



LEONARDO DA VINCI
TRANSFER OF INNOVATION
CONVENTION 2011-FR1-LE005-24388



Report of the meeting New Advisers N°2 in Nantes (France), May 29th – 31st, 2012

A. Conditions of the meeting

Chamber of agriculture in Nantes 9:00 am to 6:00 pm - Visit on countryside on May 30th – 4:00 to 8:00 pm

Participants:

Rosa Leis Romaris and Constante Lorenzo – Federacion EFA Galicia – Spain
Joao and Fernanda Coelho - Casa Escola Agricola CampoVerde Portugal
Michael Hennessy, Tim O'Donovan and Joe Hanlon - Teagasc - Ireland
Hanna Johansson - Hushållningsällskapet and Per Erik Larsson - Biological vocational school - Sweden
Karl-Heinz Kolb – bbv-LandSiedlung GmbH and Ann Kathrin Spiegel – FiBI - Germany
Gergely Dózsa and Margit Batthyany-Schmidt - Hungarian Chamber of Agriculture – Hungary
Uros Zgonec - Chamber of Agriculture and Forestry of Slovenia
Etienne Regnaud – Résolia and Sylvain Sturel - APCA – France
Eric Waldmeier, IALB – Swiss
Philippe Delval – Acta – Endure
Claude Falgas - Consultant on Pedagogy - Yotta-g – France
Pascal Dagron and Sarah Beigel - Lead partner - AC3A and Philippe Blondeau - CRA Poitou Charentes
Claude Delbos, Coordinator, Chamber of Agriculture of Loire Atlantique - Nantes

Excused: Frank Pervançon – Résolia – APCA – France

Local guests on May 29 and 30th, 2012

Philippe Lemaire and Emmanuel Mérot - Chamber of Agriculture of Loire Atlantique – France
Jeanne Bailly-Manceau - Chamber of Agriculture of Vendée – France
Olivia David and Jean Baptiste Aninat – Projet CasDAR « Conseillers demain » – France

Welcome by Jean-Yves Marnier, chief manager of the advisory service in Chamber of agriculture in Nantes. He emphasizes the importance of advisers as 'smugglers' in transferring knowledge to farmers.

B. Purpose of the meeting

New Advisers project aims to improve and disseminate the professional innovation in agronomic advisory, particularly concerning pesticides reduction. Hence we focus on advisers' abilities (and not on farmer's skills to reduce pesticides).

The second meeting concerns the objectives of the different workpackages (WP): We will:

1. Feed production of the first outcomes of the project:
 - Notes on problems and resources - WP1
 - Descriptions of some problem situations - WP2
2. Organize the test of tools transfer (mobilization of each partner, phasing, supports and observations) – WP2
3. Frame the work on skills and competences and the next meeting in Germany - WP3
4. Use assessment results to improve the effectiveness of our partnership - WP4
5. Ensure external communication (paper and web) – WP5
6. Enhance and extend the work already done by other projects and organisations – WP6

C. Presentation of Endure by Philippe Delval (Tuesday, May 29th, 2012)

ENDURE regroups 22 partners from 10 countries and different organizations (research, extension, universities and industry). One of the main objectives is to ensure that advisers and growers in Europe are able to practically implement any IPM-related recommendations (See 2 websites <http://www.endure-network.eu/> and <http://www.pure-ipm.eu/>)

New technologies, co-innovation activities and multi-stakeholder approaches are important ways to reduce pesticides in crops production. For knowledge transfer ENDURE published an IPM Training guide for advisers (*arguments to introduce training for farmers, methodology on agronomical problems, combination of tactical methods with group and comparison from other European experiences*).

As the idea about co-innovation seems very close between ENDURE and New Advisers Leonardo project, different collaborations are to be developed:

- *Mutual information about European transfer projects and IPM websites*
- *Information about the French activities: (Ecophyto IPM website: <http://agriculture.gouv.fr/ecophyto>, <http://www.gis-reliance-agronomique.fr/Axe-Formation> WG Dynamics of change)*
- *Use of ENDURE / PURE common mailing lists, publication on ENDURE website of periodic news about Leonardo project 'New Advisers',*
- *Dissemination in the IPM Training Guide (one tool = one sheet), common workshop or meeting, ...*

D. Progress of tools tests in each country (Tuesday, May 29th, 2012)

The experimentation on tools and methods of facilitation is driven by the Irish partner. Between March and May each country had to implement first tests; achievements and difficulties are to be shared in order to adjust the device and succeed the second phase of test.

Michael Hennessy stated the objectives of testing advisory methods across in Europe, founded on identifying trans-European problems and taking in account European Sustainable Use Directive (SUD) on pesticides, adapted in each country. How to combine Education/cross compliance/advisory? Teaching and advisory capacities are the aim of this project. They differ between countries, so each country must:

- *Have a look on the local problem under cross compliance*
- *Try to address problems by using the tools already identified, i.e. discussion groups, problem based learning (learning by doing/testing) and clear vision.*
- *Implement the tests for each tool, using the information put on Google Docs.*
- *Report by filling the questionnaire in two parts: experimenter – participant*
- *Criticize the description of the tool made in the format Endure IPM Training Guide: anybody from another country must able to take possession of information from this sheet.*

For a general view on the experiment, see the scheme of test procedure in the report of the first meeting in Santiago (appendix VIII).

