

Strategic Management in Philippine Agribusiness: A Critical Literature Synthesis

¹Julius Caesar G. Llarenas Jr, ²Abdani D. Bandera, ³Omairah M. Usman-Macadaag

¹Department of Plant Science, College of Agriculture, Mindanao State University-Main

^{2,3}Department of Agribusiness Management, College of Agriculture, Mindanao State University-Main

Abstract: *This literature-based analysis examines strategic management implementation in the Philippine agribusiness sector, drawing from academic studies, policy documents, and industry reports. Despite national frameworks such as the Agriculture and Fisheries Modernization Act (AFMA, 1997), the Philippine Digital Agriculture Strategy (2021–2025), and the OneDA Reform Agenda, the sector faces a persistent gap between policy ambition and operational reality. The review identifies five interconnected themes – strategic planning, competitive positioning, value chain integration, digital transformation, and institutional coordination – while revealing that structural barriers have persisted for nearly three decades. Findings indicate that while firms employing differentiation strategies and coordinated value chain mechanisms achieve improvements in farmer incomes and market access, these successes remain geographically concentrated. Small and medium enterprises confront persistent obstacles due to fragmented markets, inadequate rural infrastructure, and weak institutional coordination across agencies. Digital transformation initiatives are hindered by Luzon-centric research bias, poor rural connectivity, limited extension capacity, and high technology costs that exclude smallholder farmers in Visayas and Mindanao. The analysis reveals that institutional fragmentation – not technological deficiency – constitutes the primary barrier to strategic management effectiveness. Future research and policy must prioritize scalable coordination models, inclusive digital infrastructure, and governance reforms that bridge the divide between national policy design and field-level execution.*

Keywords: *Strategic management, Philippine agribusiness, competitive advantage, value chain, digital transformation, strategy implementation, agricultural modernization*

I. INTRODUCTION

Strategic management involves the formulation and implementation and evaluation of decisions which enable organizations to achieve their long-term goals (David & David, 2017). The process includes top management developing and executing major organizational initiatives while they assess both available resources and the internal and external conditions that affect organizational operations (Raji et al., 2024). Agribusinesses require strategic management because their business activities must adjust to changes in the market and technological progress and competition from domestic and international sources (Wheelen et al., 2018). The Philippine agribusiness sector shows strong potential for studying strategic management functions because it operates under a productivity-employment paradox, which exists because the agricultural sector employs 22 percent of the national workforce yet produces only 9 percent of GDP according to 2025 data (Farmonaut, 2025).

The Philippine Statistics Authority (2023) reports that agriculture serves as a primary employment source in the Philippines. However, the sector shows substantial labor absorption which contradicts its economic decline because its GDP contribution decreased to 9% but the workforce maintains its productivity through inefficient operational processes (New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, 2025). The sector has experienced slow productivity growth which shows structural problems that affect its performance when compared to global market trends and productivity levels of other developing countries. Agricultural production in the Philippines experienced an annual growth rate of only 0.2% between 2013 and 2022 which falls short of the global average growth rate of 1.8%. Agribusiness systems require modernization and innovative solutions together with strategic Efficiency development which strengthens their competitive advantage (OECD, 2025; Briones, 2019). The ongoing difference between policy goals and actual execution under AFMA requires strategic management frameworks to develop institutional coordination and value chain

integration and climate adaptation systems as essential elements for achieving sustainable sector growth (Development Academy of the Philippines, 2021; Sarip & Bandera, 2025).

Agribusiness competitiveness depends more on value chain coordination and innovation adoption and institutional support according to recent research findings (Porter, 1985; Sarip & Bandera, 2025; FAO, 2022). Firms achieve sustainable competitive advantage through vertical coordination mechanisms like contract farming, while smallholder collectives enhance bargaining power through inclusive organizations (Ba et al., 2019; Manyise & Dentoni, 2021). The value chains which exist in developing economies provide essential support for market access and technology redistribution, but benefits become limited because of weak institutional enforcement and infrastructure deficits (Lowitt et al., 2015; Mishra et al., 2020). The existing system limitations require organizations to develop strategic management frameworks which will provide solutions for their three main operational challenges, which include governance deficiencies, technology implementation, and institutional partnership needs. Developing economy contexts require sustainable agribusiness growth to establish operational systems, which require organizations to develop strategic management frameworks that provide solutions for their three main operational challenges.

The Philippine illustrates this complexity through AFMA-mandated partnerships which increased farmer incomes and postharvest facilities, but fragmented markets and inadequate rural infrastructure still obstruct progress because of their performance limitations which have continued for three decades since the program began (Mataia et al., 2020; Development Academy of the Philippines, 2021). Agribusiness companies use strategic management to connect their production, processing, and marketing activities with market demands and policy requirements while needing to develop skills that enable them to handle climate changes and digital disruptions and changing consumer patterns (Vutseme et al., 2025; Baclayon & Sarsale, 2025). The review investigates the four dimensions of Philippine agribusiness through its examination of strategic management methods which operate in the fields of strategic planning and competitive positioning and value chain integration and collaboration and digital transformation and institutional support mechanisms.

