



**AGRIDEMO**

# Case study reports: France CS<sub>3</sub>



AgriDemo-F2F has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 Research and innovation program under grant agreement No 728061

# 1. Background

## Programme

This group of 12 dairy farmers localized in the north east of Brittany meet regularly in an Agroecological group coordinated by the Regional Chamber of Agriculture. The principal objective is to work on autonomy in proteins with an objective to improve the revenue without losing on the quality of life, meaning working time and painfulness. This group exchanges on technical solutions to turn their conventional dairy farming system into a grassland and/or organic dairy system. They meet 6-7 times per year in different events most of the time on a farm of the group: exchanges of the farm system, training session on technical topics, visit of experimental farm and travel in other region or country. In Brittany they are nearly 50 "Agroecological" groups financed by regional and national programs with the same organisation but on different topics: pesticide, veterinary med, fuel...

## Funding and Governance

At the beginning the Chamber of agriculture organised a meeting on soils with the farmers in the local area. Finally there were two topics on which they wanted to work, it was either soil or self-sufficiency in proteins. The group began with this meeting. Then they subscribe to the national program and were labelled as an agroecological group with the project to improve their dairy farms self-sufficiency in protein. The group and the Chamber of agriculture had 75 000 € for 3 years to reach their goal. The dairy farmers suggest the ideas, orientate the works to do on their farm and with the group. So their role is to give directions, make decisions and experiment technical solutions on their farms. Farmers also suggest the form of the meeting, the content, and then organise the agenda... Moreover, they communicate a lot on the results of their projects: they host students, groups of breeders, journalists...

The facilitator of the Chamber of agriculture advises the farmers and follows the experiments they try to improve the self-sufficiency in proteins. She also organises the meeting, finds the resources according to the questions the farmers are being asked. She also facilitates the meeting with technical experts and organises the communication: demonstration, leaflet, article... She also manages the project budget.

## Actors and networks

The main actors for the group the demo activity are the dairy farmers and the facilitator. They work with other dairy groups in Brittany, ask to experts to come and train them to improve their knowledge and find solutions on several topics: economic, grazing, feed, veterinary...

## How it works

During summer the farmers decide of an annual program of 5-6 meetings. They find the topics, choose the expert and the farm to visit. Sometimes there is no expert but only results exchanges and discussion between them. The coordinator helps them to choose the most pertinent subject, organises the meeting, finds the experts and manages the program. The coordinator collects data, analyses and presents the farmer's results.

## Event Farm and location

The farm which supports this case study is a conventional dairy farm: 1 young farmer, 50ha (32 ha grassland, 11 ha maize, 7ha barley), 390 000 l of milk with 55 cows and 25 heifers. He tries to produce milk with the maximum of grazing. The farm is located at Landéan.

[https://www.google.fr/maps?q=land%C3%A9an&um=1&ie=UTF-8&sa=X&ved=oahUKEwjs46yq7-fdAhURVhoKHelpCB8Q\\_AUICigB](https://www.google.fr/maps?q=land%C3%A9an&um=1&ie=UTF-8&sa=X&ved=oahUKEwjs46yq7-fdAhURVhoKHelpCB8Q_AUICigB)

The demo was on the 14th of June, due to weather conditions only 5 farmers attend to the meeting. The meeting set up on a farm of the group. During the coffee break farmers exchanged on the grazing management during spring. Each farmer presents what he did, his problem and his solution to deal with heifer parasitism. Then the expert presents parasitism cycle, solution to manage it without treatment. During the visit the farmer presents his heifer raising.

## 2. Method

In line with the Methodological Guidelines, three main data sources are used: a background document and interviews at Programme and Farm level to analyse structural and functional characteristics, and event tools and surveys to analyse event level participation and learning, as follows:

1. A background document for every case study was completed by the AgriDemo-F2F partner who carried out the case study.
2. Interviews with representatives of programme/networks (level 1) and farm level interviews with demonstrators/hosts (Level 1) to reveal how the functional and structural characteristics enable learning. Analysis of these interviews is reported in Sections 3 and 4. Data is sourced from interviews with 1 Programme/Network member and one Farm level interviewee. The analysis followed 4 themes: (1) Coordinating effective recruitment of host farmers and participants, (2) Developing and coordinating appropriate interaction approaches, (3) Planning, designing and conducting appropriate demonstration processes, (4) Enabling learning appropriate to purpose, audience, context, (5) Follow-up activities.
3. Event tools and surveys (Level 3) to reveal peer to peer learning processes. Event details and analysis is reported in Section 5. This data is sourced from 4 pre and post demonstration surveys for participants, 1 pre and post survey for the demonstrator and an event observation tool completed by an observing researcher. This data is mainly used for the analysis of learning processes and learning outcomes related to the specific event and overall comments on the effectiveness of the event.

Finally, partners reviewed the case study reports to prepare their workshops with different stakeholders related to the case studies. These workshops aimed at validating the data presented in the case study reports and to discuss on key characteristics related to effectiveness of demonstrations. The workshop for the French case studies took place on the 9<sup>th</sup> of November, 2018.

### 3. Structural characteristics

#### T1: Programme/network level

##### 1. The main organisations involved in the demonstration activities and their roles

###### *Agriculture ecologiquement performante" (AEP) programme / project / network*

In Brittany they are nearly 50 "Agroecological" groups coordinated by the Regional Chamber of Agriculture on several different topics such as pesticide, veterinary med, fuel (Poster). This case study has to do with one of those groups, which consists of 12 dairy farmers, in the north east of Brittany. The farmers' group meets regularly (6-7 times per year) in different events, most of the times on a farm of the group. There is an intense knowledge exchange on the farm system, some training sessions on technical topics, visits of experimental farm and travel in other region or country. The programme is coordinated by a facilitator of the Chamber of Agriculture. More specifically the programme "Agriculture ecologiquement performante" (AEP) is run by the Regional Council of the Chamber of agriculture. It is an entirely bottom-up project as all crucial decisions are made at the thematic meetings of the farmers' group itself. The farmers' group works also with other dairy groups in Brittany. The AEP network/programme is connected to other networks, projects and/or organisation, while there are efforts of the group to connect with other farmers' groups or networks in the region such as other chamber of agriculture groups/programmes or employees, the ERN group at Vitre, a breeder from CEDAPA network, AgriPass etc. So there are some visits and exchanges of the group on/with other farms/groups, networks or institutions mainly in Brittany but also abroad. The group is open to new entries; any interested farmer can participate or attend for a little time or freely exit. Some people may attend as far as they interested for a specific topic. The facilitator or the breeder themselves invite relative persons to join. Some of the farmers in the group belong or have contacts with other networks.

