

PIN-ACU-224

**GEM PROGRAM IMPACT  
ASSESSMENT SURVEY 2000  
FINAL REPORT**

Prepared By:

Domingo M. Non, Ph.D.  
Wilfred D. Bidad, MSc  
MINDANAO STATE UNIVERSITY FOUNDATION, INC.  
General Santos City, Philippines

for the

UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT  
GROWTH WITH EQUITY IN MINDANAO (GEM) PROGRAM  
Davao City, Philippines

April 2000

A

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Executive Summary .....	i
1. Background and Rationale .....	1
1.1 The GEM Program.....	1
1.2 Assessing the Impact of the GEM Program .....	2
2. The MSUFI Survey 2000 .....	3
2.1 Objectives of the Survey .....	3
2.2 Design and Pre-Testing of Questionnaires.....	3
2.3 Sampling Design.....	5
2.4 Data Collection.....	6
2.5 Reduced Sample Size.....	7
2.6 Data Encoding and Processing .....	9
3. Survey Results and Analysis.....	9
3.1 GEM's Impact on Farmer/Fisher Beneficiaries....	9
3.2 GEM's Impact on Business Enterprises .....	17
3.3 Secondary Beneficiaries of GEM Projects .....	19
3.4 Impact of Infrastructure Projects .....	21
3.5 Non-Income Contribution of GEM Projects .....	24
4. Summary of Key Findings.....	25
4.1 Highlights of Survey Results.....	25
4.2 Survey 2000 vs. Survey 1998 .....	26

## ANNEXES

Annex A	Survey Data on Farm-Based Projects
Annex B	Survey Data on Enterprise Projects
Annex C	Survey Data on Infrastructure Projects
Annex D	Survey Data on Secondary Beneficiaries
Annex E	Sample Survey Questionnaires

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Growth with Equity in Mindanao (GEM) Program is a technical assistance program funded by a grant from the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and implemented through a USAID contract with Louis Berger International, Inc. The program, which began its operations in October 1995, aims to accelerate economic growth in Mindanao, and help ensure that the benefits of growth are widely distributed among the people of Mindanao, especially those belonging to marginal economic sectors.

In pursuit of this goal, GEM has initiated or assisted during a period of four years over 500 projects in a range of agribusiness and industrial sectors. GEM reports that, as of September 1999, 319 of these projects are "on-the-ground" (that is, actual investments have been made) and are still active. They include contract growing, market linkage, agribusiness, SMEs and infrastructure projects and are located all over the island.

GEM and USAID management felt that the positive response of the GEM program's target clients and cooperating organizations, as well as the results of its internal monitoring, indicate the success of the program. Nevertheless, the need to develop a method for quantifying the "equity" portion of the program has been recognized earlier on. It was important to know whether or not the GEM program was actually contributing to employment generation and to improvement of family incomes, particularly in the countryside.

In late 1997, the Mindanao State University-General Santos City Foundation, Inc. (MSUFI) was hired by USAID as an independent subcontractor to implement a sampling survey on the "Quantitative Assessment of the Effects of the GEM Program on Farming/Fishing Families in Mindanao." The survey project developed and implemented a survey instrument to provide accurate information on the number and type of GEM beneficiaries and changes in their employment, family income and general "well-being" that could be attributable to the program's assistance. This rapid appraisal survey covered a sample of 88 GEM-assisted projects and interviewed key persons and a total opportunity sample of 543 program beneficiaries/clients in as many of the projects as could be contacted. The survey results generally indicated that GEM was, indeed, significantly contributing to employment generation and income improvement among its beneficiaries.

The GEM program is now well on its last two years of operation. Two years after the MSU survey, GEM reports that the number of projects the program

has assisted has increased almost threefold. Economic conditions in Mindanao, however, have changed. During the last two years, Mindanao has not escaped several well-documented constraints operating in the business and agribusiness environment in the Philippines and Southeast Asia, in general. These constraints on business development include the following: extreme climatic conditions of El Niño and La Niña limiting both agricultural and fisheries development; an economic recession severely limiting anticipated local and outside investment in the area and availability of credit to participants; and an increase in peace and order problems in some areas of Mindanao, undercutting planned development of agricultural resources. These may have affected the level of investments and viability of business projects in the island, including those that have received GEM assistance. While it is hypothesized that GEM has benefited more people over time, the importance of measuring the program's impact had once again come to the fore.

For this purpose, GEM contracted the MSUFI to conduct a second round of survey to assess the latest impact of the GEM program on its target beneficiaries. The objectives, methodology and expected outputs of this survey were very similar to those of the MSUF survey in 1998. In fact, the latest survey built upon the results and the experience of implementing that first survey.

The MSUF Survey 2000 was implemented between February and March 2000. The survey was able to reach 150 (79%) of a target sample of 190 GEM-assisted projects. These included 59 coop-based projects, 64 plant/enterprise-based, and 27 infrastructure projects. A total opportunity sample of 746 respondents were interviewed. In addition, a sample of 28 secondary beneficiaries of some of these projects were also reached. A number of factors prevented the survey of 40 projects and the interview of some project participants/employees, including the unavailability of key informants for interview, difficult physical access to the project sites, critical peace and order situation, and inoperation of some projects.

Based on a sample of 746 respondents participating in 150 GEM-assisted projects throughout Mindanao, following are the key indications of program impact:

- There are 5,646 farmer/fisher households presently participating in the 59 farm-based projects surveyed. About 23% of these are women, 18% are Muslims, and 15% are indigenous people. Despite the greater number of sample projects in the latest survey, there is a reduction in the number of participants in the farm-based projects surveyed as

compared to the previous survey. The 1998 survey reported 9,198 participating farmer/fisher households. This indicates that the average number of participants per project decreased from 204 in 1998 to 97 in 2000. Women's participation in GEM projects slightly increased, while Muslim and indigenous community participation remained almost the same.

- There is a significant increase in the average annual income reported by both the coop leaders/key informants of the 59 farm-based projects surveyed and the 364 sample participants of these projects. The coop leaders estimated the average income of project participants increasing by 183% from a pre-project level of PhP241,292 to PhP683,840. For the 53 non-agroforestry projects, they estimated average income to have increased by 163% from PhP267,046 to PhP702,167.
- The sample participants had a more conservative view of their income levels, estimating lower pre- and post-project incomes than the coop leaders did. Because of the lower baseline income, however, the resulting percentage income changes are higher. They reported their average pre-project income of PhP68,792 for all projects rising by 392% to PhP338,909. For non-agroforestry projects, their average income increased by 371% from PhP68,575 to PhP323,526. The average increase in reported farm-based income is lower this year for all projects (compared to 523% in 1998) but higher for non-agroforestry projects (compared to 164% two years ago).
- A total of 11,007 jobs were directly generated by the 150 projects surveyed (including 3,349 farm-based, 5,226 enterprise-based, and 2,432 infrastructure project-based jobs). More jobs were reported this year, with the average number of jobs per farm-based project significantly increasing to 64, from 13 in 1998. There was a slight reduction in the average number of jobs per plant/enterprise-based project, from 83 in 1998 to 82 this year.
- The average annual income of sample employees in the 64 plant/enterprise-based projects surveyed increased by 30% from a pre-project level of PhP36,924 to PhP48,089, while the total value of employee income and benefits improved by 24%. The improvement in enterprise-based employee income is higher this year but for the total income and benefits, the latest survey results indicate the same magnitude of change as in 1998.

- The average income of farmer-beneficiaries of 16 surveyed WB Social Fund infrastructure projects was reported to increase by 122% from PhP31,976 to PhP70,957.
- Some 16,100 secondary beneficiaries derive employment and income benefits from either replicating or linking with the surveyed GEM projects. This number is less than the 38,978 reported in 1998.

Following are the main problems mentioned by the beneficiaries of GEM-assisted projects in the implementation of their projects:

- Natural calamities, particularly the prolonged effects of El Niño and La Niña on agricultural production in Mindanao;
- Lack of capital/credit facilities, which constrained agricultural expansion activities of local cooperatives. The financial crisis that hit the Philippines and Southeast Asia also hurt many GEM-assisted agri-based and enterprise projects that either contracted their operations or stalled their operations;
- Failure/Stalling of joint ventures;
- Rising production costs;
- Falling market demand;
- Lack of access to improved technology; and
- Poor infrastructure facilities (e.g., transport and communications) in some areas in Mindanao, which made it difficult for local producers to improve the marketing of their products.

# **1 BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE**

## **1.1 The GEM Program**

The Growth with Equity in Mindanao (GEM) Program is a technical assistance program funded by a grant from the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and implemented through a USAID contract with Louis Berger International, Inc. The program, which began its operations in October 1995, has the following goals:

- Accelerate economic growth in Mindanao, and help ensure that the benefits of growth are widely distributed among the people of Mindanao;
- Focus on development of private enterprise, essential infrastructure, and needed policy changes; to work with producers' associations and cooperatives, NGOs, chambers of commerce, local and national government agencies, small and medium scale businesses, financial institutions, donor agencies and other working to bring about equitably distributed economic growth in Mindanao;
- Help ensure that all groups in Mindanao participate in Mindanao's economic progress, with particular focus on religious and cultural minorities; and
- Provide limited "deal-specific" financial support on a cost-sharing basis for technical assistance and training to producers' groups and organizations working toward equitably distributed economic growth in Mindanao.

Many of the GEM program activities focus on enterprise development assistance. These include mainly technical assistance in market identification and access, joint venture matching, technology transfer and training, and financial packaging to producers' associations, cooperatives, investors and small and medium enterprises. GEM also provides assistance to chambers of commerce and other business support organizations in investment promotion and project facilitation. In addition, GEM provides technical assistance in policy research and advocacy that will lead to modification and improvement of government policies to make them more responsive to promoting investments and economic development in Mindanao.

In pursuit of the abovementioned goals, GEM has initiated or assisted during a period of four years over 500 projects in a range of agribusiness and industrial sectors. GEM reports that, as of September 1999, 319 of these projects are "on-the-ground" (that is, actual investments have been made) and are still active. They include contract growing, market linkage, agribusiness, SMEs and infrastructure projects and are located all over the island.

## **1.2 Assessing the Impact of the GEM Program**

### **1.2.1 The MSUFI Survey 1998**

GEM and USAID management felt that the positive response of the GEM program's target clients and cooperating organizations, as well as the results of its internal monitoring, indicate the success of the program. Nevertheless, the need to develop a method for quantifying the "equity" portion of the program has been recognized earlier on. It was important to know whether or not the GEM program was actually contributing to employment generation and to improvement of family incomes, particularly in the countryside.

In late 1997, the Mindanao State University-General Santos City Foundation, Inc. (MSUFI) was hired by USAID as an independent subcontractor to implement a sampling survey on the "Quantitative Assessment of the Effects of the GEM Program on Farming/Fishing Families in Mindanao." The survey project developed and ran a survey instrument to provide accurate information on the number and type of GEM beneficiaries and changes in their employment, family income and general "well-being" that could be attributable to the program's assistance. This rapid appraisal survey covered 88 of the target 127 active projects assisted by GEM two years after the start of its operations. Between December 1997 and January 1998, the survey team interviewed key persons and a total opportunity sample of 543 program beneficiaries/clients in as many of the projects as could be contacted. The survey results generally indicated that GEM was, indeed, significantly contributing to employment generation and income improvement among its beneficiaries. (Copies of the MSUFI Report on this survey are available at the GEM Program Management Office in Davao City for reference.)

### **1.2.2 Tracking the Gains of the Program**

The GEM program is now well on its last two years of operation. Two years after the MSU survey, GEM reports that the number of projects the program has assisted has increased almost threefold. Economic conditions in Mindanao, however, have changed. During the last two years, Mindanao has not escaped

several well-documented constraints operating in the business and agribusiness environment in the Philippines and Southeast Asia, in general. These constraints on business development include the following: extreme climatic conditions of El Niño and La Niña limiting both agricultural and fisheries development; an economic recession severely limiting anticipated local and outside investment in the area and availability of credit to participants; and an increase in peace and order problems in some areas of Mindanao, undercutting planned development of agricultural resources. These may have affected the level of investments and viability of business projects in the island, including those that have received GEM assistance. While it is hypothesized that GEM has benefited more people over time, the importance of measuring the program's impact has once again come to the fore.

For this purpose, GEM has again contracted (after competitive bidding) the MSUFI to conduct a second round of survey to assess the latest impact of the GEM program on its target beneficiaries.

## **2 THE MSUFI SURVEY 2000**

### **2.1 Objectives of the Survey**

The objectives, methodology and expected outputs of this survey were very similar to those of the MSUF survey in 1998. In fact, the latest survey built upon the results and the experience of running that first survey.

In close coordination with GEM, the MSUFI was tasked to implement a set of survey instruments (which were developed by GEM and USAID) that will provide accurate information on the following:

- Number of GEM program beneficiaries;
- Type of beneficiaries (e.g., farmers, fisherfolk, women, members of religious/cultural minorities, etc.);
- Socioeconomic background of beneficiaries;
- Changes in individual and family incomes;
- Other changes indicative of improvements in "well-being"; and
- Anecdotal information on improvements in "well-being."

### **2.2 Design and Pre-Testing of Questionnaires**

The MSUFI research team implemented the survey using the following set of survey forms developed by GEM/USAID:

- Survey Form #1:* Key Informant/Cooperative Leader (one respondent per beneficiary group participating in the project);
- Survey Form #2:* Participating Household Beneficiaries (up to 8 respondents per participating beneficiary group in each project);
- Survey Form #3:* Business Enterprise Owners/Managers (one respondent per project);
- Survey Form #4:* Plant/Business Enterprise Employees (up to 6 respondents among the additional workers hired under the project and/or existing employees benefitting from the project);
- Survey Form #5:* Infrastructure Project Key Informant/Proponent (one respondent per project);
- Survey Form #6:* Infrastructure Project Beneficiary Household (up to 6 respondents per project); and
- Survey Form #7:* Secondary Beneficiaries Interview (a sample of respondents referred by the coop leader, enterprise owner/manager or infrastructure key informant).

Survey Forms 1 to 4 are very similar to those used in the 1998 survey and were, in fact, revised versions of the previous ones. GEM developed three new survey instruments (i.e., Forms 3 to 7) to gather data on infrastructure projects and a sample of secondary beneficiaries. Annex E presents sample questionnaire forms.

The MSUFI research team and SOCKSARGEN survey team participated in the pre-testing of the questionnaires in General Santos City on February 9, 2000. The GEM survey adviser (Ms. Kay Calavan) and program evaluation specialist (Mr. Ronald Sison) finalized and reproduced the survey forms (with the help of the GEM area offices) immediately after the discussion of the results of the pre-test and the joint GEM-MSUFI training/orientation on February 10-11, 2000 also in General Santos. The MSUFI research team, SOCKSARGEN survey team, and the other area team leaders participated in the two-day training program. On the GEM side, the area heads and research assistants in-charge of the projects to be surveyed attended the workshop. This

exercise also gave the GEM and MSUFI counterparts to discuss their respective area survey schedules, resource and coordination requirements. After the training, the MSUFI conducted its own echo training among its different area survey teams.

### **2.3 Sampling Design**

The survey respondents were chosen from the target 190 on-the-ground projects assisted by GEM. GEM provided the MSUFI research team with a final list of these candidate projects for the survey. It is the understanding of the research team that the final list had gone through a series of shortlisting by the GEM management and area offices, who carefully evaluated the need and practicality of surveying them with due consideration to accessibility, availability of proponents, status of the projects (whether still active or failed/stalled), and peace and order situation in the project sites.<sup>1</sup>

As in the 1998 survey, the same basic sampling design was adopted for the latest survey. The cooperative leaders, enterprise owners/managers and infrastructure project key informants who were available were interviewed. Best efforts were made to interview a target opportunity sample of 8 farmer/fisher beneficiaries per agri-based project and 6 employees per enterprise project. The GEM area offices were again instrumental in facilitating the MSUFI survey teams' access to the target respondents. GEM arranged the survey schedules with the project proponents and beneficiaries, provided adequate background information on the projects (e.g., project profiles), made the necessary introductions, assisted in the logistical requirements (e.g., advising the survey teams on transport requirements), facilitated the entry into the project sites, and accompanied the survey teams during the actual surveys. This assistance was critical in enabling the MSUFI teams to complete the survey within the tight schedule of three weeks.

For agri-based projects, the coop leaders were asked to identify a random set of "more active" and "less active" participants in their respective projects. The survey team interviewed the respondents either at the project site or at an appointed venue (when going to the site was inconvenient and unsafe).

For plant/enterprise-based projects, the MSUFI survey teams went to the plant/office and randomly picked the interviewees from among the employees

---

<sup>1</sup> GEM will prepare a separate report on the profile and impact of the 129 projects that were not included in the final survey list, using data from the GEM internal monitoring system.

there (i.e., only those identified by the owner/manager as being new workers hired for the project or previous employees now benefiting from the project).

For infrastructure projects, the key informant was asked to identify participants in the project and/or users of the infrastructure facilities. The survey teams then picked out at random the beneficiary respondents who were available for interview.

Coop leaders, enterprise owners/managers and infrastructure project key informants were also asked at the end of the interviews to identify possible secondary beneficiary groups who either replicated the GEM-assisted project or were linked to it. The survey teams randomly selected from these referrals and interviewed a limited sample.

## **2.4 Data Collection**

Given the number of projects to be covered and the limited timeframe for the survey, simultaneous surveys in all the GEM clusters throughout Mindanao were done by the MSUFI research team. One team leader was assigned for each of the seven cluster areas. Each cluster survey team had an average membership of five enumerators each, with the team leaders also doing interviews. Particularly in the sites with higher concentration of but more dispersed projects, some survey teams were divided into sub-teams to cover more ground in less time.

For the survey, the MSUFI tapped its network in the following areas for survey implementation and coordination:

- MSU-General Santos City (to cover the SOCKSARGEN and Davao areas);
- MSU-Iligan and MSU-Naawan (to cover the Greater Northern Corridor area);
- MSU-Jolo and MSU-Tawi Tawi (to cover the Western Mindanao area);
- MSU-Marawi (to cover the Central Mindanao area); and
- MSU-GSC and local affiliates (to cover the Northwestern Mindanao and Caraga areas).

Throughout the course of survey implementation, MSUFI worked closely with the GEM-PMO in Davao City and with the respective GEM area offices in the following areas:

- Davao City (for the Davao Gulf cluster area);
- General Santos City (for the SOCSKSARGEN cluster area);
- Cotabato City (for the Central Mindanao cluster area);
- Cagayan de Oro City (for the Greater Northern Corridor cluster area);
- Butuan City (for the Caraga cluster area);
- Zamboanga City (for the Western Mindanao cluster area); and
- Dipolog City (for the Northwestern Mindanao cluster area).

During the three-week survey proper, the MSUFI core research team visited the different areas to monitor the progress of the simultaneous surveys, coordinate with GEM, and provide “troubleshooting” advice to the cluster survey teams. The accomplished survey questionnaires were first checked by the survey team leaders before leaving the project sites, clarifications made with the interviewees (when necessary), and edited before being sent to the MSUFI headquarters in General Santos City for encoding.

## **2.5 Reduced Sample Size**

Despite best efforts to reach all the projects in the survey list, only 150 (79%) of the target 190 GEM-assisted projects were covered in the survey (see Table 1.) These include 59 coop-based projects, 64 plant/enterprise-based, and 27 infrastructure projects. A total of 746 respondents were interviewed. In addition, a sample of 28 secondary beneficiaries were interviewed. For some projects, however, the target sample of 8 beneficiaries and 6 employees were not achieved due to the unavailability of enough respondents during the survey.

A number of factors prevented the survey of 40 projects and the interview of some project participants/employees, as follows (see Table 2):

- Difficult physical access to the project sites;
- Prevailing critical peace and order situation;
- Projects have become either permanently or temporarily inoperational;
- The key informants were not available for interview (despite best efforts to locate and contact them); and
- Project proponents refused to be surveyed.

The unavailability of project key informants during the survey was the reason for the inability to survey majority (58%) of these 40 excluded projects. A third could not be reached due to impassable roads caused by heavy rains, especially in the Caraga area.

**Table 1**  
**Number of Surveyed Projects and Respondents**

Area	Total Projects		Not Visited	Cooperatives		Plant/Business		Infrastructure		Number of Respondents	Secondary Beneficiaries
	Target	Actual		Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual		
Greater Northern Corridor	27	24	3	13	10	3	3	11	11	126	0
Caraga	32	17	15	26	14	3	2	3	1	136	1
Central Mindanao	30	26	4	13	10	10	10	7	6	158	4
Davao Gulf	21	19	2	9	7	12	12	0	0	42	2
SOCSKSAR GEN	48	38	10	11	6	27	23	10	9	126	19
Western Mindanao	16	11	5	11	7	4	4	1	0	87	0
Northwestern Corridor	16	15	1	5	5	11	10	0	0	71	2
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>746</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>% of Target</b>		<b>79%</b>			<b>67%</b>		<b>91%</b>		<b>84%</b>		

**Table 2**  
**Summary of Reasons Why Projects Were Not Visited by the Survey Team**

Area	Difficult Physical Access <sup>1</sup>	Peace & Order <sup>2</sup>	Failed/ Stalled Project <sup>3</sup>	Informant Not Available <sup>4</sup>	Total
GNC	2	0	0	1	3
Caraga	9	0	0	6	15
C. Mindanao	0	1	0	3	4
Davao	0	0	0	2	2
SOCSKSARGEN	0	2	0	8	10
W. Mindanao	0	2	1	2	5
NWC	0	0	0	1	1
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>% of Total</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>58%</b>	<b>100%</b>

*1 During the survey, heavy rains made roads to some survey sites impassable. This particularly affected the Caraga projects.*

*2 The survey team was advised not to penetrate project areas with critical peace and order situation (e.g., ongoing military operations vs. Muslim rebels).*

*3 Due to operational, financial, marketing and organizational problems, some projects have either permanently or temporarily stopped their operations.*

*4 The key informants (cooperative leaders and/or enterprise owners/managers) could not be contacted even after several attempts to do so. These informants were the key to providing an overview of project operations and to identifying the beneficiaries/employees to be interviewed.*

## **2.6 Data Encoding and Processing**

MSUFI established a survey data processing center in General Santos City, manned by three full-time encoders and assisted by the survey team leaders. After final review and editing by the team leaders, the processed survey returns were encoded using the Visual Foxpro database program developed by GEM. As a countercheck measure similar to the 1998 survey, GEM undertook "shadow" encoding of the survey returns. Edited copies of survey questionnaires were provided the GEM-PMO by batches.

A few days' delay was encountered in the encoding schedule to further review/edit the survey returns, to allow GEM several refinements on the database program and install it in the MSUFI computers, and to test run the program and generate the survey summary tables. In the second week of March, the MSU encoding team moved over to the GEM-PMO to do final review, editing and encoding in coordination with the GEM survey advisers and encoders. At this point, GEM decided to discontinue with the completion of its own encoding due to lack of time. The partial encoded returns by GEM was used to validate MSUFI's encoded returns for the same projects, which helped both teams to review and do final editing on-the-spot.

The preliminary summary tables were printed out and reviewed by both GEM and MSUFI. Further refinement of the tables (e.g., inclusion of additional data columns, rechecking of formulas, etc.) was done to finalize the said tables (which are included in this report as Annexes A to D).

## **3 SURVEY RESULTS AND ANALYSIS**

### **3.1 GEM's Impact on Farmer/Fisher Beneficiaries**

#### **3.1.1 Description of Beneficiaries**

A total of 5,646 farmer/fisher beneficiary households were reported by the key informants/cooperative leaders of the 59 farm-based projects surveyed (see Table 3). About 23% of these are women, 18% are Muslims, and 15% are indigenous peoples.

The higher number of farmer/fisher beneficiaries is reported in the Central Mindanao, Caraga and Greater Northern Corridor (GNC) clusters. Together, these three areas account for 74% of the total beneficiaries. This is mainly due to the higher concentration of GEM-assisted agricultural and aquaculture

projects in these parts of Mindanao. On the other hand, the other areas generally have more plant/ enterprise-based projects.

