

LAC C3 Tables**Table 3.1** Definition of structures and variables included in the model

| Structure | Variable | Variable's definition |
|---|--|---|
| Macrocontext Barriers to International trade | Non-tariff barriers based on social concerns | It is the body of official regulations and directives based on social indicators devised for the supply chain, which restrict the trade of agricultural products and services. |
| | Monitoring protocols and regulations for assuring product traceability and quality certification | It is the body of official regulations and directives relevant to the quality of food and products along the supply chain, with the aim of ensuring their safety to both domestic and foreign customers. |
| | Non-tariff barriers based on environmental concerns | It is the body of official regulations and directives based on environmental indicators devised for the supply chain, which restrict the trade of agricultural products and services. |
| | Tariff barriers | It is the body of official regulations and directives intended to protect the trade of domestic agri-business products from external competition. |
| Competitivity of agricultural business | Competitivity of agricultural business | Ability of LAC agri-business to displace similar products and services from markets by offering products and services at prices and qualities demanded by consumers |
| | Differentiation of innovative products | Products with increased added value from the use of R+D processes and marketing |
| | Access to markets of innovative differentiated products | Placement of innovative products with increased added value in international markets |
| | Information and Communication Technology (ICT) as a tool for facilitating commercial transactions in agri-business | Use of diverse electronic communication resources to reduce transaction costs in the trade of agri-business products. |
| Commodities' costs | Commodities' costs | Production and transaction costs of commodities in agri-business |
| | | |
| Demands from final consumers | Demands from final consumers | Demands for diversification of agri-business products from several segments of final consumers. |
| | Demand for healthy and safe foods | Public's interest in foods harmless to health and nutraceuticals (foods with medicinal effects) |
| | Consumer information | Free access to product information as suited to the needs of final consumers. |
| Climate change | Climate change | The effects of increased frequency and intensity of climate phenomena driven by temperature, rainfall, wind, etc. on agricultural activities |
| Epidemics/food contamination | Diseases, pests and food contamination | Occasional outbreaks of diseases, pests and/or diverse kinds of food contamination in different countries and regions |
| Advances in knowledge | Advances in biology and biotechnology | Research in biology and biotechnology moves steadily on the discovery of fundamental biological knowledge |
| | Advances in information technology | Information and Communication Technology (ICT)'s progress on novel modes for the communication and flow of information |
| | Advances in nanotechnology | Progress on fundamental nanotechnological knowledge |
| Traditional/indigenous knowledge | Traditional/indigenous knowledge | Dynamic body of knowledge and practices accumulated by traditional/indigenous communities and agricultural production systems as a result from the interaction between the latter and both nature and agricultural practice |
| Social monitoring of innovation | Public perception of S&T (Science and Technology) | Public trust on the results and conclusions from scientific and technological activities |
| | Social monitoring of | Involvement of social actors on the aims, planning, |

| Structure | Variable | Variable's definition |
|------------------|-----------------|--|
| | innovation | implementation, results and impacts of S&T activities |
| Governance | Governance | A wide and inclusive social compact buttresses the stability of social, economic, environmental and innovation policies in LAC |

Table 1: Definition of structures and variables included in the model (cont.)

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| Policies for development | Integration of policies for innovation and social development Proposal and implementation of agricultural policies Biosecurity policies | Development is facilitated by the integration of national, sub-national entity and sectorial policies ¹ The ability to devise agricultural policies together with the existence of organizations and institutions prepared to implement them Policies for reducing the intrinsic risks of foods and agriculture (environmental risks included) These are policies for the security of food, health and the life of plants and animals Policies for facilitating the access of vulnerable rural and urban populations to education, credit, health and housing Policies for the development of science and technology |
| Management of regulations and standards | Social development policies Incentive policies for research Regulations and standards Implementation of regulations and standards | The mechanisms that (a) regulate intellectual property rights for the results of scientific research, including the production of living organisms (cultivars) and (b) set the provisions for trading agricultural products in LAC and other world regions Set of actions addressing the implementation and monitoring of regulations and directives governing agricultural S&T and agricultural products Degree of schooling of productive systems' actors |
| Education of PS ² actors Urban food security | Education of PS actors Access to food security Access to food security | Ability of urban consumers (particularly the poor ones) for regularly purchasing food in enough quantities for ensuring their well-being Ability of urban consumers (particularly the poor ones) for regularly purchasing healthy food in the sense of low risks as to biological contamination, allergenic potential and pollution |
| Social inequality | Social inequality | Relative access to employment, food security, education and health of different social groups – like e.g. small family-farmers, subsistence farmers, large farmers, wage-earners – involved in agricultural production activities |
| Environmental sustainability of agriculture R+D systems Focus of research | Environmental sustainability of agriculture Focus of research Harmony between R+D organizations and their social environment Prioritized activities Demands for research Survey of future | Ability of the agro-ecosystem to keep its productive functionality in future times Strategic orientation of the objectives and results from R+D activities to social groups attended by them Congruence between the mission, objectives and products from R+D organizations and the needs and expectations of their clients, users, beneficiaries and other pertinent stakeholders Strategic choice of topics/problems for developing projects and project portfolios in R+D organizations The need of knowledge and technology to take advantage of opportunities or to remove checks on the performance of agricultural production systems Systematic evaluation of likely demands for |

¹ Sub-national entities (or administrative division) is a generic term for an administrative region within a country or Political division — on an arbitrary level below that of the sovereign state — typically with a local government encompassing multiple municipalities, counties, or provinces with a certain degree of autonomy.

² Productive Systems.

