while two did not rate the Plenary and Consultations with the MTR.

The Overall Meeting Organization was evaluated on three points: scheduling of activities, facilitation and travel arrangements. Participants rated the scheduling of activities as excellent (26%), very good (55%) and good (16%). Facilitation was rated as excellent (36%), very good (50%) and good (21%). Travel arrangements were rated excellent (21%), very good (45%) and good (21%). One participant did not evaluate the scheduling of activities and facilitation while 5 persons (13%) did not rate the travel arrangements as this item did not apply to them. One participant commented that the dinner cruise was very nice and the food was excellent. There was another comment that the final meeting agenda should have been sent prior to participants' coming to the meeting.

Suggestions for the next meeting covered organizational as well as content areas. Among the suggestions for the organization were: a longer time for preparations for the meeting; have more space for display of exhibits; timing of the workshop in mid-November; shorter country-level discussions (45 minutes); more time for exchange/sharing with other countries; and invite more participants for experience sharing. The suggested contents include: discussions on the next phase; invite private sector to participate; include a "cultural solidarity night"; one or two days allocated for wider stakeholder audience or non-partners to participate and learn and/or network with the programme; and develop detailed country work-plans. Other comments were: to organize the next meeting just like the current one; and another comment that stated looking forward to the next meeting with the same participants.

Participants read out and assessed how they had delivered on commitments made in 2013 and wrote down their renewed commitments and plans to move the regional programme "*Towards a Non-toxic Southeast Asia*" forward. These will be assessed in the next regional meeting to be held in Myanmar.

Closing remarks were delivered by the heads of offices of the regional partners: Mr Jan Willem Ketelaar, Chief Technical Adviser/Team Leader, FAO Asia IPM/PRR Programme; Mr Marut Jatiket, Executive Director, The Field Alliance/Thai Education Foundation; Ms Sarojeni Rengam, Executive Director, Pesticide Action Network – Asia Pacific (PAN-AP); and Mr Ule Johansson, Senior Adviser Development Cooperation, Swedish Chemicals Agency (KemI).

## **Annex 1**

### **Concept Note Regional Meeting of the Swedish-supported Programme “Towards a Non-toxic Southeast Asia” Bangkok, Thailand, 21-23 September 2016**

#### ***Background***

The Swedish-supported Programme “Towards a Non-toxic South-East Asia” aims to reduce health and environmental risks by monitoring, regulating and managing agricultural, industrial and consumer chemicals. The programme covers the Mekong Region countries: Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar, Thailand and Vietnam as well as the Yunnan, Guangxi and Hainan provinces in China PR.

Throughout Phase I (May 2007-June 2013) and first half of Phase II (September 2013-August 2016), regional meetings were organized by FAO, regional CSO partners Thai Education Foundation/The Field Alliance, Pesticide Action Network-Asia Pacific (PAN-AP) and their programme partners. These meetings had served as a forum for review and planning of various community education initiatives and advocacy/awareness addressing pesticide risks. Whereas each of the regional and country programme partners have its own distinctive implementation role in this joint Programme, these meetings have acted as a forum for exchange and facilitated a dialogue on GO-NGO collaboration and joint planning as to strengthen the impact and sustainability of community education for pesticide risk reduction programmes. Mid-way during the implementation of Phase II (July 2013-June 2018), there is a need to review and summarize the accomplishments of community education programmes on pesticide risk reduction over the past three years (September 2013-August 2016), identify implementation challenges faced and define revised and new strategies to strengthen collaboration and explore/demonstrate the added value of working together to address pesticide risks in convergence areas. The meeting will be different from previous forums as partners of the Swedish Chemicals Agency (KemI) looking at the broader Chemicals Management Component and partners of KemI and FAO implementing the Policy Component will be participating to identify future areas of work, including possible linkages and collaboration among the various Programme Components working together to address pesticide and broader chemical risks. The meeting will also coincide with the de-briefing of the Mid-term Review Mission of the Phase II Programme. For this purpose, a regional meeting of the Swedish-supported Programme “Towards a Non-toxic South-East Asia” is scheduled to be held in Bangkok, Thailand on 21-23 September 2016.

