



AGRIDEMO

Case study reports: Belgium CS₄



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

1. Background

The farm is 45 hectares which hosts several different agricultural and livestock activities and produces a variety of products such as such as orchards, honey, cider, potatoes, poultry, and market gardening.

Event date: May, 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 (Level 1) and Farm level interviews with demonstrators/hosts (Level 2) to reveal how the functional and structural characteristics enable learning. Analysis is reported in Sections 3 and 4. Data is sourced from 1 host farmer interview, who was interviewed in June 2018. 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 6 pre and 4 post demonstration surveys for participants, 2 pre and post demonstrator survey, a 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.

3. Structural characteristics

T1: Programme/network level

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

The farming organisation

This farming organisation is an interesting and innovative in many dimensions venture, which, although not a farm in legal terms, aims to address several challenges that small scale farmers face in their attempt to have access to land but also to embrace organic agriculture and even further to apply agro ecology practices and an holistic permaculture approach (Farm level interviewee). They are the owners of a 45 hectares land in east/south-east Belgium, in which they are inviting farmers to organise their production in an environmental friendly way; The overall objective is to build a mesh of productive activities that would, eventually, lead to a brand name under which alternative farming and further rural activities (such as agri-tourism) will flourish. Being an incubator of food business and artisans, as the case study interviewee prefers to describe it (post host farmer interview), their business model is built around a co-ownership of farming economic activities (an interesting application in agriculture of a model traced in boosting ICT start-ups/ventures, but still more sustainable and committed in its perspective); access to market services to farmers' production; and supplementary administrative services offered to hosted agri and rural businesses (farm level interviewee +poster). In this model, demonstration activities are seen as a device that could serve multiple goals, which range from building a proof of concept of a legal innovation that would mitigate the problems deriving from farmers' lease of land-owners fields, or increasing the visibility of environmental friendly practices, to even a simple additional income stream that would strengthen the sustainability of the venture (Farmer).

So, the idea started from access to land. Now we realise there's a secondary realisation that people that want to do small scale agriculture have burning passions. [...]So, one of the bets we make here economically is that by having a multitude of enterprises here, we can beneficially mutualize. So, what we want to offer is administrative services. We want to do accounting which we can't do now for cheaper than an accounting bureau. We want to offer a commercial identity, access to markets. This we still have to work on. (Farm interviewee)

So, we start legal - juridical - structures, entities, and business basically and we take 50% of the investment by bringing the land, by bringing all types of services and we take 50% of the risk. If there would be a bad year, then the organisation would help the farmer out and if there would be a bad year, then we don't sell as much and we have losses on our side as well (Farmer).

So, what we try to set up here is a legal alternative where there's a clause in the law that says if you, as the landowner, take part in minimum 50% of the undertaking itself and 50% of the risks, then you can have a normal type of contract. It doesn't have to be farming-related. So, what we try and do here is try to bridge the gap between landowners and farmers by actually renting the land from a landowner (Farmer).

We really want to do long term and this is for obvious environmental reasons. (...) our minimum is organic (...) but we want to then, the more we can, towards agro ecological principals. So, polyculture is a big one, hedges, beneficial agrobiodiversity, really holistic water management. (Farmer)

Here, we're not really an education centre, we're not really a farm in the legal terms of it, so (Farmer)

In that direction, the farming organisation has organised in the last five years both one off and recurrent events depending on the topic or demonstrated practice (post host farmer interview). These demos were the "side" responsibility of a small core team in the organisation, and although quite random in their selection of topics and focus, they were guided by the "farm's" culture and approach that focuses on hands-on experiences of participants and the visibility and transfer of the innovative structure of the initiative. Events included workshops on water management and permaculture applications, as well as open farm days which started as daily events and turned to whole weekend ones with a large number of attendees. Moreover, efforts were also

extended to cultural events, such as concerts, that would attract more people and bring them closer to the initiative. This accumulated experience has forced the host organisation to consider that in order to meet the overall strategy of the venture, demo events should be organised in a more structured way. Thus, a new employee was recently hired in order to take lead in developing a strategy and keeping a common thread in organising demos. The overall idea is to create synergies between different activities so focus is also placed on the products of farmers as well as on the launch of new ones.