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| Incorporation of formal knowledge | demands for research Incorporation of formal knowledge | research in the future Incorporation of advances in formal knowledge to the R+D process |
| Incorporation of traditional/indigenous knowledge | Incorporation of traditional/indigenous knowledge | Incorporation of traditional/indigenous knowledge and practices to the formal process of knowledge and technology production |
| Availability of resources for R+D | Alternative resources for funding R+D Funding for R+D production Infrastructure for the production of R+D | Alternative non-fiscal sources of R+D funding Funding necessary for producing the technologies and knowledge demanded by the clients/users of R+D Facilities and equipment necessary for the production of knowledge and technologies demanded by the clients/users of R+D |

Table 1: Definition of structures and variables included in the model (cont.)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Performance of R+D systems | Products and services generated by R+D Effectiveness of R+D Efficiency of R+D | Portfolio of products and services generated by R+D organizations for their clients Products are delivered according to consumer, client, and whole society needs Ability of R+D organizations to generate lowest-cost products and services |
| Management of R+D | System for project planning, monitoring and evaluation (PME) in R+D organizations Project portfolio Projects Management of research teams. Multidisciplinary approach Reward systems | The systematic process for setting objectives/goals, procuring and distributing resources, implementing projects and programs, and adjusting the implementation and evaluation of projects and final services obtained from R+D organizations Collection of projects intended to solve a large national or regional strategic problem Management tool with goals clearly defined by: the nature of a problem; a particular request; particular favourable conditions for meeting some goals; or the interest of groups that seek translating ideas into concrete results in a preestablished period of time and at a known cost Mechanisms of planning, monitoring, evaluation and organization of R+D work Interaction, synergism and interfacing among diverse fields of knowledge Processes for valuing or approving (or both) the results of research work in R+D organizations by means of both material and immaterial rewards |
| Relative spaces of public and private R+D | Relative spaces of public and private R+D Public-private alliances Competition between agricultural R+D organizations Privatization of the R+D system | Fields covered by each of public and private research organizations Agreements between public and private organizations with the aim of complementing resources for projects in which there is a common research interest Strategies of public and private R+D organizations to predominate in markets for agricultural industry technologies Complete transfer of public R+D infrastructure and activities to the national or international private sector |
| Social involvement in the management of R+D | Social involvement in the management of R+D | Social groups are involved in the decision making and implementation of R+D activities |
| Proper technologies for agricultural activities | Proper technologies for agricultural activities | The degree with which the technologies generated by R+D systems support sustainable development and also are suitable to the culture, resources and conditions of the agricultural production systems |

Agricultural production systems

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| Incorporation of knowledge to productive systems | Support to the incorporation of knowledge Incorporation of knowledge to productive systems | Operation of mechanisms for giving technical assistance (public or private) to productive systems for adopting appropriate technologies Choice and adoption of appropriate technologies by productive systems |
| Attended markets | Integration of production chains Attended markets | Degree of connectivity with and participation of productive systems in established production chains These are the markets agricultural production systems send their produce |
| Social organization of vulnerable production systems | Social organization of vulnerable production systems Social movements focalized on the most vulnerable production systems | It is a mechanism for attaining economies of scale in production, negotiation capacity, and improvements in the management and trade of agricultural productive systems goods and services Social mobilization as an instrument for accessing resources and empowering production systems |
| Availability of resources for agriculture | Availability of resources for agriculture | Access of production systems to credit, land, water and knowledge |

Table 1: Definition of structures and variables included in the model (cont.)

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| Performance of agricultural productive systems | Efficiency | Relationship between costs of production and returns in productive systems |
| | Quality of products and processes | Sustainability of agricultural products and processes, and the degree of agreement between them and consumer needs |
| Rent inequality in agriculture | Products, sub products and waste Rent inequality in agriculture | Characteristics of the products, sub products and waste in regard to their effect on the environment Relative access to rent by diverse social groups involved in agricultural production, like family farmers, salaried employees, subsistence farmers, large producers, etc.) |

Table 2. Subjects used for scenario building

| | | | |
|--|--|--|---------------------|
| Approach in relation to the management of environmental services | Approach in relation to governability and economic development | | |
| | Globalized | Mixed | Regionalized |
| Reactive | Global symphony |  | Order from strength |
| Mixed | | Life as it is | |
| Pro-active | Techno-garden |  | Adaptive Mosaic |

