

Rose is a rose is a rose is a rose – double standards to be applied for biorationals?

Donat C

*bio-ferm GmbH, Technopark 1, A-3430 Tulln
christina.donat@bio-ferm.com*

Preparing the efficacy package for a pesticide for the registration as well as for the marketing requires many resources. It can be stated that this requires usually at least a multiple investment compared to the rest of the data requirements to be addressed. Time is money - the field trials need to be performed over several seasons, and as long as the realization is done only on one hemisphere, it is even more time consuming. This shows how important this issue is for the whole production chain: at the end it is an economical question for the farmer to get the best result for his investment.

Plant protection tools are chosen with the aim to reduce the loss in agricultural production and it is important for the user to know what he can expect. In some cases less efficacy may be balanced by other benefits like no preharvest interval, a clear decision for the user should be possible – carefully comparing his expectations with the claims of the product on the label. In Europe plant protection products are evaluated by the competent authorities for their efficacy against the claimed disease or pest, but one has to keep in mind that an evaluation takes place only every ten years. Resistances can occur e.g. of fungal pathogens against chemical fungicides and it will take several years before this fact might be reflected on the label. Even if it is possible for biorational products to show the same efficacy as the chemical reference product, the communication of this fact is much more extensive. Biorationals are under general suspicion to be not as efficient as chemical products; a science based approach – for the risk as well as for the efficacy evaluation - could help to expand the application area of such rational products.