Yes so there's the AEP network, (...) so there's a group that we could solicit, it's true that we didn't do it much yet/ Then there are groups of the Chambers of Agri, colleagues that we know well, we went to visit an ERN group of FG at Vitre for example, and then we are connected to other networks, for example we went to see... a breeder from CEDAPA recently, in the department 22. And then we went to see ...the Chamber of Agri too. And then in the very beginning on meslin, they were... in relation with the network [indistinct] where we went to see... then we've organised events on the topic, same with experimental farms, all the Chamber of Agri... [indistinct]... we went to see [indistinct], so they were also farms... in Normandy we also were. So there's this, then there are breeders who... they participate also sometimes in other programs, individually... So it's true that it's mostly in Britany, and then there's the trip in Ireland as well, so I don't know if. (...) One of the objectives of this project is also to connect institutions and so on. But you see...we have contacts to breeders for the next time. (Programme interviewee)

Yes so they got an AEP project, so it was a project of the Regional Council, they got founding for three years, so it's for training of groups like the dairy group, classic groups but also experimental, for individual domains, and for other forms, for example here we will travel... for example other forms of openness, in order to progress. So there's this project that is coming to an end, three years ago it was possible to get an extension for the programme, we had two prolongations. (Programme interviewee)

It's true that in projects "Agriculture ecologiquement performante" (AEP) there's a committee and it's true that practically there's no... There's no really... there's no committee that meets apart from thematic meetings where we... it's a group of breeders who decides, there's no external person who... participates with their suggestions. It's really only breeders. Yes and so there's no person in charge of the group either, there's a... we can say... there are breeders who are leaders a little, but there's a few of them as well.... there are core people in the group on whom we can rely, in the end me in any case I can rely on them in order to schedule dates and stuff like this. (Programme interviewee)

The group began with this meeting. Then they subscribe to the national program and were labelled as an agroecological group with the project to improve their dairy farms self-sufficiency in protein. The

group and the Chamber of agriculture had 75 000 € for three years to reach their goal (Background info)

Yes we try... within the framework of Bassin Versant we are somewhat obliged to do it, we look at mobilisation on the territory and... So it's true, I think that there was a... there were farmers who mobilised themselves who wished to... former groups, the youth too, who's seen the group function and felt like joining one, and that's what they did. So the group wasn't created just for this, but it contributed to it, because there were questions about it at the beginning so it favoured the creation of another group and then individual changes. (Programme interviewee)

I didn't say... we invite... sometime we invite more too... we try to expand because... because sometimes there are people who leave the group, people who arrive and they are... they are breeders sometimes in the group that like to transmit. So we try to open to other breeders as well, particularly via flash techniques when we do... at the Bassin Versant for example so we try to open... it will be breeders who ask themselves questions about their farming system, production system, who want to evolve, who search to be accompanied, search for ideas. So it's either me who invited them or breeders who invite them, it's the best when it's them anyhow. (Programme interviewee)

It's a lot when it's themselves, when they manage to invite someone that they know, through their networks. Because, in this way, we have two in a group... Yeah, it works better like this, but then I also invite, but it works not so well. (Programme interviewee)

Yeah, that is to say that the visits... when it's visits... of the farm... visits... of other farms on a different sector yeah. It's easy to implement [indistinct]. There are certain who don't necessarily want to be a part of the group on the long term. (Programme interviewee)

## CETA

The specific farm where the event occurred is connected to other demo farms and/or other knowledge exchange organisations like CETA of Louvigné region, independently from the AEP programme. Many different kind of training initiatives occur in the frame of CETA such as self-sufficiency in proteins, revenue improvement, genetics, CAP, trimming, essential oils, forage crops, grasslands, grazing, everything that concerns a farm. Some training visits are included under these initiatives, which are not connected to the AEP's groups meeting. Some meetings occurs each year in the frame of the CETA departmental network. The farm's performance, accountings and average numbers are extensively discussed on the scale of the department (Farmer).

Yes, with the CETA. Q: And CETA, how many farms are in this group?

R: Hmmm, I'm in the CETA of Louvigné, we are 8 or 9. Q: OK and how does a CETA work? R: It's the same, but CETA is independent. And also it's both VIVEA and farmers that pay for training. Q: Which training did you do with CETA? R: I'm with CETA since the very beginning, I've done trainings such as: become self-sufficient in proteins, how to improve my revenue, genetics, CAP - how it works, trimming, essential oils, forage crops, grasslands, grazing, everything that concerns a farm, the work, penalties. (Farmer).

Q: Do you discuss about it sometimes? I don't know, for example follow-up on costs of milk production? R: Yeah, I even see at CETA, we really... the first meetings in a year we take the figures, accounting and we put it on the table, and then thanks to the CETA departmental network we can see average numbers on the scale of the department. So then we can compare ourselves with others, it's then that we see... or what's good or not. (Farmer)

## 2. The main actors involved in the demonstration activities and their roles

The main actors engaged in this group's demo activities are the dairy farmers and the facilitator. They work with other dairy groups in Brittany, invite experts to come and train them to improve their knowledge and find solutions on several topics: economic, grazing, feed, veterinary etc.

### *The Initiators*

The initiator was an employee of the Chamber of the agriculture, some years ago. After a first meeting at the watershed of Haut Couesnon, the Chamber of agriculture organised a new meeting with the farmers in the local area in order to select a topic to work on as a group. The farmers concluded to two different topics on which they wanted to work, (soil or self-sufficiency in proteins). The group began with this meeting, and thereafter they subscribed to the national program and were labelled as an agroecological group with the project to improve their dairy farms self-sufficiency in protein.

The objectives were decided at the very beginning, the very beginning, so it wasn't me, it was my colleague who initiated this, I think after the first meeting... at the watershed of Haut Couesnon, she's in charge of mobilisation so she'd invited them. A meeting on soils took place at the beginning, and then finally there were two topics on which they wanted to work, it was either soil or self-sufficiency in proteins, and they ended up voting, they chose the latter, because there are many breeders in this area. So this is how it started... Q: It was decided by the breeders? R: It was decided by the breeders, yeah. And then every time it's discussed, the topics, every time the breeders... let's say at least once a year (Programme interviewee).

### *Facilitator*

As already mentioned the whole process is coordinated/ managed by a facilitator of the Chamber of Agriculture. The facilitator advises farmers and follow the experiments they implement on their farms. The facilitator also organises the group's meetings and finds the resources according to the farmer's needs. S/he also facilitates the meetings with technical experts and organises the communication part such as demonstrations, leaflets, articles etc. The coordinator also collects data, analyse and present the farmer's results. Finally she is in charge of the project's budget management.

The breeders of the group are the initiators and the leaders in relation to the topics/themes selected as well as the content and the form of the demos. They also choose the possible experts they need at their meetings and the farm that they are going to visit etc. The facilitator after consultation with colleagues from the chamber of agriculture sometime mediates to the group by proposing some suitable/reference farms out of the group concerning a topic the group have decided. All crucial decisions are taken by the dairy farmers who belong to the group through their meetings. The coordinator also helps the farmers to choose the most pertinent subject or makes some propositions on emerged topics/issues. They usually plan and organise the agenda of the group's actions. The facilitator simply facilitates and schedules the dates/time of these meetings and coordinate the processes and the activities, based on farmers' decisions. Finally the facilitator during the demo meetings keeps some kind of discipline, to the whole processes and offers a minimum framework of "formality" to ensure a successful event. Feedback and evaluation processes are totally informal in the framework of the meetings. The facilitator asks some feedback through open/informal discussions but only on the content of the meeting and not on the form of it. They do not evaluate the meeting formally i.e. through surveys.

