



FAIRshare

DIGITAL TOOLS FOR FARM ADVISORS



Deliverable 6.6: Evaluation framework and evaluation report.

Authors: Alex Koutsouris (AUA), Vasiliki Kanaki (AUA)

Contributions from: Raquel Ferreira and Tom Kelly (Teagasc), Peter Paree (ZLTO), Patricia Fry and Eléonore Tran (HAFL), Vanja Biševac (CEMA)

Feedback from: project partners and UC leads

This report only reflects the views of the author(s).

The Commission is not liable for any use that may be made of the information contained therein.

Project funded under the Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation Programme.



Technical References

Project Acronym	FAIRshare
Project Title	Farm Advisory digital Innovation tools Realised and Shared
Project No.	H2020 818488
Project Coordinator	TEAGASC
Contact	Tom Kelly (Tom.Kelly@teagasc.ie) and Raquel Ferreira (Raquel.Ferreira@teagasc.ie)

Deliverable No.	D6.6
Deliverable Name	Evaluation framework and evaluation report.
Dissemination level	Public
Work Package	WP6
Task	Task 6.6: Assessment of training and adoption support activities and added value metrics of expanded use of digital tools in each of the use cases (M32-60)
Lead beneficiary	AUA
Contributing beneficiaries	CEMA (Co Lead), Teagasc, SEASN, LAAS, ZLTO (regional cluster leads)
Deliverable type	Other
Due date of deliverable	M60 (Oct 2023)
Actual submission date	M60 (Oct 2023)

v	Date	Beneficiary	Author
	16/10/2023	AUA	Alex Koutsouris Vasiliki Kanaki



Contents

1. Introduction	4
2. Assessment of Task 6.3 - Cross Visits (CVs)	6
2.1 Timeline and duration of CVs	12
2.2 CVs and assessment participants.....	13
2.3 Quantitative evaluation of CVs	13
2.4 Quantitative UC/BC ‘assessment’	14
2.5 Qualitative assessment of CVs.....	17
3. Assessment of Task 6.4 - dedicated training programme	30
4. Assessment of Task 6.5 - Train the Trainers course	32
4.1 Evaluation of the Training the Trainers course	33
4.2 Interim assessments	34
4.3 Final assessment	36
4.3.1 Quantitative assessment	36
4.3.2 Qualitative assessment.....	41
4.4 Assessment of advisors’ training	42
4.5 Pilot measurement of advisor support for and farmer adoption of digital tools	44
4.5.1 Qualitative assessment by UC leaders.....	47
5. Appendices.....	49
Appendix 1	49
Appendix 2	53
Appendix 3	54
Appendix 4	59
Appendix 5	62
Appendix 6	63



1. Introduction

In recent years, the adoption of digital technologies is increasingly deemed necessary for farmers to make more informed decisions and improve any aspect of farming. Digital skills are becoming a vital element of modern farming practices and management. Nevertheless, despite the wide variety of digital tools available to farmers nowadays, most of them are underutilized. On the other hand, as agriculture changes through digitalization, farmers should have the appropriate support to allow them to adopt or adapt such technologies. Such support can be provided through farmers' advisors which, in turn implies that advisors have the relevant knowledge and skills.

The FAIRshare project aims at ensuring that farm advisors and their organizations effectively use digital tools and services for supporting a more productive and sustainable agriculture.

WPs 1, 2 and 3 are dedicated to the development of a Permanent Networking Facility (PNF) with pan-European online search and open inventory of Digital Advisory Tools and digital support Services (DATS), (WP1), the collection of 'Good practice' DATS (WP2) and the in-depth exploration of the ways digital agriculture is advocated and animated in the interface between the advisory and farming communities (WP3).

WPs 4, 5 and 6 generate and resource a participatory 'Living Laboratory', empowering advisor peers from across the EU to interact with the online inventory and, in a series of workshops, to exchange, co-adapt, co-design and apply digital tools. The FAIRshare 'Living Laboratory' consists of several funded user cases (UC), spread throughout Europe, covering several sectors. These UCs directly adapt the use of digital tools to the needs of the practice and properly implement them.

Work Package 6 (WP6) of the project expands the use of proven high impact digital technologies among advisors within and between regions, member states of EU and internationally. In order to support the exchange, modification and use of digital tools by advisors the WP comprises the following Tasks:

- T6.1 Business Case
- T6.2 Implementation
- T6.3 Cross Visits
- T6.4 Training, fostering adaption of DATS
- T6.5 Train trainers
- T6.6 Assessment of training and adoption support activities

In particular, the objective of Task 6.6 is the assessment of training and adoption support activities and added value metrics of expanded use of digital tools in each of the use cases. This, according to the Project Grant Agreement, includes the development of evaluation



criteria for assessing satisfaction and effectiveness of Tasks 6.3, 6.4 and 6.5 as well as the carrying out of a pilot measurement of advisor support for and farmer adoption of digital tools using UCs for this project.

The evaluation framework was co-developed with project partners and UCs. Furthermore, the Deliverable has been reviewed and verified by all UC leaders.



2. Assessment of Task 6.3 - Cross Visits (CVs)

As stated in the relevant Deliverable (D 6.3.1 “Guidelines and methodology for implementation of Cross-Visits”) Cross-Visits (CVs) are a key-activity of the FAIRshare project in terms of supporting its implementation, that is the effective use of DATS (Digital Advisory Tools and Services) among agricultural advisors and farmers to improve agriculture sustainability. Each CV brings together various stakeholders and through international exchange provides support to the implementation of UC/BC; CVs facilitate the exchange of experience and peer-to-peer learning while also demonstrating to advisors and farmers the practical benefits of DATS and, therefore, assist in the digitalization of the sector.

As mentioned in D6.3.1, “The desired outcomes of the cross-visits are:

- ✓ A deeper understanding of the DATS adoption process in practice;
- ✓ A better understanding of the factors influencing the adoption of DATS and how to overcome barriers;
- ✓ Inspiration for improvements in adoption strategy;
- ✓ Supporting of opinion “Work smarter not harder”;
- ✓ Better understanding of benefits that specific DATS can bring to advisory service and farm management;
- ✓ Inspiration for (digital) improvements in the field of agricultural advisory services and in different sectors of farm management;
- ✓ Solutions to the challenges and issues within each UC and therefore faster and more successful implementation of UC/BC actions.”

The FAIRshare UCs are presented in Table 1 of Deliverable 6.2 (D 6.2 “First report on implementation”) as follows:

Table 1 (D6.2). Overview of agricultural sector, aim and type defined for the FAIRshare UCs

UC title, Organisations Name & COUNTRY	Sector	Aim	Type
1 Teagasc (Ireland) Digital agricultural advice	● Various Sectors	Using tablets to optimize the use of digital tools by advisors and farmers and to enhance efficiency, efficacy and frequency of farm visits by agricultural advisors)	Internal
2 IPN1 (Serbia) Farm Profitability and Gross Margin Calculation	● Various Sectors	To improve the effects of advisors and their work with Family Farms to increase their profitability by improving the efficiency and efficacy of advisory work	Internal

<p>3 IPN2 (Serbia) Improvement of health and welfare of dairy cows in South-East Europe</p>	<p>● Dairy</p>	<p>To use DATS to improve awareness and management of Mastitis in dairy cows in South East Europe</p>	<p>Internal</p>
<p>4 CAFS1 (Slovenia) Digitalisation of the conventional Agricultural Advisory Service model</p>	<p>● Various Sectors</p>	<p>1. To gather all the expertise of the public agricultural advisory service in one place by establishing E-learning platform based of Moodle 2. To reduce the time spent on administrative tasks</p>	<p>Internal</p>
<p>5 CAFS2 (Slovenia) Strategic farm management planning</p>	<p>● Various Sectors</p>	<p>To spread strategic thinking among farmers with the help of the digital tool SMT (Strategic Management Tool)</p>	<p>Internal</p>
<p>6 MofA1 (Croatia) Phytoview</p>	<p>● Horticulture & Crops</p>	<p>To implement a Pest Monitoring System in horticulture</p>	<p>Internal</p>
<p>7 MofA2 (Croatia) Farmers Information Center</p>	<p>● Various Sectors</p>	<p>To implement a system for the collection and sharing of information based on farmers' needs</p>	<p>Internal</p>
<p>8 Inagro (Belgium) Advisors tackling ration challenges on dairy farms</p>	<p>● Dairy</p>	<p>To implement DATS to better manage feed and ration levels on Belgium dairy farms</p>	<p>Internal</p>
<p>9 EPC (Belgium) Overcoming the challenge of farm sensor data interpretation for the optimisation of poultry production</p>	<p>● Poultry</p>	<p>To use DATS to interpret and utilise farm sensor data collected in poultry farms</p>	<p>Internal</p>
<p>10 ZLTO (The Netherlands) Optimisation of soil health with a Farm Soil and Water Plan</p>	<p>● Various Sectors</p>	<p>To optimise soil health by implementing a Farm Soil and Water Plan</p>	<p>Internal</p>
<p>11 INTIA (Spain) Overcoming the challenge for advisors of sharing and keeping knowledge and expertise using DATS</p>	<p>● Horticulture & Crops</p>	<p>To share and maintain the organisational knowledge generated from using and applying DATS</p>	<p>Internal</p>
<p>12 I4Agri (United Kingdom) Overcoming the challenge of on farm meeting restrictions for farm</p>	<p>● Livestock & Soils</p>	<p>Provide opportunities for online knowledge exchange (remote consulting, peer-to-peer exchange, training) to support face-to-face interaction in a post-COVID world. Focus on the challenge of climate change by</p>	<p>Internal</p>



advisors by choosing appropriate DATSand their remote use		implementing the IfA Live – online resource and event platform, as well as the IfA Carbon Decision Support Tool	
13 CAJAMAR (Spain) Digitalising the advisory activity for greenhouse-grown vegetables in the South-East of Spain	● Horticulture & Crops	Helping advisors in the decision making about management of greenhouse-grown vegetable crops and facilitating digital on-farm registration of the advisor recommendations	Internal
14 CONSULAI (Portugal) MobITAlqueva - Mobilizing the Alqueva Region with an Information Technology tool (AgroBI)	● Various Sectors	To gather different data sources with useful and timely information for decision making based on sustainable practices in the Alqueva Region	Internal
15 IDELE (France) Enlarging the use of the decision tool COUPROD, to improve livestock farmers’ competitiveness	● Livestock	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Calculate the production costs of different activities in the enterprise, the cost price and the labour remuneration 2. Help in strategic decisions by using benchmarking and farm comparison 3. Enlarging the use of COUPROD among advisors and farmers 	Internal
16 NAK (Hungary) Standard Production Value (SPV) Calculator	● Various Sectors	To implement and enhance the Standard Production Value (SPV) calculator & achieve wider use of it among advisors and farmers	Internal
17 Naturland (Germany) Bundling and optimisation of communication channels in advising farmers	● Various Sectors	To improve its specially branded app to enhance communication for farmers and advisors	Internal
18 APCA (France) Enriching the services of the platform Mes Parcelles	● Various Sectors	To enrich the services and use of the landmapping platform Mes Parcelles	Internal
19 LKO (Austria) Advisory services for the digital farm	● Livestock	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To support advisory services for the digital farm 2. Increase advisor service quality by enabling farmers to develop more self-reliance using digital tools with low entry barriers/learning curves 3. Improving animal health and digital record keeping proving compliance with regulatory/legal measures 	Internal

<p>20 LAAS (Lithuania) Digital communication and better access to digital services and information for advisors and farmers</p>	<p>● Various Sectors</p>	<p>To implement digital communication and better access to digital services and information for advisors and farmers</p>	<p>Internal</p>
<p>21 2BForest (Portugal) Ecosystem Services powered by ForestSIM</p>	<p>● Horticulture & Crops → Forestry</p>	<p>To enhance the use of the ForestSIM – which is a tool for the certification of ecosystem services among forest owners across Portugal</p>	<p>External</p>
<p>22 AEDIT (Italy) Tuscany living lab to support a wider adoption of a sustainable crop management DATS</p>	<p>● Horticulture & Crops → Olive growing</p>	<p>To implement a unique DATS for olive growing using a user-centric approach for sensing, prototyping, validating and refining in a real-life context</p>	<p>External</p>
<p>23 IPS (Croatia) Smart Sustainable Farming for Young agro entrepreneurs</p>	<p>● Crops & Livestock</p>	<p>To create a platform (based on an existing Austrian version) to provide information relevant for farmers and advisors in the one place & to also facilitate innovation, networking, decision making via this platform</p>	<p>External</p>
<p>24 LLKC1 (Latvia) Digitization of the existing crop rotation and fertilizer planning tool</p>	<p>● Horticulture & Crops</p>	<p>To digitize the LRATC crop and fertilization plan (currently in Excel spreadsheets), to increase its use and functionality for farmers and advisors</p>	<p>External</p>
<p>25 LLKC2 (Latvia) Digital platform of knowledge and advisory “digiagsume”</p>	<p>● Various Sectors</p>	<p>To implement a digital platform to ensure the efficiency of the exchange of information between advisors, farmers and researchers</p>	<p>External</p>
<p>26 Patriotisk (Denmark) DIGI-WEED, digitalisation of weed treatments. Benefits of cost, work time and pesticide reduction for farmers and consultants</p>	<p>● Horticulture & Crops</p>	<p>To optimize advisors’ use of data for decision making and targeted treatments for weed control using the digital tool DIGI-WEED.</p>	<p>External</p>
<p>27 ProAgria (Finland) Improving utilizing My Farm WISU</p>	<p>● Horticulture & Crops</p>	<p>To enhance the use of the plant production and planning services to My Farm ‘WisU’ among farm advisors to support crop farmers in Finland</p>	<p>External</p>



<p>28 SEGES Innovation PS (Denmark) Implementation of the dynamic fertilizer plan</p>	<p>● Horticulture & Crops</p>	<p>1. To change the tradition among farmers and local advisors by implementing and advancing their skills to the CropManager tool</p> <p>2. To implement a more dynamic fertilizer system in Denmark by benefitting from real-time satellite data via the CropManager tool</p>	<p>External</p>
<p>29 WODR-CDR (Poland) A comprehensive system supporting the collection of data of the market of the fertilizer and plant protection products in Poland</p>	<p>● Horticulture & Crops</p>	<p>To develop a user friendly national database of fertilizer and plant protection products</p>	<p>External</p>

The CV reports can be found in the respective Deliverable (D 6.3 “Report on cross visits, targets and schedules”). An overview of the CVs carried out is provided in Table 1 of D6.3 as follows.