Up to now, it's been quite random. (...) it's been more about just random meetings and then acting upon it. Now, we've just hired D. full-time and the idea is really to be able to now start having a common thread, a real vision. It's not really determined yet but we really want to do different types of cycles of demos. One would be much centred on growing citizens and another would be centred on growing farmers, so different types of demos for different audiences. (Farmer)

Q: So, the main people involved in the demonstrations and their roles? R: (...) Generally, we're 3. So D. was now hired so she will be doing that mainly (...) So, like this weekend, I'm the one doing the attendance, but she did all the administrative work behind it...the idea is to run it as a team but D. will be in charge. (Farmer)

In 2017 there were organised: 5 x farm open days; training for apple trees with trunks higher than 1,6m; training on water management. In 2018: Show by musical group "La Crapaupe"; 3 x open-farm weekends; trainings. (Post host farmer interview)

Yeah. It's a five-day workshop we give here at the farm. It's on holistic water management and planning at a farm level. (Farmer)

Q: what is the typical timespan for the demonstration activities and why? R: One year because it's a whole agricultural cycle for this one or a couple of days where it's a specific topic and it takes time to get in depth into it. (Farmer)

There's also lots of things we want to do related to culture. We have had two concerts in the past... The idea is really to get the people here actually through workshops (Farmer)

One other thing I didn't mention are the "Journées Fermes Ouvertes". This year it's going to be weekends. We do three weekends where we try and organise big activities and we open our doors. It's in an initiative ... which is also subsidized by the region and they estimate that between 1,400 and 1,500 during the weekend (Farmer)

Two weeks ago we launched the new product of the cider farm which is the distilled cider like calvados. This is really good and we had 200 people over for dinner and then a concert and everything and we served them the first chickens of the farm as well. One activity helped the other and it all worked. (Farmer).

While the organisation of the demo events is pretty much top down in its nature both in the selection of scope and topics, when it comes to the structure of the event and its content the managing team seems to give sufficient degrees of freedom to the trainers and demonstrators. It should be noted that although till now demonstrators were external experts/trainers and/or advisers and practitioners which have been invited to deliver demos on specific topics of their expertise, the organisers intend to develop a strand of demo events which will be designed and delivered by the farmers. Finally, depending on the topic of the demo its focus ranges from showcasing a specific application/farming practice to more whole farm ones related to environmental and/or sustainability issues.

Q: is there something you would say to demonstrators? That you want it to be really hands-on? Or you leave them that they take care of that part? R: Generally, they take care of that part but it's our philosophy. I doubt we would work with a teacher that would say "OK, we're going to stay in the classroom and they're going to listen to me, show some images on the Power Point". We would really want the hands-on approach. (Farmer)

It would depend on the coordinator. I don't give courses myself so... (Farmer)

Q: How would you describe the demonstrations, the workshops that you provide are they whole farm, single focus or somewhere in between. R: We do both, we do the whole spectrum, this would be one activity, and water management would be looking at the farm as a whole. (Farmer)

Intended Audience/type of participants and communication activities

As the farming organisation is focusing both on farming and on additional agri- and rural related activities, its planned events aim to attract and engage different target groups of participants. These could range from farmers willing to embrace organic agriculture and agro ecology schemes, consumers willing to support short supply chains and even citizens willing to consider the potential of an alternative organisation of the market for agricultural products and food consumption.

In order to reach out to them, the farming organisation uses a variety of communication tools. These consist of newsletters, with recipients built up of previous attendees, flyers and posters on forthcoming events as well as social media applications such as Facebook. A powerful tool seems to be the local media which seems to have spotted the farm's activity in their radar and monitor and publicize its activities.