#### ***Objectives***

The overall objectives of this meeting will be:

1. To share highlights of achievements and impact resulting from Community Education for Pesticide Risk Reduction work during the first half of Phase II, including follow up on pledges made for joint GO-NGO work in the 2013 meeting in Chiang Mai, Thailand;
2. To share highlights of achievements and impact of policy formulation, enforcement and implementation challenges with regards to reducing pesticide and chemical risks;
3. To present and discuss findings and recommendations of the Mid-term Review Mission for Phase II of the Swedish-supported Programme “Towards a Non-toxic Environment in Southeast Asia”;

4. To identify needs, opportunities and challenges for strengthening country and regional strategies for continued collaboration and sustainable impact of the Pesticide Risk Reduction Community Education initiatives and chemicals management, especially in pilot convergence areas as part of Phase II Programme implementation planning for the remaining years (2016-2018).

### ***Organizing and Funding Body***

The meeting will be organized and hosted jointly by all Regional Programme partners, including the FAO, KemI, TFA and PAN-AP. FAO and TFA, both based in Bangkok, will take the lead in local organization of -and logistics for- the workshop. Costs, including participant travel and partial per diem, will be covered by all Regional Programme partners from their individual project budgets. FAO will negotiate a meeting package with the hotel which will cover coffee/tea breaks, lunch and meeting room service fees with costs covered by the FAO project component.

### ***Dates, Location and Schedule***

The Meeting will be held in Bangkok, Thailand for three days (not including travel) from Wednesday to Friday, 21<sup>st</sup> to 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2016. A tentative schedule is attached.

### ***Participants***

Participants at the proposed workshop will total some 40 persons, including representatives from each of the core Greater Mekong Sub-Region member countries (Cambodia, China PR, Lao PDR, Myanmar, Thailand and Vietnam). Selected representatives from KemI, Regional Partner Organizations, other National IPM Programmes in the Asia region, resource persons and FAO staff will also be invited to participate in the meeting. For reasons of continuity and follow up, participation of those involved in the 2013 Chiang Mai WG-CEPRR meeting and still involved in PRR community education work will be prioritized.

### ***Preparation***

Each country is expected to prepare for the various agenda items included in the meeting. A brief outline of these expected preparations, along with general logistical information, will be provided in an Information Note to be circulated upon confirmation of selected participants.

*National IPM Programmes and local partner CSOs (i.e., under the Working Group on Community Education Programmes for Pesticide Risk Reduction) are expected to work together in the preparation of a poster and/or photo exhibit. The exhibition will replace formal country presentations in plenary sessions on Community Education Programmes for Pesticide Risk Reduction. More information about the exhibits will be provided in the Information Note.*

*All participants - Regional Programme partners, country government and local CSO partner representatives - are encouraged to bring along relevant publications, case studies, awareness raising and training materials and other relevant documentation for sharing at the regional meeting.*