Except for GNC and Western Mindanao, women participation in GEM projects is more or less the same throughout the island, with the highest proportion recorded in the Davao Gulf area. As expected, Muslim participation in GEM projects are higher in the Muslim-dominated Central and Western Mindanao regions. In contrast, there are minimal numbers of indigenous groups participating in projects in the latter two regions, with the addition of SOCKSARGEN.

**Table 3**  
Number of Active Participants of Surveyed Farm-Based Projects, By Area

Area	Total Present Participants	Women		Muslims		Indigenous	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
GNC	1,012	100	10%	4	0%	261	26%
Caraga	1,458	381	26%	1	0%	306	21%
C. Mindanao	1,679	397	24%	877	52%	54	3%
Davao	410	134	33%	6	1%	150	37%
SOCKSARGEN	637	186	29%	105	16%	7	1%
W. Mindanao	188	24	13%	45	24%	-	0%
NWC	262	97	37%	5	2%	55	21%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>5,646</b>	<b>1,319</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>1,043</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>833</b>	<b>15%</b>

### 3.1.2 Farm-Based Income Benefits

Project income benefits were estimated by the key informants/coop leaders based on their knowledge of project participants' pre-project and current incomes. In cases when current income could not yet be reported as the project had not yet provided income (e.g., long gestating crops, agroforestry projects, newly operated start-up projects), estimates of future (or expected) income were provided.

Table 4A indicates a 108% average income change among farmer/fisher beneficiaries for all the 59 non-agroforestry projects surveyed, as estimated by the coop leaders. On the average, the leaders report a PhP267,046 pre-project income per year per farmer/fisher, which increased to PhP556,800 actual current income. The income change, however, goes up to 163% if the expected income from future project operations were imputed into the average. The average for actual and expected income becomes PhP702,167. Coop leaders of surveyed non-agroforestry projects in all the areas generally reported improvements in income, with the leaders of projects in Central Mindanao and Caraga providing the higher estimated incomes. The greatest income improvement was cited by coop leaders in GNC, Western Mindanao and Caraga where estimated beneficiary incomes more than tripled. Higher income generating projects are fruit tree farming (e.g., mango), citronella production, white potato production, eel culture, and seaweed farm expansion.

**Table 4A**  
Average Income of Participants of Surveyed  
Non-Agroforestry Projects as Estimated by Key Informant

Area	Ave. Pre-Project Income (in Pesos)	Ave. Post-Project Income (in Pesos) <sup>1</sup>			% Change in Income <sup>2</sup>		
		Actual	Expected	Ave. Actual & Expected	Actual	Expected	Ave. Actual & Expected
GNC	27,284	180,062	92,543	150,889	560%	239%	453%
Caraga	222,527	422,500	1,004,207	874,939	90%	351%	293%
C. Mindanao	688,615	1,366,964	1,705,063	1,524,743	98%	148%	121%
Davao	59,678	179,631	21,700	140,148	200%	-64%	134%
SOCOKSARGEN	195,869	59,629	481,730	376,204	-70%	146%	92%
W. Mindanao	67,583	128,604	467,143	297,873	90%	591%	341%
NWC	147,750	472,875	104,400	399,180	220%	-29%	170%
<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>267,046</b>	<b>556,800</b>	<b>870,792</b>	<b>702,167</b>	<b>108%</b>	<b>226%</b>	<b>163%</b>

<sup>1</sup> Expected Post-Project Income is the average annual income realistically expected by the beneficiary once the planned production and marketing system is completely in place.

<sup>2</sup> Calculated as the change in average post-project income of farmer/fisher beneficiaries (actual, expected, and both) of non-agroforestry projects divided by the average pre-project income as reported by the key informant x 100.

The improvement in income for agroforestry project beneficiaries presents a rosier picture, albeit taking a longer waiting period to realize such income (see Table 4B). With a lower baseline average pre-project annual income of PhP43,838 each, the coop leaders of six industrial tree farming projects saw their members' incomes increasing by 1,084% when their trees start reaching

their maturity within 5 to 7 years from now. The tree farmer leaders expect their members to earn a substantial average annual income of PhP518,899 each until the next 10-year cycle of their trees.<sup>2</sup> The key informants of Caraga projects were particularly more enthusiastic about their income prospects.

**Table 4B**  
Average Income of Participants of Surveyed  
Agroforestry Projects as Estimated by Key Informant

Area	Ave. Pre-Project Income (in Pesos)	Ave. Post-Project Income (in Pesos) <sup>1</sup>			% Change in Income <sup>2</sup>		
		Actual	Expected	Ave. Actual & Expected	Actual	Expected	Ave. Actual & Expected
GNC	95,000	NA	250,000	250,000	NA	163%	163%
Caraga	27,250	NA	689,784	689,784	NA	949%	2,431%
C. Mindanao	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Davao	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
SOCSEKARGEN	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
W. Mindanao	59,032	NA	104,259	104,259	NA	77%	77%
NWC	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>43,838</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>518,899</b>	<b>518,899</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>1,084%</b>	<b>1,084%</b>

<sup>1</sup> Expected Post-Project Income is the average annual income realistically expected by the beneficiary once the planned production and marketing system is completely in place. The large expected windfall incomes of tree farming projects reported during the survey actually referred to the total income from all the trees in the farm. To get the annual income, the total income was divided by 10 years, the average maturity cycle of a tree.

<sup>2</sup> Calculated as the change in average post-project income of farmer beneficiaries (actual, expected, and both) of agroforestry projects divided by the average pre-project income as reported by the Informant x 100.

NA - No survey data available.

Generally, it is very difficult for a coop leader to provide an accurate estimate of the average income of participating project beneficiaries especially when there is a wide diversity in the size of farmholdings, intercrops and resource capabilities across beneficiaries. The MSUFI research team, therefore, feels that the incomes reported by the participating beneficiaries themselves may provide the better estimate. Tables 5A and 5B present the income estimates

<sup>2</sup> During the survey, both coop leaders and farmer respondents reported very large expected incomes from their agroforestry projects. It is suspected that the tree farmers may actually be referring to the windfall income expected from harvesting all or most of their tree stands. Thus, such reported incomes may, in effect, be earned for at least every cycle of about 10 years when new tree stands would have been replaced and become harvestable again. It is also surmised that the expected income reported is not on a per hectare basis but on an average landholding basis per farmer. We can annualize this reported income by dividing it by 10 years (the trees' harvest cycle) to come up with the average annual income per agroforestry farmer.

from the beneficiary household interviews. Based on a sample of 328 respondents, the typical non-agroforestry project beneficiary estimated his/her annual pre-project income at PhP68,575. The reported average actual current income of PhP102,352 is a 49% improvement over previous income. However, a higher average income of PhP580,088 (a 746% increase) is expected by these farmer/fisher beneficiaries in the future. The combined average actual and expected income of PhP323,526 results in a 371% change. Farmers/Fishers in Central Mindanao and Caraga still report the higher income changes. Mango growers generally report the highest improvement in income. Producers of other high value commodities such as citronella, banana and seaweed are also high income gainers.

**Table 5A**  
Average Income of Participants of Surveyed  
Non-Agroforestry Projects as Estimated by Participant Sample (N=328)

Area	Total Respondents	Ave. Pre-Project Income (in Pesos)	Ave. Post-Project Income (in Pesos) <sup>1</sup>			% Change in Income <sup>2</sup>		
			Actual	Expected	Average Actual & Expected	Actual	Expected	Average Actual & Expected
GNC	50	38,194	62,272	110,573	86,422	37%	190%	126%
Caraga	78	176,752	398,116	711,867	617,742	73%	303%	249%
C. Mindanao	87	74,073	117,015	1,089,918	672,960	56%	1,371%	808%
Davao	21	37,667	61,298	NA	61,298	63%	NA	63%
SOCSEKARGEN	18	44,813	67,447	86,973	77,210	51%	94%	72%
W. Mindanao <sup>3</sup>	49	29,792	43,240	20,930	39,522	45%	-30%	33%
NWC	25	12,809	34,278	26,021	30,975	168%	103%	142%
<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>328</b>	<b>68,575</b>	<b>102,352</b>	<b>580,088</b>	<b>323,526</b>	<b>49%</b>	<b>746%</b>	<b>371%</b>

*1 Expected Post-Project Income is the average annual income realistically expected by the beneficiary once the planned production and marketing system is completely in place.*

*2 Calculated as the change in average post-project income (actual, expected and both) reported by the sample farmer/fisher beneficiaries of non-agroforestry projects divided by the average pre-project income reported by the same sample x 100.*

*3 The expected income is actually for one mango production project in Zamboanga. While the reported pre-project income for this particular project is only PhP1,500 (indicating a high percentage change), the income for other projects brought up the average to a level higher than the post-project income, thus, resulting in a negative change.*

A more optimistic view of their current economic situation is reflected in the interviews of 36 agroforestry project beneficiaries. Citing an average pre-project income of PhP71,502, these farmers have actually improved their current income by 102% to PhP144,600. They further expect this to reach PhP595,156 once their trees mature, or a 732% income change. The combined

average actual and expected income per farmer becomes PhP505.045 (for a 606% income change).

**Table 5B**  
Average Income of Participants of Surveyed  
Agroforestry Projects as Estimated by Participant Sample (N=36)

Area	Total Respondents	Ave. Pre-Project Income (in Pesos)	Ave. Post-Project Income (in Pesos) <sup>1</sup>			% Change in Income <sup>2</sup>		
			Actual	Expected	Average Actual & Expected	Actual	Expected	Average Actual & Expected
GNC	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Caraga	28	81,861	NA	595,156	595,156	NA	627%	627%
C. Mindanao	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Davao	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
SOCKSARGEN	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
W. Mindanao	8	40,428	144,600	NA	144,600	258%	NA	258%
NWC	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>71,502</b>	<b>144,600</b>	<b>595,156</b>	<b>505,045</b>	<b>102%</b>	<b>732%</b>	<b>606%</b>

*1 Expected Post-Project Income is the average annual income realistically expected by the beneficiary once the planned production and marketing system is completely in place. The large expected windfall incomes of tree farming projects reported during the survey actually referred to the total income from all the trees in the farm. To get the annual income, the total income was divided by 10 years, the average maturity cycle of a tree.*

*2 Calculated as the change in average post-project income (actual, expected and both) reported by the sample farmer beneficiaries of agroforestry projects divided by the average pre-project income reported by the same sample x 100.*

NA – No survey data available.

### 3.1.3 Jobs Generated by Farmer/Fisher Projects

Based on estimates of the coop leaders, the 364 surveyed farmer/fisher projects created a total of 3,349 farm-based jobs (see Table 6). Full-time jobs include farm caretakers and administrative staff who regularly work on the projects and get paid salaries. Generally, however, these agri-based projects provide mostly seasonal jobs for farmhands who help out in the land clearing and preparation, planting, harvesting, packing, etc. About 68% of the total jobs for all these agricultural projects are seasonal jobs.

Except for Caraga and GNC, the additional jobs created are almost evenly distributed across the other GEM areas. The larger job-generators are the peanut, coffee, abaca, banana and sugar production and marketing projects. The sweet banana contract growing tie-up of a Bukidnon-based cooperative

with a fruit processor generated the single highest number of jobs (479) among the farm-based projects.

In terms of income, the average daily income of these additional workers is PhP117.00, translated into an average annual income of PhP31,005. Area-wise, the workers in Central Mindanao generally enjoy higher incomes. In terms of project types, higher incomes are earned by workers in the sugar, rubber, landscaping ornamentals, and aquaculture projects (e.g., bangus, eels, seaweeds).

**Table 6**  
**Number of Farm-Based Jobs and Average Income**  
**Generated by Surveyed Farmer/Fisher Projects, as Estimated by Key Informant**

Area	Estimated No. of Farm-Based Jobs Created <sup>1</sup>	Ave. Daily Income Per Hired Person (in Pesos) <sup>2</sup>	Ave. Annual Income Per Hired Person (in Pesos) <sup>3</sup>
GNC	843	82	21,730
Caraga	195	97	25,705
C. Mindanao	505	194	51,410
Davao	411	115	30,475
SOCKSARGEN	518	57	15,105
W. Mindanao	427	107	28,355
NWC	450	99	26,235
<b>TOTAL/AVERAGE</b>	<b>3,349</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>31,005</b>

*1 As estimated by the key informants/coop leaders for their respective projects.*

*These include full-time, part-time and seasonal farm labor.*

*2 Averaged across all types of workers.*

*3 Average annual income = Ave. Daily Income x 265 working days per year.*

### 3.1.4 Key Problems of Farmer/Fisher Beneficiaries

Coop leaders and participants of farm-based projects seem to be facing a very harsh economic environment at present. Many farmer/fisher beneficiaries have become vulnerable to problems that affected their economic performance and income. For some, economic constraints have threatened the survival of their projects. Following are the main problems mentioned by some of the sample project beneficiaries to have affected their operations:

- *Natural Calamities.* Heavy floods as a result of la niña brought havoc to aquaculture projects in Cotabato and Davao, adversely affecting

their production and income. Among the commodities affected are seaweed, bangus fingerlings, eels, elvers, and trash fishmeal. One mango production project in Sultan Kudarat was stalled due to poor quality products due to heavy rains. In some areas of Caraga, heavy rains cut off access to farm-to-market roads, bringing down the sales volume of some cooperatives. Pests have also attacked some of the industrial trees in Caraga and Western Mindanao, as well as the peanut farms in SOCSKSARGEN.

- *Lack of Capital/Credit Facilities.* Coop leaders mentioned the absence of credit facilities for start-up capital. Unable to obtain credit, they were not able to venture or expand their production. In some cases, though, access to credit reverses the trend as in the case of the South Cotabato peanut producers reporting lesser incomes as a result of unpaid loans.
- *Joint Venture Problems.* Failed joint ventures were reported in SOCSKSARGEN, such as the case of asparagus production and marketing. One proponent reported a falling out with an exporter-partner, causing the collapse of his asparagus marketing venture.
- *Sourcing/Access to Improved Technology.* Non-adherence to technical specifications and advice has caused problems for a few farm-based projects. An example is the peanut production project in South Cotabato, wherein some farmers used low-yielding third generation peanut seeds (against the advice of GEM).
- *Rising Production Costs.* Increasing costs of farm inputs and labor have rendered some products of GEM beneficiaries uncompetitive. For example, the costs of shelling peanuts in SOCSKSARGEN rose by over 50% while net quality harvests dropped as a result of low quality seeds.
- *Falling Market Demand and Prices.* The economic depression resulting from the Asian financial crisis generally dampened market demand for many agri-based products. In NWC, the demand for tilapia dropped, prompting some producers to seek local markets (e.g., restaurants). Ornamental plant growers in Davao were also hurt by falling market prices.
- *Transportation Problems.* Absence of good infrastructure adversely affected important production areas particularly in NWC, Western

Mindanao and Caraga. The poor road network in these areas has made it difficult for local producers to improve the marketing of their products.

- *Communication Problems.* Acute communication problems were noted in the Western Mindanao area, especially in Tawi-Tawi and Sulu. Key informants revealed difficulties in setting up market linkages in the mainland due to poor communication facilities. One anecdote goes that a project proponent in Tawi-Tawi can only be called at night (when trunklines are not congested) and she has to be on a hill or mountain to be able to receive telephone calls.

### 3.2 GEM's Impact on Business Enterprises

#### 3.2.1 Jobs Generated by Plant/Enterprise-Based Projects

The 64 surveyed business enterprise projects directly generated 5,226 jobs (see Table 7). Majority (58%) of these are contractual workers while 26% are full-time employees who regularly work at least 40 hours per week. The rest are part-time and seasonal workers.

Table 7  
Number of Direct Jobs Generated by Surveyed Enterprise Projects

Area	No. of Direct Jobs Created <sup>1</sup>					Future Jobs <sup>2</sup>
	Total	Full-Time	Contractual	Part-Time	Seasonal	
GNC	761	471	290	0	0	0
Caraga	15	13	2	0	0	14
C. Mindanao	198	82	65	24	27	151
Davao	906	350	118	16	422	69
SOCOSKARGEN	3,006	371	2,502	3	130	482
W. Mindanao	187	34	8	15	130	0
NWC	153	62	37	0	54	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>5,226</b>	<b>1,383</b>	<b>3,022</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>763</b>	<b>716</b>

<sup>1</sup> Jobs are defined as follows: Full-Time = at least 40 hrs. of regular work per week; Contractual = work for at least 1 year under a contract; Part-Time = less than 40 hrs. of work per week; Seasonal = specific short-term work performed during certain periods of the year.

<sup>2</sup> Future jobs are usually those to be generated by the enterprises' future expansion programs.

SOCOSKARGEN accounted for more than half of additional jobs generated. The buy-out of a tuna cannery in General Santos City alone accounted for 2,500 contractual workers who would have, otherwise, lost their jobs had the

buy-out not been brokered by GEM. The production and marketing expansion of a biscuit factory in Iligan City and a cement factory in Davao also significantly contributed to employment.

The owners/managers of the business enterprises seemed to be wary of their future prospects. They projected a total of only 716 future jobs directly resulting from their planned expansion programs (if any).

### 3.2.2 Employee Income

As shown in Table 8, 154 employee respondents of enterprise projects reported an average increase of 30% in their incomes and 24% in their combined income and other benefits (e.g., bonuses, allowances, health insurance, free or subsidized foodstuffs, transport, etc.). From an average annual pre-project income of PhP36,924, their average current income has gone up to PhP48,089. Their total value of annual income and benefits averaged PhP42,974 before GEM assistance, increasing to PhP53,480 at present.

Table 8  
Average Income as Reported by Employee Sample (N=154)

Area	Total Respondents	Annual Employee Income (in Pesos)			Total Value of Annual Employee Income and Benefits (in Pesos)		
		Ave. Pre-Project	Ave. Post-Project	Ave. % Change	Ave. Pre-Project	Ave. Post-Project	Ave. % Change
GNC	12	57,371	61,184	7%	53,446	56,867	6%
Caraga	13	46,059	54,669	19%	46,258	59,496	29%
C. Mindanao	24	32,962	67,565	105%	33,010	69,637	111%
Davao <sup>1</sup>	2	14,820	26,520	79%	14,820	34,320	132%
SOCSKSARGEN	53	50,188	53,881	7%	47,099	50,131	6%
W. Mindanao	19	15,000	34,674	131%	NA	NA	NA
NWC <sup>2</sup>	31	21,669	26,292	21%	47,726	41,678	-13%
<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>154</b>	<b>36,924</b>	<b>48,089</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>42,974</b>	<b>53,480</b>	<b>24%</b>

<sup>1</sup> Data for Davao is only for one wood-based furniture project. No employee was interviewed for the other projects, where income is potentially higher.

<sup>2</sup> The significant reduction in the combined income and benefits in an aquaculture and handicraft project brought down the average income share in the NWC area.

The largest (more than double) improvement in employee income and benefits were realized in the Davao, Western and Central Mindanao areas. Significant income changes happened to employees of the crab and tilapia projects in Cotabato, the handicraft enterprises (e.g., novelty items, guitars) in Cotabato and Pagadian City, and the wood-based furniture project in Tagum City.

Minimal increases were reported in the NWC, GNC and SOCSKSARGEN regions.

### 3.3 Secondary Beneficiaries of GEM Projects

#### 3.3.1 Description of Secondary Beneficiaries

The coop leaders of the surveyed farm-based projects and the owners/managers of business enterprises said that their projects are also helping 16,100 secondary beneficiaries (see Table 9). Farm-based projects indirectly benefit mainly other farm/fisher households in nearby communities and towns who have either replicated the projects or are linked with their business operations. Plant/enterprise-based projects, on the other hand, help more secondary beneficiaries that include farmers/fishers and other producers, raw material suppliers, traders, etc. who benefit from such business linkages.

Table 9  
Number of Secondary Beneficiaries of Surveyed Projects

Area	Number of Secondary Beneficiaries <sup>1</sup>		
	Farm-Based Projects	Enterprise-Based Projects	Total
GNC	69	10	79
Caraga	354	0	354
C. Mindanao <sup>2</sup>	1,296	12,430	13,726
Davao	10	478	488
SOCSKSARGEN	10	1,371	1,381
W. Mindanao	NA	9	9
NWC	39	24	63
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,778</b>	<b>14,322</b>	<b>16,100</b>

<sup>1</sup> Secondary beneficiaries are farmers/fishers, other producers, entrepreneurs, and other individuals who have benefitted from the GEM-assisted project either by replicating the project or whose linkages with the project have created income opportunities in production, processing, marketing and/or transport.

<sup>2</sup> The largest number of secondary beneficiaries were generated by a coconut fiber mat processing plant (7,000 coconut farmers) and a tilapia project (4,000 tilapia farmers) in Maguindanao.

Central Mindanao projects generated the most number of secondary beneficiaries. Worth noting are the coconut fiber mat processing plant and a tilapia project both in Maguindanao which are benefitting an estimated 7,000 coconut farmers and 4,000 tilapia growers, respectively.

### 3.3.2 Employment and Income Impact on Secondary Beneficiaries

The survey was able to reach a small sample (22) of secondary beneficiaries of a few agri-based and enterprise-based projects. While not able to provide a general profile of the total number of secondary beneficiaries who gained from linking with GEM-assisted projects, they can serve as case studies indicating some of the impact of such linkages on their own businesses and lives.

Table 10  
Indicators of Employment and Income Impact on Secondary Beneficiaries (N=22)

Type of GEM Project Replicated/ Linked With <sup>1</sup>	No. of Beneficiaries Sampled	No. of Jobs Generated by Linked Business				Ave. Annual Net Income from Linked Business (in Pesos)	Types of Beneficiaries/Products
		Total	Full-Time	Part-Time	Seasonal		
Fruit Orchard Development	1	6	2	0	4	2,301,000	Fruit grower (durian)
Mango Production	1	12	0	0	12	NA	Fruit grower (mango)
Fruit Processing Plant	1	52	1	0	51	2,160,000	Mango grower
True Potato Seed Project	2	17	2	0	15	215,000	Potato producers (TPS potato)
Tree Crop Contract Growing	3	0	0	0	0	64,000	Marketing of kalakat and oil palm strips.
Peanut Seed Production	1	0	0	0	0	7,200	Seasonal worker (planter, harvester, weeder)
Peanut Production	9	99	0	0	99	41,908	Peanut production and marketing of peanut seeds.
Fish Processing Plant	1	8	3	5	0	10,000	Marketing of tuna residue
Ice Plant	1	0	0	0	0	180,000	Retailing of ice
Seaweed Farming	2	2	0	0	2	13,200	Buying station for agar-agar (seaweed), Marketing of seaweed
<b>TOTAL/AVERAGE</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>196</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>183</b>	<b>554,700</b>	

<sup>1</sup> These are the GEM-assisted projects which the sample secondary beneficiaries either replicated or established business linkages with.

Table 10 shows that, like the principal beneficiaries of farm-based projects (e.g., fruit tree and industrial tree farming, TPS potato farming, peanut production, seaweed farming), secondary beneficiaries of these projects also derive income and employment benefits. These projects create mostly seasonal jobs in the farm. The 22 sampled secondary beneficiaries reported a total of

196 jobs. Generated income levels depend on the type of project. For instance, agroforestry projects indirectly provide more earnings than, say, peanut farming.

Producers/Buyers/Traders/Retailers also gain from marketing tie-ups with GEM enterprise projects. The number of jobs they create depend on the type and size of their enterprises. The mango processing plant, for example, indirectly created 52 new jobs while the ice plant reported none.

### **3.4 Impact of Infrastructure Projects**

#### **3.4.1 Number of Beneficiaries and Jobs Created**

Some 27 GEM-assisted infrastructure projects in GNC, Caraga, Central Mindanao and SOCSKSARGEN were covered in the survey (see Table 11). These include 14 community warehouses/solar dryers, 2 farm-to-market roads, and 3 Madrasah schoolbuildings (all funded by the World Bank Social Fund for SZOPAD); a fishport expansion project; 4 telecommunications projects; and 3 airport and airport support facilities funded by private sector investors.

