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**Foreword**

Although many agricultural extension researchers have highlighted the important influence that peers have on the adoption of farm practices, few authors propose strategies for how a program might utilise peer support and enhance its effectiveness. This report reviews a peer support trial delivered by the 'Enhancing community-based commercial forestry in Indonesia' project with the aim of improving forest management practices on farms.

The Farmer-to-Farmer Mentoring (F2FM) trial sought to scale-out smallholders' experience and knowledge after their participation in Master TreeGrower (MTG) training courses. Farmers who participated in MTG training courses were encouraged to share their experiences and knowledge about tree growing with other farmers in their local communities. It was clear from the evaluation of the MTG courses that the participants were keen to help others in their community.

With the aim of improving the effectiveness of peer support in community forestry, the F2FM trial selected a small number of MTG participants from different regions and provided them with training in mentoring techniques and support for undertaking a mentoring trial. The F2FM trial was conducted in three of the CBCF project sites, namely Gunungkidul (Yogyakarta), Pati (Central Java) and Bulukumba (South Sulawesi), Indonesia. Lessons learnt from this trial are intended to be used to refine the concept and its implementation for the future actions – both for another trial and the adoption of the concept by local, provincial and national government agencies and other organisations interested in supporting smallholder forestry.

The Study Team

Muktasam, Rowan Reid, Abdul Kadir Wakka and Digby Race

February 2020
**Glossary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td><em>Hutan Rakyat</em> – Community Forest (land privately owned by smallholders, <em>hutan rakyat</em>, HR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HTR</td>
<td><em>Hutan Tanaman Rakyat</em> – Community Planting Forest (and state-owned land leased to smallholders, <em>hutan tanaman rakyat</em>, HTR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2FM</td>
<td>Farmer-to-Farmer Mentoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTG</td>
<td>Master TreeGrowers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KASA</td>
<td>Knowledge, Attitudes, Skills and Aspiration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFG</td>
<td>Forest Farmer Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBCF</td>
<td>Community-Based Commercial Forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4T</td>
<td>Trees for Trees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UGM</td>
<td><em>Universitas Gadjah Mada</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3SEKPI</td>
<td><em>Pusat Penelitian dan Pengembangan Sosial Ekonomi Kehutanan dan Inovasi</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOERDIA</td>
<td>Forestry and Environment Research, Development and Innovation Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>The Art and Science of Helping Others</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Abstract
The first phase of this Community Based Commercial Forestry (CBCF) project identified that Indonesian smallholders generally lack the understanding, skills, and support networks required for good private forest management. A Master TreeGrower (MTG) approach to farmer learning was introduced to address these issues. The first phase of MTG courses was conducted in 2014 at five project sites (Pati, Gunungkidul, Bulukumba, Sumbawa and Konawe). The second series of MTG courses were then conducted in 2018 at the five project sites (Pati, Gunungkidul, Bulukumba, Buolemo, and Lampung). These two series of MTG training courses confirmed the effectiveness of the model in improving farmer knowledge, extending their information networks and, ultimately, changing farmers’ forest management practices.

Recognising that the MTG participants were keen to share their knowledge with other farmers, a Farmer-to-Farmer Mentoring (F2FM) model was introduced and trialled as a possible means of scaling-out the impacts of MTG training courses. A training workshop among potential mentors from Bulukumba, Pati and Gunungkidul was conducted in Semarang and Ungaran on the 26th-29th July 2018. The F2FM Training Workshop produced a Mentoring Action Plan to support the participants’ mentoring other farmers.

The Mentoring Action Plan has been used to monitor the progress and to evaluate the effectiveness of the F2FM. Monitoring data collected from August 2018 to February 2019, and the final evaluation conducted in February to April 2019 confirmed that the technique has the potential to promote further changes in the surrounding farmers. The F2FM pilot programs were judged to have been very successful in Bulukumba while a lower performance was recorded in Gunungkidul and Pati. This report reviews the F2FM trial and presents the results of the monitoring and evaluation data.
1. Introduction

It has long been recognised that farmers are influenced by the practices, knowledge and opinions of their peers. Vanclay (2004) argued that adoption of farming practices “takes place in a social context with farmers discussing their ideas with other farmers”. He goes on to add that adoption is more common when “the idea or practice has become part of the normative concept of good farm management” within a community of farmers. Phillips (1985) noted that when making decisions about alternative practices, farmers tend to validate the advice received from professionals against the opinions and experience of trusted peers.

The first phase of this project – ‘Enhancing community-based commercial forestry (CBCF) in Indonesia’ (ACIAR FST/2015/040), identified that Indonesian smallholders generally lack the understanding, skills, and support networks required for optimum private forest management. A Master TreeGrower (MTG) approach to farmer learning was introduced to address these issues. The first phase of MTG courses was conducted in 2014 at five project sites (Pati, Gunungkidul, Bulukumba, Sumbawa, and Konawe). The second series of MTG courses were then conducted in 2018 at the five project sites (Pati, Gunungkidul, Bulukumba, Buolemo, and Lampung). These two series of MTG training courses confirmed the effectiveness of the model in improving farmer knowledge, extending their information networks and, ultimately, changing farmers’ forest management practices.

Recognising that the MTG participants were keen to share their knowledge with other farmers a Farmer-to-Farmer Mentoring (F2FM) model was trialled as a possible means of scaling-out the impacts of MTG training courses. Whilst it is not practical for all farmers to participate in a MTG course it is likely that those that have undertaken the training will provide a credible source of information and support for other farmers considering adopting similar forestry management practices. As members of the community the MTG participants are also able to leverage their relationships with neighbours and family members to actively encourage them to consider applying alternative practices (Kueper et al. 2013).

Farmer-to-Farmer Mentoring is an approach to scaling-out smallholders’ learning and complement the Master TreeGrower (MTG) training courses. Both approaches aim “to increase the capacity & number of smallholders able to make informed decisions about their silvicultural approach & likely returns from CBCF” (Objective 2). Farmers who have been trained through MTG training courses are expected to “show their trees and farm management practices” and “to share their learning and experiences” with other farmers in their respective forest farmer groups (FFG), family and friends, and the local community in general. These processes have taken place naturally with limited intervention on “how to be an effective mentor” (Muktasam & Reid, 2017).

Even though farmer to farmer learning, such as the F2FM, is compatible to the existing practices in Indonesian extension, such as voluntary field extension agent, training for pioneer farmers or farmer leaders, and learning from champion farmers, it brings innovation to the topic of farmer learning in that, first, the content and the process in the F2FM follow the contents of MTG course, and second, the F2FM concept gives an important focus on the identification and selection of potential mentors and then trains them in the F2FM training workshop where basic concept of mentoring as “art and science to help other people” is given to the participants.

