# Results-Based Monitoring and Evaluation System (RBME)

**Acknowledgement**

Agricultural Training Institute Regional Training Center 8 (ATI-RTC 8) would like to thank the following people for their contribution to the success of the study:

(1) Municipal Mayors in the selected municipalities for their support;
(2) Municipal Agriculturists, for allowing their Agricultural Extension Workers in their respective municipalities to be tapped by ATI as enumerators for the farmer client-respondents;
(3) Agricultural Extension Workers of the selected municipalities for their time and effort as an enumerator of the conducted evaluation;
(4) Farmer and AEW client-respondents for their active participation in the conduct of the evaluation; and
(5) Planning, Monitoring, and Evaluation Unit (PMEU) for making this evaluation possible.

## Executive Summary

Results-Based Monitoring and Evaluation (RBME) is a powerful public management tool that is used to help policymakers and decision makers track progress and demonstrate the impact of a given project, program, or policy. The main purpose of the RBME system is to determine the results of the interventions of ATI – policies, programs, and projects – as it answers the "so what" questions.

The sample size for the farmers is 278 individuals. This is based on the assumption that there are at least 1000 farmer clients trained and not more than 2500 individual. For AEWs trained, the sample size is set at 72 individuals. The information gathered from AEWs served as reference and validation to the responses of farmers. A total of 350 individuals was interviewed. Proportionate allocation of sample was used to get the sample size for the farmer client-respondents and AEWs in selected municipalities. Primary and secondary data were both used. Descriptive statistics such as means, totals, frequencies, and percentages were used to analyze qualitative and quantitative data.

The trainings conducted by the ATI-RTC 8 covered 100% of the area in the 6 provinces of the region. The total number of clients served by the Center last 2015 is 66,215 and 8.44% of the total population are marginalized clients.

All of the client-respondents interviewed said that they have an increased in knowledge through trainings attended conducted by ATI. As one output of trainings, participants were tasked to prepare an action plan, and 66.86% of the client-respondents adopted and accomplished their action plans and 99.14% adopted new AF technologies introduced to them. Also, of the total trainees last 2015, 449 of them are certified with skills competencies (NC II and NC III).

Additionally, 100% were satisfied with the interventions they have received and 72.86% said that the interventions are relevant. On part of the Center, 100% of the interventions were accomplished as scheduled and the absorptive capacity is also 100%.

Furthermore, client-respondents claimed that their income increased by adopting the technologies taught to them through trainings, 82.86% of the total respondents has an increased in income, 26.57% of them are engaging into diversified farming, and 20.86% practices value-adding activities.

Moreover, out of the 350 client-respondents, 77.14% turned into agripreneurs and 36% are marginalized clients. Also, 4.57% of the clients employed in AF related job are promoted to a higher position for the past 3 years. Additionally, 4 learning sites are up-scaled into school for practical agriculture.

In addition, 64% of the client-respondents has alternative AF-related job competencies, 71.43% of these clients has social protection and 83.14% of them said that they are confident of coping from unfortunate events but only 72% have coped up with unfortunate events by applying adaptation and mitigation measures.

Lastly, 6.86% of the of the farms owned by the client-respondents are certified by other

accreditation body other than ATI, 4.86% of these farms has products that is also certified, and 8% of them produces demand-driven products.

Based on the results, pre-tests and post-tests should be strictly implemented, more climate-related topics should be incorporated in all of the trainings, and farmers/farm-owners should be encouraged more to produced demand-driven and certified products for them to engage in exports and be able to earn more.

## Table of Contents

## List of Tables

***AFE RBME Indicator Values***

*Increased Access to AFE Interventions*



*Improved Attitude, Skills, and Knowledge of Clients*



*Improved Provision of Interventions*



*Increased Productivity of Clients*



*Increased Empowerment of Clients*

*Increased Resiliency of Clients*



*Increased Competitiveness of Clients*



*Summary of the AFE RBME Results Indicators*

## List of Annexes

## List of Acronyms

| | |
|---|---|
| **4H** | Head, Heart, Hand, Health |
| **AEW** | Agricultural Extension Worker |
| **AF Technologies** | Agriculture and Fisheries Technologies |
| **AFE RBME** | Agricultural and Fisheries Extension Results-Based Monitoring and Evaluation |
| **ATI** | Agricultural Training Institute |
| **ATI – RTC 8** | Agricultural Training Institute - Regional Training Center 8 |
| **BFAR** | Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources |
| **CAW** | Code of Animal Welfare |
| **CSC** | Civil Service Commission |
| **DAR** | Department of Agrarian Reform |
| **DA-RFO 8** | Department of Agriculture – Regional Field Office 8 |
| **DBM** | Department of Budget and Management |
| **DENR** | Department of Environment and Natural Resources |
| **DILG** | Department of Interior and Local Government |
| **DOLE** | Department of Labor and Employment |
| **DOST** | Department of Science and Technology |
| **DOT** | Department of Tourism |
| **DSWD** | Department of Social Welfare and Development |
| **DTI** | Department of Trade and Industry |
| **FAO** | Food and Agriculture Organization |
| **FOs** | Farmers' Organizations |
| **FRA & UN OHCHR** | European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights and the Office of United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights |
| **GAHP** | Global Alliance on Health and Pollution |
| **GAP** | Good Agricultural Practices |
| **GMP** | Good Manufacturing Practices |
| **GSIS** | Government Service Insurance System |
| **HACCP** | Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Point |
| **ICT** | Information and Communication Technologies |
| **IEC Materials** | Information, Education and Communication Materials |
| **IPs** | Indigenous People |
| **LGU** | Local Government Unit |
| **LS** | Learning Site |
| **M & E** | Monitoring and Evaluation |
| **N** | Population |
| **n** | Sample Size |
| **N/A** | Not Applicable |
| **NC** | National Competency |
| **NDA** | National Dairy Authority |
| **NEDA** | National Economic and Development Authority |
| **NIA** | National Irrigation Authority |
| **OSY** | Out of School Youth |
| **PAG-ASA** | Philippine Atmospheric, Geophysical and Astronomical Services Administration |
| **PCA** | Philippine Coconut Authority |

| | |
|---|---|
| **PCIC** | Philippine Crop Insurance Corporation |
| **PhilFIDA** | Philippine Fiber Industry Development Authority |
| **PLGU** | Provincial Local Government Unit |
| **PNOC-EDC** | Philippine National Oil Company – Energy Development Corporation |
| **PTCACS** | Philippine TVET Competency Assessment and Certification System |
| **PWD** | Person with Disability |
| **SALT** | Sloping Agricultural Land Technology |
| **SBAP** | Swine Breeders Accreditation Program |
| **SOA** | School on Air |
| **SPA** | School for Practical Agriculture |
| **SSS** | Social Security System |
| **SUCs** | State Universities and Colleges |
| **TESDA** | Technical Education and Skills Development Authority |
| **TVET** | Technical and Vocational Education and Training |

## Background and Rationale

Monitoring and Evaluation is a complex, multi-disciplinary, skill-intensive endeavor - even more so when it is conducted at the levels of large programs, organizations or governments. At these more complex levels, there are two additional challenges. First, there is a need for M&E systems, not just frameworks, with consideration given to a range of organizational and human issues and challenges as well the purely technical aspects of M&E. These systems should be designed to last for years, so sustainability questions are critical from the start. Secondly, because M&E at these wider organizational levels has longer time-horizons than for a typical development project, it needs to concern itself with longer-term results: outcomes and even impacts, as well as outputs and activities. These are the attained results in Results-Based Monitoring and Evaluation (RBME).

Results-Based Monitoring and Evaluation (RBME) is designed to tell us whether we are doing the right things not just whether we are doing the things right. This calls for an understanding of the possibilities and limitations of acquiring data and knowledge about outcomes and impact. It measures and reports results to produce results (pro-active tool). RMBE is often seen as a dynamic tool of planning and budgeting for improving substantive performance and achieving results. It is an exercise to assess the performance of an institution and/or a program or a project, on the basis of impacts and benefits that the institution and/or the program/project is expected to produce.

This shift from the traditional Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) to RBME system entails a results-based approach which focuses on outputs, outcomes, and impact of interventions to clients to ensure the alignment of extension interventions to the Philippine Government's goals for the agriculture and fisheries sector in the country.

In pursuit of excellence and improved governance in Agriculture and Fisheries Extension services, the Agricultural Training Institute as the extension arm of the Department of Agriculture is currently institutionalizing the Agriculture and Fisheries Extension (AFE) Results-Based Monitoring and Evaluation (RBME) System.

## Purpose and Objective

The main purpose of the RBME system is to determine the results of our interventions – policies, programs, and projects – as it answers the "so what" questions. The information gathered from the AFE RBME system can help the ATI personnel, especially the ATI management and program implementers, to have a better knowledge and understanding of how our interventions work. Further, these information will help the ATI management come up with better-informed and evidence-based decisions towards continuous organizational improvement and reforms. Additionally, it will help us promote and report to the general public what our performance is being the apex agency for the agriculture and fisheries extension in the country. This performance doe not only account for accomplishments in terms of deliverables and outputs made but rather for positive changes that happened in the lives of our clients.

**Approach and Methodology**

*Data Collection and Sampling Method*

Using the guide in computing sample size as mentioned in the ATI Monitoring and Evaluation Guidelines and Toolkit (2017), the sample size for each training center is 278 farmer individuals. This is based on the assumption that there are at least 1000 farmer clients trained and not more than 2500 individual.

| |
|---|
| Population (N): Famers trained is < 1000 but > 2500<br>**Sample size (n): 278 individuals**<br>Margin of Error: ± 5<br>Confidence level: 95%<br>Distribution: 50% |

For AEWs trained, the sample size is set at 72 individuals. The information gathered from AEWs will serve as reference and validation to the responses of farmers. A total of at least 350 individuals was interviewed.

Proportionate allocation of sample was used to get the sample size for the farmer client-respondents and AEWs in selected municipalities (Annex 1 & 2).

Primary and secondary data were both used. The secondary data are based on previous reports and documents prepared by the center arranged to suit the needs of the RBME system. Another secondary data used was the database for the farmer clients which is provided by the Policy and Planning Division based on the consolidated TOACR submitted by the center. This list was used for gathering the primary data, which was collected through an interview using a structured questionnaire (Annex 3).

A formal request letter was given to the office of the municipal Mayor in each respective municipality requesting permission to conduct a survey on some of the barangays that are under his control.

*Analysis and Interpretation*

Descriptive statistics were used to characterize the effects of the interventions – policies, programs, and projects of the ATI-RTC 8. The study used means, totals, frequencies, and percentages to analyze qualitative and quantitative data.

*Limitations*

The evaluation aimed to provide a complete set of information that could describe the output, outcome, and impact of the interventions - policies, programs, and projects of ATI. The findings is limited only to the available data that were collected and used in this evaluation in determining the results of the interventions of the ATI.

**Results and Discussion**

*Socio-demographic Characteristics of Client-Respondents*

Based on the assumption that there are at least 1,000 farmer clients trained and not more than 2,500 individuals, also, by using the guide in computing sample size as mentioned in the ATI Monitoring and Evaluation Guidelines and Toolkit (2017), a sample of 278 farmers were interviewed.

For AEWs trained, the sample size is set at 72 individuals. Out of the 72 AEWs, 64 were engaged in farming and 10 AEWs were not. A total of 350 individuals were interviewed.

Type of client-respondents

| **Type** | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Farmers | 278 | 79.4% |
| AEWs - Engaged in farming | 64 | 18.3% |
| AEWs - Not engaged in farming | 8 | 2.3% |
| Total | 350 | 100.0% |

One hundred eighteen (118) or 80.8% of the male client-respondents are farmers and twenty eight (28) or 19.2% are AEWs. On the other hand, 78.4% or 160 of females are farmers and the remaining forty four (44) or 21.6% are AEWs.

Out of the three hundred fifty (350) respondents, 204 of them are females and the remaining 146 are males. This means that females are more responsive to invitations for trainings than males.

Gender of client-respondents

| **Type** | **Male** | | **Female** | | **Total** | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage |
| Farmers | 118 | 80.8% | 160 | 78.4% | 278 | 79.4% |
| AEWs | 28 | 19.2% | 44 | 21.6% | 72 | 20.6% |
| Total | 146 | 100.0% | 204 | 100.0% | 350 | 100.0% |

The table below shows that the percent distribution of respondents aged forty one to fifty years old is higher both in farmer client-respondents and AEWs. A total of 110 or 31.4% of the respondents are in this age group. Eighty seven (87) of the farmers and 23 of the AEWs belonged to this age range. Mean age of the farmer client-respondents is 52 years old while for the AEWs is 46 years old.

Thirteen (4.7%) farmers aged greater than 70 and 31.3% of them has age that ranges from 51-60. Based on the age classification of the National Economic Development Authority (NEDA), these farmer-clients are already old (46-60 years old) and are senior citizens (61 years old and above). Likewise, 31.9% of the AEWs belonged to the old age group.

Age of client-respondents

| **Range** | **Farmers** | | **AEWs** | | **Total** | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage |
| less than 21 | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| 21-30 | 12 | 4.3% | 3 | 4.2% | 15 | 4.3% |
| 31-40 | 28 | 10.1% | 21 | 29.2% | 49 | 14.0% |
| 41-50 | 87 | 31.3% | 23 | 31.9% | 110 | 31.4% |
| 51-60 | 87 | 31.3% | 19 | 26.4% | 106 | 30.3% |
| 61-70 | 51 | 18.3% | 6 | 8.3% | 57 | 16.3% |
| greater than 70 | 13 | 4.7% | 0 | 0.0% | 13 | 3.7% |
| Total | 278 | 100.0% | 72 | 100.0% | 350 | 100.0% |
| **Mean** | **52** | | **46** | | **51** | |

Majority (84.6%) of the client-respondents are married. This suggests that married people are more willing to engage in any activities/trainings that could give them additional source of livelihood and possibly increase their income. Also, the higher number of married client-respondents is correlated to the result in age, which is majority of them belonged to 41-50 age group.

Twenty six (7.4%) of the total client-respondents are widow/er, 7.1% are single, and 0.9% are separated.

Marital status of client-respondents

| **Status** | **Farmers** | | **AEWs** | | **Total** | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage |
| Single | 15 | 5.4% | 10 | 13.9% | 25 | 7.1% |
| Married | 240 | 86.3% | 56 | 77.8% | 296 | 84.6% |
| Separated | 2 | 0.7% | 1 | 1.4% | 3 | 0.9% |
| Widow/er | 21 | 7.6% | 5 | 6.9% | 26 | 7.4% |
| Total | 278 | 100.0% | 72 | 100.0% | 350 | 100.0% |

Most of the farmer client-respondents were not able to go to college. Seventy five or 27% of the farmers were on the primary level and did not able to finish elementary. Only 39 graduated in grade school, 64 reached high school level, and 43 graduated high school. Not being sent to school in a continuous manner by the parents/guardians might be the reason for it. Instead of going to

school, some of them might have chosen to give up/sacrifice their studies to earn a living for them to help their parents for the family needs.

