Midterm Impact Assessment Study of Special Area for Agricultural Development (SAAD) Program

Cynthia M. Rodriguez Keneth G. Bayani Mabel M. Caccam Valentino V. Prado Rodolfo G. Nillo Emerita D. Galiste Rufo A. Baro Ma. Victoria C. Domingo Rolyne Mae C. Pajarillo

Don Mariano Marcos Memorial State University Sapilang, Bacnotan, La Union

Table of Contents

	Page
Title Page	i
Abstract	iii
RATIONALE	1
REVIEW OF LITERATURE	5
METHODOLOGY	15
DISCUSSION OF RESULTS AND FINDINGS	24
SAAD Program Process	24
Program Management	25
Social Preparation	38
Production and Livelihood	40
Marketing Assistance and Enterprise Development	41
Impact Pathway	44
SAAD Activities	45
SAAD Outputs	53
SAAD Outcomes	68
SAAD Initial Impacts	87
Initial Adoption Rate and Trends	96
Reasons for Adoption and Non-adoption	112
Size and Distribution of Initial Benefits	115
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	167
LITERATURE CITED	186
APPENDICES	189

Abstract

The Special Area for Agricultural Development (SAAD) is a locally-funded program of the Department of Agriculture (DA), intended to help alleviate poverty among the marginalized sectors – agriculture and fishery. This midterm impact assessment study aimed to: document the entire SAAD program process from management and social preparation, production and livelihood interventions, and development of communitybased enterprises; describe the plausible impact pathway; assess initial adoption rate and trends; examine the reasons for adoption and non-adoption; assess the size and distribution of initial benefits; and provide recommendations to enhance the effective implementation of the SAAD Program. This midterm evaluation involved the conduct of a desktop analysis which harnessed SAAD baseline data and other documents published in the SAAD website. Field studies were undertaken to gather evidences of actual ground-level experiences of a sample of targeted SAAD beneficiaries from 15 provinces, including feedback and perspectives among SAAD program implementers at the regional, provincial, and municipal levels. The background desktop analysis revealed that the SAAD 2017 to 2018 program implementation in the target provinces was strictly guided by the SAAD framework. Designed activities under the program management, social preparation, and production and livelihood components were intended to be fully implemented commencing 2017. The marketing assistance and enterprise development component was only limited to the conduct of trainings on entrepreneurship and value adding, thus expected outputs and outcomes were not yet fully realized. A comprehensive analysis of the sample survey, FGD, pilot, and case studies revealed that the achievement of intended outputs and outcomes are in line with the plausible impact pathway blueprint developed for this midterm impact assessment study. A systematic investigation of the observed adoption of technology/interventions for agriculture and fishery production introduced through the SAAD program demonstrates an overall increasing adoption trend. At the same time, it disclosed factors influencing sustained adoption and non-adoption of the technologies/interventions introduced. The sample survey results further reflect the positive initial benefits of the SAAD program in improving household food consumption and economic status of beneficiaries. Moreover, the full accomplishment of the intended outputs, outcomes, sustained adoption of the SAAD interventions and expected subsequent desired impacts has been bounded by some limitations especially observed during the initial program implementation. Specific constraints and implementation bottlenecks were reported at the grassroots level through the sample survey of target beneficiaries (and complementary pilot study and case studies) and documented through the SAAD Program implementers FGD feedback and perspectives at all levels. An objective assessment of these challenges and constraints faced by target beneficiaries and program implementers identified opportunities for midterm re-prioritization, redirection, and improvement to enhance the more effective implementation and achievement of the desired impacts of the SAAD Program.

Keywords: agriculture, fishery, midterm impact assessment, SAAD

Rationale

Agricultural development programs are initiated to improve farmers' access and use of agricultural knowledge, technologies, marketing systems, and infrastructure for the purpose of contributing to higher productivity, profitability, and farm income. Agricultural development is a subset of rural development. However, rural areas cannot attain development without its agriculture being developed because the majority of the rural dwellers are engaged in agricultural practices as their major source of income. The main objectives of agricultural development are the improvement of material and social welfare of the people. Therefore, creating a sustainable agricultural development path means improving the quality of life in rural areas, ensuring enough food for present and future generations, and generating sufficient income for farmers. Supporting sustainable agricultural development also involves ensuring and maintaining productive capacity for the future and increasing productivity without damaging the environment or jeopardizing natural resources (Udemezue & Osegbue, 2018). This initiative likewise addresses the sustainable development goal of zero hunger for the world populace.

The Department of Agriculture (DA) of the Philippines is the government arm in-charge of food security and making food accessible to all residents of the country. It is responsible for the promotion of agricultural development by providing the policy framework, public investments, and support services needed for domestic and exportoriented business enterprises. In order to fulfil these responsibilities, it is the primary concern of the Department to improve farm income and generate work opportunities for farmers, fisherfolks, and other rural workers. In the Philippines, poverty incidence is greatest in the rural areas where people rely mainly on agriculture and fisheries as sources of their livelihood. The DA currently implements six banner programs (rice, corn, high value crops, livestock, fisheries, and organic agriculture) to boost national production of these commodities. The Special Area for Agricultural Development (SAAD) program is a locally funded program of the DA, intended to help alleviate poverty among the marginalized sectors in agriculture and fisheries. The SAAD program was established to complement the DA national banner programs by providing interventions in areas not reached by the regular DA programs. In line with the mandate of DA to uplift the poor economic situations of farmers and fisher folks, SAAD likewise assists beneficiaries to organize an efficient production, post-harvest, and marketing process to improve profit.

The SAAD is a project of the DA that demonstrates coherence between social protection and agriculture. This program is planned to be implemented for 6 years from 2017 to 2022 with the aim of reducing poverty among the marginalized and poorest sectors of agriculture and fishery. It has targeted 30 provinces based on PSA 2012 and 2015 data as well as the areas covered by Executive Order No. 70, series of 2018, as shown in Figure 1. With the DA's goal of alleviating poverty, food security and improving productivity in farming and fishing sectors, SAAD interventions were targeted to these classified poorest provinces/municipalities in the countryside.

Figure 1



Priority Provinces Covered by the SAAD Program Implementation

Note: Adapted from *SAAD Regions and 30 Provinces Covered, 2020* (http://saad.da.gov.ph/priority_provinces/)

This midterm impact assessment study has been appropriately scheduled midterm in 2020 with surveys and case studies undertaken during the period April 2021 to November 2021, specifically for the provinces covered by the SAAD Program during the 2017 and 2018 implementations. These studies were systematically undertaken with focus on evaluating the effectiveness of the four major components of the SAAD program and specifically determining identified gaps in these focal activities that can be further enhanced to ultimately meet the expected outcomes and impacts of the program.

Specifically, the study sought to:

- Document the entire program process from management and social preparation to release of production and livelihood interventions, and development of community-based enterprises;
- 2. Describe the plausible impact pathway, highlighting the observed outputs, outcomes, and impact so far achieved by the SAAD Program;
- 3. Assess initial adoption rate and trends;
- 4. Examine the reasons for adoption and non-adoption in the target and adjoining areas;
- Assess the size of initial benefits and distribution of these benefits improved household food consumption and increased income and enhanced economic status of partner-beneficiaries (gender-disaggregated, youth);
- Provide recommendations to enhance the effective implementation of the SAAD Program covering its four (4) program components.

Review of Literature

The assessment of the potential impacts of the SAAD program implemented by the Department of Agriculture, in line with its mandate to uplift the poor economic situations of farmers and fisherfolks, may draw lessons and relevant concerns from similar programs undertaken in the international, regional and national agricultural development space. Extensive lessons are learned from studies on the impacts of agricultural development program investments in South Asia, Southeast Asia and East Asia. These cover a broad range of impacts, ranging from the impacts in South Asia of agricultural research investments since the Green Revolution, the effects of risk management in rice-based farming systems of south-west coastal Bangladesh, adaptation pathways for rural livelihoods and global change in Indonesia, the Integrated Agricultural Productivity Program (IAPP) and the electrification projects reviewed by the World Bank, and the impacts of farmers' livelihood capitals on improving agricultural labor productivity in the Zhagana agriculture-forestry-animal husbandry composite systems in China.

Increased productivity in agriculture still has strong growth linkage impacts on regional and national economic development in South Asia, but these are not as powerful as they were during the Green Revolution (GR) era. South Asia's economic transformation has led to a more diverse set of engines for national economic growth, and agriculture no longer dominates; even many rural areas are now driven more by urban than by agricultural linkages. However, productivity growth in agriculture is still important for underpinning a good deal of agro-based industry as well as the livelihoods of vast numbers of rural people. It is also necessary for maintaining favorable national food balances, keeping food prices down, and meeting the region's rapid growth in demand for high-value foods (Hazell, 2008). A similar scenario in terms of gross domestic product by industry in the Philippines, the contribution of the agriculture, forestry and fishery (AFF) sector showed a declining trend of 11.3% in 2015 to 9.2% in 2019. The AFF was the lowest contributor among the three major sectors of the Philippine economy (PSA, 2020)

While farmers in Bangladesh were proactive in managing the risks they faced on a day-to-day basis, there was considerable uncertainty about the longer-term trends in the farming environment. Despite the current economic viability of the farming systems, threats remain from the anticipated impacts of climate change and increased salinization in the coastal zone. The sustainability of the coastal farming and livelihood systems in the study villages analyzed are likely to experience serious challenges. In this context, it is important to assess the economic viability of current and potential farming options in terms of future climate and environmental scenarios. Policy interventions need to be targeted at (a) investing in the infrastructure required to protect and enhance the farming environment and (b) providing farmers with an array of options (e.g., crop varieties, irrigation technologies, marketing arrangements) from which they can continue to construct resilient livelihoods (Kabir et al., 2019). Likewise in the Philippines, efforts had been focused on the development of resilient varieties of crops suited to environmental changes.

The Integrated Agricultural Productivity Program (IAPP) was successful in promoting adoption of many new crops and technologies, but this adoption has not led to increases in yield or income for crops. For fisheries, participation in IAPP has led to increased fish cultivation, but no increase in yields. This suggests that after two years of project participation, IAPP group members are not experiencing much of the improvement in living standards that the project hoped to achieve. Consistent with findings on missions, it appears the project has a heavy concentration of resources on conducting demonstrations, and less on ensuring that adoption farmers see project benefits. The problem does not seem to be caused by a lack of inputs or adoption: for crops, Development Impact Evaluation (DIME) monitoring showed that most villages received and distributed seeds during the adoption phases, and these seeds were adopted by farmers. For fisheries, we see more farmers/fisherfolks taking up fish cultivation. However, despite correct distribution of inputs and adoption, increases in yields failed to materialize. The World Bank reports that this is likely because the farmers did not correctly utilize the new technologies, either due to lack of training or lack of complementary inputs. In fact, reported yields of all non-paddy crops as well as fisheries are well below what was expected by IAPP. This suggests that even though the project has had some success in promoting new technologies, these technologies have not delivered on their promise for project participants (World Bank Report, n.d.).

Based on the report of Butler et al. (2014), provincial leaders' responses in eastern Indonesia indicated that the causes of community vulnerability are indeed highly complex and dynamic, influenced by 20 interacting drivers which are generating rapid change, of which climate variability and change are only two. Decision making is also contested due to tensions around formal and informal leadership, corruption, community participation in planning and female empowerment. Hence a process must be designed which can identify and implement no regrets and co-benefit strategies which do not foreclose future adaptation options, while proactively addressing proximate and systemic causes of vulnerability and related contested values and rules.

A study conducted in Zhagana Village in Gansu Province of China (Yang et al., 2019) concluded that the incentive livelihood capital indicators that influences

7

rural households' planting decisions on highland barley are the households' cultivated area, and productivity of farming activities, but the restrictive livelihood capital indicators are types of houses, the number of guest rooms at households' inns and the number of relatives in the same village. The incentive livelihood capital indicator that influences rural households' planting decisions on oilseeds is the number of household's smartphones, but the restrictive livelihood capital indicator is the quantity of horses. The restrictive livelihood capital indicator that influences rural households' planting decisions on potatoes is expectations for offspring to undertake farming, and the incentive livelihood capital indicator that influences rural households' planting decisions on other crops is the number of laborers in a household. Highland barley, as a typical crop and key element of the Zhagana Agriculture-Forestry-Animal Husbandry Composite System (ZCS), plays a significant role in maintaining the sustainable development of the system. In order to implement dynamic conservation of ZCS, the key is to recover the scale of planting highland barley. Therefore, based on the results of screening of livelihood capital indicators, this paper established policy interventions aiming at improving incentive livelihood capital indicators of planting decisions on highland barley. The crux of policy interventions is to improve agricultural labor productivity through the cooperation of the local government, the community and rural households.

Based on the regional accounts reported by PSA as of April 2021, the Philippines has growth rates at constant 2018 prices of 7.1% in 2016, 6.9% in 2017, 6.3% in 2018, 6.1% in 2019, and -9.6% in 2020, which clearly shows the effect of the COVID-19 pandemic in its economy. Moreover, based on the same report, the country is greatly dependent on its services sector, followed by the industry sector,

with the agriculture, forestry, and fishing sector as the least contributor to its economic activities.

Gross Domestic Product Percent Share, by Industry, At Constant 2018 Prices					
Year	Agriculture, Forestry, and Fishing	Industry	Services		
2016	10.4	30.3	59.3		
2017	10.1	30.3	59.6		
2018	9.7	30.6	59.8		
2019	9.2	30.4	60.4		
2020	10.2	29.2	60.7		

Table 1

Note: Data sourced from Philippine Statistics Authority (2021)

Based on the World Bank Report in 2021, the Philippines has been one of the most dynamic economies in the East Asia Pacific region. Average annual growth increased to 6.4% between 2010 to 2019, from an average of 4.5% between 2000 to 2009. With increasing urbanization, a growing middle class, and a large and young population, the Philippines' economic dynamism is rooted in strong consumer demand supported by a vibrant labor market and robust remittances. Business activities are buoyant with notable performance in the services sector including business process outsourcing, real estate, tourism, and finance and insurance industries. The Philippine economy has also made progress in delivering inclusive growth, evidenced by a decline in poverty rates and its Gini coefficient. Poverty declined from 23.3% in 2015 to 16.6% in 2018 while the Gini coefficient declined from 44.9 to 42.7 over the same period.

However, the COVID-19 pandemic and community quarantine measures imposed in the country have severely impacted economic growth and poverty reduction. Growth contracted significantly in 2020, driven by heavy declines in consumption and investment growth, and exacerbated by the sharp slowdown in exports, tourism, and remittances. Similarly, the previous trend in real wages, which is expected to have a positive impact on household incomes—particularly those from the lower income groups—has been severely hampered by the impact of the COVID-19, with negative consequences also for poverty reduction in the Philippines.

Nevertheless, the economy has started to recover with a 3.7% year-on-year expansion in the first half of 2021, buoyed by public investment and a recovery in the external environment. With continued recovery and reform efforts, the country is getting back on track on its way from a lower middle-income country with a gross national income per capita of US\$3,430 in 2020 to an upper middle-income country (per capita income range of US\$4,096–\$12,695) in the short term. Economic growth is expected to further rebound assuming a containment of the virus domestically and globally, an acceleration of mass vaccination pace, and with more robust domestic activity bolstered by greater consumer and business confidence and the public investment momentum. The recovery is expected to also have an overall positive impact on poverty reduction.

Impact Assessment: Underlying Framework

The principles underlying this midterm impact assessment study draw from the massive literature on impact assessment of agricultural development investments (e.g. agricultural research), impacts of agricultural productivity growth through growth linkages and the theory of change, among others. The concepts and underlying framework are discussed below.

Impact assessment attempts to determine the extent to which research contributes to higher-level development goals, such as increased farm production or food self-sufficiency. One can differentiate two main types of impact assessment: one is conducted during planning (ex ante) and another is conducted after the research results have been available for some time (ex post). Impact evaluations, which often indicate rates of return on the research investment, are primarily used to convince policymakers to allocate more resources to research. It can help in strategic planning, priority setting, and resource allocation, and can show how economic policies and technology interact. Ex post impact assessment usually has a time frame of 10 or more years after research results have been released, making it less of a management tool than the other types of evaluation. As with other ex post evaluations, the baseline data, targets and assumptions from planning (ex ante evaluation) are the basis for determining progress and ultimate impact. Research projects, which may be good candidates for impact assessment, such as those with potential national results or highly innovative research, must have their needs built into the original Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) systems. For instance, if market prices need to be monitored periodically for use in a future impact evaluation, this must be identified at the planning stage and monitored during the course of the activity (National Academy of Agricultural Research Management, n.d.).

When the impacts of agricultural productivity growth through growth linkages and food prices are taken into account, there is much more consistent evidence that it reduces poverty. Since rural and urban poor people alike spend large shares of their income on food, their real income improves significantly when food prices fall. Aggregate analyses show that public investments in agricultural research have proved very effective in reducing poverty, with more people raised above the poverty line per dollar spent than almost any other public investment in rural areas. Market liberalization may have reduced the power of the growth linkages and food price effects, as suggested by diminishing numbers of poor helped per dollar spent on research in recent years. Even so, the numbers of poor helped each year remain impressive (Hazell, 2008).

A theory of change can be used for strategic planning or programme/policy planning to identify the current situation (in terms of needs and opportunities), the intended situation and what needs to be done to move from one to the other. This can help to design more realistic goals, clarify accountabilities and establish a common understanding of the strategies to be used to achieve the goals. A theory of change can also be used during implementation to identify which indicators must be monitored, and to explain to staff, funders and partners how the programme or policy works (Rogers, 2014).

The Farmer Field School (FFS) is an extension strategy that provides capacity building and training activities. In Tanzania, the Agricultural Sector Development Programme-Livestock (ASDP-L) and the Agriculture Service Support Programme (ASSP) trained their beneficiaries through the FFS. Following the project's intervention details, Figure 2 shows the theory of change (TOC) for the projects. The figure summarizes the framework of the intervention, spanning from inputs (activities) to outputs, outcomes and impacts (Garbero & Chichaibelu, 2018). Looking at the causal pathways of the figure, note that the designed outcome expected from the FFSs is the adoption of acquired knowledge in improved practices and marketing by the beneficiary farmers. It was also expected that the acquired knowledge through FFS participation will be diffused largely into the local community in the form of farmer-to farmer knowledge sharing with neighbours or friends, who are referred to as FFS spillovers.

The theory of change can be developed up front as an input to planning an intervention but then effectively ignored once implementation is underway. This is

12

not good practice. Rather, a theory of change can be a valuable management tool to help in keeping the intervention on track and should be seen as an evolving model of the intervention (Mayne & Johnson, 2015).

The conservation model of agricultural development evolved from the advances in crop and livestock husbandry associated with the English agricultural revolution and the concepts of soil exhaustion suggested by the early German chemists and soil scientists. The conservation model emphasized the evolution of a sequence of increasingly complex land and labour-intensive cropping systems, the production and use of organic manures and labour-intensive capital formation in the form of physical facilities to more effectively use land and water resources. This model was the only approach to intensification of agricultural production that was available to most of the world's farmers (Udemezue & Osegbue, 2018).

The diffusion approach to agricultural development rests on the empirical observation of substantial differences in land and labour productivity among farmers and regions. The route to agricultural development, in this view, is through more effective dissemination of technical knowledge and a narrowing of the productivity differences among farmers and among regions. The diffusion of better husbandry practices was a major source of productivity growth even in pre-modern societies. Before the development of modern agricultural research systems' substantial effort was devoted to crop exploration and introduction. Even in nations with well-developed agricultural research systems a significant effort is still devoted to the testing and refinement of farmers' innovations and to testing and adaptation of exotic crop varieties and animal species. Model was developed emphasizing the relationship between diffusion rates and the personality, characteristics and educational accomplishments of farm operators (Udemezue & Osegbue, 2018).

13

Figure 2 illustrates the FFS extension strategic framework applying the theory of change concept as earlier mentioned. This midterm impact assessment report for the SAAD program constructs a similar applicable framework which tracks the plausible impact pathway that can effectively guide the assessment of the SAAD program.

Figure 2



Note: Adapted from Impact Assessment Report: The Agricultural Sector Development Program-Livestock and the Agriculture Service Support Programme, Tanzania, by A. Garbero and B. B. Chichaibelu, 2018, IFAD.

Methodology

Conduct of Desktop Analysis

All readily available and relevant secondary data from the SAAD National Program Management Office (NPMO) and Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources (BFAR) were carefully collated, studied, and systematically summarized in order to establish a reliable background and benchmark data for the assessment of the SAAD program. In particular, this benchmark provides a basis for understanding the effectiveness of the four major intervention points of the SAAD program. The baseline/background data has been particularly useful in determining the sampling design for the survey, as well as in the formulation of the survey questionnaire, FGD guide, and interview guide.

Building the Plausible Impact Pathway

The systematic construction of the SAAD program plausible impact pathway (illustrated finally in the results section) followed the underlying conceptual framework presented in the previous section with a sample illustrated in Figure 2 and the SAAD Program Framework illustrated in Figure 3.

The SAAD impact pathway highlights the documented program process in the SAAD framework starting from program management and social preparation, to production and livelihood interventions, and marketing assistance and enterprise. Specific details of the impact pathway were sought, scrutinized, validated, and enhanced during the actual data collection across all regions, provinces, and municipalities through the survey questionnaire, focus group discussions, and interviews.

Conduct of Field Survey

Coordination with Concerned DA Offices and SUCs

Initial coordination with the Regional Program Management Support Office (RPMSO) and Provincial Project Management Support Office (PPMSO) were done through official email communication and telephone calls. Identification of key informants from the different municipalities covered by the program was done at this stage.

Further, the project team sought the assistance of SUCs for the assignment of a focal person and recruitment of local research assistants from the different provinces. A Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) was forged with partner State Universities and Colleges (SUCs) detailing the roles and responsibilities of both parties, to include the provision of salaries to the research assistants and professional services to the focal person. (*See Appendix A – List of Partner SUCs*).

Sampling Design and Strategy¹

This midterm assessment of the Special Area for Agricultural Development (SAAD) Program commenced in January 2021. The baseline profile data covered the initial two years period across the 18 provinces where the SAAD program was implemented so far in 2017 and 2018. The latest profile data available from SAAD NPMSO and BFAR at the time the project officially commenced was utilized as basis for the final sampling frame. This profile data contained names of farmer and fisherfolk beneficiaries per province, municipality, and barangay as well as the documented intervention provided and year it was given.

¹ The sampling design and strategy applied in this Midterm Impact Assessment Report has been thoroughly discussed in the DMMMSU "Proposal on Midterm Assessment of the SAAD Program" approved by SAAD Management in October 2020. This section provides a summary for ready reference.

A stratified multistage random sampling design was adopted for the field survey. For each of the provinces covered, the municipality was identified as the primary or first-stage sampling unit, and the association and household levels were identified as secondary sampling units.

Each province was considered a stratum, and within each province, homogeneous clusters of municipalities (classified as High, Medium, and Low welfare condition municipalities) were considered as sub-strata. The High (H), Medium (M), and Low (L) welfare classification for municipalities were identified based on secondary data on the city/municipality income classification published by the Philippine Statistics Authority (PSA). Subsequently, for each of the H, M, L substrata, sample municipalities were identified using simple random sampling. Similarly, simple random sampling was also utilized in the selection of sample associations, farmers and fisherfolks, for each of the sample municipalities.

Determination of the sample size at each sampling stage was based on preliminary analysis of available profile data. The 2017 and 2018 data sets, with critical scrutiny of quality of the profile data provided by SAAD were considered. The sample was estimated based on four variables including estimated population variance, reasonable error of estimation and desired confidence level, as well as cost. Based on approximate variance estimates of a specific welfare variable (income levels), 5% error of estimation, and 95% confidence level, the estimated number of respondents was estimated to be 4,056 beneficiaries (2,976 farmers and 857 fisherfolks, 143 farmer associations and 80 fisherfolk associations). Proportional allocation was subsequently employed to determine the number of sample municipalities for each sub-strata, and number of sample associations and households for each municipality. While these estimates were determined using a simulated range of income variance estimates, the sample size for this study was finalized upon final cost factors and the estimation of actual variations using the final profile data provided by SAAD. During the course of the field survey, however, various challenges including heightened security and restrained transport across distant villages were aggravated by the spread of COVID-19 in the provinces under study. The increase in confirmed COVID cases and the corresponding lockdowns during the scheduled data collection period restricted the mobility of research assistants in the target municipalities and barangays. Survey turnout was most seriously noted in North Cotabato, Bukidnon, Masbate, Leyte, and Apayao (Tables 2 and 3).

Region	Province	Agriculture			Fisheries		
		Targeted	Interviewed	Validated	Targeted	Interviewed	Validated
Luzon							
CAR	Apayao	269	111	105	123	24	24
V	Catanduanes	49	49	48	18	18	17
V	Masbate	390	104	104	13	0	0
V	Sorsogon	293	314	242	26	24	22
Total		1,001	578	499	180	66	63
			Visayas				
VII	Negros Oriental	294	183	26	0	0	0
VIII	Leyte	54	7	7	125	55	54
VIII	Southern Leyte	128	92	89	154	98	90
VIII	Northern Samar	148	142	115	52	52	24
VIII	Western Samar	67	67	65	134	134	131
Total		691	491	302	465	339	299
Mindanao							
IX	Zamboanga del Norte	-	-	-	83	75	70
Х	Bukidnon	44	5	5	-	-	-
XI	Compostela Valley	82	80	75	-	-	-
XII	North Cotabato	672	277	191	47	22	16
XII	Sarangani	66	76	58	-	-	-
XII	Sultan Kudarat	-	-	-	25	12	12
Total		864	438	329	155	109	98
Grand	Total	2,556	1,507	1,130	800	514	460

Table	2
-------	---

Distribution of Individual Respondents per Province

Region	Province	Agriculture			Fisheries			
		Targeted	Interviewed	Validated	Targeted	Interviewed	Validated	
Luzon								
CAR	Apayao	11	2	2	9	-	-	
V	Catanduanes	-	-	-	-	-	-	
V	Masbate	5	1	1	1	-	-	
V	Sorsogon	5	5	5	1	1	1	
Total		21	8	8	11	1	1	
			Visayas					
VII	Negros Oriental	14	5	-	-	-	-	
VIII	Leyte	10	-	-	13	4	4	
VIII	Southern Leyte	4	-	-	6	1	1	
VIII	Northern Samar	2	-	-	8	-	-	
VIII	Western Samar	2	-	-	-	-	-	
Total		32	5	-	27	5	5	
Mindanao								
IX	Zamboanga del Norte	-	-	-	12	10	10	
Х	Bukidnon	-	-	-	-	-	-	
XI	Compostela Valley	-	-	-	-	-	-	
XII	North Cotabato	52	28	21	4	1	1	
XII	Sarangani	-	-	-	7	11	11	
XII	Sultan Kudarat	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Total		52	28	21	23	22	22	
Grand	Total	2,556	105	41	29	61	28	

Table 3Distribution of Group/Association Respondents per Province

Furthermore, the following cases contributed to interview non-response: deceased beneficiaries, beneficiary households who have relocated/moved to another place, those who were away during the time of survey, and those who refused to be interviewed. Also, those who stated that they only received SAAD interventions in the year 2020 and those who claimed that they had not received any intervention yet at the time of the survey (April - November 2021) were not included in the assessment. These were documented through certifications signed by the LGU representative. The number of specific cases for each of the above mentioned reasons is shown in Appendix H.

Aside from interview non-response during the survey period as previously discussed, item non-response or failure to obtain answers to specific items in the questionnaire was also encountered. Some of the reasons for this include: respondents' unwillingness to disclose the information being asked or being unaware of the answer; or the research assistants' omission of some questions during the interview. To address the case of missing data, a systematic cleaning and validation procedure was developed to improve the quality and reliability of the full data set collected from the survey. First, whenever possible, the DMMMSU research team recalled research assistants and asked them to go back to collect the missing data. In this case, non-responses were requested to be checked for appropriate data entry. Second, the research team also embarked on a thorough review of the full set of data collected from each respondent. A systematic screening protocol was undertaken to ensure data quality and consistency. There were indeed many instances when missing data were resolved using the information gathered from respondents for other questions or other parts of the questionnaire. The protocol entailed a tedious careful review of the series of responses in the entire data row (for each respondent) in order to resolve the proper entry for a particular missing item. In many cases too, the Research Assistants' notes and remarks were very useful in resolving these cases of missing data.

Development and Testing of Survey Instruments

Survey questionnaires were developed using the SAAD framework as primary basis and laid out in congruence to the beneficiary and association profiles provided by SAAD NPMSO. The questionnaires were piloted among SAAD farmer and fisherfolk beneficiaries in Apayao who were not included as sample respondents. After the pilot testing, the project team sought the assistance of a consultant in the validation and finalization of the survey instruments. The validated questionnaires were then translated into e-survey instruments using the KoBo ToolBox and deployed through Android tablets. (See Appendix B - Survey Questionnaire for Individual Farmers and Fisherfolk; Appendix C - Survey Questionnaire for Farmer and Fisherfolk Associations).

Training of Research Assistants

Prior to the conduct of the survey, the Android tablets were distributed to Research Assistants through their respective focal persons. Orientation and training of the research assistants through Google Meet was also conducted to explain the specific contents of the questionnaires and to demonstrate data collection using the esurvey instruments in the Android tablets. In addition to the online training, the research assistants were also provided with an instructional manual as guide on how to use the e-survey instrument as ready reference (*See Appendix D - Research Assistant's Guide to the e-Survey Instrument*). After the training sessions, online group chats with the focal persons and research assistants were setup using Facebook Messenger as a communication tool to raise and address inquiries, issues, and concerns related to the field survey.

Actual Field Visits

Actual field visits to target project beneficiaries were conducted in coordination with local government units (LGUs) and/or association officers. To maximize resources during each visit to the municipalities, target beneficiaries who were found to be ineligible as respondents of the study or had met a valid non-response reason were replaced with beneficiaries from the same municipality under the same category (as farmer or fisherfolk) and same year of intervention provision based on the SAAD profile data. Signed certifications as to the reason for non-response or ineligibility of the target respondent were secured as documentation evidence for replacement (*See Appendix E - Certification Form Template*). Close

coordination among the project staff, focal persons, and research assistants were conducted through telephone calls, short messaging service (SMS), emails, online chat, and video calls.

Survey Data Limitations. Readers and users of data for this report should consider that data were obtained from a sample survey from the list of SAAD 2017 and 2018 beneficiaries available during the time the project officially commenced. As such, it is subject to sampling variations since observations were not taken from the true population. Estimates, especially financial indicators, may also be affected by non-sampling errors such as deliberate under or overstatement of income, debt, savings, and budgets. Responses from the sampled beneficiaries may also involve recall limitations, e.g. their production levels before they became SAAD beneficiaries up until the year 2020.

Conduct of Focus Group Discussions

Key informants for the Focus Group Discussions were identified at the regional, provincial, and municipal level to inquire on the perspectives on program management. Official invitations were forwarded to the prospective participants to get their preferred schedules. Links for the virtual meeting using Google Meet platform were forwarded to the participants prior to the scheduled FGD. Similar to the survey instrument, interview questions for the focus group discussions were developed using the SAAD framework as guide (*See Appendix F - Focus Group Discussion Protocol*).

Conduct of Case Study

Four (4) case studies were implemented to complement the midterm impact evaluation survey data. These case studies aimed to identify and explore best practices, investigate and understand critical issues, identify constraints, determine potential opportunities, and provide recommendations on specific areas for improvement. It was also intended to address some limitations observed in the available SAAD benchmark profile data sets, e.g. baseline production data levels.

The project team judiciously selected the province of Sorsogon as the case study site especially considering accessibility and transport restrictions during the case study implementation period. Four (4) cases were studied:

- Oyster farming (Brgy. Ginablan, Pilar)
- Integrated Farming (Vegetable, Duck, Swine) (Brgy. Sipaya, Juban)
- Upland Rice and Vegetable Production (Brgy. Puting Sapa, Juban)
- Duck-raising (Brgy. San Bartolome, Sta Magdalena)

Documentation of Evidence of Initial Impact

Evidences of initial impact are documented in two reports. This Midterm Impact Assessment is a comprehensive report demonstrating the entire program process from initial SAAD program implementation and performance of communitybased production and livelihood enterprises via a plausible impact pathway analysis. This report highlights lessons learned, i.e. what worked and what did not work. Specific midterm impact indicators were based on adoption trends and patterns on farming and fisheries technologies in the SAAD target provinces, improved productivity, total production area expansion, and income, among others. This is complemented by a set of case studies that demonstrates significant institutional and qualitative outcomes including food security and nutrition, production intensification and diversification, expansion of access to market, and enhanced resilience to climate induced disasters, with consideration of gender disaggregation. These case studies document benefits accruing to farmers and fisherfolk who applied crop, poultry, and aquaculture technologies in the province of Sorsogon.

Discussion of Results and Findings

SAAD Program Process

The program process of the Special Area for Agricultural Development is outlined in the program framework (Figure 3). The overall plan of activities is anchored in the framework and the measure of performance of project implementation is guided by the target outputs, outcomes and impact. The SAAD program process and its actual implementation across regions during the project horizon were analyzed using available official documents and data/perspectives gathered through focus group discussions (FGD). Observed implementation of the SAAD program process was documented and deviations between the approved program plan and actual experiences/evidences gathered across regional FGDs were identified to highlight potential areas of improvement in SAAD program implementation. The focal persons of SAAD from the regional and provincial level and the Municipal Agriculture Officer as implementers were invited to participate in the virtual FGD conducted in six (6) groups. The participants came from BFAR Region 12 (North Cotabato, Sarangani & Sultan Kudarat); provinces of Catanduanes, Eastern Visayas, Southern Leyte, Northern Samar, Negros Oriental, Sultan Kudarat, Sarangani and North Cotabato.

Figure 3 SAAD Program Logical Framework



Note: Adapted from SAAD 2018 Annual Report

Program Management

Program management is the first focal activity identified in the SAAD framework. Program management is a strategic management approach to executing and controlling multiple related projects. This component comprises activities that are strategic, operational and preparatory to ensure efficient, effective, timely, and properly documented program implementation. Data on this component were elicited from reviewing available documents and from the results of FGDs conducted.

During its inception in 2017, the SAAD National Program Management Office (NPMO) led by the SAAD Program Director had five (5) working groups or clusters: Planning and Budget, Administrative, Operations, Public Relations and Communications, and Information Technology, tasked to carry out the program management component activities. There were also eight (8) regional focal persons assigned for the 2017 target provinces.

In 2018, the NPMO structure was streamlined into three (3) clusters or units: Planning and Monitoring, Information Technology, and Administration. In this setup, the Operations, and Public Relations and Communications cluster was integrated into the Planning and Monitoring Unit. Additional regional focal persons were also assigned for the additional target provinces for 2018.

The current implementation structure of the DA-SAAD Management is reflected in Figure 4. This is comprised of the Program Steering Committee (PSC); National Program Management Office (NPMO) composed of the SAAD Program Director, Deputy Director and Staff; Regional Program Management Support Office (RPMSO) composed of the Regional Executive Director, Regional Focal Person and Staff; and the Provincial Program Management Support Office (PPMSO) composed of Provincial Coordinators, Area Coordinators, Area Staff, and other Area Technical Staff. The said groups are organic DA officials/staff designated or assigned to the program as well as staff/consultants hired for the program.

Figure 4 DA-SAAD Organizational Structure



Note: Adapted from SAAD Program Operational Manual (2021)

The SAAD NPMO is accountable to each stakeholder including the farmers, government and private organizations, local government units, extension workers,

Non-Government Organizations (NGOs), State Universities and Colleges (SUCs), National Commission on Indigenous Peoples (NCIP), Population Commission (POPCOM), Department of Agriculture (DA), Agricultural Training Institute (ATI, responsible for training and extension), Bureau of Agricultural Research (BAR, responsible for research and development), Bureau of Plant Industry (BPI, responsible for the quality of planting materials and market assistance), Go Negosyo (private group) for enterprise development and marketing assistance; and Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO).

The SAAD regional and provincial team are responsible for the outcome of every project, project implementers ought to report each movement to provide transparency. The RPMSOs and the PPMSOs are expected to oversee and carry out the implementation of SAAD in the field. In line with the Program's participatory approach, other institutions and stakeholders are considered and are expected to significantly affect program implementation.

Moreover, there is a reported difficulty in SAAD program implementation in Lanao Del Sur and Maguindanao due to unstable peace and order situation, profiling beneficiaries and delivery of interventions are affected. For DA-RFO10-Lanao Del Sur, the culture in the province is different from Region 10 communities, and the Marawi Siege from May to October 2017. For DA-RFO12-Maguindanao, there is no Municipal Agriculturist, and problems in transferring funds affected project implementation.

Formulation of Plans and Budget

The Administrative and Procurement Unit is responsible for the management of NPMOs' administrative, human resource, records, logistics, and finance aspects. Administrative activities include the provision of assistance to the SAAD Director in terms of schedule of the management, review of documents prior to the Director's appropriate action, liquidation of travel reimbursement, and dissemination of critical information to the NPMO staff; hiring and recruitment of staff for the NPMO; facilitation of incoming and outgoing documents; property management and office maintenance; maintaining accurate and up-to-date records of the NPMO; and overseeing all logistics-related activities.

The NPMO conducts harmonization meeting, direction setting, planning (consultative planning), and national planning and budget workshop participated by SAAD NPMO, BFAR SAAD, and SAAD Regional Field Offices (Luzon -CAR, IV-B, V; Visayas - VI, VII, VIII, and Mindanao- IX, X, XI, XII, XIII).

As of 2020, the program has a total budget allocation of 2,996,418,876; with increasing annual budget of Php 872,235,000 in 2017, Php 991,268,000 in 2018, Php 1,430,339,807 in 2019, and Php 1,132,615,876 in 2020.

Further, among the respondent provinces, as of 2020, Zamboanga del Norte has reported the biggest budget utilized in their production and livelihood interventions and Bukidnon reported the least budget utilized. Moreover, all of their utilized budget has decreased in 2020, implying that the COVID-19 pandemic has disrupted their operations.

There are two modalities for program implementation, one is the budget allocation to the DA Regional Office and the other is the Fund transfer to PLGU, C/MLGU, BLGU, and other institutions. In the first modality, the DA Regional Office uses the approved project proposals to identify specific items to be produced for each package of intervention. A list of items can be grouped together and later be organized into a larger procurement process. The regional DA procurement process is followed. Accordingly, the actual delivery and distribution of items to partnerbeneficiaries and monitoring of projects are handled by the PPMSO and RPMSO. Budget allocation for this modality is under the General Appropriations Act. In the second modality, the budget is transferred directly to the LGUs and other institutions from the GAA allocated to the RPMSO or NPMO. Procurement, therefore, is under the recipient's domain. The funds transferred are based on the financial requirement of the proposed project as reflected in the approved project proposal. The requirements for the fund transfer are: approved project proposal including Work and Financial Plan; SB/SP Resolution from the LGU; and Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between the DA Regional Field Office (RFO) or NPMO and the LGUs or other institutions.

The ACs and PCs in close coordination with the RPMSO and recipient institution consistently and closely monitor the status of fund utilization and the delivery and management of projects. They also monitor the compliance of the recipient institution to the provision stated in the MOA. The RPMSO have the discretion on what modalities they see fit to utilize the Program's financial resources more efficiently and to implement the projects more effectively.

Moreover, for funding proposals submitted by farmer or fisherfolk groups or by LGUs, a proposal is submitted to the PPMSO. The PC/APCO validates the proposals per target area and beneficiaries covered. If approved at the PPMSO level, project proposals are consolidated and must be forwarded to RPMSO for further analyses and validations.