Among these projects, the warehouse-solar dryer projects appear to have the most direct impact on farm households. Most of the 14 postharvest facilities are either newly constructed or still being constructed in selected corn-producing areas of participating Moro National Liberation Front (MNLF) beneficiaries. A total of 781 farm households were reported to be using these facilities already, with another 4,065 users expected to benefit when all the facilities become fully operational. The key informants interviewed during the survey said that, with these postharvest facilities, they expect to secure better prices for their products, reduce spoilage, and improve their incomes. At least 82 new jobs, mostly seasonal and part-time, will be created by these projects.

The two farm-to-market roads in Central Mindanao are expected to benefit about 13,500 local farmers, entrepreneurs and residents. For the farmer/fisher households, this means improved access to product markets and reduced production and marketing costs.

The WB Social Fund project also supports social infrastructure projects such as the construction of Madrasah schoolbuildings in selected SZOPAD communities. The three projects of this type surveyed in Central Mindanao are already being used by 472 Madaris/Arabic school students, with 525 more students expected to benefit in the near future.

**Table 11**  
**Beneficiaries of GEM-Assisted Infrastructure Projects**

Area/Type of Infrastructure <sup>1</sup>	No. of Beneficiaries <sup>2</sup>		New Jobs Created <sup>3</sup>	Types of Beneficiaries/Users	Average Annual Income <sup>4</sup>		
	Actual No. of Users	Expected No. of Users			Pre-Project	Post-Project	% Change
<b>GNC</b>	<b>1,255</b>	<b>596,018</b>	<b>56</b>				
Airport (1)		591,692	NA	Construction workers, business people, producers, general public	NA	NA	NA
Warehouse-Solar Dryers (9)	329	3,800	35	Coop farmers	31,530	88,341	180%
Telecoms (1)	926	526	21	Telephone subscribers	NA	NA	NA
<b>Caraga</b>	<b>2,000</b>	<b>1,500</b>	<b>0</b>				
Telecoms (1)	2,000	1,500	NA	Telephone subscribers	NA	NA	NA
<b>C. Mindanao</b>	<b>15,011</b>	<b>1,375</b>	<b>33</b>				
Farm-to-Market Roads (2)	13,500		NA	Local producers, local residents	30,043	53,651	79%
Warehouse-Solar Dryer (1)	300		20	Coop farmers	46,198	71,363	54%
Madrasah Schoolbuildings (2)	397	450	13	Madaris students, Arabic school students	NA	NA	NA
Public Calling Office (1)	814	925	NA	Commercial, residential and walk-in customers	NA	NA	NA
<b>Davao</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>				
<b>SOCKSARGEN</b>	<b>210,897</b>	<b>283</b>	<b>2,282</b>				
Warehouse-Solar Dryer (4)	222	208	27	Local farmers	24,973	32,238	29%
Madrasah Schoolbuilding (1)	75	75	2	Madaris students, Arabic school students	NA	NA	NA
Telecoms (1)	1,600	NA	17	Telephone subscribers	NA	NA	NA
Fishport Expansion (1)	NA	NA	2,226	Municipal fishermen, boat owners, laborers	NA	NA	NA
Airport Navigational Facility (1)	209,000	NA	NA	Airlines, aircraft operators, passengers	NA	NA	NA
Airport Refueling Depot (1)	NA	NA	10	Airlines, aircraft operators	NA	NA	NA
<b>W. Mindanao</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>				
<b>NWC</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>				
<b>TOTAL/AVERAGE</b>	<b>229,163</b>	<b>599,176</b>	<b>2,432</b>		<b>31,976</b>	<b>70,957</b>	<b>122%</b>

<sup>1</sup> No. of projects indicated in parenthesis.

<sup>2</sup> As estimated by the infrastructure project proponent/key informant.

<sup>3</sup> Including temporary jobs (e.g., construction workers during the construction of the facility) and longer-term jobs (e.g., employees, staff, etc.).

<sup>4</sup> As reported by the sample farmer-beneficiaries of the infrastructure facilities.

The four GEM-assisted telecommunications projects in Camiguin, Cotabato Province, Caraga and South Cotabato are now serving 5,340 telephone subscribers/users. An estimated 2,951 more users are expected to benefit from the expanded telecommunications services, which was seen as contributing to business development in these areas. The Camiguin and South Cotabato telephone projects created 38 new jobs.

The Laguindingan Airport project is foreseen to benefit close to 600,000 users. The transfer of trunkline airline operations from the existing Cagayan de Oro and former Iligan airports to Laguindingan municipality (strategically located at the center of the Greater Northern Corridor growth area) is expected to greatly stimulate business and economic development in the corridor. Among others, the new airport is projected to provide improved access to larger domestic and export markets for the area's produce. However, no estimate of jobs to be generated (e.g., construction workers, airport personnel) was given by the key informant.

In General Santos City, it was reported that the new airport navigational facility and refueling depot at the GSC international airport are expected to directly benefit airline operators. It was opined that these infrastructure facilities will lead to an expansion in the number of flights to/from the city, thereby benefitting over 209,000 passengers, local producers, business people and residents. Improved air transport will, likewise, stimulate investments in the SOCKSARGEN area. There were 2,226 new jobs reported to have been created by the fishport expansion project, which will directly benefit municipal fishermen, boat owners and laborers. The refueling depot project added 10 more jobs.

Altogether, the 27 infrastructure projects generated a total of 2,432 new jobs.

### **3.4.2 Income Impact**

During the survey some of the beneficiaries of infrastructure projects, particularly the WB Social Fund projects, were able to provide estimates of changes in their income. The 61 sample corn farmer-beneficiaries of the community-based warehouse/solar dryer earn, on the average, a pre-project income of PhP34,234 per year. With the new facility in place, they now earn PhP63,981 representing an average 87% improvement. The highest average increase (180%) was reported by the warehouse/solar dryer users in GNC.

Fourteen farmer-beneficiaries of the farm-to-market roads were also asked how this new road infrastructure has affected their household income. They

reported that from their average PhP30,043 pre-project level, their annual income grew by 79% to PhP53,651.

As a whole, the average annual income of the total 75 respondents among the farmer beneficiaries of these WB Social Fund infrastructure projects improved by 122%.

### **3.5 Non-Income Contribution of GEM Projects**

Not all of GEM's economic impacts can be quantified in money terms. From the anecdotal information and insights gained during the interviews, following are some of the non-income benefits<sup>3</sup> reported by survey respondents:

- Improvement in Product Quality – A significant number of coop leaders and farmers/fishers indicated increases in the percentage of their first quality produce.<sup>4</sup> This allows them to command higher market prices for their products.
- Better Purchasing Power – Some beneficiaries were able to purchase more business assets and/or household items (e.g., farm equipment, tools, transport vehicle, appliances, more foodstuffs, etc.) after the project.
- Better Education – Some were able to send their children to school (or to better schools). In the case of the Madrasah schoolbuilding projects, more students can avail of longer classroom teaching.
- Closeness to Family – It is interesting to note that some beneficiaries and enterprise employees were willing to sacrifice higher-paying past jobs to work on the GEM-assisted projects, if only to be closer to their homes and families in their hometowns.

---

<sup>3</sup> This is not to say, however, that these "non-income" benefits do not translate into higher incomes for the beneficiaries. In fact, some of them (e.g., higher product quality, closeness to the family) can directly influence their cost and revenue streams.

<sup>4</sup> First quality produce is defined as the portion of the total volume of the project's products which commands the best price in the market.

## **4 SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS**

### **4.1 Highlights of Survey Results**

Based on a sample of 746 respondents participating in the 150 GEM-assisted projects throughout Mindanao which were included in the survey, following are the key indications of program impact:

- There are 5,646 farmer/fisher households presently participating in the 59 farm-based projects surveyed. About 23% of these are women, 18% are Muslims, and 15% are indigenous people.
- There is a significant increase in the average annual income reported by both the coop leaders/key informants of the 59 farm-based projects surveyed and the 364 sample participants of these projects. The coop leaders estimated the average income of project participants increasing by 183% from a pre-project level of PhP241,292 to PhP683,840. For the 53 non-agroforestry projects, they estimated average income to have increased by 163% from PhP267,046 to PhP702,167.
- On the other hand, the sample participants reported their average pre-project income of PhP68,792 for all projects rising by 392% to PhP338,909. For non-agroforestry projects, their average income increased by 371% from PhP68,575 to PhP323,526.
- A total of 11,007 jobs were directly generated by the 150 projects surveyed. This number includes 3,349 farm-based, 5,226 enterprise-based, and 2,432 infrastructure project-based jobs.
- The average annual income of sample employees in the 64 plant/enterprise-based projects surveyed increased by 30% from a pre-project level of PhP36,924 to PhP48,089. The total value of employee income and benefits likewise improved by 24%, on the average.
- The average income of farmer-beneficiaries of 16 surveyed WB Social Fund infrastructure projects was reported to increase by 122% from PhP31,976 to PhP70,957.
- Some 16,100 secondary beneficiaries derive employment and income benefits from either replicating or linking with the surveyed GEM projects.

## 4.2 Survey 2000 vs. Survey 1998

Following is a comparative look at the findings of the 1998 and 2000 GEM program impact assessment surveys. As may be recalled, the MSUFI conducted a similar survey on 88 GEM projects in 1998.

- Despite the greater number of sample projects in the latest survey, there is a reduction in the number of participants in the farm-based projects surveyed as compared to the previous survey. The 1998 survey reported 9,198 participating farmer/fisher households. This indicates that the average number of participants per project decreased from 204 in 1998 to 97 in 2000.
- Women's participation in GEM projects slightly increased while Muslim and indigenous community participation remained almost the same.
- The average increase in farm-based income, as reported by the sample participants, is lower this year for all projects (392% vs. 523%) but higher for non-agroforestry projects (371% vs. 164%).
- The improvement in enterprise-based employee income is higher this year but for the total income and benefits, the latest survey results indicate the same magnitude of change.
- More jobs were reported to have been directly generated by the projects surveyed this year. The average number of jobs per farm-based project significantly increased to 64, from 13 in 1998. There is a slight reduction in the average number of jobs per plant/enterprise-based project, from 83 in 1998 to 82 this year.
- The 107 average number of secondary beneficiaries per project reported this year is lower than the 443 reported in 1998.

**Annex A**  
**Survey Data on Farm-Based Projects**

SOI DATA ON FARMER/FISHERFOLK BENEFICIARIES FROM THE COOPERATIVE LEADER SURVEY AND THE PARTICIPANT SAMPLE SURVEY

PROJ. NO.	PROJECT NAME	PROJECT SITE	COOPERATIVE NAME	PROJECT TYPE	INVESTMENT COST (P/P Million)	DATE GEN ASSISTANCE	CURRENT PROJECT STATUS	FARMER FISHERFOLK BENEFICIARIES					ESTIMATED INCOME BY LEADER			PARTICIPANT REPORTED INCOME			ESTIMATED JOBS BY LEADER			AVERAGE INCOME PER HED PER DAY				
								TOTAL NUMBER PARTICIPANTS	NUMBER MORE ACTIVE	NUMBER WOMEN	NUMBER BUS/UNS	NUMBER INDIGENOUS PEOPLES	SECONDARY BENEFICIARIES	PREPROJECT INCOME	POSTPROJECT INCOME	% CHANGE	SAMPLE NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS	AVERAGE PARTICIPANT PREPROJECT INCOME	AVERAGE PARTICIPANT POSTPROJECT INCOME	AVERAGE % CHANGE PARTICIPANT INCOME	TOTAL # JOBS		# FULL-TIME JOBS	# PART-TIME JOBS	# SEASONAL JOBS	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	
<b>CARAGA</b>																										
1. CAR01	Coffee Production	Tubay, Sorsogon, Litchi po and Jabonga, Agusan del Norte	Brazil Small Coffee Multi-Purpose Cooperative	Contract Growing	23.5	April 1996	Post-GEI assistance; active project	22/10 (45.3%)	7 (31.8%)				140	36,000	200,000 (P)	455.5	(P/A) / (P/E)	37,438	64,812	128	25.0		25		100.0	
2. CAR03	Expansion of Seaweed Production	Brgy. Linao, Langa Surigao del Sur	Surigao del Sur Seaweed Growers Association	Market Linkage	0.5	January 1995	Post-GEI assistance; project activity stopped/stalled	36/21 (54.3%)	7 (18.4%)				32	43,800	198,876 (P)	354.2	(P/A) / (P/E)	128,903	472,744	275					0.0	
3. CAR41	Coffee Production	San Luis, Agusan del Sur	Kangyal Farmers MPC	Contract Growing	24.0	January 1995	Post-GEI assistance; active project	279/284 (96.0%)	75 (27.2%)			206 (74.8%)		26,500	4,026,048 (P)	18,092.6	(P/A) / (P/E)	652,031	2,367,370	177	80.0	4	33		101.4	
4. CAR49	Mango Production	Masab, Agusan del Norte	DUB MPC	Market Linkage	0.2	January 1998	Post-GEI assistance; active project	200/180 (90.0%)	140 (70.0%)					1,051,700	5,220,820 (P)	118.0	(P/A) / (P/E)	215,092	1,141,178	430	18.0		10		60.0	
5. CAR50	Expansion of Rubber Plantation	Beyogan, Agusan del Sur	CARAGA Women's Agro-Industrial MPC	New Investment	2.0	January 1997	Post-GEI assistance; active project	31/25 (80.7%)	24 (77.4%)					618,000	660,000 (P)	8.8	(P/A) / (P/E)	36,945			10.0		10		100.0	
6. CAR54	Industrial Tree Plantation	Agusan del Norte	UNFI Multi-Purpose Cooperative	New Investment	1.0	January 1998	Ongoing GEI Assistance; project implementation stopped or stalled	150/145 (96.7%)	1 (0.7%)	1 (0.7%)				8,000	275,000 (P)	4,493.3	(P/A) / (P/E)	275,000			18.0		10		49.3	
7. CAR59	Marketing of Dried Freshwater Shrimp	Bangayon, Kitchanon, Agusan del Norte	Bangayon FWS Association	Market Linkage	2.5	July 1998	Post-GEI assistance; active project	30/20 (66.7%)						30,000	45,000 (P)	80.0	(P/A) / (P/E)	23,400	36,481	64					0.0	
8. CAR62	Industrial Tree Plantation	Colorado, Jabonga, Agusan del Norte	Colorado Tree Farmers Association	New Investment	8.0	May 1998	Ongoing GEI Assistance; project continues to be implemented	30/18 (60.0%)	10 (33.3%)					7,500	200,000 (P)	2,750.0	(P/A) / (P/E)	11,154	368,506	3,210					0.0	
9. CAR72	Mango Plantation	Jabonga, Agusan del Norte	Colorado Tree Farmers Association	Key Agribusiness Enterprise	8.0	May 1998	Post-GEI assistance; active project	400/240 (60.0%)	80 (20.0%)			100 (25.0%)		18,000	652,800 (P)	323.7	(P/A) / (P/E)	4,787	487,185	10,120	3.0		1		100.0	
10. CAR86	Industrial Tree Farming	Braol	Brazil Small Tree Farmers Association	New Investment	8.0	April 2000	Post-GEI assistance; active project	27/10 (45.6%)	7 (11.8%)					100	36,000	200,000 (P)	455.5	(P/A) / (P/E)	34,429	288,564	738	25.0		25		100.0
11. CAR87	Industrial Tree Farming	Surigao City	Surigao Economic Development Foundation Inc.	New Investment	6.0	"bad date"	Ongoing GEI Assistance; project continues to be implemented	10/6 (60.0%)						60	60,000	2,083,838 (P)	3,372.4	(P/A) / (P/E)	200,000	1,448,740	623	15.0	8	5	3	120.0
12. CAR92	Coconuts Production	Davao Island	Talagon Essential Producers Association	New Investment	3.8	"bad date"	Ongoing GEI Assistance; project continues to be implemented	82/66 (80.6%)						32	8,750	800,000 (P)	9,042.8	(P/A) / (P/E)	37,188	645,125	1,742					0.0
13. CAR93	Agusan FIC Fruit Production and Expansion	Province-Wide	Agusan del Sur Fruit Industry Development Council	Key Agribusiness Enterprise	3.6	September 1998	Post-GEI assistance; active project	15/9 (60.0%)							0 (P)	(P/A) / (P/E)	117,991	621,837	198						0.0	
14. CAR94	Lucasian Banana Production	Bangayon	ITAMCO Tree Farmers Multi-Purpose Cooperative	Contract Growing	10.0	January 1998	Post-GEI assistance; active project	155/137 (88.4%)	30 (19.1%)					74,000	73,000 (P)	195.3	(P/A) / (P/E)	43,673			11.0		11		100.0	
<b>SUB-TOTALS / AVERAGES</b>					<b>95.2</b>				<b>1,458/1,151 (78.9%)</b>	<b>281 (26.1%)</b>	<b>1 (0.1%)</b>	<b>308 (21.0%)</b>		<b>354</b>	<b>182,441</b>	<b>817,964 (A)</b> <b>422,589 (A)</b> <b>889,872 (C)</b>	<b>403.6 (S/A) / (S/E)</b>	<b>190,872</b>	<b>611,299 (A)</b> <b>286,116 (A)</b> <b>666,427 (C)</b>	<b>305</b>	<b>195.0</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>178</b>		<b>98.7</b>
<b>COTABATO-ARMM</b>																										
15. CO011	Contract Growing of Fruit Trees	Prov. Rizal, Cotabato Provincial	Multi-Ass'n of Barangay Councils	Contract Growing	4.0	February 1998	Ongoing GEI Assistance; active project	38	22 (58.4%)						1,948,000	4,128,000 (P)	111.9	(P/A) / (P/E)	40,228	146,716	1,263	3.0	2			80.0
16. CO018	Supply of Fruit Tree Planting Materials to Orchard Dev'l Proj. Lanas H and EX	Superior, Kibinawan, Cotabato	Coat. Producers Multi-Purpose Coop. Inc.	Market Linkage	1.6	February 1998	Ongoing GEI Assistance; active project	24/19 (79.2%)	6 (25.0%)	1 (4.2%)				163,116	740,774 (A)	348.6	(P/A) / (P/E)	146,716	328,032	75	8.0	6		2		80.0
17. CO021	Gift Growers and Marketing	Pocorayon, North Cotabato	Talagon MPC	Contract Growing	8.8	June 1997	Post-GEI assistance; project activity stopped/stalled	100/100 (100.0%)	18 (18.0%)	100 (100.0%)					42,500 (A)			44,152	60,023	13						0.0
18. CO034	Lake Buluan Aquaculture Development	Lake Buluan, Buluan, Maguindanao	Integrated Dev't for Livelihood of Maguindanao MPC	Key Agribusiness Enterprise	6.0	January 1997	Ongoing GEI Assistance; active project	426/262 (61.5%)	8 (1.2%)	426 (100.0%)				10	81,800 (A)			10,820	34,822	225	3.0	2			125.0	
19. CO046	Soon Grove Establishment/Fruit Orchard Development in Malabon	Malabon and Maguindanao	Lansang Impulsi Farmers Cooperative	Key Agribusiness Enterprise	1.0	February 1998	Ongoing GEI Assistance; active project	61/51 (83.6%)	31 (100.0%)					120	62,000 (P)		(P/A) / (P/E)	18,378	118,204	810					0.0	
20. CO051	Fruit Orchard Development in Lipi	Lipi, Maguindanao	Malabon de Lantoran Foundation, Inc.	Key Agribusiness Enterprise	1.0	November 1998	Ongoing GEI Assistance; active project	12/9 (75.0%)	22 (17.8%)	83 (42.4%)				16	29,700	162,497 (A)	413.4	(P/A) / (P/E)	133,823	1,063,046	698	7.0	2	6		81.4
21. CO061	Fruit Nursery	Bulabog, Lanas del Norte	Lanas Fruit Growers Coop	Key Agribusiness Enterprise	1.0	August 1998	Ongoing GEI Assistance; active project	41/43 (94.1%)	26 (61.2%)	60 (99.2%)					67,800	7,634,147 (A)	1,220.2	(P/A) / (P/E)	145,272	6,431,748	4,486	3.0	3			100.0

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

LEM IMPACT SURVEY 2000  
 TABLE 1.1 - SOI DATA ON FARMER/FISHERFOLK BENEFICIARIES FROM THE COOPERATIVE LEADER SURVEY  
 AND THE PARTICIPANT SAMPLE SURVEY