The model used for the introduction of F2FM was developed by the Otway Agroforestry Network in Australia. Reid (2017) explained how the Otway Peer Group Mentoring program developed: “Noticing how farmers in their region valued the leadership and advice provided by those that had completed the local Master TreeGrower courses, the Otway Agroforestry Network (OAN) began to explore the concept of enhancing and facilitating farmer-to-farmer extension. Their proposal was to train, then pay, experienced local tree growers to act as mentors who would then support and assist other landholders as they set about designing and managing their agroforestry projects.”
As part of the process “to increase the capacity & number of smallholders able to make informed decisions about their silvicultural approach and likely returns from CBCF” (Objective 2), as it is stated in the Project Work Plan, the project team for Objective 2 is expected to “Design and deliver a pilot program for farmer-to-farmer mentoring (F2FM)”. A F2FM Training Workshop was conducted at Semarang and Ungaran in late July 2018, the F2FM trial has been initiated to help more smallholder farmers improve their farm and tree management practices. Eight mentors from the 3 project sites – Pati, Gunungkidul and Bulukumba – had been equipped with mentoring knowledge and skills and a follow-up activity plan had been produced.

It was expected that the mentors, working as a team, would help other farmers in their respective sites improve their farm management by practicing silvicultural techniques such the planting of improved seed stock and the adoption of more intensive silvicultural management such as pruning and thinning. The mentors worked with farmers in their communities after the workshop (August 2018) up until January 2019. Monitoring during the trial, and evaluation activities conducted from February to April 2019 assessed the progress and identified the issues of the F2FM trial.

This document provides general information on the F2FM trial’s effectiveness and set out some criteria for delivering future projects aligned to the concept of the F2FM trial to support on-farm commercial forestry in Indonesia.

2. Objectives and Significances

The ultimate objective of the evaluation was to explore the effectiveness of the F2FM pilot trial in delivering the expected outputs and outcomes of farmer to farmer mentoring – more farmers adopting improved tree management practices. The specific objectives of the evaluation were:

1. To collect data on the F2FM trial activities, outputs and outcomes;
2. To identify issues and gaps between the planned activities, outputs and outcomes and the actual activities, outputs and outcomes; and
3. To promote sound corrective measures to address the issues and gaps that may lead to the refinement of F2FM concept and the design of any future implementation.

The results of these evaluation activities are expected to improve and refine the F2FM concept for any future implementation. As it is a complement to the MTG approach, it is expected that the F2FM concept may be adopted by the local, provincial and national government agencies and other organisations interested in promoting smallholder forestry.

3. Farmer to Farmer Mentoring and Learning: Review of Literatures

Farmer to farmer learning and mentoring is one approach in extension methods (among others) that has been used to promote more effective farmer learning. In essence, some forms of farmer to farmer learning have been used in Indonesia such as what is well known as Farmers’ Field Schools (FFS) that was first introduced in 1989 in the field of Pest and Disease Management in Indonesia for rice production by the Food and Agricultural Organisation (FAO, 2019). Due to its success, this form of farmer to farmer learning or as the FAO referred to it as “Farmer-to-Farmer field school in Indonesia”, were then introduced and used in more Asian and African countries (FAO, 2019). It was also used in other crops and farm sectors such as food crop production (legumes, fruits, vegetable, and tuber crops, livestock, water conservation (CIP-UPWARD, 2003), and also in climate issues and responses (Siregar and Crane, 2011).
The other forms of farmer to farmer learning in Indonesia include:

1. Community Voluntary Forestry Extension Agent or *Penyuluh Kehutanan Swadaya Masyarakat* or it's well known as PKSM;
2. Champion Farmer Approach to Extension; and
3. Key roles of Contact Farmers in helping other farmers (Muktasam, et.al. 2019).

In other countries, the concept of farmer to farmer learning, farmer to farmer extension and mentoring have been introduced and widely used where progressive farmers or peer farmers help their neighbouring farmers (FAO, 2019). The following sections provide a critical analysis on how these approaches to farmer-to-farmer mentoring and learning have been implemented, and what appears as important factors for success.

### 3.1. Some Experiences

Farmer to farmer learning, extension and or mentoring has been used widely in some countries such as Australia, New Zealand, USA, as well as in a number of countries in Africa and Asia (Niewolny and Patrick, 2010; Reid, 2011; National Family Farm Coalition, 2011; Greenhalgh and Rowlinson, 2014; Brent, 2015; Reid, 2016; National Sustainable Agriculture Coalition, 2017). These forms of farmer to farmer learning have been used and implemented in a wide range of areas such as forestry and agroforestry (Reid, 2011 and 2016), food crops, livestock, climate, fisheries, forestry, and others, and even to prepare the next generation of farmers and ranchers (livestock farmers).

Overall, farmer to farmer learning in these countries was implemented using one or a combination of the following techniques: (1) hands on/experiential learning or field practices, (2) one-on-one technical assistance/mentoring, (3) classroom-based activities such as workshops, classes, multi-day programs, (4) farmer to farmer strategies through networking, peer teachers, farmer to farmer teachers, and (5) a combination of different methods (Coalition, 2017).

Niewolny and Patrick (2010) concluded that *experiential learning, peer learning, mentoring* are all parts of what is considered best practice in the area of sustainable agriculture teaching and learning. They also highlighted the use of the approaches beyond the conventional agricultural extension content, views and practices, as they stated: "conservation and land acquisition, niche and direct marketing, organic farming, whole farm planning, farm worker rights, and personal goal assessment."

### 3.2. How Extension Uses Farmer to Farmer Learning

Even though farmer to farmer learning has been used in different fields (forestry and agroforestry, dairy farm, food crop production, fisheries, and others), there are some common steps taken to promote more effective farmer to farmer learning (Lutz, 2010; Reid, 2012; Greenhalgh & Rowlinson, 2014). The following points summarised the steps taken to promote F2F learning and or mentoring:

1. The selection of lead farmers (e.g. the Otway Agroforestry Network uses 5 criteria: completed a MTG course, own land within the local community, has experience growing trees, has effective communication skills, and is willing to work with other farmers (See Study Tour Report, 2019));
2. Training of lead farmers to do the extension work;
3. Lead farmers work with local and surrounding farmers;
4. Monitoring, supervision and evaluation;

---

1Original references: (Reid, Otway Agroforestry Network - Peer Group Mentor Manual, 2011); (Brent M. Simpson, May 2015); (Reid, 2016); (Greenhalgh & Rowlinson, 2014)
Paying lead farmers for their time and works; and,

Regular up-grading lead farmers’ knowledge and skills.

### 3.3. What Works and Does Not Work?

Reviews of F2F learning and mentoring in other countries highlight the factors affecting the performance of the approaches, for its success and for its failures. Dairy NZ (2012) highlighted the following points in promoting effective mentoring and coaching: (1) “Spend time choosing the right mentor and (2) Mentors are motivated by wanting to impact on someone’s life by sharing their knowledge and experiences”. Some key features of the F2F learning that were reported to be working well are as follows: (1) Farmers with limited monetary incentives, (2) Effective lead farmers, (3) Participatory selection and training of lead farmers, (4) Working on less risk interventions (Greenhalgh & Rowlinson, 2014). On the other hand, some constraints for the success where the mentoring was not working well have been due to the following points: (1) Paid lead farmers, (2) Inappropriate lead farmers (poor mentors), (3) Project-based approach to farmers’ learning (top-down approach to F2F extension), and (4) Not for high risk interventions (Greenhalgh & Rowlinson, 2014).

