



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



Report of the meeting New Advisers N°3 in Herrsching (Germany), Feb. 27th – March 1st, 2013

A. Conditions of the meeting

“Haus des bayerischen Landwirtschaft Herrsching” from 9:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.

Farm visit on Feb. 28th – 2:00 to 4:30 p.m.

Participants:

Sarah Beigel - Lead partner and Philippe Blondeau - CRA Poitou Charentes - AC3A
Joao Carlos Da Silva Coelho - Casa Escola Agricola CampoVerde -
Constante Lorenzo Santos and David Colunga Quesada – Federacion EFA Galicia
Michael Hennessy, Tim O'Donovan and Joe Hanlon - Teagasc
Karl-Heinz Kolb and Stephanie Ress - bbv-LandSiedlung GmbH ; Ann Kathrin Spiegel – FiBI
Hanna Johansson - Hushållningssällskapet and Per Erik Larsson – Swedish board of agriculture
Gergely Dózsa and Gabor Nadudvary - Hungarian Chamber of Agriculture
Uros Zgonec - Chamber of Agriculture and Forestry of Slovenia
Sylvain Sturel - APCA and Eric Waldmeier, IALB
Claude Falgas - Consultant on Pedagogy - Yotta-g
Claude Delbos, Coordinator, Chamber of Agriculture of Loire Atlantique - Nantes

Guests:

Jens Erik Jensen - UFL – Endure
Ramon Lamelo Otero – Xunta Galicia – Spain
Silke Dachbrodt Saaydeh – Julius Kühn-Institut (JKI) – Germany
Jacques Dugon and Michel Jeanrenaud – Agridea – Swiss
Anne-Kathrin Jackel – Region of Unterfranken - Germany

Excused: Etienne Regnaud – APCA Resolia and Pascal Dagron - Lead partner - AC3A

B. Objectives of the meeting

The 3rd meeting takes place at the end of test tools. We will start the dissemination phase towards the target audiences and stakeholders and organize the administrative and financial closure of the project.

Thus, in the three days together, we will:

1. Present a synthesis of the 3 tools tests
2. Write down what we have learned about the transfer
3. Implement in each country WP3's workshops about competencies
4. Organize the next meetings (Paris- 22nd-24th May, Budapest- 10th-12th Sep)
5. Revise the budget of the project to get the best result

Claude Delbos summarizes the 20 project's outcomes, which will be presented on Google Drive (internal use), on ADAM website (all Leonardo projects, all sectors can access), on ENDURE website (agriculture, advisory), on video specialized website.

About the budget revision, Karl Heinz points out that the work packages they work on haven't really begun yet, so it is normal that they've not spent much money!

C. Results of the tools tests

1 – General overview (Michael)

The Irish partner has looked at the questionnaires, and prepared a short report on them.

To date, only a third of the expected tests; this small number does not allow a statistical analysis, and conclusions are very narrow. Moreover questionnaires anonymity was guaranteed to participants, but this is a problem to understand the background

2 - Problem based learning (Joe)

Problem based learning was used for alternatives for pesticides and IPM. Most of testers were trainers for advisers, a few advisers and tutors. Learners found it brought new knowledge, others said it was useful, a few disagreed. The manual is “easy to understand” and “usable”.

Even if trainers may find difficult to carry out this training, the learners may find it very useful.

3 - Discussion groups (Tim)

Trainers: All agreed the manual was easy to understand and all agreed it was usable. Most said it was better than other guides (however, we don't know which country it's from, so we can't say if this is because they simply don't have any other!)

Learners: Most said it was good and would lead to positive changes on the farm.

Trainers perhaps had some small issues (they slightly agreed, not totally), and the learners benefited.

4 - Clear Vision (Michael)

All CV was used for IPM - Most had never used CV. Most said the manual easy to understand, but 1/3 said it was usable and 2/3 slightly disagreed that it was usable. 1/3 slightly disagreed that the guide is better than other guides, but same as before, this isn't very clear.

- Uros says, perhaps it's because the tool itself can be used differently.
- Karl-Heinz, perhaps it's because they're not used to using this type of tool.
- Michael feels it's the hardest tool

Generally, compared the other tools, for CV more negative comments from trainers, and the learners felt the opposite, learners were very positive

Clear vision is a good tool, but it takes too long, the advisers have too many clients in Ireland currently so it will be complicate to integrate it into their program.

5 - General conclusions (Michael)

All partners should have participated in WP2. The tools were difficult; they need training and constant support. But nobody asked the partner n°3 for help, as they were coordinator, even though they reminded people several times.

We need to determine why it didn't happen. Is it the advisory context that means we couldn't do it?

Partner n°3 has created a questionnaire for partners on the current situation in each country and how the tools can be integrated. Why some countries didn't do any tests? Failure to convince advisers, advisers couldn't see the benefit, lack of time; some advisers don't have the autonomy? Did the partners adapt the manuals according to their country??

- Ramon says: We need perhaps some examples of positive outcomes following the use of the tools
- Joao: Situation in Portugal is so difficult at the moment, I have run one test PBL with students, and two discussion groups
- Tim says: To convince an adviser to use the tool, I even went to see him and explained the tool in person, and gave him a step by step plan of action (in the manual). The adviser, even though he was very very busy, said that discussion group worked really well and everyone benefitted from it. The adviser said the guide was excellent, but we can see that the coaching helped too, advisory services need to give back up.
- Gregory – we have done 2 CV and 1 PBL (8 people) and 2 Discussion groups (8 people each time).
- Michael: We need these results to draw our conclusions on the test!

D. Workshops: why did the tests fail? What to do now?

Feedback group 1: Why did the tests fail in Portugal?

Joao did a few tests with students:

- i. Discussion group: One session (13 Learners - 1 trainer) - Topic record keeping and applying pesticides (cross compliance). Once preparation was done, it was easy to do in class time. Students like the idea. The tutor liked the concept of the tools.
- ii. CV does not suit and is harder to learn.
- iii. PBL will be done but there is time to do it with the current students. Joao can run PBL himself but it is not valid as he knows the project. He will try to get another colleague to run it using the manual. Part of the test is to see will the tutor be able to understand the manual.

It seems not possible to do any more. Is it a cultural and attitude problem in Portugal?