## Annex 2

## AGENDA

<b>20 September: Tuesday</b>		
<b>Time</b>	<b>Activity</b>	<b>Notes/ Facilitators/ Chairperson</b>
AM/PM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Arrival in Bangkok</li> <li>• Hotel details</li> <li>• Registration</li> <li>• Setting up of exhibits on <i>GO-NGO Country Presentations</i> (Rattanakosin Room)</li> </ul>	-Refer to Information Note on instructions on <i>How to Get to the Hotel</i> -US \$1 = 34.85 Baht
<b>21 September: Wednesday (Venue: Rattanakosin Room)</b>		
<b>Opening Session &amp; Regional Partner Presentations</b>		<i>Chairperson:</i> Mr Ule Johansson, Senior Adviser Development Cooperation, KemI
0900	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opening and Introductory Notes</li> <li>• Meeting Objectives, Expected Outputs and Agenda</li> <li>• Introduction of Participants (by country teams)</li> </ul>	Mr Piao Yongfan, Senior Plant Protection Officer, FAO RAP Ms Jenny Rönngren Adviser/Programme Manager International Unit, Swedish Chemicals Agency Ms Sarojeni Rengam, Executive Director, PAN-AP Mr Marut Jatiket, Director, TEF/TFA
0930	<i>Regional Programme Overview of Community Education on Pesticide Risk Reduction</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Farmer Education on IPM and Pesticide Risk Reduction</li> </ul>	Mr Jan Willem Ketelaar, Chief Technical Adviser, FAO Asian Regional IPM/Pesticide Risk Reduction Programme
	<i>Awareness Raising, Health and Environmental Education, and Advocacy in Support of a Non-toxic Environment</i>	Regional CSO Partners
0950	⇒ Pesticide Action Network-Asia Pacific (PAN-AP)	Ms Sarojeni Rengam, Executive Director, PAN-AP
1010	⇒ The Field Alliance (TFA)	Mr Marut Jatiket, Director, TFA
1030	Tea/Coffee Break	
<b>Other Plenary Presentations</b>		<i>Chairperson:</i> Mr Romy Quijano, PAN Philippines
1100	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strengthening Regulatory Control of the Importation, Distribution and Use of Pesticides</li> </ul>	Mr Piao Yongfan, Senior Plant Protection Officer, FAO RAP
1120	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capacity Building for Better Chemical Management in Southeast Asia</li> </ul>	Mr Ule Johansson, Senior Adviser Development Cooperation, KemI
1140	<b>Plenary Discussions</b>	
1200	Lunch Break	

1330	<b>Official Opening and Viewing of Exhibits (Bus Stop Method)</b> <b>Consultations with Mid-Term Review Mission (see attached programme)</b>	Ms Jenny Rönngren, Adviser/Programme Manager, International Unit, Swedish Chemicals Agency
1515	<b>Instructions for Chao Phraya Working Dinner and Day 2</b>	
1530	Tea/Coffee Break	
1600	Consultations with Mid-Term Review Mission	
1615	Departure for Welcome Reception and Dinner hosted by FAO	Anantara Riverside Resort (boat cruise)
<b>22 September: Thursday</b>		
<b>Food-for-Thought Presentations</b>		
	<b>Parallel Session I: Pesticide Risk Reduction</b> <b>(Venue: Baan Thai 1 Room)</b>	<b>Parallel Session II: Agroecology and Farmers Field Schools</b> <b>(Venue: Rattanakosin Room)</b>
	<i>Chairperson:</i> Mr Jayakumar Chealaton, Co-Director, PAN India/Thannal (TBC)	<i>Chairperson:</i> Mr Ngin Chhay, Director of Rice Department, MAFF, Cambodia
0830	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impact Assessment of the Swedish-supported IPM/Pesticide Risk Reduction Training: Results from the longer-term assessments in Cambodia and Vietnam, Principal Investigators from Cambodia (CENTDOR) and Vietnam (HAU)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Introduction of the FAO FFS Guidance Document and Summary of FFS Institutionalization Workshop Results, Jan and Dada/FAO-RAP</li> <li>Agroecology and Farmers Field Schools, Mr Marut Jatiket, TFA; Ms Sarojeni Rengam, PAN-AP and Mr Jan Willem Ketelaar, FAO-RAP (Panel Discussion)</li> </ul>
0915	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Chemicals Management-Disposal of pesticide containers, PPD-Vietnam and KemI</li> </ul>	
1000	Tea/Coffee Break	
1030	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regional studies on pesticide impacts to children and community, Marut Jatiket, TFA and Dr. Vanvimol Patarasiriwong, the Ministry of Natural Resource and Environment, Thailand</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Country Case Studies: Agroecology &amp; FFS</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Yunnan Experience on Agroecology, Mr Zhu Xiaoming, NATESC</li> <li>➤ Save and Grow-SIRP FFS work: Experiences and Results to date, Mr Phoukaothong Sykaisone, Laos</li> <li>➤ Status of Brassica IPM and Biological Control Work in SEAsia, DoAE Thailand/PPD-Vietnam</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
1115	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community Pesticide Action Monitoring (CPAM), Ms Deeppa Ravindran, PAN-AP and Ms Pham Huong Thao, CGFED</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Country Cases: Private Sector Collaboration</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Kampong Cham Organic Chili Cooperative, Mr Chou Cheythyrih, Cambodia</li> <li>➤ Myanmar Mango IPM Case Study, Ms Sandar Myo, MFVP</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
1200	Lunch Break	
<b>Plenary and Consultations with Mid-Term Review Mission</b>		
1330	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Presentations of Preliminary Findings by the Mid-Term Review Mission and questions for group discussions</li> </ul>	Mr Klas Markensten, MTR Team Leader, NIRAS Indevlop
1445	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Country-level validation and discussions on draft findings by Mid-Term Review Mission and group discussions</li> </ul>	
1530	Tea/Coffee Break	