RPMSO should analyze and validate the proposal/s submitted by the PPMSO for inclusion in the crafting of Planning & Budget proposals of the Program.

If approved at the RPMSO level, budgetary requirements for the consolidated project proposals must be submitted to the NPMO using the suggested forms and templates as required by the NPMO.

Procurement of Supplies and Materials

The procurement activities involve preparation of documents for NPMOs' supplies, meetings, training, workshops, and other requirements; supervision, control, and distribution of funds; and coordination with DA Financial Management Service on matters of budget and other financial requirements. As one of the usual constraints in delivering government services, SAAD NPMO is constantly finding ways in improving their procurement systems from early procurement to community participation procurement.

There are existing suppliers of items proposed in a project, otherwise, the project is not initiated. If there are identified suppliers, the following are further assessed: Distance - the location of identified suppliers is very critical during the delivery of stocks or items to target communities. Ideally, the winning supplier is within the province for easier facilitation of distribution of items given that SAAD target areas are hard-to-reach areas. This is also to ensure the health of animal stocks and the quality of agricultural inputs is not compromised during transport. Thus, a project which has identified suppliers who are closer to target communities are favored and given higher scores in the evaluation; and Supplier's Qualifications - Identified suppliers must be accredited by PhilGeps to facilitate procurement. Moreover, they should have proven their capacity to supply the required quality and quantity of stocks and items specified in the project. Suppliers who meet these shall be favored and given higher scores in the evaluation.

Once the budget is appropriated to the RPMSO through the General Appropriation Act, the procurement is facilitated by the RPMSO and is strictly in accordance with the Republic Act No. 9184 also known as the "Government Procurement Reform Act" and its related rules and regulations. The RPMSO designated staff, preferably the Administrative Officer, to process all procurement related documents and to monitor its progress. To avoid delays, the RPMSO consults in advance and always coordinates with appropriate technical personnel in DA-RFO (e.g. BAC TWG) in the preparation of Purchase Request (PR). This ensures that the prices, quantities, and specifications required are correctly and completely reflected in the PRs. Each PR indicates and follows the default warranty.

Once the procurement succeeds, inspection, acceptance, and delivery shall commence immediately. Contracted suppliers are advised to deliver the items specified in the PRs in the nearest available holding area to the target beneficiaries either managed by the DA, LGUs, or organizations or as stated in the purchase order's contract within a specified period. This easily facilitates the delivery and actual distribution of items to the partner-beneficiaries. The SAAD hired Technical Staff is primarily responsible for the inspection of items procured and delivered. The inspector checks and validates the delivered items vis-a-vis the quantity and specifications indicated in the approved PR. A representative from the RPMSO is present during the inspection. The inspector shall issue an inspection report and acceptance (if ever there were no discrepancies) to the RPMSO. Once this is done, the delivered items are ready for distribution to partner-beneficiaries or partnerorganizations.

Hiring of Staff

The RPMSO and PPMSO are manned by regular Department of Agriculture's employees and Contract of Service (CoS) personnel.

The designated positions in the SAAD NPMO were derived from the program's structure and functions. The COs SAAD hired will carry the duties provided in each unit to assure the success of the overall implementation of the program. Appropriate government equivalent positions were deliberated and approved by the Program Director. The rates and job titles were based on the nature of work and number of deliverables for each hired staff. Accountability of staff based on deliverables and availability of funds were also considered by the program in the creation of positions.

The SAAD NPMO positions are aligned to existing government positions; the program provided a list of equivalent positions based on its requirements, salary grade and number of positions per job title with equivalent qualifications/requirements for each position.

The specific functions per hired staff are based on the functions of the unit/subunit where the staff is assigned. The functions shall be the basis of deliverables required per staff and are used to assess their performance subject to the renewal or termination of contract. Qualifications per position are based on the required qualifications for the corresponding equivalent Government Positions including years of experience, knowledge, and skill sets required and hours of training required. Also, the program includes the assessment of personality and psychological capacity.

Qualified applicants undergo examination and interview for the program to assess their qualifications and rank the top applicants. Once selected, the NPMO
Administration and Procurement Unit gathers the necessary requirements and drafts a contract for the hiring of the selected individual. Once all documentary requirements are satisfied, the selected individual is endorsed to the DA Personnel for the processing and finalization of Contract.

The validity of the contract is based on the prescribed timeline of the DA-OSEC. Termination of contract is done by the employer (Program Director) if the COS has a failing performance rating based on the evaluation. The source of funds for the salaries, travelling expenses, TEVs and other financial claims by the SAAD NPMO staff comes from either the SAAD Current or Continuing Funds as released in the General Appropriations Act (GAA]. All claims/reimbursement are based on existing Commission on Audit (COA) rules and regulations. Since the SAAD Program is identified as a locally funded project under DA-OSEC funds, its hiring and renewal are subject to the approval of the DA Secretary. No positions are filled nor terminated without the consent of the DA Secretary. All hiring is based on existing COA and Civil Service Commission (CSC) rules and regulations.

Furthermore, hired staff undergo internal capability building activities first before proceeding with the implementation. This includes the program objectives, scope, timeline, requirements, and processes to be conducted in the field. These capability building activities helped in setting program implementation directions and harmonized the understanding of the project implementers.

Coordination with LGUs, Agencies, and Other Stakeholders

The participation of LGUs, NGAs, and other stakeholders such as businesses, NGOs, SUCs, and other CSOs is crucial during the preparatory stages of program implementation. It is important to involve them to explore possible areas of cooperation and partnerships. Given that the resources allocated to the program is not as huge, partnerships will play a key role in mobilizing other resources and in providing logistical support.

To conduct initial planning and preliminary activities, the Regional Program Management Support Office (RPMSO) shall be created before the implementation of the program. The RPMSO shall be manned by regular Department of Agriculture's employees and Contract of Service (CoS) personnel.

Formulation and Updating of Manual of Operations

As a guide in the implementation of the program, the operations manual is updated to provide the mechanics of implementation per activity from program management, social preparation, production and livelihood intervention, and marketing and enterprise development. For the preparatory activities, the selection of municipalities and barangays shall be done based on criteria considering poverty status and other considerations (level of malnutrition, peace and order condition, accessibility, previous performance of LGU, absorptive capacity, and number of municipalities and barangays. Needs and environment assessment and project identification are done with the participation of the farmers and stakeholders. Moreover, a field implementation manual is formulated to provide the mechanics of implementation per activity.

Monitoring and Evaluation

The Project Monitoring and Evaluation (PME) Unit of SAAD is the heart and soul of the program's operations. The group ensures the smooth implementation of the program in the provinces targeted through planning, monitoring, and evaluation by directly coordinating with the RPMSOs' of the agriculture sector and BFAR Central Office, which handles the SAAD's fishery sector. The PME unit prepares, reviews, and consolidates planning and budget-related documents, which are required to obtain funding from the Department of Budget and Management. They also evaluate and recommend project proposals, budgets, and proposed realignments of the program. They are also assigned to coordinate with the Program Steering Committee through the provision of required reports, policy recommendations, among others. Moreover, the unit handles the monitoring of ongoing projects amid the CoViD-19 pandemic and other external affairs as well.

Given that the program is results-oriented, timely monitoring of projects and its implementation is expected of the ACs. Though the program advocates for those areas often not reached by government intervention, it takes the fact that some areas are very difficult to reach to the extent that it hampers Program implementation. Thus, the accessibility and safety are carefully considered and assessed.

SAAD practices timely monitoring and evaluation. This helps the program extract relevant information from the past and on-going activities that are used as the basis for the fine-tuning, redesigning, and future planning of the program in general. Further, a "results-based" M & E system is adopted where the PPMSO and RPMSO work with their system while ensuring needed results-based information at the NPMO level is captured and reported on.

The SAAD beneficiary is geo-tagged using the SAAD Profiling App - Open Data Kit (ODK). This tool was utilized in infrastructure project verification and monitoring in remote areas. This initiative also aims to promote a holistic planning, transparency and accountability of the delivery of goods, and services. Geo-tagging involves attaching location-specific information such as geographical coordinates to pictures of beneficiaries of the program. The manual/protocol entails a comprehensive enumeration of all SAAD proponents/beneficiaries socio-economic and other relevant information based on SAAD Profiling Form.

There are two levels of M&E conducted and adopted for the SAAD Program, the operational level, and the program impact level. Operational is more in line with "monitoring" and the day-to-day activities and allows the program management to adjust based on feedback from monitoring reports. Program impact is more of the evaluation type. The number of impact evaluations done ultimately depend on DA funding (both at the central office and regional offices). However, at least the midprogram and the end program evaluation shall be done.

A feedback mechanism is done during the implementation and monitoring of activities. This mechanism aims to help inform decision-makers on bottlenecks or issues that affect program implementation. There are two levels of the feedback mechanisms and follows the program organizational structure. As part of the capacity building initiatives of the program, all field implementers are oriented on all suggested monitoring tools and forms. The NPMO and RPMSO shall facilitate the orientation. Periodic evaluations are conducted based on the resources available. The pre-program evaluation is the gathering of baseline information that is consistent with the indicators. This is done during the initial stages of program implementation particularly during the conduct of desk study, consultation and coordination with LGUs and other agencies, and during the validation and profiling of beneficiaries. The mid-program evaluation is the assessment of the achievement of results vis-a-vis the targets. Not only results but operational efficiency is also assessed to improve the overall implementation of SAAD. This is done during the implementation proper stage where procurement and delivery of interventions are already realized. The endof-program evaluation pertains to the impact evaluation of SAAD. The program's

impact shall be measured based on its goals and objectives. Data on indicators shall be completely gathered and carefully processed and analyzed. This shall be done when the program ends in 2022.

Further, the pre-program and mid-program evaluations are done internally. The NPMO facilitates these two types of evaluation together with the RPMSO. Accordingly, the NPMO and RPMSO seek the help of the PPMSO and other concerned agencies, particularly during the data gathering stage. The ACs, PCS, LGU partners, and stakeholders provide logistical support and critical information to facilitate the activity. On the other hand, the end-of-program evaluation (impact) shall be done by external evaluators. The NPMO, RPMSO, and PPMSO shall provide necessary inputs within their capacity to help the external evaluators in their research.

Conduct of Meetings

The conduct of meetings is inherent across all the above-mentioned activities in the pre-implementation stage of the SAAD Program. Internal meetings within the SAAD structure (NPMO, RPMSO, PPMSO) and external meetings with partner agencies to include the LGUs, DA Bureaus and attached agencies (BFAR, ATI, BAI, BPI, BSWM, BAFE, PhilMech, among others), and other government agencies (DSWD, DOH, DepEd, TESDA, NCIP) are essential to ensure smooth implementation of the SAAD projects in the target communities.

Social Preparation

This component encompasses a series of activities to ensure appropriate livelihood interventions and ensure readiness and empowerment of the identified farmers and fisherfolk beneficiaries in accepting and managing the livelihood projects. It also includes coordinating with partner-agencies and organizations for possible collaboration. Various capacity-building activities and specialized trainings

38

are conducted for the SAAD beneficiaries to prepare and empower them before the turnover of projects.

Community Organizing

The initial step in the social preparation activities is community-organizing. The series of activities is designed to prepare the beneficiaries to cope with the implementation of government programs or development projects and to encourage them to actively participate and prepare their community and personal responsibilities in the livelihood, and other government programs for the poor.

On top of the Community Needs Assessment (CNA) that shall be done at the stage of project identification, another set of social preparation activities shall be conducted by the PPMSO and RPMSO. Community orientation and mobilization shall commence once the projects are approved and have budget allocation. The aim is to have consensus with the communities on what SAAD is all about, the support available, the commitments needed from the communities, and mobilizing everyone towards initiating the project.

LGUs and other concerned groups shall likewise participate in community orientation and mobilization to level-off expectations and to discuss areas of cooperation. Further, the roles and responsibilities of each group can be defined to ensure smooth implementation of the project. Capability building for the program beneficiaries shall be coordinated with the Agricultural Training Institute (ATI) for inclusion in their Work and Financial Plans (WFP). In case ATI cannot accommodate said capacity building requirements, these may be incorporated in the Program's WFP.

Capability Building

Training programs other than specialized training can also be conducted to prepare the partner-beneficiaries in implementing the projects to be provided to them.

These training programs include but are not limited to the following: Values Formation, Leadership Training, Organizational Development, Indigenous Peoples (IPs) mentoring, and other related training programs.

Project Orientation

Project orientations are performed to focus on achieving efficiency and effectiveness of the SAAD program. Stated in the 2017 SAAD Annual Report, SAAD NPMO will be conducting orientation and workshops to FY 2017 and FY 2018 priority provinces to create Community Logical Frameworks. According to the World Bank (2000), the Logical Framework has the power to communicate the essential elements of a complex project clearly and succinctly throughout the project cycle. It is used to develop the overall design of a project, to improve the project implementation, monitoring and to strengthen periodic project evaluation. In 2018 the Community Logical Framework and SAAD Orientation was conducted with the different regional and provincial staff. The logical framework was further enhanced by the SAAD NPMO which is necessary for effective program monitoring and evaluation.

Consultation Workshops and Meetings

As part of the social preparation workshops on project proposals were conducted in 2017. This activity is a way of empowering the SAAD beneficiaries. Regular meetings are also essential to keep abreast on possible problems and to be able to come-out with solutions.

Production and Livelihood

This component entails the implementation of various livelihood projects based on the assessed needs of the farmers and fisherfolk in the target provinces.

Provision of agri-inputs, tools, machineries, facilities, and equipment

The SAAD program provided interventions to the identified provinces under survey like planting materials, livestock, poultry, capture fishery and aquaculture. Along with these, agri-inputs, various tools, machineries, and equipment for production were also provided. These provisions are geared toward improvement of farm and fishing production and productivity through enhanced farming skills, expansion in production areas, and improvement in farm and fishing technologies.

Provision of post-production facilities and equipment

Post-production facility and equipment can reduce losses and add value to farmer/fisherfolk produce. The provision of these facilities and equipment are a prelude to enterprise development which is the end goal of the SAAD program.

Conduct of Technical Training

Technical trainings enhance the capability of the SAAD beneficiaries in the operation and implementation of their respective projects. In some aspects, it is encompassed in the social preparation component specifically capability building.

Marketing Assistance and Enterprise Development

As pointed out in the SAAD framework, activities to facilitate marketing assistance and enterprise development are: local market study; conduct of technical training on entrepreneurship and value adding; provision of logistics support; and audit of livelihood enterprises. All of these activities aim to increase volume of sales through expanded access to the market. It is clearly seen from the framework that the ultimate goal of SAAD is building enterprise out of the farming and fishing activities of the beneficiaries. The implementers shall assist in marketing the beneficiaries' produce to sustain their livelihood. This component is the end goal of the SAAD program which completes the holistic development approach to uplift the lives of farmers and fisherfolk beneficiaries.

Local Market Study

The primary aim of the SAAD program is to improve household food consumption of partner-beneficiaries who belong to the identified poorest of the poor provinces in the country through its various projects. The program has reached a significant level of production sustainability based on the satisfaction level of beneficiary-respondents. However, a good harvest where surplus is great, marketing support becomes a necessity. To increase the income and improve the economic status of partner-beneficiaries, such support should at least assure the beneficiaries a market of their produce and fair price.

Conduct of Technical Training on Entrepreneurship and Value Adding

The conduct of technical training on entrepreneurial and value adding improves the basic entrepreneurial skills and business management skills of the intended participants. It creates a level of confidence of success and motivation among partner-beneficiaries.

Provision of Logistics Support

Logistics support for farmers and fisherfolk primarily involves transportation, tools and equipment. Transport enables farmers and fisherfolk to increase mobility of their products, from farm to market and to their ultimate buyers. The means of transportation vary from public to private modes, from two wheels to more wheels. The more it becomes private, the higher is the farmers' or fisherfolks' control for the distribution logistics of their products.

Audit of Livelihood Projects

The guidelines for this activity are not yet reflected in the DA-SAAD Operations Manual. This will be done in the established livelihood enterprises to ensure that appropriate systems in the enterprise operations are in place anchored on protecting and promoting the welfare of the farmer or fisherfolk associations and its members.

The SAAD Project flow for the creation of community agri-enterprises is intended to serve as a guide for the succession of SAAD projects from FY 2020 to 2022, aside from considering the identified needs of partner-organizations and partner-beneficiaries. Projects and corresponding designs shall be anchored in these four (4) aspects. This is to ensure the establishment of community enterprises that will likely result in improvement in household food consumption and to increase in partner-beneficiaries' incomes.

Likewise, corresponding budgetary requirements for these projects shall be identified from 2022 to 2022. The conduct of multi-year planning and budgeting shall be facilitated by the RPMSO and PPMSO with guidance from NPMO and in coordination with LGUs, partner-organizations, and partner-beneficiaries.

The evaluation and approval of project proposals shall undergo the regular process as discussed in the previous sections.

Figure 5 *Flow of SAAD projects towards creation of community agri-enterprises*



Creation of Community Agri-Enterprises

Note: Adapted from the SAAD Program Operational Manual (2021)

Impact Pathway

The plausible impact pathway of the SAAD Program is closely aligned with the DA-SAAD framework (Figure 18) encompassing the activities, outputs, outcomes, and impacts across its four components: program management, social preparation, production and livelihood, and marketing assistance and enterprise development. The SAAD program process and its actual implementation across regions during the project horizon were analyzed using available official documents and data/perspectives gathered through focus group discussions (FGD). Observed implementation of the SAAD program process was documented and deviations between the approved program plan and actual experiences/evidences gathered across regional FGDs were identified to highlight potential areas of improvement in SAAD program implementation. The focal persons of SAAD from the regional and provincial level and the Municipal Agriculture Officer as implementers were invited to participate in the virtual FGD conducted in six (6) groups. The participants came from BFAR Region 12 (North Cotabato, Sarangani & Sultan Kudarat); provinces of Catanduanes, Eastern Visayas, Southern Leyte, Northern Samar, Negros Oriental, Sultan Kudarat, Sarangani and North Cotabato.

SAAD Activities

Program Management

Among the seven identified activities in the program management component, the FGD participants identified three activities where they are involved, which includes **coordination with LGUs and other stakeholders**, **monitoring and evaluation**, and **conduct of meetings**.

All the participants of the FGD with Regional and Provincial SAAD coordinators agreed to have participated in program management through coordination with LGU-OPAG, LGU-Municipal level down to the barangay levels. "In one municipality of North Cotabato, the MAO and his staff evaluate the initial list of beneficiaries, they revalidate the information before submitting to the provincial coordinator". In the province of Sarangani, "the SAAD provincial coordinator conducted FGD with the municipal coordinators and identified ice makers for the fishery association".

Based on the FGD, monitoring and evaluation of implemented projects was done on a monthly basis in the presence of a SAAD representative and written reports were submitted to the provincial SAAD office. Specifically observed in Eastern Visayas were regional assessments conducted to address critical issues or problems. Meetings with beneficiaries were also organized.

As gleaned on the SAAD framework, activities of program management that were not identified by the provincial and municipal focal persons are the following: formulation of plans and budget; procurement of supplies and materials; hiring

45

of staff; and formulation and updating of manual of operations. It is noted that these activities are mostly done at the national level. The Administrative and Procurement Unit is responsible for the management of NPMOs' administrative, human resource, records, logistics, and finance aspects. Administrative activities include the provision of assistance to the SAAD Director in terms of schedule of the management, review of documents prior to the Director's appropriate action, liquidation of travel reimbursement, and dissemination of critical information to the NPMO staff; hiring and recruitment of staff for the NPMO; facilitation of incoming and outgoing documents; property management and office maintenance; maintaining accurate and up-to-date records of the NPMO; and overseeing all logistics-related activities.

On the other hand, procurement activities involve preparation of documents for NPMOs' supplies, meetings, training, workshops, and other requirements; supervision, control, and distribution of funds; and coordination with DA Financial Management Service on matters of budget and other financial requirements.

Social Preparation

As community organizations are recognized as effective vehicles for agricultural development, the SAAD program identified social preparation as one of the four essential program components with the aim to establish organized communities and capacitate partner-beneficiaries. The social preparation component has been designed such that the selection of beneficiaries of the SAAD program does not necessarily require membership in formal community organizations. It is in fact the intention in the SAAD implementation framework that beneficiaries who are not members of community organizations are given appropriate training and are assisted by SAAD in facilitating their formal registration and accreditation by an appropriate government authority.

On **community-organizing** as an activity in social preparation, the focal person from Sarangani province said that they federalized barangay fisherfolk associations providing their strong support to this activity. Likewise in North Cotabato, they made use of existing organizations and organized new ones.

For **capability building**, Sarangani conducted a series of training in basic organization management. This endeavor of the province is intended to empower the organizations in managing their affairs as partners of the government for development. As also shown in Table 25, capacity-building activities for social preparation, particularly Organizational Development Training and Values Formation Seminar, have been conducted for the fisherfolks in Sarangani and Bukidnon, respectively.

Project orientation is also viewed as an important aspect of social preparation prior to program implementation. All the focal persons who joined the FGD are one in saying that they conducted orientation about the SAAD programs and the role of the beneficiaries. They emphasized that the orientation was not only for the beneficiaries but also for the barangay officials so that they understand the SAAD program being implemented in their barangays. In Sultan Kudarat, orientation was conducted prior to the awarding of the intervention. **Consultation** was also conducted based on the FGD. In Catanduanes, profiling of the beneficiaries was conducted. To quote from the FGD: "They propose what they need and what they want; then the LGU-SAAD verifies the qualification of the beneficiary. If qualified, then the interventions were given". In Northern Samar, the focal persons conducted validation and needs assessment, then requested the materials from SAAD. In Negros Oriental,

the focal persons conducted ocular visit in the barangays. According to them "many interventions were offered but they opted for cattle dispersal".

Production and Livelihood

The country, predominantly, is an agricultural country engaged in various farming activities to include crops, poultry and livestock production and in the fisheries sector, capture fisheries and aquaculture. Farmers rarely operate in a single commodity or enterprise to meet basic needs such as food, clothing, and shelter among others. In crops, rice and corn are major commodities but the need to plant high value vegetable and plantation crops and raise poultry and livestock and engage in fisheries is imperative to survive various life pressures amidst climate change and crises like the COVID-19 pandemic.

Part of the activities of the SAAD Program is the **provision of agri-inputs**, **tools, machineries, facilities, and equipment**. The approved proposals of beneficiaries include the interventions to be provided by the SAAD program in the form of agri-fishery inputs, tools, machineries and equipment. The list of these interventions is included for procurement. Likewise, **provision of post-production facilities and equipment** is focused on the agri-fishery associations. Based on the focused group discussions, the following information was generated:

Rice, Corn, and Vegetable Production. In upland areas, the farmers benefited from the distribution of corn and upland rice seeds and fertilizers; high value vegetable seeds (eggplant, tomatoes, pechay, etc) and were given farm tools (sprinkler, rake, laminated sacks, drums, etc) that were shared among group members in Amlan, North Cotabato, Negros Oriental and Catanduanes. These seeds were distributed to rice and corn farmers and vegetable growers which were supplemented with farm tools and implements to lower production cost and to improve their efficiency in production processes. The amount of intervention depended on the area of production, cropping seasons, and the capacity of farmers.

Plantation and Fruit Production. The SAAD program supported the tiger grass production through giving of planting materials and marketing assistance and the ornamental crops production of one association of North Cotabato; abaca and cacao seedlings were also distributed to farmers in Amlan, North Cotabato and fruit trees (rambutan and budded lemons) in Negros Oriental and Catanduanes. These two production systems were viewed as livelihood for the farmers to generate food and income.

Livestock and Poultry Production. Most farmers in Amlan, North Cotabato were recipients of native chickens raised in abaca plantations (abaca cum manukan project) while native chickens were also raised in Negros Oriental and Catanduanes. Cattle and carabao dispersal was practiced in Amlan, North Cotabato. The beneficiaries of the dispersal (cattle and carabao) program were required to sign a contract that the ownership of the animal will still be for the municipality for a period of five (5) years. This agreement had discouraged the beneficiaries to sell the animals and to return to the association a female offspring to be dispersed to other members. Goats were also distributed in Amlan, North Cotabato and Southern Leyte. Hog fatteners and feeds were also distributed in Leyte though it was stopped due to African Swine Fever (ASF). Lately, they were offered a duck raising project for balut making as a new venture or enterprise in the area. Housing of animals is a shared resource of farmers and SAAD. The distribution of animals to farmers provided them with initial stocks for the production of animals (livelihood) for various uses as breeders, fatteners, and for reproduction as a source of food and income.

Despite the pandemic phenomenon the world suffered today, farmers were able to survive difficult times through provision of food and attained food sufficiency at home. The SAAD beneficiaries experienced food always available in the home from food crops, poultry (chickens and ducks) and income from cash crops (tiger grass, ornamentals, fruit crops, and surplus from vegetables). This, in a way, provided them livelihood in the farm despite limited mobility during lockdown, closures of sources of inputs and transport for the delivery of goods and services. At this time, farmers were able to survive and maintain their good health and living amidst pandemic times.

Fisheries. In the fisheries sector, results of the FGD revealed that livelihood assistance started in 2017 though some were implemented in 2018 and 2019 due to various reasons e.g. change in leadership among others. SAAD activities such as the provision of inputs, tools, machineries and equipment were realized in the Capture Fisheries to include motorized and fiber-glass boats, fishing gears like nets, crab pots and hand lines for bait fishing, and other paraphernalia for fishing purposes. Payao, a fish aggregating device and an accessory gear for deep-sea fishing was also provided for the SAAD members of association in the Visayas region. Likewise, provision of stocks/fingerlings (e.g. tilapia, hito etc.) and corresponding feed requirements for aquaculture purposes were given as identified by the stakeholders. Expansion and diversification of livelihood (e.g. excavation of rice paddies) for tilapia farming was also noted by SAAD beneficiaries. Mariculture fish farmers were assisted through provisions of seaweed seed stocks, fish cages, and pens to raise fish and other aquatic resources in open water coastal areas of the country.

Provision of production and post-harvest fisheries facilities were also undertaken. As mentioned by one of the FGD participants, SAAD provided an ice

50

maker machine to beneficiaries in 2017 and added more of this equipment in 2018. Demand on ice was indicative of increased fish production and landed catch that prompted the beneficiaries to request more of this equipment to SAAD. Additional motorized fishing boats were also provided to the request of individuals or associations after thorough evaluation of the needs. As mentioned, SAAD interventions were identified and classified based on needs of clients through series of focus group discussions with the provincial government and LGU such that needs assessment and profiling with the target beneficiaries were conducted. One provincial coordinator noted that the interventions for particular beneficiaries were identified in 2017, but were awarded only in 2019. Nevertheless, situations indicating intervention delays may be cross-checked or triangulated with the subsequent survey results among beneficiaries.

Generally, SAAD interventions as assessed by the FGD participants indeed augmented the regular programs of Department of Agriculture in ensuring food security in the country – considering that the interventions are not within the regular programs of the Department. SAAD goal targeted the marginalized sector of farmers and fisherfolk basically for food/fish self-sufficiency and increased income. Needless to say, SAAD food production and intervention in the fisheries sector contributed coastal productivity and optimized and benefited small-scale fishermen beneficiaries and families in the countryside in terms of additional food supply. Based on the FGD feedback from Regional and Provincial SAAD focal persons and LGU representatives, the substance and goal of the interventions were met. As a result of regular (monthly) monitoring, implementers of the SAAD interventions in the fisheries sector noted that beneficiaries were satisfied of the many interventions given; as they rated SAAD program as a very good project of the Department of Agriculture. They noted the positive impact on the livelihood and sustained food needs among families of fisherfolk beneficiaries.

Alongside the distribution of livelihood interventions, **technical trainings** are also conducted in relation to crop, livestock and poultry production, capture fisheries, and aquaculture. Based on the FGD, these trainings were conducted before giving the interventions.

Marketing Assistance and Enterprise Development

The results of the FGD show that no **local market studies** were conducted during the 2017 and 2018 implementation of the SAAD program. However, as a result of the survey conducted, the beneficiary-respondents in the provinces of Compostela Valley (Davao de Oro), Sarangani, Leyte, Western Samar and in Apayao identified the conduct of local market study in their areas. Nevertheless, it could be assumed that market studies (formal/informal) were done prior to its conceptualization as a basis in the identification and approval of various interventions given to target stakeholders of the program.

FGD participants from Sultan Kudarat pointed out that their produce is just enough or even less than what is needed. Hence, they saw no need for a market study at present. Likewise, there were no problems with marketing as supply was just enough for the local market (North Cotabato); beneficiaries marketed their produce in the municipality through the KADIWA program (Catanduanes). KADIWA is a market system of the Department of Agriculture which sells major agricultural goods at reasonably low prices to help poor Filipino households.

Conduct of Technical Training on Entrepreneurship and Value Adding

As shown in Table 25, a total of 31 specialized trainings related to Marketing Assistance and Enterprise Development were conducted and attended by 910 fisherfolk beneficiaries in the provinces of Leyte, Compostela Valley, Sarangani, Southern Leyte, Eastern Samar, and Northern Samar. These specialized trainings include product development, processing, and value adding trainings for fishery products, business planning, record keeping, bookkeeping, basic accounting, and enterprise development which all aimed to improve the basic entrepreneurial skills and business management skills of the fisherfolk beneficiaries.

Provision of Logistics Support

The FGD participants stated that no logistics support were provided yet to the beneficiaries in their respective regions and provinces. In one of the interviews during the pilot study in Apayao, however, an association was provided with a manual sidecar as logistics support for marketing their meat products. However, the respondent revealed that the sidecar was too heavy for them thus remained inoperable.

Audit of Livelihood Enterprises

This activity is based on the establishment of livelihood enterprises in the target provinces. During the 2017 and 2018 implementation, this was not yet implemented based on the discussions during the FGD.

SAAD Outputs

As shown in the SAAD program framework, the intended outputs of the program are specifically outlined in accordance with the activities in each of the four (4) program components.

Program Management

Under the program management component, the expected outputs as a result of the planned activities include: formulated plans and secured budget; established procurement plans; hired staff at provincial, regional, and national level; formulated and updated manual of operations; established partnerships and agreements; established monitoring and evaluation system; and documented meeting reports.

The formulated program and procurement plans once executed are translated ultimately as budget releases and financial reports. Table 4 presents the SAAD Program budget utilization for the livelihood projects from 2017 to 2020. As shown,

Table 4

SAAD Program Budget Utilization for	Livelihood	Projects for	Fiscal Ye	ar 2017-	2020
(in millions)					

Province		Total			
	2017	2018	2019	2020	
Zamboanga del Norte	56.963	62.733	72.037	52.497	244.231
Masbate	-	47.265	118.533	51.708	217.515
Apayao	61.367	57.246	42.106	36.787	197.506
Western Samar	134.124	13.372	10.915	23.635	182.047
North Cotabato	45.760	36.995	41.227	45.753	169.734
Sultan Kudarat	-	29.347	72.334	33.711	135.391
Negros Oriental	56.931	18.060	28.587	15.684	119.261
Northern Samar	70.312	5.363	15.376	10.932	101.983
Sorsogon	-	32.358	37.605	29.742	99.705
Leyte	-	33.470	23.367	13.787	70.624
Sarangani	15.224	12.806	17.882	22.327	68.238
Compostela Valley	-	15.243	25.648	18.296	59.187
Catanduanes	-	20.658	21.029	16.296	57.983
Southern Leyte	-	30.038	19.762	4.452	54.252
Bukidnon	-	39.882	-	-	39.882
Grand Total	440.680	454.836	546.407	375.607	1,817.530

Note: Sourced from DA-SAAD Official Website (Project Profile per Province)

Social Preparation

Under this component, the expected program outputs include organized and capacitated communities, and capacitated partner-beneficiaries as a result of the community organizing and capability building activities, as well as the project orientations, consultation workshops, and meetings in the target communities.

Based on published data in the DA-SAAD official website, a total of 239 activities related to social preparation were conducted in year 2017 and 2018 among 23,614 target beneficiaries.

DA-SAAD Accomplishments for Social Preparation Component					
Year	No. of Social Preparation	No. of Participants			
	Activities				
2017	102	6,740			
2018	137	16,874			
2019	333	15,767			
2020	226	14,008			
2021	400	6,506			
Total	1,198	59,895			

Note: Sourced from DA-SAAD Official Website

Table 5

The survey data (Table 6) shows that across all regions, less than half of the farmer/fisherfolk beneficiaries (i.e. 46.55% of farmers and 40.43% of fisherfolk) are members of associations in their respective localities. As also shown in Table 6, the provinces in the Visayas region have the highest association memberships among beneficiaries. This is led by Leyte (85.71% of farmers), and Northern Samar (100% of fisherfolk respondents). In Luzon, the province of Masbate shows the highest association membership (60.58% of farmer beneficiaries), while Catanduanes has the lowest (with only 14.58% membership among farmers and 11.76% among fisherfolk). In Mindanao, 67.02% of farmers and 56.25% of fisherfolk respondents in North Cotabato belong to organizations. It is noted, however, that none of the interviewed beneficiaries in Bukidnon are members of any farmers association.

Province	Farmers		Fish	erfolk
-	Count	%	Count	%
Luzon	189	37.88%	31	49.21%
Apayao	44	41.91%	10	41.67%
Catanduanes	7	14.58%	2	11.76%
Masbate	63	60.58%		
Sorsogon	75	30.99%	19	86.36%
Visayas	176	58.28%	122	40.80%
Negros Oriental	21	80.77%		
Leyte	6	85.71%	22	40.74%
Southern Leyte	44	49.44%	37	41.11%
Northern Samar	77	66.96%	24	100.00%
Western Samar	28	43.08%	39	29.77%
Mindanao	161	48.94%	33	33.67%
Zamboanga del Norte			23	32.86%
Bukidnon	0	0.00%		
Compostela Valley	10	13.33%		
North Cotabato	128	67.02%	9	56.25%
Sarangani	23	39.66%		
Sultan Kudarat			1	8.33%
Total	526	46.55%	186	40.43%

Table 6Membership in Associations (%)

The case of the Farmers Association for Rural Upliftment (FARU) of the Chananaw indigenous people of Kalinga is noteworthy to mention. The members of FARU were able to increase their rice production by 36% in 2010 compared to the baseline data in 2000 (UNDP 2012). Prior to the initiative, the community was dependent solely on agriculture for their income, a subsistence economy which could only support what they needed to survive.

Production and Livelihood

After the social preparation activities, the production and livelihood component follows where activities essentially revolve around the distribution of livelihood interventions in the form of agri-inputs, tools, machineries, facilities, and equipment for production and post-production activities of target farmers and fisherfolk beneficiaries. The basis for the provision of interventions is the result of the needs assessment activities conducted in the social preparation component. Based on the published data in the DA-SAAD official website, a total of 78,515 individual beneficiaries and 1,361 group beneficiaries have been assisted by the SAAD program during the 2017 and 2018 implementation.

DA-SAAD Accomplishments for Production and Livelihood Component						
Particulars		Year	of Implemer	ntation		Total
	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	
No. of Livelihood Projects	402	778	766	525	251	2,722
No. of Individual Beneficiaries	34,255	44,260	35,089	20,744	2,463	136,811
No. of Group Beneficiaries	815	546	1,050	1,023	858	4,292
Members	15,420	14,448	29,036	33,600	25,329	117,833

DA-SAAD Accomplishments for Production and Livelihood Component

Note: Sourced from DA-SAAD Official Website

Table 7

Farming and Fishing Activities of Beneficiaries

Based on the survey, farming activities of the farmer-beneficiaries vary from crop production, livestock production, poultry production, integrated farming and agri-aqua activities (Table 8). All the beneficiary-respondents in Compostela Valley and majority of the farmers in the provinces of Apayao, Catanduanes, Masbate, Negros Oriental, Sorsogon and Southern Leyte are engaged in crop production. Furthermore, all respondents in Bukidnon and the majority in North Cotabato and Sarangani are into integrated farming. More than 50% of the respondents in Northern Samar are engaged in livestock production.

Province	Farming Activities						
	Crop	Livestock	Poultry	Integrated	Agri-		
	Production	Production	Production	Farming	Aqua		
Luzon	83.97	1.00	1.20	11.82	2.00		
Apayao	58.10	3.81	0.00	28.57	9.52		
Catanduanes	91.67	0.00	4.17	4.17	0.00		
Masbate	94.23	0.00	0.96	4.81	0.00		
Sorsogon	89.26	0.41	1.24	9.09	0.00		
Visayas	41.72	32.78	12.91	10.60	1.99		
Negros Oriental	57.69	42.31	0.00	0.00	0.00		
Leyte	28.57	42.86	0.00	14.29	14.29		
Southern Leyte	70.79	22.47	1.12	5.62	0.00		
Northern Samar	13.91	54.78	31.30	0.00	0.00		
Western Samar	46.15	3.08	3.08	40.00	7.69		
Mindanao	54.41	2.74	0.30	41.34	1.22		
Zamboanga del Norte							
Bukidnon	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00		
Compostela Valley	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		
North Cotabato	40.84	4.71	0.52	51.83	2.09		
Sarangani	44.83	0.00	0.00	55.17	0.00		
Sultan Kudarat							
Total	64.07	10.00	4.07	20.09	1.77		

 Table 8
 Farming Activities of Farmer Beneficiary Respondents (%)

Likewise, survey results revealed that fisherfolks are involved not only in capture fisheries and aquaculture, but also in agriculture-related activities such as crop production, livestock, and poultry production (Table 9). A great majority of the fisherfolk respondents in the Visayas region are into capture fisheries. In Mindanao, almost all the fisherfolk respondents in Sultan Kudarat are engaged in aquaculture, those in North Cotabato are into agri-aqua activities, while the majority in Zamboanga del Norte are involved in both capture and aquaculture.

Province	Fishing Activities					
	Capture	Aquaculture	Capture and	Agri-Aqua		
	Fisheries		Aquaculture			
Luzon	39.68	26.98	0.00	33.33		
Apayao	4.17	8.33	0.00	87.50		
Catanduanes	82.35	17.65	0.00	0.00		
Masbate						
Sorsogon	45.45	54.55	0.00	0.00		
Visayas	86.29	0.00	1.00	12.71		
Negros Oriental						
Leyte	98.15	0.00	0.00	1.85		
Southern Leyte	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		
Northern Samar	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		
Western Samar	69.47	0.00	2.29	28.24		
Mindanao	2.04	30.61	41.84	25.51		
Zamboanga del						
Norte	1.43	27.14	58.57	12.86		
Bukidnon						
Compostela Valley						
North Cotabato	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00		
Sarangani						
Sultan Kudarat	8.33	91.67	0.00	0.00		
Total	61.96	10.22	9.57	18.26		

 Table 9

 Fishing Activities of Fisherfolk Beneficiary Respondents (%)

Agri-inputs, tools, machineries, facilities, and equipment distributed

The interventions provided to qualified beneficiaries are primarily based on the above farming and fishing activities of the target beneficiaries, which include animals, crops, fisheries production, and post-production inputs, tools, machinery, facilities, and equipment to improve their farming and fishery production practices and productivity.

Based on the survey, Tables 10 to 19 show the list of livelihood interventions received by the respondent beneficiaries.

