



## Case study reports: Spain CS1



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 farm is a family farm in Galicia. There they produce milk and dairy products with ecological certification and belongs to the Regulatory Board of Ecological Agriculture (CRAEGA).

EL CRAEGA is the body in charge of the control and certification of organic production in Galicia. It informs about the ecological production regulations, the current operators authorized for organic production and the establishments recommended to buy organic products.

Within this framework, it also visits other ecological and non-ecological livestock farmers to encourage, increase and promote the creation of alliances among farmers.

In 2002, the farm is officially certified as ecological. It was one of the first dairy farms to become organic, and today they are the second largest organic producers in Spain. A reference at the national level.

From that moment and in agreement with the CRAEGA the farm receives 20 professional visits of a size of 15-20 farmers per year.

## Funding and Governance

The farm receives 2 types of visits:

- Leisure visits - tourism: Objective is to publicize the farm and sell its products.
- Professional visits of farmers: The main objective is to promote and collaborate with other farms to increase the number of organic farmers.

They are going to focus on the logistics and organisation of the professional visits of farmers.

These visits are the majority of them organised from agrarian organisations such as (CRAEGA, Agricultural Professional Training Centers or Agricultural Cooperatives).

## Actors and networks

The actors in this case study are:

- Technicians of agricultural organisations: They are responsible for selecting the participating farmers and detect the demand to visit initiatives of organic production among farmers.
- Visiting coordinators: an employee is responsible for coordinating all technical / professional visits and leisure visits. It is the person in charge of the farm working in a commercial way and can receive visits at the same time.
- Demonstrators of the farm: Team consisting of 4 demonstration advisors who explain the farm, follow a methodology and receive specific demonstration training. This equipment is financed with leisure visits paid by schools / families / etc. ... but the professional technical visits of the farmers are free for farmers.

## How it works:

1. The technicians detect in the agrarian organisations a demand to see demonstrative farms in ecological production.
2. The visits are requested by the technicians of the agrarian organisations, these technicians look for alternatives for intensive exploitations normally.
3. The farm has a team of demonstrators (1 coordinator 2 demonstrators for leisure visits and 2 demonstrators for professional visits) that coordinates the visits.

4. The coordinator of the visits establishes a date at least 1 month in advance with the technician of the agrarian organisation.
5. Coordinating meeting - agricultural technician to analyse the contents of the visit.
6. The coordinator informs the demonstrator of the farm about the subject of the visit
7. The demonstrator prepares the contents and methodology of the visit.
8. The demonstrator and the technician of the agrarian organisation are the ones who direct the visit the day of the event.

**Event Farm and location**

- Event Date: 15/05/2018

## 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 1 interview at the Programme Level. The analysis followed 5 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 20 pre and post-demonstration participant surveys, 1 pre-demonstration facilitator survey, 1 post-demonstration host farmer interview 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.

### 3. Structural Characteristics

#### T1: Programme/network level

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

###### *The Regulatory Body of Organic Agriculture in Galicia*

The Regulatory Body of organic agriculture is planning training and demonstration activities to support its farmers-members in their farming work. It works on a tentative plan/proposal of activities at the end of the year for next year's activities, which is approved by the Control Board Plenary, which consists of the registered organic farmers.

To start with, all activities carried out by the Regulatory Body are approved by a body called the Control Board Plenary, which is constituted by the producers registered with the Regulatory Body. And in principle, well, a budget for a range of activities is made in the last quarter of the previous year and the Control Board Plenary approves those activities which will be carried out in the following year. (Programme interviewee)

When the proposal is approved, the administrative staff of the regulatory body coordinates work among experts and technical staff in order to design training and demo programmes. In this line of work the organisation benefits also from the support of the local Department of Rural Development (Programme interviewee)

Well, the Control Board Plenary is the entity which approves the activities and those who take part in these activities are, well, on the one hand, the staff of Regulatory Body such as the Secretary for the Regulatory Body, technical professionals specialized in organic production, people in charge of carrying out the promotional theme; and on the other hand, there is mainly, in most cases, the Department of Rural Development in Galicia which acts through the Service for Agro-alimentary Quality represented by (...)the Head of the Promotion Service Department and who helps us to design those programmes (Programme interviewee)

Along with the work done internally to trace and assess the needs of organic farmers in Galicia, the organisation engages its member-farmers in identifying topics and reflects on their suggestions on potential farms/farmers that could host events. In the same vein, the Programme interviewee argued that farmers' are always involved mainly in the development and preparation of individual demo events, but also in the overall programme development.

