

Miloš Dimitrijević

University of Kragujevac
Faculty of Economics
Department of General Economy and
Economic Development

INNOVATIVENESS OF THE AGRI-FOOD SECTOR AS A FUNCTION OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Inovativnost poljoprivredno-prehrambenog sektora
u funkciji održivog razvoja

Abstract

Innovation is very important for sustainable development of countries. In agriculture, innovations shift the focus from mere productivity-based technology to the economic, ecological and social aspects of sustainable development. Given that there is no unique framework for measuring innovation in the agri-food sector, and no single conclusion can be drawn as to which country is the most innovative in agriculture, the subject of the paper is the measurement of innovation in the agri-food sector of the most innovative countries and the Republic of Serbia. The aim of the paper is to prove the necessity of introducing innovations in the agricultural sector of the Republic of Serbia, in accordance with the innovations introduced by more agriculturally innovative countries. Innovative approaches such as precision agriculture and others, which are in line with sustainable development, play an increasingly important role in agriculture. The OLS panel regression on the example of innovative countries and the Republic of Serbia proved that the introduction of innovation in agriculture has a positive impact on sustainable development. Only in the case of inputs used in agriculture, this impact was negative, which is why it is important to introduce modern technologies and innovative approaches in order to increase their productivity, optimization and less use. The Kruskal-Wallis test proved that the Republic of Serbia lags behind agriculturally innovative countries, which is why it is important to follow the example of innovative countries in terms of introducing innovative approaches in agriculture and increasing input productivity.

Keywords: *agri-food sector, innovations, conceptual framework, Republic of Serbia vs. innovative countries, precision agriculture, sustainable development*

Sažetak

Inovacije su veoma važne za održivi razvoj zemalja. Inovacije u poljoprivredi pomeraju akcenat sa tehnologije, koja se odnosi na produktivnost, na ekonomske, ekološke i socijalne aspekte održivog razvoja. S obzirom na to da ne postoji jedinstven okvir za merenje inovativnosti u poljoprivredno-prehrambenom sektoru i ne može se izvesti jedinstven zaključak koja je zemlja najinovativnija u poljoprivredi, predmet rada je merenje inovativnosti u poljoprivredno-prehrambenom sektoru najinovativnijih zemalja i Republike Srbije. Cilj rada je da dokaže neophodnost uvođenja inovacija u poljoprivredni sektor Republike Srbije, u skladu sa inovacijama koje uvode poljoprivredno inovativnije zemlje. Inovativni pristupi kao što su precizna poljoprivreda i drugi, koji su u skladu sa održivim razvojem, igraju sve značajniju ulogu u poljoprivredi. OLS panel regresija na primeru inovativnih zemalja i Republike Srbije dokazala je da uvođenje inovacija u poljoprivredu pozitivno utiče na održivi razvoj. Samo kod inputa koji se koriste u poljoprivredi ovaj uticaj je bio negativan, zbog čega je važno uvesti savremene tehnologije i inovativne pristupe u cilju povećanja njihove produktivnosti, optimizacije i manje upotrebe. Kruskal-Wallis test je pokazao da Republika Srbija zaostaje za poljoprivredno inovativnim zemljama, zbog čega je važno slediti primer inovativnih zemalja u pogledu uvođenja inovativnih pristupa u poljoprivredi i povećanja produktivnosti inputa.

Ključne reči: *poljoprivredno-prehrambeni sektor, inovacije, konceptualni okvir, Republika Srbija naspram inovativnih zemalja, precizna poljoprivreda, održivi razvoj*

Introduction

The agri-food sector is very important in countries, contributing to GDP and national welfare. Constant supply of food results in enormous environmental costs. Improving the system of food production is key to sustainable development. That is why innovations that lead to the sustainable development of the agri-food sector are important [22]. Innovation leads to increased competitiveness of the agri-food sector and overall economic development [13]. Improving the competitiveness of the economy is achieved through the development of innovations and innovative activities [29].

Innovations in agriculture have mostly been related to technology, with the aim of achieving economic goals and increasing productivity. Innovations in agriculture shift the emphasis from technology and productivity to balance in nature and between economic, ecological and social goals of sustainable development [1].

There is a growing interest for these sustainable development goals in the agri-food supply chain. Also, there is an increasing use of new technologies within agriculture 4.0, which significantly affect the sustainability of supply chains [28]. Innovations in the agrarian value chain include agricultural producers, suppliers of agricultural inputs, as well as processors and distributors of finished products [32].