II. METHODOLOGY

This study employed a qualitative literature review methodology using a systematic document analysis approach. Academic journal articles, policy documents, government reports, and industry publications were sourced from databases such as Google Scholar, ResearchGate, and official government websites. The search process used the following keywords for the research study: strategic management in agribusiness, Philippine agricultural competitiveness, value chain management, Philippines digital transformation, agriculture Philippines, AFMA strategic framework. The inclusion criteria required sources to be either peer-reviewed or policy-based or published by recognized institutions. The study focused on literature published during the past 15 to 20 years while including essential strategic management theoretical frameworks for its conceptual foundation. Thematic analysis was used to examine data which revealed common themes about strategic planning and competitive positioning and technological innovation and policy development activities. Thematic analysis produced insights which applied to the development of agribusiness strategies in the Philippines.

III. LITERATURE REVIEW

Strategic Planning and Competitive Positioning

Strategic planning functions as an essential element of strategic management because it establishes long-term goals that businesses need to achieve under their current environmental situations (David & David, 2017). Agribusiness companies use strategic planning to perform market research and analyze their competitors while assessing their production capabilities. Philippine agribusiness firms face challenges because they need to navigate unpredictable commodity markets which demand that they develop both strategic plans and flexible operational methods. Agricultural businesses depend on strategic planning to achieve sustainable competitive advantages because their operations occur within complex and dynamic environments which experience market fluctuations and technological progress and changing customer preferences (Chen, Yueh, & Liang, 2016).

The Philippine agriculture sector operates according to a socio-productive model which requires all its organizational financial and technological and productive components to work together. The strategy requires all stakeholders from developing countries to work together because their interests face conflicts through market failures (Ochoa et al., 2024). Thus, a systemic vision that strikes a balance between industrial goals and more general socioeconomic development objectives is necessary for successful strategic management (Vutseme et al., 2025). The Philippine Development Plan 2023-2028 demonstrates this need because it shows agricultural modernization needs both better

production methods and complete value chain development together with farm clustering and digital systems that improve market access and business competition (National Economic and Development Authority, 2023; Department of Agriculture - Agricultural Training Institute, 2023).

The competitive advantage theory developed by Porter in 1985 shows that businesses can achieve better performance results through three strategic pathways which include cost leadership and differentiation and focus strategies. Cost leadership enables businesses to provide their lowest prices through operational efficiency and scale economies while differentiation enables businesses to charge premium prices by providing unique value through their high-quality products and innovative features and focus strategies enable businesses to compete in specific market segments through their cost advantages or their ability to differentiate their products (Ali & Anwar, 2021; Makina & Oundo, 2020). Philippine agribusinesses use differentiation strategies to establish their market presence through organic certification and geographic indication labeling and value-added processing which help them maintain control over commodity price fluctuations while reaching specialized market segments (Sekine, 2021).

This strategic orientation depends on Porter's (1985) observation that organizations achieve lasting competitive advantages through operational efficiency combined with their ability to control unique strategic market positions which other organizations find difficult to duplicate. Modern research shows that hybrid organizational structures which combine central control with local decision authority help agribusinesses achieve better strategic flexibility, while existing strategic management models which prioritize efficient operations and competitive market position fail to address uncertain business environments; organizations need to adopt complete performance systems that incorporate market sensitivity, innovation, and disciplined planning for their ongoing performance management (Usman et al., 2025). Agribusinesses that use systematic structured planning methods achieve better outcomes than others who use reactive planning methods (Sarip & Bandera, 2025) because strategic positioning helps businesses create safe market areas through their special product offerings which drive continuous business expansion.

Value Chain Integration and Collaboration

Agribusinesses depend on value chain integration as their essential business strategy because agricultural products need to undergo multiple processing stages before they reach their final customers. The integration of production, processing, distribution, and marketing operations results in greater efficiency and increased value creation for businesses (Porter, 1985). Proper execution of value chain integration enhances market access for smallholder farmers while establishing stronger links between them and agribusiness companies, which provide market access and technical assistance and high-quality agricultural inputs. The entire supply chain system gains improved efficiency through this process (Mishra et al, 2020; Lowitt et al, 2015). Research demonstrates that companies employing coordinated value chains attain enhanced competitiveness and profitability, especially in developing nations where fragmented markets and infrastructural deficiencies frequently hinder performance (Manyise and Dentoni, 2021).