- Advisers are driven by commercial sales and chemical companies, and so they're not motivated to reduce pesticides and to carry out or implement tests.
- Advisers work to the levels set by the government, but if they go over these levels for pesticides, there aren't any penalties = a lack of control of the pesticide use.
- Portugal generally lacks a strategy, lack of motivation. At the moment there' no national action plan, and until one comes in, there won't be any motivation for advisers and farmers.

Michael: If people are paid on an hourly basis, they haven't a salary, so it's difficult to convince them to go over what they do normally to do something new.

Tim: it's probably not a real problem if Portugal have only tested one tool, but several times it would be ok as a compromise, he has tried to do the other tools and it's not possible.

Joe: Please note that it has been stated by the Irish Partner, that if one test does not suit locally or culturally, then the country could try to carry out one that is more suitable to the local situation.

Philippe: The teachers in Poitou-Charente have their own training methods, so it was difficult to convince them to test Problem based learning. A specific relationship needed to be made with the teachers. It has happened, but it was difficult. Clear vision and Discussion groups were easier.

Feedback group 2: Why did the tests fail in Germany?

Karl Heinz contacted twice the managers to convince them to take part. Then he sent them the manual; and he contacted them again to see if there were any problems and could he help them on any point. However, there was no success, nothing happened.

Everyone has to figure out the tool themselves (a bit like if it was just on the internet). Perhaps this method doesn't work. They couldn't see how it could fit it into their work, and said they could only organize it for next April, in order to integrate it correctly.

The German partner tried to convince the manager of a number of advisers and at the head of institutions of different states – but they are unwilling to try. A “bottom-up” and “top-down” approach was tried and it did not work. Despite the fact that the tools are good, it is difficult to convince people of the benefits of those tools. In addition, it is difficult to convince people to change their work, (as they think that they are good enough already), it will be difficult.

For Clear Vision – farmers in Germany generally have more than one adviser – for different things (one for building, one for crop husbandry, one for economic and financial planning, etc.). Not many advisers have a holistic view of the farm over several years; the structure that exists does not suit this tool.

There is probably no good way in getting advisers to do what we want – the German partner's approach was a closed approach as it may be done on the internet and if the tools are to be used by the adviser are more open approach may be useful – advisers and managers will need support.

Slovenia said that - we need support to implement any of the tools - for example Discussion Groups need data (it is not just talking) to combine and compare with other farmers and farmers within the group. Not only a manual is needed, support is also needed from the equivalent of “Specialists”. Most people feel the teachers and advisers need back up support and not just the manual.

In Germany, it is possible that one region may carry out a test in April but have too much work until then and will do it then.

Feedback group 3: How could the use of the tools be implemented in the future?

Ramon: Profile of the adviser- some have more technical profile, or more administrative profile. Technical may be better, but farmers seem to prefer administrative advice, as a technical advisory takes more time.

We have a group of advisers who are supported. We could have a meeting with them and show them the 3 tools. Currently, they just give advice as well as they can, but they don't have specific methods. In a second meeting, we will provide them with the documents. We could give them each a goal to achieve (ie. at least 10 farmers involved in each activity), with an incentive (not money, but invite to a specific meeting). This process can be repeated with other advisers. The tools should reduce their workload and facilitate their work!

Uros: Each country is different, advisers have different tasks to carry out, not only discussion groups. In Slovenia, advisers have to deal with an area, not a sector, so they have to advise on crops, animals, vines etc. - Farmers don't like sitting down! So we should limit the time the adviser spends with them. We need to prepare some protocols (how many farmers involved etc.). There are 2 levels: Providing advisers with new methods and then convincing the farmers to participate. The step by step plan for discussion groups has effective results. The first meeting is important to "catch" the farmers for the discussion group; they must see the reasons to work in the group. And we need support from Slovenian agricultural institute, university, etc.

Gabor: As an adviser, I have the time to learn the tools, but with 400 farmers, I can't spend several hours with one farmer. Giving individual advice, it's impossible!

Tim: we must think of financial incentives for farmers. It is relatively easy to justify funding SUD from public money as it is a public good. We did this in Ireland: farmer got €1,000 from the government for a year to participate in dairy discussion groups. This is finished now, but we think we will maintain 2/3 of numbers now even without the money. We should propose to E.U. to fund tools for farmers 'innovations, in the short term only. As we have seen in Ireland, this has worked. Those who use the tools, need education and then on-going coaching, not just using the tools from a manual (perhaps this explains why the tools haven't been used).

Discussion: Tests, will they continue?

Sarah: the intermediary evaluation does mention the test and the critical situation of WP2; we need to draw more results from the tests for the project to have meaning!

Claude: Optimistic commitment was 9 tests in each country, but we do not have much more time and can't give another deadline. The test time is nearly over; we can carry on with experiments, but without being official tests for the project. We must also learn from the "un-success".

He asks for partners to write their intention for the next month – 1 page describing what will be done in terms of testing the tools month. And at the end you do the same page compete the page to see what was done. Then carry out a review of the training and the problems encountered. This can be used as part of the evaluation of WP3, but will not be included in the statistical analysis of the tests

The tests can link to and be included in the report of WP2 and in the workshops in WP3. Sweden said that there will be no problem asking Anita to compile the results but there will not be any statistical analysis as there is an insufficient number for valid analysis. It will be monographic.

Karl-Heinz: the testing works so differently in different countries. We need time.

Philippe: we will have some more tests to do in the coming months.

Future:

Tim: In Ireland, we will keep Discussion groups. PBL is new tool for us, but we can apply it for merchants about S.U.D., they need very specific training, which the PBL suits. It is useful especially in remote locations and for exams on very specific topics. For the farmers, it will take too much time. Clear vision too stays very specific for a special case, no time any more.

Ramon: In Spain, same idea: PBL for shop-keepers. Motivation was less waste out of the store.

Philippe: Advisers have to be certified and to be updated continually. They would use the tools to help the training; for example, use of PBL to bring advisers up to a level, as preparation for an update course.

Karl Heinz: In Germany it is proposed to complete a test with a group of teachers and advisers – the aim is to update and certify the advisers in their work.

Germany has proposed to use Discussion Groups and Clear Vision for the advisers for the training and to certify them after the training. The tests and training will be run between June and Dec 2013.

Clear Vision will be specifically used to train advisers in water quality. Clear Vision with all the farmers focusing on the new cropping section, the global farm system and focused on the cropping system using Clear Vision in autumn 2013.