Table 3. Selected indicators: current situation of variables

| Variable | Current situation | Source |
|---|---|------------------------------------|
| Context variables for AKST systems and agricultural production systems | | |
| Tariff barriers | In LAC there are lower import tariffs, and no subsidies to exports and production of goods compared to the both the World and rich countries | Anderson y Valenzuela, 2006 |
| Non-tariff barriers | Agricultural exports are the most likely to be penalized with non-tariff barriers. This effect is less in LAC than in the Middle East, North Africa, Europe, USA, Canada and Japan. . Agricultural exports are the most likely to be penalized with non-tariff barriers. This effect is less in LAC than in the Middle East, North Africa, Europe, USA, Canada and Japan. | Bora et al., 2002 |
| Market competitiveness | <u>Agricultural products</u> : net-exporting countries: Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Paraguay, Uruguay, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua; net-importing countries: Peru, the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, El Salvador, Mexico, Panama, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Haiti, Jamaica and Trinidad and Tobago. <u>Foods</u> : net-exporting countries: Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Paraguay, Uruguay, Nicaragua; net-importing countries of foods and agricultural products: Peru, the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, El Salvador, Mexico, Panama, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Haiti, Jamaica and Trinidad and Tobago | de Ferranti et al., 2005 |
| Demands from final consumers | Consumers increasingly demand better quality in foods. According to Renard (1999) quality – in its manifold dimensions and meanings - is the factor that binds together consumers, wholesalers, industry and farm production | Renard, 1999 |
| Epidemics/food contamination | In developed countries many episodes of transboundary diseases have been recorded since the 1980s In LAC the foot-and-mouth disease and the avian flu are epizootics of much concern because of their impacts on important sources of work and earnings for rural communities. The capacity to quickly and effectively react to transboundary diseases' outbreaks would expose institutional weaknesses in many LAC countries as well as agencies responsible for monitoring, prevention and sanitary control of those kinds of diseases. The diverse agricultural production methods in use decrease the effectiveness of international monitoring and harmonization of public programmes for preventing and fighting transboundary diseases. | Jaffee et al., 2005 CEPAL, 2006 |
| | In regards to avian flu a team from the Inter-American Development Bank assessed the integration of agricultural and health measures before an outbreak of that kind of disease. It is shown that the degree of that integration is greater in the Southern Cone than in other regions of LAC (Central America, Andean countries and Latin Caribbean). The countries in the Southern Cone show some differences in the degree of integration among themselves. In regard to poultry consumption, it accounts for 35% of meat consumption in LAC, 42% in Central America and 45% in the Latin Caribbean. These relatively high percentages point to the existence of a food insecurity risk in the event of an | Schneider et al., 2007 |

| Variable | Current situation | Source |
|--------------------------------|---|--|
| Climate change | <p>outbreak of avian flu.</p> <p>If the following three indicators – i.e. units for veterinary practice, available personnel, and economic resources – were taken in account for combating foot-and-mouth disease on an area basis in South America, each of Bolivia, Chile, Guyana and Peru has two out of those three indicators with lower values than in the rest of the continent. Brazil, Ecuador, Paraguay and Uruguay are the less vulnerable countries.</p> <p>Parameters related to agriculture. Severe environmental restrictions to dry land farming in LAC 1961-1990: Central America and the Caribbean, 51% (mostly arid lands); South America, 61.9% (poor soils). Lands without restrictions: 10% of LAC. Average yield potential 1961-1990 (Mtons/year): Central America, 101; South America, 543; developed countries, 0.002815.</p> | <p>PANAFTOSA, 2005</p> <p>Fischer et al., 2005</p> |
| Governance and policies in LAC | <p><u>Political stability</u>. Positive values for Chile, Costa Rica, Uruguay, Cuba and the Dominican Republic; negative values for the rest of the countries, and particularly small values for Haiti, the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Bolivia, Ecuador, Colombia, Guatemala and Peru.</p> <p><u>Government effectiveness</u>: Positive values for Chile, Trinidad and Tobago, Costa Rica, Uruguay, and Panamá; negative values for the rest of the countries, and smaller values for Haiti, Ecuador, Cuba, the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Paraguay and Bolivia.</p> <p><u>Regulatory Quality</u>: Positive values for Colombia, Brasil, Peru, El Salvador, Panamá, Uruguay, México, Costa Rica, Trinidad and Tobago and Chile; negative values for the rest of the countries, and smaller values for Cuba, Haiti, the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, and Ecuador. For all three indicators, positive values were given to Uruguay, Costa Rica, and Chile, and negative ones to the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Ecuador, Paraguay, Argentina, Bolivia, Honduras, Guyana, and Nicaragua</p> | <p>Kaufmann et al., 2006</p> <p>de Ferranti et al., 2005</p> |
| Advances in formal knowledge | <p><u>Education</u>: Education quality is assessed by the average number of students with mathematical skills in three education levels: basic, primary and secondary. There is a correlation between the quality values measured in urban and in rural students, but in no case average values are greater in the rural students. Country-wise Cuba shows high skill scores in both student populations (greater than 90%); Brasil, Chile and Argentina reach 80% skill in urban students; the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela Paraguay, México, and Colombia show skill values ranging from 50% to 70% for both urban and rural students. The rest of the countries — Perú, Bolivia, Honduras, and the Dominican Republic — show values below 60% for both the urban and rural students.</p> <p>The private sector invests annually more than USD 1.5 billion in biotechnology in a large part of developed countries; public organizations doing agricultural research in developing countries invest USD 100-150 million per year; the CGIAR centers invest about USD 25 million per year; and</p> | <p>Byerlee and Fischer, 2000</p> |