Who is your intended audience for the demonstrations? Is it farmers? Is it the general public? R: It depends on the demonstration. We're going to do demonstrations on crafts, on food, probably at one point it's going to become also on reflection, maybe economics for transition, maybe healthy living...the people I am most interested in having, and for obvious social reasons, are really our neighbours. We want to do the maximum we can in selling directly to the end consumer. A big question here is always going to be the right price. How can we correctly reattribute the producer for his work, a sales person for his works, and not have a cucumber that is a ridiculous price for the end consumer. So, try and re-appropriate the chain so you can do a just distribution for everybody.Also, what we want to do with the events is create such a social fabric. (Farmer)

For the moment, we're building up a newsletter. So, I think now we must be around 750...Generally, people that have already followed a workshop are part of that.... we make posters that we go and put a bit everywhere around the place. We do flyers so when we go to markets, when there's workshops here, people can go with flyers. Then we use Facebook, now a bit more than 1,000 people on Facebook and we know.... (Farmer)

We start being quite present on the local media. Sometimes we contact them but mainly they contact us.... Like the cider farm, it's mainly once a month that they're in the local papers. (Farmer)

2. Networks

Demonstrations of the farming organisation are not part of a network or programme. However, its managing team is linked to different emblematic farms and networks both within Belgium and internationally. Although not a network, according to the farm level interviewee, this interaction facilitates the exchange of practical information and knowledge and thus strengthens the developmental potential of the venture and the sustainability of farming practices. Moreover, through those contacts the organisers see the potential of having joint events with similar-minded ventures.

Q: Are the demonstrations here part of any broader network of demonstrations? R: Not yet. One partner we're talking with is Nata Goa and we might start developing workshops with them. They might use our farm but it's at a discussion stage, so it's an idea. (Farmer)

Q: To what extent is the demo farm connected to other demo farms and/or other knowledge exchange organisations? (A colleague) worked at *La ferme du Bec Hellouin*. [...] They're basically the one that proved scientifically and then the INRA, the national institute for agriculture, admitted that permaculture was a viable way of cultivating land. (Farmer)

Q: So, you're connected to them? R: (a colleague) had experience there. Two of the founders studied agro ecology so they are really close friends to the founders of Agro ecology in Action. Agro ecology Europe. Otherwise... BioWallonia, Diversifirme, Crelan, Mimosa. (Farmer)

It's difficult to say we're in partnership with because they're existing and we're in contact. Sometimes when there is a specific question, we might pick up the phone and call them. They know who we are but it's not like we're in a continuous partnership where they depend on our functioning for their functioning and vice versa. There's no deal. (Farmer)

3. Resources, finances and incentives

Funding of demonstrations seems to be both a concern and a challenge for the organisers. Participation fees are the sole funding of events, which in turn challenged the organisers to focus on quality and practical outcomes of their offered services. At the same time, however, the farm level interviewee indicated some indirect benefits that may result from those events. These relate mainly to the opportunities offered for direct sales when people visit the farm, and the multiplying effect of spreading the news on the innovative structure. At the same time, the organisers highlighted that benefits may also result from synergies and cross-selling of services and products between participating business ventures (such as for instance through booking in their B&B and extending their staying on the farm).

Q: What are the funding arrangements for your demonstration activities? R: Well for the moment, it's self-funded. It's by the participation by the people doing the workshop. (Farmer)

Well, if we can make it viable and people are willing to pay. Of course, the funding will be the determining factor if it works or not. So, yes. If people are willing to pay. It's quite difficult in Belgium. (Farmer)

The thematic are going to be around food and agriculture and we cannot compete with subsidized workshops... Here, we're not really an education centre, we're not really a farm in the legal terms of it, and so it's very hard for us to get these kind of helps. So, we can't compete, so our workshops will mostly be based on more, let's say innovative, or like [main demonstrator on the day we visit] is doing... (Practical things) (Farmer)

The idea is that we can benefit from people coming over - synergies between the different aspects we have. If a group would come and they would go picking in the fields, then Renaud would get a little bit out of it. They could book and stay in the B & B and then we could do a visit to the cider farm the day after that. Then bit by bit, the fact that people come over, we can have the different activities support each other. (Farmer)

So if you would have a sheep shepherd, an orchard, a B&B, a lady making natural colours, a cider farm, you could attract people directly to the farm. So, skip distribution and re-appropriate the margins made by distribution and diversify your incomes with visits, workshops, and a restaurant. So that's kind of the economic bet that the farm takes as a whole based on the legal innovation. (Farmer)

4. Materials and assessment

Apart from the newsletter the organisers regularly send to participants and the wider public, currently they do not seem to provide any other material during and after the demonstrations to participants.