Conclusions:

1. Partners who have not yet given Hanna info on their tests (even if they haven't got the questionnaires) send it to her now!!
2. Irish partners will talk with each partner to get their feedback from their tests, why they didn't run as planned.
3. The tools are good tools, they have been tested and we've got the results, and the issue now is to integrate them in each country.
4. The internet is a cold way to inform people and without help tests are difficult to implement. In the next step, we will go directly to the contact of relevant advisers and managers, we will meet them before and support them very practically during the test
5. Will we carry out a new analysis using the results of new tests? Even next tests won't be analyzed in WP2, they will be a useful experience for project partners and about transfer process.
6. Each partner should write down what they want to do in the next two months (March and April), and **report what was done should be send to Michael before 2013, May 5th.**

E. WP3 workshops

Karl-Heinz presents a slideshow on competencies in advisory, and emphasizes on specific aspects as to move away from short term decisions in advising to more long term, to empower the farmer so that he makes the decisions, to include experiences from different institutions.

The goal of the WP3 workshops is to define:

- Which skills and competencies are used in which contexts, required for which tools, for daily work?
- What external aspects set limits for advisory?
- What training is already offered for S&C?
- What kind of training would help the future of advisory?

The structure of workshop (see PowerPoint) may be adapted to each specific country, even to who haven't really tested the tools. More instructions for the workshops will be sent from Karl Heinz to the partnership before mid-March.

Planning of the workshops:

- Portugal, only 4 teachers on April 16th and 17th
- Spain- 2 meetings- Cross Compliance advisers, Vine production advisers. Would like Etienne Regnaud to come to at least one of these. Advisers have to come to the meetings, so that won't be a problem. If Etienne could come, it's more relevant for the vine advisers to show them the IPM techniques. Dates: end of April.
- Ireland : in March or beginning April
- Germany- Policy makers - Maybe not just from BBV but from any other partners.
- Sweden: in April someone from a behavioral scientist university will come and speaks in English. Would someone come from Ireland? Hanna needs 200€ a day to convince advisers to come.
- Hungary: probably end of March- A new government in Hungarian chamber of agriculture, so we cannot make any decisions now.
- Slovenia mid-April, German speaking: someone of the German partner can come.
- France: April 5th in Nantes: 10 advisers from Poitou-Charente with some managers.

F. Debrief of first day

Joe: Group sessions in the morning were very important. We need a solution for more information. Michael's questionnaires are very important.

Per Erik: Small groups were very interesting.

Gabor: First time he's come to the meeting, feels he can use what he's learnt to change his views and his colleagues views.

Ann-Kathrin: Interesting to see the differences between all of the countries. It was very useful to speak about the WP3 workshops. She wants everyone to leave of Friday with a clear idea about the workshops.

Uros: good to see that they're not the only ones with problems! And that they can still use the project to make their advisory service better.

Constante: Interesting to see that the countries are at a similar level. Good to decide what we are going to do in the next months, to improve communication between partners before the meetings.

David: Able to face the problems and make decisions to solve them.

Ramon: Interesting to find out the techniques from other partners and integrate them in the way we work.

Hanna: Interesting to see where we need to work and where we can't, how to go about taking other actions for this. Sub groups are very effective.

Philippe: Small groups- why things have/haven't worked, finding out the differences between countries. Now he's looking forward to WP3, what will be done in each country etc.

Michael: We're near the end of the project; external people need to be able to see what we're doing.

Tim: very clear now about what to do during the workshops. Looking forward to the national action plans.

João: Have to qualify the action plan for the project. We need to make sure we stick to the schedules.

Gregory: things are much clearer now. Things in Hungary are quite challenging. We have two more meetings, to complete the production/dissemination. We're not ready yet to hold a final meeting.

Claude F: working in groups- very effective way of working. It will be useful tomorrow when we can stand back and look at the activities objectively.

Claude D: he's not satisfied on the results of the test, shame when people don't reply to emails. Hopefully now each country can use the project to be useful!

G. National Action Plans in some countries

NAP in Germany by Silke Dachbrodt-Saaydeh - See PowerPoint and <http://nap-pflanzenschutz.de>

Plan has not been adopted yet, but it's prepared and will be sent for adoption in April. It supposed to be in November 2012, but many countries have not yet submitted their plans.

The plan does not give a percentage of reduction of pesticides; instead it requires the reduction of pesticides to the "necessary minimum" calculated from reference farms.

NAP includes the maintaining by the regions (=Länder) of the state advisory system ('independent' advisers on plant health questions, crop protection, nutrition, etc. specialized. Controls are partly done by the advisers too). East Germany- larger state advisory system, in the rest of Germany the budgets are smaller, but they do exist, and a few private companies have developed.

Network of reference farms: 134 farms, for the whole of Germany. Not quite chosen randomly, was supposed to be (but they has to go for farms who volunteered), they get a very small amount of money for doing this.

Demonstration farms project (5 arable crop farms - 7 apple orchards - 4 vineyards - The aim is to reach 60 demonstration farms over the next 5 years) - Farmers do as they would operate normally. The uptake of IPM is encouraged. (IPM and organic farming increase uptake (20% of land), 30% of farmers farm according to a guideline and within 5 years 50% to farm according to guidelines).

Advisory is one to one and based on face to face decisions. One scout supports 5 farms. The additional efforts necessary (time needed by adviser) have been calculated: no comparison to normal advisory service available. Scientific part is done by JKI (research state). There is no official training process involved in the demonstration farms. It initiates the thinking process for the farmer but there is no training per se.

Michael: are there trials in the fields? Answer- not in the classic sense, not converting the whole farm, but farmers may test something on one farm. If something goes wrong, and they get a reduced yield, they are compensated for this loss of income, but otherwise they're not paid.

About system with the scouts, we have no official decision on whether be maintained in the long term.

NAP in Spain and Galicia, by Ramon Lamelo Otero

Spanish NAP was approved at the end of 2012; it has 7 objectives and 30 sub objectives. The plan is applied throughout Spain. Reports are sent to a central control office.

In Galicia are many small farmers, a lot of pastures - Main crops: 30 000 ha vineyard, 20 000 ha potatoes, 65 000 ha corn for animals breeding / 40 000 farmers (specifically milk); some lack of professionalism however. But there are still a lot of people who want to be farmers, especially a lot of breeder farmers. Use of phytosanitary products is high in vine productions, around the coast (high humidity), lower in other productions. No GM.