How do you target farmers to host demonstrations? : Well, in different ways, through surveys or consultations which are made, by heeding suggestions received by the Regulatory Body, or at certain times, well, (dealing with) problems detected by us in the market or in this type of production (Programme interviewee)

How do you identify/select relevant topics that will interest farmers? (prompt: do you involve hosts and/or participants in the selection?): Yes, when we design a promotion action, well, we set a framework, an index about the discussion topics but we also let some freedom to the speakers in case they want to introduce some new issues, so, they can do it (Programme interviewee)

Are host farmers involved in the development of the individual demonstration activities? Always - Yes, always. When, as I have already said, we end all promotion actions with a practice test, well, we need the farmer to have prepared in advance [he defines it], he defines it... he must have already prepared the framework, where he is going to carry out the training, what tools we are going to use, he also must have developed a field where we are going to have the training and so on (Programme interviewee)

Are host farmers involved in the development of the overall demonstration programme? Always! And we try to get them involved. If we are going to do a demonstration in a ... [On the general approach of the programme, I mean... the farmers decide on the general approach of the programme, don't they?] ... Yes, in principle, yes (Programme interviewee)

However, surprisingly enough, the interviewee described the approach followed in organising the programme as mostly top down. Equally interesting is his indication of the character of the demo activities as single focused, despite the fact that their focus, work and interests relate to organic agriculture.

As an organisation, how would you describe your general approach to providing demonstration activities? Mostly top down (Programme interviewee)

How would you best describe demos in your programme? Single focus (Programme interviewee)

The top down approach seems to be related mainly to the decision on the structure of the training and/or demo event, which is rather informed by the organisation's learnings and experience by relevant work in the last years. This results to events that can be described as a mixture of exemplary and experimental work.

We always listen to the farmers but sometimes we don't do the training or other activities in the manner they ask for. We try to introduce some details which, in our opinion, make the programme more enjoyable and more complete. [Why do you take this approach?] Well, I have just explained, because we design it so... [Because it is the most effective approach...] We have organised the training courses for some years and believe this approach provides better outcome (Programme interviewee).

How would you best describe demonstrations in the programme? A mixture (experimental and exemplary) (Programme interviewee)

Finally, when designing the programme, and subsequently when applying for grants to fund trainings and events, the organisation tries to add elements that would allow for some compensation to be available for farmers that decide to host events in their farms.

Do you offer any incentives to farmers to host demonstration activities?: YES, As much as possible, if our budget allows it, well, I like to reward people who dedicate a part of their time to these training programmes (Programme interviewee).

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

### *Host farmer and other experts*

As indicated earlier the organisation selects host farmers among its members, on the basis of work done internally to identify topics that would be of interest to organic farmers, and then matching needs and topics to the appropriate farm. The host farmer does have some flexibility to introduce some additional issues in the programme.

Although there seem to be additional trainers and experts involved in the process, there are not sufficient info to detail their role and contribution in the implementation and delivery of demo events.

Yes, when we design a promotion action, well, we set a framework, an index about the discussion topics but we also let some freedom to the speakers in case they want to introduce some new issues, so, they can do it (Programme interviewee)

[...]and those who take part in these activities are, well, on the one hand, the staff of Regulatory Body such as the Secretary for the Regulatory Body, technical professionals specialized in organic production, people in charge of carrying out the promotional theme; and on the other hand, there is mainly... (Programme interviewee)

It would be interesting to note, though, that the host farmer in case, has formed a dedicated team of demonstrators which are responsible for all events implemented in his farm. The farmer applied an internal evaluation for the selection of the demonstration staff (poster), and now there is a team of three demonstrators in place who deliver events (post host farmer interview).