Moreover, 81.9% of the AEWs are college graduates and 11 or 15.3% already pursue post graduate studies.

Educational attainment of client-respondents

| Level | Farmers | | AEWs | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage |
| Elementary Level | 75 | 27.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 75 | 21.4% |
| Elementary Graduate | 39 | 14.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 39 | 11.1% |
| High school Level | 64 | 23.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 64 | 18.3% |
| High school Graduate | 43 | 15.5% | 0 | 0.0% | 43 | 12.3% |
| College Level | 29 | 10.4% | 0 | 0.0% | 29 | 8.3% |
| College Graduate | 21 | 7.6% | 59 | 81.9% | 80 | 22.9% |
| Post-graduate | 3 | 1.1% | 11 | 15.3% | 14 | 4.0% |
| Vocational | 4 | 1.4% | 2 | 2.8% | 6 | 1.7% |
| Total | 278 | 100.0% | 72 | 100.0% | 350 | 100.0% |

More than one-half (51.7%) of the household of the client-respondents are composed of two (2) to four (4) members which is represented by one hundred eighty one (181) client-respondents. This household size is usually represented by a married couple having one (1) to two (2) children.

One hundred twenty four (124) or 35.4% of the total number of households have five (5) up to seven (7) members. Meanwhile, 8.3% have members ranging from eight (8) to ten (10). This is due to the presence of extended families in the area covered. Two (2) households, which is equivalent to 0.6%, is composed of 11 (11) members and above.

The average family size of the two types of households is usually differing with respect to its counts concerning the ranges of household size. However, data shows a homogenous distribution of household size between the two groups.

Household size of client-respondents

| Size | Farmers | | AEWs | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage |
| 1 | 11 | 4.0% | 3 | 4.2% | 14 | 4.0% |
| 2 to 4 | 142 | 51.1% | 39 | 54.2% | 181 | 51.7% |
| 5 to 7 | 97 | 34.9% | 27 | 37.5% | 124 | 35.4% |
| 8 to 10 | 26 | 9.4% | 3 | 4.2% | 29 | 8.3% |
| Greater than 10 | 2 | 0.7% | 0 | 0.0% | 2 | 0.6% |
| Total | 278 | 100.0% | 72 | 100.0% | 350 | 100.0% |
| **Mean** | **5** | | **4** | | **5** | |

The household head is the person who generally provides the chief source of income for the household unit. He is the adult person, male or female, who is responsible for the organization and care of the household or who is regarded as such by the members of the household. On the other hand, the household member is a person who can be claimed as a dependent for tax purposes. (PSA, 2017).

Fifty eight percent of the total respondents were household heads while the remaining 42% are household members. One hundred sixty three (163) farmers headed their households and the remaining 41.4% are household members. Furthermore, 55.6% of the AEWs are household heads and 44.4% are members.

Household role of client-respondents

| **Role** | **Farmers** | | **AEWs** | | **Total** | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage |
| Head | 163 | 58.6% | 40 | 55.6% | 203 | 58.0% |
| Member | 115 | 41.4% | 32 | 44.4% | 147 | 42.0% |
| Total | 278 | 100.0% | 72 | 100.0% | 350 | 100.0% |

Marginalized groups are composed of different groups of people within a given culture, context and history at risk of being subjected to multiple discrimination due to interplay of different personal characteristics or rounds, such as sex, gender, age, ethnicity, religion or belief, health status, disability, sexual orientation, gender identity, education or income, or living in various geographic localities. (FRA and UN OHCHR, 2018)

As a result, one hundred fifty five of the total client-respondents are part of the marginalized groups, 94.8% of this are farmers and 8 or 5.2% are AEWs. Some of these marginalized groups include, out of school youth (OSY), rural women, indigenous people (IPs), senior citizens, persons with disabilities (PWD), rebel returnees, etc.

Percentage of marginalized client-respondents

| **Type** | **Yes** | | **No** | | **Total** | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage |
| Farmers | 146 | 94.8% | 132 | 67.3% | 278 | 79.4% |
| AEWs | 8 | 5.2% | 64 | 32.8% | 72 | 20.6% |
| Total | 154 | 100.0% | 196 | 100.0% | 350 | 100.0% |

In connection to the 154 client respondents who claimed that they are part of a marginalized group, seventy two or 20.6% of them are senior citizens, 68 are farmers and the remaining 4 are AEWs. Linking this to our previous result which shows that 36% of our farmer-clients are already old (46-60 years old) and are senior citizens (61 years old and above). Also, 31.9% of the AEWs belonged to the old age group.

Furthermore, 66 or 18.9% of our client-respondents are rural women, nine or 2.6% are out of school youths (OSY), 5 (1.4%) are indigenous people (IPs), and the rest, 0.6% are persons with disabilities (PWDs).

Kind of marginalized client-respondents

| Kind | Farmers | | AEWs | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage |
| Out of School Youth | 9 | 3.2% | 0 | 0.0% | 9 | 2.6% |
| Rural Women | 62 | 22.3% | 4 | 5.6% | 66 | 18.9% |
| Indigenous People | 5 | 1.8% | 0 | 0.0% | 5 | 1.4% |
| Senior Citizen | 68 | 24.5% | 4 | 5.6% | 72 | 20.6% |
| Persons w/ Disabilities | 2 | 0.7% | 0 | 0.0% | 2 | 0.6% |
| N/A | 132 | 47.5% | 64 | 88.9% | 196 | 56.0% |
| Total | 278 | 100.0% | 72 | 100.0% | 350 | 100.0% |

According to Penunia (2011), Farmers' Organizations (FOs) are essential institutions for the empowerment, poverty alleviation and advancement of farmers and the rural poor. Politically, FOs strengthen the political power of farmers, by increasing the likelihood that their needs and opinions are heard by policy makers and the public.

A total of 272 client-respondents are members of different farmers' organizations, two hundred forty three or 89.3% are farmers and the remaining twenty nine or 10.7% are AEWS.

Client-respondents with membership to farmer organizations

| Type | Yes | | No | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage |
| Farmers | 243 | 89.3% | 35 | 44.9% |
| AEWs | 29 | 10.7% | 43 | 55.1% |
| Total | 272 | 100.0% | 78 | 100.0% |

The LS is a farm practicing applicable agricultural technologies, employing doable farming strategies and operating successfully, thus, worthy of emulation. It serve as model or an example to showcase applicable agriculture technologies and agri-products/by-products processing technologies. In this way, they are seen to help improve capabilities of small farmers and other rural community members.

From 350 client-respondents interviewed, twenty three or 79.3% farm-owners/farmers are already certified learning site of ATI.

Client-respondents certified as a learning site cooperator

| Type | Yes | | No | | N/A | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage |
| Farmers | 23 | 100.0% | 238 | 78.0% | 17 | 77.3% |
| AEWs | 0 | 0.0% | 67 | 22.0% | 5 | 22.7% |
| Total | 23 | 100.0% | 305 | 100.0% | 22 | 100.0% |

Rural farms tap by ATI will serve as Learning Sites (LS) for knowledge sharing opportunities for farmers and would-be farmers. Being an accredited LS is an advantage in terms of opportunities, connections, assistance, and market linkages. In that sense, farm owners will be encouraged and be more interested in developing their farm and apply for accreditation.

Consequently, 150 client-respondents were interested in becoming a learning site cooperator, 82.7% or 124 are farmers and the remaining twenty six (26) or 17.3% are AEWs.

Client-respondents interested in becoming a learning site cooperator

| Type | Yes | | No | | N/A | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage |
| Farmers | 124 | 82.7% | 130 | 82.3% | 24 | 57.1% |
| AEWs | 26 | 17.3% | 28 | 17.7% | 18 | 42.9% |
| Total | 150 | 100.0% | 158 | 100.0% | 42 | 100.0% |

*Extension Interventions Received by Client-Respondents*

One definition of agricultural extension widely used in the FAO publications sees extension as a service or system which assists farm people, through educational procedures, in improving farming methods and techniques, increasing production efficiency and income, bettering their levels of living and lifting the social and educational standards of rural life (Swanson, 1984).

Almost one half of the client-respondents (36.6%) received IEC materials from the center. Also, thirty five (35) or 10% listened trainings through School on the Air, 31 or 8.9% enrolled and finished e-Learning courses, 15 (4.3%) receives advisory services, and 3 (0.9%) AEWs received scholarships.

Other extension interventions received by client respondents from ATI

| Form | Farmers | | AEWs | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage |
| School on the Air | 29 | 10.4% | 6 | 8.3% | 35 | 10.0% |
| Advisory Services | 9 | 3.2% | 6 | 8.3% | 15 | 4.3% |
| e-Learning | 7 | 2.5% | 24 | 33.3% | 31 | 8.9% |
| IEC Materials | 80 | 28.8% | 48 | 66.7% | 128 | 36.6% |
| Scholarships | 0 | 0.0% | 3 | 4.2% | 3 | 0.9% |
| N/A | 168 | 60.4% | 18 | 25.0% | 186 | 53.1% |
| Total | 278 | 100.0% | 72 | 100.0% | 350 | 100.0% |

As the lead agency in agricultural and fisheries extension, the Agricultural Training Institute (ATI) also give other assistance other than free trainings.

One hundred eleven (111) or 31.7% of the trainees received farm inputs as after training support, 37 farmers received farm animals as livelihood support, 21 farmers received cash grants as support for being a learning site, and 3.6% of the farmers received farm tools and garden tools. Likewise, 8 farmers received other livelihood support.

Furthermore, 3 farmers and 1 AEW (1.1%) has gained connections and/or market linkages through the interventions of ATI. And 1 (0.3%) AEW received ICT from ATI.

Other assistance received by client-respondents from ATI

| Kind | Farmers | | AEWs | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage |
| Farm Animals | 37 | 13.3% | 0 | 0.0% | 37 | 10.6% |
| Farm Inputs | 99 | 35.6% | 12 | 16.7% | 111 | 31.7% |
| Machineries & Equipment | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Cash Grants | 21 | 7.6% | 0 | 0.0% | 21 | 6.0% |
| Market Linkage | 3 | 1.1% | 1 | 1.4% | 4 | 1.1% |
| Farm tools | 8 | 2.9% | 0 | 0.0% | 8 | 2.3% |
| Garden tools | 2 | 0.7% | 0 | 0.0% | 2 | 0.6% |
| ICT | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 1.4% | 1 | 0.3% |
| Livelihood support | 8 | 2.9% | 0 | 0.0% | 8 | 2.3% |
| N/A | 148 | 53.2% | 58 | 80.6% | 206 | 58.9% |
| Total | 278 | 100.0% | 72 | 100.0% | 350 | 100.0% |

According to FAO (2017), investing in agriculture has a greater impact on reducing poverty than investing in other sectors, as it offers the most direct route for rural people to benefit from their main assets: land and labor. Investment in small-scale family farming and in the livelihoods of fishers is an engine for sustainable poverty reduction.

In connection to this, different government agencies are exerting effort to help and capacitate farmers and extension workers through trainings and other types of support. Two hundred ninety two (292) of the interviewed client-respondents claimed that they received interventions from different national government agencies aside from ATI.

Client-respondents that received interventions from other government agencies

| **Type** | **Yes** | | **No** | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage |
| Farmers | 238 | 81.5% | 40 | 69.0% |
| AEWs | 54 | 18.5% | 18 | 31.0% |
| Total | 292 | 100.0% | 58 | 100.0% |

More than one half of the client-respondents (59.7%) have attended trainings conducted/ sponsored by national government agencies and 35.7% or 125 of them received farm inputs (seeds, fertilizers, etc.) as after training support.

Moreover, 87 (24.9%) became beneficiaries of livelihood projects. In relation to this, 43 or 12.3% of the beneficiaries received farm animal as livelihood support, 37 or 10.6% received machineries and equipment, and 25 or 7.1% received cash grants. Furthermore, 9 farmers and 2 AEWs have already built connections and increased market linkages through ATI.

Interventions received by client-respondents from other government agencies

| **Type** | **Farmers** | | **AEWs** | | **Total** | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage |
| Trainings | 147 | 52.9% | 62 | 86.1% | 209 | 59.7% |
| Livelihood Projects | 79 | 28.4% | 8 | 11.1% | 87 | 24.9% |
| Cash Grants | 18 | 6.5% | 7 | 9.7% | 25 | 7.1% |
| Farm Inputs | 98 | 35.3% | 27 | 37.5% | 125 | 35.7% |
| Farm Animals | 37 | 13.3% | 6 | 8.3% | 43 | 12.3% |
| Machineries or Equipment | 31 | 11.2% | 6 | 8.3% | 37 | 10.6% |
| Market Linkage | 9 | 3.2% | 2 | 2.8% | 11 | 3.1% |
| N/A | 83 | 29.9% | 4 | 5.6% | 87 | 24.9% |
| Total | 278 | 100.0% | 72 | 100.0% | 350 | 100.0% |

More than one-half (57.7%) of the client-respondents received interventions from DA-RFO 8, 159 from the farmers and 43 from the AEWs. Our client-respondents also received interventions from LGU (15.1%), Municipal Agriculture Office (11.1%), DSWD (7.4%), DAR (5.7%), and PCA (5.4%), City and Provincial Agriculture Office (4.3%), and DOLE (4%).

Moreover, they received interventions from PRC, FAO, BFAR, PNOC-EDC, Land Bank, DILG, NIA, TESDA, PCIC, DTI, DENR, NDA, DOT, DOST, SUCs, PAG-ASA, CSC, PLGU, DBM, NFA, and PhilFIDA.