PROJ. NO.	PROJECT NAME	PROJECT SITE	COOPERATIVE NAME	PROJECT TYPE	INVESTMENT COST (\$/P. Million)	DATE GEM ASSISTANCE	CURRENT PROJECT STATUS	FARMER FISHERFOLK BENEFICIARIES						ESTIMATED INCOME BY LEADER			PARTICIPANT REPORTED INCOME				ESTIMATED JOBS BY LEADER				AVERAGE INCOME PER Hired PERSON PER DAY		
								TOTAL NUMBER PARTICIPANTS	NUMBER MORE ACTIVE	NUMBER WOMEN	NUMBER MUSLIMS	NUMBER INDIGENOUS PEOPLE	SECONDARY BENEFICIARIES	PREPROJECT INCOME	POSTPROJECT INCOME	% CHANGE	SAMPLE NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS	AVERAGE PARTICIPANT PREPROJECT INCOME	AVERAGE PARTICIPANT POSTPROJECT INCOME	AVERAGE % CHANGE PARTICIPANT INCOME	TOTAL # JOBS	# FULL-TIME JOBS	# PART-TIME JOBS	# SEASONAL JOBS			
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26		
21. COT62	Marketing of Eat and Ewars	Colabato City and Maguindao	1st CPA Ewars Kapatid MPC	Market Linkage		0.3 June 1998	Ongoing GEM Assistance; active project	64	13 (20.2%)	9 (7.8%)				480,000	486,000(A)	1.2%	6	60,375		-100					60		
22. COT63	Sale of Handloom Products(MTE)	Davao, Sultan Kudarat and Maguindao	Davao Weavers Association	Small & Medium Enterprise		0.5 January 1994	Ongoing GEM Assistance; active project	30,30	(74.9%)	37 (94.9%)	38 (97.4%)	1 (2.6%)		70	213,120	632,800 (E)	150.0%	8	18,994	30,596	60					60	
23. COT63A	Coat Plus Margin Arrangement Sugar Production	Separate locations in North and South Cotabato	CoSumDECO	Contract Growing		10.7 January 1999	Ongoing GEM Assistance; active project	15,13	(86.7%)	1 (6.7%)	1 (6.7%)			1,438,800	1,714,500(A)	22.3%	(5A)/2(2)2	104,320	186,126	78	45.0	40			0	335.0	
24. COT63B	Coat Plus Margin Arrangement Sugar Production	Separate Locations in North Cotabato and South Cotabato	Integrated Mindanao Ass'n for Native MPC	Contract Growing		10.7 January 1998	Ongoing GEM Assistance; active project	150,137	(81.3%)	8 (5.0%)	147 (98.0%)			150	4,760	24,287(A)	409.2%	(5A)/1(2)3	63,136	111,155	70	72.0			72	354.1	
25. COT63C	Coat Plus Margin Arrangement Sugar Production	Separate Locations in North Cotabato and South Cotabato	Kabuyan MPC	Contract Growing		10.7 August 1998	Ongoing GEM Assistance; active project	100,97	(81.3%)	26 (24.5%)				120	60,100	68,907 (E)	89.3%	4	81,182	140,703	64	66.0			64	654.3	
26. COT63D	Coat Plus Margin Arrangement Sugar Production	Separate Locations in North Cotabato and South Cotabato	Idama Multi-Purpose Cooperative	Contract Growing		10.7 November 1998	Ongoing GEM Assistance; active project	73,58	(79.5%)	5 (6.9%)	26 (35.4%)			80	6,005	240,993 (E)	4,087.4%	(5A)/1(2)3	106,360	111,943	3	32.0			32	498.8	
27. COT63E	Coat Plus Margin Arrangement Sugar Production	Separate Locations in North Cotabato and South Cotabato	Manung Development MPC	Contract Growing		10.7 August 1998	Ongoing GEM Assistance; active project	70,82	(86.6%)	8 (8.0%)				320	34,884	73,784 (E)	111.5%	(1A)/1(2)3	65,062	110,822	101	67.0			87	64.9	
28. COT63F	Coat Plus Margin Arrangement Sugar Production	Separate Locations in North Cotabato and South Cotabato	Sta. Nilda Multi-Purpose Cooperative	Contract Growing		10.7 August 1998	Ongoing GEM Assistance; active project	334,319	(86.3%)	167 (50.0%)				350	3,358,236	6,238,850 (E)	88.8%	(5A)/1(2)3	42,534	113,782	187	200.0			200	33.0	
SUB-TOTALS/AVERAGES						76.3		1,879,130	(77.5%)	397 (23.4%)	877 (52.2%)	54 (3.2%)		1,296	688,615	1,624,744	121.6%	(4A)/1(1)2	74,073	672,905	808	505.0	56	5	444	184.2	
																1,266,964 (A)				117,019 (A)							
																1,708,043 (E)				1,088,918 (E)							
DAVAO GULF																											
29. DVO09	Landscape Ornamentals Production	Davao City	Malays Growers MPC	Key Agribusiness SME		0.8 January 1999	Ongoing GEM Assistance; active project	17,12	(100.0%)	8 (50.0%)				186,240	588,230(A)	214.7%	3	29,040	66,412	128	3.0	3				150.0	
30. DVO10	Landscaping and Ornamentals Production	Davao City	Green Palms MPC	Key Agribusiness SME		0.5 January 1998	Ongoing GEM Assistance; active project	50,40	(80.0%)	50 (100.0%)				18,868	8,400 (E)	-11.2%	2	90,200	108,025	80	4.0	2			2	100.0	
31. DVO11	Landscape Ornamentals Production	Catagan, Davao City	Catagan Everbloem Cultiver Cooperative	Key Agribusiness SME		2.0 "Seed sale" 0	Ongoing GEM Assistance; active project	87,44	(77.2%)	54 (94.7%)				76,320	139,250(A)	82.6%	(5A)/1(2)3	28,821	63,868	117	3.0	3				114.0	
32. DVO12	Banana Production	Davao City	MARWABEMPCO	Key Agribusiness Enterprise		3.4 June 1997	Ongoing GEM Assistance; active project	107,102	(85.3%)	8 (7.6%)	43 (42.1%)			40,180	83,300(A)	132.3%	6	43,360		63.0	78			14	213.2		
33. DVO13	Magnolia Agro-forestry Project	Davao City	Begra Agro-Forestry	Key Agribusiness Enterprise		2.0 September 1998	Post-GEM assistance; active project	5						20,000	33,800 (E)	71.0%	0			2.0				2		100.0	
34. DVO14	The Potato Seed (TPS 2000) Project I	Davao Out-ville	Mahatka MPC	Key Agribusiness Enterprise		8.0 September 1998	Ongoing GEM Assistance; active project	88,24	(61.4%)	1 (1.7%)	8 (8.9%)			77,600	180,000(A)	108.4%	0			10.0				10		70.0	
35. DVO15	The Potato Seed (TPS 2000) Project II	Davao Out-ville	Saturay MPC	Key Agribusiness Enterprise		8.0 November 1998	Ongoing GEM Assistance; active project	31,15	(48.4%)	5 (16.1%)	10 (32.3%)			5	7,500	76,000(A)	800.0%	0	40,787	36,108	-13	21.0			18	82.8	
36. DVO16	Abaca marketing and Consolidation	Davao City and Davao del Norte	ATA Farmers MPC(A)/NAACO	Market Linkage		8.0 October 1999	Ongoing GEM Assistance; active project	90,70	(77.9%)	10 (11.1%)	90 (100.0%)				24,000(A)		0				275.0				5	275	70.0
SUB-TOTALS/AVERAGES						22.4		419,307	(74.9%)	134 (32.7%)	6 (1.9%)	100 (26.6%)		10	88,748	140,148	154.4%	(2A)/1(1)2	37,447	61,296	62	411.0	81	7	313	314.8	
																178,831 (A)				61,296 (A)							
																21,700 (E)				0 (E)							
GREATER NORTHERN CORRIDOR																											
37. GNC01	Harap Production Program	Combing, Sultan	Demung Fruit Growers MPC	Contract Growing		8.0 April 2000	Ongoing GEM Assistance; project continues to be implemented	80,10	(82.7%)	11 (18.2%)		14 (23.7%)		147,187	203,362 (E)	38.0%	(5A)/1(2)3	28,350	96,866	240	13.0	3	1	11		81.3	
38. GNC02	Agribusiness Project	Tapaning, Capayan de Oro City	Tapaning Farmers Multi Purpose Cooperative	New Investment		0.2 September 1996	Ongoing GEM Assistance; active project	141		24 (16.7%)		8 (5.6%)		86,000	280,000 (E)	183.1%	0				9.0					9	61.0
39. GNC03	White Potato Production	Lundin, Don Mariano and Tapaning, Sultan	Palmas Farmers Association	Contract Growing		10.0 January 1997	Ongoing GEM Assistance; project implementation stopped or stalled	122,15	(11.2%)	2 (1.6%)	24 (19.7%)			16,800	781,000(A)	4,833.3%	(1A)/1(2)3	40,000	224,616	711	80.0			60		80.0	
40. GNC04	Marketing of Ornamental Plants	Combing de Oro	Northside Mindanao Ornamental	Market Linkage		1.2 July 1997	Post-GEM assistance; active project	45		30 (66.7%)					0(A)		0				73,290	86,016	17			80.0	

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

GEM IMPACT SURVEY 2000  
 TABLE 1.1 - SO1 DATA ON FARMER/FISHERFOLK BENEFICIARIES FROM THE COOPERATIVE LEADER SURVEY  
 AND THE PARTICIPANT SAMPLE SURVEY

PROJ. NO.	PROJECT NAME	PROJECT SITE	COOPERATIVE NAME	PROJECT TYPE	INVESTMENT COST (P/UP MBBS)	DATE GEN ASSISTANCE	CURRENT PROJECT STATUS	FARMER FISHERFOLK BENEFICIARIES						ESTIMATED INCOME BY LEADER			PARTICIPANT REPORTED INCOME			ESTIMATED JOBS BY LEADER			AVERAGE INCOME PER HEDD PER DAY			
								TOTAL NUMBER PARTICIPANTS	NUMBER MOORE ACTIVE	NUMBER WOMEN	NUMBER MUSLIMS	NUMBER INDIGENOUS PEOPLE	SECONDARY BENEFICIARIES	PREPROJECT INCOME	POSTPROJECT INCOME	% CHANGE	SAMPLE NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS	AVERAGE PARTICIPANT PREPROJECT INCOME	AVERAGE PARTICIPANT POSTPROJECT INCOME	AVERAGE % CHANGE PARTICIPANT INCOME	TOTAL # JOBS	# FULL-TIME JOBS		# PART-TIME JOBS	# MAJOR JOBS	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	
42. GNC35	TPS Production (TPS 2000)	Five (5) sites in Misamis Occ. One (1) in Misamis Occ., One (1) in Cagayan, & TN	Horiculture Foundation Inc. Aringlaya, Misamis, Kautayan United Neighbors MPC	Key Agribusiness Enterprise		14.2 March 1999	Ongoing GEM Assistance; project continues to be implemented	140/140 (100.0%)	6 (4.3%)					4,288	61,601(A)	1,364.0	(24)/140	20,728	45,800	121	140				140	0.0
43. GNC43	Sweet Banana Plantation	Solo Lana, Grgy, Kibon, Municipality of Sumilao In Bulidnon	FARSA (First Agrarian Rabun Multi-Purpose Cooperative)	Key Agribusiness Enterprise		140.6 October 1998	Ongoing GEM Assistance; active project	210	2 (1.0%)	4 (1.9%)	170 (81.0%)			7,005	31,100(A)	345.0	6	83,234	87,413	38	470.0	333	72	72	72.4	
44. GNC47	Marketing of TPS Variety Potato	Bulidnon	Aringlaya, Misamis, Kautayan United Neighbors MPC	Market Linkage		1.2 March 1999	Ongoing GEM Assistance; project continues to be implemented	140/140 (100.0%)	6 (4.3%)					4,236	63,607 (E)	1,364.0	(24)/140	20,728	48,433	123					0.0	
45. GNC46	Marketing of Cavendish Bananas	Misamis Oriental and Compost	Secret Bapay Multi-Purpose Cooperative	Market Linkage		0.5 October 1997	Ongoing GEM Assistance; project continues to be implemented	19/16 (100.0%)						12,872	14,000(A)	14.0	(20)/16	15,540	18,095	16	10.0	5			4	90.0
48. GNC82B	IMPFA Peanut Seed Production	El Salvador, Misamis Oriental	Northern Mindanao Peanut Industry Association	Key Agribusiness Enterprise		0.8 October 1999	Ongoing GEM Assistance; project continues to be implemented								137,200(A)				45,800						0.0	
47. GNC2C	IMPFA Peanut Seed Production	El Salvador, Misamis Oriental	ACRES Multi-Purpose Coop.	Key Agribusiness Enterprise		0.0 July 1998	Ongoing GEM Assistance; project continues to be implemented	101/60 (58.4%)	11 (10.9%)		45 (44.6%)			10,398	10,822 (E)	2.1	(20)/60	18,920	22,000	37	124.0	101	15	8	81.2	
46. GNC43	Mango Production Contracting	Misamis Oriental	Katagan Workers Multi-Purpose Coop	Key Agribusiness Enterprise		5.0 July 1999	Ongoing GEM Assistance; project continues to be implemented	34	6 (33.6%)					15,414	62,570(A)	240.4	(24)/110	65,945	81,690	36	8.0	2	2	2	115.6	
SUB-TOTALS/AVERAGES						223.6			1,012/406 (40.1%)	100 (9.9%)	6 (0.4%)	261 (25.8%)		69	34,805	160,800	261.9	(25)/177	38,194	46,422	120	843.0	446	150	247	81.4
NORTHWESTERN MINDANAO																										
49. NYC10	Location Banana Nursery & Production	RT Lim, Zamboanga del Sur	R. T. Lim Multi-purpose	New Investment		24.0 November 1998	Ongoing GEM Assistance; active project	131/100 (76.3%)	61 (46.4%)	3 (2.0%)	48 (39.8%)			20	360,000	787,000(A)	118.7	(50)/100	17,354	28,841	62	210.0	10	200	81.9	
50. NYC11	Oropetala Banana Demo Farm	Oropetala City	Oropetala Fruit Growers Association	New Investment		1.0 May 1999	Ongoing GEM Assistance; active project	20/10 (50.0%)	2 (10.0%)		10 (50.0%)			1	81,000	258,000(A)	191.3	6	16,320	47,040	184	108.0	6	100	112.0	
51. NYC12	Banana Expansion	Colombia, Misamis Occidental	Bulay Farmers Association	New Investment		4.0 April 1999	Post-GEM assistance; active project	6/8 (100.0%)	3 (37.5%)					10	44,000	184,000(A)	318.1	4	12,896	42,948	223	109.0	6	100	63.3	
52. NYC16	Eel Production	RT Lim, Zamboanga del Sur	LOU (Livelihood Assistance and Management Program)	Key Agribusiness Enterprise		0.6 January 1999	Ongoing GEM Assistance; active project	30/1 (3.3%)	5 (16.7%)						104,400 (E)			25,200			8.0			8	120.0	
53. NYC18	Shogury Seaweed Farming	RT Lim, Zamboanga del Sur	TAPA (Tilapia-Agar-agar Farmers Association)	Key Agribusiness Enterprise		44.0 July 1999	Post-GEM assistance; active project	63/42 (66.1%)	28 (44.1%)	2 (3.0%)				8	98,000	664,000(A)	681.6	(20)/100	4,256	12,844	20	15.0		15	120.0	
SUB-TOTALS/AVERAGES						73.0			262/177 (87.8%)	87 (37.0%)	5 (1.9%)	66 (21.0%)		30	147,240	389,180	170.1	(16)/100	12,808	30,976	44	450.0	34	426	99.4	
SOSKARGEN																										
54. SSG101	Eel Culture and Production	Tauk, Sulu	Tauk Multi-purpose Coop of Farmers (Tarauc)	New Investment		1.1 January 1997	Post-GEM assistance; active project	34/16 (42.1%)	12 (31.6%)	22 (54.2%)	8 (18.8%)				600,000	1,000,000 (E)	100.0	(24)/100	30,143	81,842	170	10.0	6	4	0.0	
55. SSG108	Peanut Seed Production	Tauk, EC and Bejambayan, SA	Tauk Integrated Agricultural Coop.	Key Agribusiness Enterprise		6.1 January 1998	Post-GEM assistance; active project	16	7 (43.8%)					10	405,000 (E)		(24)/100	23,583	34,100	44	12.0			12	74.1	
56. SSG111	Linak Peanut Production	Upper Khan, Lanat, Patomok, Sa, Odatok	Peanut Production Inc Commercial use	New Investment		0.8 "half date" 0	Post-GEM assistance; active project	107	14 (13.0%)						0 (E)				300.0					300	80.0	
57. SSG70	Rice Production	Tacwang, Sultan K.	Card of Kautayan state Rev. Com.AMLP MPC	Key Agribusiness SME		1.0 February 1998	Post-GEM assistance; active project	108/54 (50.0%)	4 (3.7%)	64 (58.3%)				68,258	98,826(A)	0.6	(24)/100	81,278	100,794	10	96.0			96	23.0	
58. SSG73	Rubber Production	Bejambayan, Sultan K.	MARSEMCO (Mangrove Agrarian National Beneficiaries Coop.	Contract Growing		0.8 April 1998	Post-GEM assistance; active project	36/31 (22.0%)	117 (31.8%)	8 (2.5%)	1 (0.2%)			28,346	40,190 (E)	41.7	(24)/100	34,101	82,383	170	110.0			110	60.0	
SUB-TOTALS/AVERAGES						37			827/331 (23.7%)	186 (29.2%)	105 (18.8%)	7 (1.1%)		10	164,869	378,204	92.0	(24)/100	44,813	77,210	72	818.0	8	612	66.7	

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

SEM IMPACT SURVEY 2000

TABLE 1.1 - SO1 DATA ON FARMER/FISHERFOLK BENEFICIARIES FROM THE COOPERATIVE LEADER SURVEY AND THE PARTICIPANT SAMPLE SURVEY

PROJ. NO.	PROJECT NAME	PROJECT DATE	COOPERATIVE NAME	PROJECT TYPE	INVESTMENT COST (P/P MILLION)	DATE GEN ASSISTANCE	CURRENT PROJECT STATUS	TOTAL NUMBER PARTICIPANTS	FARMER FISHERFOLK BENEFICIARIES						ESTIMATED INCOME BY LEADER			PARTICIPANT REPORTED INCOME			ESTIMATED JOBS BY LEADER			AVERAGE INCOME PER HED PER DAY						
									NUMBER MORE ACTIVE	NUMBER WOMEN	NUMBER MUSLIMS	NUMBER INDIGENOUS PEOPLE	SECONDARY BENEFICIARIES	PREPROJECT INCOME	POSTPROJECT INCOME	% CHANGE	SAMPLE NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS	AVERAGE PARTICIPANT PREPROJECT INCOME	AVERAGE PARTICIPANT POSTPROJECT INCOME	AVERAGE % CHANGE PARTICIPANT INCOME	TOTAL # JOBS	# FULL-TIME JOBS	# PART-TIME JOBS		# SEASONAL JOBS					
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26					
<b>ZAMBOANGA-ARMM</b>																														
1. ZB006	Industrial Tree Farming	Isabela, Basilan	UWARRS(MPC) United Workers Agrarian Reform Beneficiaries (MPC)	Market Linkage		10/0	January 1998	Post-GEI assistance; active project	20/20 (100.0%)	5 (25.0%)					99,832	104,259 (E)	78%	6	40,428	144,000	257	202		20	84.0					
60. ZB042	Marketing Cacao	Lantoran, Basilan	Lantoran Agrarian Reform Beneficiaries MPC (LARBECCO)	Market Linkage		2/0	May 1998	Post-GEI assistance; active project	40/40 (100.0%)	5 (12.5%)	5 (12.5%)				30,950	65,000(A)	110%	8	34,337	42,601	25	85.0	40	85	84.8					
1. ZB032	Marketing of Rubber	Basilan	United Workers Agrarian Reform Beneficiaries MPC	Market Linkage		0/0	January 1999	Ongoing GEM Assistance; project continues to be implemented	11/11 (100.0%)	1 (9.1%)	6 (54.5%)				NA	NA		8	33,748	45,964	31	22.0	22		168.7					
41. ZB054	Integrated Rubber and Coffee Plantation	Isabela, Basilan	United Worker's Agrarian Reform Beneficiaries MPC	New Investment		0/0	January 1998	Post-GEI assistance; active project	30/30 (100.0%)		10 (33.3%)				0(A)	0(A)		8	38,476	42,937	17	215.0	136	30	50	104.3				
61. ZB055	Mango Plantation	Pasacoding, Zamboanga City	Holy Rosary Family Center, Pasacoding MPC	New Investment		7/0	June 1998	Ongoing GEM Assistance; project continues to be implemented	43/43 (100.0%)	18 (41.9%)	17 (39.5%)				3,000	900,000 (E)	29,800%	8(A)/10(E)	1,600	20,930	1,298					0.0				
1. ZB038	Rubber Plantation in Lantoran	Bray, Dabobo, Lantoran, Basilan	LARBECCO (Lantoran Agrarian Reform Beneficiaries MPC)	New Investment		40/0	August 1998	Ongoing GEM Assistance; project continues to be implemented	20/20 (100.0%)	3 (6.9%)	2 (6.7%)				24,281 (E)	24,281 (E)		8	36,834	43,302	23	35.0	35		178.0					
63. ZB068	Rehab of Coffee Plantation	Babobo, Lantoran, W Basilan	LARBECCO(MPC) Lantoran Agrarian Reform Beneficiaries MPC	New Investment		8/0	January 1998	Ongoing GEM Assistance; project continues to be implemented	8/8 (100.0%)	1 (12.5%)					158,800	192,200(A)	123%	9	38,057	44,477	23	46.0	20	20	86.3					
<b>SUB-TOTALS / AVERAGES</b>									181/188 (100.0%)	24 (12.8%)	45 (23.9%)				65,445	218,150 (E)	291%	199(A)/103(E)	37,315	84,833	74	427.0	252	30	145	107.4				
<b>TOTALS / AVERAGES</b>									654/0	8,646/3,661 (62.2%)	1,319/23.7%	1,043/18.4%	883/14.7%	1,778	241,292	682,842 (A)	183.4%	364	68,792	338,990	391	3,348.0	841	195	2,246	117.2				
															(E) = Expected Income	802,883 (E)		182 (E)		542,164 (E)										
															(A) = Actual Income															

**TOTAL NO. OF JOBS CREATED FOR ALL PARTICIPANTS**

TOTAL	FULL-TIME	PART-TIME	SEASONAL
3,349	889 (26.5%)	195 (5.8%)	2,265 (67.6%)

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

GEM IMPACT SURVEY 2000  
 TABLE 1.2 - SO1 DATA ON FARMER/FISHERFOLK BENEFICIARIES FROM THE COOPERATIVE LEADER SURVEY  
 AND THE PARTICIPANT SAMPLE SURVEY (AGRO-FORESTRY PROJECTS)

PROJ. NO.	PROJECT NAME	PROJECT SITE	COOPERATIVE NAME	PROJECT TYPE	INVESTMENT COST (P/P Million)	DATE GEM ASSISTANCE	CURRENT PROJECT STATUS	TOTAL NUMBER PARTICIPANTS	FARMER FISHERFOLK BENEFICIARIES				ESTIMATED INCOME BY LEADER			PARTICIPANT REPORTED INCOME			ESTIMATED JOBS BY LEADER			AVERAGE INCOME PER HREC PER DAY					
									NUMBER MORE ACTIVE	NUMBER WOMEN	NUMBER MUSLIMS	NUMBER INDIGENOUS PEOPLE	SECONDARY BENEFICIARIES	PREPROJECT INCOME	POSTPROJECT INCOME	% CHANGE	SAMPLE NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS	AVERAGE PARTICIPANT PREPROJECT INCOME	AVERAGE PARTICIPANT POSTPROJECT INCOME	AVERAGE % CHANGE PARTICIPANT INCOME	TOTAL # JOBS		# FULL-TIME JOBS	# PART-TIME JOBS	# SEASONAL JOBS		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26		
<b>CARAGA</b>																											
1. CAR54	Industrial Tree Plantation	Aguasan del Norte	UNAFI Multi-Purpose Cooperative	New Investment	1.0	January 1998	Ongoing GEM Assistance; project implementation stopped or stalled	150/145 (96.7%)	1	0 (0.7%)	1	0 (0.7%)		8,000	275,603 (E)	4,433.3	0 (0.0%)		275,603			18.0	1			15	89.1
2. CAR52	Industrial Tree Plantation	Colorado, Jabonga, Agusan del Norte	Colorado Tree Farmers Association	New Investment	8.0	May 1998	Ongoing GEM Assistance; project continues to be implemented	30/18 (60.0%)	10	23.3%				7,200	200,000 (E)	2,781.1	0 (0.0%)	11,154	369,200	3,210							0.0
3. CAR56	Industrial Tree Farming	Brasil	Brazil Small Tree Farmers Association	New Investment	5.0	April 2000	Post-GEM assistance; active project	22/19 (86.4%)	7	31.8%				100	30,000	200,000 (E)	455.5	0 (0.0%)	34,428	338,984	736	25.0				25	100.0
4. CAR57	Industrial Tree Farming	Surigao City	Surigao Economic Development Foundation Inc.	New Investment	6.0	"bad date"	Ongoing GEM Assistance; project continues to be implemented	10/9 (90.0%)						50	80,000	2,063,536 (E)	3,272.6	0 (0.0%)	200,000	1,448,750	621	18.0	5	3	3	3	120.0
SUB-TOTALS/AVERAGES					16.0			212/179 (84.4%)	18	8.5%	3	0.4%		150	27,220	469,784	2,411.3	0 (0.0%)	81,867	695,164	627	58.0	10	3	42	103.0	
<b>GREATER NORTHERN CORRIDOR</b>																											
5. GNC57	Agrobossey Project	Tapanahy, Cagayan de Oro City	Tapanahy Farmers Multi-Purpose Cooperative	New Investment	0.2	September 1998	Ongoing GEM Assistance; active project	14/14 (100.0%)	24	18.7%				95,000	250,000 (E)	163.1	0					8.0				6	61.0
SUB-TOTALS/AVERAGES					0.2			14/14 (100.0%)	24	18.7%				95,000	250,000	163.1	0			0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	8.0				6	61.0
<b>ZAMBOANGA-ARMM</b>																											
6. ZD06	Industrial Tree Farming	Subota, Basilan	UNWABMPC (United Workers Agrarian Reform Beneficiaries MPC)	Market Linkage	100.0	January 1994	Post-GEM assistance; active project	20/20 (100.0%)	5	25.0%				99,032	104,258 (E)	78.6	0	40,428	144,000	257	20.0				20	84.0	
SUB-TOTALS/AVERAGES					100.0			20/20 (100.0%)	5	25.0%				99,032	104,258	78.6	0	40,428	144,000 (A)	257	20.0				20	84.0	
TOTALS/AVERAGES					118.2			316/199 (62.9%)	42	11.5%	6	1.5%	8	2.1%	150	43,838	618,997	1,063.6	0 (0.0%)	71,802	808,048	606	85.0	10	3	72	88.0
Note: Large estimates of future income are the calculated total on the basis of single harvest of trees.														(B) = Expected Income		(A) = Actual Income											

TOTAL NO. OF JOBS CREATED FOR ALL PARTICIPANTS

TOTAL	FULL-TIME	PART-TIME	SEASONAL
85	10 (11.7%)	3 (3.5%)	72 (84.7%)

IMPACT SURVEY 2000  
 TABLE 1.3 - SOI DATA ON FARMER/FISHERFOLK BENEFICIARIES FROM THE COOPERATIVE LEADER SURVEY  
 AND THE PARTICIPANT SAMPLE SURVEY (NON-AGRO-FORESTRY PROJECTS)