Ramon works for the regional government of agriculture. They have several services, they do controls, they execute the national and regional pesticide plan at the level of the farm (taking samples etc., but not in the market), control distribution of pesticides and control of one producer of pesticides. They have farming schools, public, private, and universities.

Main actions NAP:

- Inspection of the equipment of application of phytosanitary products - Inspection and registration of sprayers since 2007. This has only been done on a small number of machines unofficially. Official Inspection is not free and will be mandatory from July 2013 and cost €20 – €120 per machine. Public and private inspections will be available. Registered private companies who charge the same fees as public inspectors may be eligible for registration as sprayer inspectors. Register of pesticides applicator operators. Book-keeping for pesticide treatments is to be improved.
- Meeting with distributors to explain to them what is required under the directive: it is not easy to get 800 distribution points to accept the new regulations. Therefore the focus is on the main distributors. Recycling the packaging of phytosanitary products packages with SIGFITO
- Meeting with local authorities to involve them in the control of pesticides in non-harvested areas (roads, parks...) –Meeting with authorities for water protection and health issues: There are also areas mapped for human water consumption and risk areas identified. This is given to farmers so that they are more aware of possible risks - Meeting about biodiversity with the wildlife services, and to let the farmer know if there are in specific areas for special consideration (SIXPAC).
- Meeting with technicians from associations for joined phytosanitary treatments in agriculture / 20 technicians for Galicia provide advice for an average of 500 farmers and make the recommendation for pesticides application. This is not all over the region – it therefore has to be completed yet. 20 technicians work with 25 farmers each and receive subsidies. Advice is also given to farmers not involved in the association.
- Learning adaptation of IMP to the regional conditions. There are experienced people in specialized areas (weeds, pests and diseases) – These people are networked to agree how to apply IPM in the region. Leonardo 'New Advisers' is hoped as a way to find new ways to disseminate this knowledge.
- Weather monitoring – farmers can subscribe to the local advisory service and receive precise weather forecasts. Advice is provided then as to recommendations to crops reports. This is done through observations on the crop. Instant weather alerts will also be available so that the farmer will know how to best time applications of pesticides. They are going to give instant weather reports- even 2 hours before etc. (so that farmers don't spray just before it rains and have to spray again, instead they know it's going to rain and will wait to spray tomorrow).
- Minimum requirement of training/qualification for all advisers controlling use of phytosanitary products, they are in a register but not yet specific requirements in terms of training.

Advisers and others players in Swiss, by Jacques Dugon (Agridea) – See PowerPoint.

Agricultural political framework: Every farmer has to have 4 crops and 7% ecological grass, not too much NO₃ (this is checked)

Advisory is organized on two levels; local and central (federal)

Local level: extension service funded by each canton

Farmers and advisers have a good relationship. Local conditions are taken into account. Local projects come from farmers and are likely to be adopted (Bottom-up). It can be difficult to build a common vision especially on a regional basis because it is set up locally.

Group discussion is already used, as show the following example:

For struggling against meligethes, an action plan with different active substances selecting different products for different regions and rotating to avoid resistance was built from a farmer's idea / discussion with the sellers / convincing farmers that the product « audienz » is not expensive if spread every 3 years – to avoid resistances/ communication technology (mobile phone messages), voluntary participation. No payment in this case because it is a win-win situation. The adviser must step back and leave the key leaders farms lead the project with several advantages. Results:

- A real efficient concerted action plan. This action has saved the rape crop in Geneva.
- Farmers treat when they receive text messages from the adviser and NOT before.
- Farmers are becoming very involved in the group dynamic and have taken the lead
- Less treatment : Farmers trust has increased
- No longer the agent of private firms who give advice - farmers trust the advisers

Agriidea is a central service to update advisory services with contents and training. It coordinates a platform for advisers to ensure relevance and quality of documents .Advisers have an information platform, annual meetings to stimulate the exchange of knowledge; deal with issues about crops, training advisers (agronomical, toxicological and environmental impacts of glyphosate)at multilingual and multiregional level.

In the new context on NAP, advisers and advisory service should:

1. implement the IPM in farms
2. should have technical (especially IMP) skills, administration and also social skills
3. be involved earlier in the process in order to prepare the needed change in the cropping system
4. be aware of the environmental situation of the farm and the regulation
5. be facilitators to encourage communication and make sure that a confident relationship is implemented between all the actors.

To train a group on IMP, it is better when the farmers are not too far from each other.

H. Water protection in Bavaria

Outside Trip on Feb. 28th afternoon

The farmer Georg Diethelm and his wife: Total- 55 hectares (11.5 hectares of his land is in a water protection area). 160 heads of cattle, 70 milk cows. Dairy for milkshakes for McDonalds in the whole of Germany and other EU countries. Five farms own the machinery together to mix the feed for the cows. He gets money from a friend for having a wind-turbine/alternative energy generator on the barn roof. 30-50% of the manure goes to biogas. A plan which saves rather than makes money. And then he gets the organic waste back to spread on his farm as fertilizer.

Peter Zimmermann (specialist for ground water protection): An initiative unique to the Bavarian context that began 18 years ago. Voluntary contracts are made with farmers; they go higher than the needs where possible. In the project there are around 96 farmers for each adviser. Farmers get some subsidies if they keep the level of nitrates low. At the start they sent farmers a lot of information, they held demonstration days. Now it's one on one advisory. The project has run for 18 years, most farmers joined the initiative quickly and have stayed. Many measures have been put into place to protect water and crop yields have not declined. Good confidence between farmer and adviser, it was optional to join the project, the subsidies aren't big, but they are big enough for motivational purposes. Farmer sees the adviser around 5 times per year. The results of the advisory for the farmer (also a result of the changeover of the farm from the parents to their son):

- Changing some arable land to grass land
- Catch crops – and he ploughs later in the year
- He uses fewer pesticides and is limited to a specific list of pesticides
- Integrated plant management

