



Programme d'éducation
et de formation
tout au long de la vie

SAGITER - Agro-ecological Knowledge and territorial ingenuity

**First returns for a partial evaluation of the advances of the project
November 2013 – May 2014**

**Anne MONEYRON
1st June 2014**

Following my participation of the two first seminars of the project Sagiter and the views exchanged with the people in charge of the coordination and organization of the transnational partnership, I suggest a first intermediate evaluation for all the partners. During your reading, you will note some repetitions, but at the date of today, you can consider this document as a simple tool to feed, at least I hope, your work.

Being conscious that an English translation is imperative, because it makes it really accessible for all, I translated it as well as I could. I ask you to apologize me for the approximation of the translation.

The field of my observations opens to questions that I ask myself and yourself today, regarding the project as it has been presented and the progress of the work since November 2013. It would be presented like this :

1. What is Agro-ecological?
2. Agro-ecology and knowledges
3. How can we preserve a diversity on the approaches “countries/territories” (regarding cultural, conceptual and practical aspects) and in the meantime having a collective progression?
4. The position of the participants on the recognition of their own knowledges and practices on this subject: an enlarged bibliography and some accurate examples of carrying out?
5. The heterogeneity of the control of the collaborative tools?
6. The achievements/progress, inter-meeting of the working groups and their sharing?
7. The knowledge/transversal mobilization of the project given by all the partners?
8. The co-inter-pluri-activity of the meeting for more inter-culturality of the agro-ecology, the knowledges and the training?

1. What is Agro-ecological?

During the seminars of November 2013, in Florac, and of May in Marburg, some of the participants asked a definition of agro-ecology. Exchanges times lead to some starting over during the seminars, so, for the group:

- Agro-ecology is a subject with vague outlines, and with a plural content, for the eleven partners from the seven countries, and this, as far as public and institutional politicals and cultural (historic) and personal overview;
- From their practices and the type of training: farm-consultants, team leaders, tutors, university lecturers, the participants approach the problematic depending their own specificities linked to their professional knowledges, so at that, there has not been really some crossing of the representations.
- The concern of the ones and the others regarding agro-ecology goes around between personal and professional involvement, be carefull that this does not lead to “black out” for the plural thought whose construction is in progress.
- Outline the sense of agro-ecology for this intercultural working group is probably too precocious. The experiences of collects/confrontation with some specific realities to every situation are not enough realized. Because of this, the first exchanges where more carried out on a perception/conviction than on a collective vision. The results of the debates are sometimes induced by the animation mode itself.
- In the following of this collective workshop, some documents have been uploaded in the internet dropbox opened to the SAGITER group. Wouldn't it be interesting to have a reviewed bibliography of this documents: who put them online, when? In other words: following this reflexion; check/give sources that do not exist for each of these documents, and, at the end, it would be interesting to know who consulted them. If the final project is really to construct a training package, the evaluation of the individual and collective progression of and from each of the partners could be, in itself, a source/tool which could contribute at the elaboration of units/cursus and curricula of the agro-ecology training;
- We have to mention also, at this date and for this theme, that only texts in French language are uploaded: how can we continue and stimulate the individual and collective reflection between the seminaries from documents written in several collaborating countries, these different languages that contain the historical, geographic and political situation of agro-ecology in their own country/areas and that could be one of the criteria of the evaluation of the collective advances of the project? So, the definition/representation of agor-ecology could be a support and a transversal working theme. It could be interesting to reveal how the representations and definitions moved during this three years : per country/per person/per structure : What were you doing that you are not anymore? What were you saying that you do not say anymore? What were you teaching that you do not teach anymore?

2. Agro-ecology and knowledges

Facing the project SAGITER, in other words the elaboration of a *training disposal around the agro-ecological knowledges and the ingenuity of the terroirs*, and a bibliographic research on the writing and experiences returned from agro-ecology, two transversal elements with no equivocal can be kept: agro-ecology is both science (agronomyt and ecology) **and** set of farming practices imitating the naturals principles. What there is in this **and**, it is one of the essential elements of argumentation of the project which is to do not lead to a division sciences/practices. The postulate of the project, to work on the agro-ecological knowlxdges, means that we have to be located between in this gap and to explore it with sharpness. The project SAGITER seems to have everything to gain to keep has a governing principle the knowledges in agro-ecology located at the crossing of academic and operational thoughts: because the concern is really “how can we produce knowledge on a different way?”