Government agencies in which client-respondents received other interventions

| Agency | Farmers | | AEWs | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage |
| DA-RFO 8 | 159 | 57.2% | 43 | 59.7% | 202 | 57.7% |
| Provincial Agriculture Office | 13 | 4.7% | 2 | 2.8% | 15 | 4.3% |
| City Agriculture Office | 15 | 5.4% | 0 | 0.0% | 15 | 4.3% |
| Municipal Agriculture Office | 39 | 14.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 39 | 11.1% |
| DAR | 18 | 6.5% | 2 | 2.8% | 20 | 5.7% |
| DENR | 3 | 1.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 3 | 0.9% |
| BFAR | 2 | 0.7% | 5 | 6.9% | 7 | 2.0% |
| NDA | 2 | 0.7% | 0 | 0.0% | 2 | 0.6% |
| PhilFIDA | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 1.4% | 1 | 0.3% |
| PCA | 14 | 5.0% | 5 | 6.9% | 19 | 5.4% |
| NIA | 4 | 1.4% | 0 | 0.0% | 4 | 1.1% |
| FAO | 5 | 1.8% | 2 | 2.8% | 7 | 2.0% |
| NFA | 1 | 0.4% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.3% |
| DBM | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 1.4% | 1 | 0.3% |
| DILG | 2 | 0.7% | 2 | 2.8% | 4 | 1.1% |
| DTI | 3 | 1.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 3 | 0.9% |
| DOLE | 12 | 4.3% | 2 | 2.8% | 14 | 4.0% |
| DOT | 1 | 0.4% | 1 | 1.4% | 2 | 0.6% |
| DSWD | 25 | 9.0% | 1 | 1.4% | 26 | 7.4% |
| LGU | 50 | 18.0% | 3 | 4.2% | 53 | 15.1% |
| PLGU | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 1.4% | 1 | 0.3% |
| DOST | 0 | 0.0% | 2 | 2.8% | 2 | 0.6% |
| CSC | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 1.4% | 1 | 0.3% |
| PRC | 7 | 2.5% | 0 | 0.0% | 7 | 2.0% |
| PAG-ASA | 1 | 0.4% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.3% |
| SUCs | 2 | 0.7% | 0 | 0.0% | 2 | 0.6% |
| TESDA | 3 | 1.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 3 | 0.9% |
| Land Bank | 4 | 1.4% | 0 | 0.0% | 4 | 1.1% |
| PCIC | 3 | 1.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 3 | 0.9% |
| PNOC-EDC | 6 | 2.2% | 0 | 0.0% | 6 | 1.7% |
| *N/A | 40 | 14.4% | 18 | 25.0% | 58 | 16.6% |
| Total | 278 | 100.0% | 72 | 100.0% | 350 | 100.0% |

*N/A - no intervention received from other government agencies

*Farming Characteristics of Client-Respondents*

Agricultural activities involves any activities directly related to the production or processing of crops, dairy products, poultry, or livestock for initial commercial sale or as a principal means of personal subsistence. Also it includes any activities directly interrelated to the cultivation or harvesting of trees and those that are related to fish farms.

Three hundred forty one (341) of the total client-respondents interviewed responded that they engaged in different agricultural activities last year. Two hundred seventy seven (277) or 81.2% are farmers and the remaining 64 or 18.8% are AEWs.

Percentage of client-respondents engaged in agricultural activities in the last year

| Type | Yes | | No | | *N/A | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage |
| Farmers | 277 | 81.2% | 1 | 100.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| AEWs | 64 | 18.8% | 0 | 0.0% | 8 | 100.0% |
| Total | 341 | 100.0% | 1 | 100.0% | 8 | 100.0% |

**N/A – AEWs not engaged in farming*

More than one half (81.3%) of the farmer client-respondents, were engaged both in crop and animal/fish production, 48 or 17.3% are cultivating their land to produce crops, and 3 (1.1%) practiced animal husbandry. On the contrary, one farmer did not able to engage in any particular agricultural activity last year. Busy with direct selling business which she earns less than 50,000 annually and no available personal resources are some of her reasons.

In addition to, 45.8% of the AEWs are also involved both in crop and animal/fish production, 34.7% are into crop production, 6.9% does animal husbandry, and 1.4% ventures into fish production. Also, eight (8) or 11.1% AEWs did not able to engage in agricultural activities due to hectic schedules as an extension worker.

Agricultural activities in which client-respondents are engaged in

| Activity | Farmers | | AEWs | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage |
| Crop production | 48 | 17.3% | 25 | 34.7% | 73 | 20.9% |
| Animal husbandry | 3 | 1.1% | 5 | 6.9% | 8 | 2.3% |
| Fishing | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 1.4% | 1 | 0.3% |
| Both-Crop & Animal/Fishing | 226 | 81.3% | 33 | 45.8% | 259 | 74.0% |
| None | 1 | 0.4% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.3% |
| *N/A | 0 | 0.0% | 8 | 11.1% | 8 | 2.3% |
| Total | 278 | 100.0% | 72 | 100.0% | 350 | 100.0% |

**N/A – AEWs not engaged in farming*

There are different reasons why almost all of our client-respondents engaged in different agricultural activities. More than one-half or 88.1% of our farmers invested their time, effort and money in farming, animal husbandry, and/or fishing to earn income. The remaining 32 or 11.5% used it for personal consumption. Also, one farmer/learning site cooperator used his accreditation as a reason why he engaged into farming.

On the other hand, AEWs has a lot of reasons why despite of busy days they still find time to enjoy farming/animal husbandry/fishing. Some of their reasons are for personal consumption (16.7%), as an additional source of income (69.5%), for them to gain actual experience to serve as a role model and can re-echo techniques or technologies learned to the farmers, in line with work or as a mandate for acquiring higher positions, and for other extension services.

Reasons for client-respondents for engaging in agricultural activities

| Reason | Farmers | | AEWs | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage |
| Personal Consumption | 32 | 11.5% | 12 | 16.7% | 44 | 12.6% |
| Source of Income | 245 | 88.1% | 49 | 68.1% | 294 | 84.0% |
| Gain actual experience | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 1.4% | 1 | 0.3% |
| Re-echo to farmers | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 1.4% | 1 | 0.3% |
| Mandated as MA | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 1.4% | 1 | 0.3% |
| In line with work | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 1.4% | 1 | 0.3% |
| For municipal plant nursery | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 1.4% | 1 | 0.3% |
| For extension services | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 1.4% | 1 | 0.3% |
| Additional income | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 1.4% | 1 | 0.3% |
| Learning Site | 1 | 0.4% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.3% |
| N/A | 1 | 0.4% | 8 | 11.1% | 9 | 2.6% |
| Total | 278 | 100.0% | 72 | 100.0% | 350 | 100.0% |

One hundred forty three (143) or 51.4% of the farmer client-respondents are tenant of the land that they cultivated, thirteen (4.7%) are leaseholders and only 42.8% or 119 are legal land owners.

On the contrary, more than one half (62.5%) of the AEWs owned their lands, only 20.8% or 15 are tenants, and 4 (5.6%) are lessee.

Land tenure of client-respondents

| Tenure | Farmers | | AEWs | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage |
| Owner | 119 | 42.8% | 45 | 62.5% | 164 | 46.9% |
| Lessee | 13 | 4.7% | 4 | 5.6% | 17 | 4.9% |
| Tenant | 143 | 51.4% | 15 | 20.8% | 158 | 45.1% |
| N/A | 3 | 1.1% | 8 | 11.1% | 11 | 3.1% |
| Total | 278 | 100.0% | 72 | 100.0% | 350 | 100.0% |

Fifty five or 33.5% of the combined numbers of farmers and AEWs are owning land size which ranges from one to three hectares.

Data shows that at higher ranges, eight of the total number of farmer client-respondents which is 6.7% of the population is owning a land that ranges from five to nine hectares while only one (2.2%) of the AEWs owned land at this range.

The mean land size owned by the farmer client-respondents is 1.14 ha while for the AEWs is 1.59 ha.

Size of land owned by client-respondents

| Size | Farmers | | AEWs | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage |
| backyard | 14 | 11.8% | 9 | 20.0% | 23 | 14.0% |
| less than 1 | 38 | 31.9% | 11 | 24.4% | 49 | 29.9% |
| 1 to 3 | 38 | 31.9% | 17 | 37.8% | 55 | 33.5% |
| 3 to 5 | 21 | 17.6% | 4 | 8.9% | 25 | 15.2% |
| 5 to 7 | 7 | 5.9% | 1 | 2.2% | 8 | 4.9% |
| 7 to 9 | 1 | 0.8% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.6% |
| more than 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| N/A | 0 | 0.0% | 3 | 6.7% | 3 | 1.8% |
| Total | 119 | 100.0% | 45 | 100.0% | 164 | 100.0% |
| **Mean** | **1.14** | | **1.59** | | **1.48** | |

Almost all of the client-respondents owned the lot that they are cultivating, only 17 has leased lands. The average land size leased by the farmer client-respondents is .83 ha while for the AEWs is .90 ha.

Seventy seven percent or ten of the farmer client-respondents and fifty percent or 2 AEWs have leased land that ranges from less than one hectares to three hectares. The remaining 4 or 23.5%

of the client respondents has a land leased at a sized of their backyards.

Size of land leased by client-respondents

| Size | Farmers | | AEWs | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage |
| backyard | 2 | 15.4% | 2 | 50.0% | 4 | 23.5% |
| less than 1 | 5 | 38.5% | 1 | 25.0% | 6 | 35.3% |
| 1 to 3 | 5 | 38.5% | 1 | 25.0% | 6 | 35.3% |
| 3 to 5 | 1 | 7.7% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 5.9% |
| 5 to 7 | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| 7 to 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| more than 9 | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| N/A | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Total | 13 | 100.0% | 4 | 100.0% | 17 | 100.0% |
| **Mean** | **.83** | | **.90** | | **.89** | |

Out of the 339 (96.9%) client respondents who has land (owner, lease, and tenant) cultivates it for crop production. The mean land size used by the farmers for crop production is 1.26 ha while the average land size used for crop production by the AEWs is 1.09 ha. The mean land size used by farmers for crop production is higher compared to the land size used by AEWs. Farmers has bigger land used for crop production compared to the AEWS because their main source of income is derived from agricultural production.

Thirty six percent of the farmers has a land size used for crop production that is less than 1 ha, 34.9% has a land size that ranges from 1 to 3 ha, 14.4% used their backyard, 10.1% has 3 to 5 ha, and the rest, 3.7% has 5 ha and above.

Moreover, almost one-half (30.6%) of the AEWs has a land size used for crop production that ranges from 1 to 3 ha. Seventeen or 23.6% has less than 1 ha, 19.4% used their backyard, and 7% has 3 ha and above.

Size of land used for crop production

| Size | Farmers | | AEWs | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage |
| backyard | 40 | 14.4% | 14 | 19.4% | 54 | 15.4% |
| less than 1 | 100 | 36.0% | 17 | 23.6% | 117 | 33.4% |
| 1 to 3 | 97 | 34.9% | 22 | 30.6% | 119 | 34.0% |
| 3 to 5 | 28 | 10.1% | 4 | 5.6% | 32 | 9.1% |
| 5 to 7 | 8 | 2.9% | 1 | 1.4% | 9 | 2.6% |
| 7 to 9 | 1 | 0.4% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.3% |
| more than 9 | 1 | 0.4% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.3% |
| N/A | 3 | 1.1% | 14 | 19.4% | 17 | 4.9% |
| Total | 278 | 100.0% | 72 | 100.0% | 350 | 100.0% |
| **Mean** | **1.26** | | **1.09** | | **1.23** | |

In agriculture, multiple cropping is the practice of growing two or more crops in the same piece of land in same rowing seasons. It is a form of polyculture. It can take the form of double-cropping, in which a second crop is planted after the first has been harvested, or relay cropping, in which the second crop is started amidst the first crop before it has been harvested. A related practice, companion planting, is sometimes used in gardening and intensive cultivation of vegetables and fruits. (Bunnett, 2002)

Almost all of the farmer client-respondents (81.5%) are practicing multiple cropping while forty six or 18.5% of the AEWs are also applying it too. A total of two hundred forty nine client-respondents are doing multiple cropping.

Percentage of client-respondents practicing multiple cropping

| Type | Yes | | No | | N/A | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage |
| Farmers | 203 | 81.5% | 72 | 85.7% | 3 | 17.6% |
| AEWs | 46 | 18.5% | 12 | 14.3% | 14 | 82.4% |
| Total | 249 | 100.0% | 84 | 100.0% | 17 | 100.0% |

A crop is a plant or animal product that can be grown and harvested extensively for profit or subsistence. Crop may refer either to the harvested parts or to the harvest in a more refined state. Most crops are cultivated in agriculture or aquaculture. Most crops are harvested as food for humans or fodder for livestock.

The term "food crops" refers to the world's major food supply derived from plants; a crop assumes human intervention through agriculture. In the main, food crops consist of grains (e.g. rice and corn), legumes (including dried beans), vegetables, fruits, herbs and spices,

beverage plants such as tea and coffee, and root crops.

Important non-food crops include horticulture, floriculture and industrial crops. Horticulture crops include plants used for other crops (e.g. fruit trees). Floriculture crops include bedding plants, houseplants, flowering garden and pot plants, cut cultivated greens, and cut flowers. Industrial crops are produced for clothing (fiber crops), biofuel (energy crops, algae fuel), or medicine (medicinal plants).

Grains have served as a staple food here in the Philippines. Grains are a principal source of human food, with rice and corn (maize) being the most widely consumed sources of grains in the country. More than one-half (61.2%) of the farmer client-respondents are planting rice and corn and also 56.9% of the AEWs.

Vegetables are an excellent source of vitamins, minerals and roughage in the human diet. Leaves are particularly important in terms of nutrients, while root vegetables contain the starch and natural sugars that supply humans with energy. Vegetables are grown both commercially and as a typical backyard or sustainable lifestyle food crop. The farmer client-respondents are planting different types of vegetables on their land, 55.4% of the population to be exact. Likewise, 56.9% of the AEWs are also cultivating vegetables.

Crops planted by client-respondents

| **Crops** | **Farmers** | | **AEWs** | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage |
| Vegetables | 154 | 55.4% | 41 | 56.9% |
| Herbs and Spices | 42 | 15.1% | 10 | 13.9% |
| Fruits | 34 | 12.2% | 10 | 13.9% |
| Grains | 170 | 61.2% | 41 | 56.9% |
| Beverage Plant | 3 | 1.1% | 2 | 2.8% |
| Industrial Crops | 64 | 23.0% | 12 | 16.7% |
| Horticulture Crops | 20 | 7.2% | 4 | 5.6% |
| Floriculture Crops | 2 | 0.7% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Forages | 2 | 0.7% | 1 | 1.4% |
| Forest Products | 1 | 0.4% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Legumes | 49 | 17.6% | 6 | 8.3% |
| Root crops | 82 | 29.5% | 11 | 15.3% |
| N/A | 4 | 1.4% | 14 | 19.4% |

Farm animals could be livestock or poultry. Livestock are domesticated animals raised in an agricultural setting to produce labor and commodities such as meat, eggs, fur, leather, and wool. The term is sometimes used to refer solely to those that are bred for consumption, while other times it refers only to farmed ruminants, such as cattle and goats. The most common livestock raised by the client-respondents is pig, 115 farmers raised pigs and 29 AEWs.

Poultry are domesticated birds kept by humans for their eggs, their meat or their feathers. These birds are most typically members of the superorder Galloanserae (fowl), especially the

order Galliformes (which includes chickens, quails, and turkeys). One hundred sixty three or 71.80% of the farmers while 33 (84.60%) of the AEWs has chickens.

