



Republic of the Philippines  
**PROVINCE OF BENGUET**  
**PROVINCIAL AGRICULTURE OFFICE**

La Trinidad, Benguet 2601  
Email Address: [agriculturebenguet@benguet.gov.ph](mailto:agriculturebenguet@benguet.gov.ph)



**TITLE:** Training Proposal on Agricultural Packages of Technologies for Farmers in Benguet

**SUB-TITLE:** a) Agri-Enterprise Development Training  
b) Training on Potato Seed Production and Certification  
c) Training on Good Agricultural Practices on Fruits & Vegetables  
d) Training on Palay Check  
e) Training on Organic Agriculture

**DATE:** March 26 to October 31, 2025

**VENUE:** Gloriosa Hall, TDC, CTS-OPAG, Puguis, La Trinidad, Benguet

**FUND SOURCE:** 2025 General Fund Training Expenses  
(Agricultural Extension Services)

**AMOUNT:** P350,000.00

#### A. PROJECT BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE

The agriculture sector in Benguet plays a crucial role in the local economy, with farming practices contributing significantly to the livelihood of its communities. However, to ensure that both women and men farmers are equipped to thrive in a rapidly changing agricultural environment, there is a need for continuous training and capacity-building. This proposal aims to provide gender-responsive training on various agricultural technologies and practices for 175 women and men farmers in the region.

In line with the **Magna Carta of Women** and its Implementing Rules and Regulations (IRR), particularly Section 23, which recognizes the contribution of women to food production and ensures their active participation in agricultural initiatives, this project seeks to enhance the role of both men and women in the agriculture sector. The MCW mandates that the State not only acknowledges the critical role women play but also ensures their involvement in sustainable agricultural practices, especially in the context of challenges like climate change.

The training will empower both male and female farmers by equipping them with updated knowledge and skills on agricultural innovations and best practices. The focus on gender responsiveness ensures that both genders have equal opportunities to access and benefit from the training, which will contribute to enhancing overall farm productivity and sustainability. In addition, promoting gender equality in agricultural practices will foster a more inclusive and efficient farming community.

This on Agricultural Packages of Technologies for Farmers in Benguet was developed in response to the findings of a comprehensive Training Needs Assessment (TNA). The assessment highlighted key areas where farmers in the region require support to

enhance their agricultural practices and improve productivity. Based on these findings, the following package of technology training modules have been designed.

## **B. TARGET BENEFICIARIES**

- **Primary Beneficiaries:**

175 farmers from Benguet, including men and women, who are engaged in agricultural activities such as potato production, fruit and vegetable farming, and rice production.

- **Secondary Beneficiaries:**

Families and communities of the farmers, as improved agricultural practices will lead to enhanced household income and overall community well-being.

## **C. GOAL/OBJECTIVES/TARGETS**

### **Goal:**

To improve agricultural productivity and sustainability through gender-responsive training on various agricultural technologies, ultimately enhancing the livelihoods of 175 farmers in Benguet.

### **Objectives:**

1. To provide gender-responsive agricultural training that ensures equal participation of both men and women farmers.
2. To equip farmers with practical knowledge and skills on Agri-Enterprise Development, Potato Seed Production, Good Agricultural Practices (GAP) for Fruits and Vegetables, Palay Check, and Organic Agriculture.
3. To enhance farmers' capacity in adopting new technologies and practices that increase crop yield, reduce environmental impact, and improve profitability.
4. To foster a deeper understanding of the importance of gender equality in agricultural development.

### **Targets:**

1. 175 farmers trained in gender-responsive agricultural practices.
2. At least 60% of participants are adopting new technologies and practices post-training.
3. Increased participation of women farmers, targeting a 50% female participation rate in all sessions.

## **D. PROJECT DESCRIPTION / ACTIVITIES**

### **a) Agri-Enterprise Development Training:**

This component will focus on providing farmers with skills in agri-business management, marketing, financial planning, and value-added product development. The training will emphasize how to create viable agribusinesses that ensure a sustainable income for farmers.