- a. In Ireland the identified problems are: *No national target to reduce pesticide, farmers not filling in pesticide records, trainers in colleges not trained in Sustainable Use Directive of Pesticides to transfer knowledge to students.* The test of Clear Vision was about a problem of weed destruction: the problem was the pesticide doesn't work because of the influence of the livestock enterprise on the farm (whole farm issue). The agronomy problem (like resistant weeds) could be explained by a larger approach, and at longer term the cropping system would require changing. The Clear Vision, similar than the Irish advisory visit, needs more advisers to be done with farmers. PBL using an online education platform is adapted for students but there was too much to cover in a short time frame and need long frame time to be done correctly (explanation by Joe Hanlon). The feedback from trainers and students is good. For adult training, less information would be provided than for training younger learners. Ireland aims to integrate PBL into the course and use it in adult learning.
- b. German analysis by Karl Heinz Kolb. Two experimentations have been done: one in school, the other with a group of advisers from an agricultural administration. The improvement is necessary for advisers and teachers. We propose discussion on future project design on IPM. It is necessary to involve consumers' market influence in the project. Improve on number of plots the reducing of pesticides compare to organic farming for example. The obstacle of the language is important to explain the problem when using foreign tools. Could we produce training modules to the tools?

- c. EFA reporting of the Spanish tests by Constante Lorenzo Santos. The difficulty for farmers to control weeds without any pesticide is noted. With the Discussing group there is not relationship between members of the group. The networking between advisers and farmers doesn't exist. In using Clear Vision, the question of pesticides use is always predominant. The difficulties are mostly observed with advisers because they don't have any practice on using these kinds of framework in advisory. Private basis is not the best way for advisers to develop new advisory is noted by Eric Waldmeier (IALB). Farmers are interested by the methods: they want to know more information on products they use. To use partnership's documents, we need more information. There are different steps to work with farmers to apply and to arrive at the sharing information point. It will be interesting to share information between us (example Ireland expectations and Spanish observations). Clear Vision will be experimented in June, about reducing use of active material for control of local crops. On the tool, we need a step by step approach.
- d. Presentation of the Slovenian experimentation by Uros Zgonec. It is noted that farmers have a lack of knowledge on pesticides. The main difficulty for trainers in using the tools is interpreting the translation of the instructions. Discussion group will be done next month. The first step is to accept the possibility to discuss on these questions. Clear Vision is easily used to accept the idea of the discussion. In university this is different than in practical school because they work on theoretical question, not really on concrete problems.
- e. Test reporting by João Coelho from Campo Verde (Portugal). The first step has been done with the João's students to test the tools. But the learning by doing is not available for students. The using of the manual of the focus group discussion, was in English, but the using is available with advisers. If participants are not involved in the discussion there is a problem because the manual was designed for those involved and would not make sense to outside people. The consideration of the skills to use the tools is not enough to make an efficient analysis of the means we used that we want to transfer. The main focuses to work are very important to compare the results of the tool transfer. Advisers seem not motivated in using PBL, we shall propose a Discussion Group session by taking the time (after food!) to explain the aim, and propose a question like "*if we stop glyphosate, what we do?*" We could also work with alumni of the school, with whom we have good relations.
- f. Question of pesticides reduction in Hungary by Gorgely Dozsa. In the same regions, the problems are different and can depend if people are involved in cooperatives or not. But generally, farmers do not know what the federal government wants to do. There is a big lack on the crop protection uses. The work will continue in June and after in autumn with interested people. One of the problems that bother us is the control of Ambrosia on an area and this could be used as a topic.
- g. Presentation of the French regional experience by Philippe Blondeau (see slideshow). Discussion group with 10 farmers - Clear vision with 3 advisers from Agricultural Chambers - Problem Based Learning not tested but will be a mix between DG and CV with young students. The question is around the method available to reduce pesticides use. Using the guide indicates that there is not enough explanation about the method. It must be complete to be usable. For Clear Vision, farmers pay for this survey. It might be adapted to be more usable for trainers. The method and the organization are good but need to be prepared with farmers to correspond to their needs which might be resolved. The best will be to have a guide with video to present examples. A short guide is interesting to discover the method and explain the approach. But a manual of using with example should be a real support for trainers and group moderators
- h. Swedish experiences on tools tested with students from biological vocational school (Pier Eric). The subject was on necessary actions for better rotation in crops for biogas production. The first step was a brain storming session on this problem where each person presented their own ideas and with reaction from the others. The problem with PBL is the difficulty when there is very important problem to understand the method approach. With PBL the benefits is the capacity for the student to share a question together and to reduce it by learning. To use the guide, people need to have some experience. For example they had group mixed from student from first level and from second level. Hanna Johansson presents the results of the survey about the partner training. They compare the number of students, trainers, advisers and farmers, the knowledge before and after training. They evaluate the method, the topics and the trainers/trainers. PBL appears more formative than DG (knowledge), but consumes more time (between 4 and 8 hours).