Some client-respondents are also into fish farming or pisciculture. It involves raising fish commercially in tanks or enclosures such as fish ponds, usually for food. The average fingerlings raised by the farmers is 890 and for the AEWs is 1,254.

Animals raised by client-respondents

| Animal | Farmers | | | AEWs | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Average No. of Heads | Frequency | Percentage | Average no. of Heads | Frequency | Percentage |
| Chicken | 15 | 163 | 71.80% | 41 | 33 | 84.60% |
| Cattle | 3 | 26 | 11.50% | 1 | 1 | 2.60% |
| Ducks | 15 | 29 | 12.80% | 20 | 6 | 15.40% |
| Fish | 890 | 17 | 7.50% | 1,254 | 8 | 20.50% |
| Carabao | 2 | 95 | 41.90% | 2 | 14 | 35.90% |
| Pigs | 5 | 115 | 50.70% | 5 | 29 | 74.40% |
| Sheep | 3 | 1 | 0.40% | 4 | 1 | 2.60% |
| Rabbit | 0 | 0 | 0.00% | 0 | 0 | 0.00% |
| Goats | 5 | 59 | 26.00% | 7 | 10 | 25.60% |
| Goose | 2 | 1 | 0.40% | 0 | 0 | 0.00% |
| Horse | 3 | 3 | 1.30% | 0 | 0 | 0.00% |
| Cow | 1 | 1 | 0.40% | 0 | 0 | 0.00% |
| Dog | 3 | 6 | 2.60% | 0 | 0 | 0.00% |
| Turkey | 0 | 0 | 0.00% | 4 | 4 | 10.30% |
| Game fowls | 0 | 0 | 0.00% | 20 | 1 | 2.60% |

Two hundred forty or 68.6% of the combined numbers of farmers and AEWs are earning income which is less than 50,000 annually.

Twenty eight (10.1%) of the farmers are earning income that ranges from 50,001 to 100,000, 3.2% earns 100,001 to 150,000, and 2.3% are has an annual income of 150,001 to 350,000. Furthermore, one farmer (0.4%) earns 400,001 to 450,000 annually.

On the other hand, 9.7% of the AEWs are earning from 50,001 to 100,000 and 3 or 4.2% has an annual income of 200,001 to 250,000.

Annual net farm income of client-respondents

| Income | Farmers | | AEWs | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage |
| less than 50,000 | 201 | 72.3% | 39 | 54.2% | 240 | 68.6% |
| 50,001-100,000 | 28 | 10.1% | 7 | 9.7% | 35 | 10.0% |
| 100,001-150,000 | 9 | 3.2% | 0 | 0.0% | 9 | 2.6% |
| 150,001-200,000 | 3 | 1.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 3 | 0.9% |
| 200,001-250,000 | 1 | 0.4% | 3 | 4.2% | 4 | 1.1% |
| 250,001-300,000 | 1 | 0.4% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.3% |
| 300,001-350,000 | 1 | 0.4% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.3% |
| 350,001-400,000 | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| 400,001-450,000 | 1 | 0.4% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.3% |
| more than 450,000 | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| N/A | 33 | 11.9% | 23 | 31.9% | 56 | 16.0% |
| Total | 278 | 100.0% | 72 | 100.0% | 350 | 100.0% |

*Non-farming Characteristics of Client-Respondents*

A total of two hundred twenty five of the combined number of the farmers and AEWs responded that they have other sources of income. Sixty eight of it are farmers and the remaining thirty two percent are AEWs.

These other sources of income includes income from business, wages or salaries, remittances, honorariums, assistance from other family members or from the government, and other non-farm income.

Percentage of client-respondents with other sources of income

| Type | Yes | | No | | N/A | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage |
| Farmers | 153 | 68.0% | 125 | 100.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| AEWs | 72 | 32.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Total | 225 | 100.0% | 125 | 100.0% | 0 | 0.0% |

Sources of income are used as a determinant in knowing how much money a household earns. Having multiple sources of income does not always mean that a household or an individual earns more than those who only have single source of income.

Aside from agricultural income, almost one-half or 38% of the client-respondents receives earned

wages or employment salary from working as laborers and service workers or as honorarium for being a barangay employee/official. Some of the client-respondents (29.7%) derived their income from venturing into non-farming business, while 4 or 1.1% receives assistance from other family members working outside the region or abroad. Moreover, 7 of them or 2% receives government assistance (e.g. pension).

Other sources of income by the client respondents

| Source | Farmers | | AEWs | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage |
| Employment salary and wages | 61 | 21.9% | 72 | 100.0% | 133 | 38.0% |
| Non-farming business ventures | 95 | 34.2% | 9 | 12.5% | 104 | 29.7% |
| Family assistance | 3 | 1.1% | 1 | 1.4% | 4 | 1.1% |
| Government assistance | 7 | 2.5% | 0 | 0.0% | 7 | 2.0% |
| N/A | 125 | 45.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 125 | 35.7% |
| Total | 278 | 100.0% | 72 | 100.0% | 350 | 100.0% |

As shown in the table below, almost one half (45.1%) of the client respondents are earning income under 50,000. One hundred thirty two or 47.5% of the farmers are earning at this range on their other sources of income. Likewise, on the 36.1% of the AEWs.
One farmer and one AEW earns 450,000 and above annually on their other sources of income. And most of the AEWs derived their income on their wages/salaries as government employee, which ranges from 50,001 to 450,000 and above annually.

Annual net income of client-respondents from other sources

| Income | Farmers | | AEWs | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage |
| Under 50, 000 | 132 | 47.5% | 26 | 36.1% | 158 | 45.1% |
| 50,001 - 100,000 | 17 | 6.1% | 19 | 26.4% | 36 | 10.3% |
| 100,001 - 150,000 | 0 | 0.0% | 4 | 5.6% | 4 | 1.1% |
| 150,001 - 200,000 | 2 | 0.7% | 7 | 9.7% | 9 | 2.6% |
| 200,001 - 250,000 | 1 | 0.4% | 8 | 11.1% | 9 | 2.6% |
| 250,001 - 300,000 | 0 | 0.0% | 2 | 2.8% | 2 | 0.6% |
| 300,001 - 350,000 | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 1.4% | 1 | 0.3% |
| 350,001 - 400,000 | 0 | 0.0% | 2 | 2.8% | 2 | 0.6% |
| 400,001 - 450,000 | 0 | 0.0% | 2 | 2.8% | 2 | 0.6% |
| 450,000 and over | 1 | 0.4% | 1 | 1.4% | 2 | 0.6% |
| N/A | 125 | 45.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 125 | 35.7% |
| Total | 278 | 100.0% | 72 | 100.0% | 350 | 100.0% |

***AFE RBME Indicator Values:***

*Increased Access to AFE Interventions*

1. # of clients served

In 2015, the Center implemented different trainings which was participated in by 3,354 farmers, 1,118 AEWs, and 1,118 other participants or private individuals. The Center also conducted 2 School-on-the-Air (SOA) programs on organic vegetable production in Samar and in Southern Leyte under the OA and HVCDPs, respectively. The SOA in Samar had 350 graduates while the one in Southern Leyte had 624 graduates, a total of 974 SOA graduates.

Moreover, farms and farm-owners who qualified the evaluation for the establishment of learning sites were given support through financial and technical assistance. These learning sites serves as venue for job training site for farmers, would-be farmers, students and other people who are interested to go into farming. This also serves as venue for actual farm demo to complement the classroom trainings of ATI and even trainings from other institutions. Last 2015, the Center supported the establishment of 12 learning sites.

In addition, a total of 59,203 copies of IEC materials were distributed to both training and walk-in clients in the Center. Three hundred sixty five walk-in clients were provided with advisory services and 71 received scholarships. Thus, the total number of clients served by the Center last 2015 is 66,215.

On the contrary, the Center did not administer E-learning courses last 2015.

**Number of clients served**

| Type | Number |
|---|---|
| Trained clients | |
| Farmers | 3,354 |
| Fisher folk | 0 |
| AEWs | 1,118 |
| Others (private individuals) | 1,118 |
| SOA graduates | 974 |
| *E-learning course graduates | N/A |
| Learning site certified | 12 |
| Clients provided with IEC materials | 59,203 |
| Individuals | |
| Groups/Organizations | |
| Walk-in clients provided with advisory services | 365 |
| Scholarship recipients | 71 |
| **Total** | 66,215 |

**E-learning course graduates – the center did not administer E-learning courses*

2. % of marginalized clients trained

Out of 5,590 total number of participants, 1,743 claimed that they are part of a marginalized group, 1,091 or 19.52% of them are senior citizens. Linking this to our previous result which shows that out of the 350 client-respondents surveyed, 36% of our farmer-clients are already old

(46-60 years old) and are senior citizens (61 years old and above). Also, 31.9% of the AEWs belonged to the old age group.

Furthermore, 291or 5.20% of the participants are out of school youths (OSY), 232 or 4.15% are rural women, 83 (1.48%) are indigenous people (IPs), and the rest, 46 or 0.82% are persons with disabilities (PWDs).

**Percent of marginalized clients trained**

| Type | Number | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Out of School Youth | 291 | 5.20% |
| Rural Women | 232 | 4.15% |
| Indigenous People | 83 | 1.48% |
| Senior Citizen | 1,091 | 19.52% |
| Persons with Disabilities | 46 | 0.82% |
| Rebel Returnees | 0 | 0.00% |
| Others | 0 | 0.00% |
| **TOTAL** | 5,590 | 100% |

3. % of area coverage

Learning is all about equipping a person to tackle not just today's issues, but preparing him/her to creatively come up with ways to tackle tomorrow's issues. Extension workers, farmers, and other AFE sectors are continually trained by the Center to capacitate them how things are done so that they can carry out a process on their own.

Almost half (49%) participants were from the Leyte province and 13% were from the province of Samar. Both Southern Leyte and Eastern Samar has 12% of the total number of trainees. Additionally, 8% were from Northern Samar and 6% from Biliran.

**Percentage of coverage in terms of area ***

| Province | No. of Municipalities & Cities | Percent Coverage |
|---|---|---|
| Province # 1 Leyte | 47 | 49% |
| Province # 2 Southern Leyte | 21 | 12% |
| Province # 3 Samar | 29 | 13% |
| Province # 4 Eastern Samar | 25 | 12% |
| Province # 5 Northern Samar | 25 | 8% |
| Province # 6 Biliran | 9 | 6% |
| **Average % Coverage** | 156 | 100% |

*Improved Attitude, Skills, and Knowledge of Clients*

4. % of clients saying that they have an increased knowledge

The level of knowledge of the training participants on the topics discussed during the training are assess using the rating scale: very much, moderate, slight, and not at all.

Results showed that more than half (60.6%) of the total client-respondents gained very much knowledge due to the interventions that they received from ATI. One hundred twenty two or 34.9% gained moderate level of knowledge and 4.6% claimed that they only gained slight

learnings from any interventions received.

Degree in knowledge gained by client-respondents due to the interventions received

| Rating | Farmers | | AEWs | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage |
| Very much | 154 | 55.4% | 58 | 80.6% | 212 | 60.6% |
| Moderate | 108 | 38.8% | 14 | 19.4% | 122 | 34.9% |
| Slight | 16 | 5.8% | 0 | 0.0% | 16 | 4.6% |
| Not at all | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Total | 278 | 100.0% | 72 | 100.0% | 350 | 100.0% |

5. % of clients passing the Post-test

Pre-tests and post-tests are still not strictly implemented by the Center last 2015. Thus, no record on post-test results can be shown.

**Average percentage of post-test scores of clients**

| Commodity Program | Percentage |
|---|---|
| Organic agriculture | None |
| Rice | None |
| Corn | None |
| High-value crops | None |
| Livestock | None |
| **Average Post-Test Scores** | None |

**No record on pre-test and post-test result*

**Percentage of clients passing the post-test**

| Commodity Program | Percentage |
|---|---|
| Organic agriculture | None |
| Rice | None |
| Corn | None |
| High-value crops | None |
| Livestock | None |
| **Average Post-Test Scores** | None |

**No record on pre-test and post-test result*

6. # of clients certified with skills competencies

TESDA pursues the assessment and certification of the competencies of the middle-level skilled workers through Philippine TVET Competency Assessment and Certification System (PTCACS). The assessment process seeks to determine whether the graduate or worker can perform to the standards expected in the workplace based on the defined competency standards. Certification is provided to those who meets the competency standards. This ensures the productivity, quality and global competitiveness of the middle-level workers. ATI in partnership with TESDA, conducted different NCs provided for free to all interested individuals.

The Center conducted a total of 16 NCs last 2015. Ten of these NCs are NC II which was participated by 195 individuals. The remaining 6 NCs are NC III and was participated by 254

individuals.

**Clients certified with skills competencies**

| National Competencies | Number |
|---|---|
| NC I | 0 |
| NC II | 195 |
| NC III | 254 |
| NC IV | 0 |
| **Total** | 449 |

Competency assessment is the process of collecting evidence and making judgments on whether competency has been achieved. It focuses in assessing an individual's skills, knowledge, attitude and work values relative to a unit or cluster of units of competency.

The Center conducted 2 batches of NC II on Animal Production (Training on Livestock and Environment) for AEWs and 2 batches for the young ones. Additionally, 2 batches of NC II on Agricultural Crops Production was conducted intended for the young potentials.

Moreover, 10 batches of NC III on Agricultural Crops Production for AEWs were conducted.

**List of national competencies gained by clients**

| National Competencies * | Subject Matter |
|---|---|
| NC I | None |
| | None |
| NC II | Animal Production (Training on Livestock and Environment) – 4 Batches |
| | Agricultural Crops Production (2 Batches) |
| NC III | Agricultural Crops Production (10 Batches) |
| NC IV | None |
| | None |

7. % of adopters based on action plan

An action plan is a document that lists what steps must be taken in order to achieve a specific goal. The purpose of an action plan is to clarify what resources are required to reach the goal, formulate a timeline for when specific tasks need to be completed and determine what resources are required.

Out of the 350 client-respondents surveyed, a total of 241 accomplished the activities on their action plan. One hundred eighty two or 75.5% of these are farmers and the remaining 59 or 24.5% are AEWs.

Percentage of client-respondent adopters based on action plan

| Type | Yes | | No | | *N/A | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage |
| Farmers | 182 | 75.5% | 93 | 87.7% | 3 | 100.0% |
| AEWs | 59 | 24.5% | 13 | 12.3% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Total | 241 | 100.0% | 106 | 100.0% | 3 | 100.0% |

*N/A -Action plan are not required

From the 350 client-respondents, 93 farmers and 13 AEWs were not able to accomplish their action plan. Three farmers responded that there are no action plan required on the activities that they have attended.

The most common reason why they have not done their action plan is that they do not have available personal resources. Twenty three or 6.6% of them do not have an interest in accomplishing it, and 3.7% forgot its details.