### **b) Training on Potato Seed Production and Certification:**

This training will cover the proper techniques for potato seed production and certification. It will include topics on seed selection, quality control, and certification procedures. This is crucial for improving potato yields and ensuring access to high-quality seeds.

### **c) Training on Good Agricultural Practices (GAP) for Fruits and Vegetables:**

GAP training will teach farmers how to adopt sustainable farming practices for the production of fruits and vegetables. Topics will include pest and disease management, soil fertility, crop rotation, and the safe use of chemicals to improve food safety and environmental sustainability.

### **d) Training on Palay Check:**

This training will focus on Palay Check, a technology designed to increase rice production by following proven management practices. Farmers will learn about field preparation, soil management, pest control, and harvest management to maximize yields and minimize losses.

### **e) Training on Organic Agriculture:**

This component will introduce farmers to organic farming principles, including the use of organic fertilizers, crop rotation, pest management, and soil conservation techniques. The aim is to enhance farm sustainability and reduce dependence on chemical inputs.

## **E. PROJECT BUDGET**

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Amount (PHP)</b>
Agri-Enterprise Development Training	19,260.00
Potato Seed Production and Certification	77,470.00
Good Agricultural Practices (GAP) Training	77,470.00
Palay Check Training	52,470.00
Organic Agriculture Training	<u>80,436.00</u>
<b>Total budget</b>	<b>307,106.00</b>

## **F. IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE**

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Start Date</b>	<b>End Date</b>
Agri-Enterprise Development Training	October 24, 2025	October 24, 2025
Potato Seed Production and Certification	April 23, 2025	April 25, 2025
Good Agricultural Practices (GAP) Training	March 26, 2025	March 28, 2025
Palay Check Training	March 26, 2025	March 27, 2025
Organic Agriculture Training	May 21, 2025	May 22, 2025

## **G. SUSTAINABILITY PLAN, MONITORING AND EVALUATION**

This Gender-Responsive Sustainability Plan ensures that the agricultural training program in Benguet is inclusive, empowering both women and men farmers. By integrating gender-sensitive strategies into the monitoring, evaluation, and implementation phases, the program aims to create sustainable, long-term benefits for the farmers and their communities. With ongoing support and effective monitoring, the adoption of improved agricultural technologies will help enhance productivity, livelihoods, and gender equality in the farming sector.

Prepared by:

  
**CORAZON P. ATEO-AN**  
Agriculturist II /  
GFPS-TWG Member

Approved by:

  
**DELINA D. JUAN**  
Provincial Agriculturist

PROJECT/ACTIVITY: PROVINCIAL ROAD IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Element and item/question (col. 1)	Done			Score for an item/ element* (col. 3)	Gender issues identified (col. 4)
	No (2a)	Partly (2b)	Yes (2c)		
<b>1.0 Involvement of women and men</b> (max score: 2; for each item, 1)					2
1.1. Participation of women and men in beneficiary groups in problem identification (possible score: 0, 0.5, 1.0) >			✓	1.0	
1.2. Participation of women and men in beneficiary groups in project design(possible scores: 0, 0.5, 1.0) >			✓	1.0	
<b>2.0. Collection of sex-disaggregated data and gender-related information</b> (possible scores: 0, 1.0, 2.0) >		✓		1.0	1
<b>3.0. Conduct of gender analysis and identification of gender issues</b> (max score: 2; for each item, 1)					1.5
3.1. Analysis of gender gaps and inequalities related to gender roles, perspectives and needs, or access to and control of resources (possible scores: 0, 0.5, 1.0) >			✓	1.0	
3.2. Analysis of constraints and opportunities related to women and men's participation in the project (possible scores: 0, 0.5, 1.0) >		✓		0.50	
TOTAL GAD SCORE – PROJECT IDENTIFICATION STAGE				4.50	
<b>4.0 Gender equality goals, outcomes and outputs</b> (possible scores: 0, 1.0, 2.0) Does the project have clearly stated gender equality goals, objectives, outcomes or outputs? >			✓	2.0	2
<b>5.0. Matching of strategies with gender issues</b> (possible scores: 0, 1.0, 2.0) Do the strategies and activities match the gender issues and gender quality goals identified? >			✓	2.0	2
<b>6.0. Gender analysis of likely impact of the project</b> (max score: 2; for each item or question, 0.67)				2.0	2
6.1. Are women and girl children among the direct or indirect beneficiaries? (possible scores: 0, 0.33, 0.67) >			✓	0.67	
6.2. Has the project considered its long-term impact on women's socioeconomic status and empowerment? (possible scores: 0, 0.33, 0.67) >			✓	0.67	
6.3. Has the project included strategies for avoiding or minimizing negative impact on women's status and welfare? (possible scores: 0, 0.33, 0.67) >			✓	0.67	
<b>7.0 Monitoring targets and indicators</b> (possible scores: 0, 1.0, 2.0) Does the project include gender equality targets and indicators to measure gender equality outputs and outcomes? >			✓	2.0	2
<b>8.0. Sex-disaggregated database requirement</b> (possible scores: 0, 1.0, 2.0) Does the project M&E system require the collection of sex-disaggregated data? >	✓			0	0
<b>9.0. Resources</b> (max score: 2; for each question, 1.0)				1.0	1
9.1. Is the project's budget allotment sufficient for gender equality promotion or integration? OR, will the		✓		0.50	