More structured seems to be their approach of requested feedback from participants during the event. This is done both through questionnaires/forms and informally through discussions after the events. The evaluation of the demo though seems to be pursued only through their informal interaction of the event, a decision justified by the farm level interview by their close proximity to the actual process and close contact with groups of participants.

Finally there does not seem to be any structured or informal process in place aiming to assess if participants have engaged to any action on the info/lessons learned during demos, nor of the extend participants or non-participants were somehow influenced by the demo events and learnings.

Q: what materials, if any, are provided during demonstrations? R: None for the moment.
(Farmer)

Q: do you continue to engage with participants after the demonstrations? R: Yes, they're added to our list and we send them reminders. (Farmer)

Q: Are follow-up materials made available to participants afterwards? R: No. (Farmer)

Q: Do you request any feedback on the event day from any participants? Yes, generally we do.

Q: So you usually do anyways, it's a forms and they collect them up after? R: Yes, and also oral.
(Farmer)

Q: Do you as the host, do you evaluate the demonstration activities. R: We're quite close to the actual process, so yes we do in a very informal way. It's more feeding based, I would say then methodological approach. (Farmer)

Q: do you assess if participants have engaged with the lessons in the demonstrations or workshops? R: No (Farmer)

Q: do you try to assess the extent of influence of your demonstration? R: No (Farmer)

Q: Do you try to assess the extent of influences at the diffusion from the demonstration to people who haven't, who haven't maybe an article written up about it. R: No, we don't even do direct. (Farmer)

T2: Farm (event) level

The event took place in May, 2018, on a 'farm' of 45 hectares which hosts several different agricultural and livestock activities and produces a variety of products such as such as orchards, honey, cider, potatoes, poultry, and market gardening (post host farmer interview).

On the day, the farming organisations' staff's involvement in the demonstrations was focused on welcoming and interacting with the participants and providing refreshments.

1. Topics/ Practice/technology demonstrated

The topic of the event was on care and treatment of orchards. The whole context of the training was organic cultivation and an alternative way of producing apples that looks at traditional/indigenous varieties and which moves away from monoculture.

Although focusing on orchards, the demonstrators talked a lot about the wider context by mentioning biodiversity and spoke at length about genetic resources in terms of varieties, seed and grafting. Moreover, environmental sustainability was a core focus of the training day. (Observation tool)

2. Structure of the event and actors' roles

The event had a morning and afternoon session.

The training day started with a classroom setting. The host farmer was the one to welcome the group. The main demonstrator had prepared slides which he used to show the participants images of plant diseases and pests etc. The two demonstrators had a very open dialogue with the participants and there was an informal atmosphere. The majority of the participants posed questions or made remarks during this session. There was a pause for lunch together and then the group went into the orchard itself to see first-hand some of the material they had learned about.

The afternoon of the training day was outside in the orchard and the participants had the chance to see (and sometimes touch) different plants and insects up-close. However, there was no hands-on activity as such. The demonstrator showed the participants some equipment he uses for taking care of the apple trees. Participants didn't try to use the equipment themselves, and instead they just watched the demonstrator do it.

At the end of the day, the main demonstrator showed to the participants some books he had brought with him and told them where they could buy them. He gave advice on which ones were better than others.