Other reasons include: lack of time (0.6%), lack of farm inputs (1.1%), no fund support from LGU (0.3%), and the project has not yet implemented (0.3%).

Reason for client-respondents for not doing their action plan

| Reason | Farmers | | AEWs | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage |
| No available personal resources | 63 | 22.7% | 10 | 13.9% | 73 | 20.9% |
| No Interest in accomplishing action plan | 22 | 7.9% | 1 | 1.4% | 23 | 6.6% |
| Forgot the details of action plan | 10 | 3.6% | 3 | 4.2% | 13 | 3.7% |
| Action plan not required | 3 | 1.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 3 | 0.9% |
| Lack of time | 2 | 0.7% | 0 | 0.0% | 2 | 0.6% |
| Lack of farm inputs | 4 | 1.4% | 0 | 0.0% | 4 | 1.1% |
| No fund support from LGU | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 1.4% | 1 | 0.3% |
| Project not yet implemented | 1 | 0.4% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.3% |
| *N/A | 182 | 65.5% | 59 | 81.9% | 241 | 68.9% |
| Total | 278 | 100.0% | 72 | 100.0% | 350 | 100.0% |

*N/A - if clients adopt the action plan

8. % of clients that adopted new AF technologies

Technology is assumed to mean a new, scientific derived, often complex input supplied to farmers by organizations with deep technical expertise. The contribution of new technology to the increased in income or yield of the farmers can only be realized when and if the new technology is widely diffused and used. Diffusion itself results from a series of individual decisions to begin using the new technology, decisions which are often the result of a comparison of the uncertain benefits of the new invention with the uncertain costs of adopting it. (Hall and Khan, 2002)

A total of three hundred forty seven, wherein two hundred seventy seven or 79.8% of this are farmers and the remaining seventy or 20.2% are AEWs adopted the agriculture and fishery technologies that are taught to them.

Percentage of client-respondents that adopted AF technologies

| Type | Yes | | No | | N/A | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage |
| Farmers | 277 | 79.8% | 1 | 33.3% | 0 | 0.0% |
| AEWs | 70 | 20.2% | 2 | 66.7% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Total | 347 | 100.0% | 3 | 100.0% | 0 | 0.0% |

More than half (64.7%) of the farmer client-respondents, applied and shared the use of the technologies that they learned from the trainings that they attended at ATI to others. Twenty three percent applied the technologies learned to their regular farming activities, and 11.9% tried it a couple of times only.

In addition, 52.8% of the AEWs applied and shared it to others, 43.1% applied it to regular farming activities, and 1.4% tried it a couple of times only.

One farmer and two AEWs did not adopt the AF technologies that they learned from the trainings attended.

Extent in which client-respondents adopted AF technologies

| Extent | Farmers | | AEWs | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage |
| Applied and shared the use of technologies to others | 180 | 64.7% | 38 | 52.8% | 218 | 62.3% |
| Applied the technology to regular farming activities | 64 | 23.0% | 31 | 43.1% | 95 | 27.1% |
| Tried a couple of times only | 33 | 11.9% | 1 | 1.4% | 34 | 9.7% |
| *N/A | 1 | 0.4% | 2 | 2.8% | 3 | 0.9% |
| Total | 278 | 100.0% | 72 | 100.0% | 350 | 100.0% |

*N/A - client-respondents did not adopt AF technologies

Most (71.6%) of the farmer client-respondents adopted the technologies on backyard gardening. One hundred fifty seven or 56.5% are practicing organic agriculture on their gardens, 48.9% are planting vegetables and 41.7% are applying what they learned on pest management. The least applied technologies are livestock production, pasture management, and organic fertilizer making.

Likewise, for the AEWs, 72.2% are practicing backyard gardening, 58.3% are into organic agriculture, 47.2% are applying the proper ways of pest management, and 41.7% are planting vegetables.

AF Technologies adopted by client-respondents

| AF technology | Farmers | | AEWs | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage |
| Backyard gardening | 199 | 71.6% | 52 | 72.2% |
| Mulching/Vermicomposting | 42 | 15.1% | 22 | 30.6% |
| SALT | 10 | 3.6% | 9 | 12.5% |
| Pest Management | 116 | 41.7% | 34 | 47.2% |
| Good Agricultural Practices | 55 | 19.8% | 22 | 30.6% |
| Product Processing | 33 | 11.9% | 5 | 6.9% |
| Organic Agriculture | 157 | 56.5% | 42 | 58.3% |
| Climate Smart Technologies | 53 | 19.1% | 13 | 18.1% |
| Vegetable Farming | 136 | 48.9% | 30 | 41.7% |
| Diversified Farming | 69 | 24.8% | 24 | 33.3% |
| Animal Waste Management | 76 | 27.3% | 16 | 22.2% |
| Modern Livestock Technology | 43 | 15.5% | 15 | 20.8% |
| Rice Production Technology | 4 | 1.4% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Coconut Farming | 2 | 0.7% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Livestock Production | 1 | 0.4% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Root crops Production | 2 | 0.7% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Aquaculture | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Pasture Management | 1 | 0.4% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Organic Fertilizer Making | 1 | 0.4% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Corn Production | 3 | 1.1% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Banana Production | 2 | 0.7% | 0 | 0.0% |
| N/A | 1 | 0.4% | 2 | 2.8% |

*N/A - client-respondents did not adopt AF technologies

Agricultural technology is the use of technology for farming that is developed to improve efficiency and profitability. It aims to improve farming through information monitoring and analysis of weather, pests, soil and air temperature. It is the application of techniques to control the growth and harvesting of animal and vegetable products.

A total of one hundred eighty five, wherein one hundred twenty three or 66.5% of this are farmers and the remaining sixty two or 33.5% are AEWs adopted the agriculture and fishery technologies that are taught to them and responded that they could learn these technologies from other sources.

Client-respondents that adopted AF technologies and suggested that they could have learned the technologies from other sources

| Type | Yes | | No | | N/A | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage |
| Farmers | 123 | 66.5% | 154 | 95.1% | 1 | 33.3% |
| AEWs | 62 | 33.5% | 8 | 4.9% | 2 | 66.7% |
| Total | 185 | 100.0% | 162 | 100.0% | 3 | 100.0% |

One hundred twenty three farmers (82.6%) and twenty six (17.4%) AEWs answered that they were already aware or familiar with the lessons and technologies taught before the training attended.

In the contrary, a total of two hundred client-respondents, wherein one hundred fifty four (77%) of this are farmers and forty six (23%) are AEWs, claimed that the lessons and technologies that they learned from the conducted training is new to them.

Client-respondents that were familiar with the lessons and technologies taught before the training attended

| Type | Yes | | No | | N/A | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage |
| Farmers | 123 | 82.6% | 154 | 77.0% | 1 | 100.0% |
| AEWs | 26 | 17.4% | 46 | 23.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Total | 149 | 100.0% | 200 | 100.0% | 1 | 100.0% |

Farmers' changes of technology use are influenced by different factors this could be technical training, meeting, oral transmission, trust on technician, belief level on technology, and others.

Though farmers have positive perception of technology taught, they faced problems in technology application due to lack of capital or no available resources (0.6%), doubts on the use and application of technology (0.3%), technology taught are not suitable in the area (0.6%), and lack of time (0.3%).

Reasons for client-respondents for not using and applying the AF technologies taught

| Reason | Farmers | | AEWs | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage |
| No available reasons | 0 | 0.0% | 2 | 2.8% | 2 | 0.6% |
| Doubts on the use and application of technology | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 1.4% | 1 | 0.3% |
| Technology taught not suitable in the area | 1 | 0.4% | 1 | 1.4% | 2 | 0.6% |
| Lack of time | 1 | 0.4% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.3% |
| N/A | 277 | 99.6% | 70 | 97.2% | 347 | 99.1% |
| Total | 278 | 100.0% | 72 | 100.0% | 350 | 100.0% |

*Improved Provision of Interventions*

9. % of clients satisfied with the intervention they received

Customer satisfaction is a matter of attitude towards or evaluation of product or service quality. It can be defined as: "a mental or emotional reaction that results as a response to the experience of interaction with the service." (Rust. and Oliver 1994). It can also be regarded as "the extent to which one realizes the effectiveness of the received product or service in fulfilling his needs (Reed, Johan & Nicholas 1997). Accordingly, customer satisfaction is a

personal feeling or evaluation, which explains the difficulty of satisfying all individuals or estimating satisfaction among a group of individuals.

One hundred sixty seven or 47.7% of the total number of client-respondents replied that they are very satisfied with the interventions received from ATI. On the other hand, one hundred fifty one or 54.3% of the farmers and thirty two or 44.4% of the AEWs responded that they are satisfied with the interventions received.

Satisfaction of client-respondents with the interventions received

| Rating | Farmers | | AEWs | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage |
| Very satisfied | 127 | 45.7% | 40 | 55.6% | 167 | 47.7% |
| Satisfied | 151 | 54.3% | 32 | 44.4% | 183 | 52.3% |
| Dissatisfied | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Very dissatisfied | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Total | 278 | 100.0% | 72 | 100.0% | 350 | 100.0% |

10. % of clients saying that the intervention is relevant

The involvement of government in the agricultural sector is all-encompassing and significant. The government policies in research, extension services, infrastructure, commodity and conservation programs, as well as organizational and structural dimensions are designed to greatly impact agriculture. Government interventions should be relevant and effective.

Majority (72.9%) of the client respondents replied that the training that they received from ATI is very relevant in terms of their current situation and needs. The remaining 27.1% answered back that it is somehow relevant.

Relevance of interventions received according to the client-respondents

| Rating | Farmers | | AEWs | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage |
| Very relevant | 191 | 68.7% | 64 | 88.9% | 255 | 72.9% |
| Somehow relevant | 87 | 31.3% | 8 | 11.1% | 95 | 27.1% |
| Not at all relevant | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Total | 278 | 100.0% | 72 | 100.0% | 350 | 100.0% |

11. % of accomplished interventions as scheduled

In 2015, the Center implemented 142 interventions based on the WFP and it also accomplished as scheduled. Thus, the percent accomplished interventions as scheduled is 100%.
This could be a good indicator that the Center delivers work on time, is productive and efficient.

**Percentage of accomplished intervention as scheduled**

| Item | Number |
|---|---|
| Interventions implemented based on the WFP | 142 |
| Interventions accomplished as scheduled | 142 |
| **Percent Accomplished Interventions as scheduled** | 100% |

12. % absorptive capacity

Last 2015, the total budget allocation received by the Center is 46,346,199.20 and the Center has fully utilized the allocated budget in that year.

The percent absorptive capacity of the Center is 100%. This shows the role of absorptive capacity as both a mechanism to identify and translate external knowledge inflows into tangible benefits, as well as a means of achieving superior innovation and time-lagged financial performance.

**Absorptive capacity of the training center**

| Item | Amount |
|---|---|
| Total Disbursement | 46,346,199.20 |
| Total Budget Allocation | 46,346,199.20 |
| **Percent Absorptive Capacity** | 100% |

***Intermediate Results***

*Increased Productivity of Clients*

13. % of clients engaged in diversified farming

A diversified farm is one that has several production enterprises or sources of income but no source of income equal as much as 50% of the total income from that source on such farm farmers depends on several sources of incomes. It is also called as general farming.

Ninety three client-respondents are engaging into diversified farming, sixty nine or 74.2% are farmers and twenty four or 25.8% are AEWs.

Client-respondents engaged in diversified farming

| Type | Yes | | No | | N/A | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage |
| Farmers | 69 | 74.2% | 208 | 81.9% | 1 | 33.3% |
| AEWs | 24 | 25.8% | 46 | 18.1% | 2 | 66.7% |
| Total | 93 | 100.0% | 254 | 100.0% | 3 | 100.0% |

14. % of clients engaged in value-adding

Value added is the creation of a competitive advantage by bundling, combining, or packaging features and benefits that result in greater customer acceptance.

Eighty nine percent of the farmers are engaging into value adding activities while eleven percent of the AEWs are practicing it. A total of seventy three client-respondents engaging into any value-adding activities.

Client-respondents engaged in value-adding

| Type | Yes | | No | | N/A | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage |
| Farmers | 65 | 89.0% | 212 | 79.1% | 1 | 11.1% |
| AEWs | 8 | 11.0% | 56 | 20.9% | 8 | 88.9% |
| Total | 73 | 100.0% | 268 | 100.0% | 9 | 100.0% |

Value –adding activities are activities that are judged to contribute to customer value or satisfy an organizational need. The attribute "value-added" reflects a belief that the activity cannot be eliminated without reducing the quantity, responsiveness, or quality of output required by a customer or organization. Value-added activities should physically change the product or service in a manner that meets customer expectations.

Some of the value-adding activities conducted by the client-respondents are packaging and branding and processing of products. Six (2.2%) of the farmers and two (2.8%) AEWs are using packaging and branding on their products. Likewise, 21.7% or 60 farmers and 11.1% or 8 AEWs are processing their products to put added value on it.

Value-adding activities conducted by client-respondents

| Activity | Farmers | | AEWs | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage |
| Packaging and branding of products | 6 | 2.2% | 2 | 2.8% | 8 | 2.3% |
| Processing of products | 60 | 21.7% | 8 | 11.1% | 68 | 19.5% |
| N/A | 213 | 77.2% | 64 | 88.9% | 277 | 79.6% |
| Total | 276 | 100.0% | 72 | 100.0% | 348 | 100.0% |

15. % of clients with increased income

Farmers can increase income by adopting technologies like crop rotation, integrated farming, organic farming, double/triple cropping system.

Data shows that client-respondents who are adopting the AF technologies taught to them during the training claimed that their income increased. A total of 290 client-respondents suggested that their income increased due to the adoption of AF technologies; 241 are farmers and 49 are AEWs.

Client-respondents suggesting an increased in income due to the adoption of AF technologies

| Type | Yes | | No | | N/A | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage |
| Farmers | 241 | 83.1% | 4 | 100.0% | 33 | 58.9% |
| AEWs | 49 | 16.9% | 0 | 0.0% | 23 | 41.1% |
| Total | 290 | 100.0% | 4 | 100.0% | 56 | 100.0% |

Out of 290 client-respondents who suggested that their income increased, 35.7% responded that there is a very much increased in income due to the adoption of AF technologies. One hundred thirty four or 38.3% replied that there is a moderate increase in income, much higher number of client-respondents compared to the previous one.

Furthermore, 31 or 8.9% has only slight increase in income; 29 are farmers and 2 AEWs. Additionally, 4 farmers answered back that there is no change in income even if they adopted the AF technologies introduced to them.