Traditionally, the agri-food sector has a low level of connectivity and application of innovations in business. On the other hand, agriculture is one of the biggest polluters, which is why the application of innovations, in order to reduce soil degradation, water pollution and biodiversity, is very important to achieve the mentioned goals of sustainable development and reduction of climate change. That is why economic and environmental goals, such as profitability and environmental protection, should be linked [23].

The 21st century is characterized by intensive agricultural production that leads to major environmental problems. Such agricultural systems with excessive use of pesticides and fertilizers have negative consequences for biodiversity. This requires a radical transformation of agriculture in order to reduce synthetic inputs [39].

Organic agriculture can be of great importance in overcoming these challenges. A low level of chemical inputs minimizes environmental pollution. That is why “Organic 3.0” is said to be an innovation [26]. The transition from a linear to a circular economy in agriculture can significantly affect the reduction of environmental pollution, while innovations play a significant role in that transition. The application of the circular economy in agriculture means as little as possible external inputs in the production [19]. But these approaches generally do not achieve satisfactory economic results. In contrast to them, precision agriculture, with help of variable application of inputs, achieves both economic and ecological goals [33] and is in line with sustainable development. Automated and autonomous agricultural equipment has the potential to ensure food safety for consumers, reduce environmental pollution and increase labor productivity [15], as well as reduce production costs and maximize profits [16]. In that sense, for the purpose of mapping and monitoring of different crop yields, remote sensing [20] which use the satellite remote sensing [6], as well as geographic information system (GIS) technology [12], unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV), artificial intelligence (AI) [4], [46] etc., are used.

Bearing in mind that the agri-food sector mainly consists of small and medium sized enterprises, greater connection and cooperation between them can lead to the development of technological and eco-innovations, which will further increase their competitive advantage and enable them to use limited resources efficiently [24]. The non-competitiveness of small agricultural households requires solutions such as the development of a Food Hub, digital store, the association of all participants in agribusiness, maintain the connection between the producers and the consumers etc. [30].

The agri-food sector is currently in the era of the development of “Agriculture 4.0”, which implies efficient use of resources, automation and digitalization. This implies the use of modern machines, ICT technologies, Internet of Things (IoT), etc. [17]. Innovations driven by digital transformation in agri-food supply chains are the main objective of “Agri-Food 4.0”. Cyber-physical systems are the main strengths in applications in precision agriculture, such as robots, drones, sensors, etc. [7].

The fourth agricultural revolution brought technological innovations, such as the IoT, Cloud Computing, artificial intelligence (AI) and etc., which have the potential to improve agriculture. Smart agriculture can provide huge benefits for sustainable agriculture development, in line with increasing productivity and environmental protection [27]. The agri-food sector has a responsible function to provide quality and safe food for the growing population. However, various constraints such as the global pandemic and climate change highlight the importance of innovation in order to overcome them and build an efficient supply chain. That is why it is crucial that manufacturers adopt new technologies and follow the innovative potential of Industry 4.0 technologies in the agri-food sector [21]. Opportunities should be sought in a potential such as better access to new technologies, as well as development of strategic relationships within food supply chain, creating value added products [25]. Further development of information technologies is expected, especially in sectors that modestly used the support of information technologies in their activities, such as agriculture [45].

The subject of the paper, which is based on the author's PhD thesis, is the review and measurement of innovativeness in the agri-food sector of the most innovative countries and the Republic of Serbia (RS), while the goal of the paper is to prove the necessity of introducing innovations into the agricultural sector of RS, in line with the innovations introduced by more agriculturally innovative countries.

According to the defined subject and research goal, the following hypotheses were defined:

- H1: The introduction of innovations in the agri-food sector has a positive impact on the economic and sustainable development of countries.
- H2: RS lags significantly behind more agriculturally innovative countries.

Material and methods

Innovation in agriculture is challenging for several reasons. First of all, it is important to point out that agri-food systems include many different sub-sectors. Innovations occur along the entire value chain. Therefore, a model