Table 1 (D6.3). Short overview of the CVs in the FAIRshare project

Reg	Country	Organ	Project partner / Country / UC title	Advisors	Farmers	IT specialists	Research	Other	Tot partps**	hosts (people)	visitors (people)	farm visits*	type	partners (organ)		
1	W	Ireland	Teagasc	DICTA (Digital agriculTural advice)	4	2			6	2	4	2 f2f	4			
2	SE	Serbia	IPN	Farm Profitability and Gross Margin Calculation	2			5	14	21	14	7	0 Onlii	5		
3	SE	Serbia	IPN	DATS for improvement of health and welfare of dairy cows in South-East Europe-SEE	4	2		3	2	11	5	6	2 Onlii	2		
4	SE	Slovenia	CAFS	E-naSVET - e-ADVICE	17	4			2	22	14	8	3 f2f	4		
5	SE	Slovenia	CAFS	Strategic Management Tool (SMT)	8	1		7	8	23	6	17	0 Onlii	7		
6	SE	Croatia	MofA	Phytoview – Pest Monitoring System in horticulture	14	4		3	0	21	8	13	4 f2f	4		
7	SE	Croatia	MofA	Questions and answers - Farmer's information center	5	2	1	2	6	15	7	8	2 f2f	3		
8	C	Belgium	Inagro	Inagro ration tool	4	2	5	3		10	3	7	2 f2f	6		
9	C	Belgium	EPC	Overcoming the challenge of farm sensor data interpretation for the optimization of poultry production	4	2	5	3		12	3	9	2 f2f	6		
10	C	NL	ZLTO	Business Soil Water Plan	4	2	5	3		10	3	7	2 f2f	6		
11	W	Spain	INTIA	Overcoming the challenge for advisors of sharing and keeping knowledge and expertise using DATS	5	2		3	3	13	6	7	1 f2f	4		
12	W	UK	I4Agri	Overcoming challenge of meeting restrictions for farm advisors, choosing appropriate DATS & remote use.	6	2		2	9	15	8	7	1 f2f	5		
13	W	Spain	CAJAMAR	Digitalizing the advisory activity for greenhouse-grown vegetables in South-East of Spain	6	1	3	1	4	14	7	7	2 f2f	7		
14	W	Portugal	CONSULAI	Mobilizing Alqueva Region with AgroBI, to gather data with useful and timely information for decision making	10	1			7	16	5	11	1 f2f	4		
15	W	France	IDELE	Enlarging the decision tool COUPROD use,	3	2		5	5	11	7	4	1 f2f	3		
16	SE	Hungary	NAK	Standard Product Value Calculator	1		1		4	6	1	5	0 Onlii	2		
17	C	Germany	Naturland	Bundling and optimization of communication channels in advising farmers	7	4	2	4	1	13	4	9	1 f2f	5		
18	W	France	APCA	Enrich the services of the platform MesParcelles	4	1	1		5	11	7	4	1 f2f	2		
19	C	Austria	LKO	Ja zu Nah – short supply chain platform	1	1	1		11	14	4	10	1 f2f	4		
20	NE	Lithuania	LAAS	Digital communication & better access to digital services and information for Advisors and Farmers: e-geba app	3	1	1	3	5	13	5	8	1 Hybr	4		
21	W	Portugal	2B Forest	Ecosystem Services powered by ForestSIM®, implementing DATS (ForestSIM®)	15	2		3	1	21	8	13	1 f2f	3		
22	C	Italy	AEDIT SRL	Tuscany Living Lab to support a wider adoption of sustainable crop management DATS	9	3	3	5	3	20	15	5	1 f2f	3		
23	SE	Croatia	IPS Konzalti	Smart Sustainable Farming for Young Agro entrepreneurs” implementing DATS e-OPG	1		1	1	10	10	2	8	0 Onlii	5		
24	NE	Finland	Proagri	Improving utilizing My Farm Wisu	11	3	2	1	2	15	4	11	1 f2f	7		
25	NE	Latvia	LLKC	Digital platform of knowledge and advisory 'Digiaugsme'	2	1	0		5	8	5	3	1 f2f	3		
26	NE	Latvia	LLKC	'Digitization of the existing crop rotation and fertilizer planning too'	5	1	2		1	9	5	4	1 f2f	3		
27	NE	Denmark	Patriotisk	DIGI-WEED	3		4		1	8	5	3	0 Onlii	2		
28	NE	Poland	WODR	A comprehensive system for data collection of the market of the fertilizer and plant protection products	6	0	3	0	5	14	9	5	1 f2f	3		
29	NE	Denmark	SEGES	The Dynamic Fertilizer Plan CropManager	5	1	2	0	0	8	5	3	1 f2f	3		
				Participants	169	47	42	57	114	390	177	213	36		119	
					43	12	11	15	29	%						



The evaluation of CVs was carried out either at the end of the CV (i.e. before the members of the visiting team went away) or as soon as possible after the CV. Both the host team and the visiting team members took part in the evaluation of the CV. The CV participants submitted their evaluation to the UC leader either as hard copy or as an online survey. Following, the UC leader had to estimate the means of the (numerical) answers received (as well as to put together the comments made) and both upload the evaluation report (along with the CV report at [FAIRshare User Cases](#) - SharePoint) and send it to the responsible for the evaluation team (AUA).

The evaluation tool comprised two parts. The first part concerned the CV as such and was based on the experience of previous H2020 projects (e.g. AGRISPIN, NEFERTITI, i2connect). The second part concerned the impressions of the CV participants about the User Case/ Business Case (UC/BC) and was based on Deliverable 4.1 (Framework for DATS pilots and User Cases) addressing issues related to the Living Lab (LL) approach taken by the FAIRshare project (see D4.1 Framework for DAT pilots and User Cases/UCs).

The evaluation tool/questionnaire comprised both Likert type questions and open questions (see Appendix 1); participants could also add comments to the Likert type questions.

2.1 Timeline and duration of CVs

The majority of the CVs (21 out of 29) took place in the summer and mainly in the autumn of 2022 (September to November; Table 1) which has, in some cases, created problems in finding appropriate or adequate numbers of visitors¹.

Table 1: Timeline of CVs

year	month	no. of CVs
2021	6	1
	11	1
2022	4	1
	6	5
	9	5
	10	12
	11	4
TOTAL		29

¹ Indeed, in 7 cases partners mentioned (in their CV reports) that they had difficulty in finding visitors; 7 CVs had less than 5 visitors with another 9 CVs getting 5 visitors. In only two cases the visiting teams had more than 10 members. Additionally, due to the specific projects (forestry and poultry) two UCs could not find/attract relevant experts in their CVs.

Six CVs were carried out on-line, one CV was organized as a hybrid event² and in two cases CVs were combined³. The average duration was 1.5 days (excluding travel to and from the host country and social events)⁴.

2.2 CVs and assessment participants

The members of the visiting teams roughly accounted for 55% of the CVs' overall 390 participants, with the members of the host teams accounting for 45% of the CVs' attendants. A more detailed account shows that the main category of attendants were advisors (ca. 45%) followed by 'others' (ca. 27%)⁵ and researchers and IT specialists (ca. 24%). Therefore, the numbers of farmers was restricted to around 5%; nevertheless, when farming was taken into account as the participants' secondary occupation the percentage triplicates. The latter can be considered an asset to the project since it indicates that "advisors/ researchers/ others" may have a good understanding of farmers circumstances and thus of their willingness and barriers in adopting/adapting DATS.

Out of the 390 participants, 302 filled and returned the evaluation questionnaires (rate: 77.44%). The high rate of return is indicative of the interest of participants. In 10 cases/CVs all the CV participants (100%) replied while in 5 cases the return rate was above 75%; in only 2 cases/CVs return rates were less than 50% (38% - 40%). Furthermore, in 8 cases the number of evaluation questionnaires filled and returned by the hosts is higher than that of the visitors and in 3 cases the numbers are equal. It is also worth mentioning that more than half of the respondents identify themselves as advisors (around 52%), followed by IT specialists (10.3%), researchers (7.1%) and farmers (3.5%); others account for 23.5%. This can be taken as an indirect indication of advisors' interest in CVs and the project, in general.

2.3 Quantitative evaluation of CVs

The quantitative part of the CVs' evaluation tool comprised 12 + 2 questions (the 2 ones referred to separately concern accommodation and catering, and access to the venue respectively; see Appendix 1). The detailed quantitative evaluations of the CVs are included as aforementioned in the CV reports, available at [FAIRshare User Cases](#) (SharePoint).

² Organized by LAAS.

³ One combined CV was organized by ZLTO, EPC and INAGRO with the second one organized by LLKC combining their two UCs.

⁴ In 14 cases the duration (as abovementioned) lasted 1.5 days and another 6 CVs lasted 2 full days. The online ones as well as the joint ones were shorter.

⁵ 'Others' refer mainly to: Project managers/project coordinators/project staff (other than the aforementioned categories); members/staff of agricultural chambers, staff of Ministries (Agriculture/ Forestry)-policy makers, various specialists and technicians, industry representatives, etc.

The overall evaluation of the CVs shows that the CVs were a success (average 4.42 out of 5⁶ with no CV scoring under 4.1).

As one can clearly ascertain from the results of the evaluations summarized in Table 2, the majority of CVs scored over 4.5/5 in all but, marginally, one question (“Learnings from the CV will be useful for my future work”; this possibly relates to the composition of the visiting teams due to/and the timing of the CVs - see below). On the other hand, there are indeed very few cases of CVs which scored under 4 in certain questions, notably the ones concerning the timing of the invitation to the CV and the composition of the visiting team (5 cases under 4 out of 5 each) – which is related to the aforementioned concentration of CVs in the three autumn months of 2022.

Similarly, high scores are attained for concerning accommodation and catering, and access to the venue (average 4.76 out of 5). Only one CV scored 3.95; in two cases participants evaluated the place where the CV took place as ‘difficult to reach’ and gave scores between 3.6 and 3.9.

2.4 Quantitative UC/BC ‘assessment’

This part of the evaluation tool comprised 11 questions (see Appendix 1). The detailed quantitative evaluations of the CVs are included as aforementioned in the CV reports, available at [FAIRshare User Cases](#) (SharePoint).

The overall participants’ grading of the UCs (thus their impression about the hosting UC) shows that the UCs were considered successful (average 4.48 out of 5 with no CV scoring under 4.1).

As one can clearly ascertain from the results of the evaluations summarized in Table 3, the majority of CVs scored over 4.5 in 8 out of the 11 questions. It may be worth mentioning here that the three questions which score under the overall average refer to users’ involvement in the UCs (a point corresponding to the one raised with regard to the numbers of different categories of participants, notably farmers, in the CVs). On the other hand, there were very few cases of CVs which scored under 4 in certain questions.

⁶ It must be noted that *stricto sensu* categorization is not possible (or fair) due to the nature of the instrument (Likert scale) and the variability between CVs and participants.