It's really only breeders. Yes and so there's no person in charge of the group either, there's a... we can say... there are breeders who are leaders a little, but there's a few of them as well.... there are core people in the group on whom we can rely, in the end me in any case I can rely on them in order to schedule dates and stuff like this. (Programme interviewee + Background info)

Oftentimes, as I said, we refer to the yearly planning, the facilitators let us know about upcoming meetings on that day at this hour, either by email or post. There's a sort of an invitation containing the theme, subjects that will be talked about, the place and the time. Then you answer: participating or not, and this is how it's done. (Farmer)

...In the group management? It's them who will suggest... who will initiate, suggest, who will... the ideas... who will orientate a little the works of the group, so their role is to give directions, make decisions. And organise too, because sometimes they will suggest the form, the content, and then

organise the agenda... very practical issues, in order to book the site, things like this...And your role in the organisation of the talks, visits, topics, the group life?

My role is to facilitate... there's facilitation, organisation of the day... trials, it's finding the resources according to the questions that are being asked. Organise as well everything with regard to communication. All the communications as well because we have open doors, things like this, demonstrations. So I accompany them daily, about all sort of things, it can also be an individual person sometimes. But then oftentimes they're rather... highly competent, often I find experts on specific topics too. (Programme interviewee)

Oftentimes we start with half an hour of talking about agriculture, we discuss about everything and nothing, during when people still arrive at the meeting, and then we take a coffee. Then the facilitator tries to bring a bit of an order because otherwise it becomes the... So then we often start with the news, what's happening more or less, around us, we always come back to the question of milk price or topics that irritate us, like the CAP, we don't know why... Then we come back to the topic, and then everyone has time to speak out, to know what's happening on their farm. So this is the morning, it's in a room, and the afternoon is often a site visit on a farm that hosts us. (Farmer)

Q: So to keep some discipline, what's the best in your opinion? R: Often it's the facilitator who puts everyone on track a little. Q: And it's necessary? R: Well yeah, because if there was no facilitator... let's assume that there was no facilitator but... it serves no purpose to do training on a topic, it's better to organise a meal, a meal in a style that we talk a bit about everything and nothing. (Farmer)

During summer the farmers decide of an annual program of 5-6 meeting. They find the topics, choose the expert and the farm to visit. Sometimes there is no expert but only results exchanges and discussion between them. The coordinator help them to choose the most pertinent subject, organise the meeting, find the experts and manage the program. The coordinator collect data, analyses and present the farmer's results. (Background info)

#### *The host farmers – members of the dairy group*

As already mentioned all crucial decisions are taken by the dairy farmers who belong to the group during their meetings. So, the host farmers are always involved in the development of the individual demonstration activities as members of the groups. More specifically, the dairy farmers suggest the ideas/ directions and orientate the work to do both on their farm and with the group.

The breeders of the group are the leaders in relation to the topics/themes selection, the content and the form of the demos. However it is important to mention that these topics are selected from a predefined-general frame of the training organisation, led by the Chamber of Agriculture. They also choose the possible experts they need at their meetings and the farms that they are going to visit etc. There is a yearly planning meeting of the group, usually in summer, where farmers decide on the annual program. In those meetings they plan and organise together the agenda of the group's training actions. The farmers usually decide on 5-7 "demo-meetings" per year in the group's farms, during which they have extensive discussions and knowledge exchange, along with an on farm walk/site visit. Finally the group's farmers are experimenting on several technical solutions on their farms and they communicate the results of their projects. For those farmers who are experimenting with some trials, the farmers-attendees have the chance to walk around, watch and discuss. Each host farmer is always the presenter/demonstrator of this farm. The host farmers sometimes are involved in the development of the overall demonstration programme through the evaluation surveys and feedback to the programme level. The host farmers always make some preparation for a meeting (the figures in relation to the farm operations, a room for everyone, a video-projector etc.). However it is intended not to over-organise the meetings as the free /spontaneous expression and discussion is a priority. The host farmers sometime assess the extent of influence (diffusion) from their demonstrations in a totally informal way through direct discussions with region's participants (but not among non-participants).

Q: How is the programme/network managed? R: In theory perhaps it should be... there's no... No but it's true that in projects "Agriculture ecologiquement performante" (AEP) there's a committee and it's true that practically there's no... There's no really... there's no committee that meets apart from thematic meetings where we... it's a group of breeders who decides, there's no external person who... participates with their suggestions. It's really only breeders. Yes and so there's no person in charge of the group either, there's a... we can say... there are breeders who are leaders a little, but there's a few of them as well.... there are core people in the group on whom we can rely, in the end me in any case I can rely on them in order to schedule dates and stuff like this (Programme interviewee).

Q: Who are the main people involved in the demonstration activities and what are their roles? R: Yes so here it's really dairy farmers, their role in the group in the end? Yeah. In the group management? It's them who will suggest... who will initiate, suggest, who will... the ideas... who will orientate a little the works of the group, so their role is to give directions, make decisions. And organise too, because sometimes they will suggest the form, the content, and then organise the agenda... very practical issues, in order to book the site, things like this. They can also participate. And then communicate as well, they communicate a lot, it's their role too. (Programme interviewee)

Q: Are host farmers involved in the development of the individual demonstration activities? T: Always. Always, yeah, we have already explained, through the programme development, training, introduction... With regard to... Communication as well, after they call me... Yeah it happens, for example, we've organised open door in January, it's them who've been contacted by the outside and who were saying "yeah I'd like that we talk... that we talk..." they were choosing with whom they wanted to present, that we present, that the group presents, and on which topic. So even if sometimes they're solicited by the outside... yeah (Programme interviewee)

Q: Are host farmers involved in the development of the overall demonstration programme? R: Sometimes. Yeah there were... so I don't know, there were meetings, evaluations, so they were engaged to give feedback. Then the surveys, like two sociological surveys that the group has participated in, so certain breeders were interviewed individually, there's an intern who's also come to the training. (Programme interviewee)

Oh it comes like it is. No, but, it's... when we prepare... there's always some preparation, get all the figures, all that, because we don't remember everything by heart, but, I want to say, otherwise it comes like this because the problem is that if we prepare a lot, often the problem is that it can be... if we off topic too much... yeah. So the best is to speak and answer like it comes. Then for preparation there needs to be a room to host everyone, have a video projector, there are little things like this but apart from this... yeah. (Farmer)

Q: How are demonstration topics selected? R: Yeah it comes from the farmers rather, but then me when I know that there are some that talked to be about one subject or if I have the impression that there's an emerging topic, I can also suggest... on the same day. (Programme interviewee)