Josef Friedl (specialist for surface water protection); He works especially on water protection the Bavarian area (small lakes and rivers) in common with the other adviser. He has to implement the EU water

directive (we are all connected; there are no borders, water flows from one country to the next!). Advice given: distance to respect when spraying pesticides, erosion problems, catch crops, avoid working with tillage. In Bavaria you can get subsidies if you keep a certain distance away from water sources. This program seems to work, generally if he invites a group of farmers to a meeting, 50% come and then 15-20% make voluntary contracts. He started this job 3 years ago, he still works with the same farmers and they help him convince new ones. The farmers get money for these contracts (specific to Bavaria)

Project “Aktion Grundwasserschutz der Regierung von Unterfranken” by Dr Anne-Kathrin Jackel - District government of lower Bavaria - See PowerPoint

Problem: only 33% of extracted groundwater is unpolluted - 17% in nitrate - very low in pesticides

Instead of building a treatment plant, they decided to work with the farmers to reduce nitrates in the water. Actions focused on public awareness for water protection (panels of communication), education for sustainable development (schools), groundwater-friendly agriculture (organic and conventional farming)

The project gives farmers who open their farm to schools for guided visits, materials to talk about water. Organic farming is not considered as the unique solution to water problems. Groundwater-friendly conventional agriculture: catch crops (but some farmers are still unsure about the advantages of catch crops, so the water board do trips for them to visit them in use, and documentation and financial support for the seeds). Marketing for ground-water friendly crops, demand for local crops and initiation of cooperation between farmers, restoration of drinking water wells, wheat protein issue... promoting the cultivation of wheat which requires fewer nitrates

Question: Do the water management agencies from different EU countries meet up?

Answer: There are some light connections between committees for different river systems.

I. Impacts on advisers ‘job? – return from workshop and discussion

Spain:

- We need a platform to bring together network actors, private companies, future farmers/advisers
- Accompany a farmer in the transition towards the NAP, keeping records, advice for implementation of the plan (not just a policeman!)
- One-to-one advising is difficult, in terms of time and logistics and so we need tools to work together- Discussion Group and PBL
- Communication with farmers to inform them that the NAP is a positive plan, explain idea behind the NAP (that it's not about restrictions!)

Hungary:

- The main thing is to do an independent advisory system for plan protection (CA advisers are generalist and don't give specialist advice on crop protection). All advisers are private, and so it's difficult to know that they aren't influenced by the pesticide companies (often they are sellers as well). Not sure the records are quite correct.
- How to make the advisers interested in giving advice on reducing pesticides?
- Difficult to live with risks, make farmers believe the rules are for them and not against them! How????!! Long term work, one-to-one advising, it needs several years, and see demonstration farms etc. This advice needs to be free!!

Germany

- Necessary minimum on one side and the farmers on the other trying to improve their daily farming. NAP- advisers need to be a mediator role between science and policy and farms.
- Funding? But it would be good that for every farmer, an adviser can help the farmer set up a road map for integrating the NAP. So one on one- specific for the farm.
- Demonstration farms, we need more of them: let key farmers take the lead, invite other farmers, and not the adviser who speaks but the farmer himself (and his colleagues learn from him), adviser just acts as moderator.

France

- Mediation between law and practical aspects. Help the farmer focus on his own strategy to cope with the NAP. Communication and transfer of the REAL meaning of the NAP to the farmers.

- There's an elaborate national plan in place for a few years, progress has already been made... however the use of pesticides went up (wet weather but also the adoption of the rules is not so good, they know the rules exist but they haven't integrated them yet). Advisers give advice to groups and the farmers understand but don't do it because of risks.

Discussion:

Jens Erik says: As advisers, we also need to LISTEN more to the farmers, and to convey knowledge and wishes from the farmers to the researchers/government etc. Farmers KNOW which parts of IPM will work on their farm or can be applied.

Ramon says: Farmers should pay something, they are more involved. Group 3 said the advice concerning the NAPs should be free... but perhaps it shouldn't be?

One proposal on financial aspects: a short term free service, and then after a certain period the farmers decide whether they continue (and pay) or stop the advice because they've learned enough.

J. Presentation of results of French project “Conseillers d'aujourd'hui”

by Claude Delbos (see PowerPoint)

A decrease in the use of pesticides leads to a change in practices. Advisory services have to take the changes into account. Advisers will be more effective with respect to reduction of pesticides that they may involve the farmer in the advice and the decisions. For this development, he will mobilize three types of resources:

1. Develop the professional context by adapting the mandate, facilitating network and exchange experiences on the successes, knowledge and practices
2. Strengthen internal support of advisers, that is to say their ability to mobilize their internal resources (psychological, physical, mental) and external resources.
3. Accompany the adviser in the acquisition and / or enhancement of facilitation skills, listening and analysis skills considering different profiles of farmers, know-how on new tools and methodologies for systems analysis and co-construction

The adviser must be secure / confident in himself in order to enable the farmer. It is the job of the network around the adviser to provide this security and confidence. The organization makes enable the adviser in their facilitation skills, listening and analytical skills, updating and up-skilling on new tools and methods for the system analysis and co-construction. Support by organization means:

- the mandate legitimate action of the adviser facing new situations
- an adequate space for exchange and sharing experiences
- a team's portfolio of skills

The outcomes of the project “Conseillers d'aujourd'hui” are available on the internet: Toolbox with 30 tools online, modeling the relationship between the adviser and the farmer, proposals for managers of extension and advisory services - Documents at <http://www.chambre-agriculture-28.com/espace-agriculteurs/conseillers-d'aujourd'hui/publications/>

K. Debrief of second day

- Difficulties in testing tools should include the fact that advisers are under pressure in terms of the number of clients they have. There is a big problem in certain countries (lack of staff).
- Do we need to include in our project something about changing policy, influencing our organizations?
- New Advisers needs to present results and give place to advisers in all countries involved in the project.
- Biodiversity will be an important issue for advisory in the future (ie. Birds and the effect of farming on bird numbers)
- It was very interesting to see how many different stakeholders are involved in the protection of water quality-companies, boards, marketing companies, local people.....we need “innovation brokers”- an adviser who can lead processes, structure situations etc.

L. Bavarian advisory and education system

By Dr. Wulf TREIBER, Head of the Conference and training Center in Herrsching, good expert on rural policies.