E. Debriefing of the first day of the meeting (Tuesday, May 29th, 2012 at 4:30 pm)

- 1) Participants strongly expressed their need for exchanges:
 - Information from the others - We have to share the same language and may be our differences to work - To know each other is interesting to progress alone in our own country
 - Comparison from different countries on their using of the same tools is interesting - Different contexts with common tools is interesting to see the uses of tools - On French Ecophyto project we know that we need tools coming from other countries
 - On other projects we exchange on ways to give more time and see what happens now and the consequences of historical event.

- 2) Participants' expectations will guide future work in the meeting and after:
 - The feedback is necessary to go advance - Progress made means that we are in the good direction - We have already done a lot of testing - Approach are done, we have to go ahead - We have now to think and to discuss how to do with.
 - We need time together for really productive exchanges - The timetable is too heavy. I think there are too many activities for the 3 days - Glad about the work of today. It may be too much to permit people to have more time to exchanges one to one may be, in particular with the common experiences of one meeting with shared experience.
 - We need more progress to see better the results at the transferable outputs - There are some acronyms not easy to understand - Fields visit could be another way to exchange and to learn.

- 3) We must consider the conditions of the test and the transfer themselves. That's one of the strongest aspects in Leonardo Transfer of Innovation:
 - How to motivate colleagues to commit to the test when they already have a lot of work? And are already overbooked (in a private and competitive status). What get those who have participated in the first test? We must listen to them.
 - How to gain the confidence of farmers? For the co-construction, we have to rewrite the methodology.
 - It is important to take into account the motivations of people involved in the test, their own concerns. We have to speak at their level.
 - What brings us together is the difference between SUD and agricultural realities, and is sometimes the lack of technical alternatives.
 - We are not trying to compare the tools, but to understand and clarify the forms of transmission and implementation of some tools, according to different situations of advisory. Our concern is to observe the conditions of transfer, more than the tool itself.
 - There are links with other projects where people have to learn for other one; here we learn for ourselves - How do you accept to do this NA work when you know that you have your normal work to do!! It is instructive.
 - Whenever possible, it will be good to act in tandem: one that leads the test, the other observes, it helps to deepen understanding during the debriefing.
 - Do not forget that in a situation of advisory, not only the tool and the adviser are involved, but the whole organization is behind the advice: Who and which can use these tools? This has an impact on the development of test and must to be observed and analyzed.

- 4) For more efficient transmission of methods and tools, we need robust educational tools, crossing language barriers.

- We need more information on individual tools to work with farmers - Explanation about model to test tools; do you have any presentations for PBL? May be necessary to have more visual with maps, board presentation
- Should it be additional information or the short guide be rewritten? The best would combine a short guide, with hyperlinks to further some part of the method and a video for examples. The video could be translated into several languages – Could be 'Discussion group' the 'first test' video?
- People must be able to make work with what it is learned – The organization will be discussed to know how to use them - A testimonial session will be interesting with the work done.
- It is also important to consider the skills to use the tools.

F. Challenges related to pesticides reduction ([Wednesday , May 30th, at 9:00 am](#))

Jean Baptiste Aninat and Olivia David (coordinator of the French project “*Conseillers demain = Advisers Tomorrow*” supported by the national found CasDAR) present some occupational issues related to pesticides reduction.

France is actually the first market for pesticides (in valor). The “Grenelle of environment” has decided to reduce half pesticides used in France during the next 10 years (based on sales). Each farmer will contribute to this reduction, but not by 50% each. Pesticides companies are trying to adapt their products to the law.

The French project “Advisers Tomorrow” wants to furnish tools and methods for advisers, to suggest new framework organization, and to transfer results...

The work mobilizes 12 advisers from different places in France, who test methods and tools. They make investigations and meeting time to share their information. Understanding the context of the farmer and his farming strategy, managing and facilitating the advice meeting (technical tools, body language, active listening ...), supporting changes on the farm, are four important issues. For the adviser, it means a “permanent investigation”.

The context influences the possibility to reduce (or not) the pesticides. If a cooperative or private company imposes drastic measures, the farmers may or may not be free to reduce pesticide use. Any adviser cannot force the farmer to treat or not, but they can provide the farmer with information to assist in the decision. For this reason, advisers are presently moving from the expert’s knowledge to a more reflexing advisory, more global to integrate all the questions and not only the immediate issue, to support the farmers in re-thinking the cropping and farming system.

