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Abstract

In the abstract should be a short introduction and the main results resp. conclusions. It should be understandable without the rest of the paper. The abstract should not exceed 1000 letters (incl. spaces).

Introduction

In the introduction is the problem in context of the “state of the art” and the goal of the paper explained. Give here an outline of the way of reaching the goal. For example: if it is a scientific paper you write the methodology. If you write a vision paper, how you did it. The introduction should not exceed 1000 letters (incl. spaces). References are not necessary but can be done in following way (Lastname et al. 2003, Lastname and Lastname 2004).

Material and methods

This chapter is only necessary if you have a scientific paper. The material and method chapter is very important to be accepted as scientific paper (if you intend to make one). This chapter is very often very weak in organic publication. If the reader can not clearly understand the way you did your work/paper will loose reputation. You should explain everything what you did and make it possible that somebody could repeat your work. If you need parameter you should explain here. References for parameter are very important or you state them as own design.

Results

This chapter is relevant for all papers. You can use an other title of this chapter. If you write more than one page in this chapter, please use sub-chapters to make it readable. Do not forget: the full paper shall not exceed 4 pages.

Example text (taken from a paper from the IFOAM Modena conference): The milk production and composition data are presented in Table 2. Although no significant differences were found for effective and energy-corrected milk (ECM) yield per cow, in every year the milk yield for the SRH was numerically lower. The energy-corrected milk yield per ha per day was significantly higher in the SRH. Concerning the milk composition no significant differences between the two stocking rates were found. Two exceptions were significant differences for lactose in 2005 and urea in 2006. Both differences are not explainable and, for lactose in 2005, may be accidental. The SCC showed no significant differences. End of Example.

If you use tables, please make it as following example (Table 1):

Table 1: Pre-grazing herbage mass and herbage quality 2004 - 2006

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | High stocking rate (SRH) | Low stocking rate (SRL) |  |
|  | Median | Min. | Max. | Median | Min. | Max. |  |
| HMPrG(kg DMa ha-1) | 1235 | 317 | 2774 | 1165 | 382 | 3234 |  |
| Ash (g kg-1 DMa) | 106 | 81 | 197 | 101 | 84 | 167 | \*\* |
| NDF (g kg-1 DMa) | 459 | 352 | 534 | 475 | 325 | 592 | \* |
| APDN (g kg-1 DMa) | 115 | 87 | 152 | 107 | 74 | 149 | \* |
| NEL (MJ kg-1 DMa) | 6.0 | 5.4 | 7.1 | 6.0 | 5.0 | 6.8 |  |

\* significant at P<0.05 and \*\* significant at P<0.01

a DM: dry matter

If you use figures, please do it as following example (from the same paper as the table above). The figures shall be in black and white color, as simple as possible to make them easy understandable. The letters should not smaller than the letters in this text. A key should be part of the table and the figures. If you use pictures, please in black and white as well. All tables, pictures and figures have a reference in the text and think about property rights of fotos and data. For units please use international standards: e.g. Kilogramm, Celsius, Hektar. If you use their abreviation, please make it always with a space to the number: e.g.: 100 %, 19 kg, 5 °C. Species are written in italic letters: e.g. *Urtica dioica* or *S. aureus.*

Figure 1. Mean skin damage score per location and total score per farm

Discussion

In this chapter you write your understanding, what the results shall tell the Organic sector. This chapter should not exceed 1000 letters (incl. spaces). If you are selected for an oral contribution, this will be the main content of your speach.

Suggestions to tackle with the future challenges of organic animal husbandry

Your paper shall contribute to a joint memorandum of all authors of the conference to give an outline for “tackling the future challenges of Organic Animal Husbandry”. This memorandum will be writen while and after the conference and be published in a scientific journal. This chapter shall give you the chance to contribute with your suggestions to “tackle with the future challenges of Organic Animal husbandry”. Your suggestions should be in context to the paper, but you can “be brave” with your comments, suggestions, recommendations. Please not more than 500 letters.
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