| Variable | Current situation | Source |
|----------------------------------|--|--|
| Traditional/indigenous knowledge | the Rockefeller Foundation and other non-profit organizations annually invest about USD 40-50 million. | Niosi y Reid, 2007 |
| | Brazil, Argentina, Mexico and Chile are the LAC countries with more firms, publications and patents in biotechnology | |
| | The largest investments in nanotechnology in 2004 were made in Europe (USD 1.32 billion), North America (USD 1.28 billion) and Asia (USD 1.16 billion); in LAC biotechnology as a whole received USD 16.2 million from only three countries: Mexico (61.7%), Brazil (35.8%) and Argentina (2.5%) | Simonis y Schilthuizen, 2006 |
| | This knowledge is in steady progress. The following features distinguishes it from occidental scientific knowledge: (1) it is verbally recorded and transmitted; (2) it is nourished by observation and experience; (3) its cosmology is rooted in the view that Nature is instilled with spirituality; (4) it is intuitive; (5) it is qualitative; (6) it is based on data generated by its users and (7) it is grounded in a social context which sees the world through multiple social and spiritual relationships among all forms of life. | Dutfield, 2001 |
| | The intellectual property of traditional knowledge of biodiversity, phyto-genetic resources, and products derived from natural principles found in wild species by indigenous communities and peoples is still an unsettled question. | WIPO, 2001 |
| Variables of AKST systems | | |
| Focus of research | There presently are three processes highly relevant for R+D in LAC and running in six countries (Brazil, Cuba, Mexico, Panamá, Peru and the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela). Those are concerned with high productivity; increase of resistance to pests and diseases; and biological control of pests and diseases. The management of water quality and use; survey and conservation in situ and ex situ of germplasm; and management, zoning and conservationist agriculture are the best assessed environmental subjects in LAC. The applications of biotechnology, livestock and plant production were considered of greatest relevance nowadays | Castro et al., 2005; Lima et al., 2005; Santamaría G. et al., 2005; Ramirez-Gastón R. et al., 2007, Saldaña et al., 2006 |
| Focalized social segments | In most countries in LAC — except Cuba — R+D is better informed on the supply-chain segments represented by big and medium producers, agribusiness, wholesalers, and retailers than on subsistence producers and indigenous communities. | |
| Capacity in R+D | There is a 'specialization index' which equals '1' for the case of all researchers with completed tertiary (university) education, and is '3' for all researchers with a doctorate. For Brazil, the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela and Trinidad and Tobago, the value of the index is '2'; for Costa Rica, Bolivia and Colombia, the average index is above '1.5' and for the rest of the countries, it is above '1'. Countries with the lowest formation level (most of researchers with a | RICYT, 2007. |

| Variable | Current situation | Source |
|---|---|--|
| Investment in agricultural R+D | licentiate degree) are Ecuador, Paraguay and Uruguay. There are no data for Cuba. The countries which invest more in terms of average GDP (1990-2004) are Brazil (0.9%), Cuba, Chile (about 0.6%), Argentina, Mexico, and Panamá (about 0.4%); the rest of the countries invest less than 0.3%, and some below 0.1% (Ecuador, El Salvador, Honduras, Jamaica, Nicaragua and Paraguay) | RICYT, 2007 |
| Performance | Technologies that because of their relevance are presently considered 'leading technologies' for most of countries are those addressing the following changes in agricultural production systems: (a) Increase in agricultural and silvicultural productivities; (b) reduction of agricultural and silvicultural production costs; (c) improvement of product quality in production chains; (d) food security; and (e) improvement process quality in agricultural and silvicultural production chains. These technologies are more suitable for medium and big producers, but less so for agri-business. | Castro et al., 2005; Lima et al., 2005; Santamaría G. et al., 2005; Ramírez-Gastón R. et al., 2007, Saldaña et al., 2006 |
| Relative spaces of public and private R+D | In Latin America a scenario is emerging such that the private sector is becoming keener to invest in R+D activities, particularly in the improvement of cultivars of crops like corn (and increasingly soybean) which would readily produce profits. In Brazil it is also observed a growing participation of the private sector — the national one mostly — in R+D. | Castro et al., 2005; Lima et al., 2005; Castro et al., 2006 |
| | There are evidences that in Argentina the transnational private sector invests in biotechnology about six times the amount invested by the public sector. | Varela y Bisang, 2006 |
| Variables for agricultural production systems | | |
| Incorporation of knowledge to agriculture | The countries which invest more in terms of average GDP (1990-2004) are Brazil (0.9%), Cuba, Chile (about 0.6%), Argentina, Mexico, and Panamá (about 0.4%); the rest of the countries invest less than 0.3%, and some below 0.1% (Ecuador, El Salvador, Honduras, Jamaica, Nicaragua and Paraguay) | RICYT, 2007 |
| Resources for agriculture | Expenses per rural inhabitant (1991-2001). <u>>USD 1,000</u> : Uruguay; <u>>USD 150 & <USD 300</u> : Mexico, Argentina, Brazil, and Chile; <u>>USD 75 & <USD 150</u> : Panamá, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, and the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela; <u><USD 75</u> : Honduras, Guatemala, El Salvador, Paraguay, Jamaica, Peru, Ecuador, Bolivia, and Colombia. Agricultural and rural public expenses as percent of agricultural GDP. Average for 1990-2001 was 12.8%. Countries where those expenses were: (a) above the average: Uruguay, Panama, Dominican Republic, Mexico, Nicaragua and Chile; (b) equal to the average: Guatemala and Honduras and (c) below the average: Bolivia, Ecuador, Costa Rica, Jamaica, Peru, Brazil, the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Argentina, Paraguay and Colombia. | de Ferranti et al., 2005 Kjöllerström, 2004 |
| Performance of agricultural systems in LAC ³ | Agricultural GDP (USD million in 1995) for 2002. (a) <u>Greater than 60,000</u> : Brazil; (b) <u>10,000-20,000</u> : Mexico, Argentina and Colombia: (c) | RLC-FAO, 2004 |

³ See also competitiveness indicators in the same table.