#### *Audience/type of participants*

The intended audience of the demonstration events are current members of the regulatory body, as well as producers who qualify and could be interested in joining the organisation. The general public (consumers) that have an interest in organic agriculture may also join demo events.

...both the producers who are registered with the Regulatory Body, other producers who may have an interest in being registered with the Regulatory Body and even consumers who are aware of... or they like organic production (Programme interviewee)

### 3. Networks

The Regulatory Body holds some collaboration with similar organisations as well as with Universities in neighbour countries (Portugal) mainly under symposia and conferences on organic agriculture/organic stock farming. Through those activities, the organisation has also supported the active engagement of the Department of Rural Development in international dialogue.

The specific host farm does not seem to be connected to other demo farms or organisations.

Q: Is your demonstration farm part of a programme or wider network? We advertise our training programmes in social networks (...) we focus on the working farmers but we have never placed any obstacle, on the contrary, we have even encouraged, well, the farmers and consumers from other neighbouring regions of Spain to register and take our training courses.

[In some cases, there were several instances of cooperation with Portugal.]

Yes, in principle, well, we have some relationships with some Portuguese Bodies and universities and we have collaborated participating in some Symposiums, even in some conferences organised by the Department of Rural Development or by the personnel of the Regulatory Body. (Programme interviewee)

[The Department of Rural Development got some support from CRAEGA (Regulatory Body of Organic Agriculture in Galicia) to attend some international Symposiums on Organic Stock Farming which were held near to Lisbon.] (Explanatory note of Programme level interviewer)

### 4. Resources, finances and incentives

The organisation uses a mix of self-financing and external financing streams approach to fund training programmes and demo activities. External financing stems either from training grants by the Department of Rural development, or from other public bodies which support similar activities. No further details are offered, if there are additional private a/or philanthropic organisations that offer grants to support their activities.

Q: What are the funding arrangements for your demo activities? How do these impact on the lifespan of the farm demo? The Regulatory Body is self-financing... well, finances these activities on the basis of quotas set in the written submissions and on the basis of some grant facilities for promotion or other grant facilities such as training grants, which we get mainly directly from the Department of Rural Development. In that case, when at the moment any funding is needed, the expenditures produced by the programmes are paid by bank transfers or other means of payment. And later, a corresponding subsidy is requested by presenting supporting documents to the competent body, which has awarded us with a grant (Programme interviewee)

[In the case of the Department of Rural Development, sometimes the personnel of Department are used, whose work is paid using government funds; and in other cases, other public funds can be also available; such as FEEDER funds which are available through the technological transfers.] (Programme interviewee)

## 5. Goal/ objectives

The overall goal of the demo events is to train farmers on organic agriculture, as well as on topics related to the promotion of farm production to the market. As stated earlier, these demo events and the overall training programme is open also to farmers which are not members of the regulatory body, but they would be interested and eligible to join the group.

Well, the objectives and overall goals are varied. On the one hand, we carry out formative programmes for producers which are registered with the Regulatory Body or for those producers who can be registered with the Regulatory Body; and on the other hand, we also implement programmes or activities related to commercialization of the products produced by our producers (Programme interviewee)

## 6. Follow up material and evaluation procedures

The Programme interviewee confirmed that dissemination material are shared with participants, either during the event or by email on a follow up step. Each event is usually followed by a structured survey through which the organiser requests the participants' feedback on the event they followed. However, the overall programme seems to be only informally assessed at

Are follow-up materials made available to participants after demos? YES, Almost always. If not always, we have all materials of presentations prepared by the speakers; a distribution of seeds in case of an agriculture programme is carried out. There is always additional material supporting training activities. [The material given is prepared as power point presentations...] There materials are sent by email or they are handed in a paper form (Programme interviewee)

Do you request feedback from demo participants? YES - Well, we usually make a survey asking for their opinion on the training activities they had (Programme interviewee).