The national policies of the Philippines support value chain integration as a means to enhance national competitiveness and foster rural development. The Agriculture and Fisheries Modernization Act of 1997 (AFMA) requires farmers, cooperatives, and agribusinesses to establish both vertical and horizontal partnerships for their market operations and infrastructure development, and institutional support requirements (Department of Agriculture, 1997). Recent integrative reviews demonstrate that agribusiness performance requires effective sectoral coordination between input production and processing sectors because their sectoral achievements work together to create success in this business sector, as evidenced in the Philippine context where broken markets have historically obstructed proper value chain management (Ambor et al., 2025). According to PCAARRD (2022), AFMA programs assist cooperatives and postharvest facilities, and farmer training programs to create more effective agricultural value chains. Research on Philippine agricultural products shows that successful value chain management increases both farmer income and their ability to reach markets sustainably (Mataia et al., 2020). The Special Area for Agricultural Development Program of the Department of Agriculture shows current proof that farmers achieve better results through integrated value chain methods which they use to operate their agricultural businesses. The research shows that coordinated production and marketing strategies used by farmer associations resulted in 70 percent greater crop yields and 66,000 Philippine peso net income for each association during their single cropping cycles. The successful groups established market connections which allowed them to sell products directly to urban areas including Bulacan and Romblon (Department of Agriculture - Special Area for Agricultural Development [DA-SAAD], 2024).

Nonetheless, studies show that institutional coordination and network collaboration are very important for improving the performance of the value chain in agribusiness. The research shows that vertical coordination mechanisms which include contract farming and inter-firm partnerships provide better supply chain coordination while reducing uncertainty and helping participants to transfer their technology (Ba et al. 2016). Additionally, inclusive producer organizations together with collective action frameworks enable smallholders to access markets while increasing their negotiating power and their ability to capture value from agricultural value chains (Gómez & Ricketts 2013). Moreover, trust-based relationships together with formal agreements enable stakeholders to exchange information while organizations achieve better quality control and greater international and domestic market competitiveness in agrifood products (Grohman et al. 2023). Therefore, these coordination mechanisms demonstrate that sustainable value chain performance in agribusiness depends not on isolated interventions but on the synergistic integration of vertical partnerships, horizontal collective action, and trust-based governance structures that align stakeholder incentives toward mutual value creation.

Digital Transformation in Agribusiness

The global agribusiness sector is experiencing a significant digital transformation which advanced technologies and changing consumer needs and sustainability requirements are driving forward (Vahdanjoo et al., 2025). Digital transformation in agriculture which people commonly call "Digital Agriculture" (DA) or "Agriculture 4.0" involves farmers using digital technologies and automated systems to conduct their work which changes their traditional farming methods and business operations (McFadden et al., 2023). The agricultural value chain undergoes a fundamental transformation through this development which extends from the cultivation process to the production process and the distribution process and the consumption process (Doda et al., 2025). Hence, Digitalization has become a widespread force which transforms agricultural business operations through its technological advancements. Agribusiness companies need to develop their digital skills throughout their entire operational process. This approach enables them to compete effectively in the modern market which relies on data.

The Philippine Digital Agriculture Strategy 2021–2025 establishes digital transformation as a principal national goal for the Philippines (DA & IRRI, 2021). About 25 percent of the work force in the Philippines finds employment in the agricultural sector. Recent evaluations show that agricultural value chains now use digital technologies which include remote sensing systems AI-driven chatbots and precision agriculture tools (Briones et al., 2023). The sector encounters various obstacles because it operates with disconnected systems and suffers from inadequate rural infrastructure and its workers lack digital skills and face expensive technology costs which particularly affect smallholder farmers (Economic Research Institute for ASEAN and East Asia, 2024) Research activity is still mostly happening in Luzon, and smallholder communities, which make up most of the producers, aren't using it very much (Taer & Taer, 2024). The existing disparities demonstrate an immediate requirement for digital strategies which need to be both inclusive and localized to create digital solutions which bridge the divide between research innovation and actual field implementation throughout the Philippine archipelago.

The Philippines' experience shows how digital transformation trends around the world are different in developing economies. The Philippines has integrated digital agriculture into its national food security frameworks (Vahdanjoo et al. 2025). The existing gap between policy objectives and real-world outcomes creates a significant obstacle for organizations to achieve their intended goals. Developed countries experience infrastructure improvements (OECD 2019) while the Philippines faces fundamental challenges with rural connectivity and digital literacy and technology expenses which prevent smallholder farmers from entering the market (Briones et al. 2023). The obstacles facing the Philippines appear in multiple developing nations because research studies about digital agricultural practices in developing countries show that smallholder farmers in sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia encounter identical obstacles which include their lack of digital skills and the presence of faulty rural internet systems and the high expenses associated with internet usage (Gumbi et al., 2023; Nxumalo & Chauke, 2025). The research evidence shows that although many digital technologies exist only a small number of them can be used by smallholder farming operations because inadequate electricity and internet service create major difficulties which prevent system expansion (Gumbi et al., 2023).

Strategic management in Philippine agribusiness must prioritize digital technology integration (Vahdanjoo et al., 2025) while addressing three critical barriers to smallholder adoption: inadequate rural infrastructure and connectivity (ERIA, 2024), limited extension worker capacity and farmer digital skills (Ugpat et al, 2025), and weak institutional coordination between policy design and field implementation (Grow Asia & Balzarelli, 2026; Nxumalo & Chauke, 2025). Bridging these gaps requires localized, inclusive solutions that align national frameworks such as the Philippine Digital

Agriculture Strategy with on-the-ground realities in underserved communities (DA & IRRI, 2021). Without such comprehensive, context-sensitive approaches, digital transformation risks exacerbating existing inequalities rather than fostering inclusive agricultural development for sustainable competitive advantage (Vahdanjoo et al., 2025; Nxumalo & Chauke, 2025). Conclusively, the digitalization success of Philippine agribusiness depends not on advanced technologies but on institutional organizations that develop environments which enable smallholder farmers to use and transform digital tools for their productivity and market access and their resilience improvement.