Degree of perceived increased income due to the adoption of AF technologies

| Rating | Farmers | | AEWs | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage |
| Very much | 101 | 36.3% | 24 | 33.3% | 125 | 35.7% |
| Moderate | 111 | 39.9% | 23 | 31.9% | 134 | 38.3% |
| Slight | 29 | 10.4% | 2 | 2.8% | 31 | 8.9% |
| Not at all | 4 | 1.4% | 0 | 0.0% | 4 | 1.1% |
| N/A | 33 | 11.9% | 23 | 31.9% | 56 | 16.0% |
| Total | 278 | 100.0% | 72 | 100.0% | 350 | 100.0% |

*Increased Empowerment of Clients*

16. % of clients turned into agripreneurs

An agripreneur is an agricultural entrepreneur. When talking about entrepreneurship in agriculture, it is termed as Agriculture Entrepreneurship or Agripreneurship. Agripreneurs, thus, do not differ from entrepreneurs in their basic traits. Agripreneurs are very articulate in personal, interpersonal and process skills. It is their pro-risk-taking attitude that makes them more likely to cash upon the opportunity available in new agricultural ventures compared to conventional farmers. They not only believe in new venture new gains, but also work consistently to prove themselves true. They are the trend setting farmers.

In this evaluation, client-respondents can only be consider an agripreneur if they satisfy all of these conditions: (1) markets their products, (2) re-invest capital to farm, (3) has ambitions and goals for the farm, (4) keeps farm records, and (5) develops business/farm strategies and plans.

Out of 350 client-respondents, two hundred twenty seven (84.1%) farmers and forty three (15.9%) AEWs can be considered as agripreneurs.

Client-respondents turned into agripreneurs

| Type | Yes | | No | | N/A | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage |
| Farmers | 227 | 84.1% | 18 | 75.0% | 33 | 58.9% |
| AEWs | 43 | 15.9% | 6 | 25.0% | 23 | 41.1% |
| Total | 270 | 100.0% | 24 | 100.0% | 56 | 100.0% |

Out of the two hundred seventy agripreneurs, 70% are marketing their products. One hundred twenty seven or 36.3% are keeping farm records, 34.6% re-invests capital to farm, 32% has ambitions and goals for the farm, and 28.3% develops business/farm strategies and plans.

The most common characteristic adopted by farmers is marketing their products (74.8%) and the least one is developing business/farm strategies and plans (28.4%). For the AEWs, more than one-half (51.4%) markets their products and 26.4% r-invest capital to farm.

Common agripreneur characteristics exhibited by client-respondents

| Characteristic | Farmers | | AEWs | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage |
| Has ambitions and goals for the farm | 84 | 30.2% | 28 | 38.9% | 112 | 32.0% |
| Markets their products | 208 | 74.8% | 37 | 51.4% | 245 | 70.0% |
| Keeps farm records | 106 | 38.1% | 21 | 29.2% | 127 | 36.3% |
| Re-invests capital to farm | 102 | 36.7% | 19 | 26.4% | 121 | 34.6% |
| Develops business/farm strategies and plans | 79 | 28.4% | 20 | 27.8% | 99 | 28.3% |
| N/A | 51 | 18.3% | 29 | 40.3% | 80 | 22.9% |
| Total | 278 | 100.0% | 72 | 100.0% | 350 | 100.0% |

17. % of marginalized clients turned into agripreneurs

As shown in the previous results, out of the one hundred forty six marginalized farmers, one hundred twenty one (121) turned into agripreneurs. Nine of this 146 marginalized farmers are OSYs, 62 rural women, 5 IPs, 68 senior citizens, and 2 PWDs.

In addition, five of the eight marginalized AEWs turned into agripreneurs.

Marginalized client-respondents turned into agripreneurs

| Type | Yes | | No | | N/A | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage |
| Farmers | 121 | 96.0% | 25 | 89.3% | 132 | 67.3% |
| AEWs | 5 | 4.0% | 3 | 10.7% | 64 | 32.7% |
| Total | 126 | 100.0% | 28 | 100.0% | 196 | 100.0% |

18. % of clients employed in AF related job or promoted to a higher position

An agricultural extension worker directly works with farmers and companies related to agriculture. Their primary role is to aid these groups to make better decisions to increase agricultural production. The extension worker is constantly armed with the latest techniques and information related to agriculture and they relay this information to farmers and agricultural business.

For the last 3 years, sixteen (4.6%) AEWs were hired or promoted to higher level promotions.

AEW's hired or promoted to higher level promotions in the last three (3) years

| Response | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | 16 | 4.6% |
| No | 56 | 16.0% |
| N/A | 278 | 79.4% |
| Total | 350 | 100.0% |

19. # Schools for Practical Agriculture assisted

An exceptionally performing Learning Site based on an evaluation to be undertaken will be up-scaled to School for Practical Agriculture or Sanayan ng Pagsasaka at Adhikaing Agrikultura (SPA) and will be developed further by the ATI. The goal of the program is to harness the full potential of the less developed but resource-rich farming/fishing communities towards a diversified, holistic, and integrated community-based agribusiness-ecotourism program to help uplift the quality of life of the Filipinos in the rural areas.

The SPA serve as a model farm for farmers and would-be farmers and is also a "school" or avenue for ATI hands-on trainings. It showcases diversified and integrated farming system which is important for field visits of fellow farmers, would-be farmers, training participants, and students. In addition, it also serves as home-stay farms for the on-the-job trainings of the 4-H ladderized courses and adopt-a-farm youth practical learning experience.

Last 2015, the Center has 4 SPAs to cater to the needs of its different trainings and activities.

**List of Schools for Practical Agriculture assisted by ATI**

| Name | Date Established | Cooperator |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Bendicar Farm and Food Products | May 2015 | Bendicar D. Gerona |
| 2.Juanito Eco Farm and Agri-Ventures (JEFAV) | November 2015 | Olegario Paredes, Jr. |
| 3. Aragon Natures Farm | June 2015 | Saturnina Aragon |
| 4. Organic-Based Farming System Model Farm | June 2015 | MIDOFSFA (McKinley Integrated Diversified Organic Farming System Farmers Association) |

20. # Farm Tourism sites assisted

There is no accredited farm tourism site last 2015.

**List of Farm Tourism sites assisted by ATI**

| Name | Date Established | Cooperator |
|---|---|---|
| 1. None | None | None |
| 2. | | |
| 3. | | |

The chosen SPA's farm shall become the "school" for hands-on-training and the farmer-owner shall be the "teacher" and community extension worker serving the other farmers to further enhance their farming knowledge and skills as well as for those who would want to venture in farming.

As tourism has become part of agricultural activities, the ATI partnered with Department of Tourism (DOT) in accrediting farm as Farm Tourism. After performing well as SPAs, farms can be scaled-up as Farm Tourism. These farms serves as a vehicle for information sharing and technology transfer on encouraging more tourists to experience actual farm activities while appreciating the value of farmers' produce. Farm tourism considers the ecosystem and aesthetic while maintaining the cultural integrity of the farm.

A total of four Schools for Practical Agriculture were assisted by the Center last 2015 and 0 Farm Tourism site.

**Number of School for Practical Agriculture and Farm Tourism site assisted by ATI**

| Type | Number |
|---|---|
| School for Practical Agriculture | 4 |
| Farm Tourism site | 0 |

*Increased Resiliency of Clients*

21. % of clients with social protection

Social protection is defined as the set of policies and programs designed to reduce poverty and vulnerability by promoting efficient labor markets, diminishing people's exposure to risks, and enhancing their capacity to protect themselves against hazards and interruption/loss of income.

A total of 250 of combined number of farmers and AEWs has social protection. One hundred eighty seven or 74.8% farmers has social protection. Likewise, 63 or 25.2% AEWS.

Client-respondents with social protection

| Type | Yes | | No | | N/A | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage |
| Farmers | 187 | 74.8% | 91 | 91.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| AEWs | 63 | 25.2% | 9 | 9.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Total | 250 | 100.0% | 100 | 100.0% | 0 | 0.0% |

Of the 187 farmers who has social protection, 41.9% has health insurance (Phil Health, Maxi care, etc.), 35.4% has crop/livestock insurance, 17.3% has social security insurance (SSS, GSIS, Pagibig, etc.), and 10.8% has life insurance (Phil Health, Maxi care, etc.).

Additionally, from the 63 AEWs, 69.4% has social security insurance (SSS, GSIS, Pagibig, etc.), 61.1% has health insurance (Phil Health, Maxi care, etc.), 40.3% has crop/livestock insurance,

and 20.8% has life insurance (Phil Health, Maxi care, etc.).

Social Protection client-respondents have

| Type | Farmers | | AEWs | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage |
| Crop/Livestock Insurance | 98 | 35.4% | 29 | 40.3% | 127 | 36.4% |
| Social Security Insurance (SSS, GSIS, Pagibig) | 48 | 17.3% | 50 | 69.4% | 98 | 28.1% |
| Health Insurance (Phil Health, Maxi care) | 116 | 41.9% | 44 | 61.1% | 160 | 45.8% |
| Life Insurance (Phil Health, Maxi care) | 30 | 10.8% | 15 | 20.8% | 45 | 12.9% |
| N/A | 91 | 32.9% | 9 | 12.5% | 100 | 28.7% |
| Total | 277 | 100.0% | 72 | 100.0% | 349 | 100.0% |

22. % of clients saying that they are confident of coping from unfortunate events

Unfortunate events or natural disasters are catastrophic events that are caused by nature or the natural processes of the earth. The severity of a disaster is measured in lives lost, economic loss, and the ability of the population to rebuild. This could be typhoon, fire, pest, flood, drought, volcanic eruption, tsunami, and earthquake.

One hundred twenty three of the client-respondents are moderately confident in coping with the unfortunate events, 29.7% are slightly confident, 18.3% are highly confident, and 16.9% are not confident at all.

Degree of confidence by client-respondents in coping with unfortunate events

| Rating | Farmers | | AEWs | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage |
| Highly Confident | 55 | 19.8% | 9 | 12.5% | 64 | 18.3% |
| Moderately Confident | 89 | 32.0% | 34 | 47.2% | 123 | 35.1% |
| Slightly Confident | 85 | 30.6% | 19 | 26.4% | 104 | 29.7% |
| Not at all confident | 49 | 17.6% | 10 | 13.9% | 59 | 16.9% |
| Total | 278 | 100.0% | 72 | 100.0% | 350 | 100.0% |

23. % of clients that have coped with unfortunate events by applying adaptation and mitigation measures

Climate change impacts are posing numerous challenges in attaining sustainable development. Consequently, it is imperative that the issue of resilience towards climate change is adequately addressed and integrated in development project planning process by different players including the government and NGOs. One important prerequisite of a successful mainstreaming of resilience towards climate change is the availability of competent professionals to plan and execute the process of mainstreaming.

ATI as the training arm of DA, incorporates climate adaptation and mitigation techniques, measures, and practices on some of their trainings, that will provide participants with a sound understanding of the processes and key impacts of climate change.

Two hundred forty or 77.4% of the farmers and 70 or 22.6% of AEWs responded that climate adaptation and mitigation techniques, measures and practices are taught during trainings.

Client-respondents taught about climate adaptation and mitigation techniques, measures and practices

| | Yes | | No | | N/A | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage |
| Farmers | 240 | 77.4% | 38 | 95.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| AEWs | 70 | 22.6% | 2 | 5.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Total | 310 | 100.0% | 40 | 100.0% | 0 | 0.0% |

Two hundred eighty six client-respondents have experienced unfortunate events affecting their farm and suffered damages and losses in the last three (3) years. Two hundred thirty (80.4%) of them are farmers and the remaining fifty six or 19.6% are AEWs.

Some of the unfortunate events or natural disasters that could possibly affect their farms and brought damages and losses could be typhoon, fire, pest, flood, drought, volcanic eruption, tsunami, and earthquake.

Client-respondents that have experienced unfortunate events affecting their farm and suffered damages and losses in the last three (3) years

| Type | Yes | | No | | N/A | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage |
| Farmers | 230 | 80.4% | 47 | 85.5% | 1 | 11.1% |
| AEWs | 56 | 19.6% | 8 | 14.5% | 8 | 88.9% |
| Total | 286 | 100.0% | 55 | 100.0% | 9 | 100.0% |

From the two hundred eighty six client-respondents who experienced unfortunate events, 78.6% of the farmers had cope with unfortunate events due to the climate adaptation and mitigation techniques, measures and practices taught during the training. Likewise, for the AEWs, 21.4% of them used what they learned to cope up with the unfortunate events that they had experienced.

On the other hand, twenty farmers and one AEW, twenty one in total, did not able to use the climate adaptation and mitigation techniques that they had learned from the trainings, in coping with the unfortunate events.

Client-respondents that had cope with unfortunate events due to the climate adaptation and mitigation techniques, measures and practices taught

| Type | Yes | | No | | N/A | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage |
| Farmers | 198 | 78.6% | 20 | 95.2% | 60 | 77.9% |
| AEWs | 54 | 21.4% | 1 | 4.8% | 17 | 22.1% |
| Total | 252 | 100.0% | 21 | 100.0% | 77 | 100.0% |

24. % of clients with alternative AF-related job competencies

Aside from the current crops produced and/or animals raised, 77.7% of the farmer client-respondents and 22.3% of the AEWs have other agriculture-related competencies and skills.

Other agriculture-related competencies and skills include: fishing, rice farming, fruit growing, raising other animals, corn production, producing other kinds of vegetables, etc.

Clients-respondents with alternative AF-related competencies and skills

| Type | Yes | | No | | N/A | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage |
| Farmers | 174 | 77.7% | 104 | 82.5% | 0 | 0.0% |
| AEWs | 50 | 22.3% | 22 | 17.5% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Total | 224 | 100.0% | 126 | 100.0% | 0 | 0.0% |

More than one-half (52.9%) of the farmers knows rice farming, 47.1% are into fruit growing, 39.7% raised other animals, 37.9% produced other vegetables, 30.5% planted corn, and 15.5% does fishing.

On the other hand, 60% of the AEWs grows fruit, 56% planted rice, 42% raised other animals and produced other vegetables, and 24% are into fish production.

Other AF-related competencies and skills of the client-respondents include bio-organic/organic fertilizer production, straw mushroom production, raising fighting cocks, pasture management, root crops production, meat processing, ornamental and flower plant grower, food processing, cut flower production, and agri-crop production.