At the stage of the agro-ecological knowledges, we managed to reveal the vision of the participants is mainly focused on the practices (what can be names and seen) instead of the knowledge which is not much visible and formalized, so it is hardly reachable. This is an important point, that is not a lexical nuance, because to construct this disposal of training, which is the heart of the project SAGITER as deposed, we will have to be attentive and to do not make the confusion between the necessity to lean on the local/territorial practices and research of transmissible and transversal, in other words the knowledge itself. To work in and with the complexes open spaces, the knowledges of the farmer, at any time, have be constructed on relationships of exchanges an on porosities with elements, in other words life. Understanding this porosity is necessary to grasp the knowledge developed facing the situations of doubts and hazard which are at once linked to humans, environmental, economical, socil, technical and political aspects. It is by this porosity that knowledges are realized and constructed, and they are located at the crossing of the sciences, philosophy, history, individual, community, inter-generation and temporality of spirited.

Regarding the question of nature and the legitimacy of the knowledges of the famrers, daily practitioners, another methodological debate took place in the group, between a classical *top-down* approach which is in place at the moment in the teaching of professions and the development of agriculture; and the *bottom-up* proposed in the project. Due to the lack of anticipation on the sanitary crises of the 1990s in Europe, the world of the agricultural research and development are at present deprived, regarding knowledge of the complexity of the alive, in front of national and European imperatives to follow the change towards an environment-friendlier agriculture. They try to preserve their monopole towards the broadcasting modes of the knowledges necessary for the fact that they consider as a simple greenwashing of agriculture. The report of lack of public research over the last 50 years both in France and in Europe regarding conceptualization and regarding recognition of the knowledges of the practitioners of agriculture and the practices often considered as outside of the agriculture, confirm that, for the production and the development of knowledges in agro-ecology, the *bottom-up* approach is the most relevant: " Agro-ecology uses a strong intensity of knowledge and it bases on techniques which are not supplied with the summit on the basis but not worked out from the knowledge and from the experience of the farmers."(Schutter O., "Rapport agroécologie et droit à l'alimentation").

At the moment, what we would like is to focus on the concrete exchanges which happened during both seminars. They confirm the double innovating nature of the problem proposed by the project SAGITER.

Its first level of innovation is due to the fact that the project postulates that the agro-ecology articulates (perceptible empirical knowledges but also questions fundamental scientific knowledge: the bases of the biology, the animal breeding, the agronomy etc. recognized scientific knowledge and used by the farmers, to see even claimed as constituent elements of some of their knowledges. Farmers, breeders, wine growers, horticulturalists, etc., in front of concrete situations which are theirs and to change the way they make for the everyday life and of reason with the alive about the long term, regarding the downward dominant agricultural model which thought of eradicating the problems of the work and to act him with alive disregarding the complexity of the reality - show critical and reflexive capacity to look to the source for the scientific knowledge: question them, confront them with the reality and integrate them in a complex way into their needs, so distancing itself from the common top *down-descendant* of the distribution of the knowledge and from the models of practices. So, to understand and validate the agro-ecological knowledges, surrounding areas of implemented collections in the project should be based on more inter / trans-disciplinarity (technical and sensitive, complex and intergenerational approach), to be able to seize the reflexive foundation of the patricians. Not overturn into a posture of refusal / exclusion of the knowledges scientific as certain partners formulate it and tend to spread it in the collective, it would be harmful for the advances of the project which does not have to turn away from the complexity of the subject of the agro-ecological knowledges and to think of being well situated as European project.