Province	Commodity	Supplies and Materials	Production Tools, Machineries, Equipment and Facilities	Post-Production Tools, Machineries, Equipment and
Apayao	Rice; Corn; Vegetables; Fruits	Seeds; Seedlings; Fertilizers;	Corn planting tool; Shovel; Grab hoe; Rake; Boots; Bolo; Spray can; Drum; Cyclone wire; Plastic tray; Rain shelter; Hand tractor; Hand tractor with trailer and thresher; Galvanized iron; Crates; Hose; Spading fork;	None
Bukidnon	Corn	Seedlings; Fertilizers;	Drum; Sprayer tank; Shovel; Sprinkler; Pick axe	None
Catanduanes	Rice; Vegetables	Seeds; Seedlings; Cuttings/ Stalks; Fertilizers;	Hoe; Rake; Sprinkler; Plastic mulch; Shovel; Seedling tray; Wheelbarrow; Drum; Hose;	None
Compostela Valley	Rice; Corn; Fruits; Plantation Crops	Cuttings; Fertilizers; Pesticides and Insecticides	Bolo; Knife; Knapsack; Shovel; Crowbar; Selector; Smoke dryer; Rice Harvester	None
Leyte	Corn	Seeds; Fertilizers	Cultivator	None
Masbate	Rice; Corn; Vegetables	Seeds; Fertilizers	Shovel; Wheelbarrow; Rake; Hoe; Drum; Planters	Sack
Negros Oriental	Rice; Corn; Vegetables; Plantation Crops	Seeds; Seedlings; Fertilizers;	Carabao (as draft animal); Water barrel; Shovel; Rake; Sprinkler; Bolo; Hand tractor	Cornmill
North Cotabato	Rice; Corn; Vegetables; Fruits; Plantation Crops	Seeds; Fertilizers	Bolo and sharpener; Shovel; Spade; Scythe; Trowel; Sprinkler; Seed spreader; Water pump; Thresher; Solar light	None
Northern Samar	Rice; Corn; Vegetables	Cuttings/ Stalks; Fertilizers	None	None

 Table 10

 Livelihood Interventions received by Respondent Beneficiaries for Crop Production

Sarangani	Rice; Corn	Seeds; Seedlings; Cuttings/ Stalks; Fertilizers; Pesticides and Insecticides	Hopscotch; Scythe; Shovel; Knapsack sprayer; Pick axe, Sprinkler;	None
Sorsogon	Rice; Corn; Vegetables; Root crops;	Seeds; Cuttings/ Stalks; Fertilizers; Pesticides and Insecticides	Hoe; Shovel; Rake; Drum; Wheelbarrow; Sprinkler; Gloves; Spade; Seedling tray; Bolo; Hand cultivator; Hose; Spade;	Thresher; Sack; Drying mat (<i>Trapal</i>)
Southern Leyte	Rice; Corn; Vegetables; Root crops;	Seeds; Seedlings; Cuttings; Fertilizers	Waterpost; Rake; Bolo; Weeder; Hat; Sickle; Net; Cap; Towel	Sack; Drying mat (<i>Trapal</i>)
Western Samar	Rice; Corn; Vegetables; Fruits; Plantation Crops	Seeds; Seedlings; Cuttings/ Stalks; Fertilizers; Pesticides and Insecticides	Seedling trays, Tractor	None

Livelihood Interventions received by Group Beneficiaries for Crop Production

Province	Commodity	Supplies and Materials	Production Tools, Machineries, Equipment and Facilities	Post-Production Tools, Machineries, Equipment and Facilities
Apayao	Corn	Seeds; Seedlings; Fertilizers;	None	Manual corn seeder; Sugarcane presser; Coffee depulper
Masbate	Rice	Seeds; Fertilizers	Grass cutter	Thresher
North Cotabato	Rice; Corn; Vegetables	Seeds; Fertilizers; Pesticides and Insecticides	Light trap; Seed spreader; Shovel; Hand trowel; Sprinkler; Spade; Bolo; Seedling tray; Knapsack sprayer; Drum; Bucket; Polyethylene bag; Rake;	None
Sorsogon	Rice; Corn; Vegetables; Root crops;	Seeds; Cuttings/ Stalks; Fertilizers	Hoe; Spade; Sprinkler; Rake; Knapsack sprayer; Drum; Hose;	Thresher; Sack; Drying mat (<i>Trapal</i>)

Province	Commodity	Supplies and Materials	Production Tools, Machineries, Equipment and Facilities	Post-Production Tools, Machineries, Equipment and Facilities
Арауао	Large ruminants, Small ruminants, Swine	Animals; Feeds; Drugs	Galvanized iron; Nails; Sealant	None
Bukidnon	Large ruminants	Animals	None	None
Catanduanes	Swine	Animals; Feeds	None	None
Leyte	Swine	Animals; Feeds; Drugs	None	None
Masbate	Small ruminants	Animals; Vaccines	Goat housing	None
Negros Oriental	Large ruminants	Animals; Vaccines	None	None
North Cotabato	Large ruminants, Small ruminants, Swine	Animals; Drugs; Vaccines	None	None
Northern Samar	Small ruminants, Swine	Feeds, Drugs	None	None
Sarangani	Small ruminants	Animals	None	None
Sorsogon	Large ruminants, Small ruminants, Swine	Animals; Feeds	None	None
Southern Leyte	Swine	Animals; Feeds; Drugs	Pail; Bucket; Tools	None
Western Samar	Small ruminants, Swine	Animals; Feeds	None	None

Table 12Livelihood Interventions received by Respondent Beneficiaries for LivestockProduction

Province	Commodity	Supplies and Materials	Production Tools, Machineries, Equipment and Facilities	Post-Production Tools, Machineries, Equipment and Facilities
Apayao	Large ruminants, Small ruminants	Animals; Drugs	None	None
Leyte	Swine	Animals	None	None
North Cotabato	Small ruminants, Swine	Animals; Feeds; Vaccines	Pigpen	None
Sorsogon	Large ruminants, Swine	Animals; Feeds	Drum; Hose	None

Livelihood Interventions received by Group Beneficiaries for Livestock Production

Table 14

Livelihood Interventions received by Respondent Beneficiaries for Poultry Production

Province	Commodity	Supplies and Materials	Production Tools, Machineries, Equipment and Facilities	Post-Production Tools, Machineries, Equipment and Facilities
Apayao	Quail	Animals; Feeds	Housing	None
Catanduanes	Chicken	Animals; Feeds	None	None
Masbate	Chicken, Duck	Animals	None	None
North Cotabato	Chicken, Duck	Animals; Feeds; Drugs; Vaccines	Waterer; Feeder; Incubator	None
Northern Samar	Chicken	Feeds	Net	None
Sarangani	Duck	Animals	None	None
Sorsogon	Chicken, Duck	Animals	Net; Reeds (pawid)	None
Southern Leyte	Chicken, Duck	Animals	Polynet; Nylon	None
Western Samar	Chicken, Duck	Animals; Feeds; Drugs	Net	None

Table	15
-------	----

Province	Commodity	Supplies and Materials	Production Tools, Machineries, Equipment and Facilities	Post-Production Tools, Machineries, Equipment and Facilities
North	Chicken,	Animals;	Net	None
Cotabato	Duck	Feeds; Drugs		
Sorsogon	Duck	Feeds	Duck shed	None

Livelihood Interventions received by Group Beneficiaries for Poultry Production

Livelihood Interventions received by Respondent Beneficiaries for Capture Fisheries

Province	Commodity	Fishing Gears and Paraphernalia; Production Tools, Machineries, Equipment and Facilities	Post-Production Tools, Machineries, Equipment and Facilities
Apayao	Fish	Nets	None
Catanduanes	Fish, Crustacean	Canoe-type banca; Motorized banca; Collapsible crab pot; Nets	None
Leyte	Fish	Fishing gears and paraphernalia	None
Northern Samar	Fish	Fishing gears and paraphernalia	None
Sorsogon	Fish, Mollusk	<i>Sibid; Pangke;</i> Nets; Fish trap; Nylon; Hook	None
Southern Leyte	Fish, Mollusk	Fish hooks; Nylon; Nets; Blinker; Spear; Fish arrow; Squid light; Saranggat; Rope; Buoy; Bottom set gill net;	None
Sultan Kudarat	Fish, Mollusk	Motorized banca, Squid jigger, Nets, Styrofoam box	None
Western Samar	Fish, Crustacean	Motorboat engine with rudder, propeller, and drive shaft; Motorboat engine with rudder, propeller, and drive shaft, and cross joint; Motorboat engine; Motorboat engine with propeller, tiller, and drive shaft	None
Zamboanga del Norte	Fish	Nets; Buoy; String; Machineries for fish capture	Pressure Cooker, Glass/Bottling set

Province	Commodity	Fishing Gears and Paraphernalia; Production Tools, Machineries, Equipment and Facilities	Post-Production Tools, Machineries, Equipment and Facilities	
Leyte	Fish	Fish cage	None	
Sarangani	Fish, Seaweeds	Motorized banca; Ice maker; Freezer; Gloves; Gillnet; Tuna handline; Squid jigger; Container; Rope; Life vest;	None	
Southern Leyte	Mollusk	Buoy; Nylon; Rope, Lights	None	
Zamboanga del Norte	Fish	Fish cage; Net;	None	

Livelihood Interventions received by Group Beneficiaries for Capture Fisheries

Table 18

Livelihood Interventions received by Respondent Beneficiaries for Aquaculture

Province	Commodity	Supplies and Materials	Production Tools, Machineries, Equipment and Facilities	Post-Production Tools, Machineries, Equipment and Facilities
Apayao	Fish	Feeds; Fingerlings	Net; Weighing scale	None
Catanduanes	Crustacean	Feeds; Fingerlings	Fish cage	None
North Cotabato	Fish	Feeds; Fingerlings	Net; Ice box; Set of circular tank, solar panels, oxygen pump, and ware filter	None
Sorsogon	Fish, Shells (Oyster)	Fingerlings; Fishing gears and paraphernalia	<i>Sibid; Pangke;</i> Net; Spat collector; Drum; Rope; Nylon	None
Sultan Kudarat	Fish	Feeds; Fingerlings	None	None
Western Samar	Fish	Feeds; Fingerlings; Fishing gears and paraphernalia	PVC pipe for drainage	None
Zamboanga del Norte	Seaweeds	Seaweeds; Fishing gears and paraphernalia	Binder; Strawlace; String; Nylon; Buoy	None

Table	19
-------	----

Province	Commodity	Supplies and Materials	Production Tools, Machineries, Equipment and Facilities	Post-Production Tools, Machineries, Equipment and Facilities
North Cotabato	Fish	Fingerlings; Feeds	Freezer; Pelletizer	None
Sarangani	Fish	Fingerlings; Feeds	Boat	None
Sorsogon	Fish, Shells	Fingerlings	Bamboo; Spat collector; Drum; Rope	None
Zamboanga del Norte	Fish, Seaweeds	Seaweeds	Binder; Strawlace; String; Buoy	Gas with regulator and hose, Hot air gun, Weighing scale; Glass/Bottling set, Pressure Cooker, Knife, Stainless tray

Livelihood Interventions received by Group Beneficiaries for Aquaculture

Based on the survey results, none of the respondent associations received postproduction machineries and equipment for livestock (Apayao, Sorsogon, Leye, and North Cotabato) and poultry (North Cotabato). For crop production, about 17% (5 out of 29) of the respondent associations received threshers as post-production tool for rice and corn. One of these associations, particularly in Apayao, further received additional post-harvest machineries and equipment such as manual corn seeder, sugarcane presser, and coffee depulper.

Out of the 25 respondent associations who were recipients of capture fishery interventions, four (4) or 16% indicated that they received post-production tools and equipment, specifically a pressure cooker and bottling set for sardines. Further, out of the 11 respondent associations who were recipients of aquaculture interventions, only one (1) reported to have received a set of post-production tools, machineries, and equipment which include a Pryce gas with regulator and hose, a large pressure cooker,

hot air gun, weighing scale, cellophane, bottling set, stainless steel trays, and knives. These post-production interventions were all from the province of Zamboanga del Norte.

Marketing Assistance and Enterprise Development

The expected outputs under this final program component include identified and established linkages with potential markets, and established and working communal agri-enterprises as a result of local market studies, entrepreneurship and value adding trainings, logistics support, and audit activities.

Based on the published data in the DA-SAAD official website, a total of 13 enterprises have been established and assisted by the SAAD program during the 2017 and 2018 implementation, and significantly increased in subsequent years (Table 20).

Table 20

DA-SAAD Accomplishments for Marketing and Enterprise Development Component							
Particulars	Year of Implementation Total						
_	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021		
No. of Enterprises	1	12	35	64	59	171	
Members	40	570	1,263	2,614	1,594	6,081	

Note: Sourced from DA-SAAD Official Website

Based on the survey results among association beneficiaries, there have been local market studies for rice and corn produce in Apayao, and rice and cultured hito in Sorsogon. However, no local market studies have been conducted in their localities for livestock, poultry, and capture fisheries. Majority of them also reported that they did not receive logistics support from SAAD and they do marketing on their own, except for one (1) association in Sorsogon who reported that SAAD has facilitated the submission of an endorsement letter to a target buyer for their rice produce, and another noted that there has been a verbal plan for marketing strategy by the SAAD Area Coordinator. Nevertheless, entrepreneurship skills may have been enhanced within the family of beneficiaries. The case study on the oyster farming beneficiary revealed that the spouse did the marketing of the cultured oyster by the husband and, together with the production of other oyster fishermen in the locality, sold them in other barangays in the municipality. Such cases reflect SAAD's effort in training the beneficiaries to be equipped with entrepreneurial capacities to face the challenges of poverty particularly within the family especially during crises like the COVID-19 pandemic.

SAAD Outcomes

This section assesses the institutional outcomes of the SAAD Program vis-avis its four (4) components, i.e. Program Management: effective, timely, and properly documented project implementation; Social Preparation, Production and Livelihood: improved farm and fishery production and productivity through enhanced farming and fishing skills, expansion in production areas, and improvement in farm and fishing technologies; and Marketing Assistance and Enterprise Development: increased volume of sales through expanded access to market.

Efficient, effective, timely, and properly documented project implementation (Program Management)

An assessment of the SAAD program outcomes with respect to Program Management as the first component reflects the effectiveness of SAAD Management in implementing its seven (7) activities from formulation of plans and budget, to monitoring and evaluation, and organization of meetings. The direct effect of program efficiency with respect to the above activities is effective targeting, delivery, and timeliness of expected outputs. One critical indicator identified in the survey result is the timeliness of implementation according to scheduled target provinces/municipalities during the SAAD Program batch 1 (2017-2022), and batch 2 (2018-2022) implementation.

Table 21 presents field survey results showing the target and actual schedule of distribution of SAAD interventions across the provinces in two (2) batches, a) starting 2017, and b) starting 2018. It can be gleaned that target beneficiaries in some provinces were able to receive the intervention as scheduled and the others received them in later years. Specifically, out of the seven (7) provinces covered in the 2017 implementation, only Zamboanga del Norte was able to distribute the livelihood interventions as scheduled to a great majority of the target beneficiaries at 94.59%, while significantly lower percentages of respondent beneficiaries were able to receive the interventions as scheduled in Northern Samar, Apayao, Negros Oriental, Sarangani, North Cotabato, and Western Samar, ranging from only 36.84% to 63.32%. It is however noted that while delayed implementation was observed in 2017, reasonable follow-up implementation in subsequent years was evident in Apayao, Western Samar, and Sarangani. Nevertheless, it remains critical to identify the bottlenecks and problems faced in Negros Oriental, North Cotabato, and Northern Samar where significant delays were observed and even targeted beneficiaries have not received any intervention during the survey period in 2021.

The delayed delivery of the interventions to the beneficiaries can be attributed to the strict implementation of the procurement law or RA 9184. Since the funding support comes from the General Appropriations Act (GAA), procurement of all needed inputs and hiring of personnel are governed by appropriate laws of the land. As pointed out in the SAAD Annual Report 2017, one of the problems encountered in the 2017 implementation was the delay in procurement and distribution of interventions. Reasons for the delay include a) unavailability of signatories of bid
documents; b) exhaustion of potential suppliers' stocks due to low priority in the processing of papers in Bids and Awards Committee (BAC); c) recommended specifications by the SAAD Technical Working Group are outdated resulting to failure of bidding; d) lack of technical person in the regional level such as budget and procurement officers; e) hired SAAD administrative officers also lack knowledge on the preparation of procurement documents; and f) other personnel-related issues and concerns.

Target Implementation	Yea	Total (%)				
	2017	2018	2019	2020	Yet to receive in 2021- 2022	-
2017	56.01	30.76	4.19	1.21	7.83	100.00
Apayao	45.19	42.96	7.41	3.70	0.74	100.00
Negros Oriental	50.00	15.00	0.00	0.00	35.00	100.00
North Cotabato	58.47	20.16	4.84	2.42	14.11	100.00
Northern Samar	36.84	47.37	7.24	0.00	8.55	100.00
Sarangani	50.85	38.98	8.47	0.00	1.69	100.00
Western Samar	63.32	35.18	0.00	0.00	1.51	100.00
Zamboanga del						100.00
Norte	94.59	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.41	
2018		74.28	18.12	3.86	3.74	100.00
Bukidnon		60.00	40.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
Catanduanes		97.01	0.00	2.99	0.00	100.00
Compostela Valley		100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
Leyte		12.90	85.48	0.00	1.61	100.00
Masbate		100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
Sorsogon		59.68	24.13	8.57	7.62	100.00
Southern Leyte		85.64	9.57	1.60	3.19	100.00
Sultan Kudarat		91.67	8.33	0.00	0.00	100.00

Table 21

Tank 21 Target and Actual Year of Distribution of SAAD Interventions, in percent

Learning from the experiences in the initial implementation, more timely delivery of interventions was observed in the second batch with more provinces reaching most, if not all, of the target beneficiaries (Figures 6 and 7). In order to further improve project implementation, it is essential to identify problem provinces and municipalities, determine specific problems on access and transport, review the reported list of beneficiaries, and strengthen monitoring and evaluation.



Figure 6

Distribution of 2017 Beneficiaries according to Year the SAAD Intervention was Received

Note: Respondents yet to receive interventions in 2021-2022 were included under year 2021 in the illustration.

Figure 7

Distribution of 2018 Beneficiaries according to Year the SAAD Intervention was Received



Note: Respondents yet to receive interventions in 2021-2022 were included under year 2021 in the illustration

Adoption of Technology/Interventions and Improved Farm and Fishery Production and Productivity (Social Preparation, and Production and Livelihood)

The two most important factors influencing benefits or impact is the adoption of the introduced technologies by the target communities and the productivity gains due to the adoption of the interventions. As presented in the SAAD framework and impact pathway, the social preparation and the provision of production and livelihood components of the SAAD program are expected to improve farm and fishery production and productivity as a result of the following key indicators: enhanced farming and fishing skills; expansion in production areas; and improvement in farm and fishing technologies. These projected gains are dependent on the adoption of the introduced technologies and interventions among the target beneficiaries. Technology adoption will be discussed comprehensively in the succeeding section of this report.

Enhanced Farming and Fishing Skills. Based on data from the SAAD Planning, Monitoring, and Evaluation Unit as of March 2021, about 1,600 specialized training sessions have been conducted from 2017 up to 2020, which were attended by about 80,000 farmers and fisherfolk in the covered provinces of the SAAD Program (Table 22). These capacity building activities were either conducted by the Regional Project Management Support Offices or downloaded to the LGUs in the target municipalities and barangays.

Table 22

Distribution of SAAD Program Specialized Trainings per Livelihood Category from 2017-2020

Livelihood Category	Number of Specialized Trainings Conducted	Number of Individual Farmers/ Fisherfolk Trained	Total Cost (in Php)	
Rice Production	247	17,938	9,462,758.00	
Corn Production	206	9,890	5,838,830.49	
High-Value Crops	303	12,502	10,415,937.93	
Livestock	302	17,905	12,728,438.45	
Poultry	114	7,538	5,974,095.78	
Fisheries	398	13,724	15,413,511.00	
Total	1,572	79,497	59,833,571.64	

Note: Sourced from DA-SAAD and BFAR-SAAD Details of Specialized Trainings

The specific specialized trainings conducted during the 2017 to 2018 implementation are shown in Tables 23, 24, and 25.

Table 23

List of SAAD Program Specialized Trainings for Crop Production from 2017 – 2018

Livelihood	Title of Training	Number of	Number of
Category		Trainings	Individual
		Conducted	Farmers
			Trained
Rice	Bokashi/Organic Rice Farming Training	1	100
Production	Lowland Rice Production Training	4	320
	Upland Rice Production Training	55	4,348
	Upland Rice/Rainfed Rice Production	1	55
	Rice Production Training	32	1,250
	Enhanced Rice Production (Training and Techno		
	Demo)	10	814
	Rice Production (Hands-on Training and Techno		
	Demo)	10	1,028
	Rice and Corn Production (Trainers Training)	1	168
	Rice and Corn Production (Technology updating		
	Inorganic Farming)	16	710
	Crop Protection and Production Training	14	1,059
Corn	Corn-Rice Integrated Production Training	2	175
Production	Corn-Vegetable Integrated Production Training	1	75
	Enhanced Corn Production Training	5	550
	Sorghum Production and Technology Training	13	650
	Enhanced Corn Production (Training and Techno		
	Demo)	5	153
	Corn Production (Hands-on training and Techno		
	Demo)	5	175
	Corn Production Training	43	2,218
	Hybrid Corn Production Training	1	90
	White Corn Production and Processing	1	47
	Corn-Peanut Production Training	16	770

	Corn, Cassava, Peanuts Production (Training of				
	Trainers)	4	80		
High-Value	Banana Production Training	2	140		
Crops	Enhanced Vegetable Production Training	5	985		
	High Value Vegetables Production (NFS)	1	82		
	Indigenous Microorganism & Oriental Herbal				
	Nutrients hands on Training	1	135		
	Organic Farming and Workshop	3	264		
	Peanut Production Training	41	1,212		
	Coffee and Corn ProductionTraining	2	286		
	Vegetable Gardening (Hands-on training and				
	Techno Demo)	21	808		
	Ginger Production Training	4	500		
	Ube Production Training	12	380		
	Sustainable Ube Production (Hands-on training				
	and Techno Demo)	6	262		
	Vegetable Production Training	61	2,253		
	Coco-based Diversified Integrated Farming	1	30		
	Cassava Livelihood Training and Food				
	Demonstration	8	341		
	Dragon Fruit Production Training	1	20		
	Cassava Production Training	3	120		
	Vegetable, Fruits and Industrial Crops Production				
	(Trainers Training)	1	168		
	Coffee, Cacao, and Durian Production	19	800		
Total		432	14,828		

Note: Sourced from DA-SAAD and BFAR-SAAD Details of Specialized Trainings

Table 24

List of SAAD Program Specialized Trainings for Integrated Farming, Livestock and Poultry Production from 2017 – 2018

Livelihood Category	Title of Training	Number of Trainings Conducted	Number of Individual Farmers Trained
Integrated	Corn, Peanut, and Livestock Production Training	5	228
Farming	Sweet Corn and Goat Production Training	3	129
	Corn-Goat Integrated Production Training	1	110
	Cattle and Upland Rice Production Training	1	93
	Rice-Duck Integrated Production Training	1	30
	Livestock and Poultry Production	28	6,772
	Cattle and Ready to Lay Chicken Production	6	150
	Training		
Livestock	Animal Health Care Production and Management	10	368
	Cattle Production Training	2	100
	Swine, Small Ruminants and Large Ruminants (Trainers Training)	1	168
	Carabao Raising/Production Training	1	70
	Cattle and Caracow Management Production	1	60
	Training		
	Cattle and Goat Production Training	13	650
	Enhanced Goat Production Training	10	353
	Goat Production Training	7	430

	Sustainable Goat Production Training	5	125
	Small Ruminants and Pasture Development	3	245
	Native Goat Production Technical Training	4	80
	Swine Production Training	4	136
	Swine Production Training (Natural Farming	3	219
	Technologies)		
	Swine Management and Production Training	35	732
Poultry	Broiler Production Training	6	500
	Duck Production Training	9	400
	Native Chicken Production Training	10	428
	Enhanced Native Chicken Production Training	14	3,115
	Layer Chicken Production Training	10	430
	Enhanced Poultry Production Training and	16	747
	Techno Demo		
	Backyard Poultry and Egg Production Training	10	423
	and Techno Demo		
	Layer Chicken and Egg Production Technical	1	20
	Training		
	Poultry Production Training	6	616
	Poultry Production (Training of Trainers)	1	168
	Egg Production Technical Training	4	160
Total		663	41,876

Note: Sourced from DA-SAAD and BFAR-SAAD Details of Specialized Trainings

Table 25

List of SAAD Program Specialized Trainings for Fisheries from 2017 – 2018

Livelihood Category	Title of Training	Number of Trainings Conducted	Number of Individual Farmers Trained
Social	Values Formation Seminar	18	450
Preparation	Organizational Development Training	1	50
Capture Fishery	Responsible Fishing Technology and Payao Installation and Regulations	10	300
	Responsible Fishing Technology	4	220
	Construction of Fiber Glass Boat (Hands-on Training)	6	464
	Boat Repair and Maintenance Training	3	150
	Payao and Bottom Set Gillnet Construction and Management Training	3	150
	Payao Installation and Management	3	43
	Fishing Gear Construction and Management	1	19
	FRP Boat Fabrication (Hands-on Training)	1	24
	Coastal Resource Management and Fishery Law Enforcement Training	3	150
	Fishery Law Enforcement Training for OMA- BMC Bantay Dagat Members	2	66
	Fishery Law Enforcement Training for CBAMB Bantay Dagat Members	1	65
	Fishery Law Enforcement Training for DDBR- SWELA Bantay Dagat Members	1	65
	Oplan Tokhang, MATA for Illegal Fishing	1	50
	Municipal Fisheries Capability Building	1	30

A	A manual transmission and transmission (Dealer	12	1507
Aquaculture	Aquaculture Technologies Training (Basic	13	1587
	Inapia Biology, Inapia Culture in Ponds, Cages		
	and Rice Paddles) Diag Eich Culture (Declarand Dand (Establishment	F	200
	Rice-Fish Culture/Backyard Pond (Establishment	5	200
	and Management Training)	4	170
	Tiles is and Lite Celtere Dechation Training)	4	170
	Tilapia and Hito Culture Production Training	5	90
	Grow-out Culture of Hito and Tilapia in Pond	1	30
	(Capacity Building and Hands-on Training)	4	100
	Freshwater Fish Farming (Hands-on Training)	4	100
	Grow-out and Good Aquaculture Practice on	1	40
	Shrimp Farming	4	120
	Grow-out Culture of Catfish in Pond (Capacity	4	130
	Building and Hands-on Training)	1	25
	Hito Culture and Management Training	1	25
	Hito Culture in Pond Training	1	25
	Hito Culture Production Training	9	40
	Induced Spawning of Catfish (Capacity Building	1	40
	and Hands-on Training)		10
	Marine Cage Culture and Management Training	l	40
	Marine Fish Cage Culture (Hands-on Training)	10	100
	Siganid Pen Culture Technology	1	40
	Tilapia Culture in Pond	23	570
	Tilapia Culture in Pond (Capability Training and	9	370
	Management)		107
	Tilapia Culture, Management, and Production	4	187
	Tilapia Culture Production Training	2	90
	Tilapia Breeding	4	80
	Tilapia Culture in Cage	3	60
	Tilapia Culture and Management Training	1	25
	Grow-out Culture of Tilapia in Pond (Capacity	1	30
	Building and Hands-on Training)		• •
	Tilapia Hatchery Management (Capacity	1	30
	Building and Hands-on Training)		
Enterprise	Business Planning and Product Development of	1	50
Development	Fishery by-products		
	Capacity Building and Record Keeping with	3	150
	emphasis on Book keeping		
	Enterprise Development Training	1	50
	Processing of Bottled Sardines in Oil	2	40
	Simple Bookkeeping and Basic Accounting	4	100
	Value Adding of Fishery Products	3	120
	Value Adding of Seaweeds and other Fishery	17	400
	Products		
Total		229	8,067

Note: Sourced from DA-SAAD and BFAR-SAAD Details of Specialized Trainings

Correspondingly, Table 26 presents the frequency and percentage distribution of sample respondents who reported to have attended trainings conducted or facilitated by the SAAD Program.

Table 26

Respondent Classification/	Count	% to Total
Livelihood Category		
Farmers	376	33.27
Crop Production	166	20.96
Livestock Production	118	69.01
Poultry Production	61	64.89
Integrated Farming	29	42.03
Agri-Aqua	2	50.00
Fisherfolk	87	18.91
Capture Fisheries	62	19.20
Aquaculture	20	15.87
Capture + Aquaculture	2	40.00
Agri-Aqua	3	50.00
Total	463	29.12

Distribution of Respondents who Attended Livelihood Trainings

Based on the survey conducted, the beneficiary-respondents identified various trainings/seminars they attended. The summary of these trainings is shown in Table 27. As contained in the annual report, trainings conducted in 2017 include Farmer Livestock School Training, Farmers Field School, Integrated Corn Production and Management and Training on Machine Operation. Series of technical training were also conducted in 2018 which are anchored on rice, corn, high value crops, and livestock and poultry. As noted in the 2018 SAAD annual report, a total of 642 training programs were conducted. It is hoped that such training programs empower and equip the farmers and fisherfolk with right knowledge to manage the livelihood projects bestowed to the beneficiaries.

Type of Training	Provinces Covered
Specific crop production technology	Apayao, Compostela Valley, Leyte, Negros Oriental, North Cotabato, Northern Samar, Sarangani, Southern Leyte, Western Samar
Using and Maintaining crop production tools, machineries and equipment	Apayao, Compostela Valley, North Cotabato, Southern Leyte, Western Samar, Leyte
Rice Production	Apayao, Masbate, North Cotabato
S.A.L.T. Technology	Apayao
Making Organic Fertilizer	Apayao
Adlay Production	Bukidnon
Corn Production	Masbate
Vegetable Production	Masbate
Crop Protection	North Cotabato, Northern Samar
Post Production Technology and Processing	Compostela Valley, Sarangani, Western Samar
Livestock and Poultry Production Technology	Apayao, Leyte, Masbate, Negros Oriental, North Cotabato, Northern Samar, Sarangani, Sorsogon, Southern Leyte, Western Samar
Livestock Trading	Apayao
Integrated Rice-Duck Raising	North Cotabato
Specific Fishery Technology	Northern Samar, Sorsogon, Southern Leyte, Western Samar, Sultan Kudarat, Zamboanga del Norte
Conduct of Local Market Study	Apayao, Compostela Valley, Sarangani, Leyte, Western Samar
Conduct of Entrepreneurial Activities	Compostela Valley, Western Samar, Sorsogon,

Table 27Summary of Trainings Attended by the Respondent Beneficiaries

Expansion in Production Areas. The Philippines is an agricultural country and the majority of the people are dependent on farming and fishery as a source of livelihood. Table 28 shows the agricultural and aquaculture areas for each of the provinces targeted by the SAAD Program.

Province	Farm	Category			
	Area (in ha)	Under Temporary Crops	Under Permanent Crops	Under Livestock and Poultry Raising	Under Aquaculture
Apayao	23,353	19,296	2,391	16	4
Catanduanes	38,056	6,676	30,735	75	-
Masbate	179,844	54,587	90,484	4,738	37
Sorsogon	101,968	17,042	83,916	68	-
Negros Oriental	123,716	86,228	28,936	358	5
Leyte	158,180	64,549	88,259	210	4
Southern Leyte	39,312	5,324	32,850	36	*
Northern Samar	116,606	23,788	91,099	57	2
Western Samar	61,608	25,327	35,538	88	-
Zamboanga del Norte	206,023	51,425	151,602	113	-
Bukidnon	316,632	204,573	79,204	14,735	-
Compostela Valley	157,021	21,815	132,275	90	11
North Cotabato	245,182	131,074	105,073	239	17
Sarangani	108,830	38,197	66,948	38	*
Sultan Kudarat	151,616	98,234	43,295	35	22

Table 28Total Production Areas for Agriculture, per Province

Note: Other categories comprising the total farm area which were not included in the table include Temporary fallow, Under temporary and permanent meadows and pastures, Covered with wood and forest, Homelot, and Others; Sourced from PSA, Census of Agriculture and Fisheries 2012 and Philippine Atlas.

Based on the profile data from the NPMSO, 256 municipalities from the 18 target provinces were listed as beneficiaries during the 2017-2018 implementation of the SAAD Program: 90 from the high welfare cluster, 100 from the medium welfare cluster, and 66 from the low welfare cluster. Correspondingly, a total of 74 municipalities were covered in the field survey: 28 from the high welfare cluster, 29 from the medium welfare cluster, and 17 from the low welfare cluster.

Figures 8 to 11 presents the total area expansion among the 2017, 2018, and 2019 respondent beneficiaries according to the different livelihood categories and commodities. The areas planted with crops (root crops, fruits, plantation crops,

vegetables, corn and rice) had increased in reference to the area planted in the baseline year of 2016 (2017 beneficiaries) and 2017 (2018 beneficiaries).



Figure 8

Total Area of Farmer Respondents in Crop Production

The expansion in the production areas for crops peaked in 2018 as shown in Figure 8 with areas for plantation crops being the highest. The production areas noted in 2019 came from the beneficiaries included in the 2017 and 2018 list but were unfortunate not to receive the intervention in the scheduled year, however, they were able to receive them in 2019 (Table 21).

Figure 9





As shown in Figure 9, extensive areas were utilized for ruminant production both for small and large ruminants as compared to swine production. This is expected because of the requirements for grazing areas as part of the production system for ruminants. On the other hand, smaller area is needed for the housing in swine production.

Figure 10





Since poultry production is only on a backyard scale, a relatively smaller area was utilized (Figure 10). Possible expansion for production areas will mean a corresponding increase in the number of heads raised by the beneficiaries.





Figure 11 shows the trend on the production areas of the respondents under the aquaculture sector in pond and in pen/cage category. SAAD interventions for aquaculture in 2017 triggered an increase in the utilization of potential space for fish production by the fisherfolk from below five (5) hectares in 2016 (before the SAAD intervention) to about 21 hectares and 18 hectares in pond and pen/cage, respectively. Nevertheless, production areas by the 2017 adopters have decreased until 2020 to less than 10 hectares attributed to several factors like inclement weather causing the loss and death of stocks and undoubtedly the effect of pandemic that also immobilized fisherfolk in their aquaculture production, e.g. from technical (maintenance of fish farm) to marketing and post-harvest components of the aquaculture technology.

Meanwhile, total production areas of the 2018 adopters of the pond and pen/cage technology were only about 2 ha and 1 ha respectively in 2017. A slight increase in the pond areas is imminent in 2018 and maintained at that level in 2020, while pen/cage production areas totally collapse in the 2019-2020 period. The last graph in Figure 12 (2019 adopters) similarly reflected a declining trend in production areas in 2020.

The above findings suggest that the aquaculture technology adopters suffered tremendous hardship in maintaining their production areas or potential space for aquaculture particularly in years 2019 and 2020.

Volume of Production. A stable volume of production is noted for rice and corn (Figure 12). This is expected because these products are considered staple crops in the country. It is also notable that the volume of production for plantation crops is stable from 2017 to 2020. The volume of vegetables produced is only small, however,

throughout the years the beneficiaries produced them as cash crops that support their food requirements and as a source of income for the family.



Figure 12

Volume of Crop Production (in tons/hectare), per beneficiary group

A stable volume of large and small ruminants produced is observed (Figure 13) mainly attributed to a stable adoption rate (Figure 20). However, there was a decreased volume of production for swine due to the African Swine Fever that affected many parts of the country.

Figure 13

Volume of Livestock Production (in metric tons)



The number of ducks produced by 2017 beneficiaries in 2020 and a stable number of ducks produced by the 2018 beneficiaries. Overall, there were more chickens produced compared to other species of poultry. In terms of egg, although there were more chickens produced compared to ducks, more ducks eggs were noted (Figures 14 and 15). Chickens that were raised by the respondent beneficiaries are mostly for meat purposes while ducks are egg type breeds.

Figure 14





Figure 15 *Volume of Egg Production (Number of Eggs)*



Figure 16 reflects the trend on the volume of production by commodities of the beneficiaries in the capture fisheries category. The 2017 beneficiaries targeted fish

and crustaceans with the former being in larger volumes. Fish production increased in 2017 to a level of 88MT but slightly declined over time to about 72MT in 2020, equivalent to an average landings of about 79MT over the last 4 years after the SAAD intervention in this sector. This indicates a higher production in fish compared to 77MT in 2016 which is the year before the SAAD assistance was given. Relatively, landings on crustacean (e.g. crab) also increased from 6.43MT in 2016 to 8.12MT and 7.33MT in 2019 and 2020 respectively, corresponding to an average production of 7.77MT for the last 4 years of the SAAD assistance to the 2017 beneficiaries.



Figure 16 *Volume of Fish Catch (Capture Fisheries)*

Likewise, the 2018 beneficiaries landed a higher volume of fish, crustacean and mollusks production as compared to their previous year of fishing operation. Nevertheless, the trend went down until 2020. Fish catch reached a high mark of about 157MT in 2018 to a low level of 59MT in 2020. Similarly, crustacean and mollusk landings went up in 2018 to about 10MT and 22MT but declined to about 3MT and 0.3MT in 2020 respectively. Average annual production was pegged at about 113.5MT, 5.6MT and 14.2MT of fish, crustaceans and mollusks respectively. On the other hand, 2019 beneficiaries have slightly increased their annual landings in fish during their first year of operation to about 130MT but seemingly declined in 2020 to 95MT. Mollusk landings remain at a constant level of annual production to 4.5MT.

Figure 17 shows the volume of production of the beneficiaries in the aquaculture sector. Fish farmers who received SAAD interventions in 2017 concentrated in fish and seaweed production. Their farming operation reflects a very significant increase during the first year of operation but declines over the next few years. Fish and seaweed production was pegged at 10MT and 16.8MT in 2017 from a low 4.5MT and 0.3MT respectively before the SAAD assistance was given. The average annual production was 7.95MT for fish and 9.44 for seaweed, notably higher than their production in 2016-the year when SAAD assistance was not yet introduced.





Meanwhile, beneficiaries of 2018 increased significantly their fish and mollusks production in their first year of aquaculture operation while crustaceans production levelled off in the succeeding years. The average annual production was pegged at 9.53MT, 4.73MT and .04MT in fish, mollusks and crustaceans respectively.

Except for crustaceans, annual production in fish and mollusks are still significantly higher than the production before the SAAD intervention was given to these beneficiaries.

On the other hand, the 2019 fish farmer beneficiaries experienced a very low fish production compared to the year when they are not recipients of the SAAD assistance. Nevertheless, this group increased their annual production in mollusk or shellfish farming about 4x higher or from less than 1MT before the SAAD intervention to 4.9MT in 2020.

Increased volume of sales through expanded access to market (Marketing Assistance and Enterprise Development)

As discussed in the previous section on outputs of the Marketing Assistance and Enterprise Development component, only one (1) association in Sorsogon has reported that SAAD has consistently facilitated the submission of an endorsement letter to their target buyer for rice for three consecutive years (2017 to 2019). Their gross sales increased from Php 24,000 in 2017 to Php 36,000 in 2018, and Php 37,200 in 2019.

SAAD Initial Impacts

The identified measures of impact stated in the DA-SAAD program framework are improved household food consumption of partner-beneficiaries, and the increased income and improved economic status of partner-beneficiaries before and after the program implementation. This midterm assessment covering the period 2017 to 2020 identifies qualitative and quantitative measures of initial impact based on a systematic analysis of survey data, complemented by FGD, and case studies. It is noted that the survey instruments, FGD and case study guidelines were designed to assess the benefits with respect to the specific metrics identified in the logical framework as well as more detailed impact indicators relevant to the above welfare measures.

Improved Household Food Consumption

The improvement in the household consumption was measured by determining the partner-beneficiaries' frequency of meals a day, incidence of hunger, variety of food products consumed at home, and incidence of malnutrition. These indicators refer and aim to assess the food security and nutrition of the SAAD respondent beneficiaries.