Following the results of our project “Advisers Tomorrow”, in order to reduce pesticides:

- a. We must adapt existing professional tools,*
- b. We need more training about methods,*
- c. We have to integrate new ideas in our organization, in relation with other structures,*
- d. We need to communicate together, to train new advisers...*

Communication between advisers: we get yet information from research and big organizations, but we need also more specific information and tips from other advisers who have already worked with farmers and adapted existing solutions to problems and can share their experience.

G. Testimony on the farm visit by Sarah Beigel ([Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 evening](#))

We have a discussion with Guy Papion, who is part of a group working with an adviser (through the Chamber of Agriculture), about his farm in Abbaretz (50km north from Nantes).

The boards he uses to present to us the specifications of his farm are in your packs from this meeting.

The farm: Mixed Livestock (poultry, no cattle) and crops (173 hectares: wheat, corn, sunflower, barley.... mainly wheat), Mr Papion works with his wife and his father, he has 2 types of land and so 2 crop

systems: 1 deep soil with a lot of organic matter where a drainage system is necessary and 1 dry land. He has a relatively long and an unusual crop rotation, compared to his neighbours. His method is successful in avoiding disease and weeds and allows him to work by himself by spreading the work out over the year. He does not produce rape seed because the roots block the drainage system which is essential. This rotation isn't perhaps the profitable, but it is the most practical for him as he can work mostly alone. As he has few problems with weeds, he has quite a reduced use of pesticides.

Even though he changed his rotation before joining the advisory group and it turned out quite successful, Mr Papion realized he had other issues and problems and so he joined the Ecophyto group. He also joined to discover how to reduce chemical products even more.

Most other farmers in the area grow corn, wheat and grasslands for animals. People ring him and ask him for advice on farming, and people go to the Chamber of Agriculture for information and the Chamber of Agriculture diffuses his methods.

We also met Christophe, a neighboring farmer who is in the same group, they both feel the group works well as they can share ideas even though each person has their own project, they don't have the same objectives but they can and do learn from each other.

There are 8 people in their group. They feel they would like to meet with the adviser more often as it is very useful to get advice and to share ideas with other farmers, but they haven't got enough time!

H. WP2 - Presentation of the tools [\(Wednesday , May 30th, 2012 morning\)](#)

On Google, each partner has already found some documents presenting the tools, using Endure standard sheet model. It appears however necessary to spend several hours for a deeper information, which will also contribute to improve these documents.

- 1) **Discussion Groups**, by Tim O'Donovan: In Ireland these groups represent 6,000 farmers (dairy farms) with a budget of 6000€. There are 15 - 20 farmers by group.

How to manage groups: Adviser knows the farmers, he is a facilitator; group is directed by a chairman. The preparation is important and the adviser encourages each participant to speak in the group. Sometimes the preparatory individual questionnaire allows everyone to approach the situation without the influence of others. With 8 meetings per year and 2-3 topics per meeting, it is important for the facilitator to have clear objectives. What do advisers need in Ireland? They need to develop a program for advisers to facilitate the group activity with or without the chairman. In this group we can see emerging innovations; there are references for advisers not to reduce the average production but rather new ways to produce. When walking round fields, a practical consideration is that participants get tired if they stay standing for more than 25 minutes without moving. Cross Compliance records is very important to observe by the group some recommendation to manage (like board, summary) – see an example on Google Docs for Cross Compliance.

- 2) **Problem based learning** by Joe Hanlon and Karl-Heinz Kolb. (see slideshow) What is-it? It's a training method to enable learners to examine problems as a group, research part of the problem with individual and collective contribution. Why: each person learns by examining the core problem, take part of that core. Some countries need the manual to be improved. Each country will have to decide the best communication method for them – face to face, internet, Google, docs Moodle, etc. Decision also has to be made on which part of Sustainable Use Directive best suits this training method. It could be used to train advisers in pesticide reduction, or to find new ways to maintain production with reduced number of available products. Transfer of the tool depends on each country's situation. Problem Based Learning will have to be adapted to suit each situation.
- 3) **Clear Vision** by Jeanne Bailly-Manceau (CA85 France). In diagram with not defined question and with large diversity of elements, the farm is situated (complex/simple). This is a very useful tool for farmers in situation of change. It is a tool which permits the adviser to identify and isolate the problem (the real problem). The tools in Clear vision are different and examine from the external situation to internal problems and back. The SWOT tool is used to identify where the problem is situated (internally or externally). Clear Vision is an individual tool best used before starting any other work with the farmer. It is very important for the adviser to identify the real question/problem. What is

possible is to use Clear Vision to identify the question (strategic/technic/agronomic) and to work after with PBL or Discussion group (for example).