Greenhalgh and Rowlinson (2014) highlighted the following points for a successful mentoring program: (1) A clear mission and goals that are communicated to mentors and mentees during promotion and recruitment; (2) Highly motivated mentees with strong desire to learn; (3) Mentors that have appropriate knowledge and are tolerant, non-judgmental, sensitive and respectful toward others; (4) Strong level of commitment from both parties; (5) Well-planned and adequate resourced programs; (6) Well design training programs for both mentors and mentees; (7) A matching process that ensures a good fit between mentors and mentees; (8) Strong supports from those responsible for overseeing the programs; (9) Continual feedback from the participants and on-going evaluation of the programs; (10) Support for the programs from employers and the wider industry; and (11) An industry wide culture that recognizes and values the benefits of mentoring as a tool for learning and is prepared to provide financial support for mentoring programs. Some of these points were discussed by other authors such as Sherk (1999), Hansford et al. (2004), and Holland (2009), where they highlighted a few barriers to successful mentoring such as lack of time for mentoring, poor planning, lack of understanding of mentoring processes, lack of commitment, and others.

The Otway Agroforestry Network (OAN) identified five criteria for an effective F2FM program (OAN unpublished):

1. Peer Group Mentoring (PGM) concept acknowledges the significant influence of peers, associates, neighbours and unrelated professionals have on land management decisions made by farmers;

2. PGM concept can add value to the work of researchers, professional extension agents and industry members, but only where the primacy of the farmer in making land management decisions and the need for new practices to reflect their particularly circumstances is acknowledged;

3. PGM concept should be part of a comprehensive extension program which aims to encourage and support landholder participation in the design and implementation of revegetation projects that reflect their interests and aspirations;

4. Peer Group Mentors are not engaged in the project as “experts”; and

5. All mentors should participate in a group training program.

Despite the concerns raised by Greenhalgh & Rowlinson (2014) about paying mentors for their time, the Otway Agroforestry Network believe that by paying mentors they are not only
Acknowledging their contribution to the program but also encouraging the mentees to use the program without having to feel they are wasting the time of the mentee (OAN, unpublished)

4. Evaluation Approach

Evaluation approach to assess the F2FM trial involved collecting qualitative and quantitative data from a range of sources.

Using the logic model, this evaluation identified the inputs (mentors and local partners and others, for both contents and process), activities (mentoring action plan, activities to help other farmers during the trial, etc.), outputs (changes in others farmers’ KASA), and outcomes of the trial (changes in other farmers’ practices, productivity, socio-economic and environmental aspects in the short, medium and long-term).

Evaluation of the F2FM trial were conducted in the three sites, namely in the villages of Jepitu (Gunungkidul) and Pati (Central Java), and the collaborating villages of Malleleng and Benjala (Bulukumba, South Sulawesi). The details of the evaluation activities are presented in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1. Evaluation Activities by Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sites &amp; Dates</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Gunungkidul: Jepitu, 24 February 2019</td>
<td>Visit to Jepitu with Pk Digby; conducted focus group discussion with Bu Eni and Pk Jaelanto; field observation on the results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Bulukumba: Benjala, 24 &amp; 25 March 2019</td>
<td>Visit to Benjala with Pk Kadir and Arman; conducted in-depth interview with Pk Jaya; field observation on the results of his mentoring by visiting and interviewing mentees such as Pk Jusmar and Pk Suaiman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Bulukumba: Malleleng, 26 &amp; 27 March 2019</td>
<td>Visit to Malleleng with Pk Kadir and Arman; conducted in-depth interview with Pk Ridwan; field observation on the results of his mentoring by visiting mentees and interviewing them such as Pk Abdul Hamid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Pati: Sumbereso Gunungwungkal, 27-30 April 2019</td>
<td>Visit to Pati and meeting Pk Mark and Mbak Devi at T4T Office in Semarang, then visiting Pati and farmers with Pk Sigit; conducted in-depth interview with Pk Darsuki and Pk Jakpar; field observation on the results of their mentoring activities. Field visit to farm failed due to the raining</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To review how the F2FM trial had been implemented and the results (outputs), the activities of every mentor were listed, the number of farmers involved as mentees recorded, the mentees’ learning (improvement on knowledge, skills and attitude) and behavioural changes (adoption) were measured and identified, and, some further changes (socio-economic and environmental changes) due to mentoring activities were investigated.

Four main approaches were used for evaluating the F2FM trial, namely: (1) contact and collect data from all local partners through the WhatsApp Group named “Enhancing CBCF”, where every local partner may share their data and information on mentor activities and outputs, (2) collect data through private contact with local partners via sms, WA messages, and phone calls, (3) collect data and information directly from mentors through mobile phone, and (4) field visits to meet mentors and to see the activities of local partners and mentors on the ground. The visits were also to observe the outputs and outcomes of the F2FM trial in Bulukumba, Pati and Gunungkidul.

Qualitative and quantitative analysis were applied to the evaluation data.
5. **F2FM Training Workshop and Follow-up Activities**

The following activities were carried out to prepare, guide and support the local partners in conducting the F2FM trial:

(1) Farmer-to-Farmer Mentoring Training Workshop was conducted in Semarang and Ungaran, 26 – 30 July 2018. Potential mentor farmers from the 3 sites of the CBCF were invited to the workshop, namely:

   a. Gunungkidul: Jaelani and Eni Wursiyati
   b. Pati: Dasuki, Jakpar and Surahman
   c. Bulukumba: Ir. Abd. Rahing, Syamsul Wijaya Kusuma, ST (Benjala), and Ridwan S. Pt (Malleleng)

   To support the F2FM trial, MTG course trainers or facilitators for those 3 sites were also invited such as Dr. Abdul Kadir (BP2LHK Makassar), Ir. Wiyono (Fakultas Kehutanan – UGM), Achmad Darisman (Trees4trees), Abdul Kafi (Trees4trees), Kuncoro Ariawan (P3SEKPI) and Sugeng Teguh (BPH Wilayah 2 Pati).

   Another relevant participant such as Pak Sunoyo, a successful horticulture farmer from Magelang was invited.

   The resource persons and facilitators of this training workshop were Dr Digby Race (F2FM concept in the CBCF project, and action plan for F2FM pilot trial), Rowan Reid (mentoring concept and its implementation in Australia, and planned activities to implement it in Indonesia), Devi Silvia (Trees for Trees, co-facilitator and training site coordinator) and Dr Muktasam (innovation decision making process, and action plan for F2FM pilot trial). Another resource person invited to the training workshop was Pk Mukidin, a successful farmer/mentor/voluntary extension agent from Ngrancah Village, Magelang, Central Java.