The indicator frequency of meals is aimed at determining how many among the beneficiaries eat three times a day or less. A typical Filipino family eats three times a day, which is considered a luxury for some of the poor communities in the country. Hence, it is a critical measure of impact for a poverty-alleviation program.

The incidence of hunger was determined by identifying how many of the beneficiaries have experienced hunger. Based on the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) of the United Nations, hunger is defined as an uncomfortable or painful physical sensation caused by insufficient consumption of dietary energy or calories. It is related to the frequency of meals, hence this includes those who have reduced food quantity or have skipped meals because of having no food on the table.

The variety of food products consumed at home determines whether the beneficiaries consume food belonging to go, glow, and grow food categories, or a combination of them. Consumption of food products belonging to these groups indicate a balanced diet and healthy eating pattern necessary to ensure proper nutrition among individuals. This can be matched with incidence of malnutrition since consumption of different food groups is expected to result in better nutritional status among individuals. Those who are unable to consume food products from any of the basic food groups can be considered to be undernourished.

The incidence of malnutrition reflects the quantity and quality of food consumed by individuals. This happens when people compromise food quality and variety, quantity and frequency. It further implies accessibility and availability for a more balanced diet among individuals to achieve optimal health. According to the Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES) developed by the FAO, compromising food quality and variety, and reducing food quantity are considered to be a moderate level of food insecurity. People experiencing moderate food insecurity are characterized as having reduced quality and/or quantity of food and are uncertain about their ability to obtain food due to lack of money or other resources. Moderate food insecurity can increase the risk of some forms of malnutrition, such as stunting in children, and micronutrient deficiencies (FAO, n.d.). Data on malnutrition was sourced from the survey wherein respondents were directly asked if they consider any of their household members to be malnourished.

Increased Income and Improved Economic Status

In addition to meeting the basic physiological needs of household members as outlined and discussed above, another indicator specified in the impact pathway is increased income and improved economic status and welfare of the SAAD beneficiaries. For the purpose of this midterm evaluation, this was assessed through various measures of financial condition, housing characteristics, education of children, and means of transportation of target households. An overall satisfaction and welfare rating before and after the SAAD Program were likewise solicited from the respondents to measure and describe the respondents' own perception on the changes in their lives brought by becoming a SAAD beneficiary. *Financial Status.* The financial status of respondents was determined by computing the amount of on-farm and total household income, monthly budget for food and recreation, health insurance, amount of debt, and amount of savings. These variables are interconnected since the amount of income affects a person's propensity to borrow and/or save, as well as corresponding average monthly budget for food, budget for recreation, and health insurance (if any, aside from PhilHealth), i.e. from lower to higher average budget for food, from PhilHealth to other Health insurance policy subscriptions, and from zero to bigger budget for recreation.

As officially defined by the PSA, income refers to cash received and receivables for goods or products and by-products sold and services rendered. It is considered as the main indicator for economic status as it is directly related to poverty, i.e. an increased income would mean improved economic status, and vice versa. Based on the latest poverty statistics, poverty incidence or the proportion of poor Filipinos whose per capita income is not sufficient to meet their basic food and non-food needs was estimated at 23.7% as of the first semester of 2021 (PSA, 2021). In 2018, this percentage was only 21.1%. Further, in 2018, farmers and fisherfolk posted the highest poverty incidences among the basic sectors at 31.6% and 26.2%, respectively (PSA, 2020).

In this study, both annual net income from on-farm activities as well as total annual household income were solicited from the respondents. Net on-farm income was estimated by deducting total cost of production from total sales of produced goods per year. On the other hand, total household income was computed as the gross earnings from off-farm activities of the beneficiary and his household plus the net income derived from sales of agricultural produce. Budget for food and recreation were also considered as financial status indicators of the SAAD respondent beneficiaries. Food usually has the highest proportion in a typical family budget among Filipinos. The budget should be sufficient to meet the basic food needs to satisfy the nutritional requirements for economically necessary and socially desirable physical activities. Further, an allotment for recreational activities generally implies that the families have surplus income. This generally provides an indication that their basic needs are already satisfied and that they have extra budget for leisure activities.

Furthermore, PhilHealth benefit is part of the National Health Insurance Program. The SAAD beneficiaries are automatic beneficiaries of this health insurance program, hence, any additional insurance policy they avail imply higher disposable income.

Another related economic status and welfare indicator is debt or amount of money owed by one party (debtor) to another party (creditor). This occurs when the debtor borrows funds to serve a financial need which cannot be readily met. This implies that the individual has an income deficit, thus, borrowing becomes an option to meet budgetary requirements. In agriculture, farm debt is a liability or obligation incurred by a farmer for the purpose of funding the conduct of farming operations. More often, the amount of debt carries with it an agreed interest rate or the corresponding cost of borrowing money which the farmer is also expected to pay. As such, increased debt makes farmers vulnerable to losses especially when the target volume of production is not met or if they are unable to market their farm outputs at an appropriate price. On the contrary, decline in debt indicates an improvement in the financial condition of the farmers which allowed them to pay off the amount of money they borrowed plus interest. In relation to income and debt is savings, which represents a net surplus of funds for an individual or household after all expenses and obligations or budgetary requirements were paid or met.

Housing Characteristics. For most Filipinos, an improved economic status is best reflected in their housing characteristics, which includes tenure status of dwelling, housing materials (main flooring, main roofing, main wall), electricity, source of water supply, toilet facility, and ownership of assets (household amenities and appliances). All of these indicators elucidate the living conditions of households.

The tenure status of dwelling pertains to the arrangement under which the household occupies all or part of a housing unit, either owned, rented or leased, or being occupied for free with or without consent from the owner (PSA, n.d.).

Further, the type of materials used in the housing units of target beneficiaries define the strength and integrity of the house structure in terms of safeguarding the occupants against adverse climatic conditions and providing privacy. Houses made of durable construction materials provide better protection and are expected to last for a long period of time, while those made of less durable materials may need more frequent maintenance or replacement. The construction materials used for the main roofing, outer wall, and flooring of housing units then provide an insight as to the living conditions of the farmers and fisherfolk and how vulnerable they are from typhoons and other calamities.

Another housing characteristic is the household's access to electricity, i.e. households with electricity implies a more decent and comfortable living.

The next housing characteristic is the source of water supply, which determines their access to safe and sustainable drinking water. This can be categorized as whether piped into their dwelling, piped into yard or plot, piped into public tap, protected or open dug wells, or developed or undeveloped springs.

Furthermore, access to toilets and the type of toilet facility describe the waste management, hygiene, and sanitation in households and in the community.

Moreover, ownership of assets or anything useful and valuable which a person or a household possesses, implies that a household has a higher disposable income to buy home appliances and other assets and amenities for more comfortable living conditions.

Education of Children. Another potential benefit of the SAAD program is the education of the beneficiaries' children. As affirmed by Ogundari and Aromolaran (2014), studies show that improvement in economic welfare is driven by educational attainment. It is the foundation of social welfare and a key factor for economic advancement (Latysheva & Borovikova, 2016). For this midterm evaluation, education was measured in terms of the highest educational attainment of children of the SAAD respondent beneficiaries. The improvement is from lower to higher educational attainment of children before and after the SAAD program implementation. The higher the educational attainment, the higher is the economic status.

Means of Transportation. Transport enables farmers and fisherfolk to increase mobility of their products, from farm to market and to their ultimate buyers. The means of transportation vary from public to private modes, from two wheels to more wheels. The more it becomes private, the higher is the farmers' or fisherfolks' control for the distribution logistics of their products.

Satisfaction and Overall Welfare. This part identifies the overall satisfaction of SAAD beneficiaries to the implemented programs and projects of the DA and the DA-SAAD before and after becoming SAAD beneficiaries.

Figure 18

SAAD Program Impact Pathway



Initial Adoption Rate and Trends

Technology adoption is a broad concept which is affected by the development, dissemination and application of existing and new biological, chemical and mechanical techniques at the farm level, all of which are encompassed in farm capital and other inputs; it is also affected by education, training, advice and information which form the basis of farmers' knowledge. It also includes technologies and practices in the whole agri-food sector that have an impact at the farm level (OECD, 2001).

The decision to adopt a new technology is analogous to an investment decision. The decision may involve substantial initial fixed costs, while the benefits accrue over time (Caswell, 2001). In the case of the SAAD Program, the livelihood interventions were provided without cost to target beneficiaries such that they have little to no reason not to utilize them for their farming and fishing activities. Hence, for the purpose of this impact assessment study, the estimation of initial adoption levels starts one year after the livelihood intervention was received by the beneficiaries who utilized the provided interventions on a specific year to the total number of beneficiaries (total number of possible adoptors) who were able to receive interventions on the year of SAAD implementation.

Crop Production

Interventions for crop production include planting materials in the form of seeds, seedlings, and cuttings for the production of rice, corn, vegetables, fruits, root crops and plantation crops. Other farm inputs provided include insecticides and pesticides for pest and disease control, various tools, machineries, and equipment for

production and post-production, as well as relevant trainings on crop production technologies. In some provinces (Sarangani, Southern Leyte, Western Samar, Sorsogon, Compostela Valley), respondents also stated that there were market studies conducted in their locality.

As shown in Figure 19, technology adoption among the 2017 beneficiaries generally follow a sustained high level of adoption across the different commodities, led by fruits and plantation crops production technologies with adoption rates ranging from 96.83% to 100%, followed by corn production technologies with adoption rates from 83.78% to 86.49%, and vegetable production technologies which remained at the level of 83.33% from 2018 to 2020.







Note: Technologies introduced include the following: **Rice** (Seeds - Hybrid and OPV, Fertilizer, Pesticides and Insecticides, Biologics, Farm tools, Machineries - hand tractor, thresher, water pump); **Corn** (Seeds - Hybrid and OPV, Fertilizer, Pesticides and Insecticides, Biologics, Farm tools, Machineries - cultivator, corn mill); **Vegetables** (Seeds - Hybrid and traditional, Fertilizers, Pesticides, Garden tools, Rain shelter); **Fruits** (Fertilizers, Pesticides, Farm tools); **Plantation Crops** (Seeds/Seedlings, Machineries – hand tractor); **Root Crops** (Tubers, Ube setts, Cuttings, Fertilizers)

Although rice is considered as a staple crop in the country, the adoption rates for rice production technologies introduced by SAAD was observed to be the lowest among the crops, at 79.25% in 2018 down to 77.36% in the two succeeding years for the 2017 beneficiaries. A comparable trend was observed overall among 2018 beneficiaries where the initial adoption rate for rice production technologies was recorded at 81.82% in 2019, but declined to 76.08% in 2020. It is noted that the initial adoption rate observed from 2019 beneficiaries was also at a comparable level at 78.79%. The decline in adoption was traced mostly to the province of Sarangani where about 68% (28 out of 41) of the respondent beneficiaries declared crop failure due to pests. They also reported that while they were provided native rice seeds and some farm tools (mostly sprayer), they did not receive other essential inputs like fertilizers, pesticides or insecticides for crop pest and disease control. In addition, some farmers in Sorsogon stated that they discontinued planting inbred and native rice seeds after they stopped receiving the interventions.

On the other hand, lower levels of technology adoption were observed among beneficiaries who received the crop interventions in 2018 compared to those who received them in 2017, particularly for corn and high-value vegetables. Specifically, the adoption trend for the corn production technologies introduced to the 2017 beneficiaries was generally steady ranging from 84% to 86%, while initial adoption rate among the 2018 beneficiaries was considerably lower at only 67.54% in 2019 and further declined to 57.02% in 2020.

Based on the survey, the 2017 beneficiaries of corn production technologies from the province of Sarangani stated that the open-pollinated variety (OPV) corn seeds provided to them were not suitable for their area and that the seeds did not survive due to pests. They wished to be provided with suitable seeds, fertilizers and biologics as they only received planting materials and crop production tools. Meanwhile, for 2018 corn production technology beneficiaries, almost 60% (14 out of 24) of the beneficiaries from Southern Leyte discontinued planting hybrid corn seeds due to a variety of reasons which include unfavorable weather conditions, low quality seeds, no fertilizer and insecticide provided, and no subsequent intervention provided for the following years. Similarly, all the respondents from Sorsogon who were recipients of corn production technologies in 2018 stopped planting corn when they no longer received interventions in 2019 and 2020.

Other critical factors explaining the declining technology adoption of corn production technology in later years as observed in the survey are highlighted as follows:

- Low quality seeds corn seeds did not grow due to weevils ("bukbok") found in the seeds provided by the program (Sorsogon, Sarangani)
- Lack of training on fertilizer management (Sorsogon)
- Incomplete package of technology (Bukidnon)
- Inappropriate training provided (e.g. Bukidnon beneficiary commented that appropriate training must be in corn production however, adlay rice production was given.)
- Drought and flooding (Apayao)

On the other hand, the initial adoption rate of vegetable production technologies among 2018 beneficiaries was only at 56.83% in 2019, and went further down to 40.98% in 2020. This was mostly attributable to the following identified factors as reported by the respondent beneficiaries:

 Inadequate supplies – amount of seeds provided was not enough; one-time provision of interventions as reported by about 81% (98 out of 121) of respondent farmer beneficiaries in Sorsogon. These technology interventions were mostly vegetable seed packs ranging from two (2) to 50 packs per individual.

- Incomplete package of technology Some beneficiaries did not receive fertilizers and farm tools (Sorsogon)
- Typhoons and other calamities

The decline in the overall adoption trends for crop production may also be attributed to various calamities such as the earthquake that had caused damages in several parts of Visayas in April 23, 2019; the strong typhoons that ravaged the country like typhoon Ambo on May 10, 2020 affecting Eastern Samar, Bukidnon, Northern Samar and Sorsogon. Other typhoons like Quinta that damaged the provinces of Bicol in October 25, 2020 and typhoon Ulysses that had caused flooding in several areas of the country in November 2020. The global COVID-19 pandemic was also a major factor in the farming activities in 2020 to 2021. These events brought forth negative consequences on the ability of the farmers to continue to utilize the technologies introduced to them or even access complementary inputs required.

Livestock Production

Based on the survey findings, livestock production technologies received by the farmer beneficiaries are mostly improved stocks of large ruminants (cattle and carabao), small ruminants (goat and sheep) and swine, as well as feeds, vaccines, and drugs for the animals. Few reported to have received animal housing materials and production tools (Apayao, Southern Leyte) such as nails, galvanized iron, pails, and buckets, as well as local market studies (Leyte and Southern Leyte) and relevant trainings. As presented in Figure 20, the initial adoption rate for large ruminant production technologies was at 85.71% a year after the SAAD implementation, but declined to 78.57% and 71.43% for the succeeding two years, among the 2017 livestock beneficiaries. Similar trends were likewise observed for swine production technologies with initial adoption rate starting at 84.21% in 2018 before declining to 73.68% and 68.42% for 2019 and 2020, as well as small ruminant production technologies which started at 72% initial adoption rate then went down to 68% and 56% in 2019 and 2020, respectively.



Figure 20

Overall Adoption Trends in Livestock Production Technologies

Based on the survey, the upgraded goat stocks provided to some of the farmers in Western Samar got sick and died, while native goat stocks provided to the farmers in North Cotabato died due to various reasons which include disease, snake bite, and complications during delivery of their young. Since said respondents received only the animal stocks as intervention, they cited lack of vitamins and medicines as a major

Note: Technologies introduced include the following: Large Ruminants (Hybrid and native stocks, Feeds, Vaccines, Drugs, Animal housing materials); Small Ruminants (Hybrid and native stocks, Feeds, Vaccines, Drugs, Goat housing); Swine (Hybrid and native stocks, Feeds, Vaccines, Drugs, Farm tools – bucket, pail)

concern. Similarly, the native swine stocks provided to beneficiaries in North Cotabato were reportedly small and sickly and eventually died. They also commented on the lack of feeds and drugs for growth and disease management. The survey also revealed that these beneficiaries did not receive any training on swine production.

Above mortality scenarios also happened among the 2018 and 2019 beneficiaries of livestock production technologies, albeit at a higher proportion, which led to the relatively lower technology adoption rate. More than half of the native goat recipients in Sarangani reported deaths in their animals due to diseases, and suggested that medicines and vaccines be included, should the SAAD program award them with additional technology interventions. This was also true for large ruminants and swine. This can be linked to the presence of the dreaded African Swine Fever (ASF) in 2019 which imparted a severe loss in the swine industry in the country.

As observed in the survey, the key factors explaining the declining livestock technology adoption in later years after the provision of SAAD interventions are summarized as follows:

- Mortalities due to lack of vaccines, vitamins, and medicines (Western Samar, Sarangani, North Cotabato)
- Lack of feeds (North Cotabato)
- Lack of training on farrowing (North Cotabato)

Proper feeding and disease management practices are critical to promote optimum growth and health of livestock animals. These animals are directly affected by their environment and any dramatic change may cause high mortality and poor production performance. Such a scenario will result in a great loss for the raisers leading to discontinuation of operations.

Poultry Production

Based on the survey, the species of poultry as part of the SAAD livelihood interventions mostly include native and hybrid chickens and ducks. Only one (1) sample respondent from Apayao reported to have received hybrid quail stocks, feeds and housing materials in 2018 which the beneficiary continued until year 2020. Other technology interventions in poultry production provided to the beneficiaries include feeds, vaccines, drugs, production tools which were mostly waterers and polynets for housing, and conduct of technical trainings. In some provinces (Western Samar, Southern Leyte, and North Cotabato), some beneficiaries noted the conduct of local market studies as well. Figure 21 presents adoption trends for the poultry production technology interventions introduced by SAAD in three phases: 2017, 2018 and 2019. In all three intervention stages, adoption of technologies was consistently higher for duck production than for chicken production.



Figure 21 Overall Adoption Trends in Poultry Production Technologies

Note: Technologies introduced include the following:

Chicken (Hybrid and native stocks, Feeds, Vaccines, Drugs, Farm tools, Equipment - Incubator); **Duck** (Hybrid and native stocks, Feeds, Drugs, Net); **Quail** (Hybrid stocks, Feeds, Housing)—Only one (1) sample respondent from Apayao reported to have received quail production technology interventions in 2018.

Among the beneficiaries who received ducks as a source of livelihood in 2017, 75% were able to continue the production in 2018 and 2019, then declined to 66.67% in the succeeding year. For beneficiaries who received interventions in 2018, 71.43% continued in 2019 and declined again to 57.14% in the succeeding year 2020. The initial adoption rate among the 2019 beneficiaries was even lower at only 50% in 2020. Considering the production cycle of ducks, they start laying at 5 - 6 months of age and become productive for 52 weeks or one year. Reconditioning the layers after molting can extend their laying but with fewer eggs. The reported concerns during the survey which caused the decline in adoption of the introduced duck production technology are summarized as follows:

- Old ducks which had difficulty in laying eggs (North Cotabato)
- Lack of feeds, High price of feeds (North Cotabato), Shortage of feeds (Western Samar)
- Mortalities due to diseases (Western Samar, Southern Leyte, Sarangani)
- Mortalities due to typhoons and flooding (Sorsogon, Western Samar, North Cotabato)
- No available area or facility for duck raising to address waste management issues (Western Samar)

For chicken production technology adoptors in 2017, more than 60% of them continued their livelihood in 2018, but declined to 52% level in 2020. According to the hybrid chicken recipients in Western Samar, their animals died as early as after a week due to disease infections. Likewise, some recipients of native chickens in North Cotabato claimed that the provided chickens were carriers of diseases which also infected other chickens in their neighborhood. On the other hand, the initial technology adoption rate among 2018 beneficiaries was significantly lower at 26.83% which was traced mostly to the poultry raisers in Northern Samar who incurred losses in their production due to high variable costs. Majority of them reported to have only received feeds and trainings.

To summarize, the reported concerns which contributed to the decline in adoption of the introduced technologies for chicken production are as follows:

- Mortalities due to diseases (Western Samar, North Cotabato)
- High cost of production (Northern Samar)

Capture Fisheries

Based on the survey, the capture fishery technology interventions received by the respondents include various fishing gears and paraphernalia, tools, machineries and equipment for bait and bottom fishing such as nets and fishing lines, hooks and arrows, nylon, spear, blinkers, collapsible crab pots, motorized and non-motorized banca. No post-production tools, machineries, and equipment were provided for the sample respondents but trainings and local market studies were reported to have been conducted in some of the provinces, specifically in Sorsogon and Southern Leyte. The different capture fishery technologies and interventions adopted by the beneficiaries as to the production of fish, crustacean, and mollusks are reflected in Figure 22.
Figure 22

Overall Adoption Trends in Capture Fishery Technologies, by target species group



Note: Technologies introduced include the following: **Fish** (Bait fishing – Motorized banca, Fishing gears and paraphernalia – fishing hook, jigger, nylon, blinker, buoy, fish net, scoop net, fishing arrow, burner, light bulb, styrofoam box; Bottom fishing – Motorized banca, Motorboat engine with rudder, propeller, drive shaft and cross joint, Fishing gears and paraphernalia - cast net, fish trap, bottom set gill net, string); **Crustaceans** (Bait fishing – Canoe type banca, Motorized banca, Collapsible crab pots; Bottom fishing – Fishing gears and paraphernalia); **Mollusks** (Motorized banca , Fishing gears and paraphernalia - squid hook, squid light, scope net, buoy, nylon, rope, fish line, fish hook, flashlight, fish arrow, blinker)

It is noteworthy that the bottom fishing technologies for crustaceans were readily accepted when it was first introduced in 2017 in Western Samar and in Catanduanes in 2018. The fishing gears and paraphernalia for catching crabs were fully adopted and sustained 100% adoption rate in subsequent years. This reflects the appropriateness and efficiency of the technology provided.

On the other hand, the initial adoption rate of interventions for capturing fishes which was mostly for bottom fishing methods was lower at 89.29% then slightly declined to 86.90% and 85.71% for the next two years. The decline in adoption is mostly attributed to the fisherfolk beneficiaries from Western Samar who noted that the fishing gears received were incomplete. One respondent stated that he was given a fishing net but does not have a boat so he was unable to use the intervention. Some quality issues in the tools and equipment were also mentioned as reasons for nonadoption. One respondent reported that the small buoy for net construction did not fit properly and should be replaced, while another commented about the damaged motor boat and nets which were no longer deemed useful. Another respondent remarked that the size of the fishing line he received was small and went on to suggest the size he needs. Other unforeseen circumstances such as sickness of a family member were also noted as reasons for discontinuation of fishing activities. Some decided to sell the tools they received in order to afford urgent needs.

A comparable initial adoption level was also observed from 2018 beneficiaries where 89.80% adopted the bait and bottom fishing technologies for capturing fishes in 2019. However, the decline in adoption for the following year was more pronounced as it went down to 54.42%. Based on the survey, the non-adoption of the interventions for bait fishing were mostly observed from fisherfolk beneficiaries in Southern Leyte where most if not all the sampled respondents discontinued the use of the capture fishery tools. The concerns forwarded mostly dwell on the appropriateness of the interventions to their fishing techniques where some respondents commented that the nylons were either too thin or too thick, and unsuitable for their fishing practices and target fish species. Most of these fisherfolk resorted to their off-farm livelihood activities (as construction worker or laborer) to support their families after they stopped fishing. As previously shown in Table 5, only about 38% of the fisherfolk respondents rely solely on on-farm income and majority had off-farm income sources.

Similar issues on the quality and appropriateness of the fishing gears and tools were raised by some of the 2019 beneficiaries who discontinued the use of the provided technology interventions for bait and bottom fishing for fish species. Most of them were fisherfolk beneficiaries from Leyte in addition to a few fisherfolk beneficiaries from Sorsogon and Southern Leyte. They indicated that the nets, nylon strings, and hooks were not in the desired size. The fishing gears were also regarded as not durable enough and lasted only for a few months. Specifically, respondents in Sorsogon reported that the nylon is easily damaged and they do not have materials to fix them, while another commented that the engine does not fit the small boat given. Some beneficiaries from Southern Leyte likewise mentioned that the fishing hooks were not used since the size was not appropriate for the fishing lines provided. In addition, unfavorable weather conditions, low catch due to illegal fishing, and high cost of gasoline for their motorized boats were also pointed out as constraints to adoption.

For the 2018 beneficiaries of capture fishery technologies for mollusks, initial adoption rate was relatively low at 52% as compared to fishes and crustaceans. The adoption level further declined to 8% by 2020. While some did not disclose their reason for discontinuation, some still noted the completeness, appropriateness and compatibility of the tools and equipment to their fishing techniques.

In summary, the primary concerns forwarded by the respondent beneficiaries which contributed to the low adoption revolve around the following issues:

- Incomplete set of fishing gears, motorboat parts (Western Samar, Leyte, Sorsogon)
- Low quality tools and equipment (Western Samar, Leyte)
- Mismatched sizes of fishing gears and tools (Western Samar, Leyte, Sorsogon, Southern Leyte)
- Inappropriate interventions for the current fishing practices and techniques of fisherfolk (Southern Leyte)

108

- Unfavorable weather conditions (Leyte, Sultan Kudarat)
- High cost of gasoline for the motorboat (Leyte)
- Presence of illegal fishers (Leyte, Western Samar)

The above findings reflect a slight shift on the adoption rates as may be explained through the availability of the capture fishery technologies extended to the beneficiaries by the SAAD program which is a function of what species group will be landed. As reported in the social preparation section of the report, the regional and provincial SAAD coordinators conduct needs assessment activities with their stakeholders in the target municipalities to ensure that the interventions provided are appropriate and acceptable. While some of the technology interventions were highly adopted, the presented constraints to adoption cited by some of the respondents should not be ignored. These signify areas for review and improvement to sustain high adoption levels and achieve the desired welfare gains. The SAAD Management may consider conducting more detailed needs assessment activities at the grassroots level between the provincial focal persons and the fisherfolks themselves.

Aquaculture

The aquaculture technologies received by fisherfolk beneficiaries from the SAAD program include fingerlings and feeds, various gears and paraphernalia, aquaculture tools, machineries and equipment such as nets, strawlace, nylon, binder, buoy, fish cages, oyster spot collector, drum, circular tank, solar panels, oxygen pump, and filter, among others. Technical trainings and local market studies were also conducted in some provinces (Zamboanga del Norte and Sultan Kudarat) as interventions. Figure 23 reflects the adoption levels of aquaculture technologies for various commodities.

Figure 23 *Overall Adoption Trends in Aquaculture Technologies, by commodity*



Note: Technologies introduced include the following: **Fish** (Pond culture – fingerlings, feeds, nets, weighing scale, ice box, PVC for drainage, set of circular tank, solar panels, oxygen pump, and ware filter; Pen/Cage culture – motorized banca, nets, drum, bamboo, fingerlings, feeds,); **Crustaceans** (Crablets, Feeds, Fish cage); **Mollusks** (Spot collector, nylon, drum floater); **Seaweeds** (Propagules/seedstocks, binder, strawlace, buoy, string).

Aquaculture technologies for fish culture were first introduced by SAAD in 2017 in the provinces of Apayao, North Cotabato, Sultan Kudarat with initial adoption rate of 88.57% and slightly declined to 85.71% for the succeeding years. The decline was attributable to pond culture technology for hito and tilapia where respondents generally received fingerlings and feeds as interventions. Based on respondent feedback, the fingerlings were relatively small and some experienced high mortality during production. The elevation of the pond was also noted as an issue, in addition to drought and limited water supply which resulted in drying up of the ponds. For the 2018 beneficiaries, the initial adoption level of 80.95% in 2019 went down to 61.90% in 2020, where the main reason identified for the discontinuation of the aquaculture operations was water supply shortage. As narrated by one of the respondents from Western Samar, all the fishes died when the municipality dam was closed due to limited water supply. Relatedly, the LGU also withheld support as to the

area to be used for the ponds. Inadequate water supply was also echoed by some of the beneficiaries in Sultan Kudarat and North Cotabato. Additionally, one recipient of the solar panels and oxygen tank pointed out that the provided panels and inverter did not match, and that the inverter always gets overloaded with too much current causing it to break down. This eventually led to death of the fishes in the pond due to lack of dissolved oxygen. Presence of predators also contributed to the high mortality rate in the pond cultures. Furthermore, flood and high mortality rate of fingerlings were noted as reasons for non-adoption by some of the 2019 beneficiaries of fish pond culture technologies in the province of North Cotabato which resulted in the initial adoption rate of 57.14% in 2020.

Above issues boil down to high mortality as the primary reason for nonadoption of the introduced aquaculture technologies. Based on the feedback from survey respondents, the contributory issues include:

- Drought, limited water supply, no pump (Apayao, Western Samar, Sultan Kudarat, North Cotabato)
- Flooding (Apayao, North Cotabato)
- No available area for pond culture (Western Samar)
- No income from pond culture: advised to distribute produce to the community or consume personally (Western Samar)

On the other hand, technologies for seaweed production were launched in Zamboanga del Norte in 2017. The initial adoption rate of the introduced technology was high at 91.30% but did not experience sustained uptake and eventually went down significantly to 27.54% in 2020. This mariculture technology is a sea-based culture or growing of seaweed using propagules/seedstock, binders/strawlace, strings/ropes, and buoy. With the aid of the ropes and floaters/buoy, the seaweeds are

hanged and maintained generally to grow for about two (2) months before harvesting. The noted issues and concerns which contributed to the significant decline in adoption of the technology include:

- Low harvest of seaweeds due to unfavorable climatic conditions
- Late distribution of planting materials The fisherfolk suggested that as much as possible the planting materials should be available in the month of December to allow for a higher volume of production.

While there were only a few respondents engaged in oyster culture, there was a noticeably sustained adoption level of shellfish culture technologies at 75% among the 2018 beneficiaries, and 80% initial adoption level among 2019 beneficiaries in Sorsogon. Similarly, there were only a few respondents engaged in crab culture but all of them fully adopted the crab culture technologies when it was introduced in Catanduanes in 2018. Shellfish grow-out culture, unlike fish, does not require commercial feeds that delivery support services of this commodity was hampered during the COVID-19 pandemic; while crab in open waters or cultured in ponds/cages/pens normally need natural feedstuff e.g. fresh flesh of fish, to grow hence resulted in the shift of adoption rate of aquaculture technologies. Such shifting or possibly diversification strategy by SAAD reflected positive contribution to the aquaculture production of the beneficiaries in time of the pandemic.

Reasons for Adoption and Non-adoption

As shown in Table 29, the lower cost of production is the most common reason for the adoption of the interventions across crops, livestock and poultry, and fisheries. Moreover, the farmers adopted the interventions on crops because of the opportunity to produce for home consumption especially for fruits and vegetables. Further, they adopted interventions on livestock and poultry because these provide them opportunity to increase their income or serve as an additional income to their household. Furthermore, the fisherfolks adopt the interventions provided by DA-SAAD because these lower their cost of production, especially on the provided fingerlings and feeds.

Table 29

Frequency	Distribution	of	Reasons	for	Adoption	of	SAAD	Interventions	per
Livelihood	Category								

Reasons for Adoption	Crops	Livestock and Poultry	Fishery
Home consumption	94	13	25
Lower cost of production	85	17	62
Increased or additional income	57	19	16
Increased volume of harvest/production	35	4	9
Improved efficiency because of provided machines and equipment	7	-	5
Trainings	-	1	-
Others	9	-	-

Table 30 summarizes the reasons for non-adoption of the SAAD interventions based on the issues and concerns reported by the respondent beneficiaries. Among those who are engaged in crop production, the primary reasons for non-adoption revolve around the adequacy and completeness of the package of technology to sustain farming operations, as well as the quality of the planting materials provided. Among those who are engaged in livestock and poultry production, the primary reasons for non-adoption is mortality of animals due to diseases such as the ASF and bird flu, as well as their need for an intervention that could be a source of daily income or livelihood, which is obviously very difficult for livestock and poultry raising. Other constraints to adoption mentioned by the livestock farmers include the high cost of production and insufficient support on feeds and animal housing. Among respondent beneficiaries who are engaged in capture fishery and aquaculture, the primary reason for non-adoption is related to the appropriateness and quality of provided interventions, and unfavorable climatic conditions.

Table 30

Frequency distribution of Reasons for Non-adoption of SAAD Interventions per Livelihood Category

Reasons for Non-Adoption	Count
Crops	
Inadequate supplies, incomplete package of technology, one-time provision of interventions	103
Low quality seeds, damaged seedlings and cuttings (corn, coffee, cacao, ube)	25
Crop failure due to pests	24
Restrictions due to COVID-19 pandemic	16
Intervention does not match with the livelihood in the barangay	15
Production failure due to calamities (typhoon and drought)	15
Incomplete package of technology (no insecticides, pesticides)	14
Limited (e.g. Water pump) or unusable (corn mill) machines and tools	12
Busy with existing off-farm work/ Shifted to off-farm work	9
Old age, pregnancy, and taking care of young or sick family members	8
Lack of appropriate training/follow-up training on crop production and fertilizer management	4
Livestock and Poultry	
Mortality of animals (carabao, swine, chicken, duck, quail) due to diseases, flooding, and stray animals	56
Need for intervention that could provide daily source of income	35
High cost of production	19
Need for continuous support for animal housing and feeds	16
Need for artificial insemination for unproductive livestock	б
Lack of feeds, shortage of feeds, high price of feeds	5
Old ducks which had difficulty in laying eggs	4
Lack of training on farrowing	2
No available area or facility for duck raising to address waste management issues	2

Fisheries

Low quality (easily damaged) fishing tools and equipment

Inappropriate and mismatched sizes of fishing gears and tools	43
Unfavorable climatic conditions	37
High mortality of fingerlings for aquaculture	12
Late distribution of planting materials for seaweeds	11
Incomplete set of fishing gears, motorboat parts	10
Presence of illegal fishers	10
Drought, limited water supply, no pump for aquaculture pond	8
Inappropriate interventions for the current fishing practices and techniques of fisherfolk	8
Lack of budget to buy boats	7
Need for continuous provision of fingerlings	6
Small, unequal sizes of fingerlings for aquaculture	6
Busy with off-farm work	5
Restrictions due to COVID-19 pandemic	5
Sickness due to age	5
Unfair distribution of interventions due to politics	5

Size and Distribution of Initial Benefits

Improved Household Food Consumption

As discussed in the impact pathway, one of the expected impacts of the SAAD program based on the designed activities, outputs, and outcomes is improved household food consumption of partner-beneficiaries. It is envisioned that after the provision of livelihood interventions in crop, livestock, poultry, and fisheries, the immediate benefit is for beneficiaries to have available food on the table coming from their farm outputs.

Frequency of Meals. Based on the survey conducted, the overall percentage of respondents who are able to eat at least three meals in a day is very high from 99.1% in 2016 to 99.8% in 2020 for farmers and from 94.7% in 2016 to 97.4% in 2020 for fisherfolk beneficiaries. This means that almost all the respondent beneficiaries have consistently been meeting required food consumption requirements

in terms of frequency of meals. These figures illustrate the attainment of the objectives of the program in enhancing food supply among the families of the farmer and fisherfolk beneficiaries.

It can also be deduced however that when compared to their farmer counterparts, there is a relatively higher percentage of fisherfolk who are unable to eat three times a day especially those engaged in capture fisheries. This was confirmed by a statistically significant, though weak, relationship found between frequency of meals and respondent classification throughout the five-year horizon studied. As shown in Figure 14, while the percentage of capture fishery beneficiaries who are able to eat at least three meals a day increased by 6.9% from 2016 (before SAAD implementation) to 2017, this percentage plateaued at 96.6% in 2019 and 2020. This overall percentage is largely attributed to the fisherfolk beneficiaries in Western Samar where the percentage of respondents who eat less than three times a day was found to be 8.1% on the average from 2016 to 2020.

Figure 24



Percentage of Farmer Beneficiaries who eat at least three meals per day

Figure 25 *Percentage of Fisherfolk Beneficiaries who eat at least three meals per day*



Further, there was no sufficient evidence to say that frequency of meals is related to the type of household the respondent belongs to. This implies that the proportion of respondents who are able to eat at least three times a day is the same regardless if they are from a nuclear household or with extended family. Likewise, no significant association was found between frequency of meals and income source, such that the proportion of respondents who are able to eat at least three times a day is comparable among those who rely solely on on-farm income and those who have both on-farm and off-farm income sources.

On the other hand, membership to an association was found to be significantly associated with frequency of meals such that the proportion of beneficiaries who are able to consume three meals a day is higher for those who are affiliated with organizations than those who are not. It can be gleaned from Table 15 that by year 4 of the SAAD implementation, the percentage of respondents who are able to eat at least three meals a day went up to 100% among association members, as compared to about 96.8% for those who are not.

Variables	Before SA		SAA	AAD Y1		SAAD Y2		SAAD Y3		D Y4
	5A	AD								
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Type of Household										
Nuclear	1165	98.6	1170	99.0	1172	99.2	1037	99.1	368	98.1
Extended	400	98.0	405	99.3	404	99.0	352	1389	131	98.5
Income Source										
On-farm only	911	98.4	919	99.2	919	99.2	811	99.1	290	99.0
On-farm and off-farm	654	98.5	656	98.8	657	98.9	578	99.0	209	97.2
Highest Educational										
Attainment										
None	13	81.2	14	87.5	15	93.8	11	91.7	2	100.0
Elementary	677	97.6	685	98.7	685	98.7	601	98.5	219	96.5
High School/	673	99.4	673	99.4	673	99.4	592	99.5	191	99.5
Vocational										
College	201	99.5	202	100.0	202	100.0	184	100.0	86	100.0
Association Member										
Yes	706	99.2	709	99.6	710	99.7	625	99.8	230	100.0
No	859	97.8	866	98.6	866	98.6	764	98.5	269	96.8

Table 31Truncated Cross-tabulation of Profile and Frequency of Meals among SAADBeneficiaries

Notes: N=1590 (Before SAAD to SAAD Y2); *N*=1402 (SAAD Y3); and *N*=508 (SAAD Y4). Frequency of meals was considered as a nominal variable (able to eat at least three times a day or not).

Likewise, highest educational attainment was also found to be significantly related to frequency of meals. As also shown in Table 14, a higher proportion of beneficiaries who are able to eat three times a day were observed for those who have achieved higher education. Among respondents who have at least attained college education, the proportion of those who were able to eat three times a day was computed at 99.5% before the SAAD implementation, and went up to 100% the following year up to four (4) years. Nevertheless, for beneficiaries who have not had any formal education, this proportion generally increased over the years from 81.2% before the SAAD implementation to an estimated 87.5% to 100% from SAAD year one to year four.

Incidence of Hunger. Figures 26 and 27 reflect the incidence of hunger among the farmer and fisherfolk respondents. They were specifically asked if they have experienced being hungry starting from the year before they became SAAD beneficiaries and succeeding years until 2020. The trends generally regressed downward from its high mark before the SAAD program implementation. Specifically, hunger incidence among farmers which were provided with crop interventions declined from 7.8% before the SAAD Program to 4.4% about four years after. Similarly for farmers engaged in livestock production, hunger incidence went down by 2.2% from 10.5% to 8.3% at four years into the SAAD Program. On the other hand, hunger incidence among poultry raisers immediately went down to 0% after only one year of being SAAD beneficiaries.

Figure 26







Figure 27 *Incidence of Hunger among SAAD Fisherfolk Beneficiaries*

As to fisherfolk respondents, the decline in hunger incidence was more pronounced as it started at a high of 19.2% (among capture fishery intervention recipients) before the SAAD implementation, and went down to less than 3% after four years. Overall, the reduction in hunger incidence among fisherfolk beneficiaries was at 12.5% after four years or about 3.1% per year on average.

These findings complement the general upward trend on the frequency of meals observed in the provinces and reflect the positive impact of the SAAD interventions to provide food security for the farmer and fishermen beneficiaries alike in the poor regions of the country. As perceived by the respondents, hunger was minimized if not totally arrested because of the SAAD interventions given to the beneficiaries.