Advisory in Bavaria

20 years ago:	80% State Free	10% private	10% industry
Today:	40%	45% (paid by farmer)	15% industry
Tomorrow (10 years):	15%	60% (paid by farmer)	25% industry

State advisory service is free, for both control and advice, but farmers will have to pay more and more:

- Traditionally and legally state advisory cannot charge for services in Bavaria. Because farmers were accustomed to free advice, there is not a cultural acceptance unless the quality of the advice is very good. 100Ha farm does not really want to pay for advice as these farmers do not change to the private and so there is a lack of advice.
- The state had a general objective to reduce its influence in the economy. Therefore the state input has reduced. 40% advisory is still sufficient to inform the farmers. Coupled with the 3 year training it is sufficient for farmers to comply with directives. The government essentially bans the advisers from doing advisory work. There is an obligation on state advisory to inform farmers of the rules and regulations. The state advisers basically take care of cross compliance and farmers go to an office for this. For a field visit, the farmer must pay either industry or private consultants.
- Good farmers tend to have a number of advisers – 1 from state, 1 private (farmers' union) and 1 from industry. State advisory are well qualified but have less time. Industry advisers are also well trained.
- Private consultants give advice on animal production machinery rings and co-operative use of machinery, and plant protection. Some private advisers however are not well qualified and the soft skills are very lacking, unless the farmer goes to a "professional adviser".

Bavarian Agriculture Training

Dual system:

- 700 young students starting each year (3 years training) - Agriculture vocational training (Main system run by the agricultural ministry)
- 300 from another sector - Agricultural technical school (2 years) - Master in agriculture (1 year extra) - Agricultural university

Most graduates for agricultural universities (120 approx.) return home to farm. The time taken to achieve the qualification is getting shorter. The quality of the training is very high, but lack of soft skills and intercultural competencies (politics, communications, cultural and social skills) – usually they do not have worked outside Bavaria

It is difficult to have all of the soft skills included in the basic training course as one year is spent in college and two outside on work experience.

Further education: the Herrsching personal training

- Young farmers from 19 - 29 years for 11 weeks course / 50 to 60 people (males and females)
- Content: communication, language skills, public relations, team work, social skills...
- Cost subsidized 25%. Most paid for by the farmers union. A small subsidy comes from the state.

M. CAP and Farm Advisory System after 2013

See Slideshow from Mrs Inge VAN OOST (E.U.), presented by Sylvain STUREL (ApcA)

Farm advisory system (FAS) since 2007 (part of CAP reform 2003). Aim was to provide advice to farmers within the context of new regulations, to help them not to lose their subsidies in the case of controls, and to provide financial support to agricultural support systems in new member states. FAS was

compulsory for member states, but optional for farmers. It was mainly about cross compliance, but could include additional subjects. After 2013: obligatory scope for member states is widened (but still voluntary for farmers): cross compliance, green payments, climate change, biodiversity, water protection, animal and plants diseases, innovation, sustainable development of the economic activity of farms, in particular small farms. The new CAP may fund cooperation measures, collective measures, dissemination of good practices and of research results.

Tim O'Donovan: Will a member state have the choice to pay money for different uses or compulsory for advisory services? Answer: Funding in each country is operated within each country.

Rural development funds provide finance if the member state includes rural development in its plan

- Support for the use of advice by farmers (advice and training)
- Setting up farm advisory service
- Support for the training of advisers

EU 2020 strategy stresses innovation and this topic is repeated in policies. European innovations: 4.5 billions € for research and innovation in the field of food security, bio-economy, sustainable agriculture / Primary production / Resource management / bio economy / supply chain / quality and consumers – co-financing to 80% by EU

EIP (European Innovation Partnership): Different measures can be used for innovation: Research and innovative projects and link to farmers. Funding will depend on how “innovative” the project is: Technical and marketing projects where innovation is part of the project, network of innovative groups and sub-groups working inside the network for innovation, operational Groups (e.g. city council, water company, agriculture dept. of Bavaria and Farmers).(Part of the second pillar of CAP).

The EU wants a synergy between research advisory and practice. Where there is a strong will to transfer strongly applied research into practice, funding will also be available.

N. European networks of agricultural advisers

By Jens-Erik JENSEN - VFL Denmark jnj@vfl.dk

Danish Agriculture and advisory (see PowerPoint)

3000 advisers for 40,000 Danish farmers 1:13. Farmers typically have 2-3 advisers. Advisers typically have 40-60 clients. This means that there is a good link between farms and advisory. The farmer is the customer and the owner. Purely private system. The amount of paper work is the reason for such a large service.

The Danish agricultural advisory service (more than 2 000 people) makes 85% advice.

50% of land in Denmark is intensively farmed. Natural areas are only in patches. Therefore drinking water is always under pressure from agriculture. Following the Danish NAP, farmers need to reduce pesticides by 40% in 2 years. Pesticide taxes are imposed to control damage currently 33% on every product. A change in taxing is coming. Depending on the active ingredient the tax will reflect the environmental damage. Advisory and consultation with stakeholders has not happened. Politically it is desirable

Intelligent Boom Sprayer and integrated machinery may be part of solution of controlling pollution in ground water!

ENDURE

Endure is an open network, with tools to contribute to networking. The network is open to all advisers and it focuses on IPM. Advisory system is fragmented by language barriers (lack of formal network). More linkage between advisers is needed. European Innovation Partnership (EIP) should be part of ENDURE.

Yammer Platform is expanding the Endure network of advisers – to discuss informally – to share new information, problems that are hard to solve, to link the advisory systems and to provoke information exchange in Europe. All advisers are invited. Sign up to receive emails. If you want to contribute, send an email to Jens-Erik.

Collaboration 2012: NA participated to the Endure Workshop in Paris April 2012 – Ph DELVAL participated at the Nantes seminary in May 2012 – two notes from NA on Endure website.

Collaboration 2013: Endure will be present at the next two NA meetings, and NA present at the next Endure meeting (Co-organization of NA meeting in Budapest 11-12 September 2013?). Endure has offered its website and results for publishing. (Marco Barzman is the webmaster). Please use Endure information center and write new newsletter about the tools tested. See www.endure-network.eu

By Eric WALDMEIER - IALB

IALB and its activities

Founded in 1961. Private organization. Network of advisers and institutions. 710 members - 7 founding countries in Europe. Exchange of information and experience about extension and advisory in agriculture. (German-speaking network). A general board represents different regional areas.

INTERREG project from 2003-2008 opened the network up to the rest of Europe.