Institutional and Policy Frameworks

The Philippine agribusiness sector functions through a complicated system of multiple governmental institutions which has experienced major changes because of the OneDA Reform Agenda. Comparative analysis across Southeast Asia indicates that systemic approaches integrating sectoral linkages, resource mobilization, and market channels enhance agribusiness performance (Caracle & Bandera, 2025). While Thailand and Vietnam demonstrate integrated, competitive agribusiness systems, the Philippines remains fragmented due to persistent institutional coordination gaps (Caracle & Bandera, 2025). These findings underscore that strategic management in Philippine agribusiness requires not only enterprise-level capabilities but also governance system transformation. The Department of Agriculture established an Institutional Development Program Management Office through Administrative Order No. 25, Series of 2021 to harmonize planning across its attached agencies and transform from a commodity-focused regulator into a demand-driven enterprise development agency (Department of Agriculture, 2021). The implementation of this mechanism establishes a partnership with the Farm and Fisheries Clustering and Consolidation Program, which creates agricultural clusters through local government units (Department of Agriculture, 2020). However, the World Bank (2023) reports ongoing problems with DA-LGU collaboration because the Philippine Rural Development Project proved effective in establishing joint planning systems yet institutional divisions still block agricultural service delivery programs from operating smoothly.

Philippine agribusiness faces ongoing difficulties with cross-sectoral coordination. The National Agriculture and Fisheries Modernization and Industrialization Plan 2021-2030 establishes a framework that the DA, DTI, DOF, DAR, and DENR should follow according to its official documentation (ATI, 2022). The Comprehensive National Fisheries Industry Development Plan 2021-2025 will direct BFAR toward specific targets according to its objectives (Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources, 2021). The OECD (2025) report shows that organizations remain divided despite NIA operating under the Office of the President and PSAT implementation. Furthermore, the Philippines experiences a common problem which prevents effective coordination between existing policies and actual administrative operations. The research conducted by Awokuse et al. (2024) and Tansuchat et al. (2022) in ASEAN shows that inclusive agribusiness requires more than effective written documents. The system needs operational frameworks which remain effective during changes in international market conditions.

FAO (2023) guidelines for anticipatory action together with climate-resilient agricultural practices depend on the assumption that DA-DENR-DOST partnership will create effective institutional cooperation, which currently operates at separate national and local jurisdictional levels. The National Food Systems Transformation Pathway (Department of Agriculture, 2021) advances an ambitious "whole-of-nation" narrative that integrates SDG and ASEAN commitments. However, Wang et al. (2022) remain skeptical that such multi-level frameworks can realistically reverse agriculture's declining global competitiveness or generate tangible rural returns. Consequently, the existing gap between aspirational policy design and actual institutional coordination system implementation needs strategic management methods which will help organizations deal with their separate governance systems and different organizational goals while transforming international agreements into specific measurable results for smallholder farmers.

The institutional frameworks at micro-level establish the strategic management capabilities which Philippine agribusiness companies need to operate their business. The organizational structure of a company determines its profitability because adaptive capability and agility and resourcefulness serve as intermediary factors which influence business results during periods of institutional constraints (Baclayon & Sarsale, 2025). Santos and Santos (2025) show that policy frameworks serve as essential elements which lead civil service organizations to achieve sustainability. Philippine agribusiness strategic management operates within a hybrid governance system which combines state-led coordination with cooperative self-governance and market-driven value chain integration because the effectiveness of decisions requires both policy coherence and institutional support.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Philippine agribusiness companies are using more and more differentiation strategies, like getting organic certification and adding value to their products, to stay competitive (Porter, 1985; Sarip & Bandera, 2025). The sector has experienced productivity growth at 0.2 percent annually from 2013 to 2022 which remains below the global average of 1.8 percent because strategic planning failed to deliver needed efficiency improvements (OECD, 2025; Philippine Statistics Authority, 2023). The reactive operational stances of smaller enterprises together with market failures that block multi-stakeholder alignment create this gap which shows that strategic planning needs complete organizational change instead of relying on single company capabilities (Chen, Yueh, & Liang, 2016; Ochoa et al., 2024).