| Variable | Current situation | Source |
|---|--|---------------|
| | 5,000-9,999: Peru and Chile and (d) 400-4,999: Ecuador, the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Guatemala, Cuba, Paraguay, Dominican Republic, Costa Rica, Uruguay, El Salvador, Bolivia, Honduras, Nicaragua, Panamá, Haiti. | |
| | Share of agricultural GDP of total GDP (%) in 2002. (a) Greater than 40%: Guyana; (b) 20%-39%: Nicaragua, Paraguay, Ecuador, Belize and Guatemala; (c) 10%-19%: Honduras, Haiti, Dominica, Bolivia, Colombia, Suriname, Dominican Republic, El Salvador and Costa Rica and (d) Lower than 10%: Saint Lucia, Peru, Grenada, Brazil, Uruguay, Panama, Jamaica, Chile, Argentina, the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Cuba, Barbados, Mexico and Trinidad and Tobago. | RLC-FAO, 2004 |
| <i>Interactions between the agricultural production and the AKST systems</i> | | |
| Rent | Rent per capita. More than USD 9,655: Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Uruguay, the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Costa Rica, Mexico, Panama and Trinidad and Tobago; USD 875 – 3,125: Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, Paraguay, Peru, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Dominican Republic, and Jamaica; Less than USD 875: Haiti. | WB, 2003 |
| Rent inequality | <p>Between 1998 and 2005 the difference between the most rich and the most poor — an indicator of social inequality — in some LAC countries shrunk between 8% and 23%; those countries were Argentina, Brazil, Ecuador, El Salvador, Mexico, Panama, Paraguay, Peru and the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela. The relatively large difference in per cent values was due to an increased participation of the lowest four population deciles as well as a decrease in the participation of the richest population decile. Chile and Costa Rica did not show any change in that indicator. Colombia, Honduras, the Dominican Republic, and Uruguay instead showed increases not greater than 13%. The value of the Gini Index confirms the emerging trend to an improvement in wealth distribution. Brazil, El Salvador, Paraguay and Peru showed a substantial decrease (4% to 7%) in the value of that index: however, Honduras showed a marked increase in the value of the Gini Index.</p> <p>Along the longer period 1990-2005, in Uruguay and Panama urban wealth distributivity markedly increase, as attested by a decrease of about 8% in the Gini Index. Honduras followed the same path, with a decrease of 4% in the value of that index. On the other hand, urban areas in Ecuador and metropolitan Asunción in Paraguay yielded a 10% increase in the value of the Gini Index, which amounts to a sizeable increase in the concentration of wealth. The index also decreased from 4% to 7% for Argentina (Great Buenos Aires area), Costa Rica and the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela.</p> <p>In 2005 Bolivia, Brazil, Honduras and Colombia showed relatively larges values (ranging from 0.584 to 0.614) of the Gini Index. The lowest value of that range (0.584) was greater than the upper value of the range 0.526 – 0.579 obtained for Nicaragua, the Dominican Republic, Chile,</p> | CEPAL, 2006 |

| Variable | Current situation | Source |
|---------------------|--|--------------------|
| Social development | <p>Guatemala, Paraguay, México and Argentina. Inequality (as measured by the Gini Index) was still less (0,470 - 0,513) for Ecuador, Peru, Panama, El Salvador, the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela and Costa Rica. Uruguay was the only country with a low inequality level: Gini Index of 0,451.</p> <p>Concern with meeting people's basic needs (e.g. assistance to education premises, sanitation, electricity, drinking water, five or more years of schooling, dwelling, avoidance of overcrowding, etc.) as measured by an index running from 0% to 100%. <u>High (equal to or greater than 70%):</u> Panama, Argentina, Chile, Costa Rica, Uruguay and Brazil; <u>medium (50% - 69%):</u> Mexico, Ecuador, Colombia, the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela and Guatemala; <u>below average (25% - 49%):</u> El Salvador, Paraguay, Peru, Bolivia, Nicaragua and Honduras.</p> | CEPAL, 2005a |
| Food security | <p>During 1979-2000, daily consumption increased about 10 kcal per capita in Peru, Ecuador, Honduras, Colombia and Brasil, but it decreased or did not change in Haiti, Argentina, Panama, Nicaragua, Guatemala, Cuba y the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela.</p> <p>Proportion of undernourished population. Greater than 35%: Haiti (improving); <u>20%-34%:</u> Bolivia (improving), the Dominican Republic, Nicaragua, Honduras (stable), Panama and Guatemala (deteriorating); <u>10%-19%:</u> Peru (reached the Millenium Goal), Jamaica, Colombia, Paraguay, El Salvador, Trinidad and Tobago and the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela (improving); <u>5% - 9%:</u> Brasil and México (improving); <u>2% - 4%:</u> Cuba, Chile, Ecuador (reached the Millenium Goal), Uruguay and Costa Rica.</p> | Morón et al., 2005 |
| Food sustainability | <p>The most serious environmental problems in LAC are: land and forest degradation, deforestation, losses of habitat and biodiversity, pollution/contamination of fresh-water sources, marine coasts and the atmosphere.</p> <p>The amount of global rainfall is enough, but it is unevenly distributed; agriculture is strongly dependent on irrigation in many areas; there has been a marked increase in livestock production and many areas are under water stress.</p> <p>There has been a striking increment in both crop and livestock production. The latter exerts a strong pressure on forest lands, even when the rate of increase in lands under agriculture has decreased. There is a noticeable trend towards soil degradation and contamination because of the intensive use of agri-chemicals, fertilizers and pesticides, salinization and deforestation. Misuse has led to soil degradation in arid, semiarid, sub humid, and dry regions.</p> <p>In the 1990s important advances were made in LAC towards institution-building for environmental management, the creation of a legal framework and specific legislation directed to natural resources and the limitation of polluting/contaminant emissions, and the implementation of tools like environmental impact assessments. Despite differences among countries, total environmental expenses (i.e.</p> | CEPAL, 2005b |

