

## Setting-up a Farm Advisory Network in the Agricultural University of Athens: an exploratory analysis

Vasilias Konstantidellis<sup>a</sup>, Alexandros Koutsouris<sup>b</sup>, Pavlos Karanikolas<sup>b</sup>, Konstantinos Tsiboukas<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Agronomist MSc, villyk@yahoo.com

<sup>b</sup> Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Development, Agricultural University of Athens, Athens, Greece, [koutsouris@aua.gr](mailto:koutsouris@aua.gr); [pkaranik@aua.gr](mailto:pkaranik@aua.gr); [tsiboukas@aua.gr](mailto:tsiboukas@aua.gr)

**Abstract:** *The current situation in Greek advisory/extension services is that of a highly fragmented and ineffective system. More specifically, after the transformation of the Greek Extension Service into a bureaucratic organization, especially since the country's accession into the EU, none of the attempts to reorganize the institution of agricultural extension has been successful. The aim of this paper is to investigate the possibilities of creating a Farm Advisory Network (FAN) based in the Agricultural University of Athens (AUA), which will provide high-quality, specialized advisory services, covering the entire spectrum of current farmers' needs. To this end, a SWOT analysis was carried out to analyse the overall position of AUA and its external environment, regarding farm advisory. In addition, a financial analysis for the establishment and pilot operation of the FAN was carried out in four Prefectures to determine the cost for the provision of the advisory services per farmer. Results of SWOT analysis, overall, indicate that AUA is capable of supporting such a project (i.e. the setting-up of a FAN in the university), due to its distinct competitive advantages of subject expertise and the strong, foreseen linkage between extension, agricultural research and education. Results of financial analysis indicate that the cost for the provision of the advisory services per farmer is not high considering the high-quality of the Network's advisory services and the multiple benefits each farmer can derive from them.*

**Keywords:** Farm Advisory Network, university extension, farm advisory, Greece

### Introduction

The first systematic attempt by the Greek State to implement an integrated advisory and training system in agriculture took place in 1951 with the establishment of the Extension Service in the Ministry of Agriculture. Throughout the first 15 years the Service was very effective in achieving its targets; therefore, this period was characterized as the "golden age" of Extension in Greece. There was a massive and well co-ordinated mobilization of the staff (agronomists) on the basis of well-designed and coordinated extension programmes (Koutsouris, 1999; Alexopoulos et al., 2009).

After the mid 60's the gradual downplaying of the Service begun with the continuous limitation of its extension/advisory role. Especially, after the country's accession in the EC (1981), the administrative burden of the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) implementation (including relevant controls) was designated to the Greek Extension Service, gradually entrapping extensionists in a bureaucratic-administrative role. Therefore, extensionists became more than ever severely restricted vis-à-vis the provision of advice to Greek farmers; information was provided to those of the farmers who actively sought for it albeit in a rather fragmented, inadequate and inefficient manner (Koutsouris and Papadopoulos, 1998; Koutsouris, 1999).

Changes, which took place in the mid 90's, such as Ministry's restructuring and decentralization, including the establishment of semi-autonomous organizations for training and research respectively, did not have any substantial positive effects (Alexopoulos et al., 2009; Papaspyrou et al., 2009). More specifically, with the first wave of decentralization (1997), the responsibility for agricultural services was transferred from the Ministry of Agriculture to Prefectures. However, this reform did not make extension services more flexible and relevant to the needs of farmers; on the contrary, it made the Prefectural service vulnerable to local pressures and politics (Koutsouris, 2014) and the cooperation between the Ministry and the Prefectures more difficult (Alexopoulos et al., 2009). Furthermore, with the second wave of decentralization (2010), various Prefectural Directories were amalgamated into a single Dir. of Agricultural Economy & Veterinary which does not include an Extension Section as such (Koutsouris, 2014).

As a result, nowadays, the overall picture of advisory/extension services in Greece is that of a highly fragmented and ineffective system. In general, none of the national level organizations are involved in the provision of advisory services. They are exclusively occupied with administrative-bureaucratic work, while facing serious understaffing and underfunding issues due to the economic crisis, which further alienate them from their advisory role. The vacuum created in the field of agricultural advisory services is partially filled by private agronomists who limit their advisory work to simple technical issues and issues relating to EU programmes (Koutsouris, 2014). As stressed by Papaspyrou et al. (2009), the transformation of the Greek Extension Service into a bureaucratic mechanism, results in the provision of inadequate services to farmers, in a time when agriculture faces serious socioeconomic as well as environmental challenges. As shown by Kaberis and Koutsouris (2012) suspicion towards, on the one hand, the bureaucratic and clientelistic public extension and, on the other hand, the largely profit-oriented private agronomists, along with allegations that agronomists do not care about what is happening in the fields or are inexperienced exacerbate the situation.

The repercussions as well as the needs that have emerged from the lack of extension services in Greece and the serious deficiencies in professional training, have been explored by a number of studies (Alexopoulos et al., 2009; Charatsari et al., 2011; Charatsari et al., 2012; Brinia and Papavasileiou, 2015; Lioutas et al., 2010; Kaberis and Koutsouris, 2012; Pappa and Koutsouris, 2014; Papaspyrou et al., 2009; Michailidis et al., 2010; Marantidou et al., 2011; Dinar et al., 2007). For example, Alexopoulos et al. (2009) and Charatsari et al. (2011) clearly indicate, that there is demand for extension and training, even if this implies fees, given that a number of prerequisites pertaining to the content, format and personnel are fulfilled.

Faced with such challenges the current work intends to explore the possibilities of creating a Farm Advisory Network (FAN) in the Agricultural University of Athens (AUA), which will provide high-quality, specialized advisory services, covering the entire spectrum of modern agricultural needs. The main objective is to estimate the cost for the provision of the advisory services per farmer. Such an estimation is deemed necessary in order to determine the project's viability, by ensuring that the cost for the provision of the advisory services per farmer is low comparing to the multiple benefits of advisory provision. Therefore, a financial analysis for the establishment and pilot operation of the FAN was carried out in four Prefectures.