The Agriculture and Fisheries Modernization Act of 1997 (AFMA) (Department of Agriculture, 1997; PCAARRD, 2022) enables value chain integration to enhance operational efficiency and enable smallholder farmers to enter new markets. The coordinated value chains deliver higher earnings to farmers while contract farming systems help farmers manage potential risks and enable them to acquire new agricultural technologies (Mataia et al., 2020; Ba et al., 2016). The presence of fragmented markets together with insufficient infrastructure create higher costs for conducting business operations according to Manyise and Dentoni. Trust-based relationships enhance value capture (Gómez & Ricketts, 2013; Grohman et al., 2023), yet the structural barriers continue to exist after almost 30 years of AFMA implementation which demonstrates that rural infrastructure and contract enforcement capacity need to be developed through additional funding to support policy implementation.

The empirical evidence from DA-SAAD (2024) demonstrates 70% yield increases and PHP 66,000 net income gains per farmer association which supports the theoretical assertions of Manyise and Dentoni (2021) about coordinated value chain competitiveness. The geographic distribution of these achievements which exist only in Bulacan and Romblon demonstrates the ongoing implementation deficiencies which Wang et al. (2022) discovered in multi-level governance systems. The trust-based governance mechanisms which Grohman et al. (2023) and Gómez and Ricketts (2013) established function within these successful clusters but their absence from the complete value chain system prevents contract farming and inter-firm partnerships (Ba et al. 2016) from creating deep changes. The government needs to establish trust between different institutions which will enable institutions to build trust-based systems which will improve their management of trust-based systems.

The Philippine Digital Agriculture Strategy 2021–2025 establishes digital transformation as a national priority (Department of Agriculture & International Rice Research Institute, 2021; Briones et al., 2023) while rural areas face three obstacles which prevent technology adoption: connectivity problems, insufficient digital skills, and steep costs which make it unaffordable for small farmers (Economic Research Institute for ASEAN and East Asia, 2024; Briones et al., 2023). The research focus on Luzon results in two-dimensional development because it ignores Visayas and Mindanao (Taer & Taer, 2024; Vahdanjoo et al., 2025). The digital divide findings of Gumbi et al. (2023) and Nxumalo and Chauke (2025) establish that both sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia experience the same obstacles which show that the Philippines shares common development problems with other developing economies instead of having its own unique national issues. The systematic review evidence that only a fraction of digital innovations prove accessible to smallholder contexts due to electricity and internet deficits (Gumbi et al., 2023) directly explains why the Philippine Digital Agriculture Strategy's ambitious targets have not translated into widespread smallholder adoption despite the Strategy's national priority status.

The extension worker capacity problems identified by Ugpat et al. (2025) and David (2025) create critical obstacles which block the successful execution of public policies from their initial development stage to their practical application stage. The research conducted by Grow Asia and Balzarelli (2026) shows that digital agriculture in ASEAN represents a delivery challenge instead of an innovation problem which explains why the Philippines fails to implement its established digital strategies. The institutional coordination failures between DA, DTI, DOF, DAR, and DENR which NAFMIP 2021–2030 requires according to ATI 2022 but which OECD 2025 and World Bank 2023 report as disjointed control show that the National Food Systems Transformation Pathway (Department of Agriculture 2021) remains an idealistic goal instead of a practical operational framework. The disconnection between multi-agency policy frameworks and ground-level execution proves Wang et al. (2022) skepticism about multi-level frameworks because these frameworks need complete governance reforms to produce real benefits for rural areas.

The primary barrier to institutional progress arises from institutional fragmentation which prevents agencies from operating together despite the OneDA Reform Agenda and National Agriculture and Fisheries Modernization and Industrialization Plan 2021–2030 presenting clear development paths (Department of Agriculture, 2021; ATI, 2022) (World Bank, 2023; OECD, 2025; Awokuse et al., 2024). Wang et al. (2022) doubt that multi-level frameworks will restore lost

competitiveness while FAO (2023) prescriptions require all agencies to work together which currently does not exist. The FAO (2023) anticipatory action guidelines presuming DA-DENR-DOST cooperation highlight this implementation paradox: climate-resilient agriculture theoretically requires integrated institutional responses yet the jurisdictional separation between national and local levels documented by David (2025) and the cross-sectoral coordination gaps identified by Awokuse et al. (2024) and Tansuchat et al. (2022) render such cooperation structurally improbable under current governance arrangements.

Organizations develop their capacity to handle new situations through their adaptive capability development yet hybrid governance systems create operational challenges because they lead to ineffective results according to Baclayon and Sarsale (2025) and Santos and Santos (2025). The Baclayon and Sarsale (2025) study shows that organizational structure together with adaptive capability and agility and resourcefulness function as intermediary elements which affect profitability during institutional constraints. Santos and Santos (2025) show that policy frameworks serve as core components which sustain civil service operations while the Philippine agribusiness sector fails to support institutional frameworks which results in poor strategic management outcomes for both public and private sectors. The micro-macro disconnect shows that strategic management efforts need to develop enterprise capabilities while transforming institutional governance systems instead of treating these two areas as different fields.

Strategic management constraints originate from three main factors which include institutional fragmentation and infrastructure deficits and resource limitations. The policy should establish different support levels for commercial enterprises and smallholder value chains while it needs to establish trust-based coordination as its main priority which should be pursued through digital solutions that include all users and its governance system should operate through organizational cooperation. Future research should examine scalable coordination mechanisms smallholder technology adoption successful institutional reforms and longitudinal firm-level outcomes to bridge the gap between policy ambition and operational reality.