1600	⇒ Country-level validation and discussions on draft findings by Mid-Term Review Mission and group discussions (cont.)	
<b>23 September: Friday</b>		
<b>Working Session: Way Forward for Remainder of Phase II</b>		<i>Chairperson:</i> Mr Ule Johansson, Senior Adviser Development Cooperation, KemI
0830	⇒ Country-level discussions on collaboration in Community Education Initiatives for Pesticide Risk Reduction in GMS	
1000	Tea/Coffee Break	
1030	⇒ Regional Programme partners meeting with country partners	
1200	Lunch Break	
<b>Plenary presentation and discussion: Way Forward for Remainder of Phase II And Beyond</b>		Ms Jenny Rönngren, Adviser/Programme Manager, International Unit, Swedish Chemicals Agency
1330	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brief introduction to the new regional strategy for Asia and the Pacific (2016-2021)</li> </ul>	Ms Louise Herrmann, Programme Manager Environment and Energy, Development Cooperation Section, Embassy of Sweden in Bangkok
1430	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Presentation on country-level consultations on findings and discussion questions of the Mid Term Review Mission and identification of needs/priorities for future Regional Collaboration, if any.</li> </ul>	Country Rapporteurs
1530	Tea/Coffee Break	
1630	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wrap up, evaluation and closing notes</li> </ul>	Regional Coordinators, Working Group - Community Education for Pesticide Risk Reduction Mr Ule Johansson, Senior Adviser Development Cooperation, KemI Mr Piao Yongfan, Senior Plant Protection Officer, FAO RAP
1800	⇒ Farewell Dinner hosted by KemI	Sukosol Hotel (Premkamol Room)
<b>24 September: Saturday</b> Departure from Bangkok, Thailand		