Findings further revealed that hunger is significantly associated with respondent classification. The proportion of fisherfolk respondents who reported to have experienced hunger before becoming SAAD beneficiaries up to the second year of the SAAD implementation was significantly higher than that of their farmer counterparts. By the third and fourth year, however, no significant difference was observed between this proportion in farmers and fisherfolk, as the percentage of fisherfolk who reported to have experienced hunger declined.

Table 32

Truncated Cross-tabulation of Profile and Incidence of Hunger among SAAD Beneficiaries

Variables	Be SA	fore AD	SAA	D Y1	SAAD Y2		D Y2 SAAD Y3		SAAD Y4	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Type of Household										
Nuclear	97	8.2	74	6.3	65	5.5	56	5.4	12	3.2
Extended	56	13.7	41	10.0	37	9.1	29	8.1	7	5.3
Income Source										
On-farm only	72	7.8	55	5.9	48	5.2	38	4.6	10	3.4
On-farm and off- farm	81	12.2	60	9.0	54	8.1	47	8.0	9	4.2
Highest Educational Attainment										
None to Elementary	68	9.8	56	7.9	49	7.1	40	6.6	11	4.8
High School/ Vocational	79	11.7	56	8.3	49	7.2	42	7.1	7	3.6
College	6	3.0	3	1.5	4	2.0	3	1.6	1	1.2
Association Member										
Yes	70	9.88	52	7.3	46	6.5	39	6.2	13	5.7
No	83	9.50	63	7.2	56	6.4	46	5.9	6	2.2

Note: N=1590 (Before SAAD to SAAD Y2); N=1402 (SAAD Y3); and N=508 (SAAD Y4).

Similarly, incidence of hunger was also found to have a significant, though weak, relationship with type of household. Specifically, more beneficiaries living with extended families experienced being hungry compared to nuclear households. This condition was observed up to the second year of SAAD implementation, but improved by the third and fourth year of SAAD implementation during which hunger incidence among beneficiaries belonging to extended households declined and was found to be statistically comparable to those living with their immediate family.

It is also notable that hunger incidence was found to have a significant but very weak association with the income source of the SAAD beneficiary in terms of whether they rely solely on on-farm income or have other sources of income. The relationship is described such that the proportion of respondents who reported to have experienced hunger is higher for those with on-farm and off-farm sources of income as compared to those who depend only on on-farm income, which suggests that those who experience hunger tend to look for other sources of livelihood in order to fulfill their food needs. The significant difference in proportion was observed from the year before the SAAD was implemented up to year 3 of its implementation. By the fourth year, however, hunger incidence among those with both on-farm and off-farm income through farming activities.

The same pattern was observed for highest educational attainment which was also found to be significantly associated with hunger incidence before the SAAD implementation up to three years thereafter. The percentage of beneficiaries who reported to have experienced hunger was found to be statistically higher for those who only achieved up to secondary level of education as compared to those who went to college, as shown in Table 15. Nevertheless, these proportions generally declined every year until four years of the SAAD implementation.

Variety of Food Products Consumed. Based on the survey results, the overall percentage of farmer respondents who are able to eat complete food groups was at 98.6% before the SAAD implementation, and went up to 98.8% after four years. As to fisherfolk respondents, this percentage was at 94.6% before the SAAD implementation and slightly increased to 96.3% after four years. The most common missing food group in the diet of the farmer and fisherfolk beneficiaries are protein-rich "grow" food such as meat, fish, eggs, and dairy products.

Figure 28



Percentage of Farmer Beneficiaries who Consume Go, Grow, and Glow Food

Figure 29

Percentage of Fisherfolk Beneficiaries who Consume Go, Grow, and Glow Food



Association tests further revealed that the variety of food consumed has a weak but significant relationship with beneficiary classification. Specifically, the proportion of farmers who are able to consume Go, Grow, and Glow food was significantly higher than that of their fisherfolk counterparts before the SAAD program and up to the second year of its implementation. By the third and fourth year, however, the proportion between the two groups were found to be statistically the same, as the proportion of fisherfolk who were able to consume food from the three (3) basic food groups improved.

No significant relationship was found between the variety of food products consumed and household type, which means that proportion of beneficiaries who are able to eat Go, Grow, and Glow food is statistically the same whether they are from nuclear or extended households. This was likewise the case for income source category and membership in organizations, where the proportion of respondents who are able to consume complete food groups were statistically the same whether the respondent relies only on on-farm income or have other additional sources, or whether the respondent is a member of a farmer or fisherfolk organization or not, respectively.

Table 33

Truncated Cross-tabulation of Profile and Variety of Food Products Consumed by SAAD Beneficiaries

Variables	Before SAAD		SAAD Y1		SAAD Y2		SAAD Y3		SAAD Y4	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Type of Household										
Nuclear	1133	95.9	1143	96.7	1139	96.4	1004	96.0	366	97.6
Extended	397	97.3	396	97.1	397	97.3	345	96.9	131	98.5
Income Source										
On-farm only	885	95.6	893	96.4	889	96.0	778	95.1	285	97.3
On-farm and off- farm	645	97.1	646	97.3	647	97.4	571	97.8	212	98.6
Highest Educational Attainment										
None	15	93.8	14	87.5	16	100.0	12	100.0	2	100.0
Elementary	662	95.4	667	96.1	668	96.3	588	96.4	219	96.5
High School/ Vocational	657	97.0	657	97.0	653	96.5	568	95.5	189	98.4
College	195	96.5	200	99.0	198	98.0	180	97.8	86	100.0
Association Member										
Yes	690	96.9	693	97.3	689	96.8	600	95.8	226	96.3
No	840	95.7	846	96.4	847	96.5	749	96.5	271	97.5

Note: N=1590 (Before SAAD to SAAD Y2); N=1402 (SAAD Y3); and N=508 (SAAD Y4).

Malnutrition. According to the Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES), compromising food quality and variety, and reducing food quantity are considered to be a moderate level of food insecurity. For those who are moderately food insecure, access to food is uncertain. They might have to sacrifice other basic needs just to eat, and when they do eat, it might be whatever is readily available or the cheapest, which might not necessarily be nutritious. Malnutrition is partly a result of this phenomenon (FAO, n.d.). This data was sourced from the survey wherein respondents were asked if they consider any of their household members to be malnourished.



Figure 30

Incidence of Malnutrition among SAAD Farmer Beneficiaries

As shown in Figure 30, the overall incidence of malnutrition declined from 3.6% before the SAAD implementation to about 2.5% to 2.8% after one to three years. This, however, increased to 5.3% after four years, mainly driven by the corresponding increase in malnutrition among crops, livestock, and poultry farmers. It can however be seen that the incidence of malnutrition among beneficiaries who received multiple livelihood interventions were relatively lower. Specifically, malnutrition incidence among recipients of multiple livelihood interventions or

integrated farming was only at a high of 1.4% at year three and subsequently went down to 0% by year four. Further, none of the agri-aqua intervention recipients reported being malnourished.

Overall, the fisherfolk beneficiaries showed an improvement in nutritional status as can be seen by the decline in incidence of malnutrition from 5.9% to 1.1%. This decline corresponds to the downtrend of hunger incidence and complements the overall increase in the percentage of fisherfolk who are able to eat a variety of food products for at least three meals a day.



Figure 31

Incidence of Malnutrition among SAAD Fisherfolk Beneficiaries

Findings also indicated a significant but weak relationship between incidence of malnutrition and respondent classification the year before SAAD implementation, such that the proportion of fisherfolk who reported to have experienced being malnourished was higher compared to farmer respondents. Notably, upon being SAAD beneficiaries until three years thereafter, the difference in the two proportions were found to be insignificant, as the incidence of malnutrition among fisherfolk declined comparable to that of their farmer counterparts. Similarly, incidence of malnutrition was also found to be significantly related to highest educational attainment even before the SAAD implementation. It can be noted from the cross-tabulation that a higher percentage of beneficiaries who only had up to elementary and up to high school education reported malnourishment in their households as compared to those who have had college education. Nevertheless, these percentages generally declined over the years of the SAAD implementation.

Overall, the incidence of malnutrition across the different profile variables was higher during the immediate year prior to the SAAD implementation and generally declined thereafter, which signifies the SAAD program's contribution in improving the nutritional status of the SAAD beneficiaries and their households.

Table 34

Truncated Cross-tabulation of Profile and Incidence of Malnutrition among SAAD Beneficiaries

Variables	Bef SA	fore AD	SAA	D Y1	SAAD Y2		2 SAAD Y3		SAAD Y4	
-	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Type of Household										
Nuclear	46	3.9	29	2.5	28	2.4	25	2.4	13	3.5
Extended	22	5.4	18	4.4	18	4.4	14	3.9	6	4.5
Income Source										
On-farm only	31	3.3	23	2.5	19	2.1	18	2.2	9	3.1
On-farm and off- farm	37	5.6	24	3.6	27	4.1	21	3.6	10	4.7
Highest Educational Attainment										
None to Elementary	38	5.4	30	4.2	27	3.8	25	4.0	10	4.4
High School/ Vocational	29	4.3	16	2.4	15	2.2	13	2.2	7	3.6
College	1	0.5	1	0.5	4	2.0	1	0.5	2	2.3
Association Member										
Yes	37	5.2	26	3.7	25	3.5	20	3.2	11	4.8
No	31	3.5	21	2.4	21	2.4	19	2.4	8	2.9

Note: N=1590 (Before SAAD to SAAD Y2); N=1402 (SAAD Y3); and N=508 (SAAD Y4).

With the above results, it can be said that SAAD's contribution to food security and nutrition was felt in the countryside vis-a-vis the considered poor provinces of the country, and that the effect of the program on the beneficiaries was generally positive. Findings likewise suggest that a continuing SAAD assistance and monitoring program will be beneficial to the farmers and fishermen, and is necessary to achieve 0% hunger and 0% malnutrition among the families in the target provinces.

Increased Income and Improved Economic Status of Partner-beneficiaries

Financial Status. The financial condition of the respondents were assessed in terms of the amount of on-farm and total household income, monthly budget for food and recreation, health insurance, amount of debt, and amount of savings before and after they became SAAD beneficiaries. In relation to this specific assessment, it is important to note that the basic source of income of the majority of SAAD farmers and fisherfolk beneficiary-respondents comes from on-farm activities.

Based on the survey results, overall, about 59% of the farmer respondents stated that they rely solely on the income from their farm production, while the remaining 41% have off-farm activities as another source of income (Table 35). As to fisherfolk respondents, an estimated 56% of them rely exclusively on their fishing and aquaculture activities, while the remaining 44% are involved in off-farm labor in addition to their farming activities, as another source of livelihood. This general dependency on farming and fishing indicate that they are indeed the target beneficiaries of the SAAD Program. This is especially true for the farmers of Sarangani, Northern Samar, and Masbate, and the fisherfolks of Zamboanga del Norte and Northern Samar where a great majority, if not all, rely exclusively on farming and fishing and fishing as source of household income.

It is, however, notable that in some provinces especially in Visayas and Mindanao, more respondents are engaged in both on-farm and off-farm activities as sources of household income. In Southern Leyte, only 30.34% of the farmers and 37.78% of fisherfolk rely exclusively on farming, while the remaining 69.66% and 62.22% have likewise ventured into off-farm activities to support their families. This case is similar to farmer respondents in Western Samar, Bukidnon, North Cotabato, Leyte, Compostela Valley, Negros Oriental, and Catanduanes, as well as fisherfolk in Catanduanes, Leyte, North Cotabato and Western Samar. This may be attributed to the fact that these provinces are frequently hit by typhoons, and farmers and fisherfolk alike are aware that relying exclusively on farming activities as a source of income will make them vulnerable and helpless during calamities.

Table 35

Duanta aa	Far	mers	Fisherfolk			
Province	Count	%	Count	%		
Luzon	325	64.93%	38	60.32%		
Apayao	61	58.10%	17	70.83%		
Catanduanes	23	47.92%	7	41.18%		
Masbate	84	80.77%				
Sorsogon	156	64.46%	14	63.64%		
Visayas	172	56.95%	138	46.15%		
Negros Oriental	12	46.15%				
Leyte	3	42.86%	23	42.59%		
Southern Leyte	27	30.34%	34	37.78%		
Northern Samar	109	94.78%	20	83.33%		
Western Samar	21	32.31%	61	46.56%		
Mindanao	174	52.89%	80	81.63%		
Zamboanga del Norte			65	92.86%		
Bukidnon	2	40.00%				
Compostela Valley	34	45.33%				
North Cotabato	80	41.88%	7	43.75%		
Sarangani	58	100.00%				
Sultan Kudarat			8	66.67%		
Total	670	59.29%	256	55.65%		

Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents Relying Solely on On-Farm Income Source

Income. Based on the survey results, the average annual on-farm income of the farmer respondents ranged from about Php 10,600 before becoming SAAD beneficiaries, up to Php 18,400 until four (4) years thereafter. When grouped according to livelihood categories, however, different patterns emerged. Agi-aqua beneficiaries reported the highest on-farm income with an average of Php 44,750 before the SAAD livelihood project implementation, up to Php 72,830 four years thereafter. The yearly average on-farm income of crop farmers was found to be consistently increasing from Php 13,100 before SAAD to at most Php 23,300 in a span of four years. On the other hand, farmers who were into integrated farming reported to earn an average of Php 10,490 before the SAAD project implementation, declined to at least Php 5,800 to Php 7,230 during year one to year three of SAAD implementation, but improved to an average of Php 15,940 by year four. Farmers engaged in livestock production reported an average income of about Php 3,870 before the SAAD implementation, then continuously increased to an average of Php 5,210 during SAAD year one to Php 14,360 by SAAD year four. On the other hand, those in poultry production suffered a decline in average annual income from Php 4,520 in SAAD year one down to less than Php 200 in SAAD year four.

Figure 32





Figure 33

Average Annual On-farm Income of SAAD Fisherfolk Beneficiaries



Overall, the average on-farm income of fisherfolk respondents ranged from Php 26,340 to Php 48,940 before and after the SAAD implementation. Specifically, fisherfolk respondents engaged in agri-aqua reported the highest average annual onfarm income estimated at Php 55,750 before becoming SAAD beneficiaries to as high as Php 114,320 four years thereafter. This is followed by capture fisheries where respondents disclosed that they were able to earn as much as Php 64,550 during the SAAD implementation, on average. On the other hand, those in aquaculture reported to have earned only Php 1,100 before the SAAD implementation, and as much as Php 7,000 during the SAAD implementation.

In terms of total household income which includes off-farm earnings of the beneficiaries and their household members, farmer respondents reported to earn an average of Php 69,420 before becoming SAAD beneficiaries which increased to an average of 101,930 by SAAD year four, overall. On the other hand, fisherfolk respondents disclosed an average annual household income of Php 94,780 before becoming SAAD beneficiaries up to Php 114,230 by SAAD year four, overall. This translates to not more than Php 8,500 per month income for farmers, and not more than Php 9,520 per month income for fisherfolk. This was found to be relatively lower than estimates published on the 2018 Family Income and Expenditure Survey (FIES), where the average annual household income of the poorest 10% and 20% of the population was Php 113,000 and Php 144,000 respectively (PSA, 2020).



Figure 34

Average Annual Household Income of SAAD Farmer Beneficiaries



Figure 35 *Average Annual Household Income of SAAD Fisherfolk Beneficiaries*

Budget for Food. The average amount spent for food ranged from Php 4,000 to Php 4,500 per month as reported by farmer beneficiaries, and from Php 4,460 to Php 5200 per month for fisherfolk. This is equivalent to about 50% to 70% of their reported total household income.









Figure 37 *Average Monthly Budget for Food of SAAD Fisherfolk Beneficiaries*

Budget for Recreation. Based on the survey results, about 10% of the farmer respondents and 20% of fisherfolk respondents spend money for recreational or leisure purposes after being SAAD beneficiaries, overall. The average amount of spending for recreation was estimated at Php 406 to Php 621 per month for farmer beneficiaries, which is equivalent to 6.5%-8% of their household income. For fisherfolk beneficiaries, this was estimated to range from an average of Php 315 to Php 400 per month, equivalent to about 3%-5% of their household income, overall. The corresponding percentages and amounts disaggregated according to the livelihood category of the respondents are shown in Figures 38 to 41.

Figure 38





Figure 39

Percentage of SAAD Fisherfolk Beneficiaries with Budget for Recreation



Figure 40



Average Monthly Budget for Recreation of SAAD Farmer Beneficiaries

Figure 41 Average Monthly Budget for Recreation of SAAD Fisherfolk Beneficiaries



Health Insurance. The SAAD beneficiaries who are likewise recipients of the Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps) are automatically entitled to Philhealth benefits as part of the National Health Insurance Program. Under said program, beneficiaries may avail of primary preventive services, diagnostic examinations, and medicines for outpatient treatment of certain illnesses. In this regard, respondents were asked if they have health insurance aside from Philhealth before and after becoming a SAAD beneficiary.

Overall, the percentage of farmer beneficiaries who have health insurance aside from Philhealth slightly declined from 6.19% to 6.11% before and after the SAAD program was launched. However, when grouped according to the type of intervention received, it can be seen that this percentage has actually increased by at most 2% for respondents engaged in livestock, poultry, and integrated farming. For fisherfolks, the overall percentage of farmer beneficiaries who have health insurance aside from Philhealth increased from 2.83% to 3.48%, mainly driven by beneficiaries who were recipients of capture fishery interventions. It can be noted that majority of these farmers and fisherfolk who were able to acquire insurance have relatively higher levels of income, most of which come from off-farm sources.







Figure 43

Percentage of SAAD Fisherfolk Beneficiaries with Health Insurance (aside from PhilHealth)



The health insurance providers mentioned by the beneficiaries include Kagawad Insurance in Apayao; ARDCI, ASA Philippines, Phil Life Insurance, CARD Insurance, and Pinoy Lingap Damayan Cooperative in Catanduanes; Puhunan Health Insurance and Tagum Cooperative in Compostela Valley; ASA Philippines and CARD Bank Inc in Masbate; CARD Bank, Cooperative Bank of Cotabato, Yakap Health Insurance, Kabalikat para sa Maunlad na Buhay Inc.(KMBI) among others in North Cotabato; ASA Philippines, CARD Bank and Gubat St. Anthony Cooperative, SEDP-Simbag sa Pag-asenso Inc. in Sorsogon; ASA Philippines, CARD Insurance in Southern Leyte; CARD Health Insurance in Western Samar; and Lorenzo Tan Multipurpose Cooperative in Zamboanga del Norte.

Debt. Based on the survey results, an estimated 58.1% of the farmer beneficiaries have entered into debt agreements even before the SAAD implementation in their localities. This percentage has declined by 3.2% for the succeeding three years but increased to 63.2% in the fourth year. In terms of amount, the median debt in a year was Php 10,000 from baseline (before SAAD

implementation) until three years thereafter, then increased to Php 15,000 by the fourth year. For 2017 beneficiaries of the program, this corresponds to the year 2020 when the COVID-19 pandemic started in the country.

The same trend was observed for farmers who received interventions for crop production, poultry raising, and integrated farming, while it had been more volatile for those into agri-aqua activities where the percentage of those with debt declined to 50% after becoming SAAD beneficiaries but abruptly increased to 75% for the next two years up to 100% in the fourth year (2020). On the other hand, the percentage of respondents with debt among those engaged in livestock production steadily declined from 69% to 58.3%. This suggests that they were able to pay off their debt after becoming SAAD beneficiaries. In terms of amount, the median debt ranged from a low of Php 10,000 among farmer beneficiaries engaged in crop, livestock, and poultry production, to a high of Php 75,000 for farmer beneficiaries engaged in integrated farming.

Figure 44



Percentage of SAAD Farmer Beneficiaries with Debt (> Php 0)



Figure 45 *Median Amount of Debt per Year among SAAD Farmer Beneficiaries*

For fisherfolk respondents, the overall percentage of those with debt likewise declined from 63.5% before SAAD implementation to not more than 62% for the next three years, but increased to 66.8% in the fourth year. In terms of amount, however, the median debt was steady at Php 10,000 then went down to Php 8,000 by the fourth year. Similar to the trend with farmer beneficiaries of agri-aqua interventions, the trend for fisherfolks provided with similar interventions was also different from the rest where the percentage of those with debt was at 83.3% then increased to 100% after two years then went down to 80% by the fourth year. The corresponding median amount for said category of beneficiaries likewise varied from Php 40,000 down to Php 28,000 by year three, then increased to about Php 42,000 by the fourth year.

Figure 46



Percentage of SAAD Fisherfolk Beneficiaries with Debt (> Php 0)

Figure 47

Median Amount of Debt per Year among SAAD Fisherfolk Beneficiaries



Above results show that beneficiaries who are engaged in more than one farming activity (integrated farming and agri-aqua) generally have higher levels of debt compared to those solely engaged in either crops, livestock, poultry, capture fishery, or aquaculture. While debt may connote an impression of financial difficulty, it does not necessarily equate to reduced welfare as these debts can be used specifically for investments to enable diversification. It is quite possible that the
farmers and fisherfolk who incurred higher debt did so in order to finance multiple livelihood ventures. Based on this finding, diversification as a source of livelihood seemingly involves higher debt and therefore it may be worth considering additional complementary interventions in the form of access to credit for the beneficiaries which could be done more efficiently through the farmers and fisherfolk associations.

In one of the case studies conducted in Sorsogon, the beneficiary for vegetable production expressed her desire to engage in swine production through the swine production project of their local farmers association. However, the association, which was also organized through the SAAD Program, requires potential beneficiaries to put up their own pigpens first as a counterpart for the pigs to be provided. The beneficiary claimed to have the technical knowledge for raising pigs, however, financial constraints prevent her from establishing the pigpens thus she is still unable to avail of the intervention. This particular case demonstrates how an unmet credit demand stemming from lack of access to credit inhibits a potential hog-raiser from adopting the introduced swine production technology. This is then another area which the SAAD Program may look into.

Savings. Results from the survey revealed that 30.7% of the farmer respondents have savings even before becoming SAAD beneficiaries. Overall, this percentage generally increased over the years and stood at 40.8% after four years from SAAD implementation. On a per livelihood perspective, beneficiaries under integrated farming had the most improvement as the percentage of those with savings grew from 34.8% to 57.1%, and average annual savings amount ranged from Php 7,800 before becoming SAAD beneficiaries to Php 18,700 (median=Php 5,000) four years thereafter. Further, more than half of the beneficiaries engaged in agri-aqua activities have annual savings which amount to Php 4,000 (median=Php 4,000) before

SAAD, and from Php 6,700 (median=Php 5,000) to Php 24,000 (median=Php 15,000)

at most four years thereafter, on average.



Figure 48 *Percentage of SAAD Farmer Beneficiaries with Savings*

Figure 49

Average Annual Savings of SAAD Farmer Beneficiaries



Similarly, the overall percentage of fisherfolk respondents who have savings was 30.7% before SAAD implementation and increased to 48.1% after four years with an average annual savings amount of about Php 8,400 to Php 9,700. This trend is

similar to fisherfolks engaged in capture fisheries as well as aquaculture. Further, while the percentage of fisherfolks engaged in agri-aqua activities and have savings declined from 100% to 60%, the average annual savings amount was relatively higher than the rest of the categories from Php 11,200 (median=Php 5,000) before SAAD to at most Php 19,500 (median=Php 10,000) from year one to year four of the SAAD program.

Figure 50





Figure 51



Average Annual Savings of SAAD Fisherfolk Beneficiaries

Above results are consistent with population statistics published by the PSA. Based on the 2018 Family Income and Expenditure Survey (FIES), households in the poorest 20% of the country's population save only an average of Php 14,000 per year, while the poorest 10% of the population have about Php 4,000 in savings per year, on average (PSA, 2020).

Housing Characteristics

Tenure Status of Dwelling. Based on the survey results, most of the farmers and fisherfolk have had their own houses prior to being SAAD beneficiaries. Nevertheless, the percentage of beneficiaries who own their current dwelling place increased by 1.95% for farmers and 1.30% for fisherfolk, alongside the decline of those who lease or pay rent for their housing. Using McNemar's test, the increase in the proportion of farmer respondents who possess their own house before and after the SAAD interventions was found to be statistically significant (p=0.001). On the other hand, while the proportion of fisherfolk respondents who reported to acquire their own house increased after the SAAD interventions, there was no sufficient evidence to say that the increase was statistically significant (p=0.0703). These findings reflect that the positive contribution of the SAAD program in terms of improving the living conditions of their partner-beneficiaries through possession of housing had a greater impact for farmers than fisherfolk.



Tenure Status of Dwelling of SAAD Farmer Beneficiaries





Housing Materials. Based on the 2020 Annual Poverty Indicators Survey, the majority of Filipino families have strong materials for housing with galvanized iron/aluminum (93.5%) as roofing material followed by cogon/nipa/anahaw (3.6%), and concrete/clay tile (1.1%); and concrete/brick/stone (60.1%), wood (13.3%), and half concrete/brick/ stone/and half wood (12.6%) as common outer walls (PSA, 2021).

These statistics are parallel to the results obtained from the field survey among SAAD farmer and fisherfolk beneficiaries. As shown in Figure 29, most of the farmer beneficiaries have galvanized iron/aluminum sheets as roofing material even before the SAAD implementation (83.89%). This percentage increased to 87.96% after the SAAD program was launched along with the decline in the proportion of beneficiaries using wood/wood planks as well as nipa/cogon/bamboo. as roofing materials.

Figure 54



Materials used for Housing units of SAAD Farmer Beneficiaries

Note: The sub-sections on the graph refer to Roofing Materials, Main Wall Materials, and Main Flooring Materials for housing units arranged from most to least durable.

As to the main material used for outer walls, many of the farmer respondents have concrete/cement walls (42.48%) before being SAAD beneficiaries, followed by

bamboo and wood materials (35.75%), and cane/palm/trunk (9.91%). Very few of them use makeshift or improvised materials such as cardboard (1.59%), and galvanized iron/aluminum sheets (1.33%) as outer wall material. After the SAAD implementation, however, the percentage of beneficiaries who use makeshift or salvaged materials declined by 0.27% as they were able to improve their walls to either galvanized iron or concrete/cement. Further, about 2% of the farmer beneficiaries who previously have walls made of cane/palm/trunk were able to change them to either bamboo/plywood or concrete/cement. Similarly, about 3% who previously used bamboo/plywood as outer walls upgraded to concrete or cement walls after the SAAD implementation.

For flooring, the majority of the farmer respondents used concrete/cement (61.95%) before the SAAD implementation, but a considerable percentage have earth/sand or basically soil (19.38%) as flooring material, while the rest use palm/bamboo (8.94%), wood or wood planks (6.19%) and ceramic and marble tiles (2.74%). After being SAAD beneficiaries, it is worth noting that about 5% of those who previously had soil as flooring were able to improve to concrete/cement and even ceramic tiled for some.

Likewise, such is the case for fisherfolk respondents where the percentage of those with galvanized iron/aluminum as roofing material increased by 9.13%, from 77.17% to 86.30% before and after the SAAD implementation. These respondents previously had roofs made of wood and other plant materials such as nipa, cogon, and bamboo. Similarly, the increase in percentage of fisherfolk beneficiaries who were able to improve their outer walls from wood materials to concrete/cement was about 9%. As to flooring, about 8% were able to provide concrete/cement flooring in their homes after becoming SAAD beneficiaries, from having less durable materials such

as palm/bamboo and earth/sand. The summary of construction materials used as roofing, main wall, and flooring in the housing units of the fisherfolk beneficiaries is shown in Figure 55.

Figure 55

Materials used for Housing units of SAAD Fisherfolk Beneficiaries



Note: The sub-sections on the graph refer to Roofing Materials, Main Wall Materials, and Main Flooring Materials for housing units arranged from most to least durable.

The increase in proportion of farmers and fisherfolk respondents who have galvanized iron sheets as roofing material, and concrete cement as main wall and flooring material after being SAAD beneficiaries was found to be statistically significant using McNemar's tests which imply the positive role of the SAAD program in terms of improving the living conditions of partner-beneficiaries through house improvements. These upgrades in housing construction materials were attributed to the SAAD Program by the farmer and fisherfolk beneficiaries themselves. As affirmed by some of them, the SAAD program helped them make improvements to their homes since they have increased income after they were provided with livelihood interventions. Some of their income was used to fix and/or improve their houses to be more durable especially during typhoon season.

Electricity. Based on the World Bank Global Electrification Database, the percentage of Philippine households who have access to electricity was at 95.63%, with the urban population having a slightly higher percentage at 97.96% as compared to those in rural areas at 93.55% in 2019 (The World Bank, n.d.). Aside from electricity, the other alternative energy sources used by Filipinos include fuelwood, charcoal, LPG and kerosene (PSA, 2013).

Overall, the percentage of farmer beneficiaries who have had access to electricity after becoming SAAD beneficiaries went up by 4.25% (from 80.97% to 85.22%) which was found to be statistically significant (p<0.000). This positive change was also observed across all the livelihood categories, however the corresponding proportion increase for poultry, integrated farming, and agri-aqua were found to be statistically insignificant (p=0.6250; p=1.000; p=1.000).



Figure 56 Percentage of SAAD Farmer Beneficiaries with Access to Electricity

Similarly, the overall percentage of fisherfolk beneficiaries who have had access to electricity after becoming SAAD beneficiaries increased by 5.22% from 88.48% to 93.70% and was also found to be statistically significant (p<0.000). When grouped according to livelihood category, the biggest improvement came from those who received interventions on capture fisheries (\uparrow 6.19%) which was likewise found to be statistically significant (p<0.000). The lowest percentage was reported by those engaged in both capture and aquaculture which remained at 80% before and after the SAAD implementation. This could mean that fisherfolk beneficiaries, specifically those in capture fisheries, prioritized having access to electricity more than acquiring their own house or making improvements on their housing infrastructure.

 Figure 57

 Percentage of SAAD Fisherfolk Beneficiaries with Access to Electricity

 Capture Fishery

 87.00%

 93.19%



Water Supply. Based on the survey results, more than half of the farmer and fisherfolk beneficiaries have water systems in their communities which are either piped into their dwelling, piped into yard or plot, or piped into public tap. The next most common water sources are either protected or open dug wells, followed by developed springs. After becoming SAAD beneficiaries, the percentage of farmer households whose water supply comes from refilling stations and community water systems increased by 1.42% and 1.24%, respectively, alongside the decline of households who rely on wells (\downarrow 1.50%), developed springs (\downarrow 0.80%), and undeveloped natural water sources (\downarrow 0.35%). Similarly, the percentage of fisherfolk households whose water supply comes from refilling stations and community water systems increased by 0.65% and 1.96%, respectively, while the percentage of those who obtain water through wells or springs went down by 1.96% and 0.65%, respectively.

Testing for statistical significance likewise provided positive results in terms of the increase in proportion of households who have access to community water

152

systems after the SAAD interventions for both farmers (p=0.0026) and fisherfolk groups (p=0.0117).

Figure 58

Water Sources of SAAD Farmer Households



Figure 59

Water Sources of SAAD Fisherfolk Households



It is also worth noting that the households who still rely on undeveloped natural water sources as of the survey period were mostly in the various purok/sitio in the municipalities of Glan and Malapatan, Sarangani. A few other households of the same

condition were found in Brgy. San Marcos in San Miguel, Catanduanes; Brgy. Awao and Casoon in Monkayo, Compostela Valley; Purok Iskagit, Tubod in Sibulan, and Purok Alangilang, Bantolina, Naga, and Cangkue in Tanjay, Negros Oriental; Purok Sambag and Orkids in Aleosan, North Cotabato; Purok 3 in Brgy. Talalora and Purok 4 and 5 in Brgy. Flormina, Mondragon, Northern Samar; Purok 3 in Basey, Purok 1 and 3 in Almagro, Sitio Kalbag in Sta. Rita, and Sitio Burabod in Daram, Western Samar; Purok 3 in Tomas Oppus and Purok 4 in Pintuyan, Southern Leyte; and Purok Masagana 2, Brgy. 11 in Lambayong, Sultan Kudarat.

Toilet Facility. As shown in Figures 60 and 61, at least 92.98% of the farmers and 90.40% of fisherfolk respondents have their own toilets at home before becoming SAAD beneficiaries. This percentage increased by about 1%-2% across all the livelihood intervention categories after the SAAD implementation in the target provinces, however, only the corresponding increase in proportion for crop farmers was found to be statistically significant (p=0.0002).



Figure 60

Percentage of SAAD Farmer Beneficiaries with Own Toilet



Figure 61 Percentage of SAAD Fisherfolk Beneficiaries with Own Toilet

The result proves the outlook of many Filipinos on the importance of solid waste management. In the Philippines where there are still 9.5 million people living in unsanitary environments, the government is struggling to offer solutions to the open defecator population. Owning a toilet is a sign of progress (Galang, 2014).

When asked about the specific type of toilet facility in their households, more than half of the farmer beneficiaries responded that they have flush toilets (56-57%), followed by pit or latrine toilets (27-28%%), bucket system (\approx 14%), and drop latrine (<1%). Very few of the farmers (<1%) stated that they have no toilet facilities. On the other hand, a relatively lower percentage of fisherfolk respondents have flush toilets which was only 50.22% and 50.65% before and after the SAAD implementation. The rest of the fisherfolk households mostly utilize the pail or bucket system (23.28%) and pit latrine toilet (23.04%). About 3% reported that they do not have toilet facilities and less than 0.5% use drop or overhung latrine. Results of the McNemar test reveal that the increase in the proportion of respondents who have flush toilets before and after the SAAD interventions was statistically significant for farmers (p<0.000), but not for fisherfolk beneficiaries (p=0.5000).



Figure 62







Ownership of Assets. Assets in this context is defined as any useful or valuable thing a person or a household possesses. Respondents were asked what assets or items with value they were able to purchase for their household as a result of

being SAAD beneficiaries. Overall, it can be derived from the survey results that about 74% of the farmers and 70% of the fisherfolk were able to acquire assets due to their increased income from the SAAD interventions. Further, the most common household items acquired by the beneficiaries are cellular or mobile phones and television where more than half of the respondents stated so during the survey. A few other respondents likewise mentioned other household items such as bed and foam, sala set, table, speakers, bicycle, Durabox cabinets, sewing machine, light bulbs, electric iron, electric kettle, and kitchenware.

	Farmers		Fisherfolk		Total	
Assets*	Count	% to Total	Count	% to Total	Count	% to Total
Cellular Phone	634	56.11	244	52.83	877	55.16
Television	618	54.69	257	55.87	875	55.03
Refrigerator/Freezer	199	17.61	85	18.48	284	17.86
Electric Fan	176	15.58	33	7.17	209	13.14
Washing Machine	148	13.10	52	11.30	200	12.58
Audio Component/Stereo	120	10.62	56	12.17	176	11.07
Stove with Gas Range	95	8.41	61	13.26	156	9.81
CD/VCD/DVD Player	72	6.37	36	7.83	108	6.79
Radio	51	4.51	4	0.87	55	3.46
Laptop	28	2.48	14	3.04	42	2.64
Videoke/Karaoke	20	1.77	13	2.83	33	2.08
Air Conditioning Unit	14	1.24	6	1.30	20	1.26
Personal Computer	10	0.88	5	1.09	15	0.94
Tablet	3	0.27	6	1.30	9	0.57
Rice Cooker	8	0.71	1	0.22	9	0.57
Landline/Wireless Telephone	5	0.44	2	0.43	7	0.44
Others	36	3.19	11	2.39	47	2.96
None	292	25.84	27	29.78	429	26.98

1 able 3

Assets Purchased by Farmers and Fisherfolk Respondents as SAAD Beneficiaries

*Multiple Responses

Education of Children. Another benefit of being SAAD beneficiaries was that the farmers and fisherfolk were able to send their children to school. Figures 64 and 65 show that percentage distribution according to highest educational attainment of the farmers' and fisherfolk beneficiaries' children. As stated by some of the beneficiaries during the survey, they were able to have their children finish secondary education with the aid of the SAAD program in their livelihood. This is illustrated by the decline in the percentage of the beneficiaries' children who are in secondary school alongside the increase in the percentage of high school graduates after their parents became SAAD beneficiaries.

Figure 64

Percentage Distribution of Highest Educational Attainment of Children of Farmer Beneficiaries





Percentage Distribution of Highest Educational Attainment of Children of Fisherfolk Beneficiaries

Means of Transportation. Before the SAAD implementation, an estimated 42.65% of farmers have private vehicles which they use for transportation. Further, the most common type of private vehicle used is the motorcycle, while the commonly used public transportation are tricycles. Very few of the farmers (1.77%) reported that they do not use either private or public transportation, but resort to walking to go from one place to another. After the SAAD implementation, however, the percentage of those who walk to and from their desired destinations declined by 0.71% which means that more farmers have been able to access available transportation options in their communities after being SAAD beneficiaries. Overall, the percentage of farmer beneficiaries who use specific private and public means of transportation likewise increased by about 4.70% and 2.74%, respectively.

	Befo	re SAAD	After SAAD		
Type of Vehicles ^a	Count	% to Total ^b	Count	% to Total ^b	
Private	482	42.65	535	47.35	
Motorcycle	401	35.49	458	40.53	
Tricycle	47	4.16	47	4.16	
Bicycle	15	1.33	20	1.77	
Car	11	0.97	10	0.88	
Motorized Banca	9	0.80	12	1.06	
Jeepney	7	0.62	11	0.97	
Pedicab	6	0.53	5	0.44	
Non-motorized Banca	5	0.44	6	0.53	
Tractor	1	0.09	-	0.18	
Public	732	64.78	763	67.52	
Tricycle	436	38.58	465	41.15	
Motorcycle (Angkas/Habal-habal)	330	29.20	347	30.71	
Jeepney	245	21.68	335	29.65	
Van	106	9.38	111	9.82	
Motorized Banca	18	1.59	20	1.77	
Non-motorized Banca	9	0.80	9	0.80	
Tractor	3	0.27	9	0.80	
None	20	1.77%	12	1.06	

 Table 37
 General Means of Transportation of SAAD Farmer Beneficiaries

^aMultiple Response; ^bTotal Percentage of Private, Public, and None do not sum up to 100% as some respondents who have private vehicles also use public transportation.

For fisherfolk beneficiaries, more than half of them (51.74%) own private vehicles even before the SAAD implementation, the most common of which is the motorcycle, followed by motorized and non-motorized banca. On the other hand, the most common public transportation used is the motorcycle which is used as *angkas* or *habal-habal*. Similar to farmers, very few (<2%) of the fisherfolk beneficiaries move from one place to another by foot or by walking. Overall, the percentage of fisherfolk beneficiaries who use specific private and public means of transportation likewise increased by about 3% and 2.17%, respectively.

	Befo	re SAAD	After SAAD	
Type of Vehicles ^a	Count	% to Total ^b	Count	% to Total ^b
Private	238	51.74	252	54.78
Motorcycle	141	30.65	154	33.48
Motorized Banca	89	19.35	94	20.43
Non-motorized Banca	20	4.35	26	5.65
Tricycle	10	2.17	12	2.61
Car	6	1.30	6	1.30
Bicycle	5	1.09	4	0.87
Pedicab	5	1.09	7	1.52
Jeepney	2	0.43	2	0.43
Tractor	1	0.22	1	0.22
Public	337	73.26	347	75.43
Motorcycle (Angkas/Habal-habal)	168	36.52	180	39.13
Tricycle	112	24.35	120	26.09
Motorized Banca	83	18.04	88	19.13
Van	63	13.70	75	16.30
Jeep	43	9.35	54	11.74
Non-motorized Banca	-	-	-	-
Tractor	-	-	-	-
None	7	1.52	6	1.30

 Table 38
 General Means of Transportation of SAAD Fisherfolk Beneficiaries

^aMultiple Response; ^bTotal Percentage of Private, Public, and None do not sum up to 100% as some respondents who have private vehicles also use public transportation.