V. CONCLUSION

The research assessed how Philippine agribusiness applies strategic management techniques by reviewing academic research and official documents and institutional publications to identify four key competitiveness factors which include strategic planning and value chain integration and digital transformation and institutional coordination. The national policy frameworks which consist of AFMA and the Digital Agriculture Strategy 2021–2025 and the OneDA Reform Agenda establish a strategic framework which links together all three elements, but organizations fail to achieve better results because of their implementation problems and their need for better infrastructure and their institutional divisions. The sector faces its main challenge because of the persistent gap which exists between policy goals and actual operational practices, while smallholder structures and weak coordination limit the ability to scale differentiation strategies and value chain integration, and digital transformation projects create new inequalities because of existing infrastructure problems. The Philippine agribusiness sector needs systemic interventions which will resolve its coordination problems and promote rural infrastructure development and institutional capacity development, while future plans will emphasize digital initiatives that promote inclusion and better inter-agency communication and regional support systems which will improve competitiveness and sustainability and resilience.

REFERENCES

- [1] Agricultural Training Institute. (2022). National agriculture and fisheries modernization and industrialization plan 2021-2030. <https://ati2.da.gov.ph/ati-main/content/publications/repost/national-agriculture-and-fisheries-modernization-and-industrialization-plan>
- [2] Ali, B. J., & Anwar, G. (2021). Porter's generic competitive strategies and its influence on the competitive advantage. *International Journal of Advanced Engineering, Management and Science*, 7(6), 42–51. <https://doi.org/10.22161/ijaems.76.5>
- [3] Álvarez Ochoa, C. P., Rendón Acevedo, J. A., & Naranjo Tuesta, Y. (2024). Sustainability strategy in agribusiness: A bibliometric and systematic analysis of the literature. *Scientific Reports*, 14, Article 00530. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43621-024-00530-w>

- [4] Ambor, S. R. B., Bandera, A. D., & Abdul-rashid, R. O. (2025). Agribusiness sector dynamics: Evolution, significance, and comprehensive analysis. *International Journal of Business Marketing and Management*, 10(6), 11–23. <https://www.ijbmm.com/paper/Nov2025/8340436743.pdf>
- [5] Awokuse, T., Lim, S., Santeramo, F., & Steinbach, S. (2024). Robust policy frameworks for strengthening the resilience and sustainability of agri-food global value chains. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0306919224001258>
- [6] Ba, H. A., de Mey, Y., Thoron, S., & Demont, M. (2019). Inclusiveness of contract farming along the vertical coordination continuum: Evidence from the Vietnamese rice sector. *Land Use Policy*, 87, 104050. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2019.104050>
- [7] Baclayon, J. P., & Sarsale, M. S. (2025). Management practices and financial performance of agri-based enterprises in Philippine state universities and colleges. *ResearchGate Papers Series Management*. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/392499496>
- [8] Briones, R. (2019). *Modernizing Philippine agriculture: Policies, investments, and institutions*. Philippine Institute for Development Studies.
- [9] Briones, R. M., Galang, I. M. R., & Mapa, C. T. (2023). Transforming Philippine agri-food systems with digital technology: Extent, prospects, and inclusiveness (PIDS Discussion Paper Series No. 2023-32). Philippine Institute for Development Studies. <https://pids.gov.ph/publication/discussion-papers/transforming-philippine-agri-food-systems-with-digital-technology-extent-prospects-and-inclusiveness>
- [10] Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources. (2021). *Comprehensive national fisheries industry development plan 2021-2025*. Department of Agriculture. <https://www.bfar.da.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2022/10/Comprehensive-National-Fisheries-Industry-Development-Plan-CNFIDP-2021-2025.pdf>
- [11] Caracle, L. R. B., & Bandera, A. D. (2025). Advancing agribusiness through systemic approach: Linking sectors, resources, and market channels. *Journal of Business Economics and Agribusiness*, 3(1). <https://doi.org/10.47134/jbea.v3i1.928>
- [12] Chen, C. C., Yueh, H. P., & Liang, C. (2016). Strategic management of agribusiness: Determinants and trends. *Journal of Entrepreneurship, Management and Innovation*, 12(4), 69–97. <https://doi.org/10.7341/20161244>
- [13] David, F. R., & David, F. R. (2017). *Strategic management: A competitive advantage approach, concepts and cases* (17th ed.). Pearson.
- [14] Department of Agriculture. (1997). Republic Act No. 8435: Agriculture and Fisheries Modernization Act of 1997. Republic of the Philippines. https://lawphil.net/statutes/repacts/ra1997/ra_8435_1997.html
- [15] Department of Agriculture. (2020). Administrative Order No. 27, Series of 2020: Farm and fisheries clustering and consolidation program. <https://www.scribd.com/document/748744461/ao27-s2020>
- [16] Department of Agriculture. (2021). Administrative Order No. 25, Series of 2021: Integration of the "OneDA Agenda" key strategies. <https://ati2.da.gov.ph/ati-main/content/sites/default/files/2022-03/pub-1.pdf>
- [17] Department of Agriculture. (2021). National food systems transformation pathway. <https://summitdialogues.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/09/Philippines-National-Food-Systems-Transformation-Pathway.pdf>
- [18] Department of Agriculture – Agricultural Training Institute. (2023). AFE strategic plan 2023-2028. ATI Central Office. <https://ati2.da.gov.ph/ati-main/content/sites/default/files/2023-08/AFE%20Strat%20Plan%202023-2028.pdf>