## **Theoretical background**

Extension and innovation systems, configurations and approaches have been a permanent subject of debate and research for a long period, and various paradigms have been influential in shaping extension development overtime (Cristóvão et. al., 2012). As stressed by Anandajayasekeram et al. (2008), over the years, a number of models have been used to enhance the effectiveness of extension services and service delivery.

Agrarian sciences have until recently been dominated by instrumental rationalist knowledge (Habermas, 1984), or the paradigm of experimental, reductionist science (Packham and Sriskandarajah, 2005). This, in turn, resulted in a 'culture of technical control' (Bawden,

2005) implying reliance upon scientific experimentation to create a 'fix' for agricultural problems (Nerbonne and Lentz, 2003). Along the same lines, the dominant in agricultural development 'diffusion of innovations' model, also known as the transfer of technology or knowledge (TOT/TOK) model, has been based on the understanding that innovations originate from scientists, are transferred by extension agents and are adopted by farmers (Rogers, 2004).

However, as stressed by Hubert et al. (2000), "The dominant linear paradigm of agricultural innovation based on delivery to, and diffusion among, farmers of technologies developed by science, has lost utility as an explanation of what happens". According to Anandajayasekaram et al. (2008), this top-down model creates a rigid hierarchy which discourages the feedback of information. Researchers work independently of farmers and extension workers, resulting in a poor understanding of farmers and the opportunities and constraints they face. Therefore, despite reductionism's dazzling achievements, alternative proposals have, since the 1970s, flourished, based on the realization of the inadequacy of linear and mechanistic thinking in understanding the source and thus the solutions of problems (Hjorth and Bagheri, 2006). Prominent among these alternatives have been systemic approaches (see Ison, 2010). Such approaches look at a potential system as a whole (holistically) and focus on the relationships (important causal inter-linkages or couplings) among a system's parts and on system dynamics, rather than the parts themselves (Koutsouris, 2012).

A leap in this respect has been, in both theoretical and practical terms (Byerlee et al., 1982; Simmonds, 1986), the emergence of farming systems research/extension (FSR/E) approaches, especially the turn from Rapid Rural Appraisal (RRA) to Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) (Chambers, 1992, 1994; Pretty, 1995; Webber, 1995). FSR/E contributed substantially to the recognition of different actors in development and helped to create awareness about the need for new ways to conduct research and extension, taking into account context and relations (see Collinson, 2000; Darnhofer et al., 2012). A suite of participatory approaches and methods relating to agricultural and rural development has thus been developed, underlining the need for interaction and dialogue between different actors and networks (Chambers, 1993; Scoones and Thompson, 1994). As pointed out by Packham et al. (2007), the acceptance of the necessity for 'co-learning' between scientists and farmers has been a major benefit arising from FSR that has penetrated most research and extension models, and efforts towards sustainable land use and rural development.

Subsequently, the development of Agricultural Knowledge and Information Systems (AKIS) and Agricultural Innovation Systems (AIS), further broadened the scope of the participatory approach, recognizing the role of other actors in knowledge and innovation. More specifically, the AKIS concept has been developed out of the old Agricultural Knowledge Systems (AKS) concept that originated in 1960s (EU SCAR, 2012). The AKS concept aimed at integrating farmers, education, research, and extension and has been depicted as a knowledge triangle, with the farmer being placed at the center of this arrangement. The AKIS concept develops the notion of AKS, emphasizing the process of knowledge generation and includes actors outside the research, education and advice fields (Dockès et al., 2011). More recently the AKIS concept has evolved as it has acquired a second meaning (innovation instead of information) thus opening up AKIS to more public tasks and to the support of innovation (Klerkx and Leeuwis, 2009).

AIS thinking emerged in parallel of AKIS (Assefa et al., 2009; Pant and Hambly-Odame, 2009). According to Hall et al. (2006), despite structural similarities, the main difference between AIS and AKIS lies in the greater and more explicit focus of AIS on the influence of institutions (seen as organisations like companies, public research institutes and governmental entities) and infrastructures on learning and innovation, and its explicit focus to include all relevant organizations beyond agricultural research and extension systems.

On parallel, public sector weaknesses regarding the provision of extension services (see Alexopoulos et al., 2009) have resulted in a variety of institutional reforms (see Rivera and Alex, 2005), such as decentralization, contracting/outsourcing, public-private partnerships and privatization. As stressed by Cristóvão et al. (2012), what we observe today in Europe,

as well as in many other parts of the world, is not a unified extension system, but, on the contrary, a plurality of configurations, involving a multiplicity of actors (Ministry services, universities, education and training institutions, farmers' organizations, private firms, etc.) which are part of the AKIS (Röling, 2007; Klerkx, 2008; Dokès, 2010) or the AIS (Klerkx, 2008). In other words, nowadays, there is a strong tendency towards pluralistic advisory services rather than pure public sector models, which clearly indicates that the concept of participation has infiltrated every aspect of agricultural extension.

On the other hand, the provision of extension services in Greece is still dominated by the transfer of technology model. As stressed by Kaberis and Koutsouris (2012), the Greek situation clearly identifies with extension systems in which agronomists have the role of experts who disseminate technical information to highly dependent upon them farmers (see Ingram, 2008). Moreover, there is neither a national policy framework nor a coordination mechanism or agreements between the AKIS actors. As a result, nowadays, the overall picture is that of a highly fragmented, uncoordinated and dysfunctional AKIS (Koutsouris, 2014).

Taking into account all the abovementioned challenges agricultural extension services are facing on both national and international levels, it is clear that there is an urgent need for the reorganisation and reorientation of extension services in Greece, following a systemic approach.