Table 1: Definition of used variables

Label	Definition	Source
Dependent variables		
HDI	Human Development Index	[36]
GDP_pc	Gross domestic product per capita (GDP per capita)	[43]
Agricultural independent variables		
Ag_gradu	Share of graduated students in the fields of agriculture, forestry, fisheries and veterinary, in the total number of graduated students of higher education (%)	[37]
Ag_cred	Loans to agriculture, mil. US \$	[11]
Ag_fert	The use of mineral fertilizers - t	[38]
Ag_mac	Use of agricultural machinery	[38]
Ag_reg_pla	Registered plant varieties	[41]
Ag_gva/pw	Gross value added per worker in agriculture (productivity)	[43]
Agf_exp	Export of agri-food products (HS classification)	[35]
Ag_In_des	Agri-food industrial design (Locarno classification)	[41]
Ag_tradem	Agri-food trademarks (Nice classification)	[41]
Control variables		
Ino	Innovation countries vs. Republic of Serbia – Dummy variable	Author's research.
GERD	Expenditure on research and development (% of GDP)	[43]
Ter_enr	Enrollment of students in higher education institutions	[43]
Cred	Domestic loans to the private sector (% of GDP)	[43].
ICT_imp	Import of high technology	[43].
GDP_pc_gr	GDP growth per capita	[43]
Patent	Patents by origin	[41]
Hi_tec_ex	Export of high technology products	[43]
Ind_des	Industrial design	[41]
Tradem	Product trademarks	[41]

Source: Author's research

based on the GII (Global Innovation Index) framework is proposed for measuring innovations in the agri-food sector [8, p. 74]. Based on the GII framework adapted to agri-food sector (Appendix 1), agricultural variables, as well as their associated control variables from GII framework, were used (Table 1).

The research refers to the introduction of innovation in the agri-food sector of RS and ten the most innovative countries [42]: Switzerland, Sweden, USA, UK, Netherlands, Denmark, Finland, Singapore, Germany and Republic of Korea, and its impact on sustainable development. The research was conducted with the OLS panel regression, for the time period 1999-2019. Due to the Hausman test, a random effect was used. The multicollinearity of the variables (Appendix 2) determined research models. This research was conducted with econometric software EViews.

In the second part of the research, the agriculture of RS was compared with the most innovative countries in the field of agriculture. For the comparison of agricultural indicators, for the period 1999-2019, the non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis test was used. This research was conducted with SPSS.

Results and discussions

The general public sees innovation as a key driver of sustainability [31]. In both developed and developing countries it has an important role in achieving sustainable

development. Agricultural innovation brings new products and processes to socio-economic use [18].

The impact of innovation on the economic and sustainable development of innovative countries and RS was examined using the following regression equations:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{GDP_pc}_{i,t} = & \alpha + \beta_1 \text{AGRICULTURE}_{i,t} + \beta_2 \text{Ino}_{i,t} + \beta_3 \text{GERDi}_{i,t} \\ & + \beta_4 \text{ter_enri}_{i,t} + \beta_5 \text{scredi}_{i,t} + \beta_6 \text{ICT_impi}_{i,t} + \beta_7 \text{GDP_pc_gri}_{i,t} + \beta_8 \text{patenti}_{i,t} \\ & + \beta_9 \text{hi_tec_exi}_{i,t} + \beta_{10} \text{ind_desi}_{i,t} + \beta_{11} \text{trdemi}_{i,t} + \varepsilon_{i,t} \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{HDI}_{i,t} = & \alpha + \beta_1 \text{AGRICULTURE}_{i,t} + \beta_2 \text{Ino}_{i,t} + \beta_3 \text{GERDi}_{i,t} \\ & + \beta_4 \text{ter_enri}_{i,t} + \beta_5 \text{scredi}_{i,t} + \beta_6 \text{ICT_impi}_{i,t} + \beta_7 \text{GDP_pc_gri}_{i,t} + \beta_8 \text{patenti}_{i,t} \\ & + \beta_9 \text{hi_tec_exi}_{i,t} + \beta_{10} \text{ind_desi}_{i,t} + \beta_{11} \text{trdemi}_{i,t} + \varepsilon_{i,t} \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where agriculture refers to Ag_gradu, Ag_cred, Ag_fert, Ag_mac, Ag_reg_pla, Ag_gva/pw, Agf_exp, Ag_In_des, Ag_tradem country *i* in the year *t*.

As for the introduction of innovations in the agricultural sector and its impact on economic development (Table 2 and Table 3), all agricultural indicators are statistically significant as well as the research models. The share of agricultural, forestry, fishery and veterinary graduates in the total number of higher education graduates (%), the number of agricultural machines, as well as the amount of fertilizer used in agriculture showed a statistically negative impact on economic development, while agricultural loans, registered plant varieties, GVA per to the worker in agriculture

Table 2: Significance of agricultural innovation for economic development of RS and innovative countries - models 1-4