PROJ. NO.	PROJECT NAME	PROJECT SITE	COOPERATIVE NAME	PROJECT TYPE	INVESTMENT COST (PHP AMOUNT)	DATE GEM ASSISTANCE	CURRENT PROJECT STATUS	FARMER/FISHERFOLK BENEFICIARIES						ESTIMATED INCOME BY LEADER			PARTICIPANT REPORTED INCOME			ESTIMATED JOBS BY LEADER				AVERAGE INCOME PER HRCO PERSON PER DAY				
								TOTAL NUMBER PARTICIPANTS	NUMBER MORE ACTIVE	NUMBER WOMEN	NUMBER MUSLIMS	NUMBER INDIGENOUS PEOPLE	SECONDARY BENEFICIARIES	PRE-PROJECT INCOME	POST-PROJECT INCOME	% CHANGE	SAMPLE NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS	AVERAGE PARTICIPANT PRE-PROJECT INCOME	AVERAGE PARTICIPANT POST-PROJECT INCOME	AVERAGE % CHANGE PARTICIPANT INCOME	TOTAL # JOBS	# FULL-TIME JOBS	# PART-TIME JOBS		# SEASONAL JOBS			
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26			
<b>CARAGA</b>																												
1. CAR08	Coffee Production	Tubay, Sarragan, Kitchano and Jabonga, Agusan del Norte	Brazil Small Coffee Multi-Purpose Cooperative	Contract Growing		23.5 April 1996	Post-GEM assistance; active project	22/10 (45.8%)	7 (21.8%)					140	36,000	200,000 (P)	455.5	(P/A) / (P/E)		37,438	84,812	126	23.0		25	100.0		
2. CAR33	Expansion of Seaweed Production	Dry, Litanco, Umpa Surbo del Sur	Bungo del Sur Seaweed Growers Association	Market Linkage		0.5 January 1996	Post-GEM assistance; project activity suspended	26/21 (58.3%)	7 (18.4%)					32	43,000	198,878 (P)	354.7	(P/A) / (P/E)		125,903	472,744	275				0.0		
3. CAR41	Coffee Production	San Luis, Agusan del Sur	Kampyl Farmers MPC	Contract Growing		24.0 January 1995	Post-GEM assistance; active project	275/264 (96.0%)	125 (27.2%)		206 (74.9%)				26,500	4,028,048 (P)	15,092.4	(P/A) / (P/E)		852,027	2,587,370	172	80.0	4	76	101.8		
4. CAR49	Mango Production	Haspil, Agusan del Norte	Culik MPC	Market Linkage		0.2 January 1994	Post-GEM assistance; active project	200/180 (90.0%)	140 (70.0%)						1,061,700	1,220,829 (P)	11.0	(P/A) / (P/E)		218,062	1,141,178	424	18.0		10	60.0		
5. CAR50	Expansion of Rubber Plantation	Beyuan, Agusan del Sur	CARAGA Women's Agro-Industrial MPC	New Investment		2.0 January 1997	Post-GEM assistance; active project	31/25 (80.7%)	24 (77.4%)						818,000	860,000 (P)	6.6	(P/A) / (P/E)		35,865			18.0		10	100.0		
6. CAR59	Marketing of Dried Fish/water Snmp	Bangayan, Kitchano, Agusan del Norte	Bangayan FHS Association	Market Linkage		2.5 July 1996	Post-GEM assistance; active project	30/30 (100.0%)							30,000	43,000 (P)	60.0	(P/A) / (P/E)		21,677	36,468	64				0.0		
7. CAR72	Mango Plantation	Jabonga, Agusan del Norte	Colorado Tree Farmers Association	Key Agribusiness Enterprise		8.0 May 1998	Post-GEM assistance; active project	400/340 (85.0%)	30 (20.0%)		100 (25.0%)				114,000	652,800 (P)	323.7	(P/A) / (P/E)		4,767	487,189	16,120	3.0		3	100.0		
8. CAR92	Carambola Production	Dinaqui Island	Tubigon Essential Producers Association	New Investment		3.6 "bad date" 0	Ongoing GEM Assistance; project continues to be implemented	22/26 (80.8%)							8,750	800,000 (P)	8,042.3	(P/A) / (P/E)		37,184	641,125	1,742				0.0		
9. CAR93	Agusan FIOC Fruit Production and Expansion	Province-Wide	Agusan del Sur Fruit Industry Development Council	Key Agribusiness Enterprise		3.8 September 1994	Post-GEM assistance; active project	15/9 (60.0%)							0 (P)			(P/A) / (P/E)		117,997	821,657	886				0.0		
10. CAR98	Lacatan Banana Production	Beyuan	TANACCO Tree Farmers Multi-Purpose Cooperative	Contract Growing		10.0 January 1998	Post-GEM assistance; active project	165/137 (83.0%)	30 (19.4%)						21,000	71,000 (P)	198.8	(P/A) / (P/E)		43,872			11.0		11	100.0		
<b>SUB-TOTALS / AVERAGES</b>																												
								79.3																				
								1,248,972 (78.0%)	383 (29.1%)		308 (24.8%)		204			222,537	874,838	293.1	(P/A) / (P/E)		178,732	817,743	249	136.0	4	135	53.8	
<b>COTABATO-ARM</b>																												
11. COT01	Contract Growing of Fruit Trees	Pres. Roxas, Comaba Province, Mar. Adu, of Barangay Councils		Contract Growing		4.9 February 1998	Ongoing GEM Assistance; active project	26	22 (58.4%)						1,948,000	4,128,000 (P)	111.9	(P/A) / (P/E)		40,236	688,718	1,363	2.0	2		50.0		
12. COT08	Supply of Fruit Tree Planting Material to Orchard Dev't Projs Lanas II and III	Isipayan, Misamis Occidental, Tacogayan, 8 Kulsan and Rigan, Lanas II	Col. Producers Multi-Purpose Coop. Inc.	Market Linkage		1.8 February 1996	Ongoing GEM Assistance; active project	24/19 (79.2%)	6 (21.0%)	1 (4.2%)					165,110	740,774 (P)	348.6	(P/A) / (P/E)		186,719	328,532	78	8.0	6	2	80.0		
13. COT21	Orchard Growth and Marketing	Pipayan, Misamis Occidental	Tasudal MPC	Contract Growing		0.5 June 1997	Post-GEM assistance; project activity suspended	100/100 (100.0%)	19 (19.0%)	100 (100.0%)					42,400 (P)			(P/A) / (P/E)		44,182	60,323	12				0.0		
14. COT34	Laba Dulcan Aquaculture Development	Laba Dulcan, Dulcan, Misamis Occidental	Integrated Serv. for Livelihood of Labad MPC	Key Agribusiness Enterprise		0.0 January 1997	Ongoing GEM Assistance; active project	426/342 (80.3%)	8 (1.2%)	426 (100.0%)				60	81,000 (P)			(P/A) / (P/E)		10,820	34,522	228	3.0	3		133.0		
15. COT48	Econ. Grove Establishment/Fruit Orchard Development in Marikina	Marikina and Marikina	Lungsod Impulso Farmers Cooperative	Key Agribusiness Enterprise		3.0 February 1994	Ongoing GEM Assistance; active project	31/31 (100.0%)		31 (100.0%)				120	62,000 (P)			(P/A) / (P/E)		18,375	118,304	410				0.0		
16. COT61	Fruit Orchard Development in Upi	Upi, Misamis Occidental	Bellutan sa Kulsan Foundation, Inc.	Key Agribusiness Enterprise		1.0 November 1998	Ongoing GEM Assistance; active project	125	66 (52.8%)	22 (17.6%)	83 (66.4%)			15	28,700	182,492 (P)	412.4	(P/A) / (P/E)		733,822	1,063,045	696	7.0	2	6	81.4		
17. COT81	Fruit Nursery	Balabong, Lanas del Norte	Lanas Fruit Growers Coop	Key Agribusiness Enterprise		1.0 August 1996	Ongoing GEM Assistance; active project	63/33 (52.3%)	26 (41.3%)	60 (95.2%)					67,800	7,834,182 (P)	1,262.9	(P/A) / (P/E)		140,372	6,433,716	4,446	3.0	3		100.0		
18. COT103	Sale of Handloom Products (ATZ)	Bukid, Dulcan Kulsan and Marikina	Dulcan Producers Association	Small & Medium Enterprise		0.5 January 1998	Ongoing GEM Assistance; active project	36/30 (83.3%)	17 (58.3%)	38 (97.4%)	1 (2.6%)			75	713,170	633,800 (P)	166.0	(P/A) / (P/E)		16,994	20,808	80				0.0		
19. COT184	Cost Plus Margin Arrangement Sugar Production	Separate locations in North and South Cotabato	COBUNDECO	Contract Growing		10.7 January 1999	Ongoing GEM Assistance; active project	12/13 (92.3%)	1 (8.7%)	1 (8.7%)					1,438,904	1,774,800 (P)	23.2	(P/A) / (P/E)		154,829	156,130	18	48.0	40		138.8		
20. COT198	Cost Plus Margin Arrangement Sugar Production	Separate locations in North	Integrated Misamis Occidental for	Contract Growing		10.7 January 1999	Ongoing GEM Assistance; active project	140/137 (97.9%)	8 (5.8%)	147 (94.0%)					4,700	24,797 (P)	409.2	(P/A) / (P/E)		68,136	111,115	70	72.0		22	204.1		

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

**GEM IMPACT SURVEY 2000**  
**TABLE 1.3 - SO1 DATA ON FARMER/FISHERFOLK BENEFICIARIES FROM THE COOPERATIVE LEADER SURVEY**  
**AND THE PARTICIPANT SAMPLE SURVEY (NON-AGRO-FORESTRY PROJECTS)**

PROJ. NO.	PROJECT NAME	PROJECT SITE	COOPERATIVE NAME	PROJECT TYPE	INVESTMENT COST (PHP MILLION)	DATE GEM ASSISTANCE	CURRENT PROJECT STATUS	TOTAL NUMBER PARTICIPANTS	FARMER/FISHERFOLK BENEFICIARIES					ESTIMATED INCOME BY LEADER			PARTICIPANT REPORTED INCOME			ESTIMATED JOBS BY LEADER				AVERAGE INCOME PER HHD PER DAY		
									NUMBER MORE ACTIVE	NUMBER WOMEN	NUMBER MUSLIMS	NUMBER INDIGENOUS PEOPLE	SECONDARY BENEFICIARIES	PREPROJECT INCOME	POSTPROJECT INCOME	% CHANGE	SAMPLE NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS	AVERAGE PARTICIPANT PREPROJECT INCOME	AVERAGE PARTICIPANT POSTPROJECT INCOME	AVERAGE % CHANGE PARTICIPANT INCOME	TOTAL # JOBS	# FULL-TIME JOBS	# PART-TIME JOBS		# SEASONAL JOBS	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	
<b>COTABATO</b>																										
2. COT19C	Cost Plus Margin Arrangement Sugar Production	Cotabato and South Cotabato	Natives MPC	Contract Growing	10.7	August 1998	Ongoing GEM Assistance; active project	105/97 (91.8%)	26 (24.5%)				126	50,100	85,907 (E)	83.3	4	91,152	140,703	64	650				65	654.5
23. COT19D	Cost Plus Margin Arrangement Sugar Production	Separate Locations in North Cotabato and South Cotabato	Kabuhayan MPC	Contract Growing	10.7	November 1998	Ongoing GEM Assistance; active project	72/58 (79.3%)	8 (8.6%)	28 (31.6%)			90	6,055	240,983 (E)	4,667.4	(24)/1500	104,360	111,843	3	327			32	496.8	
4. COT19E	Cost Plus Margin Arrangement Sugar Production	Separate Locations in North Cotabato and South Cotabato	Manupal Development MPC	Contract Growing	10.7	August 1998	Ongoing GEM Assistance; active project	70/62 (88.6%)	6 (8.4%)				326	34,864	73,794 (E)	111.4	(10)/1100	55,062	110,822	101	670			67	64.9	
5. COT19F	Cost Plus Margin Arrangement Sugar Production	Separate Locations in North Cotabato and South Cotabato	Das. Imito Multi-Purpose Cooperative	Contract Growing	10.7	August 1998	Ongoing GEM Assistance; active project	334/319 (95.5%)	167 (50.5%)				350	3,358,224	8,238,850 (E)	83.8	(50)/1100	42,654	113,742	167	2003			200	35.0	
<b>SUB-TOTALS/AVERAGES</b>					74.3			1,679/1301 (77.6%)	387 (23.4%)	877 (52.2%)	64 (3.2%)		1,296	648,615	1,324,742	121.4	(46)/14100	74,073	872,860	806	5050	86	5	444	194.2	
<b>DAVAO GULF</b>																										
6. DVG09	Landscape Ornamentals Production	Davao City	Halayra Growers MPC	Key Agribusiness SME	0.3	January 1998	Ongoing GEM Assistance; active project	12/12 (100.0%)	8 (66.6%)				186240	548,326(A)	214.7	3	29,080	65,613	126	30	3				150.0	
17. DVG10	Dendrobium and Landscaping Ornamentals Production	Davao City	Green Fields MPC	Key Agribusiness SME	0.3	January 1998	Ongoing GEM Assistance; active project	89/40 (80.8%)	60 (100.0%)				18,846	8,400 (E)	-31.2	2	60,000	108,025	80	40	2			2	100.0	
8. DVG11	Landscape Ornamentals Production	Cabalan, Davao City	Cabalan Evergreen Outdoor Cooperative	Key Agribusiness SME	2.0	"bad date" 0	Ongoing GEM Assistance; active project	87/44 (77.2%)	54 (54.7%)				78,320	128,250(A)	82.4	(50)/1100	20,821	33,548	157	30	3				114.0	
28. DVG12	Banquet Production	Davao City	HAWAIDEMPCO	Key Agribusiness Enterprise	2.4	April 1997	Ongoing GEM Assistance; active project	107/102 (95.2%)	9 (7.5%)	6 (5.6%)	43 (42.1%)		40,150	83,000(A)	122.3	4	43,340			83	78			11	213.2	
9. DVG13	Hageeta Agro-forestry Project	Davao City	Begam Agro-Forestry	Key Agribusiness Enterprise	2.0	September 1998	Post-GEM assistance; active project						20,000	35,000 (E)	75.0	0				20	20			2	100.0	
31. DVG08A	True Potato Seed (TPS 2000) Project I	Davao Out-estate	Maharlika MPC	Key Agribusiness Enterprise	6.0	September 1998	Ongoing GEM Assistance; active project	64/34 (81.4%)	1 (1.7%)				6	77,500	160,000(A)	106.4	0				100			10	70.0	
12. DVG08B	True Potato Seed (TPS 2000) Project II	Davao Out-estate	Samurai MPC	Key Agribusiness Enterprise	6.0	November 1998	Ongoing GEM Assistance; active project	37/15 (48.4%)	9 (16.1%)				5	7,500	78,000(A)	900.0	4	63,787	35,100	-15	21	5		16	92.8	
33. DVG10	Albica marketing and Consolidation	Davao City and Davao del Norte	ATA Farmers MPOU/AMCO	Market Linkage	6.0	October 1998	Ongoing GEM Assistance; active project	95/70 (73.2%)	10 (11.1%)				90 (100.0%)	24,000(A)		0					2750			5	270	70.0
<b>SUB-TOTALS/AVERAGES</b>					22.4			410/307 (74.9%)	134 (32.7%)	6 (1.8%)	150 (36.6%)		10	87,784	140,148	134.4	(20)/1100	37,867	81,298	62	4110	81	7	313	114.8	
<b>GREATER NORTHERN CORRIDOR</b>																										
14. GNC05	Mango Production Program	Dumaguete, Bulacan	Dumaguete Fruit Growers MPC	Contract Growing	60.0	April 2000	Ongoing GEM Assistance; project continues to be implemented	69/35 (88.2%)	11 (18.2%)				147,147	203,202 (E)	38.0	(50)/1100	28,340	94,608	240	110	3		11		61.3	
15. GNC06	White Potato Production	Surreles, Com Victoria and Impusugang, Bulacan	Francis Farmers Association	Contract Growing	10.0	January 1997	Ongoing GEM Assistance; project implementation stopped or stalled	122/16 (12.2%)	2 (1.6%)				49	18,800	781,000(A)	4,833.2	(10)/1100	40,000	324,518	71	600			80		90.0
8. GNC29	Marketing of Ornamental Plants	Cogayan de Oro	Northern Mindanao Ornamental Horticulture Foundation Inc.	Market Linkage	1.37	July 1997	Post-GEM assistance; active project	45	30 (66.7%)					0(A)		0					73,280	85,616	17			0.0
17. GNC30	TPS Production (TPS 2000)	Five (5) sites in Misamis Or. One (1) in Misamis Occ. One (1) in Compostela, & TN	Ampangga, Zamboanga, Zamboanga United Neighbors MPC	Key Agribusiness Enterprise	14.2	March 1999	Ongoing GEM Assistance; project continues to be implemented	140/140 (100.0%)	6 (4.3%)				4	4,284	63,607(A)	1,384.0	(10)/1100	20,728	48,800	127	1400				140	0.0
38. GNC43	Small Banana Production	Sito Lupa, Oriz, Kausar, Municipality of Surreles in Bulacan	FARM (First Agrarian Return Multi-Purpose Cooperative)	Key Agribusiness Enterprise	140.8	October 1998	Ongoing GEM Assistance; active project	210	7 (1.6%)	4 (1.9%)	170 (81.2%)		7,000	31,190(A)	343.0	4	83,234	87,413	34	4780	331	72	72		72.0	
4. GNC47	Marketing of TPS Variety Potatoes	Bulacan	Ampangga, Zamboanga, Zamboanga United Neighbors MPC	Market Linkage	1.2	March 1998	Ongoing GEM Assistance; project continues to be implemented	140/140 (100.0%)	6 (4.3%)					4,284	63,607 (E)	1,384.0	(10)/1100	20,728	48,433	123						0.0
10. GNC48	Marketing of Cavendish Bananas	Misamis Oriental and Compostela	Begam Supply Multi-Purpose	Market Linkage	0.5	October 1997	Ongoing GEM Assistance; project	18/18 (100.0%)					6	12,873	14,800(A)	14.0	(40)/1100	13,440	18,000	16	100			6	80.0	

34

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

SEM IMPACT SURVEY 2000  
TABLE 1.3 - SOI DATA ON FARMER/FISHERFOLK BENEFICIARIES FROM THE COOPERATIVE LEADER SURVEY  
AND THE PARTICIPANT SAMPLE SURVEY (NON-AGRO-FORESTRY PROJECTS)

PROJ. NO.	PROJECT NAME	PROJECT SITE	COOPERATIVE NAME	PROJECT TYPE	INVESTMENT COST (PHP MILLION)	DATE GEM ASSISTANCE	CURRENT PROJECT STATUS	FARMER/FISHERFOLK BENEFICIARIES						ESTIMATED INCOME BY LEADER			PARTICIPANT REPORTED INCOME			ESTIMATED JOBS BY LEADER			AVERAGE INCOME PER Hired PERSON PER DAY		
								TOTAL NUMBER PARTICIPANTS	NUMBER MORE ACTIVE	NUMBER WOMEN	NUMBER MUSLIMS	NUMBER INDIGENOUS PEOPLE	SECONDARY BENEFICIARIES	PREPROJECT INCOME	POSTPROJECT INCOME	% CHANGE	AVERAGE NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS	AVERAGE PARTICIPANT PREPROJECT INCOME	AVERAGE PARTICIPANT POSTPROJECT INCOME	AVERAGE % CHANGE PARTICIPANT INCOME	TOTAL # JOBS	# FULL-TIME JOBS		# PART-TIME JOBS	# SEASONAL JOBS
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26
SUB-TOTALS / AVERAGES																									
NORTHWESTERN MINDANAO																									
11	HW10	Lactan Banana Nursery & Production	RT Lim, Zamboanga del Sur	R.T. Lim Multipurpose	New Investment	24.0 November 1998	Ongoing GEM Assistance; active project	151	108 (71.2%)	81 (49.4%)	3 (2.0%)	45 (29.8%)	20	300,000	787,000(A)	118.7	(5A)/15(E)	17,864	28,841	61	210.0	10	200	81.9	
12	HW11	Oroquieta Banana Demo Farm	Oroquieta City	Oroquieta Fruit Growers Association	New Investment	1.8 May 1999	Ongoing GEM Assistance; active project	20	10 (50.0%)	2 (10.0%)	10 (50.0%)	1	87,000	258,000(A)	181.3	(5A)/10(E)	16,800	47,040	184	108.0	8	100	112.0		
13	HW12	Banana Expansion	Colombia, Misamis Occidental	Subang Farmers Association	New Investment	4.0 April 1999	Post-GEM assistance; active project	8	8 (100.0%)	3 (37.5%)			10	44,000	184,000(A)	318.1	(5A)/10(E)	12,800	42,948	232	109.0	6	163	63.3	
14	HW16	Eel Production	RT Lim, Zamboanga del Sur	LOU Livelihood Assistance and Management Program	Key Agribusiness Enterprise	0.5 January 1999	Ongoing GEM Assistance; active project	30	1 (3.3%)	3 (10.7%)			10	104,400 (E)		(5A)/1(E)	23,200		8.0				8	120.0	
15	HW18	Sibuyan Sesame Farming	RT Lim, Zamboanga del Sur	TAPA (Tahay Agri-Sea Porters Association)	Key Agribusiness Enterprise	44.0 July 1999	Post-GEM assistance; active project	63	52 (81.1%)	26 (49.1%)	2 (3.2%)		8	98,000	664,000(A)	69.4	(5A)/3(E)	4,758	12,864	201	15.0		13	120.0	
SUB-TOTALS / AVERAGES																									
BOSKARGEN																									
16	BS0101	Eel Culture and Production	Tupi, Soc	Tupi Multipurpose Coop of Farmers (Farmers)	New Investment	1.1 January 1997	Post-GEM assistance; active project	36	18 (42.1%)	12 (31.8%)	32 (84.2%)	6 (16.8%)		600,000	1,000,000 (E)	100.0	(5A)/4(E)	30,185	81,582	170	10.0	8	4	0.0	
17	BS0108	Peanut Seed Production	Tupi, JC and Bagumbayan, SA	Tupi Integrated Agricultural Coop.	Key Agribusiness Enterprise	0.1 January 1998	Post-GEM assistance; active project	16	7 (43.8%)				10	406,000 (E)		(5A)/10(E)	22,983	34,100	44	12.0		17	74.1		
18	BS0111	Lonok Peanut Production	Upper Kanan, Lonok, Patomoko, So, Cotabato	Peanut Production by Commercial	New Investment	0.8 "trial demo"	Post-GEM assistance; active project	107		48 (43.0%)				0 (E)					300.0			300	60.0		
19	BS070	Rice Production	Turcom, Sultan A.	Central Sultanate Rice Rev. COMARALP MPC	Key Agribusiness SME	1.0 February 1998	Post-GEM assistance; active project	108	54 (50.0%)	4 (3.7%)	84 (86.3%)		10	86,250	88,620(A)	0.6	(5A)/10(E)	81,378	100,794	16	86.0		86	33.0	
20	BS073	Rubber Production	Bagumbayan, Sultan A.	MARDUCCO Messy Agrarian Reform Beneficiaries Coop.	Contract Growing	0.8 April 1998	Post-GEM assistance; active project	368	81 (22.0%)	117 (31.8%)	9 (2.5%)	1 (0.2%)	10	28,344	40,190 (E)	41.7	(5A)/10(E)	34,107	92,383	170	110.0		110	60.0	
SUB-TOTALS / AVERAGES																									
ZAMBOANGA-ARMM																									
21	ZB042	Marketing Cocoa	Lantian, Basilan	Lantian Agrarian Reform Beneficiaries MPC (ARBECC)	Market Linkage	2.0 May 1998	Post-GEM assistance; active project	40	40 (100.0%)	1 (2.5%)	8 (12.5%)			30,950	66,000(A)	116.0	(5A)/10(E)	34,327	42,801	22	85.0	40	66	64.8	
22	ZB042	Marketing of Rubber	Basilan	United Worker's Agrarian Reform Beneficiaries MPC	Market Linkage	0.8 January 1998	Ongoing GEM Assistance; project continues to be implemented	11	11 (100.0%)	1 (9.1%)	6 (54.5%)				0(A)			22,748	40,984	21	22.0	22		166.7	
23	ZB044	Integrated Rubber and Culture Plantation	Basilan, Basilan	United Worker's Agrarian Reform Beneficiaries MPC	New Investment	0.6 January 1998	Post-GEM assistance; active project	50	30 (60.0%)		19 (33.3%)				0(A)			34,476	42,931	17	216.0	134	30	104.1	
24	ZB048	Mango Plantation	Parang, Zamboanga City	Haji Family Family Center, Haj Family MPC	New Investment	7.0 June 1998	Ongoing GEM Assistance; project continues to be implemented	43	43 (100.0%)	19 (41.9%)	17 (39.5%)			1,000	800,000 (E)	28,000.0	(5A)/10(E)	1,600	28,830	1,296					0.0