The current study concerns the establishment of a FAN in AUA which will provide high-quality, specialized advisory services, covering the entire spectrum of modern agricultural needs. According to the international experience, the provision of advice to farmers through Services operating under the umbrella of academic institutions, is widespread in the United States (U.S.) for more than a century. More specifically, in 1914, the Cooperative Extension Service (CES) was established to disseminate information about agriculture and home economics from land-grant universities to the U.S. public (Ahearn et al., 2003). Peters (2014) clarifies that the word “cooperative” signals extension's organizational structure as a formal partnership between the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), land-grant colleges and universities, and state and county governments. As pointed out by Ahearn et al. (2003), the “cooperative” in the service's title is a reference to its funding, which was and is provided by local, State, and Federal sources. CES is administered separately in each state by land-grant institutions, usually by a faculty member who is appointed as director (Peters, 2014). Moreover, this decentralized extension system has an extension office in nearly every county within each state (Swanson and Rajalahti, 2010). Papadopoulos (1996), points out three distinctive features of the American extension model: the institutional linkage between extension, agricultural research and educational institutions; the intense educational dimension of agricultural extension function due to the close connection with educational institutions, such as universities and colleges; the local dimension of the agricultural extension programmes.

The early focus of CES was on farming but over the years its mission has broadened considerably to meet the shifting needs and priorities of American people. Today, most Extension organizations across the county categorize their programming outreach in the four traditional areas of Agriculture, 4-H Youth Development, Family & Consumer Science (FCS), and Community Development. These categories offer great breadth, depth, and diversity of programming outreach (Raison, 2014). Nonetheless, each state has its own goals and extension priorities (Wang, 2014). As Rasmussen (1989) stated, “The mission of the Cooperative Extension Service is to help people improve their lives through an educational process which uses scientific knowledge focused on issues and needs”. CES has helped to improve agricultural productivity growth, strengthen the rural economy, educate youth, promote better human health, sustain the environment, and much more, since 1914 (Wang, 2014). Despite the fact that private firms have played an increasing role in providing production-related information to farmers (Padgitt et al., 2000), the public extension system is unique in providing a multi-functional portfolio of programs as a public good (Wang, 2014). Kistler and Briers (2003) concluded that “since its establishment in 1914 through the Smith-

Lever Act, the Cooperative Extension System (CES) has grown to become the largest youth and adult education organization in the United States, if not the world”.

## Study Design

### Basic structure of the Farm Advisory Network

As aforementioned this study seeks to explore the possibilities of creating a Farm Advisory Network in the Agricultural University of Athens. The provision of advisory services under the umbrella of a university was chosen due to the failure of all the previous attempts to reorganize the institution of agricultural extension (see Koutsouris, 2014). The FAN's headquarters will be located at the AUA. Initially, a pilot Network of advisors will be set up and operate exclusively in four Prefectures. The selection criteria for these four Prefectures were their relatively small distance from Attica Prefecture where the AUA is based and their strong agricultural activity. Finally, the Prefectures selected were: Viotia Prefecture, Phthiotis Prefecture, Achaia Prefecture and Laconia Prefecture.

In each Prefecture there will be a specified number of advisors – based on the target population of the farmers who are expected to collaborate with the FAN. Their advisory work will be coordinated by the Network's secretariat located in the AUA. The Network shall be placed under the general supervision of a faculty member who will be appointed as scientific manager of the Network. In addition, the FAN will build a website where useful information, educational material as well as web tools for farmers will be posted; access to the website will be open. Furthermore, the advisors may play a broader role in the Prefectures through the provision of general information to all interested farmers (not only clients) for free (e.g. group and mass methods).

### Competitive Advantage of the AUA FAN

The competitive advantage of the Network lies in the fact that operating under the umbrella of the AUA it is able to link agricultural research, extension and education. As a result, the knowledge gap between farmers, researchers and advisors which leads to advice that does not respond to farmers' needs is largely reduced. Through the Network, a two-way information flow system is created from farmers to researchers and vice versa. More specifically, the Network's advisors along with the farmers will identify the problems of the latter and then transfer the information to the university's researchers, who will contribute their knowledge to find the most appropriate solutions that respond to the farmers' needs. On the other hand, the transfer of knowledge and innovation generated by academic research to the farmers is facilitated through the Network's advisors.

One of the major roles of the Network's advisors, is that of the facilitator who, according to Ingram (2008), helps “farmers to understand the problems and opportunities within their own farming systems” through farmers' empowerment “in terms of raising general awareness about problems as well as teaching [explaining] certain principles and practices”. Therefore, facilitative encounters “are built on dialogue, mutual respect and shared expectations and this provides the right context for joint learning”.

Moreover, the AUA FAN has, due to the university's wide relationships with various public and private actors involved in the agri-food sector and, in general, rural development (Ministry, Rural Development Programme (RDP) Managing Authorities, research institutes, farmers' organizations, food industries, retail chains, etc.), the ability to develop synergies and partnerships, especially as far as the co-creation of innovations and the provision of pluralistic advisory services are concerned.

### Methodology and Data

In order to explore the possibilities of creating a FAN in the Agricultural University of Athens, a SWOT analysis was carried out to help identify the strengths and the weaknesses of the university in relation to the opportunities and the threats of the external environment, regarding farm advisory. It should be noted that agriculture and related fields are the fields in

which SWOT is used the most (Ghazinoory et al., 2011). The SWOT framework does not have a strictly defined structure. However, in recent years, several methodological advances on SWOT appeared and many researchers, in an attempt to improve its effectiveness, have integrated it with other methods (see Ghazinoory et al., op. cit.).

In this study, SWOT analysis is carried out, based on the integrated SWOT framework proposed by Bell and Rochford (2016). This framework uses the resource-based view (RBV) to identify strengths and weaknesses (internal analysis) and PESTEL analysis as well as Porter's five forces model to identify opportunities and threats (external analysis).

The data used in the internal analysis (RBV) are either documented by the content of this study or were obtained through personal communication with faculty members of the AUA (February 2017). The data used in the external analysis (PESTEL analysis and Porter's five forces model) are either documented in the Greek literature cited in this study or were obtained from other secondary sources (Hellenic Statistical Authority, National Rural Development Programme, legislation, etc.)