Do you evaluate the demonstration activities overall? NO - [And... How do you evaluate the programme? What results do you get? Do you evaluate something? Do you look at the whole programme or are the activities evaluated in an informal way: were they carried out well or badly]: We make an informal evaluation. Let me see, if an activity wasn't performed as we expected, we usually do not repeat this activity (Programme interviewee).

Depending on the implemented programme, and if they see it relevant, the organisation tries to engage participants after the demo has taken place. This approach is also taken, but rather less formally, when they are trying to assess if participants have acted on the lessons of the demonstration, and even less so, in assessing the extent of influence to non-participants.

Do you - at the programme level - continue to engage participants after the demonstrations?: YES - Well, it depends on the type of the formative programme we do, but we have already done some programmes and after finishing them the farmers are sent some tasks to develop on their own farms; and after a while they are contacted and asked about their training, or if the seeds we supplied have sprouted, or .... (Programme interviewee)

Do you assess if participants have engaged with/acted on the lessons of the demonstrations? Sometimes - As I have already said, sometimes yes and sometimes not. It is a theoretical course, there isn't great practical work, we don't follow it up but we usually contact our participants after finishing the course (Programme interviewee).

Do you try to assess the extent of influence (diffusion) from your demonstration programme(s) to non-participants (those who have not attended demo events)? YES - Sometimes there are comments, and even talking about the case of seeds, well there was a part of seeds they (participants)



had collected during a course, so they made some test with these seeds, with other organic products from other regions, which came off better for those producers who didn't come than those who came and so on. Yes, we usually do this (Programme interviewee).

## T2: Farm (event) level

The demonstration event was held on a dairy farm that has 400 cow in production and 170 hectares of land. The farm is dedicated to the production of milk and subsequent transformation in the own exploitation of milk to yoghurts, cheeses and other dairy products. (Observation tool)

The host farmer organises one-off events. No follow up activities are envisaged (observation tool). Feedback is not requested in a structured way (post-demo host farmer interview). At the end of the event though, the demonstrator held an informal discussion with participants, requesting their reaction on what they have seen during their visit (post-demo participants' survey).

## 7. Farm's layouts and practice/technology demonstrated

There were not typical comparative layouts on the farm. However the 20 participants of the demonstration had previously visited another intensive exploitation, which have the demonstrator the opportunity to refer to their prior visit in order to highlight better the process followed in their demo farm (Observation tool).

The farm has monitors that tell the history of the farm and show/project a guided tour of the farm facilities. There were no additional material shared with participants. No external equipment was showcased either (observation tool).

## 8. Topic:

Organic dairy production and manufacturing processes (Observation tool).

## 9. Group size

20 participants (pre/post demo participants surveys & Observation tool)

## 10. Actors' roles

### *Host farmer - demonstrator*

The host farmer has a dedicated team that is responsible for demo events. The responsible employee explained the philosophy and how they work in the farm; he gave notions of the operation of the farm as well as a brief history of its development (the farm's origins are traced back to the '60s). He guided the farm and to different processing/manufacturing units, guided and facilitated discussion (Observation tool).

### *Participants*

The 20 attendees were mainly farmers, and a small number were advisers. All but three of them are active in the local area, which supports the view of three quarters of them that they belong in the same network (pre-demo participants' survey). Participants had the opportunity to see the entire manufacturing process of the farm's products. A dedicated Q&A session of about 45 minutes followed was planned at the end of the event. Finally at the end of the visit they were able to taste the farm's products (observation tool).

Three out of four interviewed participants agreed or strongly agreed that they have actively been involved during the whole demonstration process (Post participant's survey).

## 11. Frequency

The host farmer hosts some 5 demonstration events per year (post host farmer interview).