(2) Soon after the F2FM Training Workshop the following guidelines were shared with the local partners. (The draft of F2FM Training Workshop Report was shared on the 18th September 2018 through email2, with some notes to remind the partners to have a look at the related section – see the following Box and Figure 1).

   **F2FM – follow-up activities:** As the last part of the session, it was explained what are the mentors (participants) may do to help other farmers and communities in their sites. Pk Muktasam explained the following points for the participants (working as mentor individually and/or in a group of 2 or 3 to help other farmers and communities:

   (1) Every mentor will work for 10 days during the next 6 months (3 mentors from each site, then meaning 30 days)
   (2) The mentor (2-3 persons) will work together and support each other to help and supervising 5 farmers.
   (3) The activities should be a mentoring type of activities. It is not a formal type of extension work where we ask farmers to get together formally at the village office. A mentor may work alone or in a group to visit farmers at the same village or other villages.
   (4) The mentor needs to record their activities and report them to the local partners such as to Pak Kadir for Bulukumba, Pk Wiyono for Gunungkidul, and Pk Darisman or Pk Kafi for Pati – Central Java.
   (5) The local partners (FOERDIA, T4T & UGM) will communicate and report the mentors’ activities to Pak Muktasam and Pak Rowan as part of their roles in this F2FM trial.
   (6) In the early 2019 (around January or February) Pak Muktasam will visit Pati, Bulukumba and Gunungkidul to do the evaluation of the F2FM trials.
   (7) The results of the evaluation will be used to improve the F2FM concept and model – Figure 5.1.

---

2 August had been a critical time for the communication due to the several strong earthquakes that took place on the 29th July, 5th/9th/19th August 2018.
The support for the F2FM pilot trial will be explained and communicated soon by the project local partners. Once the steps, approaches, and budget are agreed by Pak Rowan, Pak Muktasam and Pak Digby, the local partners are expected to start managing the activities through meeting the mentors and finalise the mentors’ action plan. These Action Plans will be used as a guide to do monitoring and evaluation.

(3) Another communication was conducted on the 19th September 2018 through “Enhancing CBCF WhatsApp Group” (wa group) regarding the F2FM trial and cost for the activity – after getting an email from Pk Digby about the total budget for the trial (an email dated 29th July). Long explanation on F2FM trial activities was discussed in the wa group on the 19th.

(4) On the 21st September another reminding message to local partners to look at Pk Digby Race’s email on the 29th July regarding the cost for F2FM trial “at the of 6-month F2FM program, the supporting organisations (T4T, UGM & FOERDIA Makassar) can send me an invoice for USC to pay back whatever the funds were spent to support the mentors”. Another wa message also sent to local partners on how to monitor the progress – such as through hand phone – phone call and wa messages.

(5) On the 11th October 2018 another reminding message F2FM trial.

(6) On the 19th October 2018 another reminding message for UGM Team on F2FM trial – see Table 3 for the planned activities and table for the action plan, and footnotes in page 13 for Digby’s explanation on the use of the budget.

---

Footnote:
31 I want to clarify with you all that I am happy to make additional funds available to support the F2FM pilot program over the next 6 months, with IDR 10 million (about AU$1,000) available for each of the 3 trial areas - Bulukumba, Gunungkidul and Pati. That is, the total additional funds for the F2FM pilot = IDR 30 million (AU$3,000). These funds can be used for materials, tools, travel, catering (food/snacks), mentors’ time (calculated on the Provincial minimum daily wage) & other items, as discussed between you and the mentors. I want to stress that I don’t want the F2FM to become a burden for our mentors (it should cover the cost of them not being available for their own farming activities). At the end of the 6-month F2FM pilot program, the supporting organisations (T4T, UGM & FOERDIA Makassar) can send me an invoice for USC to pay back whatever funds were spent to support the mentors (Pk Digby’s email on the 29th July 2018 to all CBCF Project Team).
6. **Mentoring Activities on the Ground: Some Findings**

6.1. **Gunungkidul**

Farmer-to-Farmer mentoring trial was not implemented in Gunungkidul. In-depth interviews with the two appointed and trained mentors found the absence of well-planned mentoring activities as discussed at the F2FM Training Workshop in Semarang and Ungaran on the 26-30 July 2018. This evaluation study also confirmed that no activities were taken by the two mentors to systematically help other farmers on tree and farm management. The two mentors stated that they were waiting for the local partner from UGM to visit and discuss the mentoring action plan. The two mentors were invited to an MTG training course conducted at Katongan Village in late October 2018, but with no clear guide and direction as to their roles. According to the two mentors, they were just doing the mentoring roles by telling and sharing the knowledge they had gained on tree and farm management whenever they had a chance to tell other farmers in their village, such as at community meetings and events (Table 6.1).

Table 6.1. Some Results of the F2FM Evaluation - Gunungkidul

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentors and Local Partners' Perceptions of F2FM Trial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mentors' Perceptions on F2FM trial:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) No clear activity was done for F2FM trial since returned from the training workshop conducted in Semarang and Ungaran.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) No follow-up activity taken by the local partner to support the two mentors perform their expected roles in helping other farmers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Both mentors were invited to Katongan MTG Redesign Training Course, but with no clear advice about its relation to F2FM trial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) The two mentors said &quot;We just waiting for the local partner team to come and support us running the mentoring work&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Even though there was no supervision and obvious support from the local partner, the mentors did some things related to their roles as mentors. One of the mentors for example shared some of her ideas on tree and farm management with local communities in informal ways or during meetings and interactions (this mentor has now joined the village office, giving her more opportunities for interaction with her local community). She shared the ideas on pruning and thinning learned through MTG training course. She has not done any further silviculture to her trees, such as pruning and thinning, due to the hilly and rocky terrain where she has her teak and acacia trees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Partners' Perceptions:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) &quot;We do not really understand the F2FM concepts and planned trial&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) &quot;We did not ask our representative who went to the training about the concept and trial&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) &quot;He did not tell and explain to us about the trial, its action plan and the concept – there was a misunderstanding about this&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) There were several emails and WhatsApp communications with all local partners as a reminding message to local partners about “F2FM Trial”, but these had no result.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) The whole team from the local partner did not get any clear ideas about the F2FM concept and the trial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) &quot;The mentors did not inform the local partner team about the F2FM trial&quot;. It's not up to them to ask about this activity with the local partner.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: The evaluation team met the mentors on the 24th February at Jepitu Village and met the local partners on the 25th February at UGM.

Further discussion with the local partner found that they were not aware of the existence of the F2FM trial. This discussion highlighted that the local partner representative at the F2FM training workshop failed to communicate and share the workshop results/action plan for the trial with the rest of the project team. As a result, all members of the local partner team had
no idea about the F2FM trial. Several additional communications through email and WA group taken by the F2FM trial coordinator did not help to bring the local partners’ attention to the trial. The leader of the local partner team only opened the F2FM training workshop report (that was shared through email attachment in September 2018) at the meeting carried out on the 25th February 2019.