### Annex 3

### LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

No	Sex	Name	Designation	Organization	City/Country	Email
<b>Cambodia</b>						
1	Mr	<b>Ngin Chhay</b>	National IPM Programme Coordinator & Director of Rice Department	General Directorate of Agriculture, MAFF	Phnom Penh Cambodia	<a href="mailto:chhay.ipm@online.com.kh">chhay.ipm@online.com.kh</a>
2	Mr	<b>Chou Cheythyrieth</b>	Vegetable IPM Project Coordinator	FAO IPM Office, Cambodia	Phnom Penh Cambodia	<a href="mailto:thyrieth.faoipm@online.com.kh">thyrieth.faoipm@online.com.kh</a>
3	Mr	<b>Moch Chantha</b>	Deputy Director	Department of Agricultural Legislation, MAFF	Phnom Penh Cambodia	<a href="mailto:moch_chantha@yahoo.com">moch_chantha@yahoo.com</a>
4	Mr	<b>Suon Seng</b>	Executive Director	The Center for Development Oriented Research in Agriculture and Livelihood Systems (CENTDOR)	Phnom Penh Cambodia	<a href="mailto:suonseng@online.com.kh">suonseng@online.com.kh</a>
5	Mr	<b>Keam Makarady</b>	Programme Director	Cambodian Centre for Study and Development in Agriculture (CEDAC)	Phnom Penh Cambodia	<a href="mailto:makarady@cedac.org.kh">makarady@cedac.org.kh</a>
6	Ms	<b>Pan Sodavy</b>	Programme Manager	Agriculture Technology Services Association (ATSA)	Phnom Penh Cambodia	<a href="mailto:davy.atsa@gmail.com">davy.atsa@gmail.com</a>
<b>China PR</b>						
7	Mr	<b>Zhu Xiaoming</b>	Agronomist	Division of Pest Control, National Agro-technical Extension & Service Center (NATESC), Ministry of Agriculture	Beijing, China	<a href="mailto:zhuxiaoming@agri.gov.cn">zhuxiaoming@agri.gov.cn</a>
8	Mr	<b>Li Peng</b>	Extension Professor & Director	General Station of Plant Protection, Department of Agriculture	Hainan, China	<a href="mailto:hainanzibao111@126.com">hainanzibao111@126.com</a>
9	Mr	<b>Huang Guangpeng</b>	Extension Professor & Director	General Station of Plant Protection, Guangxi Autonomous Region	Guangxi, China	<a href="mailto:hgp9376@163.com">hgp9376@163.com</a>
10	Ms	<b>Yang Hong Yan</b>	Executive Director	Pesticide Eco-Alternatives Center (PEAC)	Yunnan, China	<a href="mailto:peac.yang@gmail.com">peac.yang@gmail.com</a>
<b>India</b>						
11	Mr	<b>Jayakumar Chealaton</b>	Co-Director	PAN India/Thannal	India	<a href="mailto:jayakumar.c@gmail.com">jayakumar.c@gmail.com</a>
<b>Lao PDR</b>						
12	Ms	<b>Yadkeo Phoummidalyvanh</b>	Deputy Director	Regulatory Division, Department of Agriculture, Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry	Vientiane, Lao PDR	<a href="mailto:pyatkeo@yahoo.com">pyatkeo@yahoo.com</a>
13	Ms	<b>Khamphoui Louanglath</b>	Adviser	FAO IPM Office, Lao PDR	Vientiane, Lao PDR	<a href="mailto:phoui2@hotmail.com">phoui2@hotmail.com</a>

14	Ms	<b>Vornthalom Chanthavong</b>	Programme Assistant	FAO IPM Office, Lao PDR	Vientiane, Lao PDR	<a href="mailto:vornthalom.chanthavong@fao.org">vornthalom.chanthavong@fao.org</a>
15	Mr	<b>Phoukaothong Sykaisone</b>	Head of IPM Unit and National IPM Programme Coordinator	Plant Protection Center, Department of Agriculture, Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry	Vientiane, Lao PDR	<a href="mailto:sphoukaothong@yahoo.com">sphoukaothong@yahoo.com</a>
16	Mr	<b>Thongdam Phongpichit</b>	Co-director	Sustainable Agriculture and Environment Development Association (SAEDA)	Vientiane, Lao PDR	<a href="mailto:pthongdam.saedalao@gmail.com">pthongdam.saedalao@gmail.com</a>
17	Mr	<b>Bounlap Pathilath</b>	Programme Manager	Sustainable Agriculture and Environment Development Association (SAEDA)	Vientiane, Lao PDR	<a href="mailto:bounlap.saedalao@gmail.com">bounlap.saedalao@gmail.com</a>
18	Mr	<b>Sonexay Komxaysana</b>	Deputy Head	Agriculture Extension Section	Vientiane, Lao PDR	<a href="mailto:sonexaykomxaysana@gmail.com">sonexaykomxaysana@gmail.com</a>
19	Mr	<b>Bandith Keothongkham</b>	Director	Rural Development Sole, Co., Ltd.	Vientiane, Lao PDR	<a href="mailto:bandith2009@yahoo.com">bandith2009@yahoo.com</a>
<b>Myanmar</b>						
20	Ms	<b>Ms Swe Swe Oo</b>	Staff Officer	Department of Agriculture, Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Irrigation	Yangon, Myanmar	<a href="mailto:swesweoocbn@gmail.com">swesweoocbn@gmail.com</a>
21	Ms	<b>Sandar Myo</b>	Adviser/ Programme Manager	Myanmar Fruit, Vegetable and Flower Producers and Exporters Association	Yangon, Myanmar	<a href="mailto:sandamyo@gmail.com">sandamyo@gmail.com</a>
<b>Philippines</b>						
22	Mr	<b>Romy Quijano</b>	Director	PAN Philippines	Manila, Philippines	<a href="mailto:romyquij@yahoo.com">romyquij@yahoo.com</a>
<b>Thailand</b>						
23	Mr	<b>Ars Ponhet</b>	Director	Sa Kaeo Vocational Training and Development Centre for Thai People along the Border Areas, Office of Nonformal and Informal Education, Ministry of Education	Sa Kaeo, Thailand	<a href="mailto:arsponhet@hotmail.com">arsponhet@hotmail.com</a>
24	Ms	<b>Vanvimol Patarasiriwong</b>	Environmentalist, Senior Professional Level	Environmental Research and Training Centre, Department of Environmental Quality Promotion, Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment	Bangkok, Thailand	<a href="mailto:vanvimol@yahoo.com">vanvimol@yahoo.com</a>
25	Ms	<b>Aurus Kongphanich</b>	Pharmacist	Thai Food and Drug Administration (Thai FDA), Ministry of Public Health	Bangkok, Thailand	aurus@fda.moph.go.th
26	Ms	<b>Kirana Roonnaphai</b>	Practitioner Pharmacist	Thai Food and Drug Administration (Thai FDA), Ministry of Public Health	Bangkok, Thailand	kirana@fda.moph.go.th
27	Ms	<b>Amornrat Leenanithigul</b>	Director	Chemical Safety Group, Policy and Planning Division, Food and Drug Administration, Ministry of Public Health	Bangkok, Thailand	<a href="mailto:amornrat_fda@hotmail.com">amornrat_fda@hotmail.com</a>

