
Integrated Solutions Platform

- Listening Session -

IS Platform Background

- **Established by the IR-4 Project Committee Management in 2017 to:**
 - Identify solutions to a pest management void through product screening research^[1]
 - Integrate biopesticides into conventional ag. systems to prevent pest resistance
 - Substitute biopesticides or short-residual reduced-risk products close to harvest to reduce the risk of MRL violations of export markets
 - Address organic production systems' needs.

^[1] Since the original approval, the scope of Integrated Solutions Platform has expanded to also include genetics (resistant varieties), application technologies and cultural practices.



IS Platform Background

Year 2025 marks the 7th season of research. To date:

- **488** new proposals for projects received
- **88** projects funded
- **> 400** field trials conducted where IR-4:
 - Screened the efficacy of new pesticides and new use patterns
 - Explored the integration of novel technologies (attractants, mating disruption etc.)
 - Assessed resistance management through rotations
 - Residue mitigation



Defining Success

Successes in funded research are defined as:

1. Identifying effective conventional products / new uses and leverage on data to initiate residue studies
2. Identifying effective biopesticides to add pest / crop on product label
3. Modifying a use pattern to make it more suitable for the targeted crop system
4. Providing a crop protection tool for the organic community
5. Identifying effective integrated pest management practices (hard to measure!)





Integrated Solutions Survey



It is now time to examine the Platform more closely and determine whether it is achieving its objectives. To assist, we invited stakeholders to fill out a survey.

- Total no. of responses: **14**
- The largest majority are from **public sector researchers** or **extension workers**

Summary of Results

- General satisfaction with the objectives
- Some suggestions were provided for measures of success
 - Clearly define measure of success
 - Results should be communicated
- IR-4 is doing a good job incorporating various pest management technologies and practices into IS research protocols but need to “**dig deeper.**”
 - Compare solo-treatment applications to exploring these tools in an integrated pest management system.
 - Explore new application tools, genetic resistance, and other technologies.
- Mixed feelings about national priorities vs. regional/local priorities

Summary of Results (cont.)

- While many recognize the benefit of having unbiased data, some expressed the concern that focusing IS resources entirely on biopesticides will result in possibly overlooking important sectors (i.e. weed science, other prospective technologies, etc.).
 - There are many factors to consider, as this is not a YES / NO question.
- Additional thoughts:
 - *“Thank you IR-4 for keeping the program relevant!”*
 - Form a committee or workgroup to guide the IS platform effectively.
 - Need for economically viable solutions for the grower.
- If IR-4 had increased funding, priority should be given to food crops, specifically: 1) Residue & Product Performance, 2) Pest problems without solutions, 3) Residue mitigation projects, 4) Organic farming support

Follow-Up Questions

1. Do the survey results align with your perspectives?
2. What would be the most effective way for IR-4 to communicate study results?
3. What unique skilled expertise should IR-4 contribute when designing protocols?
4. If IR-4 were to establish some regional priorities, how would you weigh a national priority vs. a regional priority?
5. What would be important considerations to make when screening biopesticides?