Furthermore, a financial analysis for the establishment and pilot operation of the FAN was carried out in four Prefectures to determine the cost for the provision of the advisory services per farmer. The financial analysis includes the determination of the start-up budget for the investment and the estimation of the annual costs for the first year of the pilot operation of the Network in the four Prefectures.

#### *Determining the mode of action and the capacity of farm advisors*

The Network's advisory activity in each Prefecture will be carried out by groups of advisors. Each group will consist of two agronomists, one holding a degree in agricultural economics and the other, depending on the scientific field covered by the group, in crop or animal science. This scheme has been selected to ensure that the provision of advisory services will cover the entire spectrum of farmers' needs, from simple technical or economic matters to complex matters that require both technical and economic knowledge.

The main advisory method that the advisory groups will employ is individual contacts (farm visits, one-to-one advice), since Greek farmers seem reluctant to take part in collective actions (see Koutsou and Vounouki, 2012; Österle et al., 2016). Nevertheless, in the future, and as far as the pilot program is well established, the provision of advice and facilitation in groups of farmers and at farming systems level will be pursued.

Regarding the capacity of each advisory group (i.e. the maximum number of farmers each advisory group can serve per year), it is calculated by empirical evidence as follows. By setting as a basis for calculation that full-time employment is eight hours per day for five days a week, the annual working days for each advisory group are estimated at 234 days per year, net of weekends, annual leave and public holidays. From these, around 60%, that is 140 days, will be devoted to farm visits and the rest 94 days to design advice corresponding to each farmer's needs.

Given that each advisory group can visit, on the one hand, up to three farms a day and, on the other hand, each farm approximately three times a year, the maximum number of farmers each advisory group can serve per year is estimated at 140 as follows:

$$(140 \text{ days} \times 3 \text{ farms a day}) \div 3 \text{ visits per farm} = 140 \text{ farms/year}$$

#### *Determining the target population of each Prefecture*

In order to specify the target population, i.e. the number of farmers expected to collaborate with the FAN in each Prefecture, data from the Integrated Administration and Control System (IACS) for 2011 were utilized. It should be clarified, that the data used concern the farmers within the age group of 20-50 years, considering that older farmers will hardly invest in advisory services. The determination of the target population has been based on the following assumptions:

First, in each Prefecture, the three dominant types of farming have been taken into account with the exception of Achaia Prefecture where the fourth dominant type of farming has been also taken into account as an attempt to cover as far as possible the advisory group's capacity as determined above. The dominant types of farming in Achaia Prefecture concern livestock production and in the other three Prefectures crop production. Secondly, regarding the economic size, holdings of more than 8,000 € have been taken into account, considering that owners of smaller economic size holdings may be unable to meet the cost of advisory services. Finally, in each Prefecture, it is estimated that the percentage of farmers who will cooperate with the FAN will approach 10% of the total number of farmers classified in the selected types of farming.

As a result, the estimated number of farmers who are expected to collaborate with the FAN is 128 farmers in Viotia Prefecture, 142 farmers in Phthiotis Prefecture, 125 farmers in Achaia Prefecture and 234 farmers in Laconia Prefecture (total: 629 farmers).

#### *Data regarding the start-up budget*

Start-up budget regards all the expenditure required to start the operation of the FAN.

#### Facilities and Equipment

As mentioned above, the FAN will be based in AUA. More specifically, the Network's Secretariat will be housed on campus in an office provided free of charge by the university.

Before establishing the Network's Secretariat at the office, some maintenance work (interior painting, maintenance of electrical installations and air conditioner) will be carried out. Maintenance cost is estimated at 300 €. Moreover, the office will be equipped with furniture, as well as electrical and electronic equipment. According to the current market prices of such equipment, the total cost of the office equipment is estimated at 2,000 € (700 € for furniture and 1,300 € for electronic and electrical devices).

#### Marketing Communications and Promotion Strategy

The marketing communications and promotion strategy aims at creating awareness of the FAN and its services within its target market (i.e. farmers and other stakeholders involved in rural development). The strategy includes: organization of four information days - one in each Prefecture, radio advertising of the information days, creation of printed information material, corporate identity creation, website construction and social media advertising campaign. Moreover, an information day to present the results and the progress of the Network's advisory action, will take place in the AUA towards the end of the first year of the Network's operation. This activity will be included in the start-up budget for the investment since it will take place only once. The cost for all the above activities is estimated at 9,723 €.

#### *Data regarding annual costs*

##### Fixed costs

Annual fixed costs arise from the start-up budget for the investment and include depreciation, fixed capital interest, maintenance and maintenance interest. Depreciation has been calculated using the straight-line depreciation method and the higher depreciation rate of 20% for such depreciable assets (tangible and intangible). Fixed capital interest has been calculated using a 7.5% medium to long-term loan rate for one year and maintenance interest has been estimated using a short-term loan rate of 7.5% for six months. Regarding maintenance costs, an amount corresponding to 10% of the start-up costs concerning facilities and equipment, has been calculated.