There was no facilitator present in the event. However, since it was a small group, there was a natural flow of questions continuously during the day. Although there wasn't any time set aside specifically for questions, the open atmosphere during the event offered ample opportunities to participants to speak up, pose questions and comment on the topics demonstrated and knowledge shared on the specificities of care and maintenance of orchards. Finally, acquiring new knowledge was facilitated for the participants through the use of photographs and through the visit to the orchard where the demonstrators pointed out different things. In sum, it was not a very hands-on training day. It was also more focused on knowledge than skills. (Observation tool)

3. Participants

No one of the six participants that were interviewed was a farmer and none of them lived in the local area. . (Pre demonstration participant survey)

4. Frequency

This was the third training day of a series of five which were spread across the year. There were not any follow-up activities planned for each training day. Participants kept building on what they have learned in their previous two meetings. (Observation tool)

5. Farms' infrastructures or arrangements

The host farmer prepared tea and snacks that were available in the morning before the training started and prepared the lunch for everybody. (Observation tool)

6. Accessibility

The travel time of participants to reach the demo farm, ranged from 40 to 90 minutes, with an average time close to 65 minutes. All participants rated their travel effort to participate as very little or little effort. (Pre demonstration participant survey).

7. Fees for participation

All participants but one stated they had to pay a fee to attend the workshop and demonstration. None of them had received any financial compensation for his attendance (Post participant's survey).

4. Functional characteristics

T1: Coordinating effective recruitment of host farmers and participants

1. Incentives

The host does not receive any financial support for the workshops.

For the moment, it's self-funded. It's by the participation by the people doing the workshop.

He says that the lifespan of a workshop is based on what people are willing to pay for.

Of course, the funding will be the determining factor if it works or not. So, yes. If people are willing to pay. It's quite difficult in Belgium. People here pay 65EUR per day, which I think is a really fair price, and people find it expensive.

2. Motivations for host farmers

The farming organisation started from questions around the access to land and the realisation that people who want to do small-scale agriculture have the passion but face many administrative and commercial hurdles. The farming organisation tries to bring a multitude of enterprises together on their 45ha and offer those administrative services, a commercial identity, and access to markets.

Motivations of the host farmer are linked to sharing knowledge with people who are interested in learning about orchard production, sustainable water management, and foraging.

Well, I find it fun, it's a very personal type of motivation. I guess in the farm sense, it would be "sensibilisation" and economic viability. What we try to set up here has a high cost in the sense that it's a very heavy structure for not that many – at least now – agricultural activities so we have to be able to find our own sources of revenue so the B&B is one, the workshops is another.

The host is also really inspired by environmental reasons.

We really want to do long term and this is for obvious environmental reasons. So here, our minimum is organic and we want to transition, because it takes a couple of years to do the conversion, but we want to then, the more we can move towards agro ecological principals. So, polyculture is a big one, hedges, beneficial agrobiodiversity, really holistic water management.

3. Motivations for participants

The host believes that gaining knowledge and the name of the demonstrator for the workshops are the aspects that attract participants. Also, their 'full immersion' programme might attract participants. Their location is a barrier he believes.

Knowledge, sometimes the name of the teacher, I would say. Let's say, we have ___ coming to give a talk here. People will come probably more for her than what she talks about and then of sounds they would listen to what she talks about and use that as knowledge, but they would be attracted by the name.

We're far away. We're not very central. We're more than an hour away from Brussels. So yeah, I think that would be a major downturn.

One of the advantages here maybe and one I really count on is, I haven't discussed yet, is full immersion. The fact that if we can give a workshop over four or five days, we can have people contributes to the everyday life on the farm. We can have people sleep well for five days, people get of their screens for five days that people eat well for five days and people be inspired by what they learn and be just in a beautiful context where they don't have to be in traffic and have their phone ring every five minutes. I think this will play a very big role in how we develop this year.

Participants themselves stated as main motivators to attend the demonstration:

To learn to manage an orchard with apple trees whose trunk is more than 1.2 metres high; For the production of fruit and ecology; To create a micro-farm; Personal commitment; Interest in nature and orchards; Budding interest in this type of fruit tree cultivation and for processing (juice, cider); Discovery and learning.

4. Target audience

The host wants to focus people living close by, as target audience. He also believes it depends on the demonstration.

It depends on the demonstration. Representing the commercial side of the farm, the people I am most interested in having, and for obvious social reasons, are really our neighbours. We want to do the maximum we can in selling directly to the end consumer. A big question here is always going to be the right price. How can we correctly reimburse the producer for his work, a sales person for his works, and not have a cucumber that is a ridiculous price for the end consumer. So, try and re-appropriate the chain so you can do a just distribution for everybody. So, for me, that's the most interesting. It's the people from around here. Also, what we want to do with the events is create such a social fabric.