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

35

GEM IMPACT SURVEY 2000

TABLE I.3 - SOI DATA ON FARMER/FISHERFOLK BENEFICIARIES FROM THE COOPERATIVE LEADER SURVEY AND THE PARTICIPANT SAMPLE SURVEY (NON-AGRO-FORESTRY PROJECTS)

PROJ. NO.	PROJECT NAME	PROJECT SITE	COOPERATIVE NAME	PROJECT TYPE	INVESTMENT COST (PAP \$/HECT)	DATE GEM ASSISTANCE	CURRENT PROJECT STATUS	TOTAL NUMBER PARTICIPANTS	FARMER FISHERFOLK BENEFICIARIES					ESTIMATED INCOME BY LEADER			PARTICIPANT REPORTED INCOME			ESTIMATED JOBS BY LEADER				AVERAGE INCOME PER HIREE PER DAY	
									NUMBER MORE ACTIVE	NUMBER WOMEN	NUMBER MUSLIMS	NUMBER INDIGENOUS PEOPLE	SECONDARY BENEFICIARIES	PREPROJECT INCOME	POSTPROJECT INCOME	% CHANGE	SAMPLE NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS	AVERAGE PARTICIPANT PREPROJECT INCOME	AVERAGE PARTICIPANT POSTPROJECT INCOME	AVERAGE % CHANGE PARTICIPANT INCOME	TOTAL # JOBS	# FULL-TIME JOBS	# PART-TIME JOBS		# SEASONAL JOBS
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26
18.28059	Rubber Plantation in Lantian	Brgy. Balobo, Lantian, Basilan	LARBECO (Lantian Agrarian Reform Beneficiaries MPC)	New Investment	40.0	August 1998	Ongoing GEM Assistance; project continues to be implemented	35	35 (100.0%)	3 (8.6%)	2 (5.7%)				34,285 (E)		8	36,836	45,302	23	35.0	35			118.0
18.28060	Rubber of Coffee Plantation	Balobo, Lantian, in Basilan	LARBECONPC (Lantian Agrarian Reform Beneficiaries MPC)	New Investment		S.S. January 1998	Ongoing GEM Assistance; project continues to be implemented	9	9 (100.0%)	3 (33.3%)				158,800	192,209(A)	33.8	9	36,097	44,477	23	40.0	20		20	86.3
SUB-TOTALS/AVERAGES					80.0			44	44 (100.0%)	6 (13.6%)	2 (4.5%)			158,800	297,872	34.7	(149)/1492	29,792	39,822	32	407.0	252	50	125	112.0
TOTALS/AVERAGES					837.8			8,270	8,442 (102.0%)	1,277 (15.3%)	5,037 (59.8%)	825 (9.8%)	1,628	297,046	702,187	182.9	329	44,516	321,376	371	3,264.0	879	192	2,193	120.3

Note: All of these Projects have short term annual crops/products or long duration crops with multiple harvests.

(E) Expected Income  
(A) Actual Income

TOTAL NO. OF JOBS CREATED FOR ALL PARTICIPANTS

TOTAL	FULL-TIME	PART-TIME	SEASONAL
3,264	879 (26.9%)	192 (5.8%)	2,193 (67.1%)

**Annex B**  
**Survey Data on Enterprise Projects**

JEM IMPACT SURVEY 2000

TABLE 2.1 - DATA ON BUSINESS AND THEIR EMPLOYEES FROM THE BUSINESS OWNER SURVEY AND EMPLOYEE SURVEY

PROJ. NO.	PROJECT NAME	PROJECT LOCATION	PROJECT TYPE	PROPRIETOR BUSINESS	INVESTMENT COST (P/P million)	CURRENT PROJECT STATUS	PRODUCT/COMMODITY TYPE	DIRECT JOBS GENERATED					ESTIMATED NUMBER SECONDARY EMPLOYEES	SAMPLE NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES	EMPLOYEE INCOME			TOTAL VALUE OF EMPLOYEE INCOME & BENEFITS				
								TOTAL # JOBS	FULL-TIME	CONTRACTUAL	PART-TIME	SEASONAL			AVERAGE EMPLOYEE PRE-PROJECT INCOME	AVERAGE EMPLOYEE POST-PROJECT INCOME	AVERAGE % CHANGE IN EMPLOYEE INCOME	AVERAGE EMPLOYEE PRE-PROJECT INCOME	AVERAGE EMPLOYEE POST-PROJECT INCOME	AVERAGE % CHANGE IN EMPLOYEE INCOME		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	
<b>CARAGA</b>																						
HR28	Furniture Village	San Vicente, Butuan City	EM	Damber and Sons Furniture	7.0	Ongoing GEM assistance; active project	Furniture Products / Equipment/Furniture/Housewares	7	5	2	0	0	0	14	6	46,935	46,831		47,826	47,826		
HR79	Rural Bank Branch	San Francisco, Agusan del Sur	New Investment	Rural Bank of Agrija	1.5	Post-GEM assistance; active project	Loans and deposits / Banking	8	8	0	0	0		7	45,184	42,400	34.1	44,690	71,187	98.2		
<b>SUB-TOTALS / AVERAGES</b>					8.5			15	13	2	0	0	14	13	46,159	44,669	15.4	46,251	59,494	24.8		
<b>COTABATO-ARMM</b>																						
OT02	Marketing of Fattened Crabs	Kalingan, Cotabato City	Market Linkage	S. R. Buy and Sell	2.4	Ongoing GEM assistance; active project	Crabs, shell, prawn / Crabs	5	5	0	0	0	0	3	215	31,840	73,500	130.0	31,850	73,500	130.0	
OT06	GFT Hatcher-Nursery Project	Parang, Maguindanao	EM	Mindanao GFT Corporation	9.5	Ongoing GEM assistance; active project	Genetically improved farm (Bapla, bangay / Tilapia)	12	12	0	0	0		4,000	1	24,000	60,000	150.0	24,000	60,000	150.0	
OT05	BMP-CAGA Business Center	Cotabato City	Contract Growing	Estaban Garden	1.0	Post-GEM assistance; project activity stopped/aborted	Business dealing with foreign investors / Services	2	1	0	1	0		0								
OT32	Marketing of Fattened Crabs and Prawns	Kalingan, Cotabato City	Market Linkage	B.R. Buy and Sell	0.5	Ongoing GEM assistance; active project	Crabs, shrimps and prawn / Crabs	5	5	0	0	0		2	215	31,850	73,500	130.0	31,950	73,500	130.0	
OT37	Lacatan Banana Production	Mue-en, Kidapawan, North Cotabato	Contract Growing	Banana Lacatan Production	3.1	Ongoing GEM assistance; active project	Lacatan production / Bananas	12	2	0	0	10		100								
OT09	Coconut Fiber Mat Processing Plant	Butan Federal, Maguindanao	Key Agribusiness Enterprise	Mandanao Coconut Car Industry Inc.	3.0	Ongoing GEM assistance; active project	Coconut fiber and car fiber / Coconut	55	26	34	3	2	125	7,000	1	61,840	66,700	87.2	61,840	80,700	74.9	
OT40	Nurseries for High Value Fruits	MAQUINDAHAO-Hala	Key Agribusiness Enterprise	Kabusayan Nursery Garden	4.0	Ongoing GEM assistance; active project	Mango, durian and langkong / Other Fruits Types	9	4	0	0	5		250	7	8,500	33,600	296.2	8,500	43,100	407.0	
OT53	Marketing of Novelty Gift and Houseware	Cotabato City and Maguindanao	Small & Medium Enterprise	Ikon Artcrafts	0.5	Ongoing GEM assistance; active project	Wooden gifts, lantern, accessories, GEM product / Equipment/Furniture/Housewares	40	9	31	0	0		150	6	28,000	67,860	170.8	28,531	64,661	171.9	
OT57	Banana Chips Manufacturing	Butuan, Maguindanao	Key Agribusiness Enterprise	ISLAM Cooperative	8.0	Ongoing GEM assistance; active project	Banana chips / Bananas	20	10	0	0	10		900								
OT65	Dracopine Products Marketing	Kalingan, Cotabato City	New Investment	LCM Breweries	9.0	Ongoing GEM assistance; active project	Breweries / Equipment/Furniture/Housewares	28	8	0	20	0		25	2	67,600	78,000	35.5	67,600	78,000	35.6	
<b>SUB-TOTALS / AVERAGES</b>					32.9			188	82	68	24	27	191	12,434	26	32,847	67,841	104.2	33,816	89,137	114.8	
<b>DAVAO GULF</b>																						
DV022	Establishment of a Woodrats Manufacturing Facility	Butuan, Comar Island	Non-Agribusiness EM	Vitancia Forest Products	6.0	Post-GEM assistance; active project	Production of wood-rat cement board / Real Estate/Construction	13	3	0	8	2		0								
DV028	Export of Cement	Davao City	Market Linkage	DVCC	10.0	Ongoing GEM assistance; active project	Cement / Real Estate/Construction	400	200	100	0	100		0								
DV041	Banquet Fingerings Production	Butuan, Davao del Sur	New Investment	Alapana Butuan Project	0.5	Post-GEM assistance; active project	Banquet Fingerings / Banquet	6	1	0	0	5		0								
DV044	Food Exports to China	Taguig City	Market Linkage	Fresh Asia Products Corp. Inc.	2.5	Ongoing GEM assistance; active project	Banana chips, cornstarch / Processed Foods	60	40	10	0	0		0								
DV045	Cold Storage and Cold Chain Network	Mediana Port, Taguig City	New Investment	Davao Cold Storage Corp.	125.0	Post-GEM assistance; active project	/ Services	80	80	0	0	0		0								
DV060	Sale of GTH Products	Davao Cluster	Small & Medium Enterprise	Special Crafts Collection, Inc.	2.5	Post-GEM assistance; active project	Home furnishings, furniture for exports / Equipment/Furniture/Housewares	165	8	0	0	157		80	0							
DV043	Mindanao Palau Tourism Linkage/Services	Davao City-Palau	Small & Medium Enterprise	Mindanao-Palau Tourism Linkage/Tour	11.0	Ongoing GEM assistance; active project	Tourism / Services	0	0	0	0	0		0								
DV045	Feeder Transport Services	Davao City	New Investment	Cryo Kevlar Van Investments, Inc.	30.0	Ongoing GEM assistance; active project	Feeder services/feeder routes for B / Services	8	4	4	0	1		11	0							

GEM IMPACT SURVEY 2000

TABLE 2.1 - DATA ON BUSINESS AND THEIR EMPLOYEES FROM THE BUSINESS OWNER SURVEY AND EMPLOYEE SURVEY

PROJ. NO.	PROJECT NAME	PROJECT LOCATION	PROJECT TYPE	PROPOSER BUSINESS	INVESTMENT COST (PHP Million)	CURRENT PROJECT STATUS	PRODUCT / COMMODITY TYPE	DIRECT JOBS GENERATED					ESTIMATED FUTURE JOBS TO BE ADDED	ESTIMATED NUMBER SECONDARY EMPLOYEES	SAMPLE NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES	EMPLOYEE INCOME			TOTAL VALUE OF EMPLOYEE INCOME & BENEFITS			
								TOTAL # JOBS	FULL-TIME	CONTRACTUAL	PART-TIME	SEASONAL				AVERAGE EMPLOYEE PREPROJECT INCOME	AVERAGE EMPLOYEE POSTPROJECT INCOME	% CHANGE IN EMPLOYEE INCOME	AVERAGE EMPLOYEE PREPROJECT INCOME	AVERAGE EMPLOYEE POSTPROJECT INCOME	% CHANGE IN EMPLOYEE INCOME	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	
1. DY064	Lumber Kiln Dryer	Tayum City	Small & Medium Enterprise	CM Tayum Furniture	1.5	Ongoing GEM assistance: active project	Furniture / Equipment/Furniture/Houseware	25	18	4	3	0	35		2	14,820	26,520	78.5	14,820	34,320	131.5	
32. DY048	Lumber Kiln Dryer	Tayum City	Small & Medium Enterprise	Marla Enterprises	1.5	Ongoing GEM assistance: active project	Wood-based furniture / Equipment/Furniture/Houseware	23	18	0	0	0	30	5	0							
3. DY067	Nursery for Upland Ricecrop	Lupatagan, Davao del Sur	Key Agribusiness Enterprise	Darciano Foundation, Inc.	0.5	Ongoing GEM assistance: active project	Cornels, Cassava and other rootcrops / Davao High-value Vegetables/High-value Crops/Root Crops	0	0	0	0	0		300	0							
4. DY068	Inbound Package Tour Development	Davao City	Small & Medium Enterprise	Davao Tourism Association	10.0	Ongoing GEM assistance: active project	Tourism / Services	0	0	0	0	0		0	0							
5. DY068	Spot Sales and Booked Orders of GTH Woven Products (BT)	Davao City	Small & Medium Enterprise	Special Crafts Collection, Inc.	5.0	Post-GEM assistance: active project	Home furnishings, export of furniture / Textile	165	8	0	0	157		80	0							
SUB-TOTALS / AVERAGES					205.0			808	336	118	18	422		81	474	2	14,820	26,520	78.5	14,820	34,320	131.5
GREATER NORTHERN CORRIDOR																						
6. GNC15	Fruit Processing Plant	Bukid, Capayan de Oro City	Key Agribusiness Enterprise	De Oro Tropical Fruit Company	40.0	Ongoing GEM assistance: project implementation stopped/stalled	Fruit drink, fruit juice, mango catapp / Mango	10	10	0	0	0			0	64,700	70,630	8.1	55,060	60,230	9.3	
7. GNC28	Plant Upgrading of Beaufort Factory	Iligan City	New Investment	London Beaufort	24.0	Post-GEM assistance: active project	Beaufort / Equipment/Furniture/Houseware	500	210	290	0	0		10	0							
28. GNC18	Rubber Processing Plant	Talaga, Bulacan	New Investment	FARDECOPLAC	8.2	Ongoing GEM assistance: active project	Rubber / Rubber	251	251	0	0	0		6	62,040	81,735	33.5	41,800	63,500	32		
SUB-TOTALS / AVERAGES					72.2			761	471	290	0	0		16	10	87,371	81,184	6.8	33,644	68,887	9.4	
NORTHWESTERN MINDANAO																						
8. MWC01	Seyna Crab Production	Lumbanang, Zambo del Sur	Key Agribusiness SME	Seyna Farms Enterprises	7.0	Ongoing GEM assistance: project implementation stopped/stalled	Prawns, Bangus, Crabs / Crabs	0	0	0	0	0		0	0							
9. MWC02	Lah Prawn Production	Lah, Sava, Zamboanga del Sur	Key Agribusiness Enterprise	Lah Prawn production	6.2	Ongoing GEM assistance: active project	Prawns and Tapes / Prawns	8	0	0	0	8		0	0							
31. MWC03	Tamano High Saline Tapes Production	Tigaplan, Dapitan	Key Agribusiness SME	Tamano Tapes Production	3.6	Post-GEM assistance: active project	Tapes (Low) / Tapes	2	0	0	0	2		0	8,400	11,880	41.4	12,840	17,832	37.2		
32. MWC04	Dumaga Taps Farm	Dumaga, Pagadian	Key Agribusiness Enterprise	Greenhouse Pining Station	4.8	Post-GEM assistance: active project	Unroasted Tapes/Restaurants / Prawns	10	2	8	0	0		2	7,300	9,600	31.6	14,600	20,070	37.4		
33. MWC05	Sale of Handcraft Products	Luhuran, Zamboanga del Sur	Small & Medium Enterprise	FEM's Handcraft	0.5	Post-GEM assistance: active project	Serialized flowers, corn cobs, flowers, / Equipment/Furniture/Houseware	25	24	0	0	1		5	8,048	8,742	11.4	4,125	1,871	-58.4		
34. MWC07	Sale of Hand-made Outlets	Papaglan City	Small & Medium Enterprise	POCHPEL Outer Center	0.5	Post-GEM assistance: active project	Outlets, Electric Outlet, Lushals, Bands / Equipment/Furniture/Houseware	30	12	18	0	0		8	37,800	48,870	28.8	35,210	131,025	272.1		
36. MWC20	High Saline Tapes Hachery	Tigaplan, Dapitan	Key Agribusiness SME	Lulu Crust Marine Resources	4.8	Ongoing GEM assistance: active project	Javel Tapes/Pets / Tapes	8	2	3	0	3		18	25,840	37,200	43.8	198,990	48,336	-75.8		
38. MWC13	Farmer Tapes Production (High Saline)	Irigy, Maria Uray, Dapitan City	New Investment	Farmer Tapes Production	2.5	Post-GEM assistance: active project	Bangus and processed bangus and Lushal / Tapes	62	18	8	0	40		1	40,800	40,800		42,304	43,504	2.8		
37. MWC14	Woods Tapes Production	Kabunatan, Zamboanga del Sur	New Investment	Woods Tapes Production		Post-GEM assistance: active project	Prawns, Bangus, Bangus /	8	8	2	0	0		1	1							
38. MWC17	Electric Tapes Production	Irigy, Lah, Sava, Zamboanga del Sur	Key Agribusiness Enterprise	ABE Agus Venture	1.7	Ongoing GEM assistance: active project	Prawns, Bangus, Crabs, Tapes / Tapes	0	0	0	0	0		1	26,000	29,250	12.8	26,000	29,250	12.8		
SUB-TOTALS / AVERAGES					32.0			163	62	37	0	54		34	11	21,889	26,291	31.8	47,736	41,874	-11.8	

GEM IMPACT SURVEY 2000

TABLE 2.1 - DATA ON BUSINESS AND THEIR EMPLOYEES FROM THE BUSINESS OWNER SURVEY AND EMPLOYEE SURVEY

PROJ. NO.	PROJECT NAME	PROJECT LOCATION	PROJECT TYPE	PROPOSER BUSINESS	INVESTMENT COST (PWP \$Miles)	CURRENT PROJECT STATUS	PRODUCT / COMMODITY TYPE	DIRECT JOBS GENERATED					ESTIMATED FUTURE JOBS TO BE ADDED	ESTIMATED NUMBER SECONDARY BENEFICIARIES	SAMPLE NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES	EMPLOYEE INCOME			TOTAL VALUE OF EMPLOYEE INCOME & BENEFITS				
								TOTAL # JOBS	FULL-TIME	CONTRACTUAL	PART-TIME	SEASONAL				AVERAGE EMPLOYEE PREPROJECT INCOME	AVERAGE EMPLOYEE POSTPROJECT INCOME	AVERAGE % CHANGE IN EMPLOYEE INCOME	AVERAGE EMPLOYEE PREPROJECT INCOME	AVERAGE EMPLOYEE POSTPROJECT INCOME	AVERAGE % CHANGE IN EMPLOYEE INCOME		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23		
SOSKARGEN																							
35001	Spunk Production	Surabaya, South Cotabato	Contract Growing	PHIL. JADE OIL, INC.	360.0	Post-GEM assistance; active project	Spunk oil processing / Tallow	0	0	0	0	0	0	141		0							
35002	Tree Crop Contract Growing	Tacurong, Sultan Kudarat	Contract Growing	Palm Oil Production	153.0	Post-GEM assistance; project activity stopped/scaled	Palm Oil / Commercial Trees	40	40	0	0	0				0							
35003	Export Marketing of Asparagus	Potomoh, South Cotabato	Market Linkage	SAFI Aquaculture	1.0	Post-GEM assistance; active project	Fresh, cool / Other High-value Vegetables/High-value Crops/Root Crops	4	4	0	0	0				0							
35005	Organic Fertilizer Production	Potomoh, South Cotabato	SM	DEALCO	2.2	Post-GEM assistance; active project	Cattle Fattening, Raw Manure / Agricultural Input	0	0	0	0	0				0							
35009	Supply of Asparagus	Potomoh, South Cotabato	Market Linkage	ARABEST ENTERPRISES	8.3	Post-GEM assistance; project activity stopped/scaled	/ Other High-value Vegetables/High-value Crops/Root Crops	0	0	0	0	0				0							
35010	Flax Processing Plant	OSG	Key Agribusiness Enterprise	Philips Seafood (Alababa) Inc.	28.6	Post-GEM assistance; active project	Vacuum-packed Tuna / Other Marine Products	65	65	0	0	0		235		15	44,834	44,652	-0.4	44,896	47,214	5.3	
35012	Hatchery Expansion	General Santos City	SM	Broiler Hatchery Plant	6.8	Ongoing GEM assistance; active project	Broiler eggs / Poultry	11	11	0	0	0			100	2	120,000	82,800	-31.2	120,000	84,600	-27.8	
35017	Supply of Asparagus	South Cotabato	Market Linkage	ARABEST Enterprises	9.2	Post-GEM assistance; project activity stopped/scaled	Asparagus / Other High-value Vegetables/High-value Crops/Root Crops	0	0	0	0	0				0							
35018	Export Marketing of Asparagus	General Santos City	Market Linkage	ARABEST Enterprises	18.2	Post-GEM assistance; project activity stopped/scaled	Asparagus / Other High-value Vegetables/High-value Crops/Root Crops	0	0	0	0	0				0							
35013	Buy-out of Tuna of Canery	General Santos City	New Investment	Marathon Canning Corporation	615.0	Post-GEM assistance; active project	Canned Tuna / Other Marine Products	2,340	80	2,500	0	0				0							
35037	Gasoline Station	General Santos City	New Investment	KARE PETROL STATION	6.0	Post-GEM assistance; active project	Car Fuel, Car Care Products, Services / Services	22	19	0	3	0			10	42,415	48,220	6.8	43,517	48,111	6.8		
35031	Buluan Kudarat Iceplant	Tacurong, Sultan Kudarat	Small & Medium Enterprise	Buluan Kudarat Ice Plant	29.4	Post-GEM assistance; active project	Ice Blocks / Real Estate/Construction	5	3	2	0	0			4	38,250	48,750	26.4	40,775	50,729	24.4		
35032	Tropical Fruits in Glass Jars	Tupi, South Cotabato	Small & Medium Enterprise	Sidones Tropical Fruit Glassery, Inc.	2.8	Post-GEM assistance; active project	Tropical Fruits in Glass Jars / Processed Foods	24	0	0	0	24		10	8	20,833	35,320	15.2	24,822	23,911	-4.0		
35033	Avian Feed Mill (New Funded)	Potomoh, South Cotabato	Key Agribusiness Enterprise	Jewel Feeds	11.2	Ongoing GEM assistance; active project	Thiamin & Biotin Feeds / Feeds	12	12	0	0	0		25	4	81,700	78,720	-4.4	82,872	90,087	43.0		
35042	Livestock Feeds	Potomoh, S Cot	New Investment	East Asia Livestock Feeds Inc.	1,248.0	Post-GEM assistance; active project	Livestock Feeds / Feeds	102	0	0	0	102		100	180	0							
35044	Air Transport Service	OSG	New Investment	Air Philippines Corporation	73.0	Post-GEM assistance; active project	Air Transport / Services	7	7	0	0	0				0							
35078	Marketing of Socogargen-made Products	OSG	Small & Medium Enterprise	Kambon Farm	1.8	Post-GEM assistance; active project	Processed Food / Equipment/furniture/Housewares	1	0	0	0	1		14	4	43,043	61,265	15.2	27,732	29,284	6.8		
35075	Restaurant Project (with 14 Berys)	Marikina, Bat	New Investment	Primo De Barro Restaurant	3.2	Post-GEM assistance; active project	Food Services / Services	0	0	0	0	0			12	0							
35084	Sale of Socogargen (SM) Products	OSG	Small & Medium Enterprise	Kambon Farm	0.7	Post-GEM assistance; active project	Processed Food / Equipment/furniture/Housewares	3	0	0	0	3			4	44,863	48,865	4.4	28,832	29,284	2.3		
35091	Marketing of Canned Tuna	OSG	Market Linkage	Marathon Canning Corporation	2.5	Post-GEM assistance; active project	Canned Tuna / Processed Foods	0	0	0	0	0				0							
35092	Seafood Market Linkage	OSG	Market Linkage	Philips Seafood Inc.	1.0	Post-GEM assistance; active project	Seafood Grade Tuna / Other Marine Products	30	30	0	0	0			4	38,118	53,825	40.8	30,448	47,884	64.2		
35094	FYHO Flaming Operation	OSG	New Investment	FYHO Flaming Incorperation	248.0	Ongoing GEM assistance;	Salt Crystallized Fish	100	100	0	0	0				0							