Alternative AF-related competencies and skills by client-respondents

| Type | Farmers | | AEWs | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage |
| Fishing | 27 | 15.5% | 12 | 24.0% | 39 | 17.4% |
| Raising other animals | 69 | 39.7% | 21 | 42.0% | 90 | 40.2% |
| Rice Farming | 92 | 52.9% | 28 | 56.0% | 120 | 53.6% |
| Corn production | 53 | 30.5% | 15 | 30.0% | 68 | 30.4% |
| Fruit Growing | 82 | 47.1% | 30 | 60.0% | 112 | 50.0% |
| Producing other vegetables | 66 | 37.9% | 21 | 42.0% | 87 | 38.8% |
| Bio-organic/Organic fertilizer production | 1 | 0.6% | 1 | 2.0% | 2 | 0.9% |
| Straw mushroom production | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 2.0% | 1 | 0.4% |
| Raising fighting cocks | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 2.0% | 1 | 0.4% |
| Pasture Management | 1 | 0.6% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.4% |
| Root crops Production | 1 | 0.6% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.4% |
| Meat Processing | 1 | 0.6% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.4% |
| Ornamental and flower plant grower | 1 | 0.6% | 1 | 2.0% | 2 | 0.9% |
| Food Processing | 2 | 1.1% | 2 | 4.0% | 4 | 1.8% |
| Cut Flower Production | 1 | 0.6% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.4% |
| Agri-Crop Production | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 2.0% | 1 | 0.4% |
| Total | 174 | 100.0% | 50 | 100.0% | 224 | 100.0% |

*Increased Competitiveness of Clients*

25. % of farms certified

Aside from ATI, other accreditation bodies also certifies farms, this includes: organic agriculture, GAHP, GAP, and others.

Twenty three farms owned by the farmers and one farm owned by AEW are certified by other accreditation body.

Percentage of client-respondents with farm certifications

| Type | Yes | | No | | N/A | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage |
| Farmers | 23 | 95.8% | 254 | 80.1% | 1 | 11.1% |
| AEWs | 1 | 4.2% | 63 | 19.9% | 8 | 88.9% |
| Total | 24 | 100.0% | 317 | 100.0% | 9 | 100.0% |

A farm owned by one of the AEW is a certified GAP farm. Twenty one farms owned by the farmers are accredited organic agriculture farm and one farm is a GAP certified farm.

One farm owned by a farmer is accredited as a GAP certified farm and also an organic agriculture

farm.

Farm certifications the client-respondents have

| Type | Farmers | | AEWs | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage |
| Organic agriculture | 22 | 7.9% | 0 | 0.0% | 22 | 6.3% |
| GAP | 2 | 0.7% | 1 | 1.4% | 3 | 0.9% |
| GAHP | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| N/A | 255 | 91.7% | 71 | 98.6% | 326 | 93.1% |
| Total | 278 | 100.0% | 72 | 100.0% | 350 | 100.0% |

26. % of products certified by an accreditation body

From the twenty four farms accredited by the other accreditation body, sixteen farmers has products that is also accredited. One product of the AEW is also accredited.

Some of the certifications received by their products are certified organic, GMP, SBAP[4], HALAL, HACCP, GAHP, CAW[3], and others.

Percentage of client-respondents producing certified products

| Type | Yes | | No | | N/A | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage |
| Farmers | 16 | 94.1% | 261 | 80.6% | 1 | 11.1% |
| AEWs | 1 | 5.9% | 63 | 19.4% | 8 | 88.9% |
| Total | 17 | 100.0% | 324 | 100.0% | 9 | 100.0% |

Fifteen farmers has products that is certified organic and 1 farmer has a product certified by HALAL.

One AEW has also a certified organic product.

Products certifications the client- respondents have

| Type | Farmers | | AEWs | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage |
| Organic | 15 | 5.4% | 1 | 1.4% | 16 | 4.6% |
| HALAL | 1 | 0.4% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.3% |
| GAHP | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| GMP | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| HACCP | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| CAW | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| SBAP | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| N/A | 262 | 94.2% | 71 | 98.6% | 333 | 95.1% |
| Total | 278 | 100.0% | 72 | 100.0% | 350 | 100.0% |

27. % of clients producing demand-driven products

More than half (55.6%) of the farmers are selling their products directly to the market. Ninety one or 34.9% sell it through middlemen/intermediary, 7.7% deliver it directly to commercial establishments, 4.2% sells directly to consumers (neighbours, friends, co-barangays, co-workers, etc.), and 1.5% are pick-up directly from the farm.

On the other hand, 37.9% of the AEWs sell their products directly to the market, 24.2% through middlemen/intermediary, 12.1% directly to commercial establishments, 9.1% directly to the consumer, 3 % pick-up directly from the farm, and 1.5% sells it on-line and in government institutions.

Product selling client-respondents was engaged in

| Kind | Farmers | | AEWs | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage |
| Through middlemen/intermediary | 91 | 34.9% | 16 | 24.2% | 107 | 32.7% |
| Directly to the market | 145 | 55.6% | 25 | 37.9% | 170 | 52.0% |
| Directly to commercial establishments | 20 | 7.7% | 8 | 12.1% | 28 | 8.6% |
| Directly to the consumer | 11 | 4.2% | 6 | 9.1% | 17 | 5.2% |
| Pick-up from the farm | 4 | 1.5% | 2 | 3.0% | 6 | 1.8% |
| On-line selling | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 1.5% | 1 | 0.3% |
| Government Institutions | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 1.5% | 1 | 0.3% |
| N/A | 33 | 12.6% | 23 | 34.8% | 56 | 17.1% |
| Total | 261 | 100.0% | 66 | 100.0% | 327 | 100.0% |

28. % of clients engaged in the overseas market

There is no client-respondents who exported their produced/processed products to other countries.

Client-respondents exporting their products to other countries

| | Yes | | No | | N/A | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage |
| Farmers | 0 | 0.0% | 245 | 83.3% | 33 | 58.9% |
| AEWs | 0 | 0.0% | 49 | 16.8% | 23 | 41.1% |
| Total | 2 | 100.0% | 292 | 100.0% | 56 | 100.0% |

There is no client-respondents who exported their produced/processed products to other countries.

**Countries client-respondents exports their products**

| Country | Products Exported |
|---|---|
| 1. N/A | N/A |
| 2. | |

**Summary and Conclusion**

*Summary of the AFE RBME Results Indicators*

The trainings conducted by the ATI-RTC 8 covered 100% of the area in the 6 provinces of the region. The total number of clients served by the Center last 2015 is 66,215 and 8.44% of the total population are marginalized clients.

One hundred percent of the 278 farmers and 72 AEWs interviewed said that have an increased in knowledge through trainings attended conducted by ATI. As one output of trainings, participants were tasked to prepare an action plan, and 66.86% of the client-respondents adopted and accomplished their action plans and 99.14% adopted new AF technologies introduced to them. Also, of the total trainees last 2015, 449 of them are certified with skills competencies (NC II and NC III).

All of the client-respondents are satisfied with the interventions they have received and 72.86% said that the interventions are relevant. On part of the Center, 100% of the interventions are accomplished as scheduled and the absorptive capacity is also 100%.

According to the client-respondents, their income increased by adopting the technologies taught to them through trainings, 82.86% of the total respondents has an increased in income, 26.57% of them are engaging into diversified farming, and 20.86% into value-adding activities.

One goal of ATI is to increase the empowerment of the clients. Out of the 350 respondents, 77.14% turned into agripreneurs and 36% of it are marginalized clients. Also, 4.57% of the clients employed in AF related job are promoted to a higher position for the past 3 years. Additionally, 4 LS are up-scaled into SPAs.

Sixty four percent of the client-respondents has alternative AF-related job competencies, 71.43% of these clients has social protection and 83.14% of them said that they are confident of coping from unfortunate events but only 72% have coped up with unfortunate events by applying adaptation and mitigation measures.

Lastly, 6.86% of the of the farms owned by the client-respondents are certified by other accreditation body other than ATI, 4.86% of these farms has products that is also certified, and 8% of them produces demand-driven products.

**AFE RBME result indicator values for the immediate result statements.**

| Result Indicator | Value |
|---|---|
| ***Increased access to AFE interventions*** | |
| # of clients served | 66,215 |
| % of marginalized clients trained | 8.44% |
| % of area coverage | 100% |
| ***Improved attitude, skills, and knowledge of clients*** | |
| % of clients saying that they have an increased knowledge | 100% |
| % of clients passing the Post-test | 0% |
| # of clients certified with skills competencies | 449 |
| % of adopters based on action plan | 66.86% |
| % of clients that adopted new AF technologies | 99.14% |
| ***Improved provision of interventions*** | |
| % of clients satisfied with the intervention they received | 100% |
| % of clients saying that the intervention is relevant | 72.86% |
| % of accomplished interventions as scheduled | 100% |
| % absorptive capacity | 100% |

**AFE RBME result indicator values for the intermediate result statements.**

| Result Indicator | Value |
|---|---|
| **Increased productivity of clients** | |
| % of clients engaged in diversified farming | 26.57% |
| % of clients engaged in value-adding | 20.86% |
| % of clients with increased income | 82.86% |
| **Increased empowerment of clients** | |
| % of clients turned into agripreneurs | 77.14% |
| % of marginalized clients turned into agripreneurs | 36% |
| % of clients employed in AF related job or promoted to a higher position | 4.57% |
| # Schools for Practical Agriculture assisted | 4 |
| # Farm Tourism sites assisted | 0 |
| **Increased resiliency of clients** | |
| % of clients with social protection | 71.83% |
| % of clients saying that they are confident of coping from unfortunate events | 83.14% |
| % of clients that have coped with unfortunate events by applying adaptation and mitigation measures | 72% |
| % of clients with alternative AF-related job competencies | 64% |

**AFE RBME result indicator values for the long-term result statement.**

| Result Indicator | Value |
|---|---|
| **Increased competitiveness of clients** | |
| % of farms certified | 6.86% |
| % of products certified by an accreditation body | 4.86% |
| % of clients producing demand-driven products | 8% |
| % of clients engaged in the overseas market | 0% |

**Lessons Learned**

Pre-tests and post-tests should be strictly implemented it could be a basis in increased in level of knowledge of the clients. More climate-related topics should be incorporated in all of the trainings to promote awareness on climate change, its adaptation and mitigation techniques, measures, and practices. And farmers/farm-owners should be encouraged more to produced demand-driven and certified products for them to engage in exports and be able to earn more.

## Recommendations

AFE Results-Based Monitoring and Evaluation System (RBME) is an effective public management tool, it should be conducted annually wherein the clients to be assessed for a given fiscal year (FY) should be those that received the interventions of ATI three (3) years before, to determine the output/outcome/impact of the interventions of the institution.

Additionally, the population to be used in determining the sample size should be the actual number of farmers and AEWs clients trained on that given fiscal year of each training centers and should not be based on assumptions.

In the client survey questionnaire, actual data should be collected and not those in range (e.g. years spent in school, land size, annual net income). In this sense, we could use the actual data in any applicable analysis and not just only for descriptive statistics. Also, removed the N/A option in some of the questions; some questions do not require N/A as a response and should be answered only by yes or no. Moreover, questions should be arranged accordingly and related questions should be group. Disarrange questions will lead to confusion.

Furthermore, client survey questionnaire and the data template should match to avoid waste of time and effort in recoding the data to satisfy the data analysis required in the AFE RBME report.

**References**


Action Plan. Accessed on October 05, 2018 from https://whatis.techtarget.com/definition/action-plan

Agricultural Training Institute (ATI). 2017. Guidelines in the Institutionalization of the Agriculture and Fisheries Extension (AFE) Results-Based Monitoring and Evaluation (RBME) System (Memorandum Ref. No. M17-12-671). Quezon City.

Agri-tech. Accessed on October 05, 2018 from https://whatis.techtarget.com/definition/agri-tech

Bunnett, R.B. 2002. Interactive Geography 4, p. 98. SNP Pan Pacific Publishing.

Care International. 2016. Measuring Farmers' Satisfaction with the Services of Agricultural Service Providers in Minya and BeniSuef Governorates. Egypt.

Crops. Accessed on October 04, 2018 from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Crop.

Diversified Farming and Its Advantages. Accessed on October 05, 2018 from http://www.agriinfo.in/?page=topic&superid=1&topicid=651

European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA) and the Office of United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (UN OHCHR). 2018. Marginalized Groups. Europe.

Farmer Organizations. Accessed on September 24, 2018 from https://www.slideshare.net/MEAS1/june-4-at-3-pm-simpson-and-franzel-definition-fbo-and-f2-

Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO). 2017. Policy Support and Governance. Accessed on September 25, 2018 from http://www.fao.org/policy-support/policy-themes/rural-poverty-reduction/en/

Food Crops. Accessed on October 04, 2018 from http://www.appropedia.org/Food_crops

Fish Farming. Accessed on October 04, 2018 from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fish_farming

Hall and Khan. 2002. New Economy Handbook: Adoption of Technology. University of California at Barkeley.

Livestock. Accessed on October 04, 2018 from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Livestock

National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA). Age Classification. Philippines.

Penunia, E. 2011. The Role of Farmers' Organizations in Empowering and Promoting the Leadership of Rural Women. Accessed on September 25, 2018 from https://asianfarmers.org/the-role-of-farmers%E2%80%99-organizations-in-empowering-and-promoting-the-leadership-of-rural-women/.

Philippine Statistics Authority (PSA). Household. Accessed on September 24, 2018 from http://nap.psa.gov.ph/glossary/terms/indicatorDetails.asp?strIndi=88.
Poultry. Accessed on October 04, 2018 from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Poultry

Swanson, B. E. & Claar, J. B., 1984. Defining extension Agricultural extension: A reference manual. Alternative models and recent trends in organizing agricultural Extension. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. Rome.