5. Advertising and recruitment

The host farm usually uses their newsletter, Facebook, posters and flyers to advertise workshops.

For the moment, we're building up a newsletter. So, I think now we must be around 750 subscribers, we hope to reach as much as we can. Generally, people that have already followed a workshop are part of that. What else? Generally, we make posters that we go and put a bit everywhere around the place. We do flyers so when we go to markets, when there's workshops here, people can go with flyers. Then we use Facebook.

The local press and papers are also believed to be a good way to advertise and recruit participants.

We start being quite present on the local media. Sometimes we contact them but mainly they contact us. Like the cider farm, it's mainly once a month that they're in the local papers. Especially recently with the launching of the new product. It's good to have the press with you. We realised that if we want people to come, we have to.

T2: Appropriate demonstration and interaction approaches

1. Involving farmers in the learning process and the demonstration programme

Participants are not involved in the process of planning the workshops. The host believes people attend for different reasons.

They just arrive on the day, the last open farm day weekend we're doing we're organising with a local gathering of people that want to create a social fabric and we're doing it with an association with a local market. So we try to co-organise with other grassroots organisation but participants in themselves no.

If you have practical based aspects then there are things you need to cover and things you need to do, they will relate to specific tasks. If it's theoretical based then maybe on subjects that are a bit broader like "sovereignty" or ecological agriculture then probably it would be a lot easier to have an open classroom and a discussion, maybe even a reverse classroom where people learn beforehand and come have the debates but already instructed. I don't know, but for the moment no, participants are taking care of, because it's on very specific subjects. Today as you followed this morning, people come for that reason.

2. Focus and Design

If a workshop is organised top-down or bottom-up depends a lot on the content.

I doubt we would work with a teacher that would say "OK, we're going to stay in the classroom and they're going to listen to me, show some images on the Power Point". We would really want the hands-on approach. I think it's really important to mix mind and body. But whether it's top-down or bottom-up is up to the teacher and is very much up to the content as well. There is a lot of content that you can't do bottom-up, you have to do top-down and I don't see this particularly as a bad thing.

The same goes for a single of whole farm approach. The host says it depends on the theme.

We do both, we do the whole spectrum, this would be one activity, water management would be looking at the farm as a whole. It depends on the "theme".

When dealing with the design of the demo's and workshops, the host farmer believes 'exemplary' is for them the best and safest option.

We're at the very beginning so I don't think we're allowed the experimental parts, we really can't "own" this as a financial income and if we want to become renowned as an educational centre I think exploration is risky, a risk we can't afford to take so I'm going for exemplary and I'm very confident that within the year when we have sufficient infrastructure we can get very interesting people here.

Because we are not subsidised, we have to go for a nice quality, so we take people with renowned experience, and bring them, at least that's we're going to try do and what we've done.

3. Ideal group size

20 people with 2 teachers who can rotate is seen as ideal by the host.

C. has a very good voice and generally, if you have a good voice you can't go over 25 and 25 for one teacher already is a big group. Unfortunately our breakeven level, generally is around 10-12 people so, and often it can get to 15. So if 25 is too big a group, then I would say 20 would be perfect and it would allow us to make some profit and it would allow maybe a more personal approach to the teacher. Maybe 20 people per 2 teachers that would be the best and they would be able to rotate, so that they don't tire too much and a second teacher, one is giving explanation and the other is available to answer personal questions.

T3: Enabling learning appropriate to purpose, audience, context

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

Depending on the topic and the goal, the host doubts between farmer to farmer or adviser to farmer as being the most efficient.

If you talk about production, knowledge sharing about production, then I would say yes farmer to farmer is the most efficient. But if you talk about the activity and technological viability "and" the activity as a whole then are most, in our case, the most efficient role we have is adviser to farmer.

The organisation of the workshops has been quite random so far. The vision of the host farm only changed recently in this respect when they hired someone to work on cycles of demo's.