Table 2: Results (quantitative) of the CV evaluation

The Cross-Visit	responses (CVs)	average	above average	below average x>4	below average 4>x>3.4	x>=4.5	notes
The invitation to the CV was on time (not too early. not too late)	29	4.53	17	7	5	18	
The introductory material (included in the invitation) regarding UC and DATS was well prepared/ clear enough to understand the purpose of the cross-visit	29	4.60	17	12		20	
The introductory session on UC and DATS was well prepared and the presentation(s) was/were easy to understand.	29	4.62	18	10	1	20	
The selection of participants (advisors. farmers. ICT experts and other stakeholders) who attended the cross visit on the part of the host team was appropriate.	29	4.57	16	13		19	
The selection of participants (op. cit.) who attended the cross visit on the part of the visiting team was appropriate.	28	4.42	19	4	5	17	
The field visit (or virtual field visit in the case of online CV) was well organized.	23	4.66	13	9	1	18	online: 6
Demonstration of DATS utilization was useful and clear.	29	4.52	14	15		16	
I felt comfortable to ask questions and participate in the discussion.	29	4.82	15	14		28	
The feedback session of the CV was well organized and productive.	27	4.49	18	8	1	18	
The CV helped me to improve my knowledge regarding adaption and adoption of DATS.	29	4.53	14	15		15	
Learnings from the CV will be useful for my future work.	28	4.46	14	14		14	
The duration of the CV was just right (not too short. not too long).	29	4.46	15	12	2	15	
CV average	29	4.42	19	10		19	
Accommodation and catering were well organized	23	4.82	16	7		21	online: 6
Access to the venue of the CV meeting was easy	23	4.69	16	5	2	19	online: 6
Average	23	4.76	15	7	1	16	



Table 3: Results (quantitative) of the UC ‘evaluation’

B. The UC/BC	responses	average	above average	below average x>4	below average 4>x>3.5	x>=4.5
The UC addresses a real-world problem (concerning large numbers of farmers and/or advisors)	29	4.57	16	12	1	21
The UC/BC’s output could have an important impact in farming communities	28	4.44	16	10	2	15
The UC partners are motivated to collaborate/work closely together	29	4.60	18	11		22
The UC partners contribute complementary resources/ skills etc. to the case	28	4.57	17	11		20
The UC partners devote enough time to the project	28	4.50	18	9	1	18
The size of the UC partnership is appropriate (re: project objectives)	28	4.49	15	13		15
The combination of the UC partnership is appropriate (re: project objectives)	28	4.52	16	12		17
The available technical infrastructure is appropriate	28	4.49	16	12		16
UC users are actively involved in the trial/adaptation/co-creation of the DATS	28	4.42	13	13	2	11
User feedback is captured – leading to active assessment/ verification and/ or changes/ adaptation to the innovation (DATS) at hand	28	4.40	14	14		12
All UC partners have appropriate access to the results of/ knowledge generated by the UC	28	4.39	17	8	3	14
UC/BC average	29	4.48	15	14		15



2.5 Qualitative assessment of CVs

The qualitative part of the evaluation comprised 5 open questions (see Appendix 1). This part of the questionnaires was analyzed using thematic analysis⁷.

With regard to the ‘**pearls**’ of the CVs⁸ the main topics^{9,10} referred to are¹¹:

1a) the CVs (57 answers). Concerning the CVs *per se* (the events) quite a number of participants praise (in general) the (organization of the) CVs they participated in as, for example: “Worthwhile exercise” as well as “Everything was well organized” – “CV was well planned” – “Everything was very well”. As it might be expected, the main issue here is the organization/creation of ‘space(s)’ to facilitate exchanges and mutual learning: “Collaborative approach and exchange during discussion” - “Dynamics were quite engaging. Networking & peer-to-peer learning was very fruitful” - “It is important to create a good atmosphere between host and visiting team, to know each other in order to be confident and share ideas” - “a good group job where we identified some good proposals and actions to be taken in terms of UC”; therefore, “Happy to open new areas and questions to think about in the future”. A member of a host team provided an analytical description of his/her experience as follows: “participants had a very positive attitude, cooperated, were ready to contribute ideas, suggestions, and that they were always very active and ready to cooperate. What we learned during the visit as organizers is that the quality of the conducted workshops, the outcome of this work depends very much on how well you prepare the workshops and how clearly you have certain goals, what the purpose of the workshops is, a good choice of methods is also important”.

Additionally some participants mentioned specific activities/instances they liked during the CV as for example: “I very enjoyed all presentations from the first day of CV. There were mentioned a lot of good thoughts we could learn from” - “Great to have demonstration activity” - “importance of icons/images to summarize workshop discussions” - “Very good preparation and clear goals of the workshop lead to satisfactory results”. As a result, the CVs

⁷ See: a) Sarantakos, S. (2005). *Social Research*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan; and b) Gibbs, G. R. (2007). Thematic coding and categorizing, <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781849208574>.

⁸ Please provide a short description of the main lessons (‘*pearls*’) learned from the Cross Visit (e.g. what will you take home/use in the future work/ utilize to the implementation of your own User Case)?

⁹ It is obvious that quite some of the answers provided may sometimes be located under different labels/issues/categories. In such cases the authors did their best in trying to understand the interviewees’ intentions when answering a certain open question; however, sometimes some overlapping is not avoided.

¹⁰ No reference is made to strictly ‘technical’ issues regarding specific DATS that very few of the respondents mentioned.

¹¹ The excerpts used to illustrate the issues pertaining the CVs are presented in their original form (excluding spelling errors which have been corrected).

proved to be/have provided “Very good experience for our CV and UC” - “Generated an idea for the next CV” - “Acquired practice regarding the organization of CV activities, correct communication (how to do it)” and/or “[the host] could become a good partner”.

1b) the exchange of project related experiences (54 answers) which, as one of the respondents noted, “CV revealed that all UC shares similar problems and challenges”; or according to someone else “Farmers, advisors and all professionals in agriculture in Europe share the same direction [digitalization] and are facing same issues”. As one participant/advisor put it “I realized that we all have similar challenges in advisory services across Europe. Collaborating with other advisors in relation to these challenges provides an opportunity to address and overcome these challenges. It is also good to learn from other systems and institutions to see how they deal and cope with the challenges”. In the same vein, another participant stated: “CVs provide an excellent opportunity to brainstorm and discuss on the uptake of digital tools by advisors, exchange ideas and experiences on farmers’ needs and engagement with digital tools, experience the functionality of the tools that each group presents and have fun networking with colleagues across Europe”. Such exchanges and collaboration is indeed at the heart of CVs. As one participant expressed it: “More heads know more, so it's necessary to work in teams to be able to reach the goal”. Or according to someone else “All participants share same concerns and create a good collaborative network to find common solution and cross-fertilize each other UCs”.

1c) the digital tools’ characteristics (33 answers). These relate, on the one hand, with the aim that “DATS must be easy to use and friendly for the user (of course, it has to be also useful)” or, in a more detailed account, “There is a great need for simple, functional tools to do calculations on site with farmers in a way that they understand and can use the results for decisions and assessments of their own efficiency”; thus, as someone eloquently put it: “a very nice tool that provides the farmer and advisor very valuable information”. This, on the other hand, raised concerns about the realization (or the already known fact that) “Implementation takes lot of time and resources – should be well planned” thus “DATS strategy required and support system [to be] in place”, or “The development and the success of those tools needs human and financial resources on the long term”. This, in turn, implies, among others, that “Technical support for the DATS is crucial” or more specifically that “you have to have a good IT team to tackle the problems” (see also 1f and 1g).

1d) the lessons learned/good practices demonstrated during the CV with regard the use of DATS by both advisors and farmers (24 answers). Indeed, one of the main objectives of the CVs was to provide opportunities for participants to get familiar with what they consider as ‘good practices’ (see Deliverables 2.3 – Collection of data on good practices, completion of vignettes and 2.4 – Trend analysis of good practice vignettes in the FAIRshare inventory) that might be utilized in their own situation/UCs. In this respect participants saw, on the one hand, that “The tool is a very useful too both for advisors and farmers” and, on the other hand,

“how the farmers and advisors can use the tool” – “how the app works and the testimony of a farmer and an advisor” – “Excellent insights into farmer and advisor perspectives on the use of DATS”; therefore, “That you can do a lot of work in a very simple and easy way” and, overall, “A lot of valuable information was gathered during the CV”.

1e) promotion/uptake of DATS (23 answers). One of the main topics that occupied the CVs can be summarized by the following excerpt: “how to motivate farmers to use the app ... how to introduce the app in the regular work of the public agricultural advisory service”. Therefore, issues such as “[how] to facilitate access to the tool” or in general the “Adoption strategy of the DATS” were discussed during the CVs. Such discussions provided, in turn, participants with useful good practices: “I got new ideas about promoting digital tools”, including for example “The idea of using agricultural influencer” - “active social networks should be used, opinion leaders should be attracted” - “To prepare demonstrations where farmers/advisors can see advantages, benefits with or without tools” and “integrate information about the app into ... courses”.

1f) the challenge of co-creation (21 answers). The CVs created a ‘space’ that allowed participants to see, understand and share that: “it’s very important to invite various interested parties to cooperate and participate in UC, especially advisors and farmers”. Or in more detail, according to another participant: “During the discussions and presentations, the most valuable knowledge is the process of the development that was used as well and the selection of participants and their involvement in the overall process. Importance of very close collaboration between users (advisors, farmers) and developers (IT) is what appear to be one of bigger differences between our UC and presented UC”.

1g) the UC/BC (14 answers). CV participants also appreciated, albeit in small numbers, the experiences/insights they acquired (during the CVs) with regard to their UCs/BCs. Thus partners were able to see “the UC is very relevant, and it seems that the team is well prepared and well structured in developing further on the DAT” or that “This UC is well incorporated into the organization policy and practice, as well as with the project guidelines and directives” and especially (as aforementioned) that “it’s very important to invite various interested parties to cooperate and participate in UC, especially advisors and farmers” as well as that [for the project to succeed] “Multi-faceted approach [is] needed to implement DATS, the DATS is just a tool”. Thus, some among the visiting teams found that they got useful experiences: “Very good experience for our CV and UC” and “how to successfully maintain the User Case” especially “considering each stakeholders plans and expectations”.

1h) the opportunity for participants to learn about others (13 answers), mainly referring to agriculture and advisory services in other countries.



1i) data protection (3 answers), i.e., “discuss the necessity of data protection” – “Take in account about data security”.

Regarding to the ‘**puzzles**’ generated to the CV participants¹² the main topics referred to are:

2a) digital tools’ design/technical issues (63 answers). At the time the CVs were carried out half of the projects’ UCs were pre-occupied with the technical and related issues concerning the development of their digital tools (see D 6.3 “Report on cross visits, targets and schedules”). Under the ‘umbrella’ concern for the “applicability of UC in practice” CV participants referred to issues such as “How to improve the application to be interesting and simple” as well as “The importance of being easy-to-use and affordable tools” and “How to design tools that are very useful for them, in simplifying their daily work?” Further concerns relate to “how often the data ... will be updated” along with “the data needed for “feeding” the digital tool. Accuracy of the data” especially for farmers; thus, the issue of “how make the things easier for farmer” with emphasis on time requirements (“Maybe it is too much work to fill it in?) emerged.

Questions were also raised concerning the volume of data (to be) included in the digital tools (“There is a lot of data in your tool. Is everything needed?”) and possible solutions (sometimes with emphasis on visualization): “Possible information overload, data interpretation and visualization”. On the other hand, there were participants wondering if “Will it be possible to integrate other tools to complement this UC?” and “Would like to know for the potential upgrade and correlation to other apps and tools” or “How to make the link with other data base information from the government or entities?” Additionally, the possibility to “Combine the needs of farmer and advisor within one app” (“Providing one tool to fit the needs of different groups is very challenging”) was questioned.

Finally, a much smaller batch of concerns/puzzles relates to issues of data ownership (“Data ownership is a big issue”) and security (“How do we protect our data?”, “How to build trust among farmers towards their data safety in using digital tools?”).

2b) dissemination/adoption of DATS (42 answers). The main objective/concern of the CVs (as also shown in D 6.3 “Report on cross visits, targets and schedules”) related to the promotion and use of their (under development) digital tools. This mainly and equally concerns farmers and advisors, i.e. ‘How encourage advisors and farmers to start using new digital tools’ so that “digital tools as a support in solving problems and decision making become a regular practice among advisors and farmers”.

¹² Please provide a short description of the main ‘*puzzlings*’/ questions are you left with (what are your main concerns) after this visit?