In 2007: starting point of project CECRA, to develop transnational competencies and soft skills BEYOND technical expertise for advisers.

In 2011: preparation of CAP 2014-2020. Decisions to participate in GFRAS's activities and to take initiatives for a larger network in Europe. IALB represent Europe in GFRAS's world network.

European Network for Rural Advisory Service (EURAS) – workshop in Feb. 2013 (35 – 40 representatives: Germany, France, Belgium, Switzerland, Ireland, Denmark, Eastland, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland – Next steps: position paper, invitation of leading advisory bodies of European countries in Dublin, website in June, Berlin in September. An initiation process is in process

Advisory qualification:

Identified trends

- University level advisers' education decreases or is inexistent
- The in-service initial training is under pressure
- Number of training institutions decreasing
- Different and more project driven bodies
- Advisory skills "just in time" needed
- Not every service or state is able to organize the needed training itself.

Identified lacks in advisers' competences are not in technical expertise but in methodological and social skills, managerial and organizational competences, and personal competence

- o In CAP 14-20, minimum standard of competence required for advisory staff funded by EU: countries will have to prove they employ staff with appropriate competences
- o Advisers involved must have methods and social and personal competency to be successful – Advisers must be trained regularly

CECRA: Certificate for European Consultant in Rural Areas

2 compulsory modules: Personal development, adviser profile and attitude / Communication and customer relations

Optional mandatory modules - select 3 from 12.

Additional conditions required:

- Previous education in agriculture
- 2 years appropriate professional experience
- Participate in 2 foreign events
- Office visit with exchange of experience and reflection of experience
- Final proof or study – self-reflection on the basis of case study.

2013 the CECRA system will be fully operational; additional partners can join. CECRA contracts training centers, it doesn't do the courses themselves. It is possible for any institution or organization to use and deliver the modules in the local language and submit to CECRA for certification.

Price of certificate €500

O. Production of outcomes

See document D21 which summarize all outcomes. Some remarks from the partners, to be used by the writers of these documents:

- D07: Publishing on the web. Could we have a fixed page where to put documents? Should we only put a synthesis of the final report and then an email contact/link to ADAM website? Also, all partners should make a commitment to put on their OWN website a presentation, some results and links to ADAM etc.
- D08 Report of testing should include recommendations, what have we learned about the tools AND about the transfer. Includes the graphics, the statistics etc.
- D09: Framework for observations take info from slideshow presented by Karl Heinz Kolb
- D10: Description of technical and relational skills (how to transfer the technical knowledge).
- D11: In the handbook refer to ECVET etc...

Before late April, the coordinator will send a “template” to everyone who has to produce a document

P. Meeting in Paris. 22nd to 24th May

Date: May 22nd to 24th in Paris

Participants: 10-12 people significantly involved in the project

Objectives:

1. Complete analysis of the tools testing and local workshops
2. Produce documents and videos (Outcomes)
3. Go on dissemination and networking
4. Prepare last meeting in Budapest

Agenda:

- Wednesday – APCA Paris: Documents and scenarios of videos
- Thursday – Fnsea Paris: Morning: Training with theater player - Afternoon: playing the 3-4 videos
- Friday – APCA Paris - Morning : Meeting with 4-5 European projects or organizations on Advisory and innovation – Mrs Inge Van Oost is invited - Afternoon: preparing last meeting

Accommodation: Some rooms are booked - Please confirm to Corail Hotel

at corailhotel@wanadoo.fr + 33 143 43 23 54

Q. Organizing last transnational meeting in Budapest

Date: 10th to 12th September 2013.

- Preparation day on September 10th
- Event for the outside people for 2 half days: 11th- long half day afternoon and evening - 12th morning (stay 1 night only)
- Collaboration with ENDURE

Target Public: advisers and advisory services managers, students preparing to be advisers, EU DGs
50 people would be very good

Aim: presenting achievements of NA in the sense that we diffuse the tools/what needs to change in the field of advisory

.Program:

- Workshops? Self-Evaluation (auto-reflexing)
- Present the tools in detail to the advisers (projection of the videos?). Could this be linked to 2 workshops, where advisers could discuss the use of these tools? We would need several rooms.
- Plays (2 minutes long) (Problem is language) or videos (series of photos)?
- Bring in farmer/adviser to give testimonies
- Simultaneous translation is difficult for the workshops?

Communication about event:

- How to incite people to come? Can NA cover some costs? Not travel, but maybe accommodation/food.
- Hungarian partner can bring leaders from surrounding countries to come and speak/participate. This would require translation (for 15 people and 3-4 different languages?)
- Diffusion through IALB, ENDURE, next meeting in Dublin
- Email/invitation needs to be sent 6 months before!! Even just a pre-invitation/alert/save the date/topic. Inform people that if they need funding to get in touch and we will see!
- Information about NA so far, a NA page on the ENDURE website.
- Irish partner present the event at another event in Dublin, to encourage people to come.

Preparation:

- Gregory send a draft invitation as soon as possible
- We organize a phone conference to agree on a final agenda
- Gregory creates a flyer for the event that everyone can translate and send to their colleagues and stakeholders concerned in the theme.
- We could invite a lot of people (from Serbia, Croatia, etc.), but we have to be careful about the number et the costs. Are there any other study visit funding opportunity?

R. Contacts with stakeholders

For dissemination, we already associated some stakeholders with the project, we make contact, we have presented the project, we can invite someone to the WP3 workshop, or to a test. This gives value to the advisory job

Portugal: we had contact with local authority, but not yet with national agency.

Uros: we will prepare info to training centers and minister, and maybe have a common meeting, Could someone present something at Budapest?

PLEASE inform Claude if you make a contact in your own country. It's important to know and to report.