## Annexes

### Annex 1

Proportionate allocation of farmer client-respondents in selected municipalities in Region 8 (2015)

| Municipalities | Provinces | Farmers | | Total Sample per Province |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Population | Sample | |
| Almeria | Biliran | 32 | 6 | 33 |
| Cabucgayan | Biliran | 30 | 6 | |
| Caibiran | Biliran | 65 | 13 | |
| Naval | Biliran | 43 | 8 | |
| Jipapad | Eastern Samar | 28 | 5 | 19 |
| Mercedes | Eastern Samar | 29 | 5 | |
| Oras | Eastern Samar | 24 | 5 | |
| Taft | Eastern Samar | 19 | 4 | |
| Baybay | Leyte | 59 | 11 | 114 |
| Capoocan | Leyte | 32 | 6 | |
| Carigara | Leyte | 34 | 7 | |
| Isabel | Leyte | 67 | 13 | |
| Javier | Leyte | 12 | 3 | |
| Kananga | Leyte | 61 | 12 | |
| La Paz | Leyte | 25 | 5 | |
| Leyte | Leyte | 28 | 5 | |
| Merida | Leyte | 85 | 16 | |
| Ormoc | Leyte | 130 | 25 | |
| Tanauan | Leyte | 59 | 11 | |
| Allen | Northern Samar | 41 | 8 | 17 |
| San Jose | Northern Samar | 32 | 9 | |
| Calbayog | Samar | 142 | 27 | 79 |
| Catbalogan | Samar | 183 | 35 | |
| Jiabong | Samar | 24 | 9 | |
| Paranas | Samar | 16 | 8 | |
| Hinunangan | Southern Leyte | 29 | 6 | 16 |
| Maasin | Southern Leyte | 24 | 4 | |
| Macrohon | Southern Leyte | 31 | 6 | |
| Total | | 1,384 | 278 | 278 |

**Annex 2**

Proportionate allocation of AEW client-respondents in selected municipalities in Region 8 (2015)

| Municipalities | Provinces | AEWs | | Total Sample per Province |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Population | Sample | |
| Culaba | Biliran | 10 | 3 | 5 |
| Naval | Biliran | 17 | 2 | |
| Guiuan | Eastern Samar | 5 | 2 | 4 |
| Salcedo | Eastern Samar | 5 | 2 | |
| Alang-Alang | Leyte | 14 | 1 | 36 |
| Carigara | Leyte | 13 | 3 | |
| Isabel | Leyte | 12 | 1 | |
| Jaro | Leyte | 18 | 6 | |
| Javier | Leyte | 23 | 15 | |
| Julita | Leyte | 9 | 1 | |
| Kananga | Leyte | 12 | 3 | |
| Leyte | Leyte | 7 | 1 | |
| Mayorga | Leyte | 13 | 5 | |
| Pinabacdao | Samar | 5 | 3 | 8 |
| Tarangnan | Samar | 6 | 5 | |
| Allen | Northern Samar | 24 | 3 | 10 |
| Las Navas | Northern Samar | 6 | 3 | |
| Lope de Vega | Northern Samar | 5 | 3 | |
| Mondragon | Northern Samar | 5 | 1 | |
| Bontoc | Southern Leyte | 5 | 2 | 9 |
| Hinunangan | Southern Leyte | 8 | 1 | |
| Hinundayan | Southern Leyte | 5 | 1 | |
| Macrohon | Southern Leyte | 10 | 1 | |
| St. Bernard | Southern Leyte | 8 | 3 | |
| Tomas Oppus | Southern Leyte | 5 | 1 | |
| Total | | 250 | 72 | 72 |

Republic of the Philippines
Department of Agriculture
AGRICULTURAL TRAINING INSTITUTE
ATI Building, Elliptical Road, Diliman, Quezon City, Metro Manila 1100
Tel. Nos. (63-2) 929-8541 to 49 & 928-7397 Fax No. (63-2) 920-9792
E-mail: ati_director@ati.da.gov.ph & ati_director@yahoo.com
URL: http://www.ati.da.gov.ph; www.e-extension.gov.ph

**Annex 3 Agriculture and Fisheries Extension Results-Based Monitoring and Evaluation System** CLIENT SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

**Consent Form**

The purpose of this survey is to determine the results of the interventions conducted by the Agricultural Training Institute. As past recipients of our interventions, we would like to interview you to know whether desired changes have been achieved or not. Please be assured that all information provided will be kept private. Any report that arises from this survey will not include your name or any other individual information by which you could be identified. Further, the information collected will be used by ATI for organizational management and improvement in the provision of interventions.

I, hereby voluntarily consent to participate in the survey regarding the Agriculture and Fisheries Extension Results-Based Monitoring and Evaluation System

Client's signature over printed name: _____
Date: _____

*If the interview is done by phone or email, asked the individual to answer the question:*
**Do you agree to participate in this survey? ( ) Yes ( ) No**

Please answer the questions honestly. Put a tick mark (✓) on the space provided corresponding to your answer. For questions not applicable, simply check or write "N/A".

**A. Client Profile**

A.1. Respondent: ( ) Farmer ( ) AEW engaged in farming ( ) AEW not engaged in farming

A.2. Gender: ( ) Male ( ) Female

A.3. Age: _____ | A.4. Status: ( ) Single ( ) Married ( ) Separated ( ) Widow/er

A.5. Highest Educational Attainment:
( ) Elementary ( ) High School ( ) Undergraduate
( ) Graduate ( ) Post-graduate ( ) Vocational

A.6. Household Size[1]: _____ | A.7. Household Role: ( ) Head ( ) Member

A.8. Part of a marginalized group? ( ) Yes ( ) No
A.9. If yes, ( ) Out of school youth ( ) Rural women ( ) Indigenous people
( ) Senior citizen ( ) Persons with disabilities

A.10. Membership to Farmer Organizations/Cooperatives: ( ) Yes ( ) No

**B. Extension Intervention Received**

B.1. What other extension interventions have you received from ATI? ( ) N/A
(*can have multiple answers*)
( ) School on the Air ( ) e-Extension ( ) Scholarship ( ) Advisory services
( ) IEC materials ( ) Others, please specify: _____

B.2. Other assistance received from ATI? ( ) N/A
( ) Farm animal ( ) Farm inputs ( ) Machineries &equipment
( ) Cash grant ( ) Market linkage[2] ( ) Others, please specify: _____

B.3. Did you receive other services from other government agencies? ( ) Yes ( ) No

B.4. If yes, ( ) N/A
( ) Trainings ( ) Livelihood projects
( ) Cash grant ( ) Farm inputs
( ) Farm animals ( ) Machineries/equipment
( ) Market linkages ( ) Others, please specify: _____

[1]Defined as a person or group of people, related or unrelated to each other, who live together in the same dwelling unit and share a common source of food.
[2]~~Refers to the process of conn~~ecting producers to the different levels of the marketing system (FAO).

B.5. From what agencies did you received the other services? ( ) N/A

_____ _____ _____
_____ _____ _____

B.6. Were you satisfied with the extension interventions you received from ATI?
( ) Very satisfied ( ) Satisfied
( ) Dissatisfied ( ) Very dissatisfied

B.7. How would you rate the relevance of the training received from ATI in terms of your current situation and needs? ( ) Very relevant ( ) Somehow relevant ( ) Not at all relevant

B.8. How would you rate the degree in which the interventions received helped increase your knowledge and understanding of agriculture and farming?
( ) Very much ( ) Moderate ( ) Slight ( ) Not at all

B.9. Were you able to accomplish the activities in your action plan? ( ) Yes ( ) No ( ) N/A

B.10. If no, what are the reasons that you were not able to accomplish the activities in your action plan? (*Can have multiple responses*) ( ) N/A
( ) No available personal resources ( ) No interest in accomplishing the action plan
( ) Forgot the details of the action plan ( ) Others, please specify: _____

**C. Use and Application of Lessons Learned**

C.1. Before attending the training, were you already aware or familiar with the lessons and technologies taught? ( ) Yes ( ) No ( ) N/A

C.2. Were you able to use or apply the technologies you learned from the training received?
( ) Yes ( ) No ( ) N/A (*If the answer is no, proceed to C.7.*)

C.3. What technologies have you used or applied in your household or farm? ( ) N/A
(*let the respondent share how he/she used the lessons learned from the training*)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| ( ) Backyard Gardening | ( ) Organic agriculture | ( ) Mulching/Vermicomposting |
| ( ) Animal Waste Management | ( ) SALT | ( ) Climate Smart Technologies |
| ( ) Pest Management | ( ) Diversified Farming | ( ) Good Agricultural Practice |
| ( ) Modern livestock technology | ( ) Product Processing | ( ) Vegetable farming |

(*Check the technologies described by the respondents, multiple answers are possible. If the response are not included in the list, kindly enumerate them below*)

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

C.4. How would you describe the manner in which you applied the technologies you learned? ( ) N/A
( ) Applied and shared the use of the technology to others
( ) Applied the technology to regular farming activities
( ) Tried a couple of times only

C.5. If it weren't for the training you received, do you think that you will learn these technologies from other sources? ( ) Yes ( ) No ( ) N/A

C.6. Do you see yourself continuously using the technologies you learned? ( ) Yes ( ) No ( ) N/A

(*Check N/A if respondent answered yes in C.2.*) ( ) N/A

C.7. What are the reasons that you were not able to use or apply the lessons learned/taught during the training?
( ) No available resources to use and apply the technologies
( ) Doubts on the use and application of the technologies
( ) Technologies taught are not suitable in the area
( ) Others, please specify: _____

**D. Farm Productivity**

D.1. What agricultural activities were you doing in the last year? ( ) N/A
( ) Crop production ( ) Animal husbandry ( ) Fishing
( ) Crop & Animal Husbandry/Fishing ( ) None

D.2. Main reason for engaging in agricultural activities? (*Only one answer is allowed)*
( ) Personal consumption ( ) Source of income ( ) N/A
( ) Others, please specify: _____

D.3. Land tenure: ( ) Owner ( ) Lessee ( ) Tenant

(*D.4. to D.5. are for respondents engaged in crop production*)
D.4. Land size: ( ) backyard ( ) less than 1 ha. ( ) 1 to less than 3 ha.
( ) N/A ( ) 3 to less than 5 ha. ( ) 5 to less than 7 ha. ( ) 7 to less than 9 ha.
( ) more than 9 ha.

D.5. Size of land used for crop production: _____ (*Use the choices in D.4. as an answer*)

D.6. Do you practice multiple cropping? ( ) Yes ( ) No ( ) N/A

D.7. What were the last crops that you planted? (*Enumerate all, write N/A if not applicable*)
_____ _____ _____
_____ _____ _____
_____ _____ _____
_____ _____ _____

D.8. Animals raised and D.9. number of heads: (*For respondents engaged in animal husbandry*)
( ) Chicken = _____ ( ) Cattle = _____ ( ) Pigs = _____
( ) Goats = _____ ( ) Fish = _____ ( ) Sheep = _____
( ) Ducks = _____ ( ) Carabao = _____ ( ) Rabbit = _____
( ) Others, please specify: _____ = _____
(*Write N/A if not applicable*)

D.10. Do you engage in any value adding activities? ( ) Yes ( ) No ( ) N/A

D.11. If yes, what value adding activities are you engaged in? ( ) N/A(*Can have multiple responses*)
( ) Packaging and branding of products
( ) Processing of products
( ) Others, please specify: _____

(*D.12. to D.14 are for respondents that answered source of income in D.2.*)
D.12. Annual net farm income: ( ) less than 50,000 ( ) 50,001 to 100,000 ( ) 100,001 to 150,000
( ) 150,001 to 200,000 ( ) 200,001 to 250,000 ( ) 250,001 to 300,000
( ) N/A ( ) 300,001 to 350,000 ( ) 350,001 to 400,000 ( ) 400,001 to 450,000
( ) more than 450,000

D.13. Did the technologies adopted helped increase your farm income? ( ) Yes ( ) No ( ) N/A

D.14. How would you rate the degree in which the technologies adopted helped increase your farm income? ( ) Very much ( ) Moderate ( ) Slight ( ) Not at all ( ) N/A

D.15. Do you have other sources of income outside of farming? ( ) Yes ( ) No ( ) N/A

*If the answer in D.15 is no or N/A, check N/A for D.16 and D.17.*) ( ) N/A
D.16. If yes, what are these: _____ _____
_____ _____
_____ _____
_____ _____

D.17 How much do you earn from these other sources annually (net income)? ( ) N/A
( ) less than 50,000 ( ) 50,001 to 100,000 ( ) 100,001 to 150,000
( ) 150,001 to 200,000 ( ) 200,001 to 250,000 ( ) 250,001 to 300,000
( ) 300,001 to 350,000 ( ) 350,001 to 400,000 ( ) 400,001 to 450,000
( ) more than 450,000

**E. Client Empowerment**

E.1. Do you engage in all of the following activities? ( ) Yes ( ) No ( ) N/A
(*For respondents that answered source of income in D.2.*)

( ) markets their products ( ) keeps farm records
( ) re-invests capital to farm ( ) develops business/farm strategies and plans
( ) has ambitions and goals for the farm

*If one item is not checked, the respondent is not considered as an agripreneur.*

E.2. For AEWs, have you been promoted or employed to higher level positions in the last three (3) years? ( ) Yes ( ) No ( ) N/A

E.3. Are you a certified learning site of ATI? ( ) Yes ( ) No ( ) N/A

E.4. If no, are you interested in becoming a certified learning site? ( ) Yes ( ) No ( ) N/A

**F. Client Resilience**

F.1. Do you have any insurance? ( ) Yes ( ) No ( ) N/A

F.2. What type: (*Can have multiple responses*)

( ) N/A ( ) Crop/livestock insurance
( ) Social security insurance (SSS, GSIS, Pagibig)
( ) Health insurance (Phil Health, Maxi care)
( ) Life insurance (Phil Health, Maxi care)
( ) Others, please specify: _____

F.3. How confident are you in case of unfortunate events such as typhoon, fire, pest, flooding, drought, and earthquake, among others?

( ) Highly confident ( ) Slightly confident
( ) Moderately confident ( ) Not at all confident

F.4. Were climate adaptation and mitigation techniques, measures and practices taught during your training? ( ) Yes ( ) No ( ) N/A

F.5. In the last three (3) years, have you experienced any unfortunate events in which your farm was affected and suffered damages and losses? ( ) Yes ( ) No ( ) N/A

(*Check N/A if the respondents answered no or N/A for either F.4. or F.5.*)

F.6. Were you able to use the climate adaptation and mitigation techniques, measures and practices taught to cope with the unfortunate events you experienced? ( ) Yes ( ) No ( ) N/A

F.7. How were you able to use the lessons learned in coping with unfortunate events? (*Let the respondent share how he/she used the lessons learned from the training*)

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

F.8. Aside from the current crops produced and/or animal raised, do you have other agriculture-related competencies and skills? ( ) Yes ( ) No ( ) N/A

F.9. What are these competencies: (*Can have multiple responses*) ( ) N/A

( ) Fishing ( ) Raising other animals
( ) Rice farming ( ) Corn production
( ) Fruit growing ( ) Producing other kinds of vegetables
( ) Others, please specify: _____

**G. Client Competitiveness**

G.1. Is your farm certified by any accreditation body? ( ) Yes ( ) No ( ) N/A

G.2. What type of certification does your farm have?

( ) Organic agriculture ( ) GAP
( ) GAHP ( ) Others, please specify: _____

G.3. Do you have any products certified by any accreditation body? ( ) Yes ( ) No

G.4. What type of certification have your products received?

( ) Organic ( ) HALAL ( ) GAHP
( ) GMP ( ) HACCP ( ) CAW[3]
( ) SBAP[4] ( ) Others, please specify: _____

G.5. How do you sell your products? (*Can have multiple responses*) ( ) N/A

( ) Through a middleman or an intermediary
( ) Directly to the market
( ) Directly to commercial establishments
( ) Others, please specify: _____

G.6. Do you export your products in other countries? ( ) Yes ( ) No ( ) N/A

G.7. If yes, what countries: _____ G.8. What products: _____

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

[3]Code of Animal Welfare
[4]Swine Breeders Accreditation Program