With regard to farmers, participants were wondering “How to attract farmers (or forest owners) in using digital tools?” including issues such as “It is not clear the strategy of the UC to increase the adoption of the DATS” - “How to motivate farmers to use the tool and how to help them understand it” and “How farmers will see benefit of using app?” as well as more specific problems such as, for example, “Resistance to change due to factors like age and literacy” and/or “will smaller growers accept to participate”. Moreover, “the question always remains whether the average EU farmer will be able to take advantage of (often) very complex applications”.

As far as advisors are concerned “The problem is how to encourage our advisors to use this type of platforms [in general, digital tools]” since “Rural advisors will need to be able to work digitally and with digital tools”. It seems that at the time “Main concern would be advisor buy-in” probably owing to “Lack of interest on the part of advisors and skills update” and the question “What are the good practices for the advisors to use DATS”. Some ‘ideas’ provided to answer the question “How is the best way to encourage advisors to use DATs?” include “How can we facilitate the knowledge exchange between advisors?” and “More training and support required” without forgetting that “[My main concern is that] the solutions may be overly complicated”.

Finally, the following couple of questions as posed by CV participants are worth of notice: “Whether the farmers/advisors can make the mindset change” while, in parallel, “Are reasons for not adapting digital solutions at a higher speed caused by too few gains by the users” or “Whether agricultural advisors working in public agricultural advisory units or farmers are convinced that solutions based on the latest IT technologies are needed for them to carry out their daily work.”

2c) organizational (28 answers) in the sense that CV participants wonder “How do we achieve all that we wish to achieve with limited resources in terms of finance and people resources?” while “[I am aware that] we still have a lot of work to do”. Time also emerges as a crucial factor for the development of the digital tools: “I feel there is not enough time dedicated to create this platform”, with special reference to advisors who “need to free some time to do it [engage the user case and prepare training content for platform]” but, according to another participant, “advisors already have a heavy workload” to which someone adds: “How can advising services be better organized?”. Therefore, organizational differences between UCs (“we suffer the gap with other countries where the organizations devoted to technical and political assistance to farmers are simpler, bigger and stronger, with less fragmentation”), particularly advisory systems (“Some countries have government financed advisory services, and other countries have private financed advisory services”) arise, with one participant making the following scathing comment: “the involvement in such projects in public sector is driven by personal motivation and interests and not by the proper strategic management”.

Another issue that some participants wondered about is “How it is possible to collaborate” (including “Is there a basis for applying for international funding for additional collaborations”) with such a collaboration concerning both project partners, especially with reference to the CV (“when we will have additional occasion to talk and cooperate more?”), and/or national stakeholders (e.g. “The role of the cooperative(s) seems to be unsure”).

2d) the CVs (21 answers). CV participants put forward some ‘puzzles’ generated to them during the CVs most of which related to the transfer/utilization of what they experienced/learned to their own work/cases, with statements such as: “How to materialize in my projects, the techniques reviewed in the visits and CV experiences in my work” - “how to transfer knowledge and experience to the development of my organization's digital services” and “Should I change our way of working, and integrate some of the ideas that are presented in this cross visit?”. In this respect, an intriguing question was posed by a member of the host team: “My only concern is whether we were able to help in any way”. Additionally, few noticed the need for additional stakeholders on the part of the hosts to participate in the CVs (“Should have been advisor users and farmers together in CV”, “cooperatives could have also attended the CV”), a fact which was also true for some of the visiting teams (“In my opinion the invited UCs should be more integrated in the CV. I think it’s important to look for synergies between UCs”). Finally various constraints/weaknesses during the CVs (e.g. “More time should be provided”, “I’ll like to know another real case” or “Workshops did not give direct answers”) were noticed.

2e) the involvement of advisors and farmers in the project activities (16 answers). The general question here is “How to attract stakeholders?” or phrases such as “We need to develop strategies to involve the end users” which in almost all cases refer to how to attract advisors (“Advisors have to engage the user case”) and farmers (“How to engage and keep farmers motivated”) to contribute in the project activities and the development of the digital tools (or as referred to in a couple of answers simply to use/utilize the DATS produced).

2f) the sustainability of UCs/DATS (10 answers). Some of the participants put forward their concerns with respect to future developments: “a difficult and important challenge is finding funds to implement and apply the solutions developed after the projects are completed” and “We have to ask ourselves what will happen to the platform when the project finishes” (e.g. “Find a business model for the platform to maintain it”).

Regarding to the ‘**proposals**’ concerning the FAIRshare project¹³, the main topics referred to are:

¹³ Please provide a short description of the main proposals do you have for the FAIRshare project?

3a) the digital (advisory) tools/apps (62 answers). Here, general recommendations such as “DAT should be easy to use, simple, and have only necessary functionalities. Complicated tools are difficult to use, and it takes time to learn to do this” - “The DATS must supply something really attractive for the final users which incentivates its initial use, especially regarding the [farm] owners. Afterwards they can discover new utilities” or “Make the DATS simple but effective. Show farmers and advisors how they will profit from using the DATS. Make trustworthy examples” are included. To these the proposal “Provide an easy and good learning material for the farmers and maybe make it free of charge” can be added.

Other proposals concern the data and the functionalities of the digital tools (either in general or with respect to certain digital tools demonstrated during the CVs). A few examples addressing general issues may suffice here. Proposals revolve around the demand “That [the digital tool] has a user-friendly interface with easy input and display of data” in parallel with the need to “Try to keep it simple, start with small things and then upgrade it eventually” - “Application can in the future be further improved with new functionalities, which is a positive fact” as well as “Adapt the DAT to the needs of customers as the situation changes”. Nevertheless, other participants propose to immediately try to “Combine different platforms in one for the farmer” - “More linkage required to join up systems” and “More data linkages needed between apps/tools so there is a less fragmented/more joined-up advisory offering for farmers” requiring, in turn, “Improve interoperability with other tools, easiness to enter the information”. Further proposals concern the time dimension (“Farmers and advisors will have to enter as less data as possible”) as well as that “Different parts/areas of the app for specific target groups (farmers/advisors)” - “Don’t target advisors and farmers in the same app”). Finally, extremely few proposals refer to the issue of data ownership and protection.

3b) the dissemination/use of the digital tool (52 answers). As aforementioned, the issue of the dissemination and thus the use of the digital tools was a ‘hot’ one among the CVs participants. Therefore, various proposals have been put together, some general ones and other, more specific ones. General proposals include statements such as: “Find what can capture the interest of the end user for their day to day life” - “Make it clear for farmers why they should start using the tool” - “good communication and demonstration strategy” - “The way to present the application so that consultants will see the benefit” - “Different methods of communication depending on target audience – advisors and farmers, different ambitions and perspectives”.

In the more specific proposals one can find a variety of extension methods, including training, experiential learning, opinion-leaders/influencers, peer-to-peer exchanges; communities of practice (CoPs), mass media and new media, open/field days and other events. Below some characteristic excerpts per category/method:



Training: “we need to focus heavily on education advisors and farmers in using our DAT” - “Training courses for farmers and advisors” - “educate farmers on the benefits of having real time information at hand” – “explaining how the tool works and why it is interesting and necessary to use it” – “the focus is on why it is interesting to use it and its benefits and positive implications in terms of the environment, savings, etc.” – “To show economical results”

Experiential learning and demonstrations: “Active use of the [digital tool] with support. Show positives and negatives” - “The effectiveness of the tool has to be shown for the users. Maybe to have good references from the use of the tool” - “Show technology and benefits by examples and real-life experiences” – “Field trials needed as background data” - “provide advisers and farmers with training/demonstrations” – “Demonstration of the DATS use to a farmer in the form of a video”;

Peer-to-peer learning and CoPs: “Include peer-to peer knowledge and experience transfer to adoption strategy of the digital tool” - “Advisor communities of practice based around sharing experiences using the [digital tool], led by an advisor champion”

Opinion leaders (influencers) “Farmer influencer, role model for other farmers;

Media: “Use mass media, such as TV for dissemination of the tool. Engage well accepted TV shows on agriculture” - “Making YouTube videos to show” - “Think about social marketing”

Events: “to present DAT at various events, conferences, field days” - “reaching target group of DATS through local media, fairs, other events”;

An interesting tip concerning advisors has been provided as follows: “The user case needs to inspire advisors as to how this [the digital tool] will make their life easier and reduce workload to find out and share information”. Moreover, the following, although marginal in terms of frequency of appearance, are of major importance: “If you can change mentality and show the benefit, adoption will follow a lot easier” and “Might be a big culture change”.

3c) the UC/BC (48 answers). The main issue here concerns (once more) the stakeholders comprising the UC teams (“Include representatives of important stakeholders”), notably the need to include/involve advisors and farmers (from the beginning) which is expressed in various ways, as for example: “Have a clear vision of who your public is and ensure to involve them from the beginning” - “try to involve farmers and advisors to focus on real needs they have” - “farmers should be included in the UC to greater extent” - “Engage important farmers or cooperatives” - “Involve advisors from the beginning” - “Advisers must participate in the program implementation work” - “Think personal interaction helps to bond the farmers,

advisors and researchers; if the farmers have an input they are more likely to use the app” - “More interactive/group activities to collect feedback for tool development” - “create focus groups among farmers and advisors and developers. So, the tool will develop to be even more useful” – “conduct workshops for advisors and farmers often” – “training will incorporate various stakeholders” or “start getting feedback from users”. As a CV participant expressed it: “continuously conduct workshops where farmers and advisors share their knowledge and experiences, and UC partners should stay in contact with farmers who are using [the digital tool] and monitor their progress”.

For some UCs the same was true (as already mentioned) for IT specialists¹⁴ (in order to help in the development of the digital tool): “Outsource the development to (external) IT company” - “Hire an IT person to solve some issues”; -“Ensure that tablet use is supported by IT/HQ” or “In order to solve IT problems - search for experienced IT specialists“ and others as well “Need specific people/teams with web design and marketing skills to design and manage digital platforms” - “integrate other science and meteorology services“. This need extends, in a few cases, to other FAIRshare UCs: “Establish close(r) relationship in sense of collaboration and cooperation with other User Cases” -“Keep in contact with other UC leaders” - “Connect with additional people from the involved countries ... who has deeper insights in the involved technologies” - “it is possible to include even more participants from other EU member states”. It seems that the overall concerns and proposals are captured by the following excerpt “Create an enterprise culture in which all comments and suggestions have a space, fostering the internal [UC] knowledge exchange”.

3d) the CV (11 answers). In the case of the CVs the main proposal (half of the answers) concerns the need to “show more examples of good practice” – “increase the practical part [of the CV] in the field” with the rest concerning specific recommendations dependent on the specific CVs which the respondents attended.

3e) organizational issues (7 answers). In this case the main issue is how to “ensure financial & time resources” along with “ensure provision of specific professional competences”, especially “on a mid-long term” (thus pointing to the sustainability of the UCs).

With regard specifically to **the CVs**¹⁵, according to participants the main issues are:

4a) agenda and timeline (37 answers). Participants argue that:

¹⁴ As it was shown in the framework of Task 4.1 digitization is not strongly embraced as a distinctive strategic component among the project partners’ organizations.

¹⁵ What aspects of such a meeting/CV could be improved? *(Please fill in the most important things, the next guest can do to make the meeting more effective)*

i) more time should be devoted to (some of) the CVs: “Allow a little more time for the cross visit” – “It should last more ... days. I have impression that we didn/t have enough time to go deeper with particular UC” – “Maybe some more time (plus half day)”;

ii) the agenda of the CV they attended should be “Little bit more flexible” – but according to others “Timetable [should be] more exact” or “be stricter on time schedule” with another participant suggesting that “changes to the agenda should be communicated more clearly”;

iii) the introductory parts of the CVs could have been better designed/organized “overview about each UC and the person participating” with some favoring round table presentations while others do not since “it takes the focus out of the cross-visit’s UC” (an alternative proposed concerns “a 2-sentence overview” for each participant/UC to be distributed beforehand to all attendants)

iv) the overall structure of the CV. Here comments are very heterogeneous since they largely depend on the specific CV in which respondents participated. Therefore comments concern, for example, “Fewer/shorter presentations - more time spent on interactive exchange activities” - “The introduction to the user case was too short” - “longer presentations on specific solutions used in guest countries that are worth discussing” - “More discussions on UC, its implementation and challenges and less talking on the unrelated topic” and “More time for discussion in the final session” but also “A cultural visit perhaps”.

4b) Field visits (24 answers). With regard to field visits during the CVs participants confirm that they wish “Visiting the farms in the field and exchange experience with farmers who use the app” and address some criticisms in the case of certain CVs within which more time should (according to their opinion) be devoted to the field visit: “If it were possible I would increase the practical part in the field” – “During the CV plan more time for farms visits”). In other cases a practical part/field visit was missing (“Extending to a practical part” – “Field visit would have improved CV”) or not relevant either by design or due to unforeseen circumstances (“Field visits was not very related to the user case” – “Maybe consider the choice of the ... and the way to present the farm's experience in using the platform” – “Farm visit more practical” – “Farm visit should have better connect with UC” or as a member of a host team put it “For unforeseen reasons ... we couldn’t make the visit to ... as planned”)¹⁶. A minor issue concerns the driving time to the field/site (“The distances between the [two sites] visited” – “Maybe the distance for farm visits a little bit shorter” – “Less driving”).