Label	Dependent variable GDP_pc			
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Intercept	** -39733.38 (-2.25)	-8034.81 (-0.63)	-462.51 (-0.05)	1215.22 (0.13)
Ag_gradu	*** -6057.67 (-3.36)			
Ag_cred		*** 0.47 (6.65)		
Ag_fert			* -0.01 (-1.66)	
Ag_mac				*** -0.01 (-2.62)
Ter_enr	*** 51156.00 (4.48)			
GERD	-510.41 (-0.27)	*** 8824.86 (3.82)	387.39 (0.22)	486.05 (0.27)
Cred		*** 209.24 (5.12)	*** 211.28 (6.11)	*** 220.50 (6.37)
ICT_imp		*** -661.12 (-4.78)	*** -731.37 (-5.01)	*** -729.31 (-5.04)
GDP_pc_gr	-333.00 (-1.22)	* 458.11 (1.89)	* 297.17 (1.35)	* 299.79 (1.38)
Ind_des	*** 0.15 (4.01)		*** 0.17 (5.72)	*** 0.16 (5.52)
Ino	*** 32804.31 (3.23)	-2404.47 (-0.16)	** 21345.76 (1.95)	** 20608.08 (1.91)
Adjusted R ²	0.49	0.52	0.53	0.54
F-statistic	*** 21.16	*** 22.26	*** 26.37	*** 27.55

Source: Author's research

Note: beta coefficients in front of parentheses, t-values in parentheses; *, **, *** indicate statistical significance at the 10%, 5%, and 1% level, respectively.

(productivity), export of agri-food products, agricultural trademarks and industrial design in agriculture showed a statistically positive impact on economic development. In contrast to highly automated production processes, agriculture, despite the automation increase, is still a labor-intensive activity. Raising the level of competitiveness of Serbian agriculture implies increasing the productivity and cost-effectiveness of processes, with the achievement of the lowest possible unit price of production [2]. In order

to increase productivity, it is necessary to increase the financing of innovation [40].

Considering that only agriculture inputs had a negative impact on economic development, increasing their productivity by introducing new technologies and efficient use must be imperative. Given that the world's population is expected to grow and there are significant climate changes, the digitization of agriculture can help to overcome these challenges. Digital tools will enable

Table 3: Significance of agricultural innovation for economic development of RS and innovative countries - models 5-9

Label	Dependent variable GDP_pc				
	Model 5	Model 6	Model 7	Model 8	Model 9
Intercept	-839.33 (-0.06)	-1516.15 (-0.17)	529.68 (0.04)	-4693.19 (-0.55)	-6172.91 (-0.58)
Ag_reg_pla	*3.92 (1.70)				
Ag_gva/pw		**0.12 (2.25)			
Agf_exp			***0.01 (4.11)		
Ag_In_des				***1.33 (5.57)	
Ag_tradem					***0.08 (4.86)
GERD	*3598.11 (1.80)	1499.01 (1.01)	1522.36 (1.09)	**3039.50 (2.08)	***3445.92 (2.38)
Cred	*79.80 (1.66)	***189.43 (5.92)	***106.76 (3.51)	***257.97 (7.74)	***221.56 (6.35)
ICT_imp	224.50 (0.73)	***-680.45 (-4.86)		***-791.28 (-5.58)	-10.75 (-0.07)
GDP_pc_gr		*313.06 (1.51)		**436.88 (2.02)	192.35 (1.02)
Hi_tec_ex			0.01 (0.65)		
Ind_des		***0.15 (5.20)			
Ino	*27173.93 (1.79)	*15177.26 (1.53)	*21685.06 (1.65)	*16194.09 (1.66)	12314.48 (1.04)
Adjusted R ²	0.17	0.54	0.23	0.52	0.34
F-statistic	***4.38	***30.81	***8.26	***32.71	***13.95

Source: Author's research

Note: beta coefficients in front of parentheses, t-values in parentheses; *, **, *** indicate statistical significance at the 10%, 5%, and 1% level, respectively.

Table 4: Significance of agricultural innovation for sustainable development of RS and innovative countries – models 1 - 4

Label	Dependent variable HDI			
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Intercept	***0.73 (21.14)	***0.78 (67.07)	***0.77 (73.67)	***0.77 (75.65)
Ag_gradu	***-0.02 (-4.73)			
Ag_cred		***0.01 (3.63)		
Ag_fert			** -0.01 (-2.34)	
Ag_mac				***-0.01 (-3.12)
Ter_enr	***0.07 (3.12)			
GERD	***0.01 (3.05)	*0.01 (1.43)	***0.01 (3.27)	***0.01 (3.30)
Cred		0.01 (0.19)	***0.01 (3.76)	***0.01 (3.99)
ICT_imp		***-0.01 (-7.69)	***-0.01 (-8.69)	***-0.01 (-8.69)
GDP_pc_gr	0.00 (-0.77)	0.01 (0.78)	0.01 (1.25)	0.01 (1.23)
Ind_des	***0.01 (3.95)		***0.01 (5.51)	***0.01 (5.61)
Ino	***0.08 (4.36)	***0.13 (8.11)	***0.10 (7.89)	***0.10 (7.86)
Adjusted R ²	0.63	0.61	0.68	0.68
F-statistic	***37.23	***31.49	***48.71	***50.33

Source: Author's research

Note: beta coefficients in front of parentheses, t-values in parentheses; *, **, *** indicate statistical significance at the 10%, 5%, and 1% level, respectively.

production to grow in a way that reduces the stress on ecosystems [14], in line with sustainable development.