project tap counterpart funds from LGUs/partners for it GAD efforts (possible scores: 0, 0.5, 1.0) >					
9.2. Does the project have the expertise in promoting gender equality and women's empowerment? OR, does the project commit itself to investing project staff time in building capacities within the project to integrate GAD or promote gender equality? (possible scores: 0, 0.5, 1.0) >		✓		0.50	
<b>10.0 Relationship with the agency's GAD efforts</b> (maximum score: 2; for each question or item, 0.67)				1.67	
10.1 Will the project build on or strengthen the LGU's commitment to the empowerment of women? (possible scores: 0, 0.33, 0.67)  IF THE AGENCY HAD NO GAD PLAN: Will the project help in the formulation of the implementing agency's GAD plan? >			✓	0.67	
10.2. Will the project build on the initiatives of actions of other organizations in the area? (possible scores: 0, 0.33, 0.67) >		✓		0.33	
10.3. Does the project have an exit plan that will ensure the sustainability of GAD efforts and benefits? (possible scores: 0, 0.33, 0.67) >			✓	0.67	
TOTAL GAD SCORE – PROJECT DESIGN STAGE				15.17	

### Interpretation of GAD Scores

### Attribution of Programs to GAD Fund (based on scores)

HGDG Score	Description	Corresponding Budget for the Year of the Program that may be Attributed to the LGU GAD Budget
Below 4.0	GAD is invisible	0% or no amount of the program/project budget for the year may be attributed to the GAD budget
4.0 – 7.9	Promising GAD prospects (conditional pass)	25% of the budget for the year of the program/project may be attributed to the GAD budget
8.0 – 14.9	Gender sensitive	50% of the budget for the year of the program/project, may be attributed to the GAD budget
15.0 – 19.9	Gender-responsive	75% of the budget for the year of the program/project may be attributed to the GAD budget
20.0	Fully gender- responsive	100% of the budget for the year of the program may be attributed to the GAD budget