Q: So it comes entirely from farmers? R: Yeah, yeah. Yeah, because there are only farmers who have experience in... because in the end we discuss about the topics but talk a lot about experience of everyone. This is what... me for example, let's assume a technique or... this will make me say "yes I do it or I don't do it" is the experience of others. Because I know that they did it, that they tried. But then I think, in the group... What's good about these groups is that people try. If it fails, it fails, if it works, even better... personally, what I feel that people from the groups try, they do trials! Then they see what happens, then they talk about it, they say "here, I tried this, this works, this doesn't work" and we say "this could be interesting" or sometimes we tell them "it would be better if you tried again but rather like this or like this". But it's mainly trials, I see that we do it a lot here. So there you go, it's an example of a trial. When the meeting is on a farm of a person who does trials, we walk around, we watch, we discuss. Or when I tried essential oils, I saw it functioned well, I continued... yeah (Farmer)

It's not easy, but then we can be sure sometimes, via discussions, that... yeah, I think there's influence more or less happens more in an informal way. If it happens sometimes, I talk again about essential oils, one time he told me, a guy who... who had a problem... Q: A guy from the group? R: Yeah, a guy

from the group, let's assume that the guy didn't ask himself the question during the meeting because he didn't have this problem and now... let's say there's a meeting two months later after the essential oil meeting, he tells me "hey, do you put essential oil for the calves, I don't know anymore, could you give me the product because I'd like to try" and voila, this is how this happens. (Farmer)

The Farmer (the host farmer) does not belong to the AEP group, although he has attended some group's meetings in the past. He is actively involved in the overall development of demos at the programme/network level at CETA. He does not hold any elected or appointed roles in any farm organisations or networks (Post host farmer interview).

I'm more rather of a free electron, I don't belong to the group in itself, I've gone to meetings once or twice, that's all. Q: OK, so the planning of the group is done by the group as a whole or is there like a small bureau like in an association? R: It functions via email. I think that the group, each farmer of the group has to think about topics, because there are 7 or 8 meetings in a year with 7 different topics, farmers think about the topics that they want to talk about I think. And then they discuss during a meeting and then they plan like this. Q: Do you know how many farmers are in the group? R: Around 10, I believe. Q: And only dairy farmers? R: Yes, yes (Farmer)

Q: Are you involved in the overall development of demos at the prog./network level? R: Yes. Yes, in the CETA, because as I said, it's a little like AEP groups, it's us who prepare the training agendas. (Farmer)

#### *Audience / type of participants*

The farmers of the group communicate actively to other entities what is really going on, on their farms. The intended audience is regional dairy farmers, groups of breeders. They also hosts students out of the frame of the group meetings. Attendance is in most cases from the existing group but sometimes other interested farmers also attend. Generally the group intends to host farmers who are open-minded and have a strong willingness to evolve and to speak in a transparent way. It is mentioned also that there are many competitive structures/organisations for local development such as CETA, AgroBio, Adage etc. This may influence the group meetings' attendance.

Q: Who is your intended audience? R: So it's dairy farmers, they're more on the watershed of Haut Couesnon because it originates from a watershed action. It's spread since then, and so it's rather breeders, do you want me to talk about profile of the breeders or not..? Yeah, if you wish, yeah. There are profiles of innovative breeders who want to progress, who are curious so rather this profile in this group, who are rather dynamic, we can say the majority has this profile. And so the initial system was a classical system we will say, conventional, with a corn part, some who were on grass, two out of ten of breeders, who had... who had an important part of grass. (Programme interviewee)

we try to expand because... because sometimes there are people who leave the group, people who arrive and they are... they are breeders sometimes in the group that like to transmit. So we try to open to other breeders as well, particularly via flash techniques when we do... at the Bassin Versant for example so we try to open... (Programme interviewee)

It's true that there are people that we tried to for example... I speak of those that we tried to engage about a group of young people who had come, for example because there were programs MAE as well so we have targeted those people ,because they were evolving and we said to ourselves "it could be interesting that they come join this group". Then there are people, it's very complicated, it's groups in general, there is a strong competition in the sector with the... Already many organisations for development like dairy. So we still talk about it with the breeders, we have the CETA, we have many structures, like AgroBio, Adage. There is lots of competition so the Farmers at some point, maybe they are... (Programme interviewee)

Q: Who is your intended audience? R: its dairy farmers from the region (Farmer).

The transparency... nothing else than transparency and that you come here without any prejudice... or you come here, it's not to criticise, I think that people feel it, it's done like this. I think that nothing else than transparency and... Let's say... having no opinion, having an open spirit, yeah. I think who comes here with definite ideas, we can't... we can't change their practices or anything at all, they don't put themselves in question "me I do it like this, it's been 20 years", I think that such people have nothing to do here. Yeah, I think it's the transparency and having an open mind are two elements that... so that the group can be... can have free and open discussions. (Farmer)

Q: Who typically attends your demonstrations activities? [So we already talked about this, its dairy farmers... do you ever host other people or is it really limited to group members?]R: It's limited to the group but... sometimes it happens that there are farmers who are interested to join... often... it's normal that we invite them. Then there are external speakers, for example vets or other people. (Farmer)

### 3. Experts and advisers

As already mentioned the chamber of agriculture sometime facilitates the meeting with a specific technical expert for each occasion. This is usually decided upon group farmers' request. In addition, external expert speakers such as vets or advisers are invited at the meetings for the needs of a specific issue.

I said it in the beginning, it allows to see something else than one's own farm... one needs to see something else to improve, it allows to have experiences of other farmers, good or not so good. It's about having multiple feedbacks from external experts like vets or people who do multiple innovations. What is good is that we meet different people, different systems... different ways of doing things, that's what's rich. Sometimes we do things that we realise could be done more easily because someone else has done it with a different method and we realise that it is simpler so... so we implement the same method on our farm. (Farmer)

### 4. Resources, finances and incentives

The "Agriculture ecologiquement performante" (AEP) is founded by a project of the Regional Council for 3 years, for the training of groups such as dairy group, classic or experimental groups etc. The specific group and the Chamber of agriculture had 75 000 € for 3 years to reach their goal (background info). If the financial needs exceeds the total budget, then it is supplementary auto-financed from the budget of the Chamber of Agriculture. The project does not seem to offer any incentives to farmers to host demonstration activities, as it seems that in the context of the programme there are not any direct payments to farmers. However the farmers are benefited by trainings, analyses, small equipment, seeds for trials, trips etc. (Programme interviewee and Farmer)

In addition there are activities organised in the host farmer's farm under the group facilitated by CETA. Activities within this group's works are financed by VIVEA and to a lesser extent Bassin Versant (BEVI). VIVEA is a French organisation that finances training activities in agriculture. Bassin Versant (BEVI) seems to finance activities that aren't eligible for VIVEA (Farmer). Both VIVEA and farmers pay for these trainings but it seems that this is not the case for AEP's groups' trainings.

