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Background – ASTI initiative

- Collects and analyzes primary data on institutional developments, investments, and capacities on agricultural R&D in developing countries and links this to a few secondary data sources for the global updates.
- Institutional survey rounds covering government, higher-education, nonprofit (and private for-profit) R&D agencies.
- Collaborative network with a large number of national, regional, and international partners; facilitated by IFPRI.
- Data collection is on a region by region basis.

www.asti.cgiar.org
Background – GCARD presentation

- Latest global update available: 2000 (second revision with major differences due to WB indicators + improvements in ASTI and secondary data sources)
- Global and regional trends mask a high level of diversity, which need more emphasis in the global/regional debates
- Is an intensity ratio of 1-1.5 percent a meaningful target?
- Data results focus on R&D inputs, not on performance

- **1981**: 9% Low income, 29% Middle income, 62% High income
- **1991**: 10% Low income, 30% Middle income, 60% High income
- **2000**: 11% Low income, 33% Middle income, 56% High income
- **2000 (incl EEFS)**: 11% Low income, 36% Middle income, 53% High income

**2000 share Brazil, China, and India in developing total = 41%**
China, India, and Brazil compared with Sub-Saharan Africa, 1981-2006
Governments remain main agricultural research performers........

Sample of about 55 low- and middle income countries, excluding China
......and funders of public agricultural research

Government agencies (371)
Total funding (2000s) = $3,782 million (2005 PPP dollars)

- Government: 84%
- Donors: 7%
- Own income: 7%
- Other: 1%
- Producer organizations & Marketing boards: 1%

Sample of about 55 low- and middle income countries, excluding China
Public agricultural researchers by major sub-sector, 2000s

Sample of about 55 low- and middle income countries, excluding China
Diversity across countries: Public R&D spending

- **Asia-Pacific (evidence up to 2002):**
  - Regionally growth was high since the mid-1990s due to substantial increase in India and China
  - Growth for China continues: adjusted for inflation 2007 level ($4.3 billion) was close to twice the 2000 total ($2.3 billion)
  - But spending growth in Pakistan, Indonesia, and Laos were sluggish or negative

- **Latin America & Caribbean (evidence up to 2006):**
  - Argentina, Brazil, and Mexico accounted for more than two-thirds of total regional spending in 2006
  - Spending at Embrapa increased with about 15 percent during 2006-08
  - In general, spending in middle-income countries increased while spending in low-income countries declined during 1996-2006
Diversity across countries: Public R&D spending (cont’d)

- Sub-Saharan Africa (evidence up to 2000 / 2008 in July):
  - Data up to 2008 for more than 30 countries are being synthesized and analyzed, some countries are finished
  - Ghana and Nigeria have seen substantial increased in spending in government sector since 2000
  - Developments in many francophone West African countries were not as favorable with declining or stagnating spending levels during 2000-08
Diversity across countries: funding agricultural R&D

- Government funding through block grants or competitive funding schemes

- Non-governmental sources of funding are increasing importance in many countries:
  - Donor funding: high dependency for many African, but also a number of Asian and Latin American countries
  - Generating internal revenues: China, Indonesia, Chile, Cote d’Ivoire
  - Production or export levies: Colombia (most advanced) but also in many other countries in Latin America, Asia, and Africa
Diversity across countries: R&D capacity trends

- No global trends available, only for some regions
- Most regions have made considerably process in building research staff capacity
- Capacity trends in most countries are less erratic than investment trends
- But high variation in the magnitude, growth and distribution in qualifications (PhD, MSc, and BSc) and gender
- Many African, but also other developing countries struggle to maintain viable agricultural capacities. This often a combination of aging research staff, brain drain, and bans on public-sector recruitment
Setting meaningful targets: Intensity ratios

- GCARD 2010 calls for countries to spend 1.0 to 1.5 percent of their agricultural output on (public?) agricultural R&D

- The evidence:
  - Average developing countries (2000): 0.6%
  - Average Sub-Saharan Africa (2000): 0.7%
  - Brazil (2006): 1.8% / China (2006): 0.5% / India (2003): 0.4%

- This means that, to reach this target, growth in public spending levels (assuming no growth in agricultural output) needs to be higher in China and India than, on average, in Sub-Saharan Africa
Setting meaningful targets: Intensity ratios (cont’d)

- Agricultural R&D investments can grow at a high pace, but with a similar growth pattern in agricultural output the intensity ratio will remain stagnant.
- Or, an increase in the intensity ratio could be the result of a decline in agricultural output.
- Need to assess the policy and institutional environment of agricultural R&D.
- And the structure and size of the agricultural sector and overall economy.
- Examples: research related to the agribusiness sector, spillovers, private sector involvement.
Main recommendations to the proposed GCARD roadmap

- In addition to global/regional trends, emphasize the diversity across countries and in time in terms of financial and human capacities in public agricultural R&D.

- In addition to increased investments in R&D, additional investments are urgently needed for human capacity building at universities and R&D agencies to redress the declining researcher capacity (aging and brain-drain).

- Intensity ratios give a good indication of research investment levels, but they should be assessed within the overall context of (public) agricultural R&D and agricultural role sector within a country.
Main recommendations to the proposed GCARD roadmap (cont’d)

- Not only look at the amount or intensity ratio but also at the efficiency of agricultural R&D investments
- Importance of up-to-date investment and capacity data for public and private sectors and improved dissemination to inform global, regional, and national dialogues
- Build capacity at the national level (where lacking) and collecting, synthesizing, and analyzing
Please visit www.asti.cgiar.org
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