The second level of innovation of the project SAGITER comes from the fact that the agro-ecological knowledges of experiments built, individually, but also often collectively, overtake the negative dimension of the label which was theirs for 50 years, in any case in France, of knowledges of resistance: a certain

legitimacy takes shape at present which tends to recognize them and to consider them as expanding and vector of change towards new forms of farming. However, in front of this flow of legitimization, the SAGITER project, and the organizers of the meeting, are all eyes on this "latest fad" and consider as postulate to do not, from these agro-ecological knowledges, to instrument the farmers like that was able to be previously made and try to open their questions to the world of the " agricultural development ". I set to illustrate two examples among all the projects of the program: the Belgians partners who are interested in the trainings of the agricultural advisers, and the Hungarian partners who work on the training of the students in agronomy and farming.

To illustrate these words, I joined you an extract, page 9, of the report 2014 of the PEI-AGRI: *European partnership of Innovation-Opportunity for the innovation in the organic farming and the agro-ecology*. You can find this document under the following links :

PEI-AGRI (in English): http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/eip/index_en.htm

PEI-AGRI (in French): http://www.tporganics.eu/upload/EIP_dossier_FR.pdf

« Le projet SOLINSA7, par exemple, étudie les mécanismes par lesquels ces différents acteurs partagent leurs connaissances et collaborent en vue de d'innover. En analysant les processus mis en jeu dans les réseaux d'apprentissage et d'innovation en agriculture durable (en anglais learning and innovation networks of sustainable agriculture ou LINSAs), ce projet a fini par comprendre les changements dont avaient besoin les chercheurs, les conseillers et les agriculteurs en termes de prise de conscience et d'activités. Les chercheurs doivent cesser de se considérer comme les seules sources légitimes de connaissances et adopter un rôle de «facilitateurs» des processus d'innovation, tandis que les conseillers doivent apprendre à agir en qualité de courtiers en innovation. »

« Les agriculteurs, quant à eux, doivent recevoir un soutien supplémentaire visant à faire d'eux des partenaires actifs des processus d'innovation multi-acteurs plutôt que des consommateurs passifs de connaissances, rôle dans lequel l'approche traditionnelle, descendante, de l'innovation les a trop longtemps confinés. »

« L'agriculture biologique constitue, à tout le moins en partie, une bonne base de départ pour l'implication dans les processus d'innovation précités. Traditionnellement, les agriculteurs du secteur ont toujours recherché activement de nouvelles manières d'innover car les systèmes de recherche et de conseils agronomiques conventionnels ne répondaient pas à leurs besoins. Cela les a encouragés à collaborer étroitement et de manière participative avec les scientifiques. Néanmoins, au fur et à mesure de la popularisation du bio, le secteur s'est de plus en plus intégré au système de connaissances et d'innovation classique. Aujourd'hui, grâce à la nouvelle approche préconisée par le PEI-AGRI, les producteurs biologiques ont l'occasion de faire revivre les traditions de leur secteur et de devenir des partenaires actifs de l'innovation durable en zone rurale. »

source, le Partenariat Européen d'Innovation-Opportunité pour l'innovation dans l'agriculture biologique et l'agroécologie, 2014, p9,
http://www.tporganics.eu/upload/EIP_dossier_FR.pdf

Today, the research works are multiplying, and collect these knowledges but the posture remains unchanged and always tends to model them and to standardize outside their human context and Ecological, their specificities of "countries / territories" and ontological of realization and construction in another report in the alive. If the perspectives of the agricultural development mention wanting to change, attention on the fact that the top down-lowering models regain the upper hand over the up-rising bottom, for the recognition of the sensitive intelligence to act it farmers. The modes of collection that the project will have tested and formalized could become modules and teaching aids of trainings in itself. How pass from a posture of education of contents to another one of facilitator of understanding and share developing in an uncertain world? Such is the continuous stake in the project SAGITER, where from sometimes certain discomfort and destabilization of their certainties lived by the partners.

3. How can we preserve a diversity on the approaches “countries/territories” (regarding cultural, conceptual and practical aspects) and in the meantime having a collective progression?