Up to now, it's been quite random. It's been meeting teachers and having a good chat with them... a good feeling with them... and co-organising something. It hasn't been particularly around a theme, it's been more about just random meetings and then acting upon it. Now, we've just hired D. full-time and the idea is really to be able to now start having a common thread, a real vision. It's not really

determined yet but we really want to do different types of cycles of demos. One would be much centred on growing citizens and another would be centred on growing farmers, so different types of demos for different audiences.

They do have clear vision for the content of these demo's, but they also know that it will be impossible to compete with subsidised workshops.

So maybe I'm going to explain what we want for different types of groups. So, we are opening a B&B, we are going to have different types of activities. So, we are going to give workshops as a whole, which are going to be given by the producing partners. We're going to have workshops that are given by external teachers. We did one last year on permaculture over five days with known farmers in Austria. So, this is the idea. So, this is the idea, firstly the subjects are going to be around food and agriculture and we cannot compete with subsidized workshops.

The host strongly believes in learning by doing and hands-on approaches.

Hands on approach, they learn by doing. Or you can learn by learning, a lot of people can but I think, anything that's really worth knowing you learn by doing, I would say. Because, learning is a personal experience you have to be able understand the things that you fail to understand and you can only do it through questioning.

2. Taking into account variation in learning

The host says it depends strongly on the habits of the teachers, and that he doesn't have a preference in their way of instructing, as long as it works and it's not straight forward one way transfer.

It's very difficult again because I'm not one of the teachers, so it would be would very much depend on the teachers, the one on the water management we had was a farmer and they tend to just explain what they do. I think here C. is very much a teacher in the proper sense, the word where he interacts with his audience more than elaborates on what he's saying. But I don't have a preference, the message that the teacher has to convey and we'll select teachers that do it, how would you say, with a certain value set and with a certain interest and we won't have somebody here who just bulldozes information into people's minds, it's not the idea.

T4: Effective follow-up activities

1. Follow-up activities and materials

None at the moment. The attendees get added to the newsletter if they want to, that's it.

Yes, they're added to our list and we send them reminders.

2. Assessing impact

They assess impact orally and informally, but not in a structured way at all.

5. Event analysis: effective peer learning characteristics

Event details

The group consisted of about 10 participants, of which 6 filled in the pre survey and 4 the post survey. Nobody works in the local area.

	n° surveys	Commercial exporter organic chocolate	Employee	Food Legislation	Industrial Engineer	Landscaper	Scientist
<i>occupations</i>	6	1	1	1	1	1	1
<i>gender</i>	6						
male	5	1	1		1	1	1
female	1			1			
<i>age</i>	6						
18-30	1	1					
31-40	4		1	1		1	1
41-50							
51-60	1				1		
60+							

T1: Learning processes

3. Communication initiation by participants

More than 50% of the participants had no problem sharing their knowledge and experiences related to the topic/ there was a very open atmosphere and participants were happy to speak up. The participants were never broken up into smaller groups. There was a natural flow of questions continuously during the day. However, there wasn't any time set aside specifically for questions. There were many questions and comments and most of the participants posed questions. There wasn't any particular reflection on the participants' points of view. The training was more focused on the specificities of care and maintenance of orchards than on getting the participants to formulate their own opinions.

	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	3/4	1/4	0
When there were any discussions, I felt comfortable sharing my opinion.	0	0	1/4	3/4	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	2/2	0	0
I encouraged the participants to formulate their own point of view during the demonstration.	0	0	2/2	0	0
I encouraged the participants to formulate questions during the demonstration.	0	0	2/2	0	0

4. Interactive knowledge creation

Hands-on opportunities and other multisensorial experiences

A hands-on activity was demonstrated, but only very shortly. The demonstrator showed the participants some equipment he uses for taking care of the apple trees. The participants didn't try to use any equipment themselves, they just watched the demonstrator do it.

The afternoon of the training day was outside in the orchard and the participants had the chance to see (and sometimes touch) different plants and insects up-close. However, there was no hands-on activity as such.