6.2. Bulukumba

The Farmer-to-Farmer mentoring trial was implemented well in Bulukumba. In-depth interviews with the local partner, mentors, and mentees found that the trial was implemented well and as planned in the F2FM Trial Action (as developed during the F2FM Training Workshop at Semarang and Ungaran). With the support of the local partner, the mentors in Bulukumba developed an action plan as it is presented in Table 6.2.

Table 6.2. Mentoring Activity Plan for Bulukumba

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Month 8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Discussion and an agreement on mentoring objectives and strategies after Semarang F2FM Training Workshop. The outcomes of the meeting were:  
  a. The objectives of the mentoring activities are to help other farmers to improve their private forest management through MTG learning approach.  
  b. Every mentor should manage their own trees and farm better so that it can become a demonstration plot for other farmers. As results, there will be 3 demonstration plots at 3 villages, namely Karassing Village (Pak Rahing’s land), Malleleng Village (Pak Ridwan’s land) and Benjala Village (Pak Jaya’s land and farm).  
  c. Visiting farmers will be conducted by the group of mentors (all 3 mentors or 2 of them), and not by individual | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| (2)      |         |   |    |    |    |    |
| Mentors to manage their own trees and farms to demonstrate to others how to manage trees and farms | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| (3)      |         |   |    |    |    |    |
| All mentors together visiting farmers they want to help at Malleleng Village – Kajang Subdistrict | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| (4)      |         |   |    |    |    |    |
| Taking follow-up activities to support more responsive farmers at Malleleng Village – Kajang Subdistrict | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| (5)      |         |   |    |    |    |    |
| All mentors together visiting farmers they want to help at Balong Village, Ujung Loe Subdistrict | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| (6)      |         |   |    |    |    |    |
| Taking follow-up activities to support more responsive farmers at Balong Village, Ujung Loe Subdistrict | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| (7)      |         |   |    |    |    |    |
| All mentors together visiting farmers they want to help at Benjala Village, Bontobahari Subdistrict | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| (8)      |         |   |    |    |    |    |
| Taking follow-up activities to support more responsive farmers at Benjala Village, Bontobahari Subdistrict | X | X | X | X | X | X |

Notes:  
The follow-up meeting to develop this plan was conducted at Malleleng in August 2018.

The meeting that was conducted in August 2018 also agreed on the following points:  
(1) Mentors will aim to work with at least 5 potential farmers and may take follow-up activities to help those farmers who give positive responses; and  
(2) Visiting farmers at their places with a less formal approach and not be too aggressive to teach and change them.

The local partner also shared the following report with the F2FM trial coordinator:  
(3) In September 2018, mentors visited farmers in Malleleng Village. A week after the first visit, two farmers expressed their positive responses, and wanted to do something to improve their trees and farm performance. They also wanted to see how the mentors manage their trees and farms. On the basis of the visit, these two farmers (Pk Jusmar
and Pk Sulaiman) were now practicing pruning on their farms and the mentors were supervising them.

(4) In October 2018 (after MTG was conducted in Malleleng), the mentors agreed to visit farmers at Balong Village, Ujung Loe Subdistrict. Other visits were also conducted by the mentors to Benjala Village.

Field observation of mentors’ activities found that mentees had made some changes in their farming and tree growing practices after observing the mentors’ trees and farms and getting help from the mentors. The 3 mentors communicated and worked with other surrounding farmers on tree and farm management. These farmers had conducted more pruning of their teak and gamelina trees at their respective farms. They learned from the mentors that they should cut some branches to let the trees develop better wood quality and improve the potential value. Detailed results of mentoring activities in Bulukumba are presented in Table 6.3.

Table 6.3. Some Results of the F2FM Evaluation – Bulukumba

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentors and Local Partner’s Statements on F2FM Trial Plan and Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Pk Jaya and his mentoring team shared the MTG topics with two farmers (Pk Jusmar and Pk Sulaiman).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Pak Jusmar growing teak and others such as bitti and gamelina .. also sengon. In Jusmar’s farm, Jaya demonstrated how to do pruning correctly, and Jusmar did the samething by his own.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Pk Jaya also talked and shared some information to Ibu Nuraeni (Jusmar’s wife) about growing trees and doing better farm management practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Nuraeni is a progressive farmer as she has been involved in selling trees and sawn timber. She bought one sengon tree for another selling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Sulaiman is a university graduated villager, now running (for the general election on the 17th April 2019) for local parliament election from PKS party. He is growing mostly gamelina in his backyard garden and learnt how to grow trees from Jaya. Jaya showed him how to do pruning and tree management. He has a good plan with Jaya, especially in establishing village level nursery and forest management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Sulaiman has a long experience in working with wood industry in Kalimantan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Pak Rahing and Ridwan are working with Jaya to support these mentees. However, these two mentors have their own farmers at their villages such as Abdul Hamid and Bate (helped by Pk Ridwan) and “Pk Haris Loi” helped and supported by Pk Rahing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Pk Kadir as the local partner allocated the funding to support mentors, and every mentor got IDR 2 million where 1.5 million as an incentive for 10 days of working, while 500,000 for communication and transportation, and in total was 6 million for 3 mentors. The rest of the budget (4 million) was allocated for local partner’s activities in monitoring and evaluation of F2FM trial (transportation, per diem, communication, etc.).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mentors helped six other farmers in their surrounding villages. For example, Pk Jaya worked and supported Pk Jusmar and Ibu Nuraeni about how to grow trees better. Pk Jaya also helped Pk Sulaimain in tree and farm management, and even talked about seedlings and the need for working in groups and promoting some activities for tree growing. Pk Sulaimain was elected to the local parliament and used to work in Timber Industry in Kalimantan and has now been back to his village for the last several years.

**Pk Jusmar and His Farm at Benjala (The Mentee):**

Field visits to the mentees’ farms such as Pk Jusmar and Pk Sulaimain confirmed that some teak trees in Pk Jusmar’ garden and gamelina trees in Pk Sulaimain’s garden had been recently pruned (Figure 5.1). Jusmar’s teak trees seem to be less than 5 years old while Pk Sulaimain’s gamelina trees appear to be more than 5 years old.
Figure 6.1. Pk Jusmar Learned Tree and Farm Management from Pk Jaya

Pk Sulaiman and His Farm at Benjala (The Mentee):
A field visit to Pk Sulaiman confirmed that Pk Sulaiman had done tree and farm management activities such as pruning several of his gamelina trees (Figure 6.2). Pk Sulaiman’s gamelina trees seem to be more than 5 years old. An in-depth interview with this mentee clarified how the mentor Pk Jaya helped him with his tree and farm management. They had even talked about the possibility of establishing a nursery garden to help local communities manage their land better. Pk Sulaiman talked about accessing government land for community empowerment, and there was still more private land and forest remaining unused in the district.

Figure 6.2. Pk Sulaiman and The Pruned Gamelina Trees in His Backyard

Pk Adul Hamid and His Farm at Malleleng (The Mentee): He learned and improved his tree management with the support from Pk Ridwan.