¹⁶ A rough estimation based on D 6.3 (“Report on cross visits, targets and schedules”) shows that in only half, more or less, of the CVs (excluding the 6 on-line ones) the field visits were strongly related to/concerned/demonstrated the host team’s DATS.

4c) CV participants (23 answers). Here participants take notice of a) the limited numbers of participants in some CVs “Participation of more project partners and User Cases leaders, [particularly since it was an online event] would have positive impact on the discussion” – “Pity not more people attended” and b) of [the expertise of those] who participated “There should be more farmers and agricultural advisors as well as IT experts or policy makers present” or “Cross Visit should include more testimonials by the farmers about using digital tool and their experiences and expectations” as well as “ Better integration of the invited UCs” that is “Select projects [i.e. participants from UCs]that are even more similar [to the visited UC/CV]”. Related to these participants also commend on “Short notice” and “the dates should not be allowed to overlap (one CV with another one), and how is it possible that training activities for UC participants are overlapping with Cross Visits?”

4d) Workshops/WSs (21 answers). Some among the participants argued that during the CVs (more) WSs were needed (“More workshops, not long discussions” – “More interactive workshop activities, icebreakers. Less time looking at power point presentations” – “it would be nice if there were some workshops organized in groups”), including “Practical workshop with the tools”. Additionally, few participants added comments about the way WSs were design/facilitated “thinking about the goal and designing workshops to meet this specific goal” – “Time consuming workshops are a waste of time if they are done wrong and without proper motivation” – “It could be convenient to write the question we have to work with, in the workshops, in order to bear it in mind and not forget the objective of the exercise” – “practical workshops in which visiting guests would participate” – “Share questions before ... to give people time to reflect on questions” and “The International Association of Facilitators (IAF) have some useful ideas for workshop activities”.

4e) various issues. Few participants made comments about i) the language (6 answers), i.e. that English were not the native language of either the hosts or the visitors (“The language gap of communicating in English, both from the hosts’ side and from the guests’ side, made communication and knowledge exchange very difficult”), that parts of powerpoint presentations were not translated or that “A translation of some basic functions of the tool would help.”; ii) the need to use tools favoring interaction (3 answers), e.g. “Include tools that can make the experience and knowledge exchange more intensive”; and iii) the demonstration of tools (3 answers), e.g. “I would like to have seen DATS working” - “I expected a demo of the new tool”.

Finally, the **additional comments** about the CVs¹⁷ revolve around learning during the CVs (34 answers). Some participants’ comments are straightforward as summarized in the following few excerpts: “Excellent, a good learning experience” - “Some valuable insights from UC” - “It was really good experience full of learnings” or “For me, it has been a very enriching

¹⁷ What other feedback would you like to share about the meeting/CV?

experience”. Others underline (the conducive environment favoring) interactive learning, for example: “Very interesting to share experiences with colleagues from (other) countries” - “These are useful ways to share ideas and hear what others have done” or “Good atmosphere to share knowledge and learn from each other”. Thus, arguments that “experience from this CV will provide new trainings and UCs opportunities” - “CV is a very useful way to develop connections, and share experience, and solutions” - “the outcomes of the CV will be useful for our future work” or “CV’s and sharing the UC’s are good activities to share experience across Europe” showing the value of CVs in general are also put forward.

Overall, thus according to the participants’ own words:

“The cross visit offers the participating partners an excellent opportunity to exchange information about the existing challenges and approaches to solutions. It is possible to assess whether the requirements and desired goals described in the action plan and the BC/UC have been implemented or whether they could be better implemented with this DAT or another one that is better suited to their needs.”

“We learned that digitalization is a process requiring among others time and knowledge. It turned out, that from this point of view, host team and guest team work on very similar issues and have similar problems while implementing new digital solutions.”

“From our perspectives the Cross Visit was very important at this stage of the UC implementation. Indeed, after some months of testing of [the digital tool] with the advisors in our living lab and their associated farmers, it was very useful to receive comments and suggestions from persons “external” to the living lab, coming from different countries and with different professionals.”

“The CV was useful, not only because of sharing the experiences regarding digital tools, but also because we discussed some questions that arising from the use of this digital tool, which should also be one of their roles.

[As a result of the CV] “We came to the conclusion, and supported it with experience, that it is essential when implementing new IT solutions to prepare a detailed description of the purpose of implementation. In addition, it is essential to prepare very detailed instructions describing every activity that can be carried out under the new system.”

“After two years of Covid you notice that many organizations are busy catching up on events that have been postponed by Covid. So, everyone has to plan his or her time very carefully. It was quite a challenge to find a good date, in hindsight it would be better to invite people personally, we did this too late and therefore attendance was less than expected.”



Cross-visits were, in general, successfully carried out and despite some difficulties¹⁸ accomplished their stated objectives. During the demonstrations (as shown in D 6.3 “Report on cross visits, targets and schedules”) many ‘good practices’ were carried out, such as skillful facilitation including the use of energizers and participatory/co-creation methods/tools (largely interactive workshops), own assessments, demonstrations of the use of DATS. These experiences (including the difficulties faced within/by UCs/BCs/CVs) should be also capitalized (i.e., along with the DATS) and made available in future projects. One further suggestion would be that in future projects those teams who do not have prior experience in organizing such events (CVs) are invited to take part into a pilot/ ‘model’ demonstration CV (besides the written materials and on-line introductions provided).

¹⁸ Difficulties, as for example the numbers and expertise of the participants in the CVs, although limited the exchanges between UCs proved useful in that host UCs had to reflect on this, as ascertained in the CVs reports.



3. Assessment of Task 6.4 - dedicated training programme

The activities of the relevant task (T6.4) include the compilation of an inventory of existing training modules to address the needs identified in previous project tasks, the development of learning outcomes/competences for advisors to support adaptation of DATs as well as of a dedicated training module that can be delivered as part of an advisor Continuing Professional Development (CPD) programme, and the identification and sharing of resource materials.

Based on Deliverables 3.1. (“Factors influencing Adoption of Digital Agriculture Tech by Farmers and Advisors”), 3.3 (“Contextual advocacy and animation approaches”), 4.3 (“Learning from Ongoing Pilot Adoptions of DATs”) and 5.2. (“Factors influencing use of DATs and UCs”), Task (Deliverable) 6.4 (“Report on Training Modules”) sought to develop and combine existing modules to targeted training, fostering adoption of digital tools by different advisory disciplines within advisory organisations and networks.

Within FAIRshare online learning tools that are effective in enabling advisors to train their clients were collected. From these and other local modules and materials targeted training modules were identified, able to support advisors in their work with digital tools in general and adapted to the challenges identified in the Use Cases (T4.2 and T6.1).

Initially (Deliverable 6.4 (“Report on Training Modules”)) 164 training modules were described by Title; Origin; Language; Targeted audience (advisors, farmers); Content keywords; Objective of training; Type of training; Pedagogical methods; Supporting materials; Duration; Necessary equipment; Link/ Additional information. These were added to the FAIRshare inventory ([Inventory of Training Modules | Fairshare \(fairshare-pnf.eu\)](https://fairshare-pnf.eu)), with the option to add more modules (currently 198).

Furthermore, key subjects and categories have been defined as the basis for training frameworks (communication, calculation, decision support) and user levels (basic and advanced). Training frameworks are series of general type and DATs specific training modules adapted to the participants’ needs; if the participant follows this recommended step by step program it is expected that s/he will become comfortable using digital tools of the chosen category. For each framework/level combination, a selection of best fitting modules was made (Table 4). As farmers face many different subjects to take decisions, in Decision Support more modules were selected to have enough variation in focus.

Table 4: Number of training modules per level of trainee

Number of training modules	basic	advanced
Communication	6	5
Calculation	7	8
Decision Support	29	35

The training framework helped to create a coherent number of trainings. The modules made it possible to remove the barriers, defined in Deliverables 3.3 (“Contextual advocacy and animation approaches”) and 4.3 (“Learning from Ongoing Pilot Adoptions of DATS”)

Overall, the training modules overview (including a wide variety of resource materials) proved extremely helpful as they provide resources for autonomous learning of anyone who might be interested. Furthermore, the module overview was the basis to make a suitable training framework, created by grouping the modules (communication, calculation and decision support, all on basic and advanced level) and selecting the best fitting modules for each category in the frameworks (see <https://fairshare-pnf.eu/training-frameworks>). The module overview and framework provided the basis for the development of the Training the Trainers course and contributed to the success of the Training for Trainers.

4. Assessment of Task 6.5 - Train the Trainers course

The activities of the relevant task (T 6.5) include the delivery of ‘Train the Trainer’ workshops for advisors from participating partners and UCs and the development of a training schedule and programme needed for each UC as well as the facilitation of the continual sharing of DATS between advisors (peer to peer) and between advisors and stakeholders

Following the aforementioned activities (re: Task 6.4), in Task 6.5 (see Deliverable 6.5 “Report on Train the Trainer Programmes and Assessment”) the 14 best trainings were selected according to certain criteria as follows: Language (English); DATS Usability (wider interest, easily adaptable, etc.) and Price (free and paid training) (Table 5)

Table 5: The 14 Best Trainings for Communication, Calculation and Decision Making

For whom	Title
Training framework "CALCULATION AND DATA"	1. CostCheck: The Mastitis Cost Calculator
	2. Farm Carbon Toolkit
	3. RISE (Response-Inducing Sustainability Evaluation)
Training framework "COMMUNICATION"	4. Mentimeter - quick preparation of interactive sheets, with polls, ranking, inventory, brainstorm, wordcloud etc.
	5. Microsoft Teams
	6. Digital tools to enable advisors to connect with their clients virtually and conduct online group activities (klaxoon)
	7. MURAL - a remote design workshop that is more productive than face-to-face
Training framework "DECISION SUPPORT SYSTEMS"	8. Best4soil
	9. Open platform for Innovative spraying equipment, training and advising INNOSETA
	10. Smart Farming Platform
	11. PastureBase - number one tool to help Irish dairy, beef, and sheep farmers manage their grass production and utilisation
	12. SustainFarm Public Goods Tool
	13. Teagasc eProfit Monitor Benchmarking Analysis System
	14. The Soil Quality Mobile App (SQAPP)

Moreover, the identification of their training needs by the UCs themselves, led to the design of four consecutive training modules:

Module 1: What DATS are and can do for you;

Module 2: How farmers can be motivated to engage with DATS

Module 3: Develop your own project to implement DATS

Module 4: Reflect deployment and enhance knowledge exchange

Learning aims of the four modules are:

- a) advisors / trainers are able to select good DATS from the FAIRshare inventory according to their needs, plan and reflect their use (modules 1, 2, 3 and 4);
- b) know the range of DATS trainings (communication, calculation, decision making) (module 1);
- c) experience the benefit of DATS on the basis of selected examples (module 1);
- d) analyse 5-10 good practices with the application of DATS and determine the impact in selected practices (module 2);
- e) know how to motivate and engage farmers, improve peer to peer exchange and sharing the results with applying DATS (module 2, 3 and 4);
- f) learn from each other how to collaborate at the interface (module 3 and 4);
- g) differentiate own roles with respect to advisory services and data collection (module 3 and 4).¹⁹

4.1 Evaluation of the Training the Trainers course

As aforementioned, based on Deliverable 6.4 (“Report on Training Modules”) the Training the Trainers course was designed. The course was tested with project partners through 4 pilot trainings (one per module) held in May 2022 (see Deliverable 6.5 “Report on Training the Trainer Programme and Assessment) in order to verify and improve the program's quality and get feedback for participants. The main feedback for Module 1 was to make the content of the training more problem-oriented and the training shorter with more time for interaction and less text on slides. For Module 2, participants suggested more time for discussion and for each participant to voice their opinions and experiences in a meaningful way. They also highlighted that training should focus on advisors, not farmers. In Module 3, participants indicated that the more the training focuses on specific DATS, the learning

¹⁹ Most of these aims rely on the training framework. In the design of the training, *motivation and engagement* (e) were added. The experience of the organizers in *adult learning* was key to include tis via effective elements in the different module.

outcomes will be much clearer. Module 4 focuses on learning from examples presented and developing them further; learning how to work with testimonials and finding suitable knowledge-sharing networks in countries.

Based on partners' feedback the 4 modules were amended and finalized; the course was shortened and more focused on adult training principles.