<b>Vietnam</b>						
28	Mr	<b>Ngo Tien Dung</b>	Adviser	Hanoi, Vietnam	Hanoi, Vietnam	<a href="mailto:ipmppd@fpt.vn">ipmppd@fpt.vn</a>
29	Mr	<b>Nguyen Quy Duong</b>	Deputy Director General	Plant Protection Department, MARD	Hanoi, Vietnam	<a href="mailto:duongnq.bvtv@mard.gov.vn">duongnq.bvtv@mard.gov.vn</a>
30	Mr	<b>Tran Van Hieu</b>	Programme Assistant	FAO IPM Hanoi, Vietnam	Hanoi, Vietnam	<a href="mailto:tvhieuipm@vnn.vn">tvhieuipm@vnn.vn</a>
31	Mr	<b>Pham Hoang Long</b>	Programme Coordinator	Center for Initiatives on Community Empowerment and Rural Development (ICERD)	Vietnam	<a href="mailto:long_hoangpham@yahoo.com">long_hoangpham@yahoo.com</a>
32	Ms	<b>Pham Huong Thao</b>	Programme Officer	Center for Gender, Family and Environment Development (CGFED)	Hanoi, Vietnam	<a href="mailto:pham_huong_thao@yahoo.com">pham_huong_thao@yahoo.com</a>
33	Ms	<b>Thúy Nguyễn Kim</b>	Director	Center for Gender, Family and Environment Development (CGFED)	Hanoi, Vietnam	<a href="mailto:nkthuy@cgfed.org.vn">nkthuy@cgfed.org.vn</a>
34	Ms	<b>Nguyen Thi Hoa</b>	Deputy Director	Centre for Sustainable Rural Development (SRD)	Hanoi, Vietnam	<a href="mailto:hoa@srd.org.vn">hoa@srd.org.vn</a>
35	Ms	<b>Doi Thi Khanh Ha</b>	Project Officer	Centre for Sustainable Rural Development (SRD)	Hanoi, Vietnam	<a href="mailto:hadk@srd.org.vn">hadk@srd.org.vn</a>
36	Mr	<b>Le Thanh Phong</b>	Deputy Director	Research Centre for Rural Development, An Giang University	An Giang, Vietnam	<a href="mailto:ltphong@agu.edu.vn">ltphong@agu.edu.vn</a>
<b>Regional Civil Society</b>						
37	Mr	<b>Marut Jatiket</b>	Executive Director	The Field Alliance/ Thai Education Foundation	Bangkok, Thailand	<a href="mailto:thaied.found@gmail.com">thaied.found@gmail.com</a> ; <a href="mailto:marutj@thaied.org">marutj@thaied.org</a>
38	Ms	<b>Alexandra Perkinson</b>	Information Officer	The Field Alliance/ Thai Education Foundation	Bangkok, Thailand	<a href="mailto:alexperkinson@gmail.com">alexperkinson@gmail.com</a>
39	Ms	<b>Parika Maneeprem</b>	Admin Officer	The Field Alliance/ Thai Education Foundation	Bangkok, Thailand	<a href="mailto:parika1119@gmail.com">parika1119@gmail.com</a>
40	Ms	<b>Sarojeni Rengam</b>	Executive Director	Pesticide Action Network, Asia & The Pacific (PANAP)	Penang, Malaysia	<a href="mailto:panap@panap.net">panap@panap.net</a> ; <a href="mailto:sarojeni.rengam@panap.net">sarojeni.rengam@panap.net</a>
41	Ms	<b>Deeppa Ravindran</b>	Pesticide Programme Coordinator	Pesticide Action Network, Asia & The Pacific (PANAP)	Penang, Malaysia	<a href="mailto:deeppa100@gmail.com">deeppa100@gmail.com</a>
<b>Other Regional Partners/Resource Persons</b>						
42	Ms	<b>Louise Herrmann</b>	Programme Manager Environment, Energy and Urban Development	Development Cooperation Section, Embassy of Sweden	Bangkok, Thailand	<a href="mailto:louise.herrmann@gov.se">louise.herrmann@gov.se</a>
43	Ms	<b>Mari Albihn</b>	Senior Advisor, Environment, Climate Change and Food Security	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency, Sida	Stockholm, Sweden	<a href="mailto:mari.albihn@sida.se">mari.albihn@sida.se</a>