Q: What are the funding arrangements for your demo activities? How do these impact on the lifespan of the farm demo? R: Difficult question. I know there's VIVEA, it's for sure, but I don't know more. Q: So can you explain what VIVEA is? R: It's an organisation that finances training activities in agriculture. It's on a European level... [It's French] Ah it's French? I believed it was European. [No, it's French... It's true that events like this are mostly financed by VIVEA, but VIVEA will not finance the entire time that Anne spends on it so...] Ah then I don't know. I believe there's also Bassin Versant to some extent. [Then you're also a group that is financed by the region of Brittany, they finance farmer groups like this notably working on environment, economic deficiency, herb production] OK. [That

must finance the time that Anne spends on this project, if there's a whole in the financing, it must be auto-financing that comes from the budget of the Chamber of Agriculture]. (Farmer)

Yes so they got an AEP project, so it was a project of the Regional Council, they got founding for three years, so it's for training of groups like the dairy group, classic groups but also experimental, for individual domains, and for other forms, for example here we will travel. For example other forms of openness, in order to progress. So there's this project that is coming to an end, three years ago it was possible to get an extension for the programme, we had two prolongations. And then we also have the Watershed who's financed the submission of the AEP project, because time is needed to develop this project, and then also first meetings for breeders to agree on the topic, what they wanted to do etc. And now that it's coming to an end we will submit another AEP project, it's ambitious because they'll finance another group rather, in this case I think it'll be VIVEA or Bassin Versant (BEVI) financing for activities that aren't eligible for VIVEA. For example we have stuff like... [indistinct], things like this, which are financed by BEVI. (Programme interviewee)

Q: Do you offer any incentives to farmers to host demonstration activities? R: No. With this AEP programme, they had... they really had advantages, because everything was paid for by the region, for the trainings, analyses, for example hay, they did it a lot, for small equipment, or for seeds for trials. Within the framework of open doors we don't necessarily have... So it's rather because they belong to AEP...

Yeah there were no advantages. Now we have the trip too, that is paid for. (Programme interviewee)

## 5. Human Resources

The demonstrator of the case study has received training in order to become demonstrator (Pre survey demonstrator). However he agreed that he could benefit from some extra training as a demonstrator (Post survey demonstrator).

## 6. The decision-making process in organising demonstrations

The Chamber of the agriculture has initiated a meeting on soils, with the farmers in the local area in order to select a topic to work on as a group, some years before. During this meeting the farmers concluded to two different topics on which they wanted to work, (soil or self-sufficiency in proteins). After this the farmers voted and chose the self-sufficiency in proteins topic to work on. So from that first meeting it seems that the decision making processes are quite inclusive.

Thereafter all crucial decisions are taken by the dairy farmers who belong to the group through their meetings. There is a yearly planning meeting of the group where farmers decide on the annual program. At those meetings they plan and organise together the agenda of the group's training actions. The farmers votes in order to conclude to several decisions. It seems also that the facilitator of the group is also voting. The processes are almost entirely bottom-up and farmers jointly make their own decisions. The breeders of the group are the leaders in relation to the topics/themes selection, the content and the form of the demos. However it is important to mention that these topics are selected from a predefined- general frame of the training organisation. Furthermore, the coordinator helps farmers to select the most pertinent subject. It seems also that some farmers of the group could be more active at the whole process and some kind of leaders, but it seems that there is no hierarchy at the whole concept. It is only peers who intend to work better through their involvement at the group.

So the principal objective is a group working on autonomy in proteins, in any case, this is how it started, with an objective to improve the revenue and then... without losing on the quality of life, meaning working time and painfulness. So being self-sufficient in proteins... seemed like the way to go for them in order to increase their revenue, it started in this context... I think that we had a little of prices... prices of milk, high input prices and then milk prices that were a little low, so... so the objectives were decided at the very beginning, very beginning, so it wasn't me, it was my colleague

(...) who's initiated this, I think after the first meeting... at the watershed of Haut Couesnon, she's in charge of mobilization so she'd invited them. A meeting on soils took place at the beginning, and then finally there were two topics on which they wanted to work, it was either soil or self-sufficiency in proteins, and they ended up voting, they chose the latter, because there are many breeders in this area. So this is how it started...It was decided by the breeders? It was decided by the breeders, yeah. And then every time it's discussed, the topics, every time the breeders... let's say at least once a year. (Programme interviewee)

How is the programme/network managed? In theory perhaps it should be... there's no... No but it's true that in projects "Agriculture ecologiquement performante" (AEP) there's a committee and it's true that practically there's no... There's no really... there's no committee that meets apart from thematic meetings where we... it's a group of breeders who decides, there's no external person who... participates with their suggestions. It's really only breeders. Yes and so there's no person in charge of the group either, there's a... we can say... there are breeders who are leaders a little, but there's a few of them as well.... there are core people in the group on whom we can rely, in the end me in any case I can rely on them in order to schedule dates and stuff like this. (Programme interviewee)

Q: OK. And how is it decided that you go to one farmer and not the other and which subject you talk about? R: It's A who chose, she called me one day and said "would there be a possibility to... to have a meeting on your farm about parasitism" and I said "yeah, no problem" and you see, that's how it's done. Q: Do you know... on the subject of parasitism, did she decide it with the bureau or farmers? R: No, they must've done a planning or a training agenda with the group, and so each... there's a day devoted to each topic. There was already a day planned in advance for the whole year, and everyone hosts on a topic of their choice in order to be a reference farm. (Farmer)

So there is one day devoted to programme design, here we vote if we want, but in the end with this group, sometimes I was not doing it in the beginning, and it's true that it wasn't bad, contrary to VIVEA, where sometimes we could allow ourselves because sometimes when they move it goes very fast and sometimes we readjust, so VIVEA or dairy groups, we foresee a year in advance, and then sometimes there are needs that appear on the way, so we readjust often questions that are asked. Or I readjust. (Programme interviewee)

Q: How are demonstration topics selected? R: Yeah it comes from the farmers rather, but then me when I know that there are some that talked to be about one subject or if I have the impression that there's an emerging topic, I can also suggest... on the same day. (Programme interviewee)

## 7. Goal/ objectives

At group's meetings extensive discussion and knowledge exchange occurs accompanied with a visit on the farm's site. During these meetings on a farmer's farm, participants discuss extensively about the topics but also express their own experiences to others. They intend to improve their situation and the profitability of their businesses.

The objective is to discuss with other farmers, not to stay closed up at our place. And then to learn too... about different techniques or methods that can be improved the profitability of a farm. (Farmer)

I said it in the beginning, it allows to see something else than one's own farm... one needs to see something else to improve, it allows to have experiences of other farmers, good or not so good. It's about having multiple feedbacks from external experts like vets or people who do multiple innovations. Sometimes we do things that we realise could be done more easily because someone else has done it with a different method and we realise that it is simpler so... so we implement the same method on our farm. (Farmer)

## T2: Farm (event) level

### 8. The farm, the topic and the practices demonstrated

The demonstration event took place on a commercial farm. It is a conventional average sized dairy farm of 50 ha (32 ha grassland, 11 ha maize, 7ha barley). The farmer owns 55 cows and 25 heifers producing 390 000 L. of milk. He tries to produce milk based on grassland and the maximum possible grazing (Post host farmer interview). There were no comparative layouts in the field (Observation tool). The host farmer is participating at the local agroecological group of dairy farmer network / programme, the last few years (Post host farmer interview). Most of the demonstration events organised on the specific farm are often a balance between room and field session. The main objectives of the meeting was heifers' parasitism management (Poster). The topic was quite technical and farmers wanted to improve their economic results by improving the heifer growth (Observation tool).