The final training materials (booklet; materials for training; planning template and check-list; and, useful links and additional material per module) are available at [TTT Train the trainer modules](#)

The 4 modules have been delivered in 4 groups (crops, data, economics, animals) as follows in Table 6.

Table 6: Timeline of trainings (Train of Trainers)

	Module 1	Module 2	Module 3	Module 4
Group 1: Crops	10/10/2022	24/10/2022	21/11/2022	8/3/2023
Group 2: Data	10/10/2022	24/10/2022	21/11/2022	8/3/2023
Group 3: Economics	12/10/2022	26/10/2022	23/11/2022	13/3/2023
Group 4: Animals	12/10/2022	26/10/2022	23/11/2022	13/3/2023

The numbers of participants varied (Table 7).

Table 7: Numbers of trainees per group per module

	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Total
Module 1	12	9	9	6	36
Module 2	11	8	5	5	29
Module 3	11	7	5	5	28
Module 4	10	6	9	6	31

A more detailed analysis shows that 16 trainees followed all 4 modules in the same group (Crops=6, Data=5, Economics=3 and Animals=2) with 1 more trainee following all 4 modules but in different groups. Another 6 trainees followed 3 out of the 4 modules in the same group; 2 trainees also followed 3 modules but in different groups. Additionally, 18 trainees followed 1 or 2 modules (in the same or in different groups).

4.2 Interim assessments



Right after each of the 3 first modules (Modules 1, 2 & 3) trainees were asked to answer a few questions (Appendix 2) regarding the module they had just attended. This was a kind of light, formative evaluation exercise that gave the trainers' team the opportunity to make adjustments to the training programme, if so needed.

The numbers of the respondents (response rate between 80% and 90%) are as follows (Table 8)

Table 8: Response rates per group per module

	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Total
Module 1	10	7	7	5	29
Module 2	10	7	4	5	26
Module 3	8	8	4	3	23

The results of these evaluations can be summarized as follows:

Regarding the **best 'elements'** of the 3 first modules, trainees emphasize the theoretical inputs related to 'adult training' (25 answers) followed by the work in small groups and thus the exchanges between them (16 answers). Other aspects of the training which satisfied the trainees were the testimonials (13 answers) and the training method, focusing on the practical work (12 answers) as well as the presentations and the teaching materials (10 answers). Other positive but rather minor 'elements' (up to 5 answers each) of the training mentioned are the dynamism and interactive character of the training, working with Miro, facilitation, and the familiarization with DATS.

Regarding **difficulties** and **suggestions** trainees prioritized the activation of participants with the inclusion of more interactive activities, opportunities to share experiences, group work and reflection (8 answers). This seems equally important with their introduction to/familiarity with DATS and their use in practice (8 answers) - which may owe to the recruitment process and/or the availability of trainees in their respective UCs (see also below); on the other hand, it must be taken into account that advisors are already under pressure in fulfilling their duties and thus offered extra time in order to participate in the project activities (also reflecting their raised interest in more in-depth knowledge of the digital tools and their use in practice).

This is followed by the need/demand, on the one hand, to work on some of the topics more in-depth (e.g., definition of the levels of the general use of DATS; the three categories of DATS; imaginative issues, design thinking; testimonials; practical exercises) (7 answers) and, on the other hand, for even more facilitation/ better coordination especially for small groups

work (7 answers). In parallel, the need for more specific/clear instructions - with regard to what was expected from them during group work and/or homework was raised (7 answers).

Some trainees would also favor more training on communication methods while others their introduction to Miro and/or MURAL, possibly before the first module (5 answers each). Topics relating to the trainees' role as trainers (e.g., conducting situational analysis; identifying barriers; handling heterogeneous groups; 4 answers) and especially 'how to' motivate participants (their trainees) were also raised (4 answers). The rest of the (rather minor - max 4 answers each) issues put forward by the trainees can be categorized into three groups. The first refers to arrangements like the duration of the training, the time available for individual preparation and the need for reminders. Especially regarding the duration of training, views are contradicting: others asked for shorter and more trainings/modules while for others training should be realized in a shorter period. The second group relates to few trainees' demands for clearer objectives of the modules and timeline while others asked for a clearer overall aim of the training - including its position within FAIRshare and the UCs. Finally, the third group refers to the demand by few among the trainees for more practical examples and to connect the training to 'real-world' assignment.

4.3 Final assessment

After the last module (Module 4) trainees were asked to fill in the evaluation questionnaire (Appendix 3); 29 out of the 31 participants/trainees of Module 4 responded.

4.3.1 Quantitative assessment

The summary of the final evaluation is illustrated in Table 9. According to these results (for analytical results see [Train the Trainers Evaluation](#)) the trainees appear to be satisfied (average 4.01 out of 5). Fourteen (14) trainees graded the training over 4; 11 trainees between 3.5 and 4; 3 trainees between 3 and 3.5 and one trainee gave the course 2.7 out of 5.

The trainees appear especially satisfied with the facilitators (average 4.59 out of 5), followed by the training per se (training experience, average 4.17²⁰) and less satisfied by the possible impact of the training and the cooperation with colleagues (average around 4 each). It is also worth noting that in only two questions ("The training exceeded my expectation" and "The

²⁰ For the calculation of average the grading of the question "the length of training was too long" was transformed so as to answer the question "the length of training was NOT too long" (see Table 9)

training program strengthened my ability to find new solutions regarding farming-related issues”) most responses did not score high (i.e., did not score 4 or 5).

Regarding the purpose of the training some of the questions are of special interest.

In the first place the training was found to be (by the trainees) well planned and organized (4.21) as well as that it achieved its objectives (4.14), although the objectives were not clear to all right from the beginning. The training materials provided either before or during the training modules were well organized and helpful (4.24 and 4.31 respectively). Overall, the content of the training was quite comprehensive (4.03) and, what is of most importance here, relevant to trainees’ needs as DATS trainers (4.21).

On the other hand, trainees do not appear particularly satisfied with the method of training²¹ and the assignments in terms of understanding DATS and their use²² (3.86 each). Nevertheless, trainees are satisfied by the “good practices” demonstrated during the training – as they were useful in understanding the use of DATS (4.1) and assess that the training program was practical and applicable in real situations (4.07).

In parallel, the training seems to be suitable in terms of duration (length was sufficient: 4.24; not too long: 3.69) while meeting their expectations to a rather good extent (3.93). For some trainees the training was not well adjusted to their current capabilities (3.76) a fact that may owe to the recruitment/ availability of trainees within the respective UCs and the fact that there was no pre-assessment of their capabilities. Nevertheless, this may also owe to the insecurity of some trainees about their capabilities who, at the end of the course, felt more confident (as shown in the next paragraph).

Of major importance are the findings showing that after the course the trainees felt confident that they could successfully plan their advisors’ training on their respective UC DATS (4.17) as well as other advisors’ trainings (4.17). In this respect one may well argue that, indeed, the training successfully reached its objectives. Furthermore, the positive influence of the training on the trainees’ professional growth and career (4.24) along with the triggering of a collaborative attitude (4.14) and the motivation to pursue further learning (4) as well as the belief that the skills learned will be used in advisory practice (4.31) enhance the worthiness of the course. Nevertheless, it must be observed that the grading of the questions relating to

²¹ This may owe to different reasons for different trainees (see qualitative evaluation). The training was delivered on-line and although not clearly stated (but by one trainee) this may also have caused some comfortlessness to some (especially the ones lacking the capabilities required for on-line work).

²² See comments on this issue both before and below. It would be expected that trainees representing their respective UCs would be, more or less, knowledgeable of the UC, its DATS and the FAIRshare project as well as that they would have some digital skills.

the augmentation of trainees' confidence concerning the use digital tools/technologies is slightly lower.

As aforementioned the assessment of the course facilitators is rather excellent. On the other hand, it seems that cooperation with peers, although overall positive and appreciated, faced some problems. The latter may relate to the fact that not all trainees participated in all modules as well as to the fact that the final assignment was coordinated/facilitated by each group itself (and not by the course facilitators) which may have resulted in gaps of communication and group work.



Table 9: Summary results of the “Training the Trainers” course evaluation

	average	grading: 4-5	grading: 3	grading: 1-2
<i>The training experience</i>				
The training was well planned and organized	4.21	24	3	2
The objectives of the training were clearly defined from the beginning	3.9	21	3	5
The objectives of the training were met	4.14	23	4	2
The length of training was sufficient	4.24	24	5	
The length of training was NOT too long	3.69	19	7	3
The training met my expectations	3.93	20	6	3
The training exceeded my expectation	3.03	13	10	6
The training content was relevant to my needs as a DATS trainer	4.21	23	5	1
The training was relevant to my needs as an advisor (e.g. motivating and communicating with farmers).	3.66	14	14	1
The training was adjusted to my current capabilities.	3.76	21	4	4
The teaching materials and tutorials[1] provided before the training were helpful and well organized	4.24	23	5	1
The teaching materials provided during the training were well organized and helpful.	4.31	26	2	1
The “good practices” demonstrated during the training were useful in understanding the use of DATS	4.1	24	4	1
The training program was practical and applicable in real situations.	4.07	23	4	2
The content of the training was problem oriented.	3.62	18	8	3
The assignments were practice-oriented and useful to understand DATS.	3.86	20	7	2
The method of training made it easy for me to understand the use of digital tools.	3.86	23	2	4
The content of the training was quite comprehensive.	4.03	24	1	4
<i>Possible impacts of the training</i>				
The training program strengthened my ability to find new solutions regarding farming-related issues.	3.34	14	10	5
The interaction with peers and other actors involved, increased my collaborative attitude.	4.14	27	2	
The training increased my motivation to pursue further learning.	4	21	7	1
I intend to use the acquired skills in my advisory practice.	4.31	25	4	
The training will be useful with regard to my professional growth and career	4.24	24	5	
I feel more confident to use digital tools/technologies for advisory purposes.	3.97	20	8	1
I feel more confident to use digital tools/technologies in general.	3.93	21	7	1



I am confident that I can successfully plan my advisor's training (on my UC DATS) based on these modules.	4.17	24	4	1
I am confident that I can successfully plan (various) advisors' trainings based on these modules.	4.17	24	5	
I feel I can, if needed, identify a 'super-user' and get his/her assistance.	3.66	19	8	2
<i>The facilitators</i>				
The facilitators were knowledgeable about the training topic.	4.69	29		
The facilitators encouraged participation and interaction.	4.59	27	2	
The facilitators had the ability to explain concepts and answer questions clearly.	4.48	27	1	1
The facilitators were supportive and eager to help me when needed.	4.69	27	2	
I have had a good cooperation with the facilitators.	4.52	25	3	1
<i>Collaboration with peer trainees</i>				
Adequate knowledge and experience was shared with my peers.	4.07	23	4	2
I had good cooperation with my peers.	3.93	21	6	2
Involving actors with different competencies was a key for the training effectiveness.	4.07	23	5	1
I intend to keep in touch with my peer trainees.	4.03	24	4	1
Average	4.01	25	3	1



4.3.2 Qualitative assessment

This part of evaluation comprises 4 open questions which followed the Likert-type questions and answers (Appendix 3).

Regarding **best** ‘elements’ of the overall training the trainees underlined the theoretical underpinnings of the exercise/course (7 answers), notably the ARIVA model, along with various ‘elements’ relating to the methodology of the course. Trainees especially refer to elements such as the practical nature of the training, the tools and (soft) skills used which encouraged their active involvement, and the processes of peer-to-peer exchanges/ sharing and feedback (5 answers each). On the positive side is also the comment referring to the opportunity provided to trainees to make up their own training plan (3 answers). Other minor comments (2 answers) concern the dynamic atmosphere during the training, the structure, aims and objectives, the trainers, the training materials, etc.

With regard to the question “Which topics/needs were **not covered** or were **insufficiently covered** during the training” trainees have only minor comments referring to, on the one hand, the clarity of instructions for group work/assignments (3 answers) and, on the other hand, the (long) duration of the training, and the ‘how to’ overcome farmers’ difficulties/ barriers to use digital tools (2 answers each). The ‘how to’ adjust the training plan if needed as well as ‘how to’ keep participants interested along with the understanding of the ARIVA model were also mentioned. Thirteen (13) trainees said, ‘everything fine’ or ‘nothing to add’.

With regard to **proposals/** comments, on the part of the trainees, aiming to make the course more affective, a number of comments refer to communication issues regarding, on the one hand, the explanation of the overall plan (including goals, timeline, milestones and deadlines for the course but even for the overall ‘training exercise’, i.e. even beyond the course – including advisors’ and farmers’ training) at the beginning of the course or beforehand (6 answers) and, on the other hand, the utilization of emails either as reminders or as means for peer-to-peer collaboration (3+2 answers). The long timing of the course was again referred to by 2 trainees. Other issues relate to the need for trainees to work on a DATS they are familiar with (or as another trainee put it “Previous experience in using DATS might be collected beforehand”²³); to make each his/her own training plan (instead of one plan per team); to work on widely known practical examples or with more advisors’ testimonies showing how to effectively train farmers to use DATS; or having the time to discuss the plan with advisors. Seven (7) trainees said, ‘everything fine’ or ‘nothing to add’.