Figure 6.3. Pk Abdul Hamid and His Pruned Trees in His Garden

Pk Bate and His Farm at Malleleng (The Mentee):
A visit to Pk Bate’s farm was undertaken with Ridwan and Abdul Hamid. Both of them showed the evaluation team a few teak trees where they practiced pruning. The recovery of
the pruned branches seems better, but some new branches were growing around the pruned spot (Figure 6.4). Figure 6.4. Pak Bate’s Farm where Ridwan as a Mentor Helped Him

The latest development in Bulukumba was reported by the local partner that the local government planned to run a training workshop on F2FM in July 2019. The following table shows the F2FM training.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day 1 (9 July 2019)</td>
<td>09.00 – 10.00 Opening</td>
<td>Committee / Bulukumba E &amp; F Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.00 – 12.00 Introduction to F2FM (Presentation and Discussion)</td>
<td>Dr. Abd. Kadir W., S.Hut., M.Si.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.00 – 13.00 Lunch and praying</td>
<td>Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.00 – 14.30 Understanding the Roles of Mentors, Advantages and Disadvantages of Mentoring (Small Group Discussion and Presentation)</td>
<td>Dr. Abd. Kadir W., S.Hut., M.Si.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.30 – 16.00 How to be A Good Mentor (Presentation and Discussion)</td>
<td>Dr. Abd. Kadir W., S.Hut., M.Si.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 2 (10 July 2019)</td>
<td>09.00 – 10.00 How to be A Good Mentor (Presentation and Discussion) - continue</td>
<td>Dr. Abd. Kadir W., S.Hut., M.Si.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|              | 10.00 – 12.00 Sharing Mentoring Experiences (Presentation by the 3 mentors) | Abd Rahing, SP.  
Muh. Ridwan, SP.  
Syamsul Kusuma Wijaya, ST. |
|              | 12.00 – 13.00 Lunch and praying                                         | Committee                                                                   |
|              | 13.00 – 14.00 Review and Discussion - Sharing Mentoring Experiences       | Dr. Abd. Kadir W., S.Hut., M.Si.                                           |
|              | 14.00 – 15.00 Roles of Mentors in Farmers’ Decision Making (Presentation and Discussion) | Dr. Abd. Kadir W., S.Hut., M.Si.                                           |
| Day 3 (11 July 2019) | 09.00 – 11.00 Practice of Mentoring                                    | Dr. Abd. Kadir W., S.Hut., M.Si.  
Abd Rahing, SP. |
|              | 11.00 – 12.00 Discussion and Reflection                                 | Dr. Abd. Kadir W., S.Hut., M.Si.                                           |
|              | 12.00 – 13.00 Lunch and praying                                         | Committee                                                                   |
|              | 15.00 – 16.00 Closing ceremony                                          | Committee / Bulukumba E & F Office                                       |
6.3. Pati

Even though there was no clear record on the F2FM trial in Pati, the local partners claimed that they did implement the trial, especially with the two mentors such as Pk Jakpar and Pk Darsuki. The local partners spoke of mentors’ activities in “sharing the MTG course contents such as tree and farm management – pruning and thinning as well as providing seedlings”. The local partners and the two mentors stated that they did not have an agreed work plan to do the mentoring trial. The two mentors seemed to be unclear with the activity promoted by T4T, between T4T’s usual business and the additional mentoring activities involved in the F2FM trial. It seems that F2FM trial had not been communicated and discussed clearly with the two mentors, for both the nature and scale of activities and what financial support was available. Details about the data obtained from field observation and in-depth interview in Pati are presented in Table 6.4.

Table 6.4. Some Results of the F2FM Evaluation - Pati

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentors and Local Partner’s Statements on F2FM Trial Plan and Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Local partner provided positive responses to the F2FM trials and hoped it will benefit farmers and the T4T activities to achieve its mission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Local partners stated that they have submitted the invoice for the F2FM Trial but have not spent the budget for the mentors to support the trial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Interviews with the two mentors confirmed that they have undertaken their roles as mentors even though with limited support from the local partner. Both of them explained that they have helped other farmers in tree and farm management, and showing their “demonstration farms” where they have helped other farmers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Jakpar explained that he shared the knowledge with more than 5 surrounding farmers through his farmer group and at his sengon farm – to those who harvested his sengon leaf (meeting local farmers who visited his farm to harvest sengon leaf for fodder).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) There was not any real and clear action-plan from the local partner to organise and help the mentors performing their mentoring roles as it was planned at the F2FM training workshop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) The local partner often visited the mentors to supervise nursery management as part of local partner’s activities, and the mentor got IDR 500,000 for 3-4 months work looking after the seedlings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) The mentors have not got any financial support for their mentoring work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) The local partner did not have any record of meeting and monitoring activities to support the mentors regularly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) The mentors did their own silvicultural practices on their own trees and farm – the mentor shared and helped the other farmers individually and within their groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) As part of the local partner team, two field staff of the local partner did not know anything about the F2FM trial and activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11) The mentor reluctant to be called as an “extension agent” as he felt he has limited knowledge, especially in Pest and Disease Management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12) Both mentors could not show the changes of their mentees.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Pak Surahman was not active due to his other activity as a religious scholar, according to Pk Sigit & Darisman.
Pk Jakpar and Darsuki at Gunungwungkal:

Pak Darsuki helped other farmers in Plausan Village, & other farmers attended the 2nd MTG training course

Pk Jakpar helped other farmers in nursery and tree and farm management (at the 2nd MTG training in Sumberrejo)

Figure 6.5. Mentors’ Activities in Pati Central Java

7. Discussion

7.1. F2FM Trial Implementation

The Bulukumba site was the only team that implemented the F2FM trial as discussed and planned at the training workshop conducted in Semarang and Ungaran. The Bulukumba team developed a follow-up work plan, discussed the steps to take for mentoring activities, provided technical and financial supports to the mentors, and the local partner did regular monitoring for the trial. The result of the mentors’ work could be identified clearly with at least 5 surrounding farmers having changed their tree and farm management practices as a result of support via the F2FM trial.

On the other hand, the F2FM trial in Gunungkidul was not implemented as expected. No follow-up activities or communication took place between the mentors and local partner. The two potential mentors in Jepitu (Gunungkidul) stated “they were waiting for the team to support them performing the mentoring roles to help other farmers, but it never happened”. In-depth interviews and group discussion with the team found that the idea of F2FM trial had never been discussed during their project meeting.