- 4) **Stephy Guide** by Emmanuel Mérot. What is Stephy guide? It's an approach in cropping systems to reduce pesticides. It contains the fundamentals of the agronomic system. It is designed to have the best possible technical approach and feasibility/practical approach. The co-design means that there is the opportunity to work together on the elaboration of the content of the crop system for the farm. It's used to train group of trainers on the guide using. In this case we need to practice using the tool and for farming research to adapt the tool to the farming (and not the farming to the tool).
- 5) **Discussion:**
 - Stephy guide seems adapted to a technical vision; it is a bridge approach to technical issues.
 - Can we be a good adviser without a general approach? We need a tool to detect clearly the work priorities, issues, before drawing up one or two action plans'. Sometimes the 'second' problem is the real problem. How can Clear Vision help us process the identified challenges in agronomy?
 - These tools may be the right approach (for instance before conversion to organic farming). They can also renew the discussion with the farmer, who is the one who makes the final decision. But it will be useful to decide when to switch to a strategic vision.
 - How do you convince farmers to implement co-designing? Answer: As each farmer has his own aims, he makes his own evolution plan of crops and techniques, with technical and environmental indicators. But we must have references for economic approach to the farm after the change of system.
 - We suffer lack of research on cropping and farming system (practice oriented research) and we have to point out that in the political level.

I. WP2 - Workshops on the 3 tools (Wednesday, May 30th and Thursday, 31st, 2012)

1. Discussion Groups

How well or poorly was the tools used in the tests?

Hungary, 9 crop farmers and 2 advisers, Gregory commented that the test went well and accepted well by the farmers, and they are particularly looking forward to a follow-up meeting. No financial incentive to come, so very good that they want to come back!

Slovenia: Preparing for the test. But commented: there are already government funded discussions groups, a milk-group mainly, EU and national funded, a plan to set up 40 more groups (2012 and 2013), this can work in tandem with the New Advisers tests.

Germany: Test has started, waiting for the results. Discussion groups are widely applied in Germany in advisory systems; Ann-Kathrin says they are successful, especially for organic farming, but they are not formal enough.

Sweden: (outside of the tests) groups are widely used: Government's subsidy for the adviser, established in the 80s. There are no very formal structures in the group, 3-4 meetings per year (according to needs). Some farmers feel it as a cheaper way to get advice

France: (outside of the tests) Groups are very common. You pay for the service. They meet regularly, but don't have a specific timetable.

Very positive in Hungary, and it will be in Slovenia, in the other countries, these practices are established already, but the tool will help to improve this.

How well can the tool handle the problem situations?

Sweden: It can re-energize the groups

Hungary: It will help farmers to get more information

Ireland and Germany: we think this could really help

Germany: They tested the tool, telling advisers they could test in on any topic. this will highlight their problems situations

How easily does the tool transfer?

Hungary: Very well, should be a good transfer out, both advisers gave positive feedback, saying they were able to use it

Sweden and Ireland: Feel it's ok and should transfer well

Germany: Established advisers seem to find the tool easy to use, but for newer advisers we probably will need a step-by-step guide (a complete guide)

Slovenia: Transfer is ok, but needs competent advisers.

Suggestions for improvement:

- A. Material on the Google Docs for dissemination to people outside of the group. This is allowed, we don't have confidential material, so we can give technical documents to the test advisers to help them. Only caution, if there's the Leonardo logo at the top of the document, we need to write "*this document does not engage the European commission*" (see communication guidelines).
- B. We will adapt the existing guide together to be a step-to-step guide, adding things we feel are important, this adapted, common guide will be released in 2014. The more input from European partners, the better! Should we have an overview at the beginning of the book and then each tool in more details?
- C. Make a video (DVD or YouTube) with testimonies from farmers to show how the participants received the tools. (Careful about image-authorizations).
- D. Promotion of the tools at agricultural fairs/shows, to get more farmers to get involved.

Erich (IALB): If you want to reach something in a goal-driven advisory service, the adviser HAS to work in groups, because it's impossible to reach everybody, and also new issues and situations. But is this system useful for integrating agronomic issues? We need to make sure people understand (dissemination etc.), that people know this is possible. Farmers during the visit yesterday said they didn't talk about agronomy in the discussion groups; we need to find out why? Why don't they talk about it? We need to make sure they know it can be useful for agronomic issues.

Etienne: We need to address the issue of the attitude and facilitation skills and competencies of the advisers, and HOW does the adviser react/address complex situations. So the tool is not enough, you need a trainer who has attitude / facilitation skills (i.e. being able to confront a group with mixed opinions, or dealing with natural leaders in the group). Is the adviser capable to do it? Are they the right advisers to do the work? This obviously concerns all of the tools. We have to talk about this further (WP3).

2. Problem Based Learning

Experiences

Portugal: Have not tried PBL yet, but think it won't be difficult to do. They feel it's better for young learners and younger advisers who would be more likely to listen and use it, but it depends on the level you use.

Spain: Constante has used it already with a group of advisers (discussing the SUD directive).

Ireland: They use it only with learners (17-18 year olds), using Moodle, they said they learned from it, but could use it with advisers

Possible Problems/Improvements:

People found the guide was not enough; it needs to have different steps, and needs to include the different levels (to learners, adviser to learners etc.).

They felt that it's important for the group using the PBL that they all have a common goal/aim. Need to make sure the group goes in the right direction (but be careful with farmers, as they might not have the same goal).