PROJECT /ACTIVITY: *Rewards & Recognition / PRAISE*

Element and item/question (col. 1)	Done			Score for an item/ element* (col. 3)	Gender issues identified (col. 4)
	No (2a)	Partly (2b)	Yes (2c)		
<b>1.0 Involvement of women and men</b> (max score: 2; for each item, 1)					
1.1. Participation of women and men in beneficiary groups in problem identification (possible score: 0, 0.5, 1.0) >			1.0		
1.2. Participation of women and men in beneficiary groups in project design (possible scores: 0, 0.5, 1.0) >			1.0		
<b>2.0. Collection of sex-disaggregated data and gender-related information</b> (possible scores: 0, 1.0, 2.0) >		1.0			
<b>3.0. Conduct of gender analysis and identification of gender issues</b> (max score: 2; for each item, 1)					
3.1. Analysis of gender gaps and inequalities related to gender roles, perspectives and needs, or access to and control of resources (possible scores: 0, 0.5, 1.0) >			1		
2. Analysis of constraints and opportunities related to women and men's participation in the project (possible scores: 0, 0.5, 1.0) >			1		
TOTAL GAD SCORE – PROJECT IDENTIFICATION STAGE					
<b>4.0 Gender equality goals, outcomes and outputs</b> (possible scores: 0, 1.0, 2.0) Does the project have clearly stated gender equality goals, objectives, outcomes or outputs? >			2		
<b>5.0. Matching of strategies with gender issues</b> (possible scores: 0, 1.0, 2.0) Do the strategies and activities match the gender issues and gender quality goals identified? >			2		
<b>6.0. Gender analysis of likely impact of the project</b> (max score: 2; for each item or question, 0.67)					
6.1. Are women and girl children among the direct or indirect beneficiaries? (possible scores: 0, 0.33, 0.67) >			0.67		
6.2. Has the project considered its long-term impact on women's socioeconomic status and empowerment? (possible scores: 0, 0.33, 0.67) >		0.67	0.67		
6.3. Has the project included strategies for avoiding or minimizing negative impact on women's status and welfare? (possible scores: 0, 0.33, 0.67) >		0.67	0.67		
<b>7.0 Monitoring targets and indicators</b> (possible scores: 0, 1.0, 2.0) Does the project include gender equality targets and indicators to measure gender equality outputs and outcomes? >		1			
<b>8.0. Sex-disaggregated database requirement</b> (possible scores: 0, 1.0, 2.0) Does the project M&E system require the collection of sex-disaggregated data? >		1			
<b>9.0. Resources</b> (max score: 2; for each question, 1.0)					
9.1. Is the project's budget allotment sufficient for gender equality promotion or integration? OR, will the			1.0		

project tap counterpart funds from LGUs/partners for its GAD efforts (possible scores: 0, 0.5, 1.0) >				
9.2. Does the project have the expertise in promoting gender equality and women's empowerment? OR, does the project commit itself to investing project staff time in building capacities within the project to integrate GAD or promote gender equality? (possible scores: 0, 0.5, 1.0) >			1.0	
<b>10.0 Relationship with the agency's GAD efforts</b> (maximum score: 2; for each question or item, 0.67)				
10.1 Will the project build on or strengthen the LGU's commitment to the empowerment of women? (possible scores: 0, 0.33, 0.67)  IF THE AGENCY HAD NO GAD PLAN: Will the project help in the formulation of the implementing agency's GAD plan? >			0.67	
10.2. Will the project build on the initiatives of actions of other organizations in the area? (possible scores: 0, 0.33, 0.67) >			0.67	
10.3. Does the project have an exit plan that will ensure the sustainability of GAD efforts and benefits? (possible scores: 0, 0.33, 0.67) >			0.67	
TOTAL GAD SCORE - PROJECT DESIGN STAGE			17.00	

### Interpretation of GAD Scores

Maximum score: 20 points

- ❖ 0-3.9 : GAD is invisible (Proposal to be returned)
- ❖ 4.0-7.9 : Has promising GAD prospects ("conditional pass")
- ❖ 8.0-14.9 : Gender sensitive
- ❖ 15.0-19.9 : Gender responsive
- ★ 20.0 : Fully Gender responsive

### ATTRIBUTION OF PROGRAMS OR PROJECTS TO GAD FUND

HGDG Score	Description	Corresponding Budget for the Year of the Program that may be Attributed to the LGU GAD Budget
Below 4.0	GAD is invisible	0% or no amount of the program/project budget for the year may be attributed to the GAD budget
4.0 – 7.9	Promising GAD prospects (conditional pass)	25% of the budget for the year of the program/project may be attributed to the GAD budget
8.0 – 14.9	Gender sensitive	50% of the budget for the year of the program/project, may be attributed to the GAD budget
15.0 – 19.9	Gender-responsive	75% of the budget for the year of the program/project may be attributed to the GAD budget
20.0	Fully gender- responsive	100% of the budget for the year of the program may be attributed to the GAD budget