In Pati, the extent of the implementation and the subsequent results of the F2FM trial were unclear. Even though the local partners and the two mentors claimed that they implemented some aspects of the trial, but no clear action plan was discussed and agreed. The mentors provided general information on how they had helped other farmers, such as showing them how to do pruning and undertake other tree and farm management practices. They stated

5 It is important to select lead farmers to promote effective F2F extension as it was done in other areas, such as in countries in Africa (Brent M. Simpson, May 2015). F2F extension has been effective to reach more farmers, however the authors caution that F2F extension is not appropriate for high-risk interventions, and where farmers are dispersed/low population densities as it increases the cost and loses much of its power in reaching a large number of farmers. In his conclusion, Simpson (2015) discussed the risk of paying lead farmers as the lead farmers may change their “voluntary” nature of their work into “salary-based” work (Brent M. Simpson, May 2015). To them, F2F extension should be in the mode of a voluntary approach.
that they had also helped other farmers at the nursery sites and at the mentors’ farms or during the MTG redesign training course. The F2FM trial evaluation team found it difficult to identify the specific mentees or any behavioural changes resulting from the F2FM trial.

This trial evaluation found that the persons in charge appointed by the local partners in both Gunungkidul and Pati were not effective in fulfilling a coordinating role in planning, recording and supporting the mentoring activities. This result highlights the need to identify and work with committed people to sustain their attention and interest in the project.

The evaluation of the F2FM trial found that another key issue was the selection of the potential mentors. Not all the appointed participants who participated in the F2FM training workshop met the criteria for effective mentors. One reason for this was the availability of appropriate candidates. For example, the preferred farmers from Gunungkidul that were initially identified to participate in the F2FM training workshop were group leaders in Dengok and Jepitu. However, due to their other commitments neither could not attend the workshop. Similarly, it was later confirmed that a highly suitable individual from Pati who was meant to undertake the mentor training (Pk Jamasri) was also unavailable at that time. The farmers from both Gunungkidul and Pati that did participate in the training appear to have lacked the confidence, ability or time to implement the F2FM trial as expected.

Whilst there was no attempt to undertake a mentoring trial in Gunungkidul, the issue in Pati was one of inadequate planning and management. According to the Pati mentors, there was no discussion or plan for the implementation of the mentoring trial and activities. The field staff of the local partner just delivered tree seedlings to the mentors and asked the mentors to look after the seedlings before distributing them to the local farmers. There was no discussion or guidance from the local partner about what to do or how to report any activities for the F2FM trial. At the end of the trial period, the mentors received IDR.500,000. It is understood that this payment was really just for looking after seedlings. These problems in Pati may reflect the local partners’ lack of understanding of the F2FM trial objectives, or their lack of attention to the F2FM trial. The local partner did not follow the clear F2FM trial guidelines given in Ungaran where mentors may work as an individual or in a team to help at least 5 farmers, and work for up to 10 days during the trial period as presented in Table 7.1. Financial report shared by the local partner in Pati may also reflect their lack of understanding on the F2FM guideline as they use the term “training for agroforestry”, “training on coffee processing”, “training on sengon pest management”, and “monitoring of MTG activities”.

Table 7.1. Farmer-to-Farmer Mentoring (F2FM) Guideline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F2FM Guideline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Every mentor will work for up to 10 days during the next 6 months (3 mentors from each site, then meaning 30 days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The mentor (2-3 persons) will work together and support each other to help and support 5 farmers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The activities should be of a mentoring type that is not a formal type of extension work where we ask farmers to get together formally at the village office. Mentor may work as an individual or in a group to visit farmers at the same village or other villages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The mentor needs to record their activities and report them to the local partner (support organisation).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The local partners (FOERDIA, T4T &amp; UGM) will communicate and report the mentors’ activities to Pak Muktasam and Pak Rowan as part of their roles in this F2FM trial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. In the early 2019 (around January or February) Pak Muktasam will visit Pati, Bulukumba and Gunungkidul to evaluate the F2FM trial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The results of the evaluation will be used to improve the F2FM concept and model.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Despite the lack of guidance, one of the Pati mentors (a treasurer of the farmer group) did seek to share his knowledge and skills with his group members whenever and wherever possible, including at the group meeting or informally in his own garden. He claimed that he guided other farmers in the correct way of cutting or pruning sengon branches for feeding to their animals. The evaluation team did not trace the farmers who acquired knowledge from the mentor.

Where the F2FM trial was conducted in accordance with the proposal developed during the training (i.e. Bulukumba), the farmers had all the recognised qualities for potential mentors: they were leaders of the group, had trees and gardens, were using good silvicultural practices, were willing to share their knowledge and skills, and had the time to commit to the F2FM trial. After the training in Semarang and Ungaran, the Bulukumba partner developed and discussed an action plan and provided supervision during the trial and assisted with the monitoring and evaluation. The plan included an agreement as to what the farmers would do as mentors and what constituted mentoring activities. In addition to the action plan, the budget was another factor that supported the effective implementation of the F2FM trial in Bulukumba. According to local partner, every mentor received IDR. 2,000,000 for their time to help other farmers. The local partners paid each mentor IDR. 200,000 per day for 10 days as it was planned in Semarang and Ungaran. The rest of the budget was allocated for supervising the trial covering the transportation, communication, monitoring and evaluation works, and per diem for the local partner.

7.2. Farmer-to-Farmer Mentoring (F2FM) Effectiveness

Evidence supporting the potential of F2FM to support CBCF in Indonesia was largely drawn from the Bulukumba trial site. Field visits and observations confirmed that the five farmers supported by the mentors in the villages of Benjala and Maleleng not only improved their knowledge but also changed their tree and farm management practices as a result of the mentoring support provided.

The effectiveness of the mentors in Bulukumba began with the way the mentors approached their neighbour farmers. Importantly the Bulukumba mentors were all farmers who were undertaking silvicultural practices on their own farms. To initiate discussions the mentors invited mentees onto their own farms and explained how they were doing pruning and thinning. In effect, the mentors’ farms not only provided as model for demonstrating how to manage trees and farms but also established the credibility of the mentors as experienced tree growers. The F2FM concept was embraced by the local partners in Bulukumba to the extent that a further 11 farmers were trained and supported to be mentors in their local villages, another indication of the capacity of the F2FM concept to be scaled-out in rural Indonesia at very little cost.

In one case, the mentor explained that other farmers usually pass through his farms and observed his trees and the performance of his crops. The visiting farmers then expressed their willingness to adopt similar practices, with the mentor visited their farms to show them how to do tree and farm management as it is given during the MTG training course.

Similar to this approach, in Pati, the mentor spoke to farmers who were coming onto his farm to collect the pruned branches of sengon and other tree species to feed their animals. This provided the opportunity for him to explain to the farmers how to do pruning for better quality timber. The essence of this approach is consistent with the F2FM concept, helping other farmers by showing and doing things on the ground.

