

EPICAH3 – Joint Report. How the Resilience of Cross-border Areas Can Be Increased at the European Level in the Area Under Study (Management and Enhancement of Natural and Cultural Heritage as a Dynamic Element of the Economy Through Tourism)

Peer review report

REVIEWER	
Your name and e-mail	Margit Säre, margitsare@gmail.com
Your organization (name, address, state, main interests, and geographical scope)	Peipis Center for Transboundary Cooperation (CTC) Puiestee 71a, 51009 Tartu; Estonia www.ctc.ee CTC works since 1994 to promote sustainable development of transboundary Lake Peipsi/Chudskoe region in the Estonian- Russian border are, and in the Estonian-Latvian border regions, Our main focus of work is Environmental education and heritage; and sustainable local resources management.
Representing which EPICAH project partner (number)	Number:PP7

1. GENERAL INFORMATION ON THE GOOD PRACTICE (to be filled before the peer review)		
EPICAH project partner responsible for the good practice (number, name)	PP4 Tokaj Wine Region Nonprofit LLC	
Title of the reviewed good practice	Digital Wine Tasting	
Location and geographical scope of the reviewed good practice	Tokaj wine region	
REVIEWEE: Main contact person (name and e-mail of the responsible / contact person)	Attila Kovacs, attila.kovacs@tbft.hu	
REVIEWEE: Main hosting organizations/presenters of the good practices (name, address, state, main interest, and geographical scope)	Gergely Ripka, host of TokajMagic and editor at TokajGuide, Hungary, https://tokajmagic.hu/en/#whoami Main interest: promotion of Tokaj wine region and its wines. Geographical scope: global.	



Hajnalka Szabo, president of Tokaj Renessaince Association, Hungary https://www.tokaji.hu/en/new-president-appointed-at-tokaj-reneszanszassociation/

Main interest: promotion of Tokaj wine region and its wines. Geographical scope: global.

2. NEEDS AND EXPECTATIONS OF THE REVIEWER (to be filled before the peer review)

Which problems and challenges of your territory/organization wants to address? Why did you choose the concrete good practice for the peer review?

As of 2 December 2021, Estonia belongs officially to the northern wine growing zone of Europe, which simplifies exporting of Estonian wines, as wine production is thoroughly regulated in the European Union. At the same time, Estonia is a very young wine growing country and its wineries are small. For the Estonian wineries, considerable share of their revenue was generated at on-site wine tastings.

Covid-19 and the restrictions caused by the pandemic have decreased or stopped on-site wine tastings and therefore the good practice promoted by Tokaj wine region was of interest for Estonian wineries.

What main kind of answers/information/findings would you like to gain from the peer review?

The peer review should answer to at least the following questions:

- What are the most important things and key steps to think about, when planning the online tasting?
- What have been your failures with organising online tastings?
- What kind of feedback have you received from the participants? Have you changed something in the set-up of online wine tasting due to the feedback?
- Have you promoted the experience of online wine tasting of Tokaj elsewhere in Hungary or Europe? What has been the feedback and what have you learned yourself from other wine regions?
- What has been the broader impact of Covid on Tokaj wine region and what other (digital) tools you have invented to overcome the problems caused by pandemic?

What method of the specific peer review is the most relevant for you? What would you like to do, to whom would you like to talk, which sites would you like to visit?

The most relevant method of the peer review would be an online interview with the practitioners and organisers of digital wine tastings from Tokaj wine region.

All participants of the online session are free to comment, ask questions and share their views.

MAIN FINDINGS OF THE PEER REVIEW

Peer review general introduction (when, where, how, participants, background, and preliminary

information gained before the peer review)

When: 7 March 2022

Where: Murimäe Wine Cellar, Valga county, Estonia and Google Meet

platform



***	European Union
1 3	European Regional
***	Development Fund

How (online, on-site, combination): combination of online and onsite; 5 persons on-site in Estonia, 2 persons online from Estonia, 4 persons online from Hungary, 1 person online from Spain.

What kind of information (in which form) did you gain before the peer review? Was it relevant and useful for you?