- [19] Department of Agriculture – Special Area for Agricultural Development. (2024). SAAD Program Phase 2: Annual Report 2024. Department of Agriculture. <https://saad.da.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2025/09/2024-Annual-Report-FINAL-FOR-PRINT-compressed.pdf>
- [20] Department of Agriculture & International Rice Research Institute. (2021). Philippine Digital Agriculture Strategy 2021–2025. DA-IRRI. <https://www.irri.org/news-and-events/news/philippine-da-and-irri-launch-legacy-site-2016-2021-collaborations>
- [21] Development Academy of the Philippines. (2021). Full-blown impact assessment of the Agriculture and Fisheries Modernization Act (AFMA): An integrative report (Vols. 1–3). Productivity and Development Center. <https://pdc.dap.edu.ph/index.php/dap-pdc-successfully-accomplishes-the-nationwide-full-blown-impact-assessment-of-the-agriculture-and-fisheries-modernization-act-afma/>
- [22] Doda, H., Sharma, A., & Thakur, N. (2025). A systematic review on sustainable practices transforming global agribusiness. *Frontiers in Sustainable Food Systems*, 9, 1566708. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fsufs.2025.1566708>
- [23] Economic Research Institute for ASEAN and East Asia. (2024). Digitalisation in agriculture and food systems in ASEAN: Pathways to its resilience and sustainability (ERIA Research Project Report No. 2023-03). ERIA. <https://www.eria.org/publications/digitalisation-in-agriculture-and-food-systems-in-asean--pathways-to-its-resilience-and-sustainability>
- [24] Farmonaut. (2025, August 8). Agriculture in the Philippines 2025: Must-know trends. <https://farmonaut.com/asia/agriculture-in-the-philippines-2025-must-know-trends>
- [25] Food and Agriculture Organization. (2022). The State of Food and Agriculture 2022: Leveraging innovation in agrifood systems. FAO.
- [26] Food and Agriculture Organization. (2023). FAO country programming framework for the Philippines 2018–2024. <https://doi.org/10.4060/cc4236en>
- [27] Gómez, M. I., & Ricketts, K. D. (2013). Food value chain transformations in developing countries: Selected hypotheses on nutritional implications. *Food Policy*, 42, 139–150. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodpol.2013.06.010>
- [28] Grohmann, P., Dietze, V., Krämer, C., & Feindt, P. H. (2023). Governance and trust in sustainability-based agri-food value chains: A comparative analysis of five cases in Germany. *Frontiers in Sustainable Food Systems*, 7, 1130895. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fsufs.2023.1130895>
- [29] Grow Asia & Balzarelli, E. (2026, February 4). From innovation to impact: Why digital agriculture in ASEAN is a delivery challenge. Grow Asia. <https://www.growasia.org/post/from-innovation-to-impact-why-digital-agriculture-in-asean-is-a-delivery-challenge>
- [30] Gumbi, N., Gumbi, L., & Twinomurinzi, H. (2023). Towards sustainable digital agriculture for smallholder farmers: A systematic literature review. *Sustainability*, 15(16), 12530. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su151612530>
- [31] Lowitt, K., Hickey, G. M., Ganpat, W., & Phillip, L. (2015). Linking communities of practice with value chain development in smallholder farming systems. *World Development*, 74, 363–373. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2015.05.014>
- [32] Makina, I., & Oundo, J. N. (2020). Effect of competitive strategies on organization performance in relation to sugar industry in Kenya. *Universal Journal of Management*, 8(5), 220–230. <https://doi.org/10.13189/ujm.2020.080502>
- [33] Manyise, T., & Dentoni, D. (2021). Value chain partnerships and farmer entrepreneurship as balancing ecosystem services: Implications for agri-food systems resilience. *Ecosystem Services*, 49, 101279. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoser.2021.101279>