##### Variable costs

In the case of the FAN, variable costs are as follows:

- a) Personnel cost
- b) Electricity and water supply costs

- c) Telecommunication costs (telephone / internet)
- d) Stationery costs
- e) Travel expenses of the advisory groups
- f) Travel and accommodation expenses of the faculty members
- g) Other costs that may arise during the operation of the FAN
- h) Interest on personnel cost
- i) Interest on all the above variable costs excluding personnel cost

Travel expenses of the advisory groups relate to the fuel costs for the farm visits and have been calculated according to the following data: The number of working days devoted to farm visits is set annually at 140 for each advisory group. According to empirical evidence, the maximum mileage that each advisory group can cover on a daily basis is 70 km. The mileage allowance paid by the Research Committee AUA amounts to 0.40 €/km. Travel and accommodation expenses of the faculty members refer to the visits that faculty members of the university can make in the four Prefectures to investigate and resolve any complex cases that groups may encounter in their advisory work. The calculation of these costs is based on the maximum compensation for travelling and accommodation expenses provided by the Research Committee AUA and the following assumptions: During the first year of the Network's pilot operation, three visits of faculty members will take place in each Prefecture, except for Laconia Prefecture, where due to a larger number of farmers, four visits will take place. Each visit will be carried out by one faculty member and will last two days (one overnight stay). The kilometric allowances have been calculated using the distances, in kilometers, between Athens and the capitals of the Prefectures. Moreover, travel expenses include the toll costs. The interest on personnel cost, as well as the interest on variable costs (excluding personnel cost), have been calculated using a short-term loan rate of 7.5% for six months. The common practice in financial analysis is not to calculate the interest on personnel cost. However, in this study, the interest on personnel cost is calculated following the principles of agricultural economics (see Tsiboukas, 2009).

#### Personnel cost

Based on the capacity of each advisory group, the estimated number of farmers who are expected to collaborate with the FAN in each Prefecture and the orientation of the dominant types of farming in each Prefecture towards crop or livestock production, the number and composition of the advisory groups in each Prefecture is shown in Table 1.

**Table 1.** Number and composition of advisory groups in each Prefecture.

Prefecture	Estimated number of co-operating farmers	Dominant production sector (crop or livestock production)	Number of advisory groups	Composition of advisory groups
Viotia	128	C.P.	1	1 agronomist (agricultural economics) 1 agronomist (crop science)
Phthiotis	142	C.P.	1	1 agronomist (agricultural economics) 1 agronomist (crop science)
Achaia	125	L.P.	1	1 agronomist (agricultural economics) 1 agronomist (animal science)
Laconia	234	C.P.	2	1 agronomist (agricultural economics) 1 agronomist (crop science)

Consequently, the FAN will offer full time employment in ten agronomists-farm advisors, of whom five holding a degree in agricultural economics, four in crop science and one in animal science. All agronomists should hold a postgraduate degree in farm advisory. Additionally, the FAN will offer full time employment in one agronomist holding a degree in agricultural economics who will staff the Network's secretariat. Finally, as mentioned above, a faculty member will be employed in the Network as scientific manager. The faculty member will not



receive additional salary from the Network. The cost of providing services will be covered by its normal annual remuneration. Table 2 below shows the number of personnel, their monthly salary and the annual personnel cost of the FAN.

**Table 2.** Analysis of the annual personnel cost of the FAN.

Position	Number of personnel	Salary (€/month)	Annual personnel cost (€)
Secretary	1	1,500	18,000
Farm advisor	10	2,000	240,000
Scientific manager	1	0	0
Total			258,000

## Results

### SWOT analysis

Table 3 below summarizes the findings of the SWOT analysis. The key strengths of the university are the linkage between extension, agricultural research and education, as well as subject knowledge and experience. In general, all the strengths listed below, enable AUA to take advantage of the opportunities appearing in the external environment regarding farm advisory. Finally, it should be noted that the main weaknesses of the university, as well as the threats from the external environment, derive from the economic crisis.

**Table 3.** SWOT analysis.

Strengths	Weaknesses
Provision of high-quality, specialized advisory services that cover the entire spectrum of current agricultural needs. Linkage between extension, agricultural research and education. Website with useful information, educational material and web tools, tailored to farmers' needs. Subject knowledge and experience. Validity of university.	Insufficient working capital. Limited resources of the university due to budget cuts imposed by the financial crisis. Severe shortages in teaching and research staff due to the ban of hiring new staff as a result of the financial crisis.
Opportunities	Threats
Lack of integrated farm advisory services. Demand for extension and training, even if this implies fees. Return of young people in rural areas due to the economic crisis. Support for advisory services through Measure 2 of the RDP 2014-2020. RDP 2014-2020 encourages entry of young farmers into the agricultural sector. There are only a few Greek blogs supported by agricultural organizations or experts in order to provide certified and validated knowledge (Ferentinos et al., 2013).	Unstable economic environment due to the financial crisis. Lack of liquidity and credit especially after the recession. Increase in production costs in agriculture due to the rise of input prices. Lack of agricultural advisory services creates a breeding ground for new entrants, also favoured by the new RDP 2014-2020 through Measure 2. New burdens on farmers' insurance and taxation (Law 4387/2016), resulting in a reduction in their income.

## Start-up budget

Table 4 presents the start-up budget for the investment, which is about 12,624 €. The main part of the budget regards the marketing communications and promotion strategy (77%). An amount of around 5% of the total initial investment cost is foreseen for unforeseen expenses that may arise during the establishment of the FAN.

**Table 4.** Start-up budget.

Investments	Cost (€)
Maintenance works	300
Furniture	700
Electrical and electronic equipment	1,300
Marketing communications and promotion strategy	9,723
Unforeseen expenses	601
<b>Total</b>	<b>12,624</b>

## Annual costs

Table 5 presents the annual costs for the first year of Network's pilot operation. The main part of the annual costs regards the personnel cost (86%). The smallest percentage of annual costs regards fixed costs (1%), while variable costs - excluding personnel cost and interests - regard 9% of the annual costs.

**Table 5.** Annual costs.

Description	Cost (€)
<b>Personnel cost</b>	<b>258,000</b>
<b>Fixed costs</b>	<b><u>3,710.2</u></b>
Depreciation	2,524.8
Fixed capital interest	946.8
Maintenance	230.0
Maintenance interest	8.6
<b>Variable costs (excluding personnel cost and interests)</b>	<b><u>27,919</u></b>
Electricity and water supply costs	600
Telecommunication costs	300
Stationery costs	600
Travel expenses of the advisory groups	19,600
Travel and accommodation expenses of the faculty members	5,819
Other expenses	1,000
<b>Interest on personnel cost</b>	<b>9,675</b>
<b>Interest on the variable costs (excluding personnel cost)</b>	<b>1,047</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>300,351</b>

## Estimating the cost for the provision of the advisory services per farmer

The cost for the provision of the advisory services per farmer results from the division of total annual costs (300,351 €) with the total number of farmers estimated to collaborate with the FAN during the first year of its operation (629 farmers) and is 477.50 €. This cost is the minimum required for covering all annual costs without the Network showing profit or loss.