Before the event the reviewee (PP7) provided information about the key speakers of the event.

The information was useful, as it helped to design the list of questions and set-up for the event.

The information was useful also for promoting the event among Estonian stakeholders.

Methods/tools applied for the peer review. Was it relevant and useful for you?

The chosen method was a semi-structured interview, which was considered relevant and useful for the peer review.

Participants (organizations presenting the good practices) – reviewees:

Gergely Ripka, host of TokajMagic and editor at TokajGuide, Hungary Hajnalka Szabo, president of Tokaj Renessaince Association, Hungary Attila Kovacs, project manager of Tokaj Wine Region Nonprofit LLC

Further relevant information: n/a.

In general, did the peer review and lessons learned meet your expectations and needs? How was it relevant for the post-Covid context? Was it innovative? The peer review met the expectations, as the two key speakers provided useful and practical information about their experience with organising online wine tasting. As the key speakers - Gergely Ripka and Hajnalka Szabo - had been involved in organising different types of events for different target groups (business to business and business to customers) and with different aims (tasting special wines from Tokaj region vs event focusing on introducing the region and finding new business partners), their answers from different perspectives were complementing each other.

The peer review was very relevant for the post-Covid context, as the issue of making one's business attractive online and engaging customers over virtual means remains significant during the years to come.

Which problems and challenges of your organization/territory / PI were finally really addressed by the peer review?

The peer review addressed the challenge of making a winery (or any business of the food industry) attractive online during the present times, when all the businesses are investing into more visible presence in digital channels. The businesses have to make such investments, as the customer behaviour has changed due to Covid, and the expectations towards attractiveness of digital channels and availability of online content have increased among the customers.

Explain in detail the type of improvement you want to achieve with the exchange

The exchange of the good practice focused on very practical matters of organising an online wine tasting (as almost only possible tasting form for groups and foreigners during the pandemic).



	European Union
	European Regiona
	Development Fund

made? Would you transfer at least some part/detail of the good practice? How could it be used in the case of your organization/territory?	Most of the experience gathered during the good practice can be transferred and made use of by Estonian wineries. More specifically, the good practice helps to improve the preparedness of Estonian wineries, which are interested in online wine tastings, as their experience with organising such events till now is non-existent or very limited. As a result of the peer review, Peipsi CTC has compiled a short guidance document about organising an online wine tasting. The guidance document covers and helps to transfer the good practice regarding the following main points of organising an online wine tasting: - setting the aim of the event; - setting the target group; - putting together the organising team; - drafting the scenario of the event; - preparing the materials for the event; - technical requirements of the event. As it was several times mentioned: good preparation of the organiser and good technical solution is essential for the success of the event.
What are the most problematic issues for you to transfer the good practice "at home"?	The good practice is fairly easily transferable. There are no significant problematic issues. The main aspects affecting the extent of the use of the good practice is the availability of resources (time and finances) and the potential return on investment estimated by the local wine producers.
How will you transfer the good practice and improve the policy instrument?	Peipsi CTC will share the guidelines with the Estonian Rural Tourism Association and the network of Estonian wineries (Estonian Wine Route). The guidance document will be disseminated also among the JS and MA of the Estonia – Latvia Progamme, so they can make it available for the projects of the Estonia – Latvia Progarmme 2021-2027.
4. MAIN RECOMMENDATIONS	
	Firstly, feedback should be asked from the participants of the event. Based on the presented examples, the participants of the online wine

What do you think could be done differently to improve the reviewed good practices (your recommendation for the hosting organizations)?

Firstly, feedback should be asked from the participants of the event. Based on the presented examples, the participants of the online wine tasting events were not asked to provide feedback for the event. For more systematic approach and improving the organisation of the event, it is recommended to send a short questionnaire to the participants 1-2 days after the event.

Secondly, especially in case of business-to-business events, which have an aim to increase the sales, impact of an event should be monitored, as much as possible.

For example, in case of the event, which promoted Tokaj wines for the restaurants of Poland (based on 15 wineries of Tokaj region), it would have been useful to ask these 15 wineries about their export volumes to Poland before and a few months after the online wine tasting event.