Both programme and farmers stated that the demonstrations organised by their organisation/or on the specific farm respectively are a mixture of exemplary and experimental approaches. Their views concerning the most preferable demo approach are not identical. The farmer believes that a mixture of experimental and exemplary approaches is better. The Programme interviewee believes that exemplary approaches are more preferable. The specific event was also classified as a mixture of experimental and exemplary approaches (Post survey demonstrator).

**Topic:** Parasitism on heifer (Observation tool).

### 9. Group size and characteristics

The meeting in June 2018 has been organised for the existing farmers' group. Due to weather conditions 6 farmers attended the meeting (Observation tool). All participants interviewed were dairy farmers worked in the local area and were part of the same network (Post participant's survey + Pre demonstration survey participant). This group exists since 4 years and meet 4-5 times a year, so they knew well each other (Observation tool). The group has a long term project and will keep on working on this topic (Observation tool +Pre survey demonstrator).

### 10. Actor's role

#### *Participants/ Group's farmers*

As already mentioned the meeting was set up on a farm of the group. During the meeting the farmers exchanged information and experiences in relation to the grazing management during spring. Each participant explained to the group which solutions he had tried on his farm to deal with heifer parasitism. They presented the problems they face and how they work on them and possible solutions (Observation tool). On the one hand all participants felt actively or very actively involved during the whole demonstration process (Post participant's survey). On the other hand, the demonstrator stated that participants (farmers, advisers, researchers etc.) were not involved in the overall development of this demonstration. According to him, the farm was simply a farmer's of the group example, offering an occasion for individual talk (Post survey demonstrator). However if farmers participants are the groups farmers they are always involved in the development of the individual demonstration activities as members of the groups (Programme interviewee).

As already mentioned possibly the two different groups the farmer participates to, result to some conflicting statements and info in some of the info provided.

#### *Expert*

An expert on the specific issue/topic was present at the meeting. The expert gave some global knowledge and tools to deal with parasitism. More specifically he presented parasitism's cycle and some solutions to manage the parasite without treatment (Poster).

#### *Host farmer*

During the visit the host farmer presented his farm, his heifer raising and the techniques he follows. The host farmer led the farm visit (Observation tool)

#### *Facilitator/ group's coordinator*

At the meeting there was a facilitator who managed/guided the questions and the open discussion that followed. The facilitator stimulated discussions but also tried to maintain the focus on the topic. The facilitator is a dairy adviser and knew very well each farmer (Observation tool).

#### *Demonstrator*

The demonstrator interviewed was a project manager worked at the local area (Pre survey demonstrator). The demonstrator explained the main protocol to avoid parasitism through some different ways (theory, practices, examples etc.). More specifically he provided some methods, tools and knowledge to the farmers. The demonstrator also stimulated the question and tried to maintain focus on the topic as the facilitator does (Observation tool).

### 11. Duration

According to available data the meeting's duration was half a day. The demonstrator felt that a full-day meeting would have been more appropriate (Post survey demonstrator).

### 12. Frequency and timing

The group meets 6-7 times per year in different events, most of the time on a farm of a farmer's group (Poster). These demonstrations occur at the specific farm ones per year (Post host farmer interview). According to the demonstrator the specific meeting was successful because it was a second meeting on this topic and the topic was held on the right time for the farmer's needs (Post survey demonstrator).

### 13. Farm's infrastructures or arrangements

The host farmer had made some arrangements for hosting the specific event. He has prepared a room and coffee for the meeting (Post host farmer interview).

### 14. Accessibility

The travel time of participants to reach the demo farm, was identical for all of the participants, 15 minutes. Two out of four participants rated their travel effort to participate as little effort, and the rest did not answer the relative question (Pre demonstration survey participant).

### 15. Fees for participation

All of the participants did not have to pay a fee to attend the demonstration. Moreover, none of the participants had received any financial compensation for its attendance (Post participant's survey).

## 16. Time as a constraint factor

Lack of time has been pointed out as a restrictive factor for new entries to the existing farmers group. It is also restrictive for organising some important functions at the programme level as for example the continuous engagement of participants after each demonstration.

So we need to think how to make people come to the group... We feel like... There is a lack of time either because there are already other groups or because they don't have time because... The youth are in structures that are more complex. (Programme interviewee)

Q: Do you - at the programme level - continue to engage participants after the demonstrations? R: Yes, but not enough in my opinion, sometimes there's some lack of... time for follow-up, I don't always have enough time to sacrifice for an individual person, but this could be not too bad. So I do it, perhaps it's not good enough, I do it quite often, not other colleagues who intervene... [Indistinct]. (Programme interviewee)

## 4. Functional characteristics

### T1: Coordinating effective recruitment of host farmers and participants

#### 17. Incentives

The Farmer was unclear about the details of the project funding. There was some funding from VIVEA, a French organisation that finances training activities in agriculture. The project was not solely funded by VIVEA, however the farmer named no other funders. Host farmers were not paid.

Difficult question. I know there's VIVEA, it's for sure, but I don't know more. [So can you explain what VIVEA is?] It's an organisation that finances training activities in agriculture. It's on a European level... [It's French] Ah it's French? I believed it was European. [No, it's French... It's true that events like this are mostly financed by VIVEA, but VIVEA will not finance the entire time that A spends on it so...]. (Farmer)

Host farmers are not paid. (Farmer)

#### 18. Motivations for host farmers

Both the Farmer and the Programme Interviewee emphasised the importance of group discussions and interactions with other farmers, indicating that the moral support and new ideas that came from these discussions was a strong motivator for the host farmer.

The objective is to discuss with other farmers, not to stay closed up at our place. And then to learn too... about different techniques or methods that can be improved the profitability of a farm. (Farmer)

At moments when things were going a little worse sometimes, they talked in a group, they were saying "luckily we were in a group, luckily we were doing innovation, change, because... we feel like getting up in the morning and going to work, otherwise it's difficult" there's lots of this. Then in order to progress I think that they learn a lot from the exchange among them and from the group and then from the others, the visits, they are always rather curious, even if they don't always learn from this... because sometimes there are things that they've already seen but... I think that always they go home with some ideas in their heads still. (Programme Interviewee)

#### 19. Motivations for participants

The host farmer felt that participants were also motivated by the opportunity to discuss and learn from other farmers.

Participants' main reasons to attend the demonstration were: 'exchanges with other farmers and demonstrators' and 'learning'.

#### 20. Target audience

The demos were specifically targeted at dairy farmers in the region.