Finally, it should be clarified that this cost concerns all the consulting services provided annually to each farmer by the farm advisory groups.

## Conclusions

This study aimed to explore the possibilities of creating a FAN in the AUA. First a SWOT analysis was carried out to analyse the overall position of AUA and its external environment, regarding farm advisory. Then a financial analysis for the establishment and pilot operation of the FAN was carried out in four Prefectures to determine the cost for the provision of the advisory services per farmer.

Results of SWOT analysis indicate that AUA is capable of supporting such a project (i.e. the setting-up of a FAN in the university), with its distinct competitive advantages of subject expertise and the strong linkage between extension, agricultural research and education. On the other hand, AUA is facing serious constraints due to limited resources and understaffing. Nevertheless, the Network will not be financially dependent on the university but on the farmers through their payment for the advisory services. As far as external threats are concerned, the impacts of the financial crisis such as unstable economic environment, lack of liquidity and credit and taxation increase may discourage some farmers from investing in advisory services.

However, the estimated cost for the provision of the advisory services per farmer, as indicated by the results of the financial analysis, is not high (477.50 €) considering the high-quality of the Network's advisory services and the multiple benefits each farmer can derive from them. For example, according to a study carried out on sheep farms in Continental Greece, their gross profit may increase from 6% to 35%, depending on the farm type, if the sheep farmer follows the optimum production schedule of the farm proposed by using linear programming method (see Sintori, 2012). More specifically, in five of the six farm types examined in this study, the increase in gross profit was estimated from 3,157 € to 6,289 €. It should be noted that linear programming is one of the most important operations research tools, widely used in the provision of advisory services.

Alternatively, the FAN could apply for funding under the Measure 2 of the RDP 2014-2020 regarding the providers of advisory services (Farm Advisory System-FAS) and if selected to provide free of charge any of the advisory services included in the six advisory packages adopted by the Measure. Of course, this requires further investigation in order to re-estimate - if deemed necessary for the viability of the Network - the cost of the provided advisory services which are not part of the advisory packages provided through Measure 2.

In parallel, the FAN may participate in cooperation activities under the Measure 16 of the RDP 2014-2020, as a broker and facilitator in European Innovation Partnership's (EIP) Operational Groups, contributing to the promotion of innovative initiatives and knowledge transfer through shared experiences and cooperation. Furthermore, the FAN can play a crucial role in facilitating the dissemination of project results to targeted stakeholders (farmers) through its advisory network. On the other hand, regardless its participation or not to that Measure, the FAN can promote, through its advisory activities, the idea of cooperation by informing the farmers on the Measure's key opportunities and encouraging their participation. However, it should be mentioned that the situation in Greece does not allow for much optimism vis-à-vis the successful implementation of such Measures (see Österle et al., 2016; Koutsouris, 2014). At this stage, it is still unknown when and how these Measures will be implemented.

In addition, the FAN may have a positive impact on the level of socio-economic development of the target-areas. Through the provision of free information to all interested farmers by the advisors and the website, it can contribute to improving the welfare of farmers and other people living in rural areas.

On the other hand, the establishment of the FAN under the umbrella of the AUA, can be the springboard for the staffing of the Network with appropriately trained advisors, capable of meeting the new roles of "facilitator" and "innovation broker" that have emerged in parallel with the shift towards participatory approaches (see Cristovão et al., 2012). However, this implies reforms in the university's academic curricula in order to equip young advisors with the appropriate skills required by the contemporary roles.

Finally, it should be noted that if the pilot operation of the FAN proves successful, it will provide the opportunity for AUA to broaden the scope of advisory activity and for the other universities to take corresponding actions in order to cover, at least partly, the lack of extension in Greece.

## References

- Ahearn, M., Yee, J. and J. Bottom (2003) *Regional trends in extension system resources*. Agricultural Information Bulletin No. 781. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service.
- Alexopoulos, G., Koutsouris, A. and I. Tzouramani (2009) The Financing of extension services: A survey among rural youth in Greece. *The Journal of Agricultural Education & Extension* 15(2): 177-190.
- Anandajayasekeram, P., Puskur, R., Sindu, W. and D. Hoekstra (2008) *Concepts and practices in agricultural extension in developing countries: A source book*. IFPRI (International Food Policy Research Institute), Washington, DC, USA, and ILRI (International Livestock Research Institute), Nairobi, Kenya.
- Assefa, A., Waters-Bayer, A., Fincham, R. and M. Mudahara (2009) Comparison of frameworks for studying grassroots innovation: Agricultural Innovation Systems (AIS) and Agricultural Knowledge and Information Systems (AKIS). In: P. Sanginga, A. Waters - Bayer, S. Kaaria, J. Njuki and C. Wettasinha (eds.) *Innovation Africa: enriching farmers' livelihoods*. London: Earthscan, pp. 35–56.
- Bawden, R. (2005) Systemic development at Hawkesbury: Some personal lessons from experience. *Systems Research and Behavioral Science* 22(2): 151-164.
- Bell, G.G. and L. Rochford (2016) Rediscovering SWOT's integrative nature: A new understanding of an old framework. *The International Journal of Management Education* 14: 310-326.
- Brinia, V. and P. Papavasileiou (2015) Training of Farmers in Island Agricultural Areas: The Case of Cyclades Prefecture. *The Journal of Agricultural Education and Extension* 21(3): 235-247.
- Byerlee, D., Harrington, L. and D.L. Winkelmann (1982) Farming systems research: issues in research strategy and technology design. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* 64: 897-904.
- Chambers, R. (1992) *Rural Appraisal: Rapid, Relaxed and Participatory*. IDS Discussion Paper 311. Brighton: University of Sussex.
- Chambers, R. (1993) *Challenging the Professions: Frontiers for Rural Development*. London: Intermediate Technology Publications.
- Chambers, R. (1994) The origins and practice of participatory rural appraisal. *World Development* 22: 953-969.
- Charatsari, C., Papadaki-Klavdianou, A. and A. Michailidis (2011) Farmers as Consumers of Agricultural Education Services: Willingness to Pay and Spend Time. *The Journal of Agricultural Education & Extension* 17(3): 253-266.
- Charatsari, C., Papadaki-Klavdianou, A. and A. Koutsouris (2012) *Conventional services for organic farmers? Attitudes of organic and conventional producers towards extension education*. Proceedings of 10th European IFSA Symposium, Aarhus-Denmark, 1-4 July 2012.
- Collinson, M. (ed.) (2000) *A History of Farming Systems Research*. Wallingford: CABI and FAO.
- Cristóvão, A., Koutsouris, A. and M. Kügler (2012) Extension systems and change facilitation for agricultural and rural development. In: I. Darnhofer, D. Gibbon and B. Dedieu (eds.) *Farming Systems Research into the 21st Century: The New Dynamic*. Dordrecht: Springer, pp. 201-227.
- Darnhofer, I., Gibbon, D. and B. Dedieu (eds.) (2012) *Farming systems research into the 21st century: The new dynamic*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Dinar, A., Karagiannis, G. and V. Tzouvelekas (2007) Evaluating the impact of agricultural extension on farms' performance in Crete: a nonneutral stochastic frontier approach. *Agricultural Economics* 36: 135–146.