To improve the guide: show how to use the tool at different levels (adviser, farmer, mature student, and student) - Select a mode of communication that suits all.

Issues to be prioritized with PBL: how to put PBL into practice, help advisers find ways to maintain production with reduced amount of active substances available, or to train users of pesticides how to use pesticides better.

How easy is it to transfer PBL?

It depends on the colleague

We need more detail in the training guides

Need to improve the guide, definitely needs to be modified.

Future plans:

France: Use PBL in a school (face to face communication)

Spain: Will test with students and further with advisers

Ireland: Will possibly test with advisers.

Portugal: Again with students after the holidays

Moodle

It is both a communication and an education tool in one. You need an administrator. You need to download it to use it; in cloud or not cloud-computing. It is free.

This was used by the Irish partners with younger students, but they feel it could be used with advisers and farmers.

You can make lesson material available to the students online (i.e. a pesticide label). Then there is a small quiz available to test their understanding by answering questions on Moodle, Moodle will mark the tests and make comments on the answers.

You can also put an exam on this tool, students only get one attempt, they can work online anywhere, and then it will be marked by Moodle, and the results will be sent to the administrator (adviser).

There is also a forum on Moodle where the students can discuss new topics.

You can use video, slideshow, and after each media, they can take a test. The step would be going out into the field and practically test it.

Irish partners feel it's useful, you can use it over and over, and the questions are not the same each time, the computer muddles up the multiple choice answers each time. So you can use the material for a number of years.

Can you make a multilingual Moodle? One could transpose or translate the quiz

The Swedish partners use another similar online tool called "Fronter" (not free). They feel ICT solutions can be a help, but they group-aspect perhaps is lacking; group is useful for PBL.

In the UK, after attending a course initially, farmers can complete online tests to get points.

Another tool (APCA), 2 days training, on online space where you learn information, but then 2 days discussions in a group with a moderator, then you take a test online, then you are certified. E-learning approach is very interesting; this type of tools saves time in face-to-face, but it needs to be blended with the group. Training sessions with a good adviser are VERY important.

3. Clear vision

How well was the tool used?

The tool hasn't really be used by partners yet. Why was this? Not a good understanding of the tools yet and maybe that the other two tools seemed more useful to begin with, and that this might come after.

The method itself and the material

Agreement: the tool is useful. It looks at the farm as a whole and has the capacity to identify the real problem (which might be completely different to the problem the farmers comes to you with in the first place, it allows you to identify sub-issues. It can also help direct the adviser to solve the problem. It is a first look; you light refer them to other people, or bring in other tools.

Example (Jeanne), the farmer said the problem was how his son could join the farm business. But in the end, several issues/challenges were identified: The type of production, the potential to earn enough money for each person, to be able to take a break, and to be able to be proud of their jobs. Then using clear vision, you can categorize these challenges (prioritization) and write a report, and then with the farmer, you can prepare an action plan.

!! Problems can arise, in this example the family refused to talk about money, but it is an important issue for the action plan for the farm. Sometimes, there were advisers who cannot talk about money. In this situation, you need help from your colleagues; you learn how to work with the farmer and the family...

Difficulties

Material: the steps aren't quite as clear as they could be. Explanations need to be longer. Video needs to be dubbed/subtitled. Step by step instructions need to be improved- clearer, using the example, to show how it works in reality by writing one example step by step: how the adviser uses scribble notes on the first and second visit, how he/she writes of actions between the second and third visit. Michael and Jeanne are going to do this.

The pictures (From the PowerPoint- “Central tool is the Circle of Questions”), but these don’t mean much to us, we don’t find them useful as they are currently.

Debate about the usefulness of the matrix.

The Name? Many partners don’t feel it is quite right. We need to find a new name.

Possibility: Link to Stephy Group tool in order to strengthen the agronomic side?

- Etienne: The important thing is that this tool opens new questions. In training, we sadly observe that most of the advisers don’t ask open questions. The farmer is driven in a technical direction. Clear vision may help farmer and adviser to broaden their thinking. Behind pesticides are other issues on security, income... Even with good technical tool, we don't progress!
- Eric: Agronomists ask agronomic questions. Our question is "*how the action plan is established on the agronomic topics? How address the problem?*"
- Karl Heinz: The action plan may be multi-level.
- Michael: please fill the “Suggested Test Schedule” sheet for the tests to be done per each partner on <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1uwPHG-0vRMh4ONw8tkwzb1zSgl9MQ5bmzsHbLCUhDps/edit>
- If you don’t understand something, please contact Michael, Tim, and Joe.