²³ See footnote 21.



Finally, regarding to the trainees' most important '**AHA moment**' during the trainings, the (need to encourage the) sharing of trainees' experiences in group work (7 answers) along with the (thorough structuring of the) training plan (4 answers) seem to prevail. The use of facilitation tools and testimonials (4 and 2 answers respectively) as well as the differences between adult and students' learning (3 answers) and the ARIVA model (2 answers) follow. Two (2) trainees did not answer while one (1) said 'none'.

Overall, the Training the Trainer course, despite some weak points (mainly relating to communication/cooperation issues and, for some, to the online delivery of the course or the need to deepen in certain topics) proved successful in that the trainees claimed that they appreciated the facilitators' team and the training materials and, most of all, owing to the knowledge and experiences gained, feel capable to successfully plan their advisors' training on their respective UC DATS and other advisors' trainings as well as improve their advisory practice in general.

4.4 Assessment of advisors' training

Following the Training the Trainers course, each UCs' trained trainer went on to train at least 4 advisors (i.e. a total of 116 advisors) who, in turn, would get in touch with farmers to provide advice using the relevant (to each UC) DATS²⁴. Within the project there was an interest in following this process as well. Therefore, each UC leader was asked to upload (at [UC Training of Advisors](#) folder) a) the training materials and b) a short report of the 'pearls, puzzles and proposals' (qualitative assessment) pertaining to advisors' training. (see Appendix 5)

It has to be mentioned that although the Trainers had followed the aforementioned Training the Trainers course, in their trainings of the advisors "The curriculum can be adjusted according to the problems of the country or region. The suggestion is that the trainers can build on and share their own country's best practices during the training but without fundamentally changing the training modules developed" (D6.5, p. 18).

The great majority of advisors' trainings were conducted between March to June of 2023. Overall, 768 advisors were trained²⁵. The main results of the assessment of advisors' trainings are provided below.

²⁴ EPC due to unforeseen circumstances did not finalize the digital tool development; therefore they did not go on with advisors' training. On the other hand, MAPA (Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, Spain) took the place of TRAGSA (MAPA's third party) and actively participated in the Train the Trainers, advisors' training and farmers advisory activities.

²⁵ More specifically, in 6 cases the required minimum of 4 advisors were trained; in 13 cases 5-10 advisors were trained; and in 10 cases more than 10 advisors were trained. The majority of trainings

Concerning the **pearls**, in the first place, advisors are reported as being highly interested, enthusiastic and satisfied with their training (12 references). Furthermore, they are said to have appreciated facilitated interaction - exchange of experiences and information (8 references) as well as their active involvement in the trainings especially in terms of practice/trial and experiment (7 references) to which the dynamic atmosphere during the training and “the activation of their experiences” (2 references each) may be added. The familiarization with the use of DATS (understanding either its usefulness or/and its use) was also found important (4-5 references each) along with the overcoming of their (advisors’) doubts about DATS (2 references) are also important. Other positive aspects of the trainings relate to working in small groups, understanding how to use the digital tool(s) with less proficient (re: digital skills) farmers and “Thinking outside the box”.

With regards to **puzzles**, the main issues, besides ‘technical’ ones relating to specific DATS (5 references), were the need for more time for advisors to “fully understand/experience the DAT” (5 references), the different levels of digital skills among advisors (5 references) and the timing of the training (4 references). Online trainings faced some particular problems such as connectivity and login issues as well as how to do interactive and/or practical sessions (overall 5 references). Other (much less referred to) issues relate to the preparation of workshops with farmers and the provision of good practical examples plus some difficulties advisors may face with farmers (age and local language).

Finally, proposals relate to the need for more practice and examples in the training, notably with the use real farm data/relevance (6) and the enhancement of interactivity in the trainings (5 references) followed by the extension (more time) of the trainings and the timing (4 references each). The need for written instructions as well as for more training, in-person (vs. online) trainings and more testimonials are also referred to (2-3 references each). Important (although single) proposals refer to “Joint training of advisors and farmers”, the need for institutional support vis-à-vis future activities and preparation “Homework to get familiar before the training”.

It thus seems that trained trainers did a good job in training their advisors with the latter enjoying these trainings and gaining from them. It is characteristics that some advisors would like to spend more time on such a training; on the other hand, it is important to note that care must be taken so that the examples provided during the training are not fictional but (good) real farm data.

(15) were carried out in-person, 13 were online and 1 hybrid. In the majority of cases (21) training was carried out in one session; in 4 cases the training comprised two sessions and in another 4 cases the training comprised 3-4 sessions. The average duration of each training session was 2 hours. In 22 cases the duration of a training session was 1-3 hours; in the rest of the cases sessions lasted 4-7 hours.



4.5 Pilot measurement of advisor support for and farmer adoption of digital tools

The trained advisors provided advice with the use of the digital tool(s) each UC had chosen to develop or adapt, to a limited number of farmers, mainly in the period May – mid June 2023. In 9 UCs the required 4 farmers were approached; in 13 UCs 5 to 10 farmers were reached; in 7 UCs the number of farmers who received advice with the use of DATS was more than 10. Overall, in 29 cases 261 farmers were reached (28% females and 72% males). The average time spent by advisors with the farmers was 1.5 to 2 hours.

Following the provision of the advice - utilizing the digital tools, farmers were asked to respond to an online questionnaire indicating the advisor support for and the adoption on their part of digital tools²⁶. Given the character of this evaluation (i.e., ‘pilot measurement’, see project GA), the target was to collect 4 farmer’s questionnaires per UC; therefore, the overall target was to collect 116 questionnaires from the 29 UCs. Indeed, most of the UCs (14) collected the required 4 questionnaires; another 10 UCs collected between 5 and 10 questionnaires; 3 UCs collected more than 10 questionnaires. Furthermore, 2 UCs did not collect questionnaires while MAPA also collected 4 questionnaires. Overall, 192 farmer’s questionnaires were collected.

The survey was based on a structured questionnaire (see Appendix 4). The questionnaire was filled by the farmers after the advisor’s visit (and the demonstration of the use of the digital tool, each UC had been developing/ working with during the project, in advisory work).

The summary results of the survey are presented in Table 10. According to the data in Table 10 it is clear that the sections “relationship with the advisor” and “on advice” score high (average: 4.57 and 4.15, respectively).

Concerning the DATS used as an aid in advisory work offered (as a pilot) to them, farmers certainly acknowledge their usefulness in terms of the improvement of the way advice is provided (4.1). As a result, they are willing both to disseminate/recommend the DATS to peers and to use more DATS in the future (4.2 each). Farmers appear to be a bit more skeptical, although overall positive and committed, with regard to their ability to work on their farm with digital tools without the presence of the advisor (average: 3.8). Furthermore, it is significant that 93.75% of the interviewees declared that they expect positive results

²⁶ The online questionnaire, originally developed in English, was translated into 15 languages to make it easier for the farmers to understand the questions.

from this advice in the future. Yet it may be still too early to grasp the full range of advantages digital tools may offer. Therefore, farmers are also a bit skeptical, but certainly positive, with regard to the support of DATS in their own work and life; support in decision-making and in problem solving score just above 4 with improvements in work comfort and time saving scoring lower (around 3.5).

Thus, it seems that, overall, the advice provided with the use of DATS has been successful and triggered farmers' interest in the digital tools used by advisors, since the benefits of the digital tools have become clearer. The question arising from this survey concerns the improvement of farmers' digital skills (their self-evaluation resulted 3.4/5) and the adjustments and promotion of DATS in the future so that they will be used by farmers themselves (if the DATS is designed to do so).

We expect that effective use of DATS in advice is easier in the case of farmers with whom advisors (seem to) have long established and very good relationships. Nevertheless, it may well work also when advisors meet hard-to-reach farmers, thus contributing to on-going efforts to bridge the current digital divide within the farming population or, in general, rural areas. It follows that the uptake of DATS is largely facilitated when advisory services are present and their advisors properly trained.



Table 10: Summary results of farmers' survey

	average	above average	below average & x>4	x>4.5	x<3
<i>On advice</i>					
The way advice on DATS was provided aided in my learning	4.2	16	4	11	1
The time devoted to the advisor (advice on DATS) was a worthwhile use of my time	4.2	16	4	11	
The information in today's advice is applicable to my work	4.1	19	3	9	1
How do you feel about this advice on DATS?	4.1	14	6	10	1
<i>On DATS</i>					
I am able to use what I learned (by myself/ without further support from the advisor)	3.8	15	N/A	6	3
I am confident that I will be able to apply what I have learned back on my farm	3.9	14	N/A	5	
I am committed to apply what I learned to my work	3.8	19	N/A	4	1
I am expecting positive results from this advice in the future	180/192				
Will save time in your work	3.4	13	N/A	3	7
Will help in problem solving	3.8	18	N/A	2	
Will make your life easier?(your work more comfortable)	3.5	12	N/A	3	3
Make the provision of advice to you better	4.1	11	7	6	
Support your decision making	3.9	16	N/A	5	
I will recommend this/these DATS to my peers	4.2	15	4	13	
I would like to use more DATS in the future	4.2	16	2	11	
I believe that my digital skills are	3.4	16	N/A	1	2
<i>Relationship with advisor</i>					
friendly	4.5	19	9	19	
professional	4.6	17	11	21	
trusting	4.6	16	11	16	



4.5.1 Qualitative assessment by UC leaders

Furthermore, the UC leaders were asked to discuss with the advisors their experience (i.e., the provision of advice with the use of the respective digital tool) and come up with short report concerning ‘pearls’, ‘puzzles’ and ‘suggestions’ (see Appendix 6) available at [UC Training of Advisors](#) folder.

Regarding **pearls**, the main issue concerns farmers’ interest on the digital tools and the tools’ positive role in the development of “good atmosphere” – “positive energy” and the facilitation of fruitful exchanges between farmers and advisors as well as between farmers (in case of group meetings-trainings/workshops). These, in turn, allowed for mutual understanding as well as for the understanding of benefits of the use of the digital tools and the (‘how to’) use of such tools and thus for the understanding of proposed policy measures and concrete advices - or the results of the measures or advices implemented in the farm (relevant references found in two-thirds of the responses). Characteristic excerpts such as “The farmers demonstrated a high interest in the functionalities of the app ... and the possibility of exchanging information with the advisors” - “New knowledge, exchange of opinions, positive energy among participants, more opportunities for their farm, an in-depth look at the state of the farm” - “Farmers were interested in learning how to use developed e-tool to facilitate their production planning and reporting” suffice to illustrate the topic. To these one may add a couple of comments concerning the advisors: “The training with the [app] users allowed us to understand what the farmers biggest difficulties are when using the platform” - “I discover some functionality very helpful for my work” and “On the farm, we validated the data with the farmers, and discussed the results achieved by the farm on our dashboards” showing the mutual benefit of the pilot - provision of advice with the use of new DATS.

Further positive issues referred to concern the readiness of farmers to use the tool and, consequently, the autonomy/flexibility of either the farmer and/or the advisor in terms of the provision of advice; and the issue of saving time when using the tool (7 and 3 references respectively).

As far as **puzzles** are concerned main issues raised are as follows: a) farmers’ digital skills or experience with digital tools (so as to be able to use the tools) along with the heterogeneity of farmers and farms (implying the possible need for differentiation of farmers’ training on the tools) and thus farmers’ capacity to use such tools by themselves (without any advice); b) good internet connection; and, c) time issues (entering data, etc.). In only two cases the issues raised concern the provision of advice as such: one concerns the time available “Short time to present each of the 9 calculations within the DAT” and the other the content “It is difficult to integrate hands on education for use of a software program and at the same time make the participants listen and understand the actual agronomy/science that it is based



upon". Nevertheless, other (single) comments such as "As the farmers learned the developed e-tool, there were recommendations for improving the work of the developed e-tool" - "Most challenges were based around the complexities of [the topic] a farming business, particularly those which have diversified [face]" - "[in developing the software of the tool] some assumptions had to be made, which affect the accuracy of the results"; and "Farmers had expected more sophisticated and flexible [solutions] ... the 3 [solutions] which promised the most impact regarding environmental protection could not be priced or are not available on the market" are valuable with regard to the future development of these or of newer DATS. Only one UC said they do not have any questions.