- Dockès, A.-C., Tisenkopfs, T. and B. Bock (2010) *Reflection paper on AKIS* (draft version 17th September). Subdeliverable of the AKIS CWG-WP1. Frankfurt/Main: Institute for Rural Development Research at Johann Wolfgang Goethe University.
- Dockès, A.-C., Tisenkopfs, T. and B. Bock (2011) *Collaborative Working Group Agricultural Knowledge and Innovation Systems*. WP1: Reflection paper on AKIS. Brussels: European Commission.
- EU SCAR (2012) *Agricultural knowledge and innovation systems in transition – a reflection paper*. Brussels: European Commission.
- Ferentinos, J., Koutsouris, A., Costopoulou, C. and M. Ntaliani (2013) *Enhancing agricultural training using blogs: the Greek case*. Proc. of the 1st International Conference on Computer Supported Education: Recent Techniques in Educational Science. Athens, WSEAS International Conferences, pp. 115-119.
- Ghazinoory, S., Abdi, M. and M. Azadegan-Mehr (2011) Swot Methodology: A State-of-the-Art Review for the Past, A Framework for the Future. *Journal of Business Economics and Management*. 12(1): 24-48.
- Habermas, J. (1984) *The Theory of Communicative Action: Reason and the Rationalization of Society*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hall, A., Janssen, W., Pehu, E., and R. Rajalahti (2006) *Enhancing Agricultural Innovation: How to Go Beyond the Strengthening of Research Systems*. Washington: World Bank.
- Hjorth, P. and A. Bagheri (2006) Navigating towards sustainable development: A system dynamics approach. *Futures* 38: 74-92.
- Hubert, B., Ison, R. and N. Röling (2000) The 'problematique' with respect to industrialised country agricultures. In: LEARN Group (eds.) *Cow up a Tree: Knowing and Learning for Change in Agriculture. Case Studies from Industrialised Countries*. Paris: INRA, pp. 13–30.
- Ingram, J. (2008) Agronomist–farmer knowledge encounters: an analysis of knowledge exchange in the context of best management practices in England. *Agriculture & Human Values* 25: 405–418.
- Ison, R. (2010) *Systems Practice: How to Act in a Climate-Change World*. London: Springer and the Open University.
- Kaberis, N. and A. Koutsouris (2012) Reflections on the 'expert syndrome': a Greek case study on extension education. In: *Producing and reproducing farming systems: New modes of organisation for sustainable food systems of tomorrow* (10th European IFSA Symposium), Aarhus-Denmark, 1-4 July 2012.
- Kistler, M.J. and G.E. Briers (2003) Change in the knowledge and practices as a result of adults' participation in the Texas A&M Ranch to Rail Program. *Journal of Southern Agricultural Education Research* 53(1): 164 - 176.
- Klerkx, L. (2008) *Matching demand and supply in the Dutch agricultural knowledge infrastructure. The emergence and embedding of new intermediaries in an agricultural innovation system in transition*. PhD Thesis. Wageningen: Wageningen University, pp. 239.
- Klerkx, L. and C. Leeuwis (2009) Shaping Collective Functions in Privatized Agricultural Knowledge and Information Systems: The Positioning and Embedding of a Network Broker in the Dutch Dairy Sector. *The Journal of Agricultural Education and Extension* 15: 81-105.
- Koutsou S. and E. Vounouki (2012) Collective action and innovation in rural areas: an efficient dialogue. A case of Greece. *Journal of Depopulation and Rural Development Studies* 12: 83-104.
- Koutsouris, A. (1999) Organisation of Extension Services in Greece. *Options Méditerranéennes, Série A: Séminaires Méditerranéens* 38: 47-50.
- Koutsouris, A. (2012) Facilitating AIS: A Critical Realist Approach. *Studies in Agricultural Economics* 114(2): 64-70.
- Koutsouris, A. (2014) *AKIS and advisory services in Greece*. Report for the AKIS inventory (WP3) of the PRO AKIS project. Available at: <http://www.proakis.eu/sites/www.proakis.eu/files/Country%20Report%20Greece%2003%2006%2014.pdf>