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

TABLE 2.1 - DATA ON BUSINESS AND THEIR EMPLOYEES FROM THE BUSINESS OWNER SURVEY AND EMPLOYEE SURVEY

PROJ. NO.	PROJECT NAME	PROJECT LOCATION	PROJECT TYPE	PROPOWENT BUSINESS	INVESTMENT COST (P/F Million)	CURRENT PROJECT STATUS	PRODUCT/COMMODITY TYPE	DIRECT JOBS GENERATED					ESTIMATED FUTURE JOBS TO BE ADDED	ESTIMATED NUMBER SECONDARY BENEFICIARIES	SAMPLE NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES	EMPLOYEE INCOME			TOTAL VALUE OF EMPLOYEE INCOME & BENEFITS		
								TOTAL # JOBS	FULL-TIME	CONTRACTUAL	PART-TIME	SEASONAL				AVERAGE EMPLOYEE PREPROJECT INCOME	AVERAGE EMPLOYEE POSTPROJECT INCOME	% CHANGE IN EMPLOYEE INCOME	AVERAGE EMPLOYEE PREPROJECT INCOME	AVERAGE EMPLOYEE POSTPROJECT INCOME	% CHANGE IN EMPLOYEE INCOME
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23
SS095	Abalone Production	Abol, Barangay	Key Ag/Business SME	SANADOR	20.0	Post-ODM assistance; active project	Fresh, ed / Other Marine Products	0	0	0	0	0									
SUB-TOTALS / AVERAGES					2,882.4			2,006	371	2,863	3	130	482	1,371	85	60,164	63,831	7.2	47,899	60,131	26.1
ZAMBOANGA-ARMM																					
ZB007	Marketing of Buko-made Handicrafts	Parang, Indanan and Saal, Bul	Market Linkage	Buko Handicrafts	0.5	Post-ODM assistance; active project	Indigenous handicrafts of Buko / Equipment/Furniture/Accessories	140	12	8	0	120									
ZB018	Marketing of Yakan Woven Product	Basilan	Market Linkage	Mandanao Integrated Weavers Association	0.5	Post-ODM assistance; active project	handwoven products / Equipment/Furniture/Accessories	25	10	0	15	0				15,000	20,820	38.8			
SA ZB061	Bongao Oil Depot and Inventory for ARMM	Bongao, Taw-Tawi	New Investment	Rajaling Star Incorporated	39.5	Ongoing ODM assistance; active project	Resal / Real Estate/Construction	18	0	0	0	10									
ZB065	Working Capital for Basilan Fed AMPCs	Pudlocan, Isabela	New Investment	Basilan Federation of Multi-Purpose Coop	1.5	Ongoing ODM assistance; active project	Wholesale trading of grocery products /	4	4	0	0	0									
SUB-TOTALS / AVERAGES					42.0			177	24	0	15	130				15,000	24,171	19.1			
TOTALS / AVERAGES					3,255.3			3,226	1,383	3,222	48	763	716	14,322	160	34,834	48,868	39.3	43,974	63,449	32.1

**Annex C**  
**Survey Data on Infrastructure Projects**

GEM IMPACT SURVEY 2000 TABLE 3.1 - INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS (04/17/2000)

PROJ. NO.	PROJECT NAME	PROJECT LOCATION	NAME OF COOPERATIVE/ LGU UNIT/ COMPANY PROPONENT	SOURCE OF FUNDS	TYPE OF INFRASTRUCTURE	PROJECT STATUS	TYPE OF BENEFICIARIES	BENEFICIARIES/USERS		NEW JOBS CREATED BY KEY INFORMANT			NO. OF BENEFICIARY RESPONDENTS	ANNUAL NET INCOME				TOTAL NO. OF PEOPLE HIRED/ BY BENEFICIARIES			
								ACTUAL	EXPECTED	TEMPORARY	LONGER-TERM	TOTAL		AVERAGE PRE-PROJECT INCOME	AVERAGE POST-PROJECT INCOME	Average Amount (P/P) Increase/Decrease	% Inc./Dec.	Full-Time	Part-Time	Season	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20		
<b>CARAGA</b>																					
1. CAR44	SMART Telecom Project		SMART Telecom	Private Infrastructure Project		(Post-GEM assistance, project continues to be implemented)	Telephone subscribers	2000	1,500			0 0 (Expected) / 0 (Actual)									
<b>SUB-TOTALS / AVERAGES</b>								2000	1,500			0 0 (Expected) / 0 (Actual)									
<b>COTABATO-ARM</b>																					
																		<b>TOTAL HIRED</b>			
2. COT41	Farm to Market Road	Brgy. Kaban, Pabian and Tanok, Butuan	Integrated Services Livelihood Acceleration for Muslim-Minority Purpose Coops	World Bank Social Fund with Cooperative proponent	Farm to Market Road segment improvement and/or culvert	Ongoing GEM assistance, project continues to be implemented	Fishermen, shippers of produced fish, cooperative/associates farmers	3500				0 0 (Expected) / 0 (Actual)	10,620	35,400	24,780	233.3					
3. COT50	Musac Community Warehouse & Solar Dryer	Pagawayan, Cotabato	Talamed Multi-Purpose Cooperative	World Bank Social Fund with Cooperative proponent	Post-harvest facility for consolidation, drying, shelving, and sale of product	Post-GEM assistance, project activity "survivor"	Cooperative farmers and municipality farmers	300		20		20 1 (Expected) / 1 (Actual)	48,195	71,365	23,170	47.6					
4. COT55	Improvement of Farm-to-Market Road		Talamed MPC, Inc.	Other Government/Donor-Funded Project	Farm to Market Road segment improvement and/or culvert	Post-GEM assistance, project activity "survivor"	Residents of Brgy. Laticac	10000				0 3 (Expected) / 4 (Actual)	49,487	73,815	24,328	48.4					
5. COT57	Kapipulan Madrasah School Building	Kapipulan, Misamis	IMLF MANSRC	World Bank Social Fund Support with LGU proponent	School Classroom(s)	Post-GEM assistance, project activity "survivor"	Arabic School Students	115	150			4 0 (Expected) / 0 (Actual)									
6. COT58	Sembelawan Madrasah School Building	Brgy. Sambelawan, Misamis	IMLF MANSRC	World Bank Social Fund Support with LGU proponent	School Classroom(s)	Post-GEM assistance, project activity "survivor"	Madrasah Students/Arabic School Students	283	300			9 0 (Expected) / 0 (Actual)									
7. COT70	Establishment of Public Calling Offices	Misamis, Cotabato	Misamis Communication System Corporation	Private Infrastructure Project	Expanded Local Telephone Exchange or Establishment of a PCO	Post-GEM assistance, project activity "survivor"	Commercial, residential, and walk-in customers	814	920	21	40	61 0 (Expected) / 6 (Actual)	48,200	80,378	32,178	73.1	70		2		
<b>SUB-TOTALS / AVERAGES</b>								16011	1,375	41	40	94 4 (Expected) / 31 (Actual)	36,122	63,829	27,707	192.7	70				
																		<b>TOTAL HIRED</b>		70	2
<b>GREATER NORTHERN CORRIDOR</b>																					
																		<b>TOTAL HIRED</b>		99	
8. GNC41	Lapadayan Airport Project	Lapadayan, Misamis Oriental	Department of Transportation and Communications-Air Transportation Office	Other Government/Donor-Funded Project		Ongoing GEM assistance, project continues to be implemented	Business people, farmers, state holder in the area, constituents in the area	691,692				0 0 (Expected) / 0 (Actual)									
9. GNC42	Warehouse-Solar Drier	Banatan, Tangal, Lanao del Norte	Tangal Bangsa Moro Multi-Purpose Coop	World Bank Social Fund with Cooperative proponent	Post-harvest facility for consolidation, drying, shelving, and sale of product	Ongoing GEM assistance, project continues to be implemented	Cooperative and municipality farmers	10	60	16	2	17 1 (Expected) / 8 (Actual)	13,110	49,830	36,720	279.2			20		
10. GNC44	Warehouse-Solar Drier	Tambon, Piguapa, Lanao del Sur	Tambon Farmers Multi-Purpose Coop	World Bank Social Fund with Cooperative proponent	Post-harvest facility for consolidation, drying, shelving, and sale of product	Ongoing GEM assistance, project continues to be implemented	Municipality and coop farmers	110	600	8		8 1 (Expected) / 6 (Actual)	16,942	25,200	8,258	48.7			11		
11. GNC40	Warehouse-Solar Drier	Kalamitan, Salvador, Lanao del Norte	IMLF Community Farmers Association	World Bank Social Fund with Cooperative proponent	Post-harvest facility for consolidation, drying, shelving, and sale of product	Ongoing GEM assistance, project continues to be implemented	IMLF farmers	130	350	2		2 0 (Expected) / 1 (Actual)	51,000	78,600	27,600	54.1			10		
12. GNC21	Warehouse -Solar Drier	Mandi, Lanao del Norte	Mandi Bangsa Moro Multi-Purpose Coop	World Bank Social Fund with Cooperative proponent	Post-harvest facility for consolidation, drying, shelving, and sale of product	Ongoing GEM assistance, project continues to be implemented	Municipality and coop farmers	95	110	7		7 0 (Expected) / 8 (Actual)	23,262	38,825	15,563	66.9			3		
13. GNC48	Campuan Telephone Expansion	Province of Campuan	Campuan Telephone Cooperative Inc.	Private Infrastructure Project	Expanded Local Telephone Exchange or Establishment of a PCO	Post-GEM assistance, project activity "survivor"	Telephone subscribers	926	126	4	17	21 0 (Expected) / 0 (Actual)									
14. GNC37	Masungao Community Warehouse- Solar Drier	Brgy. Palacpac, Mariguay, Lanao del Norte	Masungao Bangsa Moro Multi-Purpose Coop	World Bank Social Fund with Cooperative proponent	Post-harvest facility for consolidation, drying, shelving, and sale of product	Ongoing GEM assistance, project continues to be implemented	Municipality and cooperative farmers		1,500			0 4 (Expected) / 0 (Actual)	61,100	158,875	97,775	159.9			1		
15. GNC46	Papawayan Com. Solar Drier	Brgy. Papawayan, Bacabod, Lanao del Norte	Bacabod Bangsa Moro Coop	World Bank Social Fund with Cooperative proponent	Post-harvest facility for consolidation, drying, shelving, and sale of product	Ongoing GEM assistance, project continues to be implemented	Municipality and cooperative members	400				0 5 (Expected) / 1 (Actual)	22,950	35,260	12,310	53.6			1		
16. GNC49	Along Com. Warehouse -Solar Drier	Brgy. Alao, Lumbayan, Lanao del Sur	Al-Hayyar Multi-Purpose Coop	World Bank Social Fund with Cooperative proponent	Post-harvest facility for consolidation, drying, shelving, and sale of product	Ongoing GEM assistance, project continues to be implemented	Cooperative farmers	300				0 0 (Expected) / 0 (Actual)									
17. GNC60	Manayun Com. Warehouse- Solar Drier	Brgy. Manayun, Lumbayan, Lanao del Sur	Manayun Farmers Multi-Purpose Coop	World Bank Social Fund with Cooperative proponent	Post-harvest facility for consolidation, drying, shelving, and sale of product	Ongoing GEM assistance, project continues to be implemented	Coop farmers	100	4			4 0 (Expected) / 2 (Actual)	35,790	237,300	201,510	564.3			1		
18. GNC41	Dalakeyan Warehouse- Solar Drier	Brgy. Dalakeyan, Kawangpan, Lanao del Sur	Kawangpan Bangsa Moro Multi-Purpose Coop	World Bank Social Fund with Cooperative proponent	Post-harvest facility for consolidation, drying, shelving, and sale of product	Ongoing GEM assistance, project continues to be implemented		440				0 2 (Expected) / 0 (Actual)	26,596	86,716	60,120	122.1			1		
<b>SUB-TOTALS / AVERAGES</b>								1214	996,815	37	19	84 13 (Expected) / 27 (Actual)	31,636	88,311	56,675	179.2	27	21	15		
																		<b>TOTAL HIRED</b>		209	

PROJ. NO.	PROJECT NAME	PROJECT LOCATION	NAME OF COOPERATIVE/ LGU UNIT/ COMPANY PROPONENT	SOURCE OF FUNDS	TYPE OF INFRASTRUCTURE	PROJECT STATUS	TYPE OF BENEFICIARIES	BENEFICIARIES/USERS		NEW JOBS CREATED BY KEY INFORMANT			NO. OF BENEFICIARY RESPONDENTS	ANNUAL NET INCOME				TOTAL NO. OF PEOPLE HIRED AFTER BY BENEFICIARIES			
								ACTUAL	EXPECTED	TEMPORARY	LONGER-TERM	TOTAL		AVERAGE PRE-PROJECT INCOME	AVERAGE POST-PROJECT INCOME	Average Annual (PPY) Increase/Decrease	Avg. % Inc./Dec.	Full-Time	Part-Time	Seasonal	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20		
<b>OSKSARGEN</b>																					
18	SSG102	Warehouse and Solar Drier	Brgy. Basmeling, GSC	Basmeling Bengamoro Farmers MPC	World Bank Social Fund with Cooperative proponent	Post-harvest facility for consolidation, drying, shelving, and sale of product	Post-GEM assistance; project activity "survivor"	Non-coop. member farmers	127		2		2.0 (Expected) / 0 (Actual)								
	SSG103	Warehouse and Solar Drier	Brgy. Bunoa, Tupi, Scot	Tupi Multi-Purpose Cooperative	World Bank Social Fund Support with LGU proponent	Post-harvest facility for consolidation, drying, shelving, and sale of product	Post-GEM assistance; project activity "survivor"	Farmers	18	18	7	1	8.0 (Expected) / 6 (Actual)	28,633	33,899	10,356	36.1		148		
	SSG104	Warehouse and Solar Drier	Brgy. Luma, Tupi, Scot	Highland Multi-Purpose Cooperative	World Bank Social Fund with Cooperative proponent	Post-harvest facility for consolidation, drying, shelving, and sale of product	Post-GEM assistance; project activity "survivor"	Farmers	2	20	2	1	3.1 (Expected) / 3 (Actual)	15,287	22,121	8,837	44.7		8		
	SSG105	Warehouse and Solar Drier	Brgy. Lambayang, Tampakan, Scot	Tampakan Christian-Muslim Highlander	World Bank Social Fund with Cooperative proponent	Post-harvest facility for consolidation/drying/shelving and sale of product	Ongoing GEM assistance; project continues to be implemented	Brgy. Farmers' Cooperative	75	120	12	2	14.1 (Expected) / 4 (Actual)	31,000	35,600	4,600	14.8		27		
	SSG113	GSC Fishport Expansion (Municipal Wharf Component)	GSC	Philippine Fisheries Development Authority	Other Government/Donor-Funded Project	Expanded Fish Port	Ongoing GEM assistance; project continues to be implemented	Municipal fishermen, boat owners, and laborers		2,200	26	2,226	0 (Expected) / 0 (Actual)								
	SSG19	Wireless Local Loop Telephone System	Marbel, South Cotabato	Marbel Telephone System, Inc.	Private Infrastructure Project	Expanded Local Telephone Exchange or Establishment of a PCO	Post-GEM assistance; project activity "survivor"	Telephone subscribers	1600			11	17.0 (Expected) / 1 (Actual)						70		
	SSG32	GSC Airport Navigational Facility	GSC	ATO	Other Government/Donor-Funded Project	Airport Improvement	Post-GEM assistance; project activity "survivor"	Airlines, airport operators, passengers	200000				0.0 (Expected) / 1 (Actual)								
	SSG33	GSC Refueling Depot	GSC	Person Corporation	Private Infrastructure Project	Airport Improvement		Aircraft Operators/Airlines and private operators			10		10.0 (Expected) / 1 (Actual)								
	SSG99	Dumadadap Madrasah School Building	Brgy. Dumadadap, Tangapan, Scot	Dumadadap Madrasah School Building	World Bank Social Fund with Cooperative proponent	School Classroom(s)	Post-GEM assistance; project activity stopped/scaled	Students, neighboring tribal communities	75	74	2		2.0 (Expected) / 0 (Actual)								
<b>SUB-TOTALS / AVERAGES</b>									21497	233	2,231	49	2,382	2 (Expected) / 16 (Actual)	24,973	32,231	7,254	31.8	10	144	
<b>TOTALS / AVERAGES</b>									229,143	696,176	2,311	121	2,432	64 (Actual)	31,874	76,887	21,283.3	126.7	161	34	347
													19 (Expected)								
																		<b>TOTAL HIRED</b>		<b>558</b>	

**Annex D**  
**Survey Data on Secondary Beneficiaries**

TABLE 4.1 - SECONDARY BENEFICIARIES

NAME OF ENTERPRISE/ PROJECT LINKED TO 1	MAJOR PRODUCT/SERVICES 2	LOCATION 3	ANNUAL NET INCOME FROM LINKED BUYERS 4	NO. OF JOBS GENERATED BY LINKED BUSINESS			
				SEASONAL 5	PART-TIME 6	FULL-TIME 7	TOTAL 8
(CAR49->Mango Production)	mango	Culit, Nasipit, Agusan del Norte	NR	12	0	0	12
(SSG71->Fruit Processing Plant)	Marketing of fresh mango	Brgy. Greña, Tacurong, Sultan Kudarat	2,160,000	51	0	1	52
No Business (SSG105->Warehouse and Solar Drier)	Corn	Brgy. Lambayong, Tampakan, SC	48,000	3	0	0	3
Balokan sa Kaunlaran Foundation, Inc. (COT51->Fruit Orchard Development in Upi)	Durian	Nuro Upl, Maguindanao	2,301,000	4	0	2	6
ISLAM (COT41->Farm to Market Road)	Tilapia	Kalian, Paitan, Buluan	1,440,000	0	3	0	3
ISLAM (COT41->Farm to Market Road)	Tilapia	Kalian, Paitan, Buluan	53,100	0	0	0	0
ISLAM (COT41->Farm to Market Road)	Tilapia	Kalian, Paitan, Buluan	75,915	5	0	0	5
Laksi and Bugkos Making (SSG02->Tree Crop Contract Growing)	Marketing kaklat and strips	Palm Oil Production	18,000	0	0	0	0
Nepes Farm (DVO60B->True Potato Seed (TPS 2000) Project II)	Potato Production using TPS technology	Salunay MPC	420,000	10	0	2	12
None (SSG109->Peanut Seed Production)	seasonal (planter, harvester, wader) in Peanut production	Tuupl, So. Cot	7,200	0	0	0	0
Palm Oil Production (SSG02->Tree Crop Contract Growing)	Palm strips	Gino Farm, Tacurong, S.K.	72,000	0	0	0	0
Phillips Sea Food (SSG108->Fish Processing Plant)	Retailing of Tuna Residue	Fishport, GSC	120,000	0	5	3	8
Seaweed Buyer (MYC18->Situgrey Seaweed Farming)	Purchase of Seaweeds	Gango, RT Lim, Z. del Sur	1,200	2	0	0	2
Tampakan Christian-Muslim (SSG105->Warehouse and Solar Drier)	Corn	Brgy. Lambayong, Tampakan, So.	60,000	6	0	0	6
Tampakan Christian-Muslim Cooperative (SSG105->Warehouse and Solar Drier)	Corn	Brgy. Lambayong, Tampakan, So. Cot	48,000	3	0	0	3
True Potato Production (TPS 2000) (DVO60A->True Potato Seed (TPS 2000) Project II)	Potato	Marilog District, Davao City	10,000	5	0	0	5

46

TABLE 4.1 - SECONDARY BENEFICIARIES

NAME OF ENTERPRISE/ PROJECT LINKED TO 1	MAJOR PRODUCT/SERVICES 2	LOCATION 3	ANNUAL NET INCOME FROM LINKED BUYERS 4	NO. OF JOBS GENERATED BY LINKED BUSINESS			
				SEASONAL 5	PART-TIME 6	FULL-TIME 7	TOTAL 8
17. UKL Kaunlaran MPC (SSG111->Lonok Peanut Production)	Peanut Production	Lunok Kinan 6, Pol. So. Co	NR	6	0	0	6
18. UKL KAUNLARAN MPC (SSG111->Lonok Peanut Production)	Peanut	Lonok, Kinan 6, Pol. So. CoL	39,200	26	0	0	26
19. UKL KAUNLARAN MPC (SSG111->Lonok Peanut Production)	Marketing Seeds Peanuts	Lunok, Kinan Pol., So. CoL	NR	0	0	0	0
20. UKL KAUNLARAN MPC (SSG111->Lonok Peanut Production)	Peanut	Upper Kinan, Polomolok, So	4,000	8	0	0	8
21. UKL KAUNLARAN MPC (SSG111->Lonok Peanut Production)	Peanut	Upper Kinan, Pol. S. C.	17,200	0	0	0	0
22. UKL MPC KAUNLARAN (SSG111->Lonok Peanut Production)	Peanut	Lonok, Kinan 6, So, CoL	177,550	14	0	0	14
23. Upper Kinan Cooperative (SSG110->Peanut Production)	Peanut Production	Upper Kinan Farmers Multi-Pur	NR	10	0	0	10
24. Upper Kinan Cooperative (SSG110->Peanut Production)	Peanut Production	Polo, Polomolok So. CoL	5,500	6	0	0	6
25. Vivie Gold trading (NYC18->Sibugay Seaweed Farming)	Buying Station for Agar-agar (Seaweeds)	Gango, RT Lim, Zam. del Sur	12,000	0	0	0	0
26. deta Cruz Ice Relaker (SSG51->Sultan Kudarat Iceplant)	Ice	Tacurong, Sultan Kudarat	180,000	0	0	3	3
27. no name (SSG02->Tree Crop Contract Growing)	Marketing Kalakal with strips	Grino Farm, Tacurong, S. K.	102,000	0	0	0	0
28. upper Kinan farmers Cooperative (SSG110->Peanut Production)	Peanut Seeds	Upper Kinan Farmers Multi-Pup	8,000	29	0	0	29
<b>TOTALS</b>			<b>7,379,865</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>219</b>

**Annex E**  
**Sample Survey Questionnaires**

**6<sup>th</sup> DRAFT (2/11/00): GEM PROGRAM IMPACT ASSESSMENT SURVEY—FEB. 2000**  
**SURVEY FORM # 1: KEY INFORMANT/COOPERATIVE LEADER**

Project # \_\_\_\_\_ Project Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
 GEM Area \_\_\_\_\_ Site \_\_\_\_\_  
 Interviewer \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_ Interviewee \_\_\_\_\_ Position \_\_\_\_\_

**Background Information:**

1. Name of Cooperative/Project Group: \_\_\_\_\_
2. Project Activity: \_\_\_\_\_
3. Type of GEM assistance: \_\_\_\_\_
4. Start Date of GEM Assistance: \_\_\_\_\_ Start Date of Project Operations: \_\_\_\_\_

**Characteristics of Project Participants/Beneficiaries:**

**5. Number and Type of Participants in the project (fill in the table):**

	# Christians	# Muslims	# Tribals	Totals	% of Total	# More Active	# Less Active
# Men						XXXXXX	XXXXXX
# Women						XXXXXX	XXXXXX
Total					XXXXXX		
% of Total				XXXXXXX	XXXXXX		

\*More Active Participants are those who have a higher level of investment (time, land, capital) and are well into the production and harvest system.