J. WP1: Typology of the identified problems (Tuesday, May 29th, 2012 at 2:00 pm)

Claude Delbos presents a typology of the problems derived from the first survey done in WP1, on 2 axis:

- The axis 1 is focused on the farm: Activities, supports, management, external environment
- The axis 2 is focused on SUD: Integrated Pest Management, Training, Cross Compliance

This analysis allows us dividing the 22 problems already identified, into 5 types of problems, which are:

- a) **Insufficient technical answers** next to or in place of (too) commonly used pesticides, like glyphosates (11 problems)
- b) **Knowledge lack of pesticide applicators**, resulting in inappropriate (too much chemical or not enough) use (5 problems)
- c) **Oversimplification of crop systems and management** for economic or organizational reasons (3 problems)
- d) **Insufficient involvement of farmers** in the implementation of the regulation (3 problems)
- e) **Insufficient involvement of advisers** in the search for alternatives to pesticides (3 problems)

It is likely that each type of problems is mobilizing different resources and skills to be addressed.

This typology may be improved over the project.

K. WP1 - Presentations of the outcomes 1 & 2 (Thursday 31st May, 2012)

Spanish partner presents a draft outcome 1 (see on the web). We expect to publish Outcome 1 in September. Comments about this document (anything to add, what have you found interesting, any comments on the structure, content, images...) are needed. Rosa will send a reminder email. Would it be important to show in the document the European diversity of advisory?

Portuguese partner presents the outcome 2 on paper (See purple document): Problem situation, Resources, Context and Usability, Access mode and Languages available. Some improvements are suggested: *Put it more in context, from the more general (common frame) and then go into details, tidy it up, make it clearer and change the title.* The purple document could be situated through a common set of knowledge, skills and tools. *“First you need the skills and then you can use the tools”.*

What information is relevant to give advisers and trainers in the context of our own country? In order to improve these documents, we need to work on it more. German and Irish partners will send Joao their

ideas for this, how they imagine the organization of these schematics, from “our mapping” (see report of the first meeting, with the connections and feedbacks).

L. WP3 – Methodology and third meeting (Thursday 31st May, 2012)

The WP3 is introduced by German Partner and C. Falgas (See PowerPoint presentation). Strategic environment is very important as it differs so much in different countries. For example, in Germany today is encouraged face-to-face in order to make business; which could cause a degradation of service quality. In some countries, the requirements of cross-compliance are overstated; in others countries they are disregarded. However we are looking in the project for **common skills** and some skills adapted to our 3 tools. Claude Falgas suggests another tool for changing attitudes in advising, which could be part of the final outcomes (in the written document), considering 3 different points of view:

- A. Contact Cycle:** obstacles come up: 1. we need to be open enough to see all that is possible, 2. we need to feel confident enough to get past them 3. At the end we have a production: what have I (or not) achieved?
- B. Spatial diffraction** (as through a rainbow): the concrete things that happen, the emotional aspects, the “sensorimotor” and the thinking.
- C. Past- Present- Future.** Present is the results of the past and the roots of the future. A and B have an effect on C.

After analysis, we could create a CV Europass, profile for advisers and teachers, and then a training module for people who are in relation with others to combine experience assets (see Claude Falgas’ article in the conference pack).

Comments on the Work Package

- Eric considers that use of tools need a short range of skills. He explains that his organization has identified basic competences and skills for a certificate (CECRA). He suggests that it could join the project and will send it to everyone (English, French and German). New Advisers could combine their work with any other holistic list, or do a reference of the project to an existing training module.
- Tim: Not every country has the resources for an observer in the testing phase. We need some evaluation questions on skills. There is a list of skills in Claude’s document, but we can add to it. We should have a document like this for each of the tools. Could we list the skills needed for the 3 tools?
- So about the observation by a second person: let’s try if possible, but if it only happens in 2 out of the 8 groups then that’s ok. And the advisers themselves do a self-evaluation, using a self-evaluation grid. We need to observe this grid using what is already online.
- Etienne: The group for WP3 (Karl-Heinz, Claude F., Hanna, Etienne, Hanna) needs to discuss about skills and competences and will meet in late June early July.

Comments on next meeting in Germany

- High consumers ‘pressure, ecological production and organic farming, relationship of advisers with ‘real’ farming. These issues should be considered during the project and we have to talk about this.
- During each meeting, we must be careful not to make too many changes and not to impact on the work already done.
- Philippe said that some of his colleagues wanted to know if all the advisers were going to be trained with all the tools....: We need to see what we are going to do after 2013.

M. WP4 - Evaluation (see note prepared by Hanna Johansson before the meeting)

To support the project management, the Swedish partner has produced and analyzed the assess questionnaire about the meeting in Santiago: the results appear very good, however we must ensure two points of difficulty: 1 - the language barrier - 2 - the time management, for some partners who already have a daily workload, and for which further the Leonardo project increases constraints.

The evaluation plan (See https://docs.google.com/file/d/0B-ZkDs_zZQ5ncHISdHJmcFhvT1E/edit) has been written by Hanna, with the support of Anita Boij, Swedish experienced consultant for evaluation. All partners will send comments to Hanna if necessary.

N. WP5 - Diffusion (Thursday 31st May, 2012 at 11:00 am)

We need to store information and make it accessible for public use. We also need some kind of network between partners (and others) to share and explain. We need to look at 2 levels: European level, and then to implement the tools at each national level (for national policy). We also need some diffusion tools which will be useful to make the project live on after September 2013.