| Variable | Current situation | Source |
|------------------------|---|--------------------------|
| Population and poverty | <p>public and private) did not go beyond 1% of GDP, and rarely beyond 3% of total public expenses. The degree of deforestation is very large. Deforestation is mainly due to the conversion of forested lands to other uses, like agriculture, livestock production, urban expansion, road and railway construction, and mining. Other causes of deforestation, which are very important in some areas but are much less widespread than the ones referred to are the harvest of firewood for either household or industrial use and the intensive exploitation of some particular tree species. Fires may also result in large forest losses.</p> <p>Conventional silvicultural approaches to forest management and use, that do not take into account the complexity of the forest ecosystem, its multiple environmental services and its benefits for the communities inhabiting them still are the preferred ones in LAC. Nevertheless there currently is a trend in most of the countries in the region to prepare national forestry plans with the idea contributing to the sustainable development of a country.</p> <p>Eight countries in the region are classed as mega-diverse: Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Mexico, Peru y the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela. The conservation of biodiversity is considered to be extremely important agriculture and food security.</p> <p>A wide variety of plants and animals make the basis of agricultural biodiversity. However, just 14 mammal and avian species altogether make up 90% of the food from animal sources people eat. And only four plant species — wheat, corn, rice and potato — provide half of the energy Man gets from plants. Latin America is the origin of many crops species relevant for human nutrition, like corn, beans, potato, sweet potato, tomato, cacao, cassava, peanuts and pineapple.</p> <p>In the last 100 years three quarters of agricultural crops' diversity has been lost; this represents a serious threat to both agriculture and food production.</p> <p>Forest cover (1990-2000). Increased: Uruguay and Cuba; invariable: the Dominican Republic and Chile; decreased: (in decreasing order) Guyana, Bolivia, Colombia, Peru, Brazil, the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Paraguay, Costa Rica, Argentina, Trinidad and Tobago, Honduras, Mexico, Ecuador (reduction less than 10%), Jamaica, Panama, Guatemala, Nicaragua (reduction between 10% and 30%), El Salvador and Haití (reduction between 30% and 50%)</p> <p>In LAC there are 432.8 million people, of which 24.2% makes the rural population. There were 170.7 million employed people in 2005. Most of the urban employed (93.9%) perform non-agricultural activities, and about three-fifths (58.8%) of the rural employed are engaged in agricultural activities.</p> <p>The rural population has in general relatively decreased (as a fraction of total population) in most of the LAC countries along the decade</p> | CEPAL, 2005a |
| | | de Ferranti et al., 2005 |

| Variable | Current situation | Source |
|----------|--|-----------------|
| | <p>1990-2001, except in Costa Rica, Ecuador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay and Peru. During 1994-2000, urban poverty as decreased in most of the countries, except in Argentina, Colombia, Ecuador, Guatemala and Nicaragua. In this same period, rural poverty decreased or remained stable, except in Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua and Paraguay; in Peru rural poverty increased. Advances in poverty reduction in LAC (1998-2005). Large (10% - 20%): Ecuador, Mexico and the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela; intermediate (5% - 10%): Colombia and Honduras; small (1% - 4.9%): Brazil, El Salvador and Chile; Increase in poverty: Argentina, Bolivia, Costa Rica, Panama, Peru and the Dominican Republic. Paraguay did not change its poverty level.</p> | CEPAL, 2005a |

Table 4: Brief description of the states of component variables in each scenario

| Variables | Global Symphony | Order from Strength | Life as it is | Adaptive Mosaic | Techno garden |
|---|--|--|---|---|---|
| <i>Barriers to international trade</i> | Trade barriers are removed, but sanitary and phyto-sanitary barriers are retained | Trade barriers and subsidies proliferate, particularly those intended to prevent bioterrorism | Trade barriers and subsidies proliferate, particularly those intended to prevent bioterrorism | Trade barriers are set, together with environmentally-friendly tariffs and subsidies | There are trade barriers at the outset, but by 2030 only sanitary and phyto/sanitary barriers are retained |
| <i>Epidemics/food contamination</i> | At the beginning of the period there is an increase in disease and pest outbreaks, which frequency and intensity increase steadily throughout 2030, when their control becomes regional. High risk of food contamination | The frequency and intensity of diseases and pest outbreaks increase. Low risk of food contamination because of strict bromatological control of food to avoid bioterrorism attacks | The frequency and intensity of diseases and pest outbreaks increase. High risk of food contamination | The frequency and intensity of diseases and pest outbreaks increase at the beginning of the scenario, but they decrease towards the end of it (2030) Decreasing risk of food contamination | The frequency and intensity of diseases and pest outbreaks increase at the beginning of the scenario, but they decrease towards the end of it (2030) At this time previously unknown pests and diseases come into the fore. Decreasing risk of food contamination |
| <i>Competitivity of agricultural business</i> | High. LAC countries are embedded in markets for basic and differentiated products | Low, due to slower development. LAC countries only compete in markets for basic products | High. There is an increased competition for embedding into markets for differentiated products | Low. The competitiveness of LAC-countries slacks off. Local markets become more relevant than international ones | High. Competitiveness increases because production costs are decreased and differentiated products are preferentially manufactured |
| <i>Demands from final consumers</i> | Consumer demands become more diversified. There is a stronger request for information on the origin and quality of products | Rich countries demand diversified products; poor countries demand cheap products | Consumer demands become more diversified. There is a definite demand for cheaper products | Consumers preferentially demand local products manufactured with due care for their environmental impacts along the production chain and waste disposal | In general, consumer demands become increasingly diversified. |
| <i>Climate change</i> | Mean temperature and the frequency of extreme events increase. Society is not fully aware of climate change impacts. By 2030 countries fully cooperate to implement global mitigation and | Mean temperature and the frequency of extreme events increase. Society is not fully aware of climate change impacts. Countries do not show mitigation and adaptation capabilities. | Mean temperature and the frequency of extreme events increase. Society is not fully aware of climate change impacts. Countries show variable mitigation and adaptation capabilities | Mean temperature and the frequency of extreme events increase. Society becomes fully aware of climate change impacts. Countries increase their mitigation and adaptation capabilities | Mean temperature and the frequency of extreme events decrease. Society is fully aware of climate change impacts. Countries have well developed mitigation and adaptation capabilities |