S. Feedback from the 3 days

- Per-Erik: He will take back knowledge of situations in other countries. The Swedish board of Agri will be very interested by the results of this meeting. Nice to meet the partners. He has changed his role in his company, so has not tested the tools, but is looking forward to using ideas from this project.
- Ramon: Will go home with many very good ideas, will easily try and benefit from this week. The visit was very interesting, how to tackle nitrates problem particularly interesting. Good to see very developed plans and so he can take them and at least start by developing small ones.
- Uros: Contact with farmer, very interesting to spend the evening with him, he has taken some very good ideas.
- Ann-Kathrin: Very interesting, especially Thursday afternoon and Friday, it gave a new point of view on advisory- all the different views that all stakeholders must be involved. Sylvain- important to know about opportunities for future and Erich's presentation was very inspiring. HOWEVER: program was very fragmented (but she hasn't really got a solution!), also would have liked to have had more time on the workshops, worried people are still not clear.
- Joao: thanks to Karl, Kathrin, Steffi, the guests were well chosen and very interesting. Excellent view of our work in Europe. Maybe work days too over-loaded; perhaps some work didn't flow as well.
- Hanna: Enjoyed the guests and the visit to the farm. We need to try and keep time schedules; it's a shame that some people had less time to speak. Very good to have the "to do lists done during the meeting", but this could also be done in the lead up to the meeting by everyone. However, it is a good thing that the guests wanted to come! It's a positive reflection of the project.
- Sylvain: pity he missed the first day but he will catch up with the reports. Very interesting 2 days

- Philippe: Really appreciated working together, especially the workshops in small groups, also interested in the NAP presentations, very interesting meeting the farmer and the water protection presentation by Mrs Jackel. Thank you to the guests. Bravo to everybody!
- Constante: Everything was good, the most important thing was that each country knows their clear role in the project before the next meeting, very good presentations throughout the conference, was able to draw many comparisons with his own system
- David: Wasn't really involved in the project before (coming for Rosa), has learnt so much and can see the wide range of things the partnership has done. One very positive thing- everyone is available for the other organizations to help/share/exchange etc. Again, it is very important to stick to the schedule, need to be conscious of this.
- Claude F: For the presentations, she had little prior knowledge of certain issues and still find them extremely interesting. Shame that there weren't as many tests as we thought, but with the experiences we have had, we can still learn from each other and go ahead, and especially it's interesting how we work together.
- Sarah: Working with everyone, learning about agri, not only agri, but agri in so many countries, visiting a farm. Obviously I see things from a management point of view and so I appreciated the steering committee and Friday's tasks. Would have liked a little time to clear my head, just 30 minutes walk in the evening before dinner.
- Claude D.: Excellent work over the few days, thanks to German partner for organizing the presentations, logistic and accommodation at best. We have the hoped results. But it's difficult to get everyone on the same subject and to go at the same speed. About the issue of having too much to do, he knew there were too many presentations, but it's difficult to find a balance, and everyone brought something very interesting. I am pleased with the results of the 3 days.
- Karl Heinz: We have to think positively about errors, when failure happen you have to analyze the things even deeper and work out a solution. Very interesting to see the European networks and how to position his organization in this, also important in the next 6 months how to contact with these existing institutions, networks and projects, and find a common way to bring things forward.

From all the partnership: **Thank you Karl Heinz and Steffi!**

T. Work schedule for the next months

See the table below a summary of the actions to be taken in the coming months, on the whole project.

Who do it?	Before when?	What to do?	WP
P05 P03	2013, 03/01 st	Transmit information about testing: from P05 to P03 (comments) from P03 to P010 (problems used in the test)	WP2
Every country	2013, 03/05 th	Complete with P03 the questionnaire on the progress of WP2 test	WP2
P03	2013, 03/05 th	Send the form to report all actions for tools inclusion from WP2 before May 5 th in each country	WP2
Every country	2013, 03/15 th	Confirm the date of the workshops WP3 in each country	WP3
P00	2013, 03/10 th	Translate the intermediary evaluation report and send it to all partners	WP6
Every partner	2013, 03/22nd	Send to AC3A a budget proposition including all coming activities: WP3 workshops, meetings in Paris and Budapest, etc.	WP6
P08 P10	2013, 04/10 th	Send invitation to others projects and organizations for meeting about advisory and innovation on May 24th in Paris	WP5
P10	2013, 04/10 th	Write and diffuse the final report of the 3 rd meeting in Herrsching	WP6
P00	2013, 04/15 th	Prepare a template for the declaration of staff costs (documents need to be joined as pay slips, etc.)	WP6
P07 P10	2013, 04/20 th	Propose draft agenda and invitation for Budapest meeting and receive commentaries from all partners	WP5
P10	2013, 04/20 th	Organize a conference call end of April on budget, WP3 workshop, outcomes and next two meetings	WP6
P05	2013, 04/20 th	Write and diffuse the evaluation of the 3 rd meeting in Herrsching	WP4
P07 (Gregory)	2013, 04/20 th	Create a flyer for the event that everyone can translate and send to their colleagues and stakeholders concerned in the theme	WP5
P00 Partners	2013, 04/30 th	Use all the networks to inform on the project – Call Leonardo National Agency about use the opportunity of Leonardo founded study visits	WP5
P10	2013, 04/30 th	Send everyone a "template" of the final document (paper Outcomes)	WP5
P10 Partners	2013, 05/01 st	Write the scenarios for the 3-4 short videos to be shot on May 23rd in Paris (Outcome N°15)	WP5
Every country	2013, 05/05th	Send to P03 one page report on " Transfer test - Inclusion from WP2." actions done in March - April	WP2
P07 P08	2013, 05/10 th	Invite to Budapest meeting the leaders from surrounding countries concerned by advisory, training, agronomy, innovation and new CAP	WP5
P10	2013, 05/15 th	Publish on Adam the Herrsching meeting report– Write a web page for Endure site	WP5
All partners	2013, 05/31 st	Diffuse invitation for Budapest in September by e-mail and direct contacts through IALB, Endure, next meeting in Dublin	WP4
P03 P04 P10	2013, 06/30 th	Write Outcomes N°06 and 08 (by P03), N°09 and 10 (by P04), N°04 and 05 (by P10) and publish on Adam/Endure web site	WP5
all partners	2013, 06/30 th	Put on each OWN partner's website a presentation of Leonardo New Advisers, some results and a link to ADAM	WP5
P10 P01 P02	2013, 07/15 th	Publish on Adam Outcomes N°01 and 02 – on Endure web site Outcome N°3	WP1
P00	2013, 07/31 st	Modify the budget according to the actions and outcomes already produced or to be produced	WP6
P04 P10 Partners	2013, 08/31 st	Write Outcomes N°11, 15 and 16 (by P04 + Yotta-g), and publish on Google/Adam/Endure web site	WP3
P10 Partners	2013, 08/31 st	Finish and publish the tutorial video(s) (=Outcome N°15) on a video web site	WP5