Finally, with regard to **suggestions**, a number of them concern the presentation of the digital tools to farmers including group (instead of one-to-one) physical or on-line training; demonstrations of the benefits using real farmers and farms; creation of exchange groups/communities of practice (either peer-to-peer or mixed groups of advisors and farmers); development of user guides; collection of more feedback after trainings as well as "Focus more on the adult learning tools learned that help to deliver the technical content and not just on the tech itself" (overall 16 suggestions). The second (most frequently mentioned) topic concerns the development of advisors' digital skills and that "It's important not to make the advising "one way" thus the exchange/interactive work with farmers ("Advising should mainly be done on farms and with the decision maker present. This way we ensure that the discussion is based on the reality of the farm and that the advisors' inputs will be taken into consideration and implemented"), including follow-up work (overall 9 suggestions). Another five suggestions refer to technical (mainly software) issues of certain digital tools while the (single) suggestion to focus on young famers "The young farmers were open to co-creating a DAT with the functionalities" may be of particular interest vis-à-vis future DATS developments.

5. Appendices

Appendix 1

Evaluation summary

Number of:

- members of the host team
- members of the visiting team

- Advisors
- Farmers
- ICT specialists
- Others

(please, specify).....

A. The Cross-Visit

		Average Score	Specific remarks? N/A?
1	The invitation to the CV was on time (not too early, not too late)	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5	
2	The introductory material (included in the invitation) regarding UC and DATS was well prepared/ clear enough to understand the purpose of the cross-visit	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5	
3	The introductory session on UC and DATS was well prepared and the presentation(s) was/were easy to understand.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5	
4	The selection of participants (advisors, farmers, ICT experts and other stakeholders) who attended the cross visit <u>on the part of the host team</u> was appropriate.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5	
5	The selection of participants (op. cit.) who attended the cross visit <u>on the part of the visiting team</u> was appropriate.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5	
6	The field visit (or virtual field visit in the case of online CV) was well organized.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5	
7	Demonstration of DATS utilization was useful and clear.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5	



8	I felt comfortable to ask questions and participate in the discussion.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5	
9	The feedback session of the CV was well organized and productive.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5	
10	The CV helped me to improve my knowledge regarding adaption and adoption of DATS.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5	
11	Learnings from the CV will be useful for my future work (see also Section 3).	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5	
12	The duration of the CV was just right (not too short, not too long).	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5	
13	<i>Accommodation and catering were well organized.</i>	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5	
14	<i>Access to the venue of the CV meeting was easy</i>	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5	

B. The UC/BC

Please rate the following statements from 1 to 5: 5) Strongly agree; 4) Somewhat agree; 3) Neither agree nor disagree; 2) Somewhat disagree; 1) Strongly disagree

		Average Score	Specific remarks? N/A
1	The UC addresses a real-world problem (concerning large numbers of farmers and/or advisors)	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5	
2	The UC/BC's output could have an important impact in farming communities	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5	
3	The UC partners are motivated to collaborate/work closely together	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5	
4	The UC partners contribute complementary resources/ skills etc. to the case	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5	
5	The UC partners devote enough time to the project	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5	
6	The size of the UC partnership is appropriate (re: project objectives)	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5	



7	The combination of the UC partnership is appropriate (re: project objectives)	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5	
8	The available technical infrastructure is appropriate	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5	
9	UC users are actively involved in the trial/adaptation/co-creation of the DATS	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5	
10	User feedback is captured – leading to active assessment/ verification and/ or changes/ adaptation to the innovation (DATS) at hand	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5	
11	All UC partners have appropriate access to the results of/ knowledge generated by the UC	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5	

C. Comments

1. Please provide a short description of the main lessons (*'pearls'*) learned from the Cross Visit (e.g. what will you take home/use in the future work/ utilize to the implementation of your own User Case)?

.....

.....

.....

.....

2. Please provide a short description of the main *'puzzlings'*/ questions you are left with (what are your main concerns) after this visit?

.....

.....

.....

.....

3. Please provide a short description of the main proposals you have for the User Case?

.....

.....

.....

.....



4. What aspects of such a meeting/CV could be improved? *(Please fill in the most important things, the next guest can do to make the meeting more effective)*

.....
.....
.....
.....

5. What other feedback would you like to share about the meeting/CV?

.....
.....
.....
.....



Appendix 2

Training of Trainers Short Evaluation – Modules (1,2,3)

Online: <https://forms.gle/6XoNbQaocQqiCZTY9>

Please give us your opinion about today's Module!

Email:

(This question is mandatory)

In which Group did you participate in? *(This question is mandatory)*

Group 1: Crops

Group 2: Data

Group 3: Economics

Group 4: Animal production

1. What did you **like best** about the training? *(This question is mandatory)*

.....
.....
.....
.....

2. Which topics/needs were **not covered** or were **insufficiently covered** during the training? *(This question is mandatory)*

.....
.....
.....
.....

3. What **suggestions or comments** do you have for making the training more **effective**? *(This question is mandatory)*

.....
.....
.....
.....



Appendix 3

Training of Trainers Evaluation form

Online: <https://forms.gle/C99MpZAtKbSHYT4S7>

We'd like to have your opinion on the various aspects and the overall quality of the training in which you participated. Please complete the evaluation below. Your feedback is valuable.

Email: Date

Which of the groups did you attend? (multiple responses if necessary)
 (Please tick where relevant)

1. Crops
2. Data
3. Economic
4. Animal production

<i>Please answer each question with a grade between 1-5, where 1 is Fully disagree and 5 is Fully agree (please tick where relevant).</i>		1	2	3	4	5
(1) Please rate the overall training experience.						
1	The training was well planned and organized					
2	The objectives of the training were clearly defined from the beginning					
3	The objectives of the training were met					
4	The length of training was sufficient					
5	The length of training was too long					
6	The training met my expectations					
7	The training exceeded my expectation					

<i>Please answer each question with a grade between 1-5, where 1 is Fully disagree and 5 is Fully agree (please tick where relevant).</i>		1	2	3	4	5
8	The training content was relevant to my needs as a DATS trainer					
9	The training was relevant to my needs as an advisor (e.g. motivating and communicating with farmers)					
10	The training was adjusted to my current capabilities					
11	The teaching materials and tutorials ²⁷ provided <u>before</u> the training were well organized and helpful					
12	The teaching materials provided <u>during</u> the training were well organized and helpful					
13	The “good practices” demonstrated during the training were useful in understanding the use of DATS					
14	The training program was practical and applicable in real situations					
15	The content of the training was problem oriented					
16	The assignments were practice-oriented and useful to understand DATS					
17	The method of training made it easy for me to understand the use of digital tools					
18	The content of the training was quite comprehensive					
(2) What is your opinion of the possible impacts of the training.						
19	The training program strengthened my ability to find new solutions regarding farming-related issues					

²⁷ Booklet and videos as well as guidance in the FAIRshare DATS’ inventory and Mural.

<i>Please answer each question with a grade between 1-5, where 1 is Fully disagree and 5 is Fully agree (please tick where relevant).</i>		1	2	3	4	5
20	The interaction with peers and other actors involved, increased my collaborative attitude					
21	The training increased my motivation to pursue further learning					
22	I intend to use the acquired skills in my advisory practice					
23	The training will be useful with regard to my professional growth and career					
24	I feel more confident to use digital tools/technologies for advisory purposes					
25	I feel more confident to use digital tools/technologies in general					
26	I am confident that I can successfully plan my advisor's training (on my UC DATS) based on these modules					
27	I am confident that I can successfully plan (various) advisors' trainings based on these modules					
28	I feel I can, if needed, identify a 'super-user' and get his/her assistance					
(3) What is your opinion of the facilitators:						
29	The facilitator was knowledgeable about the training topic.					
30	The facilitator encouraged participation and interaction					
31	The facilitator had the ability to explain concepts and answer questions clearly					
32	The facilitator was supportive and eager to help me when needed					

<i>Please answer each question with a grade between 1-5, where 1 is Fully disagree and 5 is Fully agree (please tick where relevant).</i>		1	2	3	4	5
33	I have had a good cooperation with the facilitator					
(4) What is your opinion of the collaboration with your peer trainees:						
34	Adequate knowledge and experience was shared with my peers					
35	I had good cooperation with my peers					
36	Involving actors with different competencies was a key for the training effectiveness					
37	I intend to keep in touch with my peer trainees					
Open Questions: Please give us your opinion on the following						
What did you like best about the training?						
Which topics/needs were not covered or were insufficiently covered during the training?						
What suggestions or comments do you have for making the training more effective?						

What was your most important AHA moment during the trainings?

Appendix 4

Short Farmer's Questionnaire

Online: <https://forms.gle/PoQ6HUUegi7XBhaW6>

UC (to be answered by the advisor)

Date

ON ADVICE

1. The way advice on DATS was provided aided in my learning

Please answer each question with a grade between 1-5, where 1 is Fully disagree and 5 is Fully agree (please tick where relevant).

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

2. The time devoted to the advisor (advice on DATS) was a worthwhile use of my time

Please answer each question with a grade between 1-5, where 1 is Fully disagree and 5 is Fully agree (please tick where relevant).

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

3. The information in today's advice is applicable to my work

Please answer each question with a grade between 1-5, where 1 is Fully disagree and 5 is Fully agree (please tick where relevant).

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

4. How do you feel about this advice on DATS

Please answer each question with a grade between 1-5, where 1 is Not satisfied at all and 5 is Satisfied very much (please tick where relevant).

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

ON DATS

5. I am able to-use what I learned (by myself/ without further support from the advisor)

Please answer each question with a grade between 1-5, where 1 is Fully disagree and 5 is Fully agree (please tick where relevant).

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

6. I am confident that I will be able to apply what I have learned back on my farm



Please answer each question with a grade between 1-5, where 1 is Fully disagree and 5 is Fully agree (please tick where relevant).

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

7. I am committed to apply what I learned to my work

Please answer each question with a grade between 1-5, where 1 is Fully disagree and 5 is Fully agree (please tick where relevant).

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

8. I am expecting positive results from this advice in the future

Yes /No

(if **NO** go to question 15)

IF YES, to what degree do you believe that the DATS presented to you:

9. Will save time in your work

Please answer each question with a grade between 1-5, where 1 is Not at all and 5 is Very much (please tick where relevant).

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

10. Will help in problem solving

Please answer each question with a grade between 1-5, where 1 is Not at all and 5 is Very much (please tick where relevant).

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

11. Will make your life easier (your work more comfortable?)

Please answer each question with a grade between 1-5, where 1 is Not at all and 5 is Very much (please tick where relevant).

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

To what degree do you believe that the DATS presented to you:

12. Make the provision of advice to you better

Please answer each question with a grade between 1-5, where 1 is Not at all and 5 is Very much (please tick where relevant).

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

13. Support your decision making

Please answer each question with a grade between 1-5, where 1 is Not at all and 5 is Very much (please tick where relevant).

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

14. I will recommend this/these DATS to my peers

Please answer each question with a grade between 1-5, where 1 is Not at all and 5 is Very much (please tick where relevant).

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

15. I would like to use more DATS in the future

Please answer each question with a grade between 1-5, where 1 is Fully disagree and 5 is Fully agree (please tick where relevant).

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

16. I believe that my digital skills are:

Please answer each question with a grade between 1-5, where 1 Very Low and 5 is Very high (please tick where relevant).

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

I consider my relationship with the advisor as:

17. Friendly

Please answer each question with a grade between 1-5, where 1 is Fully disagree and 5 is Fully agree (please tick where relevant).

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

18. Professional

Please answer each question with a grade between 1-5, where 1 is Fully disagree and 5 is Fully agree (please tick where relevant).

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

19. Trusting

Please answer each question with a grade between 1-5, where 1 is Fully disagree and 5 is Fully agree (please tick where relevant).

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

Appendix 5

Advisors' Training Mini report

(To be filled in by UC Leader)

*Please upload this report on your **UC Training of Advisors** folder.*

User Case Title:	
Name of UC leader:	
DAT used:	
Date(s) of training:	
Training duration (hours):	
Number of participants: (advisors trained)	
<i>Number of Female:</i>	
<i>Number of Male:</i>	

Pearl

Please describe at least one aspect of the training that went very well.

Puzzle

Please describe at least one major challenge – what was the most important difficulty/ies?

Proposal

Any suggestions to improve training?

Pictures

Please upload pictures of your UC training in your UC Training of Advisors SharePoint.

UC Sharepoint → [UC Training of Advisors](#) folder → your UC folder



Appendix 6

Advising Farmers Mini report

(To be filled in by UC Leader)

Please upload this report on your UC Training of Advisors folder.

User Case Title:	
Name of UC leader:	
DAT used:	
Period of advising:	From To
Average duration (hours):	
Number of participants: (farmers)	
Female:	
Male:	

Pearl

Please provide at least one aspect of the advising that went very well.

Puzzle

Please describe at least one major challenge – what was the most important difficulty/ies?

Proposal

Any suggestions to improve advising?