The French-English translation settled as brake during both meeting, in particular because the used methods were really time-consuming. But it remains necessary to keep both working languages put as such in the project. Certainly it represents a gymnastics of thought and word for each, but has to remain so without the one dominates the other one, we can say the others, because let us not forget that English is native language of none of the partners there: for the group it is a language of use. So 'French' have to be any conscious of the double effort, cultural and intellectual, granted by their partners.

In its work on the difficulty translating, *European Vocabulary of the philosophies. Dictionary of the untranslatable*, Barbara Cassin points the question of the untranslatable “not from the uniqueness, [...] but from the plurality, by parking in the multiplicities of the languages and in the multiplicity of the meanings of the various words. We are in farther dictionaries [...] which base on the conviction of the universality of the linguistic and cultural schemas, or on that of the reality and the uniqueness of the concept, even on both.[...] Not a common abstract language, but a space or common geometry (...) showing in what terminologies are and are not superposables from a language to the other one [...]” (Cassin B., http://www.transeuropeennes.eu/fr/articles/voir_pdf/83). If the compost of the agro-ecology is common because it draws its source from the complexity of the alive, to translate this concept it does not raise for the group of the double difficulty in the research for this common geometry which is to understand and to accept the socio-historic conditions of its not transferability and superposability as is from a country to the other one. It is of the diversity that is born the creativity and the coherence of this project.

In May in Marbourg, a time, voluntarily imposed by Guy Lévêque, equips Florac-coordination project, is dedicated to prop up the levels of information on the finances by country and the common budget. The number of questions, surprises and discoveries of the financial reality showed that this time was important and necessary for each and for a well-balanced functioning of the collective.

4. The position of the participants on the recognition of their own knowledges and practices on this subject: an enlarged bibliography and some accurate examples of carrying out?

The various partners, by the fact of having co-built this project on the theme of the knowledges and the agro-ecology, showed that they do not arrive today without possessing certain knowledge and have a practice, without asking itself certain questions, often relevant and essential. Nevertheless they seem in a posture of “expectation” towards the project.

So, according to the principles of the search-action(search-share,research-action), the posture chosen to lead this project several questions are outlined in a transverse way:

- How to be finer on the analysis of their situations to be able to exchange then?
- How pass of an analysis of their situations (example from the visits) in a crossed explicitation?
- Can a bibliography widened and co-elaborated with examples of realizations and questionings according to countries be envisaged?
- In the dropbox, few elements in the file "literature" and few contributions of country other than France?

The heterogeneity of control of the collaborative tools

These tools are essential for the partners compared to the geographical and temporal estrangement to bring a dynamics and a continuous follow-up: but be careful not to be confused between finality of tools and their functional uses.

There also, at the meeting of May, a time of information was proposed, by Marie-Laure Girault, Equip Florac-coordination project, to reach and/or improve the control of tools. It has been a little, even not, seized by the participants.

The projects “countries” not enough presented and developed

There seems to be a “pedagogic” gap not to present enough the concrete advances of the projects, and to make the study collectively. The partners were requested, upstream, to prepare a support for the meeting in Marburg, some had made it, other steps, and the animation maybe fished not to boost them on this theme.

What we keep from the fragments of information:

- * Slovenia : 3 farms visited in agro-ecology while they tell not to know that is agro-ecology
- * Belgium : training of councillors
- * Hungary : construction of curricula for student from a survey on what the latter know / ignore about the agro-ecology and about what is taught them
- * Spain: creation of a hop sector which integrate, by the training and the action, the intergenerational and the economy.
- * France : 5 partners

Fumeterre = wants to conceptualize the already implemented tools in their activity of advice-training.

They will have not much contact with local groups.

Geyser = collection of knowledge with local groups: national and regional parks;

The Blackbird =?;

Know how to make and discoveries =?;

SupAgro Florac = training) in and transmission of the SAE.

As it was reminded in May to Marburg, such a panel of projects shows well the necessity, was called back, to always keep the same hard core contribuants in the seminars and in the exchanges not to begin again on every meeting, the upgrades of advances and the information.