44	Mr	<b>Ule Johansson</b>	Senior Adviser Development Cooperation	International Unit, Swedish Chemicals Agency (KemI)	Sundbyberg, Sweden	<a href="mailto:Ule.Johansson@kemi.se">Ule.Johansson@kemi.se</a>
45	Ms	<b>Jenny Ronngren</b>	Adviser/ Programme Manager	International Unit, Swedish Chemicals Agency (KemI)	Bangkok, Thailand	<a href="mailto:jenny.ronngren@kemi.se">jenny.ronngren@kemi.se</a>
46	Mr	<b>Klas Markensten</b>	Team Leader, MTR	NIRAS Sweden AB	Sweden	<a href="mailto:klasmarkensten@gmail.com">klasmarkensten@gmail.com</a>
47	Mr	<b>Andrew McNaughton</b>	Team Member, MTR	NIRAS Sweden AB	Canada	<a href="mailto:amcn46@gmail.com">amcn46@gmail.com</a>
<b>FAO</b>						
48	Mr	<b>Piao Yongfan</b>	Senior Plant Protection Officer	FAO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific	Bangkok, Thailand	<a href="mailto:yongfan.piao@fao.org">yongfan.piao@fao.org</a>
49	Mr	<b>Jan W. Ketelaar</b>	Chief Technical Adviser/Team Leader	FAO ICP for IPM in Vegetables, Regional Office, FAO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific	Bangkok, Thailand	<a href="mailto:johannes.ketelaar@fao.org">johannes.ketelaar@fao.org</a>
50	Ms	<b>Alma Linda Abubakar</b>	Programme Development Officer	FAO ICP for IPM in Vegetables, Regional Office, FAO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific	Bangkok, Thailand	<a href="mailto:almalinda.abubakar@fao.org">almalinda.abubakar@fao.org</a>