These examples of farmers sharing their own experience with neighbours reflect the principles for successful mentoring explained by Pak Mukidin at the F2FM Training Workshop (Table 7.1). This list was very similar to that provided by Digby Race at the training session and presented at the IUFRO Small-scale Forestry conference (Table 7.2).
Table 7.1. Key Factors to Successful Mentoring

| Key Factors to Successful Mentoring by Pak Mukidin  
Presented at the F2FM Training Workshop |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Start from your own experience and show the examples (Pak Mukidin stated “...to change others or to ask others to do good things, first show them good examples”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Ask them with good ways and not to teaching them (you are not a teacher)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Be a useful person for others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Do not tell and disseminate things that you are not doing your self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Be humble and willing to help other farmers (with no expectations to get compensation or any payment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Persuade them by letting them see and observe – not just by telling them (See and observe what I am doing, and not just listen and hear what I am saying).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Where possible work with and within groups – the groups that have effective rules – following the “peer group mentoring” concept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) It is important for Mentors to grow not only trees, but also other crops for daily and monthly income - The importance of growing agroforestry, and not growing trees as a monoculture practices - we grow mix of crops and trees to address issues on pest and diseases, and to get cash from different products).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) Recognise that it is farmer themselves to make decisions for their farm management practices, and not the mentor. “I am just supplying them with information to support their decisions”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) Encourage farmers and groups' members to identify local trees and crops that are growing well on their land. As a result, farmers identified crops such as kemukus (Piper Cubeba L.F), kapulaga (Amomum compactum) and cabe jamu (Piper retrofractum).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11) Before you ask the others, do it yourself!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.2. The success factors for effective mentoring presented by Dr Digby Race at the IUFRO Small-scale Forestry Conference (July, 2019).

The Otway Agroforestry Network (OAN) has run a Peer Group Mentoring program for more than 10 years for their members. The farmers who join the group receive ongoing support from a team of trained mentors who are paid to provide the service. The funds come from a range of sources, including from government, philanthropic and industry partners. The OAN regularly reviews their program and have identified five criteria for an effective mentor:

1. They own land within the OAN region;
2. They have personal experience in growing their own trees;
3. They have completed a Master TreeGrower course;
4. They are willing to share their experience with other landholders; and
5. They have the time and communication skills to participate in the program.
7.3. Delivering an Effective F2FM Program

The Otway Agroforestry Network developed a training manual for their Peer Group Mentoring program which identified 10 principles for an effective F2FM program (OAN unpublished):

**Principle 1:** The Peer Group Mentoring concept acknowledges the significant influence of peers, associates, neighbours and unrelated professionals have on land management decisions made by farmers.

**Principle 2:** The Peer Group Mentoring concept can add value to the work of researchers, professional extension agents and industry members, but only where the primacy of the farmer in making land management decisions and the need for new practices to reflect their particularly circumstances is acknowledged.

**Principle 3:** The Peer Group Mentoring concept should be part of a comprehensive extension program which aims to encourage and support landholder participation in the design and implementation of revegetation projects that reflect their interests and aspirations. Peer Group Mentors should not be used to deliver incentives, promote particular land management practices, or regulate landholder activities.

**Principle 4:** Although they may have a great deal of practical knowledge and expertise, Peer Group Mentors are not engaged in the project as “experts”. The attributes of an effective mentor include a willingness to share their experience and help others achieve their goals, and, an appreciation that land management practices must be tailored to the individual's needs and aspirations.

**Principle 5:** All mentors should participate in a group training program. The initial training should focus on the role and responsibilities of the mentor, include a ‘mock’ mentoring exercise, and encourage participants to contribute ideas about how the program could be delivered.

**Principle 6:** As a group, the mentors are an important part of the network. Regular meetings (dinners, field trips, seminars etc.) are conducted specifically for the mentors to gather feedback on their experiences, explore new opportunities, provide additional training, introduce new ideas and build their information networks.

**Principle 7:** Peer Group Mentors are allocated to a landholder by the PGM coordinator after an initial assessment of the property by members of the management team. The team would review the interests and needs of the landholder and identify a suitable mentor to work with the landholder as they develop and implement their plans. The mentor may or may not have been involved in the initial site visit.

**Principle 8:** The type and extent of support to be provided by the mentor is largely determined by negotiation between the landholder and the mentor (with some oversight by the PGM coordinator). There is a limit to the time and expertise that can be provided by the group in which case the network may suggest suitable consultants or contractors (or seek payment to the network for additional support). In any event, the mentors are encouraged to maintain contact with the landholders to follow developments.

**Principle 9:** By involving experienced and enthusiastic members in a peer group mentoring program and providing them with an opportunity to contribute to the review and development of the program helps instil ownership and pride in the group and its purpose.

**Principle 10:** To be effective the Peer Group Mentoring concept must be built on a commitment and willingness to engage local landholders in the identification, adaptation and evaluation of land management practices that they believe will help them solve their problems and achieve their goals. The benefits to the wider community flow from the shared goals of building sustainable and productive farming communities.
This list highlights the importance of having strong leadership and maintaining effective communication and support to the team of mentors. Whilst the success of the Bulukumba F2FM trial suggest that the concept is applicable to smallholder forestry in Indonesia, the limited progress of the F2FM trial in Gunungkidul and Pati highlights the importance of involving partners and farmers that understand and support the concept, and have the resources, time and willingness to commit to the program.

7.4. The Way Forward

Even though this F2FM trial provided some evidence supporting the potential of farmers’ learning from their peer, a better planned trial is needed. The local partners need to better understand the F2FM concept and provide support to the local mentors to perform their roles in helping other farmers, including financial support for transportation and their time. Some mentors may travel for some distance and lose time for their own jobs. The following points list the steps needed to conduct a more effective F2FM trial in the future:

1. Effective selection of project site/s for trial.
2. Effective selection of potential mentors (refer to PGM selection, Australia, noted above) from the project trial sites.
3. Proper selection of local partners who understand and support the F2FM concept (so they will help coordinate and support the mentors).
4. Conduct F2FM Training Workshop and develop a mentoring action plan with all participants.
5. Implementation of F2FM trial at the selected sites.
6. Monitoring and evaluation.
7. Project workshop for reflection, evaluation and recommendations.

8. Conclusions and Recommendations

This F2FM trial confirms the effectiveness of farmers’ learning from other farmers when it is planned and well supported. Farmers in Bulukumba learned from the three mentors and changed their tree and forest management practices as a result. All the farmers realised the importance of applying good silvicultural practices such as pruning and thinning to produce good quality timbers from their farms.

These effective learning and changes in tree and farm management can been attributed to the work of the farmers (mentors) who live in the same area and are actively practicing tree management on their own farms. Being willing to show other farmers good practices and explain why and how they are undertaken can have a powerful influence on surrounding farmers. As Pk Mukidin, the successful mentor from Ngrancah Village (Magelang, Central Java) stated: "... do not ask other farmers to do something that you yourself have not done on your farm". This is supported by another statement made by a farmer in Sumbawa: "... don’t let a field extension agent who has never grown trees to tell us how to grow trees".

On the basis of these findings, it is recommended that any future project undertake another F2FM trial with better planning and support from the local partners. The selection of project sites should focus on those areas where farmers are growing trees (for example in Duren Sawit Village - Pati; Katongan Village in Gunungkidul, and Malleleng Village in Bulukumba). There is also a need to ensure that every local partner fully understands and supports the F2FM concept and approach.
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