Discussion opportunities and negotiating conflicting points of view

There was no facilitator. However, since it was a small group, the questions flowed freely without the need for one. There weren't any open discussions as such, but there were plenty of questions. There weren't any conflicts about points of view.

	participant answers				
	strongly disagreed	disagreed	agreed	strongly agreed	not applicable
In my opinion, there were interesting discussions during the demonstration.	0	0	1/4	3/4	0
If participants didn't agree with each other during discussions, somebody (demonstrator/other participant) tried to reach a consensus between them.	1/4	1/4	0	1/4	1/4

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

5. Engagement during the event

This was the third time that most of the participants met so they did seem to know each other and there was a good rapport between them and between the main demonstrator and them. Both demonstrators were approachable and seemed to be well-liked by the participants.

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

T2: Learning outcomes

Acquiring new knowledge was facilitated for the participants through the use of photographs and through the visit to the orchard where the demonstrators pointed out different things. It was sufficiently understandable. It wasn't a very hands-on training day. It was also more focused on knowledge than skills. Common methods or ways of thinking on farming were questioned and alternatives were shortly elaborated on in group. The whole context of the training was organic cultivation and an alternative way of producing apples that looks at ancient varieties etc. and which moves away from monoculture. In that sense, the demonstrator spoke about questioned the "received knowledge" on the dominant ways of producing apples at the moment, but didn't question organic methods as such, nor the return to old production methods. It was implied that this was better. The training didn't question how it is that we learn, nor the best methods of teaching people.

What would you ideally like to learn today?	participant answers				
	strongly disagreed	disagreed	agreed	strongly agreed	not applicable
Management of pests without treatments; Theory/practice					
The demonstration met my expectations regarding what I wanted to learn.	0	0	0	4/4	0
The demonstration exceeded my expectations.	0	0	0	4/4	0
I felt surprised at some point(s) during the demonstration.	1/4	1/4	2/4	0	0
I obtained a clearer understanding of the topic(s) demonstrated.	0	0	2/4	2/4	0
I have the feeling I learned something new (knowledge, skill, practice, etc.).	0	0	0	4/4	0
I thought about how I could implement some of the ideas and practices on my own farm.	0	0	0	4/4	0
I reflected on my own point of view at some point during the demonstration.	0	0	2/4	2/4	0
I learnt about the principles underlying a practice.	0	0	2/4	2/4	0
I thought about how we learn something new on demonstrations (e.g.: teaching methods).	1/4	0	1/4	2/4	0
I thought about why I want to learn about the topic(s) of this demonstration.	0	1/3	1/3	1/3	0

what do you intend for the participants to learn today?	demonstrator answers				
	strongly disagreed	disagreed	agreed	strongly agreed	not applicable
Analysis and observation; To become independent in their orchards					
I think participants have learnt what I intended them to learn.	0	0	1/2	1/2	0
I tried to surprise participants with uncommon/new knowledge/new skill.	0	2/2	0	0	0
I felt surprised at some point(s) myself during the demonstration (e.g. by a question or discussion).	0	2/2	0	0	0
I obtained a clearer understanding of the topic(s) myself.	0	0	1/2	0	1/2
I have the feeling I learned something new during this demo (from participants, discussion...).	0	0	2/2	0	0
I reflected on my own point of view myself at some point during the demo.	0	1/2	1/2	0	0
I encouraged participants to reflect on their own point of view during this demo.	0	0	2/2	0	0
I encouraged participants to reflect on their own situation sometime during this demo.	0	1/2	1/2	0	0
I encouraged participants to reflect on how we learn something new on demonstrations.	2/2	0	0	0	0
I encouraged participants to reflect on why we are trying to learn about the topic of this demonstration	1/2	1/2	0	0	0

T3: Overall comments on the effectiveness of the event

Participants:

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

As main effective characteristics of the demo participants mentioned: Very practical and entirely effective.

None of the participants made a suggestion on how to improve the demonstration.

Demonstrator:

As main effective characteristics of the demo, the demonstrators reported: An interested audience and orchard setting, 'on the ground'.

As suggestion for improvement the demonstrator mentioned: 'Carrying out the treatments together.'