In relation to above, respondents were likewise asked on the means of transportation used by their children when going to school. It is worthy to note that the proportion of farmer households whose children go to school by walking declined from 42.22% to 9.60% before and after the SAAD implementation, alongside the increase in percentage of those who are able to afford private and public transportation by 5.66% and 3.94% respectively.

Satisfaction and Overall Welfare

In addition to improved household food consumption, increased income and improved welfare as impact indicators, respondents were also asked as to their satisfaction with the programs of the Department of Agriculture before and after the SAAD Program was implemented in their communities. Figures 66 and 67 present the results for farmers and fisherfolk beneficiaries, respectively.

Figure 66

Farmer Respondents' Satisfaction with DA interventions before and after the SAAD Program



Figure 67

Fisherfolk Respondents' Satisfaction with DA interventions before and after the SAAD Program



Before the SAAD Program, about half of the farmer beneficiaries (52.30%) felt neutral with the interventions provided by the Department of Agriculture (DA). Further, about 27% were generally satisfied and 20% were generally dissatisfied. After the SAAD Program, the percentage of farmer beneficiaries who were satisfied and very satisfied with the DA interventions improved to 63%. While there were around 32% who still felt neutral, the percentage of farmer beneficiaries who were generally dissatisfied were down to about 5% (Figure 66).

On the other hand, before the SAAD program, more fisherfolk beneficiaries were generally dissatisfied (43.04%) with the DA interventions than those who were generally satisfied (18.91%). After the SAAD Program, however, this significantly improved as more than half of the fisherfolk beneficiaries (52.17%) were generally satisfied and the percentage of those who were still generally dissatisfied was reduced to 23.70% (Figure 67).

Above improvement in the satisfaction of beneficiaries towards the Department of Agriculture can be attributed to the targeted and specific livelihood interventions provided by the SAAD Program to farmers and fisherfolk.

Respondents were further asked to rate their overall welfare before and after becoming a SAAD partner-beneficiary from very low to very high. This overall assessment integrates the impact measures on financial status, housing characteristics to include assets acquired, and education of children. As shown in Figure 68, an estimated 56.98% beneficiaries perceived their overall welfare and living conditions to have improved after the SAAD interventions, while 41.13% felt no change and very few (1.89%) stated that their conditions further deteriorated. This pattern was observed for both farmers and fisherfolk beneficiary respondents.



Change in Overall Welfare and Living Condition of SAAD Beneficiaries

When grouped according to livelihood category, Figure 69 shows that most of the farmer beneficiaries who were recipients of interventions in agri-aqua, crop production, and integrated farming perceived their overall welfare and living conditions to have improved after the SAAD Program. On the other hand, the majority of those who were recipients of livestock and poultry production interventions assessed their welfare status to have stayed the same.

Few beneficiaries under integrated farming, crops, and livestock production stated that their welfare declined after becoming SAAD beneficiaries. According to some of the respondents, there has been no improvement in their living conditions as they were not able to sustain the livelihood project as some of the animals provided died due to sickness, seeds provided were found to be unsuitable for their area, in addition to low production and unstable prices which limited their income.



Change in Overall Welfare and Living Condition of Farmer Beneficiaries

As to fisherfolk beneficiaries, it is noteworthy that most if not all the respondents who received interventions for aquaculture, agri-aqua, as well as the combined capture and aquaculture technologies recognized their overall welfare and living conditions to have improved after the implementation of the SAAD program in their localities.

On the other hand, more than half of the respondents (52.32%) who were recipients of capture fishery interventions reported that their overall welfare and living conditions did not change significantly after becoming SAAD beneficiaries, while very few (1.55%) said that their general welfare declined. Some of these respondents commented that the interventions provided were not of great help and that they were only able to use them for a few months.



Change in Overall Welfare and Living Condition of Fisherfolk Beneficiaries

Both farmers and fisherfolk beneficiaries expressed their gratitude to the SAAD Program for providing livelihood interventions which allowed them to sustain their food needs and for some to augment their income and improve their living conditions. They wished for the SAAD Program to continue their livelihood assistance through provision of complete agricultural materials, conduct of relevant trainings, and more frequent monitoring in order to address issues and concerns at the farm level.

Conclusions and Recommendations

This midterm impact assessment of the SAAD Program harnessed all available SAAD baseline data and documentations: Annual Reports, Operations Manual, Memoranda and Special Orders, Social Preparation Guidebook, Guidelines, and other documents published in the SAAD website; and PSA data on income classification at the municipal level, production areas per province and commodity. These provided background information and detailed description of the SAAD management and operations which were integral to the desktop analysis for this midterm assessment.

In addition, four (4) field studies were undertaken to gather evidences of actual ground-level experiences of a sample of targeted SAAD beneficiaries as well as feedback and perspectives among implementers of the SAAD Program at the regional, provincial, and municipal levels. Four (4) databases were established for this midterm evaluation:

- Pilot study in Apayao covering 15 farmers and fisherfolk, and 5 associations
- Sample survey of 15 provinces including 1,590 farmers and fisherfolk, and 57 associations
- Focus group discussions among SAAD implementers at the regional, provincial, and municipal levels
- Case studies in the province of Sorsogon featuring: Oyster farming (Brgy. Ginablan, Pilar); Integrated Farming (Vegetable, Duck, Swine) (Brgy. Sipaya, Juban); Upland Rice and Vegetable Production (Brgy. Puting Sapa, Juban); and Duck-raising (Brgy. San Bartolome, Sta Magdalena)

Conclusions

The main conclusions of the study were drawn from a synthesis of the desktop study and a comprehensive and systematic analysis of the sample survey and complementary FGD, pilot and case studies.

- 1. The SAAD Program in 2017 and 2018 covered the poorest 20 provinces in the country with the goal of alleviating poverty, food security and improving productivity in farming and fishing. A thorough investigation of the published documentations used in the desktop study indicated that overall, the SAAD program implementation in the target provinces was strictly guided by the SAAD framework composed of four (4) components. However, limitations have been observed on the following:
 - 1.1. Program Management
 - 1.1.1. Some farmers and fisherfolks included in the SAAD Beneficiaries List do not consistently follow the criteria defined as "poor" set by SAAD. Some names in the list are duplicated, while some others identified as beneficiaries were found to be non-existent, as verified by the barangay officials.
 - 1.1.2. Scheduled implementations in some provinces were delayed as highlighted in the FGD feedback at the regional, provincial and municipal level, as well as survey results among beneficiaries (see Table 21, Figures 6 and 7).
 - 1.1.3. The project team likewise undertook a thorough analysis of the SAAD Annual Reports and noted a significant improvement in its quality from 2017 to present. Further, the establishment of the SAAD website in 2019 was a significant improvement in the

168

awareness and information dissemination efforts of the SAAD Program. However, weak coordination between SAAD and some MLGUs was noted during the pilot study in Apayao. In this case, the Municipal Agricultural Officer was surprisingly not aware of the SAAD Program. This might be an isolated case but needs to be investigated nevertheless.

- 1.1.4. Some beneficiaries have difficulty differentiating between the regular DA programs and the SAAD program as observed in the pilot study and sample survey. Further, there seems to be a lack of awareness of the SAAD program which may require mass media exposure among farmers and fisherfolks.
- 1.1.5. The Monitoring and Evaluation baseline datasets obtained from SAAD which were required to facilitate the sampling frame development for the midterm evaluation were found to be incomplete (e.g. barangay) or still in the process of updating (e.g. production areas). According to the 2019 SAAD Annual Report, this is due to the failure of bidding of Information and Communications Technology (ICT) equipment and gadgets needed in profiling and geotagging of beneficiaries.
- 1.2. Social Preparation
 - 1.2.1. Community-organizing. Less than half of the sample respondents belong to farmers and fisherfolk associations. The target beneficiaries are expected to be members of the association in their locality.

- 1.2.2. Capacity building. A series of training in basic organization management was conducted but it was not done across all the associations under survey.
- 1.2.3. Project orientation. Based on the FGD, focal persons conducted orientations and consultations about the SAAD program and the role of beneficiaries. However, some beneficiaries did not receive the same.
- 1.3. Production and Livelihood
 - 1.3.1. Provision of agri-inputs, tools, machineries, and equipment. There is a high appreciation of the SAAD program among respondents, emphasizing that the expected expenses for farming inputs (e.g. planting materials) has saved a lot from their budget. The farming and fishing tools, machineries, and equipment also bolstered their ability to improve their production thereby increasing their income and enhanced their economic status. The study revealed that some recipients (listed or identified as SAAD beneficiaries in the SAAD roster) did not receive the livelihood interventions as scheduled but received them during the succeeding years. Still others who were listed in the SAAD beneficiary roster for 2017 or 2018 reported that they have not received any of the expected interventions in 2021 (survey period).
 - 1.3.2. Post-production facilities and equipment are channeled to the farmers and fisherfolk associations for safe-keeping and where members can share its use. Based on findings, such facilities and

170

equipment were not received by the respondent associations particularly for livestock and poultry. There is also a low percentage of association recipients for crop, capture fishery and aquaculture.

- 1.3.3. Conduct of technical training. The very high number of trained farmers and fisherfolk in the covered provinces of the SAAD Program based on the DA-SAAD and BFAR-SAAD Details of Specialized Trainings report is highly commendable. This, and the high number of specialized training conducted is one of the highly regarded achievements that the program can boast. The report is backed by the favourable feedback and statements of RPMSOs and PPMSOs during the FGDs conducted. Despite these tremendous efforts, lack of training among some beneficiaries was reported during the pilot and survey studies.
- 1.4. Marketing Assistance and Enterprise Development
 - 1.4.1. Local market study. The conduct of local market studies has not yet been formally undertaken in any of the target provinces and municipalities. However, some initiatives have been identified and started informally on a limited scale.
 - 1.4.2. Technical training on entrepreneurship and value-adding. The DA-SAAD has conducted several trainings on entrepreneurship and value adding, as demonstrated in some well-established enterprises backed by SAAD. For example, a total of 171 enterprises supported by 6,081 members have now flourished since they started with only one established enterprise with 40

members in 2017. With respect to specialized training, capacity building activities has been focused primarily on production trainings for crop, livestock, and poultry. Only the fisheries group under BFAR-SAAD reported to have conducted capacity building activities related to product development, business planning to include bookkeeping, and value adding during its 2017 to 2018 implementation.

- 1.4.3. Logistics support. The DA-SAAD has provided logistical support to very few enterprises so far, so that this type of support has not yet been evident among the farmer and fisherfolk association members interviewed.
- 1.4.4. Audit of livelihood enterprises. This activity of the DA-SAAD was not yet observed among the farmers and fisherfolks since a limited number of enterprises were established in 2017 and 2018.
- 2. The identification of SAAD target areas (provinces) was guided by a set of criteria formulated by the NPMO. Using this criteria, the municipal LGUs identified the beneficiaries and the list was forwarded to the provincial focal persons. Interventions programmed for distribution to the first batch of beneficiaries in 2017 were not all delivered as scheduled; and some were received one or two years later. Nevertheless, there was a significant improvement in the distribution of interventions for the 2018 batch of beneficiaries. With the introduction of SAAD interventions in 2017 and 2018, it was observed that there was an overall increase in the production areas utilized for farming and fishery activities.

- 3. Adoption trends for 2017 beneficiaries of crop production interventions was found stable for the next three years for all types of crops, whereas, among beneficiaries in 2018 the adoption rate declined in 2020. For livestock interventions adoption rate among 2017 beneficiaries declined in 2019 and 2020. The same trend was observed among 2018 beneficiaries except for the adopters of small ruminants. In the poultry sector, a decline in the adoption rate was also observed, except for chicken and quail beneficiaries in 2018 which were found to be stable. For capture fisheries, a steady adoption rate was noted among 2018 beneficiaries. For interventions in aquaculture, fish farming beneficiaries in 2017 and crustaceans beneficiaries in 2018 recorded a stable adoption rate.
- 4. There were various reasons why the beneficiaries adopted the different interventions introduced by SAAD. The most common reasons are: increased home consumption since their produce is used as a source of food; increased or additional source of income; and considering that farm inputs were provided by the program as an intervention, this resulted in lower net cost of production on the part of the beneficiary. While the above factors positively influenced adoption, the beneficiaries responded with quite specific critical factors (by commodity) that constrained adoption. In crop production, the beneficiaries identified inadequate supplies, incomplete package of technology, and only one-time provision of interventions to restrict adoption. For livestock and poultry, the top critical factors are animal mortalities due to diseases, flooding, and stray animals. In this sector, the beneficiaries indicated

that they needed interventions that could provide them a source of daily income. In the fishery sector, the primary constraints to adoption include low quality (i.e. easily damaged) fishing tools and equipment, and inappropriate and mismatched sizes of fishing gears and tools provided.

- 5. The indicators used to evaluate the initial impacts of the SAAD Program include the following: improved household food consumption, increased income and improved economic status. Improved household food consumption was determined by the frequency of meals per day, incidence of hunger, variety of foods consumed, and incidence of malnutrition. The financial status of the beneficiaries was evaluated by determining the amount of on-farm and total household income, budget for food and recreation, health insurance, amount of debt and savings. Likewise housing characteristics, education of children and means of transportation were considered in the impact pathway.
- 6. Overall, the SAAD program resulted in observed positive initial benefits for the targeted farmers and fisherfolks, particularly with respect to improving their household food consumption and other indicators of welfare gains and economic status.

Recommendations

- 1. Program Management
 - 1.1 Formulation of plans and budget. Given the defined qualifications to become a SAAD beneficiary, a thorough review of the current list of target beneficiaries is called for. It is strongly recommended that in the formulation of plans, the SAAD M&E baseline data including the list of bonafide target beneficiaries and corresponding essential qualifications be well established, validated and updated on a regular basis.
 - 1.2 **Procurement of supplies and materials**. Early procurement of supplies and materials is encouraged and should be institutionally supported with sustained community participation to ensure timely, cost-effective and more efficient implementation of the SAAD supported projects in the target communities.
 - 1.3 **Hiring of staff**. As observed, the majority of the program's manpower is composed of non-plantilla items, which may affect the stability of municipal, provincial, and regional operations. Hence, the NPMO should endeavor to institutionalize SAAD as a regular program of DA to have more plantilla items.
 - 1.4 **Coordinating with LGUs, agencies, and other stakeholders**. Based on the reports of barangay captains and municipal officials that they were unaware of the DA-SAAD program, it is recommended that the SAAD municipal level responsible officer strengthens and prioritizes their coordination with barangay captains and municipal officials with respect to the implementation of DA-SAAD Program activities. This will require a more aggressive awareness campaign or initiative by concerned MAO

officers (aided by the significantly improved DA-SAAD website) to inform LGU stakeholders, concerned agencies and partner-beneficiaries about the existence and compelling objectives of the DA-SAAD Program. Relevant to the above-mentioned DA-SAAD website, this Midterm Assessment highly commends the significant continuous development of the DA-SAAD website. This should be fully harnessed and optimized as a powerful tool in addition to traditional broadcast media and social media platforms towards creating public awareness about the SAAD program.

- 1.5 Formulating and updating manual of operations. The SAAD Program Operational Manual was finalized as a copyrighted handbook in year 2021. An annual review of the manual of operations is recommended to align processes with latest regulations or policies.
- 1.6 Monitoring and evaluation. Linked with recommendation 1.1 (which recommended a well-established and updated baseline data roster of qualified SAAD beneficiaries), the SAAD M&E Unit must be professionally well-established to coordinate a regularly scheduled data collection and update to support the critical monitoring and evaluation of the conditions and progress of the SAAD partner-beneficiaries. Adding to the baseline profile database updates, monitoring should be financially sustained and strengthened focusing on onsite validation and on facilitating program management quick response to priority issues and concerns raised by target farmer and fisherfolk beneficiaries in coordination with their respective local government units. At the

program level, quarterly regional assessments among DA and BFAR SAAD implementers are strongly recommended.

- 1.7 **Conduct of meetings**. The regular conduct of meetings from national to municipal levels should be sustained. A database of all the minutes of the meeting accessible through the local area network may be explored to facilitate referencing and cross-referencing among the implementers.
- 2. Social Preparation
 - 2.1 **Community organizing**. This recommendation is linked with Recommendation 1.4. It is critical that the SAAD implementing authorities strengthen and prioritize its coordination with barangay and municipal officials to optimize the participation of the targeted beneficiaries in the SAAD Program. It is strongly recommended that, in particular, the program entry protocol should be strictly adhered to by the concerned authorities and staff. Moreover, profiling and needs/risks assessment should be critically and cautiously executed in order to identify the most appropriate interventions for the target beneficiaries. Again, it is encouraged that the well-developed SAAD website be fully utilized as a powerful tool in raising awareness among all stakeholders about the activities, protocols and other useful information about the SAAD Program at all levels regional, provincial, and municipal.
 - 2.2 Capacity building (leadership, values formation, organizational development). Capacity building activities are listed under social preparation, but these training are not specifically identified for leadership, values formation, and/or organizational development. Hence, it is suggested that an inventory of the full list of these trainings be
undertaken to check and ensure complete identification and coverage of the training package contents. Well-defined and specific training components are essential to ensure that program implementers and partner-beneficiaries are equipped with appropriate organizational and entrepreneurial skills expected from the program.

- 2.3 It is suggested that an Orientation and Refresher Workshop be organized by SAAD on a bi-annual basis to include staff, municipal and barangay officials, and partner-beneficiaries to refresh and remind SAAD stakeholders about the SAAD program implementation protocols covered in its manual, guidebook, policies and procedures.
- 2.4 It is recommended that the suggested SAAD Orientation Workshop above be immediately followed-up by regularly scheduled consultations (smaller meetings) among staff, municipal and barangay officials, and partner-beneficiaries to focus on priority issues and quickly respond to concerns that significantly affect the successful implementation of the SAAD program. It is strongly advised that the minutes of these meetings be documented (by responsible municipal level officer) and summarized for submission to SAAD Headquarters for priority attention.
- 3. Production and Livelihood
 - 3.1 **Provision of agri-inputs, tools, machineries, facilities, and equipment**. Based on the survey results and feedback from farmer and fisherfolk beneficiaries, the primary constraints to sustained adoption of the SAAD technology interventions include, among others, inappropriate technology components, inadequate supplies, incomplete technology package and low quality or easily damaged tools and equipment. It is

strongly recommended that a thorough review of the earlier needs and risks assessments be undertaken by SAAD regarding appropriate technology interventions for the farmers and fisherfolks targeted by the SAAD program. This includes re-examination of the criteria and protocol in choosing appropriate interventions and recalibration of the identified technology components to ensure that appropriate interventions are identified and provided to optimize and sustain technology uptake. In the procurement of supplies and materials, it is suggested that the concerned DA-SAAD Purchasing Officer undertake coordination with suppliers, considering more closer detailed specifications and comprehensive quality assurance procedures to assure that the SAAD program interventions are of high quality for sustained adoption and productivity gain by target beneficiaries.

Provision of post-production facilities and equipment. This midterm 3.2 assessment supports the SAAD strategy to sustain livelihood interventions starting from production inputs to post-production to enable adoption and achieve ultimate welfare gains for all target beneficiaries. Thus, similar to the above recommendation, a need and risk assessment review for post-production facilities/equipment is called for. As well, closer coordination with suppliers, more appropriate technical specifications, and comprehensive quality assurance procedures for post-production facilities and equipment are also warranted. For example, based on the survey, irrigation facilities such as Small Water Impounding Project (SWIP) were identified as critical by the beneficiaries especially during the dry season. The SAAD Management may consider appropriating funds for this type of project in coordination with other Units of the Department of Agriculture and other allied agencies.

- 3.3 Conduct of technical training. Drawing from the survey results, it is recommended to review the criteria for selection of participants to trainings to ensure that the training provided is aligned with the livelihood source of target beneficiaries. This also ensures efficiency in the use of training funds. Post-training evaluations which include feedback from the participants should also be done to ensure that training objectives are met, and to assess the overall training activity for possible areas of improvement. Specific suggestions are cited below with respect to technical training most frequently cited in the survey among SAAD beneficiaries: (1) The Training on Good Agricultural Practices (GAP), as well as the Post-Harvest Quality Management (PQM) for crop production should be conducted in all target provinces; (2) The training packages for livestock and poultry production should also include a section on proper waste management disposal to maintain good air quality and avoid disease outbreaks; and (3) The training on the use of agro-meteorological weather stations (AIWS) for scheduling of crop cycles towards climate-smart technology applications should also be explored.
- 3.4 Based on the relative high risk concerns in agriculture and fishery production expressed by the farmers/fisherfolks respondents, it is proposed that DA-SAAD explore Insurance Programs for crops, livestock, poultry, and fisheries as a potential intervention

complementary to the production and post-production supplies, tools, machineries, and equipment provided by the SAAD Program. This may be judiciously considered in coordination with other concerned Units of the Department of Agriculture and other allied agencies.

- 4. Marketing Assistance and Enterprise Development
 - 4.1 **Local market study**. In preparation for the conduct of local market studies, it is recommended that the DA-SAAD undertake the following systematic process:

Step 1: The DA-SAAD team identify the maturity level of the established enterprises or potential enterprises;

Step 2: Assess and prioritize the new enterprises for financial support;

Step 3: Identify the business operational gaps of existing enterprises;

Step 4: Conduct value chain and supply chain analyses to attain a better understanding of the enterprise's commodity market linkages;

Step 5: As a basis for prioritizing enterprises that should receive funding support, a business plan or feasibility study (containing market, technical, organization and management, financial, and socio-economic viability) is required to be presented by the representative association of farmer and fisherfolk participants; and

Step 6: The DA-SAAD team should explore backward and forward linkages for the community.

4.2 Conduct of technical training on entrepreneurship and value adding. It is recommended that training on community enterprise development system be anchored on the Implementing Rules and Regulations of R.A. 11321 or the Sagip Saka Act to include: enterprise

identification and assessment, provision of technical and financial assistance (poor-friendly); installation of community management systems through intensive training similar to KAMMP with on-the-job training for potential agri-preneurs in partnership with Go Negosyo, DTI, DOST, Agribusiness Universities, CHED, TESDA, and other relevant stakeholders.

In consultation with the above cited potential training partners, training modules to enhance entrepreneurship and value adding should be developed to include: business planning, enterprise development and management; establishment of business development service. For example, this covers training across all livelihood categories on enterprise management, bookkeeping, internal control, cost analysis, financial management, among others. Additional modules may be explored to fully harness the entrepreneurial potential of the community associations, including promotion of clustering approach through partnership and network building; trial shipment of priority products from specific sources to identified markets; market promotion through trade fairs, caravans, cross visits, study tours; trade facilitation through conduct of market matching or linkage activities; shelf-life testing of priority commodities/products; enhancement of packaging and labeling of priority products; and support towards product accreditation to enhance market access (e.g., organic certification, halal certification, among others.)

4.3 **Provision of logistics support**. Marketing assistance and enterprise development is considered an important last mile in achieving the

desired impact of the SAAD Program. It has become clear from the feedback from the surveys and focus group meetings at all levels that the targeted farmer and fisherfolk beneficiaries require logistics support as they approach this last mile. With respect to marketing and enterprise development, DA-SAAD will not be able to do this alone. It will definitely require effective collaboration and sustained partnerships with other concerned stakeholders.

It is therefore recommended that the DA-SAAD management should strengthen collaboration and the harmonization of plans, programs, and services related to enterprise development, with the following: First, with relevant attached DA bureaus, agencies, and corporations; second, with partner government agencies like DAR, DENR, DSWD, DOF, DOST, DPWH, DOT, CHED, TESDA, DEPED, NCIP and universities and colleges with food technology programs; third, with partner LGUs (from provincial to the barangay levels); and last but not least, Non-Governmental Organizations or Civil Society Organizations; and the private or business sectors. In particular with respect to provision of logistic support, it is recommended that the DA-SAAD team explore and prioritize according to the local level circumstances and commodity-wise requirements of target beneficiaries and associations. Examples of logistics (for marketing and enterprise development) support for consideration in partnership with other concerned entities include: (1) establishment of consolidation and packing/packaging facilities; (2) establishment of processing facilities in partnership with universities and colleges with food technology facilities; (3) establishment of an auction market facility with the attendant weighing scales and the holding pens for large animals including the auction market system; (4) establishment of slaughterhouses and dressing plants, and establishment of trading posts/centers with ancillary facilities and equipment such as minimal facility, cold storage facility, transport facility, weighing scales, plastic crates, and others; (5) development of common service post-harvest facilities (e.g. thresher, corn sheller, community warehouse for cereals); (6) establishment of common service facilities for drying (both solar and mechanical) for palay, corn, coffee, cacao, copra and others; (7) establishment of vapor treatment and hot water treatment facility with the attendant packing/packaging houses; (8) establishment of cassava drying, chipping, and granulizing facility with marketing service (secured supply contracts); (9) establishment of rice and corn mills with attendant drying and warehouse facility for cereals; (10) establishment of shared service facilities in partnership with the Department of Trade and Industry; and (11) establishment of start-up businesses in partnership with the Department of Science and Technology. All of the above will require institutionalizing the technical support services in DA-SAAD field units aimed at improving productivity, market linkages, and entrepreneurial skills among participating producer groups.

4.4 Audit of livelihood enterprises. To ensure transparency, accountability, and empowerment among community enterprises which have been established with support of the SAAD Program, it is recommended that the Management Team initiate and finalize the formulation of procedures in auditing these community level enterprises anchored on the

Commission on Audit rules and regulations to define the scope of audit/examination and establish the required techniques, methods and guidelines.

Literature Cited

- Butler, J.R.A., W. Suadnya , K. Puspadi , Y. Sutaryono, R.M. Wise, T.D. Skewes, D. Kirono, E.L. Bohensk, T. Handayani, P. Habibi , M. Kisman , I. Suharto, Hanartani, S. Supartarningsih, A. Ripaldi, A. Fachry, Y. Yanuartati, G. Abbas, K. Dugga, A. Ash (2014). Framing the application of adaptation pathways for rural livelihoods and global change in eastern Indonesian islands. Global Environmental Change, 28/ 368-382
- Caswell, M. (2001). The Adoption of Sustainable Agricultural Production Practices: Results from the U.S. Department of Agriculture Area Studies Project. *Adoption of Technologies for Sustainable Farming Systems* (pp. 97-104). OECD.
- Food and Agriculture Organization (n.d.). *Hunger and Food Insecurity*. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. https://www.fao.org/hunger/en/
- Galing, K. (2014). "Philippines: Owning a Toilet is a Sign of Progress" Published in East Asia and Pacific on the Rise. Nov. 17, 2014.
- Garbero, A. & Chichaibelu, B.B. (2018). Impact Assessment Report: The Agricultural Sector Development Programme-Livestock and the Agriculture Service Support Programme, Tanzania. Rome: IFAD
- Hazell, P.B.R. (2008). An Assessment of the Impact of Agricultural Research in South Asia since the Green Revolution. Science Council Secretariat: Rome, Italy
- Latysheva, K.O., & Borovikova*, V.O. (2019). Educational Background as a Factor of National Welfare Boosting. In F. Casati, G. A. Barysheva, & W. Krieger (Eds.), Lifelong Wellbeing in the World - WELLSO 2016, vol 19. European Proceedings of Social and Behavioural Sciences (pp. 96-105). Future Academy. https://doi.org/10.15405/epsbs.2017.01.13
- Mayne, J. & Johnson, N. (2015). Using Theories of Change in the CGIAR Research Program on Agriculture for Nutrition and Health. Evaluation 2015. Vol. 21(4) 407-428
- Mula, M.G. & Lustria, U.J. (2021). SAAD Program Operational Manual. Special Area for Agricultural Development (SAAD) Program, Department of Agriculture. 174 pp. ISBN 978-971-704-052-3/978-971-704-053-0
- Kabir, M.J., Cramba, R., Alauddin, M. & Gaydona, D.S. (2019). Farmers' perceptions and management of risk in rice-based farming systems of southwest coastal Bangladesh. Land Use Policy. Volume 86, July 2019, Pages 177-188

- Murthy, Morla Raja Krishna and S. Bindu Madhari. (2017). Process Evaluation cum Impact Assessment of Agriculture and Veterinary Research Projects & Programmes. Journal of Agriculture and Veterinary Science. Vol 10 Issue 2 Ver II.
- National Academy of Agricultural Research Management (n.d.). Usefulness of NARS: Impact Assessment. https://naarm.org.in/VirtualLearning/vlc/dmainPME-IAA-M6.htm
- Ogundari, K. & Aromolaran, A.B. (2014). Impact of Education on Household Welfare in Nigeria, International Economic Journal, 28:2, 345-364, DOI: 10.1080/10168737.2013.811279
- Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (2001). Adoption of Technologies for Sustainable Farming Systems.
- Philippine Statistics Authority (2021, December 17). Proportion of Poor Filipinos Registered at 23.7 Percent in the First Semester of 2021. https://psa.gov.ph/poverty-press-releases/nid/165535
- Philippine Statistics Authority (2021, December 16). Proportion of Poor Filipinos in the First Semester of 2018 was Estimated at 21.1 Percent. https://psa.gov.ph/poverty-press-releases/nid/165534
- Philippine Statistics Authority (2021, July 15). *Nine in Every 10 Families Reside in a Single Type Building/House (Results from the 2020 Annual Poverty Indicators Survey (APIS))*. https://psa.gov.ph/press-releases/id/164828
- Philippine Statistics Authority (2020). 2018 Family Income and Expenditure Survey:NationalandRegionalEstimatesVolume1.https://psa.gov.ph/sites/default/files/FIES%202018%20Final%20Report.pdf
- Philippine Statistics Authority (2020, June 3). Farmers, Fisherfolks, Individuals Residing in Rural Areas and Children Posted the Highest Poverty Incidences Among the Basic Sectors in 2018. <u>https://psa.gov.ph/poverty-press-releases/nid/162541</u>
- Philippine Statistics Authority (2020). Agricultural Indicators System. Economic Growth: Agriculture. poverty-action.0rg/printpdf/7331
- Philippine Statistics Authority (2013, December 27). *Electricity is the most common source of energy used by households*. https://psa.gov.ph/content/electricity-most-common-source-energy-used-households
- Philippine Statistics Authority (n.d.) *Official Concepts and Definitions*. Inventory of Statistical Standards in the Philippines. https://psa.gov.ph/ISSiP/concepts-and-definitions
- Rogers, P. (2014). Theory of Change, Methodological Briefs: Impact Evaluation 2, UNICEF Office of Research, Florence.

- The World Bank (n.d.). Access to electricity (% of Population) Philippines. https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/EG.ELC.ACCS.ZS?locations=PH
- The Word Bank (n.d.) Integrated Agriculture and Productivity Project, Impact Evaluation Endline Report https://www.gafspfund.org/sites/default/files/inlinefiles/IAPP_IE_Endline_Report_RCT.pdf
- Udemezue, J.C. & Osegbue, E.G. (2018). Theories and Models of Agricultural Development. Annals of Review and Research. Vol. 1 Issue 5.
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). (2012). Farmers Association for Rural Upliftment, Philippines. Equator Initiative Case Study Series. New York. NY
- Yang, L., Moucheng, L., Fei, L., Quingwen, M. & Wenhua, L. (2019). The Impacts of farmers' livelihood capitals on planting decisions: A case study of Zhagana Agriculture-Forestry-Animal Husbandry Composite System. Land Use Policy 86 (2019) 208-217

APPENDIX A

List of Partner SUCs

Province	State Universities and Colleges	
Apayao	Apayao State College	
	San Isidro Sur, Luna, Apayao	
	Focal Person: Lorna Caraang	
	Research Assistant: Jay Arr Padamada	
Catanduanes	Catanduanes State University	
	Virac. Catanduanes	
	Focal Person: Nicca Aira A. Marquez	
	Research Assistant: Thelma G. Tenerife	
Masbate	Dr. Emilio B. Espinosa Sr. Memorial State College of	
	Agriculture and Technology	
	Cabitan, Mandaon, Masbate	
	Focal Person: Dr. Cynthia L. Dimayuga	
	Research Assistant: joamarie B. Amante	
Sorsogon	Sarsagan State College	
Sologon	Magsaysay St. Sorsogon City	
	Focal Person: Dr. Jenet B. Fuentes	
	Research Assistant: Michell I. Matienzo & Roneer Malasa	
Negros Oriental	Negros Oriental State University	
riegios orientar	Capitol Area Kagawasan Avenue Dumaguete Negros Oriental	
	Focal Person: Merivic Catada	
	Research Assistant: Io Camille Mamac	
Northern Samar	University of Fostern Philinning	
Northern Samar	University Town Catarman Northern Samar	
	Focal Person: Karina Milagros Cui	
	Research Assistant: Jessica Pateño	
Samar	Samar Stata University	
Sama	Arteche Blyd Bray Guindanunan Cathalogan City Samar	
	Focal Person: Sherie Ann I abid	
	Research Assistant: Ma Paula Iov Llantos	
Levte	Visavas State University	
Leyte	Pangasugan Baybay City Levte	
	Focal Person: Moises Neil Seriño	
	Recearch Assistant: Wendy Enerlan	
Southern Levite	Southern Levie State University	
Southern Leyte	Concencion St. Sogod Southern Levie	
	Focal Person: Wade C. Lim	
	Recearch Assistant: Lagrai Havahav	
Zamboanga del Norte	Iosa Bizal Mamorial State University	
Zamboanga der Norte	Gov Sta Cruz Guading Adasa St. Dapitan City Zamboanga del	
	Norte	
	Focal Person: Charie Mae Pamunag	
	Research Assistant: Eva Mae Descallar	
Bukidnon	Control Mindongo University	
DURITION	Savre Hwy Maramag Bukidnon	
	Focal Derson: Tracy Van Tangonan	
	Research Assistant Roque G. Cole	
	I REPORTED A DESTRUCTION OF COLO	

Compostela Valley	Compostela Valley State College		
	P-10, Poblacion, Compostela, Compostela Valley		
	Focal Person: Lemuel L. Alvior		
	Research Assistant: Jumardy C. Parba		
North Cotabato	University of Southern Mindanao		
	Kabacan, Cotabato		
	Focal Person: Jennet R. Magaso		
	Research Assistants: Gretel Bisagar, Connie Jean I. Guinmapang		
	& Alpi B. Recapente		
Sarangani	Mindanao State University-Dadiangas		
	General Santos City, South Cotobato		
	Focal Person: Edna P. Oconer		
	Research Assistant: Honey Grace Sario & Joan Grace P. Silaya		
Sultan Kudarat	Sultan Kudarat State University		
	Tacurong City, Sultan Kudarat		
	Focal Person: Dr. Ruby Hechanova		
	Research Assistant: Roen Kristofer Munoy		

APPENDIX B

Survey Questionnaire for Individual Farmers and Fisherfolk

Midterm Impact Assessment Study of Special Area for Agricultural Development (SAAD) Program Survey Questionnaire for Individual Farmers/Fisherfolks

Objectives: This study aims to assess the Midterm Impact of the Special Area for Agricultural Development (SAAD) Program of the Department of Agriculture in attaining improved household food consumption, increased income, and improved economic status of their partner beneficiaries.

PERSONAL PROFILE			
Do you belong to any farmers/fishe O Yes O No	erfolks association?	Please specify organization name	
Name (SURNAME FIRST NAME I SUFFIX e.g. Jr., Sr.)	Sex O Male O Female		
Address (REGION PROVINCE MUNICIPALITY/CITY BARANGAY SITIO/PUROK)			
Mobile Number 09	Person with Disability* ○ Yes ○ No	Primary Language Spoken**	
Date of Birth MM/DD/YYYY	Religion O Roman Catholic) Jehovah's Witnesses	
Place of Birth PROVINCE, MUNICIPALITY/CITY	 Protestant (UCCP) Islam Aglipayan No religion Iglesia ni Cristo Others, please specify The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints 		
Civil Status	Highest Educational At	tainment	
 Single Widowed Married Separated Indigenous Peoples Yes, Pls specify group No 	 None College Undergraduate Elementary Undergraduate College Graduate College Graduate Masteral Degree Highschool Undergraduate Doctoral Degree Vocational 		

* Psychosocial disability; Disability due to chronic illness; Learning disability; Mental disability; Visual disability; Orthopedic disability; Communication disability

** Aklanon; Bikol; Cebuano; Chavacano; Hiligaynon; Ibanag; Ilocano; Ivatan; Kapampangan; Kinaray-a; Maguindanao; Maranao; Pangasinan; Sambal; Surigaonon, Tagalog; Tausug; Waray; Yakan; Others, please specify

HOUSEHOLD DATA			
Type of Household (○ Nuclear Family ○ E	extended Family	
Number of Male Adult Household Members (18 years old and above)Number of Female Adult Household Members (18 years old and above)		Number of Male Household Members (below 18 years old)	Number of Female Household Members (below 18 years old)
Number of Years in Farming Number of Years in Fishing			
Land Tenureship Owned O Leased O Rented O Others, please specify			

LIVELIHOOD, INTERVENTIONS, OUTPUTS, AND OUTCOMES						
Main Source of Inco	ome () On-Farm () Off-Farm					
Other Sources of Ind	come 🔿 On-Farm 🔿 Off-Farm 🔿 None					
Respondent Classifi	cation					
Farming Classificat	ion 🗆 Crop 🗆 Livestock 🗆 Poultry					
Fishing Classificatio	n 🗆 Capture Fishery (Bait/Bottom Fishing) 🗆 Aquaculture (Pond, Pen, Cage)					
	FARMER					
	Year When CROP Intervention Received from SAAD					
□ Crop	\bigcirc 2017 \bigcirc 2018 \bigcirc 2019 \bigcirc 2020 \bigcirc No Intervention Received					
🗆 Livestock	Year When LIVESTOCK Intervention Received from SAAD					
	\bigcirc 2017 \bigcirc 2018 \bigcirc 2019 \bigcirc 2020 \bigcirc No Intervention Received					
	Year When POULTRY Intervention Received from SAAD					
□ Poultry	\bigcirc 2017 \bigcirc 2018 \bigcirc 2019 \bigcirc 2020 \bigcirc No Intervention Received					
FISHERFOLK						
	Year When CAPTURE FISHERY Intervention Received from SAAD					
□ Capture Fishery	\bigcirc 2017 \bigcirc 2018 \bigcirc 2019 \bigcirc 2020 \bigcirc No Intervention Received					
	Year When AQUACULTURE Intervention Received from SAAD					
□ Aquaculture	Aquaculture $\bigcirc 2017 \bigcirc 2018 \bigcirc 2019 \bigcirc 2020 \bigcirc$ No Intervention Received					

OFF-FARM INCOME						
Industry	Occupation	Employment Status	Total Monthly Household Off-	Family N Invo	/Iembers lved	
quarrying Manufacturing Electricity, gas, steam, and air-conditioning supply Water supply, sewerage, waste management, and remediation activities Accommodation and food service activities Information and communication Financial and insurance activities Professional, scientific and technical services Administrative and support service activities Public administrative and defense; compulsory security Education Human health and social work activities Arts, entertainment, and recreation Other service activities Activities of private households as employers and undifferentiated goods and services and producing activities of household for own use Activities of extraterritorial organizations and bodies Others, pls specify	Professionals Technicians and associate professionals Clerical support workers Service and sales workers Skilled agricultural, forestry and fishery workers Craft and related trades workers Plant and machine operators and assemblers Elementary occupations Armed forces occupations Others, pls specify	 Permanent Temporary/ Casual Contractual Job Order Others, please specify 		Male	Female	

	ON-FARM INCOME			
CROP This part of the qu where intervention (Before SAAD), 20	estionnaire is repeated for each was first received from SAAD o 2017, 2018, 2019, and 2020.	applicable year w e.g. CROP > 201	which depends on the selected year 7 > Required data would be 2016	
Select Year				
● 2016 ○ 2017	○ 2018 ○ 2019 ○ 2020			
Select Crop				
○ Rice ○ Corn	h 🔿 High-Value (Fruit) 🔿 Hi	gh-Value (Vegeta	ble) 🔿 Other	
Number of	Variety		Cultivated Area	
Cropping Season/s	O Native/Traditional O Inbr O OPV O Other, specify	ed 🔿 Hybrid		
	VOLUME OF PR	ODUCTION (K	G)	
Seed Purposes	Personal Consumption Sold			
	MARKET	ING (PHP)		
Selling Price/Kilo	gram	Gross Sales		
	COST OF PRO	DUCTION (PHP)	
Fixed Cost	Variable Cost	Net Income fro	m Production Activities	
	NUMBER OF ASSOCIATIO	ON MEMBERS	INVOLVED	
Male		Female		
PROVISION OF MATERIALS AND SUPPLIES Specific Intervention				
Please select as m	Please select as many as applicable Quantity Unit of Measurement			
 Seeds Seedlings Cuttings/Stalks Fertilizers and Other Soil Ameliorants Pest and Disease Control (Pesticides and Insecticides) Biologics None 				
PROVISION OF PRODUCTION TOOLS, MACHINERIES, EQUIPMENT, AND FACILITIES Specific Intervention				

Please select as m	any as app	licable		
 Crop Production Tools Crop Production Machineries and Equipment None 				
Details			Quantity	Unit of Measurement
	VO	LUME OF PROCES	SSED PRODUCT	ГS (KG)
Processed Product	cessed Personal Consumption duct		Sold	
		MARKET	ING (PHP)	
Selling Price/Kilo	gram		Gross Sales	
	C	OST OF PRODUCT	PROCESSING	(PHP)
Fixed Cost	Fixed Cost Variable Cost		Net Income fro	m Product Processing
	NUMBE	ER OF ASSOCIATIO	ON MEMBERS	INVOLVED
Male		Female		
PROVISION OF	PRODUC'	TION TOOLS, MA Specific Ir	CHINERIES, EQ	UIPMENT, AND FACILITIES
Please select as m	any as app	licable		
 Post-production Post-production 	Tools Facilities	□ Post-production № □ None	Machineries and E	Equipment
Details			Quantity	Unit of Measurement
	PR	OVISION OF MAR	KETING ASSIS	ΓΑΝCΕ
Local Market Stu	ıdy		Provision of Logistics	
○ Yes ○ No	\bigcirc Yes \bigcirc No \bigcirc N/A			
	C	C ONDUCT OF TEC Specific Ir	HNICAL TRAIN	NING
 Please select as many as applicable 1 Specified crop production technology 2 Using species crop production materials and su 3 Using and maintaining specified crop production 			applies on tools	Frequency

 4 Using and maintaining specified crop production machineries and equipment 5 Maintaining specified crop production facilities 6 Specified post-production technology 7 Using specified post-production materials and supplies 8 Using and maintaining specified post-production tools 9 Using and maintaining specified post-production machineries and equipment 10 Maintaining specified post-production facilities 11 Conduct of Local Market Study 12 Establishment of Entrepreneurial Activities 13 None 			
Issues and Concerns			
Suggestions			
Did you receive interventions from other agencies during the year (aside from SAAD)?			
\bigcirc Yes \bigcirc No			
If yes, please specify the intervention/s and the funding agency/ies.			