| Variables | Global Symphony | Order from Strength | Life as it is | Adaptive Mosaic | Techno garden |
|--|--|---|---|---|---|
| <i>Governance</i> | Global Symphony adaptation programmes. Governance reasonably improves but not uniformly across the region. By 2030 problems derived from the biophysical and social environments become serious. | There is a marked worsening of governance | Governance ranges from mediocre to bad | Governance progressively improves across the region until becoming optimal just in some countries by 2030. | Governance is optimal across the region by 2030 |
| <i>Policies for development</i> | Policies are not even across LAC, but show a clear trend to becoming uniform | Widely divergent policies across LAC at the beginning, but they become more uniform by 2030, because of the pressure exerted by countries endowed with (comparatively) abundant resources | Widely divergent policies across LAC, but generally addressing biosecurity issues. Scarce resources are allocated to social policies | Policies are improved and made more consistent across LAC, with emphasis on the development of traditional knowledge and the conservation of the environment and biodiversity | Policies are improved and made more consistent across LAC, with focus education, traditional knowledge and the environment and biodiversity |
| <i>Management of regulations and standards</i> | It fastly improves throughout | There is an improvement in management because countries endowed with (comparatively) abundant resources press for it, progress is slow – | It does not substantially change, because of lack of consistency across LAC countries | It fastly improves throughout, but not a the same pace across the region | It fastly improves throughout. Quality standards and certification processes become universal across the region |
| <i>Education of productive system-actors</i> | Strong public and private investments in education | Scarce public and private investments in education | Scarce investments in education at the beginning, but social demand for education makes the private sector to get involved into its improvement by 2030 | Scarce investments in education at the beginning; however, resources are substantially increased by 2030 | There is a remarkable increase in investments, particularly in private education. This even reaches the most vulnerable population |
| <i>Social monitoring of innovation</i> | In general, public in LAC has trust in the outcomes of innovation | There is some public distrust of innovation, because its stewardship is in the hands of social elites | The public sector leads in innovation but as it progressively becomes under funded, the space thus relinquished is taken up by the private sector | The social control of innovation becomes the norm, and the focus of research is mostly aimed to solve environmental problems. | There is a growing public trust on the outcomes of innovation |
| <i>Advances in knowledge</i> | Large investments in R+D are made, particularly in the | There is a growing gap in R+D activities between the | Rich LAC-countries make large investments in | Investments in R+D are mostly directed to environmental | R+D advances at great strides, but close to 2030 there is a |

| Variables | Global Symphony richer LAC countries | Order from Strength richer and the poorer countries. LAC imports R+D products | Life as it is R+D, which makes its development very uneven across the region. However, the region becomes a leader in some some fields of R+D | Adaptive Mosaic sustainability and biodiversity conservation | Techno garden growing social concern for the environmental impacts of many engineered production systems |
|--|---|---|---|---|--|
| <i>Traditional/indigenous knowledge</i> | There are few advances, because this knowledge is not valued as such | Almost nil; it is not highly rated by governments, because they are wary of it | Slow advances. There is not much incorporation of it to formal knowledge | There is a growing acknowledgment of the epistemological value traditional/indigenous knowledge and the consequent furtherance of its application | There is a growing acknowledgment of the epistemological value traditional/indigenous knowledge and the consequent furtherance of its application |
| <i>Focus of research</i> | Improvement of the competitiveness of agricultural products and the production of biomass for making biofuels. The needs of indigenous communities and subsistence farmers are not taken into account | Food innocuousness (biosecurity) and economic efficiency of agricultural production | At the beginning, it is food production and its economic efficiency. At the end (2030) the focus is on the most dynamic food production chains, particularly in the larger countries in LAC | For all social groups, the environmental sustainability of production systems, eco-labeling of foods, and mitigation and adaptation to climate change | For all social groups, the competitiveness and environmental sustainability of production systems, their adaptation to climate change and the valuation of environmental and ecosystem services, and biodiversity. |
| <i>Incorporation of formal knowledge</i> | Some countries in LAC strive to keep their capacity for integrating knowledge into new technologies | The capacity to integrate knowledge is rather restricted, and shows a large variability across countries because it depends on national circumstances | The capacity to integrate knowledge is constrained by meager resources, and shows a large variability across countries because it depends on national circumstances | It is conditioned to the putative effects of the incorporated knowledge on the environment and biodiversity | Very intense across the region |
| <i>Incorporation of traditional/indigenous knowledge</i> | Just isolated initiatives in this regard | None | Fortituous | Growing | Growing |
| <i>Availability of resources for R+D</i> | They are irregularly distributed across the region. A large part of resources are obtained from international sources | Their amount is substantially reduced because of decreasing national investments in R+D, which are partly compensated by international | Their amount is substantially reduced because of decreasing national investments in R+D, but differing among countries because of | They are substantially increased, but not enough. They are mostly channelled to R+D on environmental sustainability and biodiversity | There are enough across the whole region |