As we kept a very small budget for Internet, it's not worth creating our own website (constraints: budget and time for administration); we will put information on sustainable sites which are linked together.

The practical implications are:

- 1- WP5 is responsible for diffusion of the whole project, but each partner has to contact his own local/national stakeholders. Each partner in their own country must make contact with the people in charge of the national action plan/directive, and see if we could be included in the "Tool Box" (and not in the action plan itself). Also ask if the partner could do a presentation at the next presentation of the national action plan (partnership should prepare some slides for all to use)
- 2- We could have different parts of the project on partner's websites and then link them together. Among the resources specified by Philippe Delval: ENDURE's website is definitely live until 2016 (it has enough money from partners and the decision has been made to keep it running until then), ENDURE/PURE common mailing list (in each partner-country), Ecophyto IPM website (Philippe Delval coordinator), WG dynamics of change. We could also contribute to evaluation of the Endure tools (IPM training guide, EIC).
- 3- In the ENDURE website, New Advisers could have a section giving updates on the project, but not storing intermediate results; these could be elsewhere (for instance on ADAM Leonardo's website) with links. Everything that needs to go to ENDURE should be sent to Claude Delbos.
- 4- Other Possibilities for diffusion:
 - In the next CAP, there is a project to create a network for innovation to promote agricultural innovation. It's only a project, it doesn't exist yet, but it might be interesting to keep an eye on its progress (Sylvain Sturel)
 - Copa-Cogeca: next congress in Budapest - possible presentation?
 - Solinsa project, an opportunity to join with them?

O. WP6 - Work schedule for the next months (Thursday 31st May, 2012 – 4:00 pm)

The action plan must be adapted to the postponement of the third seminar at the end of February – So the test of tools will be finished before December 31, 2012

Hanna: *'The program of the meeting was too extensive; we are in a hurry at the end of the third day of the meeting. We need enough time on the timetable to discuss what has to be done'*

See Work schedule on next page.

	What to do?	What date?	Who do it?
WP1	Read Rosa's document outcome N°1, send back comments	1 st September 2012	All partners
WP1	Send to Joao and Claude D. suggestions and remarks about outcome N°2	1 st September 2012	All Partners
WP1	Prepare a new document- outcome 2 and send it to everybody	30 th September 2012	Joao and Claude D.
WP1	Send back comments on the two 'second-draft' documents outcomes N° 1 and 2	31 st October 2012	All partners
WP1	Complete outcomes 1 & 2	30 th November 2012	Spain and Portugal
WP2	Give feedback from meeting 2 to improve the steps of the tools testing	1 st September 2012	All Partners
WP2	Schedule and perform the tests (at least 3 tools on 3 problem situations) before 31 st December 2012	1 st September 2012	All partners
WP2	Re-write presentations for each tool	10 th September 2012	Irish Partners
WP2	Fill the right column in "Suggested Test Schedule" on Google Docs for the tests to be done per each partner	10 th September 2012	All Partners
WP2	Send to Irish partner comments and complements on the notes presenting tools (see Google Docs)	1st October 2012	All Partners
WP2	Send back the evaluations to Hanna and Irish partners (and photos from the test)	31st December 2012	All partners
WP2	Introduce all the comments on the tools in the presentation material before publication on the web	15 th February 2013	Irish Partners
WP2	Present the results at the meeting in Germany	27 th February 2013	Irish & Swedish Partner
WP3	Complete method to observe and analyze skills and competences during and after the tests	15 th July 2012	Karl-Heinz, Claude F
WP3	Provide a conference call to organize the observation of skills	30 th September 2012	Coordinator
WP4	See timetable on Google docs for Evaluation Plan, send comments to Hanna if necessary	1 st September 2012	All Partners
WP5	Regroup all press articles and TV links in a folder on Google Docs	28 th June 2012	Coordinator
WP5	Seek to present the project at the meeting of Copa-Cogeca 1-3 October in Budapest	1 st September 2012	Gergely + Sylvain
WP5	Send to Claude D. your website addresses with a link to where you present the NA project	30 th September 2012	All Partners
WP5	Contact your National Action Plan Authorities, discuss NA with them	30 th September 2012	All Partners
WP5	Prepare a 5-8 slide-show to introduce the project to each national authorities	30 th September 2012	Coordinator
WP5	Clarify the role of Hungarian and Slovenian partners in the implementation of WP5	30 th September 2012	Coordinator
WP5	Put reciprocal links between pages with the New Project Advisers on the different websites involved (partners, Endure and Adam)	31 st October 2012	Coordinator
WP5	Prepare the videos to present the tools and the testimonies	1 st June 2013	Coordinator+ All Partners
WP6	Put on Google Docs documents and photos. Use the information to support your project activities.	All over the project	All Partners
WP6	Inform partners on the program of the 3rd meeting in Germany	1 st December 2012	Karl Heinz + Claude D.