#### 21. Advertising and recruitment

Invitations with an RSVP were sent out to dairy farmers who belong to the programme group. The invites contained details about the event and what subjects would be covered.

Often it's for... [For dairy farmers who belong to the group] Yeah [So who is in charge of invitations and facilitating and how is everything coordinated?] Oftentimes, as I said, we refer to the yearly planning, the facilitators let us know about upcoming meetings on that day at this hour, either by email or post. There's a sort of an invitation containing the theme, subjects that will be talked about, the place and the time. Then you answer: participating or not, and this is how it's done. (Farmer)

## T2: Appropriate demonstration and interaction approaches

### 22. The nature of interaction

Both the Farmer and the Programme Interviewee describes the nature of interactions as 'entirely bottom-up'. Both felt it was important to construct the demos around farmers' experience and personal stories. The Programme Interviewee added that this seemed to be an effective way for farmers to learn.

Yeah, because there are only farmers who have experience in... because in the end we discuss about the topics but talk a lot about experience of everyone. (Farmer)

It's pedagogical... a pedagogical method that seems to me that it functions well so that... the idea is that farmers learn... all that is new practices to change their system. So it's mostly based upon exchange, stories, we always try to work on their cases, individual cases, their figures, even if it's very technical. (Programme Interviewee)

### 23. Involving farmers in the learning process and the demonstration programme

According to the Programme Interviewee, host farmers were always involved in individual demonstrations. It seems the host farmers play a very active role, from choosing the topic and with whom they want to present, to providing the introductions and training on the day.

Always, yeah, we have already explained, through programme, training, introduction... With regard to... Communication as well, after they call me... Yeah it happens, for example, we've organised open door in January, it's them who've been contacted by the outside and who were saying "yeah I'd like that we talk... that we talk..." they were choosing with whom they wanted to present, that we present, that the group presents, and on which topic. (Programme Interviewee)

Host farmers were also involved to some extent at the programme level, through meetings and evaluation that allowed them to give feedback. There were also surveys and interviews for the breeders to enrich feedback.

Yeah there were... so I don't know, there were meetings, evaluations, so they were engaged to give feedback. Then the surveys, like two sociological surveys that the group has participated in, so certain breeders were interviewed individually, there's an intern who's also come to the training. (Programme Interviewee)

The Programme Interviewee made no comment about the involvement of participating farmer in the network programme or in individual demonstrations.

### 24. Focus

Both the Farmer and the Programme Interviewee described the network as 'in between' whole farm and single focussed.

### 25. Design

Both the Farmer and the Programme Interviewee described the network as 'a mixture' between experimental and exemplary practices. The Farmer preferred this approach; however the Programme Interviewee expressed a preference for 'exemplary' practices, as these help to enrich the demonstration. The Programme Interviewee also pointed to the fact that exemplary practices often form the basis for the experimentation.

## 26. Ideal group size

The Farmer and Programme Interviewee suggested a similar optimum size for the demo days: between 10 and 15. This was considered large enough to have diversity within the group, but small enough that everyone can express themselves.

You can't be too many, because everyone needs to be able to express themselves... And not too few either, because the diversity... enriches it too. 10-15 max I think. (Farmer)

So the size, let's say 10 to 12 breeders, here we are fewer people. So why, because not everyone can always be there, so it's good that we are a minimum number... minimum always 8-10 during the event. So it's true that 10-12... And why is it more efficient? Because it's for everyone to be able to exchange, so that everyone can express themselves. (Programme Interviewee)

### T3: Enabling learning appropriate to purpose, audience, context

## 27. Facilitating interaction and learning: structure, content and techniques

The structure of the days varied depending on the topic, although the Programme interviewee felt it was always important to make time for participants to contribute, even when there is an expert speaker present.

Yeah, it depends a lot on the topic, this is why I, yeah... but then during a typical event really focused on one topic... let's say... where there's a speaker, even when there's an expert speaker we still try to have... some time to... ideal situation is not to only have contribution, but also time to practice, show examples, to work, in sub-groups or things like this. (Programme Interviewee)

Some printed information was provided for participants, but it was predominantly up to the farmers to take their own notes.

The Farmer cited 'participants ask questions and talk openly' as the most important technique for engaging participants, but gave no justification for this choice. The Programme Interviewee cited 'Problem solving - farmers feel they know how to solve a problem' as the most important, because it allowed farmers to really understand the topic and apply it to their own situation.

It allows themselves to really comprehend the topic. And then, for example, and through exercise, they manage to extrapolate to their own case. (Programme Interviewee)

## 28. Taking into account variation in learning

The Farmer felt that different learning styles were accommodated for through the varied structure of the demonstration days.

There's a (meeting) room, it can also be meetings outside, a visit... outside of the group, for example in the month of May with the CETA we went to visit a micro-AD site in the Manche (department) for example, so yeah, it's varied. But the most often we stay still in a meeting room and then we visit the farm but otherwise it can change too. (Farmer)

The Programme interviewee did not accommodate different learning styles; people were given individual support if they had a specific question, but variations in learning and different levels of knowledge were not taken into account in the structure of the demo. The Programme interviewee felt there should be more effort

to account for variations in learning, adding that there were some participants who had stopped coming to the demos because they were struggling to engage.

#### T4: Effective follow-up activities

##### 1. Follow-up activities and materials

There was an effort to engage with participants after the event. The Farmer seemed satisfied with the amount that was done in this respect; however the Programme Interviewee felt that more time could be made for this.

Yes, but not enough in my opinion, sometimes there's some lack of... time for follow-up, I don't always have enough time to sacrifice for an individual person, but this could be not too bad. So I do it, perhaps it's not good enough, I do it quite often, not other colleagues who intervene... (Programme Interviewee)

##### 2. Assessing impact

The Farmer mentioned a survey that was given to participants at the end of the demo day as a means of assessing impact, although the Programme Interviewee made no mention to this or any other form of assessing impact. There was no means of assessing the impact of the demos among the wider farming community.

## 5. Event analysis: effective peer learning characteristics

### Event details

The group consisted of about 6 participants and 4 of them filled in the pre and post survey. All of them were male, worked in the local area and were dairy farmers. They were between 38 and 52 years old.

### T1: Learning processes

#### 3. Communication initiation by participants

In their small group of 6, each farmer described his farm, his technic, his problem and what he planned to do. Then the farmer asked the opinion of the group on his problem. There was a lot of time for questions. The facilitator and the demonstrator stimulated questions but also tried to maintain the focus on the topic. There were a lot of questions, exchanges and discussions. Almost every participant formulated their own points of view regarding the topic.

	participant answers				
	strongly disagreed	disagreed	agreed	strongly agreed	not applicable
I had the feeling that I could share my own knowledge as relevant information.	0	0	1/4	3/4	0
I asked at least one question during the demonstration .	4/4 yes				
I shared my own point of view at least once during the demonstration.	4/4 yes				
I felt encouraged to ask questions during the demonstration.	0	0	1/4	3/4	0
When there were any discussions, I felt comfortable sharing my opinion.	0	0	0	4/4	0

	demonstrator answers				
	strongly disagreed	disagreed	agreed	strongly agreed	not applicable
I asked participants to share some of their own background knowledge during the demo.	0	0	0	1	0
I encouraged the participants to formulate their own point of view during the demonstration.	0	0	0	1	0
I encouraged the participants to formulate questions during the demonstration.	0	0	0	1	0

#### 4. Interactive knowledge creation

##### *Hands-on opportunities and other multisensorial experiences*

There was no multisensorial or hands-on experience.