\*\*Less Active Participants are those who have made a lower level of investment and/or who have barely started the learning curve in the production system and/or who have reduced their level of investment.

**6. Check Current Project Activity Status:**

- \_\_\_\_\_ Ongoing GEM assistance, project continues to be implemented (i.e., it is operating)  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Ongoing GEM assistance, project implementation stopped/stalled (i.e., not fully operational)  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Post-GEM assistance, project activity "survivor" (i.e., still operating)  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Post-GEM assistance, project activity stopped/stalled. When stopped? \_\_\_\_\_

**7. Key Problems encountered in implementing the project:**

- \_\_\_\_\_ Joint investment problems                      \_\_\_\_\_ Links to markets problems  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Access to credit problems                      \_\_\_\_\_ Transportation problems  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Links to raw materials problems                      \_\_\_\_\_ Peace and order problems  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Sourcing/Access to improved technology problems  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Others. Specify \_\_\_\_\_

**Project Benefits:**

8. Check if the following benefits are \_\_\_\_\_ Actual \_\_\_\_\_ Expected

**9. Fill in the table to indicate total group commodity change or amount of commodity expansion:**

Time Period	Commodity Type	Total Hectares*	Total Harvest Volume**	% First Quality Market Produce***
Pre-Project				
Current				
Planned-New				

\* Depending on type of commodity, this unit of measure could be fishcages, ponds, etc. Specify units.

\*\* Depending on type of commodity, this could be total amount harvested per season, per catch, etc. Specify.

\*\*\* For some commodities, higher value produce gets a higher market price. Fill this in only if relevant.

**10. Economic Benefits --Estimate following average incomes per year for 2 types of participants in your group using agricultural, aquacultural, or agro-forestry sources:**

Type of Participant Household	Pre-Project Major Commodities (Volumes or Amounts)	Pre-Project Net Income Per Year (A)	Post Project Major Commodities (Volumes or Amounts)	*Net Post Project Income Per Year (D)	% Increase or Decrease in Income (D - A) / A
Active Participant					
Less Active Participant					

\*Consider some pre-project income was lost if the new crop or commodity was substituted for a pre-project commodity. This could be a substitution of all the land or part of the land.

**11. Estimate the Number and Type of New Paid Jobs generated by the Project (Check jobs taken by men, women, and/or children):**

Paid Jobs	Specify Types of Jobs	Total No. of Jobs	Men	Women	Children	Average Pay/Day
1. Full-time*						
2. Part-time**						
3. Seasonal***						

\*Full-time job is at least 40 hrs. of work per week; \*\*Part-time job is less than 40 hrs. of work per week;

\*\*\*Seasonal job is specific short-term work performed during certain periods of the year (e.g., land preparation, weeding, harvesting, etc.).

**12. Proxy Indicators/Anecdotes indicating Improved Income due to Project Income (items or services purchased after project income):**

a. \_\_\_\_\_ b. \_\_\_\_\_  
c. \_\_\_\_\_

**13. Did the GEM assistance to your project contribute to your decision to invest in/implement this project?**

- \_\_\_\_\_ Critical contribution (wouldn't have pushed through with the project without GEM)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Moderate contribution (GEM helped in many aspects of project start-up and implementation)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Minor contribution (GEM helped in project start-up and we took it from there)

**14. Impact of this project on production and income of linked Secondary Beneficiaries:**

Check type of secondary beneficiaries:

- \_\_\_\_\_ Independently replicated (copied) the model of this GEM-assisted project
- \_\_\_\_\_ Linked—This GEM-assisted project created opportunities in production, processing, marketing and/or transport which secondary beneficiaries developed into income activities.

Describe these secondary beneficiaries and their activities: \_\_\_\_\_

Estimated # of secondary beneficiaries \_\_\_\_\_

Recommended respondent(s) for follow-up questions: \_\_\_\_\_

6<sup>th</sup> DRAFT (2/11/00): GEM PROGRAM IMPACT ASSESSMENT SURVEY—FEB. 2000  
 SURVEY FORM # 2: PARTICIPATING HOUSEHOLD BENEFICIARIES

Project # \_\_\_\_\_ Project Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
 GEM Area \_\_\_\_\_ Site \_\_\_\_\_  
 Interviewer \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_ Interviewee \_\_\_\_\_

Type of GEM Assistance: \_\_\_\_\_

**Participant Characteristics:**

1. Name of Cooperative/Project Group: \_\_\_\_\_
2. Level of Household Project Participation (check one): \_\_\_\_\_ More Active \_\_\_\_\_ Less Active
3. Type of Project Income Activity for Participant \_\_\_\_\_
4. Date of First Harvest and Income: Received \_\_\_\_\_ Or Expected \_\_\_\_\_
5. Gender (M/F) \_\_\_\_\_ 6. Identity (check one): \_\_\_\_\_ Muslim \_\_\_\_\_ Christian \_\_\_\_\_ Tribal

7. Fill in the table to indicate a commodity change or commodity expansion in your production system, harvest, and income due to the Project: (Enumerator carefully find out if the project commodity substituted for a previous commodity or was added on idle land to previous commodity)  
 Was project commodity: \_\_\_\_\_ Substituted for a Previous commodity  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Added to other commodities

(If commodity was substituted for a previous commodity, Enumerator will need to make certain that the previous commodity income is not added into the current post-project income.)

Time Period	Commodity Types	Total Hectares*	Number Harvest Seasons Per Year	Annual Harvest Volume Per ha**	Total Annual Volume Per Commodity	% First Quality Produce	Net Income From Commodities	Total Net Income
Pre-Project (A)								
Current (B)								
Planned/New (C)				xxxxxxx	xxxxxxx	xxxxxxx	xxxxxxx	xxxxxxx

\*Depending on type of commodity, this unit of measure could be fishcages, ponds, etc. Specify units.

\*\*Depending on type of commodity, this unit could be per ha, per day, per week, or per month, etc. Specify.

8. Calculations made from above Table by Interviewer:

Percent Increase (Decrease) in Current Production Area  $[(B-A)/A \times 100]$  \_\_\_\_\_ %

Percent Increase (Decrease) in Planned Production Area  $[(C-B)/B \times 100]$  \_\_\_\_\_ %

Percent Increase (Decrease) in Current Harvest Volume per unit  $[(B-A)/A \times 100]$  \_\_\_\_\_ %

Percent Increase (Decrease) in First Quality Produce  $[(B-A)/A \times 100]$  \_\_\_\_\_ %

Percent Increase (Decrease) in Annual Net Income  $[(B-A)/A \times 100]$  \_\_\_\_\_ %

9. Check if the above benefits are \_\_\_\_\_ Actual \_\_\_\_\_ Expected

10. Key Problems (if any) encountered by HH in implementing new income activity:

- a. \_\_\_\_\_
- b. \_\_\_\_\_
- c. \_\_\_\_\_

11. Type/Number of Jobs created in your Project-related household production activity:

Paid/Hired Jobs	Specify type of job/task	# Hired	#Men	#Women	#Children	Average Pay/day
1. Full-time*						P
2. Part-time**						P
3. Seasonal***						P

\*Full-time job is at least 40 hrs. of work per week; \*\*Part-time job is less than 40 hrs. of work per week; \*\*\*Seasonal job is specific short-term work performed during certain periods of the year (e.g., land preparation, weeding, harvesting, etc.).

12. Proxy indicators/Anecdotes indicating improved household income due to project income (purchased after project income):

- a. \_\_\_\_\_
- b. \_\_\_\_\_
- c. \_\_\_\_\_

**6<sup>th</sup> DRAFT (2/11/00): GEM PROGRAM IMPACT ASSESSMENT SURVEY—FEB. 2000**  
**SURVEY FORM # 3: BUSINESS ENTERPRISE OWNERS/MANAGERS**

Project # \_\_\_\_\_ Project Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
 GEM Area \_\_\_\_\_ Site \_\_\_\_\_  
 GEM Assistance: \_\_\_\_\_

Interviewer \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_ Interviewee \_\_\_\_\_ Position \_\_\_\_\_

**Background Information:**

1. Name of Plant/Enterprise \_\_\_\_\_
2. Major Products/Services \_\_\_\_\_

**Enterprise Characteristics:**

**3. Check Current Project Activity Status:**

- \_\_\_\_\_ Ongoing GEM assistance, project continues to be implemented (i.e., it is operating)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Ongoing GEM assistance, project implementation stopped/stalled (i.e., not fully operational)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Post-GEM assistance, project activity "survivor" (i.e., still operating)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Post-GEM assistance, project activity stopped/stalled. When stopped? \_\_\_\_\_

**4. Key Problems encountered in implementing the project:**

- \_\_\_\_\_ Joint investment problems
- \_\_\_\_\_ Access to credit problems
- \_\_\_\_\_ Links to raw materials problems
- \_\_\_\_\_ Sourcing/Access to improved technology problems
- \_\_\_\_\_ Others. Specify \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_ Links to markets problems
- \_\_\_\_\_ Transportation problems
- \_\_\_\_\_ Peace and order problems

**5. Indicate changes in enterprise operations affected by this project as specified in the table:**

	Types of Products Marketed	Production Volume/ Month	# Workers by Gender			# Workers by Type of Employment***			
			Total	W	M	Full-Time	Contractual	Part-Time	Seasonal
Pre-project*									
Current									
% Increase									
Expected**									

\*If newly created business enterprise, indicate by putting zeros in the Pre-project row.

\*\*If expected to be in operation in the next few months, put expected employment figures and any other figures that are known, e.g., types of products marketed and # months/yr operation.

\*\*\*Employment Classification: Full-time permanent job is at least 40 hrs. of regular work per week; Full-time contractual job is work for at least 1 year under a contract; Part-time job is less than 40 hrs. of work per week; Seasonal job is specific short-term work performed during certain periods of the year (e.g., equipment maintenance work, bagging, etc.).

6. Identity of current employees: #Muslims \_\_\_\_\_ #Christians \_\_\_\_\_ #Tribals \_\_\_\_\_

7. Do you have plans to **further expand** the business enterprise? Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_ Don't Know \_\_\_  
If yes, specify type of expansion and estimate the # of new jobs to be created \_\_\_\_\_

8. Did the GEM assistance to your project **contribute to your decision to invest in/implement this project?**  
\_\_\_ **Critical** contribution (wouldn't have pushed through with the project without GEM)  
\_\_\_ **Moderate** contribution (GEM helped in many aspects of project start-up and implementation)  
\_\_\_ **Minor** contribution (GEM helped in project start-up and we took it from there)  
Explain your answer: \_\_\_\_\_

9. **Impact of this project on production and income of linked Secondary Beneficiaries:**  
Check type of secondary beneficiaries:  
\_\_\_ **Independently replicated** (copied) the model of this GEM-assisted project  
\_\_\_ **Linked**—This GEM-assisted project created opportunities in production, processing, marketing and/or transport which secondary beneficiaries developed into income activities.  
Describe these secondary beneficiaries and their activities: \_\_\_\_\_  
Estimated # of secondary beneficiaries \_\_\_\_\_  
Recommended respondent(s) for follow-up questions: \_\_\_\_\_

**6<sup>th</sup> DRAFT (2/11/00): GEM PROGRAM IMPACT ASSESSMENT SURVEY—FEB. 2000**  
**SURVEY FORM # 4: PLANT/BUSINESS ENTERPRISE EMPLOYEES\***  
 (\*Additional Workers Hired Under the New Project  
 or Existing Employees who have been benefited by the New Project)

Project # \_\_\_\_\_ Project Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
 GEM Area \_\_\_\_\_ Site \_\_\_\_\_ Name of Plant/Enterprise \_\_\_\_\_  
 GEM Assistance: \_\_\_\_\_

Interviewer \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_ Interviewee \_\_\_\_\_ Position \_\_\_\_\_

**Employee Characteristics:**

1. Type of Job: \_\_\_\_\_ Production \_\_\_\_\_ Administrative Staff \_\_\_\_\_ Managerial/Supervisory  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Construction (related to a project activity)  
 2. Gender \_\_\_\_\_ 3. Identity: \_\_\_\_\_ Muslim \_\_\_\_\_ Christian \_\_\_\_\_ Tribal  
 4. Current Work Status (Check one):  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Full-time permanent employee (At least 40 hrs. work per week)  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Full-time contractual employee (Hired for at least 1 year under a contract)  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Part-time (Less than 40 hrs. work per week). Specify number of hours per week \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Seasonal worker (Hired for specific jobs during certain work periods in the year).  
 Specify number of months per year \_\_\_\_\_

**Economic Characteristics:**

**5. Salary/Benefits of Pre-project and Project work. Estimate the PhP annual value of the ff:**

	Annual Salary (A)	Other Non-Salary Income (B)	**Value of In-Kind Benefits (C)	***Value of Other Income Benefits (D)	Total Value of Income/Benefits (A+B+C+D)	Specify Types of In-Kind & Other Benefits
Pre-Project						
Project						
Amount and % Increase*						
Amount and % Decrease*	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	
<b>TOTAL CHANGE</b>						

\*Calculate the amount and percent increase or decrease from the Pre-project period to the Project period: (Project value - Pre-project value) / PP value x 100). If there is no change, write "NC".

\*\*Some examples of in-kind benefits are free or subsidized commodities (e.g., rice), medicines, uniforms, transport services, etc.

\*\*\*Some examples of other income benefits are emergency allowances, SSS benefits, health insurance, etc.

**6. Proxy indicators/Anecdotes indicating improved household income due to project income (purchased after project income):**

- a. \_\_\_\_\_  
 b. \_\_\_\_\_  
 c. \_\_\_\_\_

**5<sup>th</sup> DRAFT (2/11/00): GEM PROGRAM IMPACT ASSESSMENT SURVEY—FEB. 2000  
SURVEY FORM # 5: INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECT KEY INFORMANT/PROPONENT**

Project # \_\_\_\_\_ Project Name \_\_\_\_\_ Project Cost PhP \_\_\_\_\_  
 GEM Area \_\_\_\_\_ Site \_\_\_\_\_

Interviewer \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_ Interviewee \_\_\_\_\_ Position \_\_\_\_\_

**Background Information:**

1. Name of Cooperative, Farmer's Association, LGU Unit/Government agency, or Company Proponent: \_\_\_\_\_

2. Check Category of Infrastructure Project:

- \_\_\_\_\_ World Bank Social Fund Support with LGU proponent (Municipality or Barangay )
- \_\_\_\_\_ World Bank Social Fund with Cooperative/Farmer Association proponent
- \_\_\_\_\_ Private Infrastructure Project (e.g., telecommunications projects)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Other Government/Donor-Funded Project (e.g., seaport or airport component, improved farm to market road segment including culverts, fish landing, municipal water supply, etc.)

3. Check Type of infrastructure constructed/planned:

- \_\_\_\_\_ School Classroom(s)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Farm to Market Road segment improvement and/or culvert
- \_\_\_\_\_ Post Harvest Facility for consolidation, drying, shelling, and sale of product
- \_\_\_\_\_ Potable Water Supply (e.g., well or spring)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Boat Landing
- \_\_\_\_\_ Expanded Local Telephone Exchange or Establishment of a Public Calling Office
- \_\_\_\_\_ Airport Improvement
- \_\_\_\_\_ Expanded Fish Port
- \_\_\_\_\_ Other. Specify: \_\_\_\_\_

4. Current Status of GEM-Assisted Project Activity:

- \_\_\_\_\_ Ongoing GEM Assistance; Project continues to be implemented.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Ongoing GEM Assistance; Project implementation stopped/stalled.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Post GEM Assistance; completed infrastructure facility being used by intended beneficiaries.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Post GEM Assistance; completed infrastructure facility not being used by intended beneficiaries.

Key problems preventing completion of construction or intended use of this infrastructure: \_\_\_\_\_

**Characteristics of Project Participants/Beneficiaries:**

5. Describe beneficiaries (e.g., fishermen or boat owners in specific location, cooperative/association farmers, Municipality farmers or business people, shippers of produce/fish, telephone subscribers, etc.) \_\_\_\_\_

6. Type of Primary Beneficiaries: \_\_\_\_\_% Muslims \_\_\_\_\_% Christians \_\_\_\_\_% Tribals

7. Estimated Number of Beneficiary Households, Businesses or Individuals:

Planned Number of Users (Specify type of units) \_\_\_\_\_

Actual Number of Users (Same units as above) \_\_\_\_\_

Realistic Number of Expected Users \_\_\_\_\_

If lower number of actual users (i.e., households, businesses or individuals), why? \_\_\_\_\_

8. Primary Types of Benefits--Check one or two most important benefits received/expected from this Project: Check if these benefits are: \_\_\_\_\_ Already received \_\_\_\_\_ Expected

**For potable water facilities:**

\_\_\_\_\_ Better access to potable water for household use in the community  
 Number of additional Households using this water \_\_\_\_\_

**For telecommunications projects:**

\_\_\_\_\_ Expanded local household access to telephone services.  
 Number New Subscribers since expansion \_\_\_\_\_  
 Average Number calls per month in Public Calling Office \_\_\_\_\_

**For School Classrooms:**

- \_\_\_\_\_ New or expanded local madrasa school facilities.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Number of additional children attending this local school after construction \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_ Number of days per week this school holds classes \_\_\_\_\_

**For Airport:**

- \_\_\_\_\_ Volume Cargo (Tons) passing through per year: Preproject# \_\_\_\_\_ Postproject# \_\_\_\_\_ %Increase \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_ number aircraft landed per year at night: Preproject# \_\_\_\_\_ Postproject# \_\_\_\_\_ %Increase \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_ number passengers carried per year: Preproject# \_\_\_\_\_ Postproject# \_\_\_\_\_ %Increase \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_ Number of flight diversion due to low visibility (1996-1999): \_\_\_\_\_

**For Fishport:**

- \_\_\_\_\_ Estimated projected number small fishermen using new Municipal Wharf: Projected#: \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_ Volume (tons) fish unloaded: Preproject# \_\_\_\_\_ Postproject# \_\_\_\_\_ %Increase \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_ Off-loading rate (tons per day): Preproject# \_\_\_\_\_ Postproject# \_\_\_\_\_ %Increase \_\_\_\_\_

**For Infrastructure that supports agricultural/fishery activities:**

- \_\_\_\_\_ Improved physical access (e.g., improved road or boat landing or fish port) to markets and trader/buyers for selling agricultural/fishery products.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Local facility for consolidation, drying, shelling, and sale of product means traders more willing to come to the site to purchase products for a better farmgate price .
- \_\_\_\_\_ Fewer postharvest losses of product due to better postharvest handling at the new facility.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Expanded and improved farmer/fishery production due to better physical access (e.g., improved road or boat landing) to agricultural, fishery or forestry inputs (e.g., seed, fertilizer, fingerlings, cages, seedlings).
- \_\_\_\_\_ Other benefits. Specify: \_\_\_\_\_

9. For post harvest facilities, fill in the table to indicate total cooperative group commodity change or amount of commodity expansion following construction of the infrastructure (Key Informant best estimate):

Time Period	Commodity Type	Total Hectares*	Total Annual Harvest Volume**	% Crop Loss	% First Quality Market Produce***
Pre-Project					
Current					
Planned-New					

\* Depending on type of commodity, this unit of measure could be fishcages, ponds, etc. Specify units.

\*\* Add harvests from multiple seasons in a year when appropriate.

\*\*\*Percentage of marketable crop remaining after losses due to lack of storage.

10. Estimate Number of New Jobs Created as a result of this infrastructure project:

# Temporary Jobs: Local \_\_\_\_\_ For outsiders \_\_\_\_\_ Total \_\_\_\_\_

# Longer-term jobs \_\_\_\_\_ Specify types of longer-term jobs: \_\_\_\_\_

11. Did the presence of the new infrastructure contribute to local decisions to engage more in agricultural, fishery, trading, marketing, or other economic activities?

\_\_\_\_\_ Critical contribution (would not have invested more without this infrastructure in place)

\_\_\_\_\_ Minor contribution (would have invested more without this infrastructure in place)

12. For infrastructure that supports other individual/group economic activities:

\_\_\_\_\_ Specify Benefits that were provided after the project was completed:

3<sup>rd</sup> DRAFT (2/11/00) GEM PROGRAM IMPACT ASSESSMENT SURVEY – Feb. 2000  
SURVEY FORM # 6: INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECT BENEFICIARY HOUSEHOLD

(This survey form is to be used in infrastructure project sites where the infrastructure is completed and where the infrastructure should contribute to economic activities in the area.)

Project # \_\_\_\_\_ Project Name \_\_\_\_\_  
GEM Area \_\_\_\_\_ Site \_\_\_\_\_  
Interviewer \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_ Interviewee \_\_\_\_\_ Position \_\_\_\_\_

**Participant Characteristics:**

1. Name of Cooperative/ Community Group: \_\_\_\_\_
2. Level of Household Use of new infrastructure facility (check one):  
\_\_\_\_\_ More Active \_\_\_\_\_ Less Active
3. How have you used this new infrastructure facility? \_\_\_\_\_
4. Have you encountered any Problems in trying to use the new infrastructure facility?  
\_\_\_\_\_ No problems  
\_\_\_\_\_ Encountered Some Problems  
Describe: \_\_\_\_\_

**Project Benefits:**

5. Check if the following benefits are \_\_\_\_\_ Actual \_\_\_\_\_ Expected
6. Has your annual net income increased or decreased as a result of using this infrastructure?:  
\_\_\_\_\_ Increased \_\_\_\_\_ Decreased \_\_\_\_\_ No Change  
Why increased or decreased?  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
7. Estimate the following:  
Annual Income prior to infrastructure completion. PhP \_\_\_\_\_ (A)  
Annual Income after infrastructure completion. PhP \_\_\_\_\_ (B)  
If increase, percent increase  $(B - A) / A \times (100) =$  \_\_\_\_\_ %  
If decrease, percent decrease  $(B - A) / A \times (100) =$  \_\_\_\_\_ %  
Why increase or decrease? \_\_\_\_\_
8. Other Benefits resulting from this infrastructure. Describe \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
9. Have you hired other laborers to work for you because of expanded economic activities due to the infrastructure? \_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No  
Seasonal Labor -- Number of persons \_\_\_\_\_  
Part-time Labor -- Number of persons \_\_\_\_\_  
Full-time labor -- Number of persons \_\_\_\_\_

2<sup>nd</sup> Draft (2/11/00) GEM PROGRAM IMPACT ASSESSMENT SURVEY – FEB. 2000  
SURVEY FORM # 7: SECONDARY BENEFICIARIES INTERVIEW

Interviewer \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_ Interviewee \_\_\_\_\_ Position \_\_\_\_\_  
Recommended as Secondary Beneficiary of Project #: \_\_\_\_\_ Project Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
Location \_\_\_\_\_ Contact #: \_\_\_\_\_

1. **Type of Secondary Beneficiary:**

\_\_\_\_\_ Entrepreneur Independently Replicated Copy of GEM-Assisted Project

\_\_\_\_\_ Linked economic activity. Entrepreneur independently developed this linked income activity after the GEM-Assisted Project created opportunities in production, processing, marketing and/or transport.

\_\_\_\_\_ Other. Describe linkage to GEM assistance. \_\_\_\_\_

**Background Information:**

2. Name of Enterprise or Business: \_\_\_\_\_

3. Major Products / Services: \_\_\_\_\_

**Links to GEM-Assisted Project:**

4. How important was the GEM – Assisted Project in contributing to the development of your business?

\_\_\_\_\_ **Critical contribution** (couldn't have pushed through with this new business or contract without the GEM-Assisted project.)

\_\_\_\_\_ **Minor contribution** (my business or contracts would have developed without the the GEM-Assisted Project ).

**Benefits:**

5. What is the Annual Net Income generated by this linked business activity or new business?  
PhP \_\_\_\_\_

6. Have you hired new employees to work in this new business or linked business activity?

Number of Seasonal Employees \_\_\_\_\_

Number of Part-time Employees \_\_\_\_\_

Number of Full-Time Employees \_\_\_\_\_