## 12. Duration

There is no reference to the duration of the event

## 13. Accessibility

According to the pre demonstration participant survey, the travel time of the vast majority of participants to reach the demo farm, was 60 minutes, with only 3 out of 20 indicating a longer trip (90 minutes). Except from five participants, mainly advisers, who indicated that they had to place substantial effort in order to attend, the majority indicated that it was rather easy for them to participate to the event.

## 14. Fees for participation

At the specific demonstration event, there were no attendance/participation fees charged (Post demonstration participants). Moreover, none of the participants was in any way compensated for attending the event (Post demonstration participants).

# 4. Functional characteristics

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

### 15. Incentives

The Programme Interviewee did not discuss how the project is funded, but did mention that when the budget allows it host farmers are paid for their time.

As much as possible, if our budget allows it, well, I like to reward people who dedicate a part of their time to these training programmes (Programme Interview)

### 16. Motivations for host farmers

It was thought that host farmers were motivated by a personal interest in the issue being covered by the programme.

Well, firstly they (farmers) should have an interest in the issue (Programme interviewee)

### 17. Motivations for participants

Participating farmers showed more interest when the activities were entertaining, suggesting that farmers were motivated the fact that the training was enjoyable.

It is very important, let me see, it is truly important that the activities, which are carried out, are entertaining. I was told in many cases, that they (participants) do not like completely theoretical training. So, we always try to combine theoretical part with the practical one, so this way they (the participants) enjoy the training activities most (Programme Interviewee)

## 18. Target audience

The target audience seemed to be anyone with an interest in organic production, whether that was producers currently registered with the regulatory body, other producers or consumers.

Our intended audience are both the producers who are registered with the Regulatory Body, other producers who may have an interest in being registered with the Regulatory Body and even consumers who are aware of... or they like organic production (Programme Interviewee)

## 19. Advertising and recruitment

The Programme Interviewee's main means of advertising and recruitment was to promote other activities and events to participants during the first demonstration.

If I have already organised some activities over time, during the first one I explain to them (the participants) that there are going to be the following activities, at the same time informing them about the place and date. I usually like doing publicity for the activities I am doing or for activities which I am going to do the following year. [You mean, if among the participants in a demo activity you see one which you consider interesting for you and maybe he or she could be a host for the next demo activity...] Yes, it is... [... you use it (the opportunity)...] Yes. [Right] (Programme interviewee)

## T2: Appropriate demonstration and interaction approaches

### 1. The nature of interaction

The Programme Interviewee described the nature of interaction as 'mostly top-down'.

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

Host farmers had a high level of involvement in the network programme, mainly in helping to decide on the general approach of the programme.

Always! And we try to get them involved. If we are going to do a demonstration in a ... [On the general approach of the programme, I mean... the farmers decide on the general approach of the programme, don't they?] ... Yes, in principle, yes (Programme interviewee)

Host farmers prepare the framework for the demonstrations, as well as the location, the tools required and whatever other preparation is needed.

Yes, always. When, as I have already said, we end all promotion actions with a practise test, well, we need the farmer to have prepared in advance [he defines it], he defines it... he must have already prepared the framework, where he is going to carry out the training, what tools we are going to use, he also must have developed a field where we are going to have the training and so on (Programme interviewee)

### 3. Focus

The Programme Interviewee described the network as 'single focussed', as opposed to 'whole farm'.

### 4. Design

The Programme Interviewee described the network as 'a mixture' between experimental and exemplary, and expressed a preference for this approach.

## 5. Group size

The Programme Interviewee gave no optimal group size, although did explain that demonstrations were held in medium sized livestock holdings, so presumably the group size would have to be appropriate to the event space.

When doing demonstration activities we always try to do it in a “model” livestock holding which is medium size, neither in a really small farm, nor in a very big one. Those aren’t an example for the course attendants (Programme interviewee)

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

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

The general structure of the demonstration days consisted of a theoretical part followed by an activity in which this theory could be applied.