- Koutsouris, A. and D. Papadopoulos (1998) Extension functions and farmers' attitudes in Greece: A case study towards a sustainable future. In: N. Roling and A. Wagemakers (eds.) *Facilitating Sustainable Agriculture: Participatory Learning and Adaptive Management in Times of Environmental Uncertainty*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 88-101.
- Lioutas, E.D., Tzimitra-Kalogianni, I. and C. Charatsari (2010) Small ruminant producers' training needs and factors discouraging participation in agricultural education/training programs. *Livestock Research for Rural Development* 22(7). Available at: <http://www.lrrd.org/lrrd22/7/liou22126.htm>
- Marantidou, A., Michailidis, A. and A. Papadaki-Klavdianou (2011) Information and Communication Technologies as agricultural extension tools. *Scientific Bulletin-Economic Sciences* 10(1): 114-125.
- Michailidis, A., Koutsouris, A. and K. Mattas (2010) Information and Communication Technologies as agricultural extension tools: A survey among farmers in West Macedonia, Greece. *Journal of Agricultural Education and Extension* 16(3): 249-263.
- Nerbonne, J.F. and R. Lentz (2003) Rooted in grass: Challenging patterns of knowledge exchange as a means of fostering social change in a southeast Minnesota farm community. *Agriculture and Human Values* 20: 65-78.
- Österle, N., Koutsouris, A., Livieratos, Y. and E. Kabourakis (2016) Extension for organic agriculture: A comparative study between Baden-Württemberg, Germany and Crete, Greece. *Journal of Agricultural Education & Extension* 22(4): 345-362.
- Packham, R. and N. Sriskandarajah (2005) Systemic Action Research for Postgraduate Education in Agriculture and Rural Development. *Systems Research and Behavioral Science* 22(2): 119-130.
- Packham, R.R., Petheram J. and R. Murray Prior (2007) *A Farming Systems Research (FSR) as a platform for RD&E in agriculture and NRM*. Proceedings of the Conference of APEN Forum '07: Capture, Consolidate and Communicate. The Changing Nature of Extension, Canberra, 13-14 November. Canberra: Australasia-Pacific Extension Network.
- Padgitt, M., Newton, D., Penn, R. and C. Sandretto (2000) *Production practices for major crops in U.S. agriculture, 1990-97*. Statistical Bulletin. No. 969. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Agriculture-Economic Research Service.
- Pant, L.P. and H. Hambly-Odame (2009) Innovation Systems in Renewable Natural Resource Management and Sustainable Agriculture: a literature review. *African Journal of Science, Technology, Innovation and Development* 1(1): 103-135.
- Papadopoulos, D. (1996) *Evaluation of the Agricultural Extension System in Greece*. PhD thesis. Athens: Agricultural University of Athens, pp. 256 (in Greek).
- Papasryrou, S., Koutsouris, A. and T. Karalis (2009) Changing agronomists' perceptions and practices vis-à-vis extension education in Greece. In: C. Paffarini and F. Santucci (eds.) *Theory and practice of advisory work in a time of turbulence*. Proceedings 19<sup>th</sup> ESEE Seminar. Perugia: DSEEA/University of Perugia, pp. 190-194.
- Pappa, H. and A. Koutsouris (2014) *Social representations for the agronomist-extensionist: The case of Anthili community*. Proceedings of the 13<sup>th</sup> Panhellenic Conference of Rural Economy, Athens, 21-22 Nov. 2014 (in Greek).
- Peters, S.J. (2014) Extension Reconsidered. *Choices* 29(1). Available at: [http://www.choicesmagazine.org/UserFiles/file/cmsarticle\\_359.pdf](http://www.choicesmagazine.org/UserFiles/file/cmsarticle_359.pdf)
- Pretty, J. (1995) *Regenerating Agriculture: Policies and practice for sustainability and self-reliance*. London: Earthscan Publications Ltd.
- Raison, B. (2014) Doing the work of Extension: Three Approaches to Identify, Amplify, and Implement Outreach. *Journal of Extension* 52(2). Available at: <http://www.joe.org/joe/2014april/a1.php>
- Rasmussen, W.D. (1989) *Taking the university to the people: Seventy-five years of cooperative extension*. Ames: Iowa State University Press.
- Rivera, W.M. and G. Alex (2005) *Extension Reform for Rural Development*. Vol. 1-5: Case Studies of International Initiatives. Washington, DC: World Bank and USAID.
- Rogers, E.M. (2004) *Diffusion of Innovations*. N.Y.: Free Press.

- Röling, N. (2007) Communication for development in research, extension and education. In: *Communication and sustainable development: Selected papers from the 9th UN Roundtable on Communication for Development*. Rome: FAO.
- Scoones, I. and J. Thompson (eds.) (1994) *Beyond Farmer First*. London: Intermediate Technology Publications.
- Simmonds, N.W. (1986) A short review of farming systems research in the tropics. *Experimental Agriculture* 22: 1-13.
- Sintori, A. (2012) *Analysis of the decision making process with multiple goals: The case of dairy sheep farming in Continental Greece*. PhD thesis. Athens: Agricultural University of Athens, pp. 365 (in Greek).
- Swanson, B.E. and R. Rajalahti (2010) *Strengthening Agricultural Extension and Advisory Systems: Procedures for Assessing, Transforming, and Evaluating Extension Systems*. Agricultural and Rural Development Discussion Paper 45. Washington, DC: The World Bank.
- Tsiboukas, K. (2009) *Introduction to Agricultural Economics*. Athens: Agricultural University of Athens.
- Wang, S.L. (2014) Cooperative extension system: Trends and economic impacts on U.S. agriculture. *Choices* 29(1). Available at: [http://www.choicesmagazine.org/UserFiles/file/cmsarticle\\_355.pdf](http://www.choicesmagazine.org/UserFiles/file/cmsarticle_355.pdf)
- Webber, L. (1995) Participatory rural appraisal design: Conceptual and process issues. *Agricultural Systems* 17: 107-131.