- [34] Mataia, A., Beltran, J., Manalili, R., Catudan, B., Francisco, N., & Flores, A. (2020). Rice value chain analysis in the Philippines: Value addition, constraints, and upgrading strategies. *Asian Journal of Agriculture and Development*, 17(2), 19–42. <https://doi.org/10.37801/ajad2020.17.2.2>
- [35] McFadden, J., Njuki, E., & Griffin, T. (2023). Precision agriculture in the digital era: Recent adoption on U.S. farms (Economic Information Bulletin No. 248). U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service. <https://doi.org/10.22004/ag.econ.333550>
- [36] Mishra, A. K., Kumar, A., & Joshi, P. K. (2020). Transforming agriculture in South Asia: The role of value chains and contract farming. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003024996>
- [37] National Economic and Development Authority. (2023). Philippine development plan 2023-2028. <https://pdp.depdev.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/PDP-Abridged.pdf>
- [38] New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade. (2025). Philippines trade and economic update – August 2025. <https://www.mfat.govt.nz/en/trade/mfat-market-reports/philippines-trade-and-economic-update-august-2025>
- [39] Nxumalo, G. S., & Chauke, H. (2025). Challenges and opportunities in smallholder agriculture digitization in South Africa. *Frontiers in Sustainable Food Systems*, 9, 1583224. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fsufs.2025.1583224>
- [40] Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2019). Digital opportunities for better agricultural policies. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/571a0812-en>
- [41] Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2025). Agricultural policy monitoring and evaluation 2025: Philippines. OECD Publishing. https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/agricultural-policy-monitoring-and-evaluation-2025_a80ac398-en/full-report/philippines_6571bcaf.html
- [42] Philippine Council for Agriculture, Aquatic and Natural Resources Research and Development. (2022). Programs and initiatives supporting agricultural modernization and value chain development. Department of Science and Technology. <https://www.pcaarrd.dost.gov.ph>
- [43] Philippine Statistics Authority. (2023). Philippine agriculture and fisheries performance report. PSA.
- [44] Porter, M. E. (1985). *Competitive advantage: Creating and sustaining superior performance*. Free Press.
- [45] Raji, M., et al. (2024). Strategic management practices and organizational performance.
- [46] Republic of the Philippines. (1997). Republic Act No. 8435: Agriculture and Fisheries Modernization Act of 1997. https://lawphil.net/statutes/repacts/ra1997/ra_8435_1997.html
- [47] Santos, K. E. S., & Santos, A. R. (2025). Strengthening agribusiness sustainability through civil service organizations: Key factors, challenges, and a localized action plan. *Research on World Agricultural Economy and Environment*, 6(1), Article 1824. <https://doi.org/10.36956/rwae.v6i1.1824>
- [48] Sarip, R., & Bandera, C. (2025). Strategic Management in Agribusiness: A Comprehensive Review of Industry Dynamics, Competitive Forces, and Evolving Market Trends., 10(6), 24-33, <https://www.ijbmm.com/paper/Nov2025/8340436744.pdf>
- [49] Sekine, K. (2021). A case of Cordillera heirloom rice in the Philippines. *Sustainability*, 13(8), 4366. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13084366>
- [50] Taer, A. N., & Taer, E. C. (2024). A systematic review of precision livestock farming and IoT applications in the Philippines. *Ceylon Journal of Science*, 54(1), 53–64. <https://doi.org/10.4038/cjs.v54i1>

- [51] Tansuchat, R., Suriyankietkaew, S., Petison, P., Punjaisri, K., & Wangkananon, S. (2022). Impacts of COVID-19 on sustainable agriculture value chain development in Thailand and ASEAN. *Sustainability*, 14(20), Article 12985. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su142012985>
- [52] Ugpat, A. F., Ojeda, J. D. C., Bacus, M. S., Quijano-Pagutayao, A. S., & Sarita, V. B. (2025). Review of agricultural extension's role in digital and smart farming technologies in Davao Oriental, Philippines. *International Journal of Research and Scientific Innovation*, 12(5), 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.51244/IJRSI.2025.120500025>
- [53] Usman, M., Bandera, A., Usman-Macadaag, O., & Macadato, N. (2025). Strategic management and organizational adaptation in modern agribusiness: Bridging the gap between strategy, structure, and resilience. *Journal of Business Economics and Agribusiness*, 3(1). <https://doi.org/10.47134/jbea.v3i1.931>
- [54] Vahdanjoo, M., Sørensen, C. G., & Nørremark, M. (2025). Digital transformation of the agri-food system. *Current Opinion in Food Science*, 63, 101287. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cofs.2025.101287>
- [55] Vutseme, G.-E. V., Wasike, S., & Kihara, A. (2025). Strategic management practices and productivity in agribusiness industry: A literature review. *Journal of Strategic Management*, 9, 112-130.
- [56] Wang, T., Yu, Z., Ahmad, R., Riaz, S., Khan, K. U., Ali, S., & Ullah, A. (2022). Transition of bioeconomy as a key concept for the agriculture and agribusiness development: An extensive review on ASEAN countries. *Frontiers in Sustainable Food Systems*, 6, Article 998594. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fsufs.2022.998594>
- [57] Wheelen, T. L., Hunger, J. D., Hoffman, A. N., & Bamford, C. (2018). *Strategic management and business policy* (15th ed.). Pearson.
- [58] World Bank. (2023). *Philippines agriculture public expenditures review* (Report No. P166521). <https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/099170002212314528/pdf/P16652105c152a0fd0a82c0eeaf0b185134.pdf>