We are inclined to do a theoretical part of an activity and then a practical part giving (the participants) the possibility to apply, if not all, but at least a part of knowledge given during theoretical activities (Programme interviewee)

The Programme Interviewee cited 'Participants ask questions & talk openly' as the most important technique for engaging participants, because communication amongst participants, and between participants and speaker, make for a more enjoyable course.

There aren't a lot of people attending these courses and they are arranged a bit more enjoyable, and the communication between the speaker and the trained participants is also better (Programme interviewee)

#### 2. Taking into account variation in learning

The content of the courses were altered depending on the prior level of knowledge held by participant; from this it was decided if a basic training course was needed or if there could be a focus on more specific issues. Besides this, there was no mention of different learning styles being taken into account.

We always ask what level of knowledge on the topic the participants of a training course have, to provide basic training courses or focus on more specific issues (Programme interviewee)

### T4: Effective follow-up activities

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

There appeared to be a fairly comprehensive protocol for engaging with participants after the event. Farmers were sent tasks to develop on their own farms, and were later contacted about this and the training they attended.

Well, it depends on the type of the formative programme we do, but we have already done some programmes and after finishing them the farmers are sent some tasks to develop on their own farms ; and after a while they are contacted and asked about their training, or if the seeds we supplied have sprouted, or ... (Programme interviewee)

Generally participants are provided with a copy of the PowerPoint and other materials used in the presentation. These are either given in paper form on the day or distributed via email. If it is an agricultural demo, the programme will also distribute seeds for participants to trial themselves.

Almost always. If not always, we have all materials of presentations prepared by the speakers; a distribution of seeds in case of an agriculture programme is carried out. There is always additional material supporting training activities. [The material given is prepared as power point presentations...] There materials are sent by email or they are handed in a paper form (Programme interviewee)

#### 2. Assessing impact

The programme sometimes assessed the impact of the events; generally assessment was only carried out when participants were given a task to carry out on their own farm, such as trialling a new seed.

As I have already said, sometimes yes and sometimes not. It is a theoretical course, there isn't great practical work, we don't follow it up but we usually contact our participants after finishing the course (Programme interviewee)

The Programme Interviewee mentioned that they assess the impact of the days among the wider farming community, although it seemed this was done in a more informal way through conversing with farmers.

Sometimes there are comments, and even talking about the case of seeds, well there was a part of seeds they (participants) had collected during a course, so they made some test with these seeds, with other organic products from other regions, which came off better for those producers who didn't come than those who came and so on. Yes, we usually do this (Programme interviewee)

## 5. Event analysis: effective peer learning characteristics

### Event details

The group consisted of about 20 participants and all of them filled in the pre and post survey.

	n° survey participants	advisor	farmer	forest farmer	unknown
<i>occupations</i>	20	6	9	2	3
<i>working area</i>	18				
local area	15	6	7	1	1
not local area	3		2		1
<i>gender</i>	19				
male	15	4	7	2	2
female	4	1	2		1
<i>age</i>	19				
18-30	19	6	9	1	3
31-40					
41-50					
51-60					
60+					

### T1: Learning processes

#### 1. Communication initiation by participants

100% of the participants had no problem sharing their knowledge and experiences related to the topic, no matter if they were in smaller or bigger groups. There was a lot of time for questions, about 45 min, and a lot of questions were asked. 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 <b>could share my own knowledge as relevant information.</b>	0	1/20	8/20	11/20	0
I <b>asked at least one question</b> during the demonstration .	17/19 yes				
I <b>shared my own point of view at least once</b> during the demonstration.	17/19 yes				
I <b>felt encouraged to ask questions</b> during the demonstration.	0	1/19	8/19	10/19	0
When there were any discussions, I <b>felt comfortable sharing my opinion.</b>	0	2/20	12/20	6/20	0

## 2. Interactive knowledge creation

### *Hands-on opportunities and other multi-sensorial experiences*

More than one hands-on activity was demonstrated very clearly but no hands-on activity was carried out by participants. All the facilities were visited. In the workshop we saw the manufacturing process of the company's products. At the end of the visit, visitors were able to taste the company's products.