ON-FARM INCOME

LIVESTOCK

This part of the questionnaire is repeated for each applicable year which depends on the selected year where intervention was first received from SAAD e.g. LIVESTOCK > 2017 > Required data would be 2016 (Before SAAD), 2017, 2018, 2019, and 2020.

Select Year

2 016	\bigcirc 2017	$\bigcirc 2018$	$\bigcirc 2019$	\bigcirc 2020
	<u> </u>	U = • = •	U = • = •	<u> </u>

Select Livestock

Select Livestock	Select Livestock			
○ Swine ○ Cattle ○ Carabao ○ Sheep ○ Horse ○ Other, specify				
Number of Cycle/s	Breed Lot Dimension			
	○ Native ○ Hybrid ○ C specify			
VOLUME OF PRODUCTION Number of Heads				
Breeding Purposes	Personal Consumption	Number of Young Sold	Number of Livestock Sold for Slaughter	

MARKETING (PHP)			
Selling Price of Young Livestock/Head	Selling Price of Livestock for Slaughter/Head	Gross Sales	
	COST OF PRODUC	CTION (PHP)	
Fixed Cost	Variable Cost	Net Income from Production Activities	
NUN	MBER OF ASSOCIATION	MEMBERS INVOLVED	
Male		Female	
]	PROVISION OF MATERIA Specific Interv	ALS AND SUPPLIES	
Please select as many as	applicable		
□ Animal □ Feeds □	Vaccines	ne	
PROVISION OF PROD	UCTION TOOLS, MACHI Specific Interv	NERIES, EQUIPMENT, AND FACILITIES	
Please select as many as	applicable		
□ Livestock Production T □ Livestock Production F	Cools □ Livestock Produc Facilities □ None	tion Machineries and Equipment	
	VOLUME OF PROCESSE	D PRODUCTS (KG)	
Processed Product	Personal Consumption	Sold	
	MARKETING	(PHP)	
Selling Price/Kilogram		Gross Sales	
COST OF PRODUCT PROCESSING (PHP)			
Fixed Cost	Variable Cost	Net Income from Product Processing	
NUN	MBER OF ASSOCIATION	MEMBERS INVOLVED	
Male		Female	

PROVISION OF PRODUCTION TOOLS, MACHINERIES, EQUIPMENT, AND FACILITIES Specific Intervention		
Please select as many as applicable		
 Post-production Tools Post-production Macl Post-production Facilities None 	nineries and Equi	pment
PROVISION OF MARKET	FING ASSISTAN	NCE
Local Market Study	Provision of Logistics	
\bigcirc Yes \bigcirc No \bigcirc N/A		
CONDUCT OF TECHN Specific Interv	ICAL TRAININ	G
Please select as many as applicable		Frequency
 1 Specified livestock production technology 2 Using species livestock production materials and supplies 3 Using and maintaining specified livestock production tools 4 Using and maintaining specified livestock production machineries and equipment 5 Maintaining specified livestock production facilities 6 Specified post-production technology 7 Using specified post-production materials and supplies 8 Using and maintaining specified post-production tools 9 Using and maintaining specified post-production machineries and equipment 10 Maintaining specified post-production facilities 11 Conduct of Local Market Study 12 Establishment of Entrepreneurial Activities 13 None 		
Issues and Concerns		
Suggestions		
Did you receive interventions from other agencies during the year (aside from SAAD)?		
○ Yes ○ No		
If yes, please specify the intervention/s and the funding agency/ies.		

ON-FARM INCOME

POULTRY

This part of the questionnaire is repeated for each applicable year which depends on the selected year

where intervention was first received from SAAD e.g. POULTRY > 2017 > Required data would be 2016 (Before SAAD), 2017, 2018, 2019, and 2020.			
Select Year			
● 2016 () 2017 () 2018	● 2016 ○ 2017 ○ 2018 ○ 2019 ○ 2020		
Select Livestock			
○ Chicken ○ Duck ○ Goose	Fowl 🔾 Quail 🔿 Pigeon 🤇) Turkey () Other, specify	
Number of Cycle/s	Breed	Lot Dimension	
	 Native O Free Range O Hybrid Other, specify 		
VOLU	ME OF PRODUCTION (Numb	er of Heads)	
Breeding Purposes	Personal Consumption	Sold	
	MARKETING (PHP)		
Selling of Poultry for Slaughter/Head	Selling Price for Eggs	Gross Sales	
	COST OF PRODUCTION (PI	HP)	
Fixed Cost	Variable Cost	Net Income from Production Activities	
NUMBER	COF ASSOCIATION MEMBER	RS INVOLVED	
Male		Female	
PROVISION OF MATERIALS AND SUPPLIES Specific Intervention			
Please select as many as applicable			
□ Animal □ Feeds □ Vaccines □ Drugs □ None			
PROVISION OF PRODUCTION TOOLS, MACHINERIES, EQUIPMENT, AND FACILITIES Specific Intervention			
Please select as many as applicable			
 Poultry Production Tools Poultry Production Machineries and Equipment Poultry Production Facilities None 			

VOLUME OF PROCESSED PRODUCTS (KG)		
Processed Product	Personal Consumption	Sold
	MARKETING (PHP)	
Selling Price/Kilogram		Gross Sales
CO	ST OF PRODUCT PROCESSIN	IG (PHP)
Fixed Cost	Variable Cost	Net Income from Product Processing
NUMBER	R OF ASSOCIATION MEMBER	RS INVOLVED
Male		Female
PROVISION OF PRODUCT	ION TOOLS, MACHINERIES, Specific Intervention	EQUIPMENT, AND FACILITIES
Please select as many as appli	cable	
 Post-production Tools Post-production Facilities 	□ Post-production Machineries an □ None	d Equipment
PRO	VISION OF MARKETING ASS	ISTANCE
Local Market Study		Provision of Logistics
○ Yes ○ No ○ N/A		
CONDUCT OF TECHNICAL TRAINING Specific Intervention		
Please select as many as applied	cable	Frequency
 1 Specified poultry production 2 Using species poultry production 3 Using and maintaining species 4 Using and maintaining species 5 Maintaining specified poul 6 Specified post-production t 7 Using specified post-production t 8 Using and maintaining species 9 Using and maintaining species 10 Maintaining specified post 11 Conduct of Local Market 	on technology uction materials and supplies cified poultry production tools cified poultry production t try production facilities echnology ction materials and supplies cified post-production tools cified post-production t t-production facilities Study	

 12 Establishment of Entrepreneurial Activities 13 None 	
Issues and Concerns	
Suggestions	
Did you receive interventions from other agencies during the	year (aside from SAAD)?
\bigcirc Yes \bigcirc No	
If yes, please specify the intervention/s and the funding agency	/ies.

ON-FARM INCOME			
CAPTURE FISHERY (Bait/Bottom Fishing) This part of the questionnaire is repeated for each applicable year which depends on the selected year where intervention was first received from SAAD e.g. CAPTURE FISHERY > 2017 > Required data would be 2016 (Before SAAD), 2017, 2018, 2019, and 2020.			
Select Year			
● 2016 () 2017 ()	2018 () 2019 () 2020		
Select Fishery			
○ Bait Fishing ○ B	ottom Fishing		
Number of Batch/es	Number of Batch/es Species		
 Fish O Shells O Seaweeds O Mollusks O Crustacean Other, specify 			
VOLUME OF CATCH (KG)			
Personal Consumption Sold		Sold	
MARKETING (PHP)			
Selling Price	Selling Price Gross Sales		
COST OF PRODUCTION (PHP)			
Fixed Cost	Variable Cost Net Income from Production Activities		

NUMBER OF ASSOCIATION MEMBERS INVOLVED		
Male	Aale Female	
	PROVISION OF MATE Specific In	RIALS AND SUPPLIES tervention
Please select as many	as applicable	
□ Fishing Gears and Pa	araphernalia 🛛 Other, spec	ify 🗆 None
PROVISION OF PRO	ODUCTION TOOLS, MA Specific In	CHINERIES, EQUIPMENT, AND FACILITIES attervention
Please select as many	as applicable	
□ Capture Fishery Too □ Capture Fishery Fac	ls □ Capture Fishery M ilities □ None	achineries and Equipment
	VOLUME OF PROCES	SED PRODUCTS (KG)
Processed Product	Personal Consumption	Sold
	MARKET	ING (PHP)
Selling Price/Kilogram	Selling Price/Kilogram Gross Sales	
	COST OF PRODUCT	PROCESSING (PHP)
Fixed Cost	Variable Cost	Net Income from Product Processing
N	UMBER OF ASSOCIATIO	ON MEMBERS INVOLVED
Male		Female
PROVISION OF PRODUCTION TOOLS, MACHINERIES, EQUIPMENT, AND FACILITIES Specific Intervention		
Please select as many	as applicable	
 Post-production Too Post-production Factor 	ls □ Post-production N ilities □ None	Iachineries and Equipment
PROVISION OF MARKETING ASSISTANCE		
Local Market Study		Provision of Logistics

 \bigcirc Yes \bigcirc No \bigcirc N/A

CONDUCT OF TECHNICAL TRAINING Specific Intervention		
Please select as many as applicable	Frequency	
 1 Specified capture fishery technology 2 Using species capture fishery materials and supplies 3 Using and maintaining specified capture fishery tools 4 Using and maintaining specified capture fishery machineries and equipment 5 Maintaining specified capture fishery facilities 6 Specified post-production technology 7 Using specified post-production materials and supplies 8 Using and maintaining specified post-production tools 9 Using and maintaining specified post-production facilities 11 Conduct of Local Market Study 12 Establishment of Entrepreneurial Activities 		
Issues and Concerns		
Suggestions		

Did you receive interventions from other agencies during the year (aside from SAAD)?

 \bigcirc Yes \bigcirc No

If yes, please specify the intervention/s and the funding agency/ies.

ON-FARM INCOME

AQUACULTURE (Pen, Pond, Cage)

This part of the questionnaire is repeated for each applicable year which depends on the selected year where intervention was first received from SAAD e.g. AQUACULTURE > 2017 > Required data would be 2016 (Before SAAD), 2017, 2018, 2019, and 2020.

Select Year

 $\textcircled{0} 2016 \bigcirc 2017 \bigcirc 2018 \bigcirc 2019 \bigcirc 2020$

Select Fishery		
○ Pen ○ Pond ○ Cage		
Number of Batch/es	Species Fish O Shells O Seaweeds O Mollusks Crustacean O Other, specify 	Cultivated Area/Cage/Pond Dimension
	VOLUME OF CATCH (KG)	
Breeding Purposes	Personal Consumption	Sold
	MARKETING (PHP)	
Selling Price		Gross Sales
COST OF PRODUCTION (PHP)		
Fixed Cost	Variable Cost	Net Income from Production Activities
	NUMBER OF ASSOCIATION MEMBERS	INVOLVED
Male		Female
PROVISION OF MATERIALS AND SUPPLIES Specific Intervention		
Please select a	s many as applicable	
□ Fingerlings	\Box Feeds \Box Fishing Gears and Paraphernalia \Box N	one
PROVISION OF PRODUCTION TOOLS, MACHINERIES, EQUIPMENT, AND FACILITIES Specific Intervention		
Please select as many as applicable		
 Aquaculture Production Tools Aquaculture Production Facilities Aquaculture Production Facilities None 		
VOLUME OF PROCESSED PRODUCTS (KG)		
Processed Product	Personal Consumption	Sold

MARKETING (PHP)			
Selling Price/H	Kilogram	Gross Sales	
	COST OF PRODUCT PROCESSING	(PHP)	
Fixed Cost	Variable Cost	Net Income from Product Processing	
	NUMBER OF ASSOCIATION MEMBERS	INVOLVED	
Male		Female	
PROVISION	OF PRODUCTION TOOLS, MACHINERIES, EQ Specific Intervention	UIPMENT, AND FACILITIES	
Please select a	s many as applicable		
□ Post-product □ Post-product	tion Tools	quipment	
	PROVISION OF MARKETING ASSIST	ΓΑΝCΕ	
Local Market	Local Market Study Provision of Logistics O Yes O No		
	CONDUCT OF TECHNICAL TRAIN Specific Intervention	NING	
Please select a	s many as applicable	Frequency	
 1 Specified aquaculture production technology 2 Using species aquaculture production materials and supplies 3 Using and maintaining specified aquaculture production tools 4 Using and maintaining specified aquaculture production machineries and equipment 5 Maintaining specified aquaculture production facilities 6 Specified post-production technology 7 Using specified post-production materials and supplies 8 Using and maintaining specified post-production tools 9 Using and maintaining specified post-production machineries and equipment 10 Maintaining specified post-production facilities 11 Conduct of Local Market Study 12 Establishment of Entrepreneurial Activities 13 None 			
issues and Co	issues and Concerns		

Suggestions
Did you receive interventions from other agencies during the year (aside from SAAD)?
⊖ Yes ⊖ No
If yes, please specify the intervention/s and the funding agency/ies.

	IMPACTS	
This part of the questionnaire is rep where intervention was first receive (Before SAAD), 2017, 2018, 2019, a	eated for each applicable year d from SAAD e.g. CROP > 20 nd 2020.	which depends on the selected year 17 > Required data would be 2016
Select Year		
● 2016 ○ 2017 ○ 2018 ○ 2	019 () 2020	
Frequency of meals a day $\Box 1$ ($\bigcirc 2 \bigcirc 3 \bigcirc 4 \bigcirc 5 \text{ or mo}$	re
Variety of food products consume	d at home □ Go □ Grow	□ Glow
Is there an incidence of hunger?	○ Yes ○ No	
Amount of Income in a Year	Amount of Debts in a Year	Amount of Savings in a Year
Tenure Status of Dwelling Ow	vned () Rented () Leased	◯ Other
	HOUSING MATERIALS	
Main Flooring	Main Roofing	Main Wall
 Earth/Sand Wood Planks Palm/Bamboo Parqued/Polished Bamboo Vinyl Linoleum Ceramic Tiles Cement 	 Thatch/Palm Leaf (Nipa) Sod/Grass (Cogon) Rustic Mat Palm Bamboo Wood Planks Makeshift/Cardboard 	 Calne/Palm/Trunk Dirt/Mud Bamboo Stone with Mud Uncovered Adobe Plywood Makeshift/Cardboard/

Iron/Aluminum

Calamine/Cement Fiber
 Roofing Shingles

() Wood

O No Roofing

○ Marble

O Other, specify

O Cement/Cement Blocks

O Stone with Lime/Cement

Wood Planks/Shingles
 Galvanized Iron/Aluminum

O Bricks

O Covered Adobe

		O Other, specify		
With housing electricity? O Yes O No				
Source of Water Supply		Do you own or share a toilet?		
 Community Water Supply Piped into Dwelling Piped into Yard/Plot Piped into Public Tap Point Source Protected Well Open Dug Well Developed Spring Undeveloped Spring/River/Stream/ Bottled Water/Refilling Station Rain Water Tanker/Truck/Peddler 	/Pond/Lake	 Own toilet Share Toilet Toilet Facility Flush Toilet Pit Toilet/Latrine Closed Pit Open Pit Drop/Overhang Pail System No Toilet/Filed/Bush 		
Ownership of Assets Household Amenities/Appliances	Means of Transportation			
Household Amenities/Appliances. Please select as many as applicable. Airconditioning Unit Washing Machine Stove with Gas Range Refrigerator/Freezer Personal Computer Laptop Cell Phone Tablet Landline/Wireless Telephone Audio Component/Stereo Videoke/Karaoke CD/VCD/DVD Player Television Other, specify	 Private - Car Private - Jeepney Private - Tricycle Private - Motorcycle Private - Bicycle Private - Tractor Private - Motorized Banca Private - Non Motorized B Public - Van Public - Jeepney Public - Tricycle Public - Motorcycle/Angk Public - Tractor Public - Tractor Public - Motorized Banca/ Public - Non Motorized Banca/ Other, specify 	/Boat 3anca/Boat xas/Habal habal Boat anca/Boat		
Number of Children Enrolled in Formal Education From elementary to college. Write N/A if the respondent has no children.	Highest Educational Attain None Elementary Level Elementary Graduate High School Level High School Graduate Vocational College Level College Graduate Other N/A	ment of Children		
Means of Transportation in Going t	o School			

Private - Jeepney				
Private - Tricycle				
Private - Motorcycle				
□ Private - Bicycle				
\Box Private - Tractor				
\Box Private - Motorized Banca/Boat				
Private - Non Motorized Banca/Bo	at			
Dublic - Vali				
Public Tricycle				
□ Public - Motorcycle/Angkas/Habal	hahal			
□ Public - Pedicab	liadai			
\square Public - Tractor				
Public - Motorized Banca/Boat				
□ Public - Non Motorized Banca/Boa	t			
□ Other, specify				
Is there an incidence of hunger? () Yes () No			
Average Monthly Budget for Food				
Is there health insurance aside	Specify Other Health Insurance			
from PhilHealth?				
\bigcirc Yes \bigcirc No				
Do you allocate a budget for	Average Budget for Recreation in a Year			
recreation?				
○ Yes ○ No				
Aside from the abovementioned imp	act variables, what are other changes in your life/your			
family which you can say is due to S	AAD?			
Bukod sa mga nabanggit na impact va	riables, anu-ano pa ang mga nagbago sa iyong sarili o pamilya			
na masasabi mong dahil sa SAAD?				

REMARKS ON THE IMPACT VARIABLES

Please provide additional details on the impact variables presented.

Frequency of meals a day

Variety of food products consumed at home

Incidence of malnutrition

Amount of income

Amount of savings

Tenure status	of	dwelling
---------------	----	----------

Housing material (main flooring)

Housing material (main roofing)

Housing material (main wall)

Electricity

Source of water supply

Toilet facility

Ownership of assets (household amenities/appliances)

Means of transport

Number of children enrolled in formal education (from elementary to college)

Highest educational attainment of children

Means of transportation in going to school

Incidence of hunger

Average monthly budget for food

Health insurance aside from PhilHealth

Budget allocation for recreation

Average budget for recreation

OVERALL ASSESSMENT

On a scale of 1-5 with 5 being the highest, how satisfied are you with the interventions provided
by the Department of Agriculture BEFORE SAAD?1 Very Dissatisfied2 Dissatisfied3 Neutral4 Satisfied5 Very Satisfied

On a scale of 1-5 with 5 being the highest, how satisfied are you with the interventions provided by the Department of Agriculture AFTER SAAD?

 \Box

1 Very Dissatisfied	2 Dissatisfied	3 Neutral	4 Satisfied	5 Very Satisfied

On a scale of 1-5 with 5 being the highest, how would you rate your overall welfare/living condition BEFORE the SAAD interventions?

1 Very Dissatisfied	2 Dissatisfied	3 Neutral	4 Satisfied	5 Very Satisfied		
				Ο		
On a scale of 1-5 with 5 being the highest, how would you rate your overall welfare/living condition AFTER the SAAD interventions?						
1 Very Dissatisfied	2 Dissatisfied	3 Neutral	4 Satisfied	5 Very Satisfied		
				Ο		

Thank You!

APPENDIX C

Survey Questionnaire for Individual Farmer and Fisherfolk Associations

Midterm Impact Assessment Study of Special Area for Agricultural Development (SAAD) Program Survey Questionnaire for Farmer/Fisherfolk Associations

Objectives: This study aims to assess the Midterm Impact of the Special Area for Agricultural Development (SAAD) Program of the Department of Agriculture in attaining improved household food consumption, increased income, and improved economic status of their partner beneficiaries.

PERSONAL PROFILE				
First Year as SAAD Beneficiary () 2017 () 2018 (received	\bigcirc 2019 \bigcirc 2020 \bigcirc No intervention			
Name (SURNAME FIRST NAME MIDDLE NAME S e.g. Jr., Sr.)	UFFIX Sex			
	□ Male □ Female			
Position in the Organization	Mobile Number			
○ President ○ Vice-President ○ Secretary ○ Tre	asurer			
O Others, please specify	09			
Association/Organization Name	·			
Address (REGION PROVINCE MUNICIPALITY/CIT	Y BARANGAY SITIO/PUROK)			
Type of Organization	Registered with			
O Association Please specify type	⊖ SEC			
○ Cooperative ○ Credit ○ Service ○ Consumer ○ Multi-purpo	se O DOLE			
O Producer O Others, plea	se O CDA			
\bigcirc Marketing	○ Not registered			
Year of Initial Operation	Date of Initial Registration (MM/DD/YYYY)			

No. of Years of Operation (as Non-registered Organization)	No. of Y Organizat	of Years of Operation (as Registered anization)	
Type of Enterprise	Total No. of Members		
	MALE	FEMALE	
□ Processing	r	Fotal No. of Active Members	
□ Others, please specify	MALE	FEMALE	

MEMBER BENEFICIARIES (Upload File)					
Year	Name of Member	Address	Assistance provided by SAAD	Assistance provided by the Organization	

LIVELIHOOD, INTERVENTIONS, OUTPUTS and OUTCOMES				
Association Activity	/ies (Pls select one) O Farming O Fishing			
	FARMING			
	Year When CROP Intervention Received from SAAD			
🗆 Сгор	\bigcirc 2017 \bigcirc 2018 \bigcirc 2019 \bigcirc 2020 \bigcirc No Intervention Received			
	Year When LIVESTOCK Intervention Received from SAAD			
	○ 2017 ○ 2018 ○ 2019 ○ 2020 ○ No Intervention Received			
Year When POULTRY Intervention Received from SAAD				
Poultry	○ 2017 ○ 2018 ○ 2019 ○ 2020 ○ No Intervention Received			
FISHING				
□ Capture Fishery	Year When CAPTURE FISHERY Intervention Received from SAAD			

	○ 2017 ○ 2018 ○ 2019 ○ 2020 ○ No Intervention Received			
	Year When AQUACULTURE Intervention Received from SAAD			
🗆 Aquaculture	○ 2017 ○ 2018 ○ 2019 ○ 2020 ○ No Intervention Received			

CROP

This part of the questionnaire is repeated for each applicable year which depends on the selected year where intervention was first received from SAAD e.g. CROP > 2017 > Required data would be 2016 (Before SAAD), 2017, 2018, 2019, and 2020.

Select Y	ear
----------	-----

● 2016 ○ 2017 ○ 2018 ○ 2019 ○ 2020

Select	Crop
--------	------

○ Rice	🔿 Corn	O High-Value (Fruit)	O High-Value (Vegetable)	() Other	
--------	--------	----------------------	--------------------------	----------	--

Number of Cropping Season/s	Variety O Native/Traditional O Inbred O Hybrid O OPV O Other		Cultivated Area
VOLUME OF PRODUCTION (KG)			
Seed Purposes	Personal Consumption	Sold	
MARKETING (PHP)			
Selling Price/Kilogram		Gross Sales	
COST OF PRODUCTION (PHP)			
Fixed Cost	Variable Cost	Net Income from Production Activities	
NUMBER OF ASSOCIATION MEMBERS INVOLVED			
Male		Female	
PROVISION OF MATERIALS AND SUPPLIES Specific Intervention			
--	--	------------------------------	-----------------------
Please select as many as applicable		Quantity	Unit of Measurement
 Seeds Seedlings Cuttings/Stalks Fertilizers and Other Soil Ameliorants Pest and Disease Control (Pesticides and Insecticides) Biologics None 			
PROVISION OF PROD	UCTION TOOLS, MACHI Specific Interv	NERIES, EQUIP ention	PMENT, AND FACILITIES
Please select as many as a	applicable		
 Crop Production Tools Crop Production Facilities 	□ Crop Production Mac les □ None	hineries and Equi	pment
Details		Quantity Unit of Measurement	
VOLUME OF PROCESSED PRODUCTS (KG)			
Processed Product Personal Consumption Sold			
MARKETING (PHP)			
Selling Price/Kilogram Gross Sales			
COST OF PRODUCT PROCESSING (PHP)			
Fixed Cost Variable Cost Net Income from Product Processing		m Product Processing	
NUMBER OF ASSOCIATION MEMBERS INVOLVED			
Male		Female	
PROVISION OF PRODUCTION TOOLS, MACHINERIES, EQUIPMENT, AND FACILITIES Specific Intervention			
Please select as many as applicable			
 Post-production Tools Post-production Machineries and Equipment Post-production Facilities None 			
Details		Quantity	Unit of Measurement

PROVISION OF MARKETING ASSISTANCE		
Local Market Study	Provision of Logistics	
\bigcirc Yes \bigcirc No \bigcirc N/A		
CONDUCT OF TECHNICAL TRAINING Specific Intervention		
Please select as many as applicable	Frequency	
 1 Specified crop production technology 2 Using species crop production materials and supplies 3 Using and maintaining specified crop production tools 4 Using and maintaining specified crop production machineries and equipment 5 Maintaining specified crop production facilities 6 Specified post-production technology 7 Using specified post-production materials and supplies 8 Using and maintaining specified post-production tools 9 Using and maintaining specified post-production machineries and equipment 10 Maintaining specified post-production facilities 11 Conduct of Local Market Study 12 Establishment of Entrepreneurial Activities 13 None 		
Issues and Concerns		
Suggestions		
Did you receive interventions from other agencies du	ring the year (aside from SAAD)?	
○ Yes ○ No		
If yes, please specify the intervention/s and the funding agency/ies.		
LIVESTOCK This part of the questionnaire is repeated for each applicable year which depends on the selected year where intervention was first received from SAAD e.g. LIVESTOCK > 2017 > Required data would be 2016 (Before SAAD), 2017, 2018, 2019, and 2020.		

Select Year

● 2016 ○ 2017 ○ 2018 ○ 2019 ○ 2020

Select Livestock

 \bigcirc Swine \bigcirc Cattle \bigcirc Carabao \bigcirc Sheep \bigcirc Horse \bigcirc Other

Number of Cycle/s	Breed		Lot Dimension
	○ Native ○ Hybrid ○ 0	Other	
V	OLUME OF PRODUCTIO	N (Number of l	Heads)
Breeding Purposes	Personal Consumption	Number of Young Sold	Number of Livestock Sold for Slaughter
	MARKETINO	G (PHP)	
Selling Price of Young Livestock/Head	Selling Price of Livestock for Slaughter/Head		
	COST OF PRODUC	CTION (PHP)	
Fixed Cost	Variable Cost Net Income from Production Activities		om Production Activities
NUMBER OF ASSOCIATION MEMBERS INVOLVED			
Male Female			
PROVISION OF MATERIALS AND SUPPLIES Specific Intervention			
Please select as many as applicable			
□ Animal □ Feeds □ Vaccines □ Drugs □ None			
PROVISION OF PROD	DUCTION TOOLS, MACHI Specific Interv	NERIES, EQU	IPMENT, AND FACILITIES
Please select as many as	applicable		
 Livestock Production Tools Livestock Production Machineries and Equipment Livestock Production Facilities None 			
VOLUME OF PROCESSED PRODUCTS (KG)			
Processed Product	Personal Consumption	Sold	
MARKETING (PHP)			
Selling Price/Kilogram		Gross Sales	

COST OF PRODUCT PROCESSING (PHP)			
Fixed Cost	Variable Cost	Net Income fro	om Product Processing
NUN	MBER OF ASSOCIATION	MEMBERS IN	VOLVED
Male		Female	
PROVISION OF PROD	UCTION TOOLS, MACHI Specific Interv	NERIES, EQUI	IPMENT, AND FACILITIES
Please select as many as	applicable		
 Post-production Tools Post-production Facilities 	□ Post-production Machines □ None	hineries and Equ	ipment
	PROVISION OF MARKE	FING ASSISTA	NCE
Local Market Study		Provision of L	ogistics
\bigcirc Yes \bigcirc No \bigcirc N/A	<u>.</u>		
	CONDUCT OF TECHN Specific Interv	ICAL TRAININ vention	ίG
Please select as many as	applicable		Frequency
 1 Specified livestock production technology 2 Using species livestock production materials and supplies 3 Using and maintaining specified livestock production tools 4 Using and maintaining specified livestock production machineries and equipment 5 Maintaining specified livestock production facilities 6 Specified post-production technology 7 Using specified post-production materials and supplies 8 Using and maintaining specified post-production tools 9 Using and maintaining specified post-production machineries and equipment 10 Maintaining specified post-production facilities 11 Conduct of Local Market Study 12 Establishment of Entrepreneurial Activities 13 None 			
Issues and Concerns			
Suggestions			
Did you receive interventions from other agencies during the year (aside from SAAD)?			

⊖ Yes ⊖ No

If yes, please specify the intervention/s and the funding agency/ies.

POULTRY

This part of the questionnaire is repeated for each applicable year which depends on the selected year where intervention was first received from SAAD e.g. POULTRY > 2017 > Required data would be 2016 (Before SAAD), 2017, 2018, 2019, and 2020.

Select Year

Select Year				
● 2016 ○ 2017 ○ 2018 ○ 2019 ○ 2020				
Select Livestock				
○ Chicken ○ Duck ○ Goo	ose () Fowl () Quail () Pige	on 🔿 Turkey 🔿 Other		
Number of Cycle/s	Breed	Lot Dimension		
	 Native Free Range Hybrid Other, please specify 			
VOLU	VOLUME OF PRODUCTION (Number of Heads)			
Breeding Purposes	Personal Consumption	Sold		
MARKETING (PHP)				
Selling of Poultry for Slaughter/Head	Selling Price for Eggs	Gross Sales		
COST OF PRODUCTION (PHP)				
Fixed Cost	Variable Cost	Net Income from Production Activities		
NUMBER OF ASSOCIATION MEMBERS INVOLVED				
Male		Female		
PROVISION OF MATERIALS AND SUPPLIES Specific Intervention				

Please select as many as applied	cable	
□ Animal □ Feeds □ Vacc	ines 🗆 Drugs 🗆 None	
PROVISION OF PRODUCT	ION TOOLS, MACHINERIES, Specific Intervention	EQUIPMENT, AND FACILITIES
Please select as many as appli	cable	
 Poultry Production Tools Poultry Production Facilities 	 Poultry Production Machinerie None 	es and Equipment
VOL	UME OF PROCESSED PRODU	CTS (KG)
Processed Product	Personal Consumption	Sold
	MARKETING (PHP)	
Selling Price/Kilogram		Gross Sales
CO	ST OF PRODUCT PROCESSIN	G (PHP)
Fixed Cost	Variable Cost	Net Income from Product Processing
NUMBER	R OF ASSOCIATION MEMBER	RS INVOLVED
Male		Female
PROVISION OF PRODUCT	ION TOOLS, MACHINERIES, Specific Intervention	EQUIPMENT, AND FACILITIES
Please select as many as applied	cable	
 Post-production Tools Post-production Facilities 	 Post-production Machineries and None 	d Equipment
PRO	VISION OF MARKETING ASS	ISTANCE
Local Market Study		Provision of Logistics
○ Yes ○ No ○ N/A		
CO	DNDUCT OF TECHNICAL TRA Specific Intervention	AINING
Please select as many as applied	cable	Frequency
□ 1 Specified poultry production	on technology	

 2 Using species poultry production materials and supplies 3 Using and maintaining specified poultry production tools 4 Using and maintaining specified poultry production machineries and equipment 5 Maintaining specified poultry production facilities 6 Specified post-production technology 7 Using specified post-production materials and supplies 8 Using and maintaining specified post-production tools 9 Using and maintaining specified post-production machineries and equipment 		
□ 10 Maintaining specified post-production facilities		
□ 11 Conduct of Local Market Study		
□ 12 Establishment of Entrepreneurial Activities		
\square 13 None		
Issues and Concerns		
Suggestions		
Did you receive interventions from other agencies during the year (aside from SAAD)?		
○ Yes ○ No		
If yes, please specify the intervention/s and the funding agency/ies.		

CAPTURE FISHERY (Bait/Bottom Fishing) This part of the questionnaire is repeated for each applicable year which depends on the selected year where intervention was first received from SAAD e.g. CAPTURE FISHERY > 2017 > Required data would be 2016 (Before SAAD), 2017, 2018, 2019, and 2020.			
Select Year			
● 2016 () 2017 ()	2018 () 2019 () 2020		
Select Fishery	Select Fishery		
◯ Bait Fishing ◯ Bo	○ Bait Fishing ○ Bottom Fishing		
Number of Batch/es	Species		
	○ Fish ○ Shells ○ Seaweeds ○ Mollusks ○ Crustacean ○ Other		
VOLUME OF CATCH (KG)			
Personal Consumption Sold			
MARKETING (PHP)			

Selling Price		Gross Sales
	COST OF PRODUCTION (PHP)	-
Fixed Cost	Variable Cost	Net Income from Production Activities
Ν	UMBER OF ASSOCIATION MEMBERS I	NVOLVED
Male		Female
	PROVISION OF MATERIALS AND SU Specific Intervention	PPLIES
Please select as many	as applicable	
□ Fishing Gears and Pa	araphernalia 🗆 Other 🗆 None	
PROVISION OF PRO	DDUCTION TOOLS, MACHINERIES, EQ Specific Intervention	UIPMENT, AND FACILITIES
Please select as many	as applicable	
 Capture Fishery Tools Capture Fishery Machineries and Equipment None 		
	VOLUME OF PROCESSED PRODUCT	'S (KG)
Processed Product	Personal Consumption	Sold
	MARKETING (PHP)	-
Selling Price/Kilogram		Gross Sales
COST OF PRODUCT PROCESSING (PHP)		
Fixed Cost	Variable Cost	Net Income from Product Processing
NUMBER OF ASSOCIATION MEMBERS INVOLVED		
Male		Female
PROVISION OF PRO	DDUCTION TOOLS, MACHINERIES, EQ Specific Intervention	UIPMENT, AND FACILITIES

Please select as many as applicable Post-production Tools Post-production Machineries and Equij Post-production Facilities None PROVISION OF MARKETING ASSISTAN Local Market Study Yes No N/A CONDUCT OF TECHNICAL TRAININ Specific Intervention	pment NCE Provision of Logistics
Post-production Tools Post-production Machineries and Equip PROVISION OF MARKETING ASSISTAN Local Market Study Yes O No O N/A CONDUCT OF TECHNICAL TRAININ Specific Intervention	pment NCE Provision of Logistics
PROVISION OF MARKETING ASSISTAN	NCE Provision of Logistics
Local Market Study O Yes O No O N/A CONDUCT OF TECHNICAL TRAININ Specific Intervention	Provision of Logistics
○ Yes ○ No ○ N/A CONDUCT OF TECHNICAL TRAININ Specific Intervention	
CONDUCT OF TECHNICAL TRAININ Specific Intervention	a
	G
Please select as many as applicable	Frequency
 I Specified capture fishery technology 2 Using species capture fishery materials and supplies 3 Using and maintaining specified capture fishery tools 4 Using and maintaining specified capture fishery machineries and equipment 5 Maintaining specified capture fishery facilities 6 Specified post-production technology 7 Using specified post-production materials and supplies 8 Using and maintaining specified post-production tools 9 Using and maintaining specified post-production machineries and equipment 10 Maintaining specified post-production facilities 11 Conduct of Local Market Study 12 Establishment of Entrepreneurial Activities 13 None 	
Issues and Concerns	
Suggestions	
Did you receive interventions from other agencies during the year (a	side from SAAD)?
⊖ Yes ⊖ No	
U Yes UNO If yes, please specify the intervention/s and the funding agency/ies.	

AQUACULTURE (Pen, Pond, Cage)

This part of the questionnaire is repeated for each applicable year which depends on the selected year where intervention was first received from SAAD e.g. AQUACULTURE > 2017 > Required data would be 2016 (Before SAAD), 2017, 2018, 2019, and 2020.