| Variables | Global Symphony | Order from Strength | Life as it is | Adaptive Mosaic | Techno garden |
|---|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | sources | national circumstances. Qualified people leave the R+D system. | | |
| <i>Management of R+D</i> | It becomes more complex and also better appreciated by society | There is a loss in management capacity | There is a loss in management capacity | It is much appreciated by society | It is much appreciated by society |
| <i>Social involvement in the management of R+D</i> | Growing participation | Scarce participation | Scarce participation | Large and very active participation | Growing participation |
| <i>Performance of R+D systems</i> | Systems are effective and focalized on the market | Systems are efficient but not relevant because protectionism impairs international trade | Systems are effective and focalized on the market | Systems are not very efficient, but they are effective in regard to the environment and biodiversity | Systems are highly effective and efficient: they are focalized on the environment and biodiversity |
| <i>Relative spaces of public and private R+D</i> | Public-private alliances are made with transnational corporations on strictly commercial terms | Transnational corporations perform R+D activities for profit. Public R+D provides input for private R+D activities and for satisfying social needs | Transnational corporations perform R+D activities for profit. Public R+D provides input for private R+D activities and for satisfying social needs | Public R+D institutions prevail over private R+D, but they collaborate with each other. R+D is strongly focused on environmental sustainability and biodiversity conservation | Public R+D institutions either collaborate through commercial alliances or compete with each other. |
| <i>Proper technologies for agricultural activities</i> | Technologies are aimed to intensified agriculture: they are not suitable for vulnerable productive systems | Technologies are aimed to the production of few common products. When specific technologies are needed, they are imported | Technologies are aimed to the production of few common products. When specific technologies are needed, they are imported | Technologies are aimed to satisfying the demands from productive systems and are closely adapted to local conditions | Social participation in technology development results in products very much adapted to user's needs |
| <i>Incorporation of knowledge to productive systems</i> | Is high; it is substantiated through inputs and practices | It is limited; it is substantiated through commercial enterprises | It is limited; it is substantiated through commercial enterprises | It is high and particularly focused on environmental protection and the development of local innovations | It is high, unevenly distributed across the region and mostly commercially oriented |
| <i>Attended markets</i> | Large productive systems serve domestic and foreign markets. Most of small productive systems remain isolated from those markets, except they can gain niche | These are restricted. Exports are generally restricted and a few countries serve niche markets. The domestic market is little developed | These are restricted. Exports are generally restricted and a few countries serve niche markets. The domestic market is well developed | Mostly local markets. These are served with sustainably produced products of good nutritional value | Both domestic and foreign markets, with sustainably produced products of good nutritional value |

| Variables | Global Symphony markets | Order from Strength | Life as it is | Adaptive Mosaic | Techno garden |
|---|---|--|--|---|--|
| <i>Social organization of vulnerable production systems</i> | Complete; it is real through production centers or cooperatives | Restricted; it is replaced by assistentialism | Restricted. It is replaced by assistentialism, but its materialization is encouraged by NGOs concerned with the environment, biodiversity and traditional/indigenous knowledge | Complete and strongly localist, but restricted by scarcity of resources | It is connected to production centers and aimed to product qualification |
| <i>Availability of resources for agriculture</i> | Sufficient. Natural resources are easily got at; knowledge is increasingly available | Large in rich countries ; resources are easily accessed in poor countries. There is some degradation of natural resources , and a restricted access to knowledge | Large in rich countries; resources are easily accessed in poor countries. There is some degradation of natural resources, and free access to knowledge | The use of natural resources is constrained by environmental concerns. There are scarce economic resources. There is free access to available resources and knowledge | The use of natural resources is constrained by environmental concerns. There are ample economic resources, and a ifree access to available resources and knowledge |
| <i>Performance of agricultural productive systems</i> | Greater efficiency and production quality in big firms. Performance is highly variable among small systems: efficiency and production quality are low, and the most vulnerable emigrate | Better efficiency and production quality in big firms. Performance is highly variable among small systems: efficiency and production quality are low, and the most vulnerable emigrate | Better efficiency and production quality in big firms. Performance is highly variable among small systems: efficiency and production quality are low, and the most vulnerable emigrate Niches of agro-ecological production stay put | Productive processes and their products are more sound and friendly with the environment. Problems emerge in regard to the production of enough quantities of food. | Large efficiency and production quality is attained in all productive systems because they are fully integrated as supply chains |
| <i>Rent inequality in agriculture</i> | Increases, but unevenly across LAC | Increases because most investments are made by transnational firms and those are not of a social kind | Increases, but unevenly across LAC | Unevenly decreases; deracination of farmers increases inequality | Decreases across LAC |
| <i>Social inequality</i> | High. Most of the population does not have ample access to education, health and home. There is a statistical reduction in inequality brought about by internal migration from rural to urban areas | High. Most of the population does not have ample access to education, health and home. | High. Most of the population does not have ample access to education, health and home. | Small | Generally small, but large variability across LAC |

| Variables | Global Symphony | Order from Strength | Life as it is | Adaptive Mosaic | Techno garden |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|---|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <i>Food security</i> | Uneven across LAC, particularly in countries with few resources for ensuring food quality | Food offer is insufficient; low quality foods | Food offer is insufficient; low quality foods | High but food quality is sub-standard | High food security and food quality |
| <i>Environmental sustainability</i> | Low | Low; particularly in the poorer countries in LAC | Low | High and stable | High, but unstable |