### *Discussion opportunities and negotiating conflicting points of view*

The farm has guides who tell the history of the farm and facilitate tours around the farm facilities. The one for this tour was a young woman with knowledge in agriculture.

Open discussions are stimulated and given a lot of time (15%). Most participants are involved. It was made sure that everybody understood the shared critical points of view.

	participant answers				
	strongly disagreed	disagreed	agreed	strongly agreed	not applicable
In my opinion, <b>there were interesting discussions</b> during the demonstration.	0	2/20	11/20	7/20	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	2/20	10/20	8/20	0



### 3. Engagement during the event

Participants all seem to know each other well, but are not close friends. The demonstrator acts like friends with the participants.

	participant answers				
	strongly disagreed	disagreed	agreed	strongly agreed	not applicable
I felt actively involved during the whole demonstration process.	0	5/20	6/20	9/20	0
I felt like the demonstration increased my ability to rely on myself as a farmer.	0	3/20	10/20	7/20	0
I could relate well to other participants (because they have an agricultural background similar to mine).	0	0	11/20	9/20	0
A lot of the other participants are part of the same farmer network as me.	0	5/20	9/20	6/20	0
I felt like I could trust the knowledge of (most of) the other participants.	0	3/20	12/20	5/20	0
The demonstration felt like an informal activity to me.	0	4/20	7/20	9/20	0
I thought the host farm was comparable enough to my own farm.	0	2/20	12/20	6/20	0
I had the feeling the demonstrator was like one of us.	0	3/20	14/20	3/20	0
I had the feeling I could trust the demonstrators knowledge.	0	3/20	10/20	7/20	0
I got along very well with the demonstrator.	0	1/20	11/20	8/20	0

## T2: Learning outcomes

Explained knowledge was very clearly understandable. Skills were addressed carefully and effectively to foster maximum uptake by participants. Common methods or ways of thinking on farming and on learning were questioned and alternatives were extensively elaborated on in group.

What would you <b>ideally like to learn</b> today?	participant answers				
	strongly disagreed	disagreed	agreed	strongly agreed	not applicable
How I can produce ecological cheese; Ecological grazing; Management of rearing and pastures; The ways of working ecological; Learn to manage an ecological farm; Learn about a futuristic system (in this case ecological); See milk production and packaging processes; All I can.					
The <b>demonstration met my expectations</b> regarding what I wanted to learn.	0	4/20	8/20	8/20	0
The <b>demonstration exceeded my expectations.</b>	0	2/20	12/20	6/20	0
I <b>felt surprised</b> at some point(s) during the demonstration.	0	1/20	8/20	11/20	0
I <b>obtained a clearer understanding</b> of the topic(s) demonstrated.	0	1/20	12/20	7/20	0
I have the feeling I <b>learned something new</b> (knowledge, skill, practice, etc.).	0	1/20	11/20	8/20	0
I <b>thought about how I could implement</b> some of the ideas and practices on my own farm.	0	1/20	6/20	13/20	0
I <b>reflected on my own point of view</b> at some point during the demonstration.	0	0	14/20	6/20	0
I learnt about the <b>principles underlying a practice.</b>	0	1/20	9/20	10/20	0
I thought about <b>how we learn something new</b> on demonstrations (e.g.: teaching methods).	0	0	11/20	9/20	0
I thought about <b>why</b> I want to learn about <b>the topic(s) of this demonstration.</b>	0	1/20	14/20	5/20	0

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

With an average of 4 on 5, participants rated the event overall as effective. 1 on 19 participants who answered the questions would not recommend the demonstration.

As main effective characteristics of the demo participants mentioned: Training in ecological production; Because the host farm was very clear; I learned about Ecological Agriculture; The clarity and conciseness of the demonstration; The structure of demonstration; The topic was interesting to me; I learned technical things; The added value of ecological milk.

3 participants made a suggestion on how to improve the demonstration: Use the technical terms; more data on techniques; more panels.