### Discussion opportunities and negotiating conflicting points of view

There was a facilitator. Open discussions are stimulated and given a lot of time. Most participants are involved. The goal of this demo was based on this sort of open discussions. The facilitator managed the discussions and the demonstrator provided some method, tool and knowledge to the farmers.

	participant answers				
	strongly disagreed	disagreed	agreed	strongly agreed	not applicable
In my opinion, <b>there were interesting discussions</b> during the demonstration.	0	0	0	4/4	0
<b>If participants didn't agree</b> with each other during discussions, somebody (demonstrator/other participant) <b>tried to reach a consensus</b> between them.	0	0	1/2	1/2	0

	demonstrator answers				
	strongly disagreed	disagreed	agreed	strongly agreed	not applicable
In my opinion, <b>there were interesting discussions</b> during the demonstration.	0	0	0	1	0
<b>If participants didn't agree with each other during discussions</b> , somebody (me or somebody else) <b>tried to reach consensus</b> between them.					

## 5. Engagement during the event

Participants act like a group of friends who know each other really well. This group exists since 4 years, meets 4-5 times a year, prepared a trip in Ireland. The demonstrator came for the second time so she is quite distant, but the facilitator knows each farmer very well because she's a dairy adviser and she followed the group since its beginning.

	participant answers				
	strongly disagreed	disagreed	agreed	strongly agreed	not applicable
I felt actively involved during the whole demonstration process.	0	0	0	4/4	0
I felt like the demonstration increased my ability to rely on myself as a farmer.	0	0	0	3/3	0
I could relate well to other participants (because they have an agricultural background similar to mine).	0	0	1/4	3/4	0
A lot of the other participants are part of the same farmer network as me.	0	0	0	4/4	0
I felt like I could trust the knowledge of (most of) the other participants.	0	0	0	4/4	0
The demonstration felt like an informal activity to me.	0	0	3/3	0	0
I thought the host farm was comparable enough to my own farm.	0	0	2/3	1/3	0
I had the feeling the demonstrator was like one of us.	0	0	1/4	3/4	0
I had the feeling I could trust the demonstrators knowledge.	0	0	0	4/4	0
I got along very well with the demonstrator.	0	0	0	4/4	0

	demonstrator answers				
	strongly disagreed	disagreed	agreed	strongly agreed	not applicable
Were participants (farmers, advisers, researchers etc.) involved in the overall development of this demonstration?	yes, examples were about farms of the group and there were individual talks				
Most of the participants were well known to me.	0	0	1	0	0
A lot of the participants are part of the same network as me.					
The demonstration felt like an informal activity to me.					
I think the host farm was well suited for this demo.	0	0	1	0	0
I got along well with the participants.	0	0	1	0	0

## T2: Learning outcomes

Explained knowledge was very clearly understandable. The demonstrator explained lots in different ways: theory, practices, example... Skills were sufficiently addressed to foster maximum uptake by participants. Common methods or ways of thinking on farming were questioned and alternatives were extensively elaborated on in group. The demonstrator insisted that all the solutions he provided had to be modified by the farmers to match their own situations. There was a lot of exchange on that. Common methods or ways of thinking on learning were questioned, but there was no elaboration on alternatives.

	participant answers				
What would you <b>ideally like to learn</b> today?	New technics and improve my knowledge; Exchanges; Improve my technical and economical results and the helper parasitism livestock management				
	strongly disagreed	disagreed	agreed	strongly agreed	not applicable
The <b>demonstration met my expectations</b> regarding what I wanted to learn.	0	0	1/4	3/4	0
The <b>demonstration exceeded my expectations.</b>	0	1/3	1/3	1/3	0
<b>I felt surprised</b> at some point(s) during the demonstration.	0	3/3	0	0	0
<b>I obtained a clearer understanding</b> of the topic(s) demonstrated.	0	0	2/4	2/4	0
I have the feeling <b>I learned something new</b> (knowledge, skill, practice, etc.).	0	0	2/4	2/4	0
<b>I thought about how I could implement</b> some of the ideas and practices on my own farm.	0	0	2/4	2/4	0
<b>I reflected on my own point of view</b> at some point during the demonstration.	0	0	1/4	3/4	0
I learnt about <b>the principles underlying a practice.</b>	0	0	2/4	2/4	0
I thought about <b>how we learn something new</b> on demonstrations (e.g.: teaching methods).	0	0	2/4	2/4	0
I thought about <b>why</b> I want to learn about <b>the topic(s) of this demonstration.</b>	0	0	2/3	1/3	0

	demonstrator answers				
what do you <b>intend for the participants to learn</b> today?	Manage parasitism				
	strongly disagreed	disagreed	agreed	strongly agreed	not applicable
I think <b>participants have learnt what I intended them to learn.</b>	0	0	1	0	0
I tried to <b>surprise</b> participants with uncommon/new knowledge/new skill.	0	0	1	0	0
<b>I felt surprised</b> at some point(s) <b>myself</b> during the demonstration (e.g. by a question or discussion).	0	1	0	0	0
<b>I obtained a clearer understanding</b> of the topic(s) myself.	0	0	1	0	0
I have the feeling <b>I learned something new</b> during this demo (from participants, discussion...).	0	0	1	0	0
<b>I reflected on my own point of view</b> myself at some point during the demo.	0	0	1	0	0
I encouraged participants to <b>reflect on their own point of view</b> during this demo.	0	0	1	0	0
I encouraged participants to <b>reflect on their own situation</b> sometime during this demo.	0	0	1	0	0
I encouraged participants to <b>reflect on how we learn something new</b> on demonstrations.	0	1	0	0	0
I encouraged participants to <b>reflect on why we are trying to learn</b> about the topic of this demonstration	0	1	0	0	0

### T3: Overall comments on the effectiveness of the event

#### *Participants:*

With an average of 4,25 on 5, participants rated the event overall as very effective. 4 on 4 participants who answered the questions would recommend the demonstration.

One participants mentioned a specific effective characteristics of the demo: 'the right balance between a clear and comprehensive speech and time to exchange'. As a suggestion on how to improve the demo, he said: 1 day would be better than half a day.

#### *Demonstrators:*

The demonstrator mentioned as effective characteristics of the demo: it's the second meeting on this topic; the topic is timed very well for questions of the farmers, the speech and exchange could happen on a real farm

As suggestion for improvement he mentioned, just like the participant: 1 day would be better than half a day.