Select Year

 $\textcircled{0} 2016 \bigcirc 2017 \bigcirc 2018 \bigcirc 2019 \bigcirc 2020$

Select Fishery				
○ Pen ○ Pond ○ Cage				
Number of Batch/es	Species O Fish O Shells O Seaweeds O Mollusks O Crustacean O Other, please specify	Cultivated Area/Cage/Pond Dimension		
	VOLUME OF CATCH (KG)			
Breeding Purposes	Personal Consumption	Sold		
	MARKETING (PHP)			
Selling Price		Gross Sales		
COST OF PRODUCTION (PHP)				
Fixed Cost	Variable Cost	Net Income from Production Activities		
NUMBER OF ASSOCIATION MEMBERS INVOLVED				
Male		Female		
PROVISION OF MATERIALS AND SUPPLIES Specific Intervention				
Please select as many as applicable				
□ Fingerlings	□ Fingerlings □ Feeds □ Fishing Gears and Paraphernalia □ None			
PROVISION OF PRODUCTION TOOLS, MACHINERIES, EQUIPMENT, AND FACILITIES Specific Intervention				
Please select as many as applicable				
 Aquaculture Production Tools Aquaculture Production Machineries and Equipment Aquaculture Production Facilities None 				
VOLUME OF PROCESSED PRODUCTS (KG)				
Processed Product	Personal Consumption	Sold		

MARKETING (PHP)		
Selling Price/K	ilogram	Gross Sales
	COST OF PRODUCT PROCESSING	G (PHP)
Fixed Cost	Variable Cost	Net Income from Product Processing
	NUMBER OF ASSOCIATION MEMBERS	S INVOLVED
Male		Female
PROVISION	DF PRODUCTION TOOLS, MACHINERIES, E Specific Intervention	QUIPMENT, AND FACILITIES
Please select as	many as applicable	
Post-productPost-product	ion Tools	Equipment
	PROVISION OF MARKETING ASSI	STANCE
Local Market Study Provision of Logistics		
○ Yes ○ No ○ N/A		
	CONDUCT OF TECHNICAL TRA Specific Intervention	INING
Please select as	many as applicable	Frequency
 1 Specified aquaculture production technology 2 Using species aquaculture production materials and supplies 3 Using and maintaining specified aquaculture production tools 4 Using and maintaining specified aquaculture production machineries and equipment 5 Maintaining specified aquaculture production facilities 6 Specified post-production technology 7 Using specified post-production materials and supplies 8 Using and maintaining specified post-production tools 9 Using and maintaining specified post-production machineries and equipment 10 Maintaining specified post-production facilities 11 Conduct of Local Market Study 12 Establishment of Entrepreneurial Activities 13 None Issues and Concerns		
Issues and Concerns		

Suggestions

Did you receive interventions from other agencies during the year (aside from SAAD)?

 \bigcirc Yes \bigcirc No

If yes, please specify the intervention/s and the funding agency/ies.

IMPACTS

Select Year

② 2016	○ 2017	○ 2018	○ 2019	\bigcirc 2020
---------------	--------	--------	--------	-----------------

Number of Male Members	Number of Female Members
Amount of Capital Shares of Members	Services Provided to Members
Amount of Income Generated	Amount of Savings Generated
Presence of Office	Available Utilities
\bigcirc Yes \bigcirc No	□ Electricity □ Water □ Gasoline □ Internet

Available Machines and Equipment

□ Office Machines and Equipment

- □ Crop Production Machines and Equipment
- □ Livestock Production Machines and Equipment
- □ Poultry Production Machines and Equipment
- Capture Fishery Machines and Equipment
- □ Aquaculture Production Machines and Equipment
- □ Post-production Machines and Equipment for Crops
- □ Post-production Machines and Equipment for Livestock
- Post-production Machines and Equipment for Poultry
- □ Post-production Machines and Equipment for Fish
- □ Post-production Machines and Equipment for Seaweeds
- □ Others, please specify___

Aside from the abovementioned, what are other changes in the organization which you can say is due to SAAD?

Bukod sa mga nabanggit, ano pa ang mga nagbago sa inyong organisasyon na masasabi mong dahil sa SAAD?

REMARKS ON THE Please provide additional details	IMPACT VARIABLES on the impact variables presented.
Number of Male Members	Number of Female Members
Amount of Capital Shares of Members	Services Provided to Members
Amount of Income Generated	Amount of Savings Generated
Presence of Office	Available Utilities
Available Machines and Equipment	Available Vehicles

	OVE	RALL ASSES	SSMENT	
On a scale of 1-5 with	5 being the highe by the Departmer	st, how satisf nt of Agricult	ied are you with ure BEFORE SA	the interventions provided AAD?
1 Very Dissatisfied	2 Dissatisfied	3 Neutral	4 Satisfied	5 Very Satisfied
On a scale of 1-5 with	5 being the highe by the Departme	st, how satisf nt of Agricul	ied are you with ture AFTER SA	the interventions provided AD?
1 Very Dissatisfied	2 Dissatisfied	3 Neutral	4 Satisfied	5 Very Satisfied
On a scale of 1-5 condition o	with 5 being the h f the organization	ighest, how w members BE	ould you rate th CFORE the SAA	ne overall welfare/living .D interventions?
1 Very Dissatisfied	2 Dissatisfied	3 Neutral	4 Satisfied	5 Very Satisfied
		D		
On a scale of 1-5 condition	with 5 being the h of the organization	ighest, how w n members A	ould you rate th FTER the SAA	ne overall welfare/living D interventions?
1 Very Dissatisfied	2 Dissatisfied	3 Neutral	4 Satisfied	5 Very Satisfied

Thank You!

APPENDIX D

Research Assistant's Guide to the e-Survey Instrument



Midterm Impact Assessment Study of Special Area for Agricultural Development (SAAD) Program

E-QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEY INSTRUMENT

RESEARCH ASSISTANT'S GUIDE

INTRODUCTION

To efficiently gather data for the Midterm Impact Assessment of the Department of Agriculture-Special Area for Agricultural Development (DA-SAAD), an e-survey tool was developed by the Don Mariano Marcos Memorial State University (DMMMSU). To guide the 18 Research Assistants from different partner State Universities and Colleges (SUCs), this manual was prepared by DMMMSU. It contains instructions on how to properly use the application. The compatibility of the tool was tested with Google Chrome.

1. LAUNCHING THE QUESTIONNAIRE APP

Tap the link sent to you via Facebook Messenger. Follow the steps as shown in the figure below (Figure 1) to launch the questionnaire in Google Chrome which is already installed in the Tablet issued to you as the Research Assistant.



Figure 1. Opening the App in Chrome.

2. ADDING A HOME SCREEN LINK

For convenience purposes, instead of always going back to the link provided to you via messenger or email, you may add a Home screen link. To do this, find and tap the three dots as shown in Figure 2 below. A menu will appear (Figure 3), tap Add to Home screen. Type "Individual" for individual respondents and "Association" for association respondents. You may opt to add automatically or drag the icon to your Home screen.



Figure 2. First step in adding a Home screen link.



Figure 3. Second step in adding a Home screen link.

3. NAVIGATING THROUGH THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Parts of the survey questionnaire were grouped according to its relevance. This too facilitates ease of browsing and makes you focus on a particular subject in the interview process. You can use the navigation buttons at the bottom of your Tablet's screen as shown in Figure 4. Alternatively, you can also use the menu icon as shown

in Figure 5 to view the grouping contents of the survey instrument. Please note that some parts are hidden and can only be shown based on the responses of prior data in the instrument.



Figure 5. Navigating the contents of the survey instrument using the menu icon.

4. RESPONDENT SIGNS THE INFORMED CONSENT FORM

In order to proceed with the interview, you should read and make sure that the Informed Consent Form (Figure 6) is understood by the respondent. If the respondent gives consent, he/she should sign in the space provided as shown in Figure 7. To clear the signing area, use the reset icon located at the bottom-left of the signing area as shown in Figure 8. You may confirm or cancel the action as shown in Figure 9. When

Next to return to the form. Tap done signing, just tap the to proceed to the next part of the survey.



Midterm Impact Assessment Study of Special Area for Agricultural Development (SAAD) Program

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

FUNDING AGENCY: Department of Agriculture - Special Area for Agricultural Development (DA-SAAD) IMPLEMENTING AGENCY: Don Mariano Marcos Memorial State University (La Union)

Project Leader: VP CYNTHIA M. RODRIGUEZ

COOPERATING AGENCY: Catanduanes State University (Catanduanes) Focal Person: NICCA AIRA A. MARQUEZ

Research Assistant: THELMA G. TENERIFE

Purpose of the Study

You are being asked to take part in a research study. Before you decide to participate in this study, it is important that you understand why the research is being done and what it will involve. This study generally aims to assess the Midterm Impact of the Special Area for Agricultural Development (SAAD) Program of the Department of Agriculture in attaining improved household food consumption, increased income, and improved economic status of their partner beneficiaries.

Figure 6. Informed Consent Form.

<i>I have rea provided that my p giving a r</i>	ad the provided information information and have have varticipation is voluntary a eason and without cost. I	on, or it has been rea d the opportunity to and that I am free to voluntarily agree to	<i>ad to me and l understand th ask questions. l understand withdraw at any time, withou take part in this study.</i>	e t
		Draw/Sign		
	_	→ Next	-	
	,	Powered by ENKĚTO		

Figure 7. Tap the Draw/Sign button for respondent's signature.



Figure 8. Clear or reset the signing area.



Figure 9. Confirm removal of signature.

5. MAPPING OF RESPONDENTS

The study intends to map all the respondents. To do this, just tap the button as shown in Figure 10 to get the actual coordinates of the actual data entry location. This function DOES NOT need internet connection. However, you need to ALLOW/ENABLE location services. In fact, you are prompted whether you allow or deny location services when you launch the survey instrument. You should always select ALLOW every time you get this prompt to make this function work.

Location Please tap the button below.		
	¢]
latitude (x.y °)		
longitude (x.y °)		
altitude (m)		

Figure 10. Respondent mapping.

6. SELECTING A DATE

Entering a birthdate on the survey app may be tricky to some users. This is rather easy. If you tap the field where you enter a date, a date picker will appear. Most likely, your respondents were born in the 1900s. To select the year, tap the year as shown in Figure 11. Scroll down and select the birth year (Figure 12). Tap SET to return to the calendar. Find and select the birth month as shown in Figure 13. Pick a day and tap SET.

Mobile Number 09567897865	2021 Th	u, <i>i</i>	٩pr	15	5			*
Date of Birth	<		A	oril 20	21		>	*
This field is requi		м						
Age								_
Computed automatica					8		10	
	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	
PLACE OF BIRTH	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	
Province	25	26	27	28	29	30		*
This field is requi	CLEA				CANC		SET	
City/Municipality								*

Figure 11. Selecting a year from the calendar.

Mobile Number	2021			*
09567897865	Thu, Apr 15	5		
Date of Birth	1964			*
	1965	5		
This field is requi	1966			
Age Computed automatical	1967			
	1968	}		
PLACE OF BIRTH	1969)		
Province	1970)		
This field is requi	CLEAR	CANCEL	SET	
City/Municipality				*

Figure 12. Scroll down to find the birth year.

09507897805	In	u, /	чрг	15)			
Date of Birth	<		A	pril 20	21		>	-
This field is regul		м						
Age						2	3	
Computed automatical	4	5	6		8	9	10	
	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	
PLACE OF BIRTH	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	
Province	25	26	27	28	29	30		
This field is requi								

Figure 13. Navigate and select the birth month.

7. SETTING UP THE REQUIRED YEARS OF RESPONSES

This part of the questionnaire should be given special attention. The example below illustrates how to set up the required years of responses based on the First Year of the SAAD Intervention. As shown in the figure (Figure 14), the respondent is a Farmer involved in crop production/processing/marketing and 2017 is the First Year when the intervention is received from SAAD.

esponde	nt Classification as many as applicable.
✔ Farm	ner 🗌 Fisherfolk
arming C	assification as many as applicable.
 Crop 	Livestock Poultry
ear Wher	CROP Intervention Received from SAAD
2017	0 2018

Figure 14. Setting up the applicable classification/s for each respondent.

From here, when you tap the button, you will be directed to the next figure below (Figure 15). Given the example above, if first SAAD intervention was received by the respondent in 2017, automatically, under the 'Select Year' field, 2016 will appear and should be the first group of questions to be answered as all information during this time are equally relevant. Some questions on this year may

not be applicable. You may refer to your spreadsheet file for annotations/comments for further guidance.

»	
Select Year To the Enumerator: I bottom of this page	Responses for each year is required. Please tap the add (+) button at the to provide a questionnaire for each year.
Select Crop	
RiceHigh-Valu	Corn 🔵 High-Value (Fruit) e (Vegetable) 🔵 Other

Figure 15. Selecting the year (2016) before SAAD intervention.

To minimize confusion and to ensure completeness of data gathered, before you start getting information 'Before SAAD' year, it is recommended that you first set-up or add a group of questions for the succeeding years using the plus [+] sign button as shown in Figure 16. In the example given above, 2016 is the 'Before SAAD'; hence, the addition of four more groups of questions for 2017-2020.



Figure 16. Adding a row/group of questions per year.

On the next set/group of questions, select the next year from the Select Year question as shown in Figure 17. Do this until you have set up all the years (Figure 18, 19 & 20). Notice the numbers on the right corner of your screen. Continue adding a set/group of questions until you have enough for all the years on the Select Year question. It is also possible that the respondent received two (2) or more interventions in a year. In this case, provide a group of questions to accommodate this scenario.



Figure 17. Selecting the second year (2017) on the Select Year question. The second year on the options is always the first year of SAAD intervention.



Figure 18. Selecting the third year (2018) on the Select Year question.



Figure 19. Selecting the fourth year (2019) on the Select Year question.



Figure 20. Selecting the fifth year (2020) on the Select Year question.

At the end of each group of questions, you notice a minus [-] sign. Tapping this icon will remove a group of questions. Please see Figure 21 below.



Figure 21. Removing a group of questions.

8. SAVE DRAFT AND SUBMIT

Only complete data can be submitted successfully! As highlighted in the survey tool, please give special attention to the group of questions [CROPS | LIVESTOCK | POULTRY | CAPTURE FISHERY | AQUACULTURE | IMPACTS] where you need to ask data for each year. While you may submit successfully without all the data which should be setup to accommodate all the years requiring responses, our team will check completeness of information and in case there is/are lacking data, it will be sent back to you. To avoid this inconvenience, prepare all the required years when you reach such a point in the interview. An alert will prompt you if you try to submit incomplete data. The system marks required fields/items in red. Please refer to Figure 23.



Figure 22. Save Draft and Submit functions.



Figure 23. Alert on submitting incomplete data.

It is highly recommended that you **finish and complete the data gathering** per respondent so that the data will queued for submission upon tapping SUBMIT button at the end of the interview (Figure 16). If you need to use the SAVE DRAFT function, please do so sparingly. You may find it hard to pull back your data for completion later on.



Figure 24. Record queued for submission notification.





To easily identify a draft record, it is highly suggested that you use the respondent's name when you are asked to enter a Record Name (Figure 26).

Save as Dra	ft	
Record Name This name allows you to easi	ly find your draft record to finish it lat	er.
Name of Responde	nţ	
	CANCEL	SAVE & CLOSE

Figure 26. Enter a record name for each draft.

9. FINISHING A "SAVE AS DRAFT" RECORD

There are two ways to view what is on the queue including your "Save as Draft " record/s. Please see Figure 27. Tap either of these to pull the Queue sidebar.



Figure 27. View what's on queue for submission and Save as Draft

Records saved as Draft appears on Queue with a pencil icon on each name as shown on the figure below (Figure 28). To finish and submit this record, just tap the record and wait to be reloaded on the survey form. It may take some time to reload.



Figure 28. Reloading a Save as Draft record for completion and submission.

Prepared by:

Midterm Impact Assessment Study Project Team

APPENDIX E

Certification Form Template

	CERTIFICATION
	Date:
Project Title:	MIDTERM IMPACT ASSESSMENT STUDY OF SPECIAL AREA FOR AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT (SAAD) PROGRAM
Implementing Agency:	Don Mariano Marcos Memorial State University
Project Leader:	Dr. Cynthia M. Rodriguez
Partner SUC:	
SUC Focal Person:	
This is to certify that (1), a resident of (2), is listed as a beneficiary of the Department of Agriculture under the SAAD Program, per 2017-2018 records of the SAAD National Project Management Office, however: has not received any SAAD intervention to datewaived the SAAD intervention during its distributionreceived the SAAD intervention only in 2019received the SAAD intervention only in 2020salready deceasedhas already relocated torefused to be interviewed for above-specified projectSigned this (3),day of (4), 2021.	

Attested true and correct:

Respondent (Signature over Printed Name or *Thumb mark) Barangay Captain (Signature over Printed Name)

Research Assistant (Signature over Printed Name) SUC Focal Person (Signature over Printed Name)

(1) Complete Name of Respondent, (2) Complete Address of Respondent, (3) Date and (4) Month the document was signed. "Thumb mark is only applicable for respondents who are not able to write. NOTE: Any household member may affix higher signature if respondent is deceased or has relocated to another municipality/province.

-

APPENDIX F

Focus Group Discussion Protocol

MIDTERM IMPACT ASSESSMENT OF THE SPECIAL AREA FOR AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT (SAAD) PROGRAM

ONLINE FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION (FGD)

OBJECTIVES

- 1. To obtain extensive information from the organizational perspective of project implementers.
- 2. To gain in-depth understanding of project implementers' insights, practices, and experiences.
- 3. To gather imperative inputs from implementers to substantiate the beneficiaries' responses.

FGD PARTICIPANTS, SCHEDULE, AND FACILITATORS/MODERATORS

There are 18 covered Provinces. The segmentation tables below will guide the SAAD Impact Assessment Team in determining the required participants, based on their roles and level of participation in the program implementation process. For each participant classification, two FGD sessions shall be conducted via Google Meet at a scheduled date and time. There will be a maximum of 10 participants per session and each session shall not exceed 60 minutes.

Participants	Islands/Region	Provinces
	<i>Luzon</i> CAR Region 5	Apayao Catanduanes, Masbate, Sorsogon
SAAD Regional and Provincial Focal	Visayas Region 7 Region 8	Negros Oriental, Siquijor Eastern Samar, Leyte, Northern Samar, Western Samar, Southern Leyte
LGU representatives	Mindanao Region 9 Region 10 Region 11 Region 12 ARMM	Zamboanga del Norte Bukidnon Davao de Oro North Cotabato, Saranggani, Sultan Kudarat Sulu

PRE-SESSION PREPARATION

- o (2mins) Moderator to check attendance, request recording for content/discourse analysis.
- (2mins) Moderator will explain the following FGD guidelines:
 - All cameras shall be turned on and microphones turned off during the 60-minute duration of the online FGD.
 - The FGD facilitator will ask a common question for all the participants.
 - When called, the participants shall unmute their microphones and start sharing their individual experiences and practices. When done, microphone should be muted back to give way for the next speaker.
 - If time to speak is over but you still want to raise a concern or add more details, please click the "raise hand" button and wait for your name to be called.
 - The focus of this online FGD is the programs of SAAD only.
- (4mins) Facilitator will acknowledge all the participants, deliver a short opening statement, and explain confidentiality concerns.

FACILITATION DURING THE SESSION

- Identified team members will record the meeting, troubleshoot IT-related issues, and take photos. Back-up recorders should also be prepared.
- Moderators will monitor the chat box for queries, concerns, and other information relayed by the participants. Non-verbal interactions shall be similarly observed.

FGD ELEMENTS FOR FACILITATORS

- o Everyone should take note and ensure even participation of all respondents.
- Facilitators should deliver careful wordings and maintain a neutral attitude.
- \circ $\,$ All observations should be noted and submitted to the team leader after the meeting.
- o After the meeting, the team will transcribe, analyze and interpret responses.

FGD GUIDE QUESTIONS

(Project Implementation Covered 2017-2020)

SAAD FRAMEWORI	K	RPM/PM	LGU
A. Program Management 1. Formulation of plans and budget 2. Procurement of supplies 3. Hiring of staff 4. Coordination with LGUs, agencies, and other stakeholders 5. Formulation and updating of manual of operations 6. Monitoring and evaluation 7. Conduct of meetings	ins and budget ulated and red ablished urement plans red staff at ncial, regional, national level inual of ations formulated updated ments vished & E system bished reting reports	How did you manage the implementation of the SAAD Program? How did you monitor and evaluate the implementation of the program in the region, provinces, and LGUs?	How did the SAAD program people coordinate with your office? What is your role in the implementation of the SAAD Program?
B. Social Preparation Component 1. Con organ capaci 1. Community organizing 2. Capability building (leadership, values formation, organizational development) 2. Cap partnet 3. Project orientation 4. Consulation workshops and meetings	mmunities nized and citated pacitated ier-beneficiaries	How did you prepare the community for the implementation of the SAAD programs? How did you determine the interventions appropriate to the needs of the beneficiaries?	Same as RPM/PM Same as RPM/PM
C. Production and Livelihood Component mach 1. Provision of agri-inputs, tools, machineries, facilities, & equipment 2. Provision of post- production facilities and equipment 3. Conduct of technical estab training	ri-inputs, tools, inneries, ties, and pment bluted st-production nineries and pment ibuted and blished	What livelihood interventions did you implement in the area? Are these appropriate?	Same as RPM/PM
D. Marketing Assistance and Enterprise Development Component 1. Local market study 2. Conduct of technical training on entrepreneurship 8 value-adding 3. Provision of logistics support 4. Audit of livelihood enterprises	ential markets fied and linkage lished mmunal nterprise lished and ng	How did you conduct local market study and what logistic support did you extend to the beneficiaries?	Same as RPM/PM How did you conduct and who did M&E?

CONCLUDING QUESTION:

On a scale of 1-5, 1 being the lowest and 5 being the highest, how confident are you that SAAD is championing its strategies to make it the leading agricultural development program and resource mobilization service of DA by 2022?

BEFORE THE SESSION ENDS:

- Facilitator give thanks to everyone for their time and cooperation.
- Moderator inform the group that they need to attend the second/last round of online FGD. Mention date and exact time.

FINAL LIST OF PARTICIPANTS:

FGD Session	Attendees
Session 1	BFAR Region XII - Laila Emperua / pmesbfar12@gmail.com
June 23, 2021	Regional Focal Person - Czarina M. Go / czarinago@gmail.com
	PFO North Cotabato - Joseph Albert Uluan / jalbert0528@yahoo.com and
	jauluan28@yahoo.com
	PFO Sultan Kudarat - Jeffrey I. Nuñez / bfar12pfosk@gmail.com
	PFO Sarangani - Gemma Chyrel G. Moreno / bfar12 aqua@vahoo.com.
	gemmachvrel@vahoo.com
Session 2	BFAR Region VIII - Cylet Lluz / bfarreight@yahoo.com, bfar8_phmd@yahoo.com,ph
June 28 2021	Levte – Julius Alpino, Julius Caballes / pfo levtenorth@gmail.com
buile 20, 2021	Southern Levte - Fervina M Avorque Anna Marie Sarsale / bfar8 pfomaasin@vahoo.com
	Samar - Vicenta Projimo Loreginia Briones Marlon Sale / nfosamar2021@gmail.com
	Eastern Samar - Nelia G. Tomayao. Rosalie Ortigosa / prosantai 2021 C. Sinantonii
	Northern Samar - Loreginia Briones Maida de la Cruz Nezzyl Tuba / hfarnfons@gmail.com
	hternfo@vahoo.com.ph
	DA-SAAD Region XII – Maimona Amil / saad darfo12@gmail.com
	amilmaimona01@gmail.com
	Sarangani - Agnes Du / aldu rak@yahoo.com
	North Cotabato - Jeremy Marpuri Elvira O Mendoza Jocelyn C Sugabo /
	said northeat @gmail.com anagneatabata@gmail.com
	DA SAAD Pagion XI Jaka Darran Calina, Naomi C. Lamata (da duo saad@gmail.com)
	BEAP CAP Michalle Paralta (manaralta 1726@vahoo com) Maynard Domingo
	(hforear@uaboo.com)
Session 2	(<u>Dialcal@yanoo.com</u>)
Session 5	Region V
June 50, 2021	Gene Flor Benavidez – Provincial Focal Person, Catanduanes
	Angle Veso - Provincial Focal Person, Masbate
G : 1	Christina Gabito - Provincial Focal Person, Sorsogon
Session 4	DA-SAAD Region VII
July 1, 2021	Gerry S. Avila – Chief, Field Operations Division / gerravil@gmail.com
	Aurea M. Madrio – Regional Focal Person / madriojake2018@gmail.com
	Leizl S. Pagaran – Regional Report Office / saadregion7@gmail.com
	PATCO Negros Oriental / saadnegoriental@gmail.com
	Sarah J. Perocho – APCO Negros Oriental
	Bernard S. Limbaga – SAAD Provincial Focal Person
	Johnpaulie O. Sunico – SAAD Coordinator
	Karl C. Cabonelas – SAAD IT
	Marcelina U. Cabonelas – SAAD Area Coordinator
	PATCO Signijor / saadsignijor@gmail.com
	Gregolito Bunado - APCO Signijor
	Agnos Guanalla M. Cafá – Provincial Coordinator
	Agnes Guanenia IVI. Care – Provincial Coordinator
	Ladylyn B. Maningo – SAAD II

APPENDIX G

List of Secondary Data from SAAD NPMSO and BFAR

	Document Name
	NPMO Reports
1.	FY 2017 - 2018 Consolidated List of Individual Beneficiaries:
	List of Livelihood Project per beneficiary for DA SAAD
2.	FY 2017 - 2018 Consolidated List of Group Beneficiaries
	List of Livelihood Project per beneficiary for DA SAAD
3.	FY 2017 - 2018 Consolidated List of Individual Beneficiaries:
	List of Livelihood Project per beneficiary for BFAR SAAD
4.	FY 2017 - 2018 Consolidated List of Group Beneficiaries
	List of Livelihood Project per beneficiary for BFAR SAAD
5.	DA-SAAD Details of Specialized Training FY 2017 - 2018 Accomplishment
6.	BFAR-SAAD Details of Specialized Training FY 2017 - 2018 Accomplishment
	Annual Reports
7.	SAAD 2017 Annual Report
8.	SAAD 2018 Annual Report
9.	SAAD 2019 Annual Report
10.	SAAD 2020 Annual Report
11.	SAAD 2021 Annual Report
	Program Management
12.	SAAD Program Operational Manual
13.	SAAD NPMO Human Resource Operations Manual
14.	PERSPECTIVE: SAAD's Capacity to view things on Agriculture and Fishery in their
	relations and relative importance
15.	Agricultural Extension and Communication: A Theoretical Guide to Social Preparation
	of the Special Area for Agricultural Development (SAAD) Program
16.	The Perseverance: 2020 Synopsis of DA-SAAD Projects: A Compendium
17.	Eligibility Requirements to be a SAAD Beneficiary
18.	DA Memorandum Circular No. 04 Series of 2019: Implementing Guidelines of the
	Special Area for Agricultural Development (SAAD) Program for 2019-2022 (April 10,
10	
19.	DA Memorandum Circular No. 15 Series of 2019: Implementing Guidelines of the
	Special Area for Agricultural Development (SAAD) Program for FY 2020-2022
- 20	(November 5, 2019)
20.	DA Memorandum: Refocusing of SAAD FY 2020 Funds in Response to RA 11469
	(Bayaninan to Hear as One Act) Re: The Plant Plant Plant and Raise Raise Raise
21	Program of DA (March 51, 2020)
21.	Areas which are covered by the PCEE (August 5, 2020)
22	DA Special Order No. 105 Series of 2021: Creation of National Management Team
22.	(NMT) and Regional Management Teams (RMTS) for the Special Area for
	A gricultural Development (SAAD) Program – Rureau of A gricultural Research (RAR)
	Research for Development (R4D) Program Partnershin (February 1, 2021)
23.	DA Memorandum: Implementing Guidelines of the Special Area for Agricultural

	Development (SAAD) Program for Swine Repopulation Support (April 26, 2021)
24.	DA Memorandum: Reiteration on SAAD Implementation for RCEF Covered Areas
	from FY 2021-2022 (June 22, 2021)
25.	Memorandum for the Secretary in FY 2021-2022 SAAD NPMO Contract of Service
	(COS) Positions and Basis for New Hiring and Renewal
26.	Administrative Order on Revised Guidelines on the Selection, Hiring and Adoption of
	Compensation System for Contract of Service Personnel for January 2020
27.	Memorandum on Approval on the Renewal and Additional Hiring of Regional and
	Provincial SAAD Personnel
28.	Approved Extension for Region 8 Submission of SAADventure
29.	Memorandum for Secretary on Transfer of the SAAD National Program Management
	Office (NPMO) to the Office Space to Vacated by PHILFIDA
30.	Memorandum for the Secretary in Authority on the Approval for the Renewal and
	Additional Hiring of Regional and Provincial SAAD Personnel
31.	Special Order on Authority to Conduct the FY 2022 Special Area for Agricultural
	Development (SAAD) Program National Planning and Budget Workshop
32.	Authority to Renew Contract of Service Personnel Under Special Area for Agricultural
	Development (SAAD) RFO 12 for January to December 2020
33.	Memorandum on Consultative Meeting for FY 2020 Direction Setting and FY 2021
24	Planning
34.	Special Order on Detail and Designation of MYER G. MULA, Ph.D. as Program
	Director of National Program Management Office, Special Area for Agriculture
25	Development (Program, Director, NPMO, SAAD)
<u> </u>	Memorandum on Highlights of the DA SAAD Online Meeting (June 20, 2020) and the
50.	READ SAAD Online Meeting (June 25, 2020)
37	Memorandum on Implementation of the 50% Work on Site (WOS) Potation as
57.	Alternative Work Arrangement (AWA) and Mandatory 5 day Quarantine Period (OP)
	for all Personnel who will return form an Official Travel
38	Letter to Hon, Elisa T, Kho
39.	Memorandum on Refocusing of SAAD FY 2020 Funds using the 3-6-9 DA-SAAD
071	Approach and Weekly Report
40.	Memorandum on Fast-Track Hiring of Information Officer/s for SAAD RPMSO
	and/or PPMSOS
41.	Memorandum for Hiring of Information Officer/s for SAAD RPMSO and/or PPMSOs
	in DA-RFO V
42.	Memorandum on Invitation to Participate on the Scheduled House Committee on Rural
	Development Online Meeting
43.	Memorandum on Meeting on the FY 2020 1 st Semester Accomplishment of SAAD
	Program
44.	Memorandum on Online Meeting on the FY 2020 Physical and Financial
	Accomplishment, FY 2021 Budget Execution Documents (BEDs) and other Reports of
	SAAD Program
45.	Memorandum on Submission of Proposed Hiring for Regional SAAD FY 2021
	Contract of Service (COS)
46.	Memorandum on Deadline of Submission for Obligation Request and Status (ORS)
47.	Memorandum for the Secretary on Request for the Immediate Renewal of SAAD
40	Program Contract of Service (COS) Staff
48.	Memorandum in Designation of Jemiema D.R. Arro as Head of the NPMO

	Administrative & Procurement Unit
49.	Minute of the Meeting April 2020
50.	Memorandum of Agreement – Secondment of DR. MYER G. MULA
51.	Memorandum from the Secretary in Notice of Work Suspension on July 20-24 2020 at
	the Department of Agriculture – Central Office
52.	Memorandum for the Secretary in Update on the Matrix of the Secretary's Directives
	from DA Management Committee Meeting
53.	Memorandum on Implementing Guidelines on the Special Area for Agricultural
	Development (SAAD) Program and the Bureau of Agricultural Research (BAR)
	Research for Development (R4D) Program Partnership
54.	Special Area for Agricultural Development (SAAD) Program Infomercial
55.	SAAD National Management Office (NPMO) Public Relations (PR) and
	Communications (Comms) Officers and Regional Information Officers (IO) Video
	Conference Meeting
56.	Memorandum from the Secretary in Designation of the Special Area for Agricultural
	Development (SAAD) Program Directorate as DA's Focal in the Inter-Agency
	Technical Working Group in the Preparation of the Philippine Multisectoral Nutrition
	Project
57.	Special Order in Authority to Conduct the FY 2022 Special Area for Agricultural
	Development (SAAD) Program National Planning and Budget Workshop
58.	Special Order in Amendment to Special Order No. 439, Series of 2020 "Creation of the
	Organizational Structure for the Special Area for Agricultural Development (SAAD)
	Program"
59.	Special Order in Creation of the Organizational Structure for the Special Area for
<u> </u>	Agricultural Development (SAAD) Program
60.	Special Order in Authority to Conduct the SAAD Technical Writing Workshop
61.	Special Order in Designation of DA BALIK PROBINSIYA, BAGONG PAG-ASA
()	(BP2) Program Team Focals
62.	Special Order in Designation of Mr. Ulysses Jr. as Deputy Program Director, National Drogram Management Office, Special Area for Agricultural Development (SAAD)
	Program
63	Momorandum in SAAD Program Organizational Structure
64 64	Memorandum on Implementation of the 50% Work on Site (WOS) Potation as
04.	Alternative Work Arrangement (AWA) and Mandatory 5 day Quarantine Period (OP)
	for all Personnel who will return form an Official Travel
65	Memorandum in Crafting of SAAD Newsletter and Intensifying the Dissemination of
05.	SAAD Press Releases or Articles
66.	Memorandum in Information on Established and Developing SAAD Agricultural and
001	Fisheries Enterprises for Press Releases
67.	Memorandum in Production of the SAADventures Publication
68.	Memorandum in SAADventures Policies and Guidelines
69.	Memorandum in Submission of All Data Requirements form SAAD IT
	RPMSO/PPMSO to SAAD NPMO IT & Database Sub-Unit
70.	Memorandum in Submission of Requested BFAR-SAAD Documents
71.	Memorandum in Updated SAAD Editorial Policies and Guidelines
72.	Memorandum in Updated Schedule of SAADventures Publications
73.	Advisory on the DA SAAD Technical Writing Workshop
74.	Memorandum in Weekly Submission of Digital Monitoring Form
75.	Memorandum in Last of Submission to the Accounting Division of Disbursement

	Vouchers (DVs) Covering Claims for CY 2020
76.	Memorandum in Project Proposals for TIKA
77.	Memorandum in Printing of 2019 SAAD Annual Report for BFAR-SAAD
78.	Memorandum in Printing of 2019 SAAD Annual Report for DA-SAAD
79.	Memorandum in Printing SAADventures Publication (Volume 2, Issue No. 1) feat.
	Cordillera Administrative Region (CAR)
80.	Memorandum in Printing SAADventures Publication (Volume 2, Issue No. 2) feat.
	Bicol Region
81.	Memorandum in Production of One-Paper Infographics of the SAAD Program under COVID-19 Situation
82.	Memorandum for the Secretary in Refocusing of SAAD FY 20120 Activities to
	Sustain Food Security in the Country Amidst COVID-19
83.	Memorandum in Request for Printing of SAAD National Program Management Office's (NPMO) Publications in Region 7
84.	Memorandum in Request for Printing of SAAD National Program Management
	Office's (NPMO) Publications in Region 9
85.	Memorandum in Request for Printing of SAAD National Program Management
	Office's (NPMO) Publications in Region 11
86.	Memorandum in Required Information for Writing a SAAD Press Release
87.	Response Letter to DA RFO 10 about SAADventures Region 10's Extension of
	Success stories
88.	Memorandum in Submission of Narrative Report of FY 2019 Accomplishment and
	Case Studies of Developed Enterprises for Annual Report in BFAR-SAAD
89.	Memorandum in Submission of Narrative Report of FY 2019 Accomplishment and
	Case Studies of Developed Enterprises for Annual Report in DA-SAAD
90.	Memorandum from the Secretary in Use of FPA-Issued List of Prices for the
	Procurement of Fertilizers by Region and Province
1	Social Preparation
91.	SAAD Social Preparation Guidebook
92.	SAAD Communications Strategies and Guidelines
93.	Special Order in Amendment to Special Order No. 696 Series of 2020 Re: Authority to
	Conduct the Special Area for Agricultural Development (SAAD) Program Social
04	Preparation
94.	Letter Marginal Note Agricultural Extension and Communication: A Theoretical Guide
05	Memorandum in Rescheduled Orientation for SAAD Public Palations and
95.	Communications Officers
96	Memorandum in Review of Social Preparation Guide Book
97	Memorandum in SAAD Guidelines on Service Continuity for the SAAD NPMO
27.	Starting August 2020
	Production and Livelihood
98.	Memorandum in Conduct of Field Monitoring Activities Per Province for Writing of
	Success Stories
99.	Memorandum in Conduct of Field Monitoring Activities Per Province for Writing of
	Success Stories
100.	Memorandum in Complementation of SAAD and 4Ks Interventions
101.	Memorandum in Printing of SAAD Brochure
102.	Memorandum in Establishment of BPI-Accredited Enterprise -Crop Nurseries (Seeds
	and Seedlings) Through SAAD Farmer Associations
	Marketing Assistance and Enterprise Development
------	--
103.	Establishment of BPI-Accredited Enterprise-based Crop Nurseries (Seeds and
	Seedlings) through SAAD Farmer Associations
104.	Memorandum for the Secretary in Establishment of Multiplier Farm-Based Enterprises
	(Livestock and Poultry Production) Through SAAD Farmer Associations

APPENDIX H

Reasons for Exclusion as Sample Respondents

Appendix Table H1. Reasons for Exclusion as Sample Farmer Respondent							
Province	No	Has not	Waived the	Received	Deceased/	Refused to	Others
	Respondent	Received	SAAD	the	Relocated	be	
	Class /	Any	intervention	intervention		Interviewed	
	Production	Intervention		only in			
	Data/ Impact			2020/2021			
	Data/						
	Intervention						
Apayao				5			
Catanduanes				1			
Masbate							
Sorsogon		23		26	16	2	5
Negros		14					
Oriental							
Northern	14	13					
Samar							
Western		2					
Samar							
Southern	1			2			
Leyte							
Compostela	5						
Valley							
North	1	34	1	4	18	15	12
Cotabato							
Sarangani					7	4	6
Total	21	87	1	38	41	21	23

. div Tabla U1 D la Da an Daan an dan t -. . 1. C

Appendix Table H2. Reasons for Exclusion as Sample Fisherfolk Respondent

Province	No Respondent Class / Production Data/ Impact Data	Has not Received Any Intervention	Received the intervention only in 2020/2021	Refused to be interviewed
Catanduanes			1	
Sorsogon		1	1	
Northern Samar	2	1		
Western Samar	28	1		
Southern Leyte	1	6		
North Cotabato			2	4
Zamboanga del Norte	1	4		
Total	32	13	4	4

Appendix Table H3. Reasons for Exclusion as Sample Farmers Association Respondent

Province	Reason	Number of cases
North Cotabato	Refused to be Interviewed	7
Negros Oriental	Project not yet implemented	5

APPENDIX I

Photo Documentations



Inception Meeting (January 6, 2021)



Meeting with Project Consultant Dr. Cynthia Bantilan (January 21, 2021)



Courtesy Call with Apayao State College President



Courtesy Call to SAAD Apayao Provincial Office



Interview with the Barangay Captain of Brgy. Emiliana, Santa Marcela, Apayao



Interview with a pilot study respondent in Luna, Apayao by Cynthia Rodriguez and Mabel Caccam



Interview with a pilot study respondent in Luna, Apayao by Rolyne Pajarillo



Interview with a pilot study respondent in Luna, Apayao by Keneth Bayani



Interview with a pilot study respondent in Luna, Apayao by Rufo Baro



Research Assistants' Orientation and Training (April 7, 2021)



Focus Group Discussion with Region XI (June 28, 2021)



Focus Group Discussion with BFAR Region V (June 30, 2021)



Focus Group Discussion with DA RFO7 (July 1, 2021)



Meeting with Focal Persons and Research Assistants (September 16, 2021)



Focus Group Discussion with Negros Oriental



Focus Group Discussion with Leyte



Focus Group Discussion with Catanduanes



Interview with Joel Furio, a beneficiary of duck-raising intervention in Sta. Magdalena, Sorsogon



Interview with Alex Solomon a beneficiary of oyster farming intervention in Pilar, Sorsogon



Interview with Rose Deocariza a beneficiary of vegetable production intervention in Juban, Sorsogon



Interview with Vidal Retoma a beneficiary of vegetable and upland rice intervention in Juban, Sorsogon



Initial Presentation of Study Results (December 28, 2021)