6. The achievements/progress, inter-meeting of the working groups and their sharing?

Maybe due to the fact of this diversity of project and approach, working groups had difficulties of being set up between November, 2013 and May, 2014. This deficiency of exchanges is not due to a lack of requests and relaunchings.

With 7 countries and 11 partners it sometimes seems that there is a certain confusion in the spirits. A picture and/or an organization chart which resumes the working groups he could not be realized, and make it in co-writing: followed, educational, investigate, etc.?

The realization of the graphics standards was fast and the participants were reactive in the requests: Maybe because it was a concrete object of exchanges and appropriation?

The reactions were lesser on the working groups: survey example. Although the later, further to the meeting of May finally establishes and meets. Maybe it fishes by a high demand of tools of turnkey survey, without having realized and analyzed pre-inquiries and crusader of the questionings from this first analysis of concrete situations, to build / choose together, but of a way targeted by situation, for the most relevant tools for every project / partner.

During the seminar, the “Hungary group” had realized a tool and proposed it in the critical analysis of the partners. A posteriori, the approach was interesting. All the partners was reluctant not to fall in the “model” to appropriate and knew how to keep its critical faculty by mobilizing its knowledges and its questions, by deciding not to use this questionnaire in a systematic way for their project. Nevertheless a posture more type “interview of explicitation and or double” would have been able to be developed, to show 'in situ' how to make say / analyze by the Hungarian partners their approach, rather than to fetch outside a support of experiment of this tool (from the visit of the AMAP). The partners and the group SAGITER, are already very rich in questions and knowledges themselves.

7. The knowledge/transversal mobilization of the project given by all the partners?

My subject concerns here the global control of the program SAGITER and joins elements of the point 4 (page 5) of this partial evaluation. What is this level of control:

On the contents of the objectives by partner country and/or by partners (I am thinking about France)?
Where are they going together?

On the other hand that also concerns the whole project: the title slid in the course of one year.

The question of a theme presented in the title of the project which was not approached during the seminars: “Ingenuity of countries”, and of which I see navigating the title, according to documents, between countries and territories?

What about its current events: maybe think about it according to the advances of the local groups? Is there not here, a concept, that is a key of seizure and concrete opening of the nuances, the gaps, the marks, that are the knowledges the agro-ecology for the program SAGITER? The generalization and the rise in genericity do not advances the project have to be made from clarified concrete situations?

SAGITER
Un dispositif de formation autour des
Savoirs AGro-écologiques et Ingéniosité des TERroirs
dépôt projet 2013

SAGITER
A device for training regarding
Agro-ecological knowledges and ingenuity of soils
project deposited in 2013

And this sector, without visible explanation, takes place as soils with territories in the reports, without having been approached on the content, the ingenuity, in any case during both seminars which I attended. What means “ingenuity”: creativity? Critical faculty? What is its origin in the project, why to have put as a title? Why not to have treated it until now? Maybe it hid itself in the folds of the various levels of questionings of the partners during meeting?

Sagiter – savoirs agro-écologiques et ingéniosité des territoires
SAGITER - Agro-ecological knowledges and ingenuity of soils
RÉUNION DU COMITÉ DE SUIVI / FOLLOW-UP COMMITTEE MEETING

22 avril 2014 par Hangouts / 22nd of April 2014 by Hangouts
idem pour la réunion comité suivi du 26 février 2014 by Hangouts
Similar at the committee follow-up meeting 26th of February 2014 by Hangouts

8. Strengtehn the co-inter-pluri-activity of the meeting for more inter-culturality of the agro-ecology, the knowledges and the training?

Was expressed during the “on live” evaluation of the meeting in Marburg the feeling of ascendancy of certain organizers. In reality, it is maybe more the language in use that prevailed than the organizers themselves. Upstream, the organization and the distribution of this animation had been organized and distributed.

Others part, during the seminar, each was capable of seizing this animation and was requested to express its opinion. But there, returns the level of complexity of the agro-ecology and its implementation in each of the partner countries