Regarding the impact of innovation in agriculture on sustainable development of the RS and innovative countries (Table 4 and Table 5), in relation to economic development, there are no significant differences. All observed models, as well as agricultural indicators, except registered plant varieties, are statistically significant. Agriculture inputs (agricultural students, number of agricultural machines, amount of fertilizer used in agriculture) have a statistical negative impact on sustainable development, while agricultural loans, registered plant varieties, GVA per worker in agriculture (productivity), export of agri-food products, agricultural trademarks and industrial design in agriculture, have a statistically positive impact on sustainable development. In that sense, innovative approaches must be introduced in agriculture in order to reduce and efficiently use inputs, which will also increase the productivity of agriculture (GVA per worker), as well as registered plant varieties, agricultural trademarks and design etc.

The agri-food sector requires a good technological, social, economic and ecological connection [10]. Sustainable agriculture is based on quality, environmentally friendly and more socially responsible system. Therefore, there are more and more initiatives in agri-food sector towards sustainable development [5].

All agricultural indicators used to analyze the introduction of innovation in the agricultural sector had a statistically positive impact both on economic and sustainable development, except the inputs. In the continuation of the research, the agriculture of RS was compared with the most innovative countries in the field of agriculture.

The agriculture of RS lags behind the agriculturally innovative countries according to all observed indicators, observed in relation to each agriculturally innovative country separately (Table 6), as well as in relation to agriculturally innovative countries in total (Appendix 3). The agri-food sector is very complex and constantly changing. Today, robotics, biotechnological and digital technologies are applied in all areas, including agri-food production, especially in developed countries [8]. Although agriculture has experienced significant changes, it is still going through the age of innovation, digital development and environmental protection. The development of this sector moves from economic to sustainable development [3]. Smart agriculture enables such goals and implies the modernization and use of 4.0 technologies, which include IoT, big data, digitization, which further facilitates the use of data and leads to new innovations [21]. The Republic of Serbia should follow the development of the fourth industrial revolution and apply important technologies

Table 5: Significance of agricultural innovation for sustainable development of RS and innovative countries - models 5 - 9

Label	Dependent variable HDI				
	Model 5	Model 6	Model 7	Model 8	Model 9
Intercept	***0.79 (59.93)	***0.77 (75.33)	***0.78 (82.37)	***0.77 (87.44)	***0.76 (69.35)
Ag_reg_pla	0.01 (0.87)				
Ag_gva/pw		***0.01 (4.50)			
Agf_exp			**0.01 (1.97)		
Ag_In_des				***0.01 (5.90)	
Ag_tradem					***0.01 (6.58)
GERD	0.01 (1.20)	***0.01 (4.45)	**0.01 (1.90)	***0.01 (4.57)	***0.01 (4.06)
Cred	-0.01 (-1.55)	***0.01 (2.86)	0.00 (-0.27)	***0.01 (4.41)	***0.01 (3.68)
ICT_imp	0.01 (1.40)	***-0.01 (-8.51)		***-0.01 (-9.59)	***-0.01 (-2.42)
GDP_pc_gr		*0.01 (1.89)		*0.01 (1.54)	*0.01 (1.44)
Hi_tec_ex			0.00 (-1.04)		
Ind_des		***0.01 (4.63)			
Ino	***0.14 (7.98)	***0.09 (6.71)	***0.13 (9.97)	***0.10 (9.14)	***0.09 (6.33)
Adjusted R ²	0.57	0.68	0.63	0.67	0.59
F-statistic	***22.57	***54.20	***42.46	***61.37	***35.91

Source: Author's research

Note: beta coefficients in front of parentheses, t-values in parentheses; *, **, *** indicate statistical significance at the 10%, 5%, and 1% level, respectively.

in its business, such as artificial intelligence, blockchain, robotics, cloud computing, etc. [34]. Innovation data sources focus mainly on the industrial production and services sector, often excluding primary agriculture. However, innovations are also introduced at the farm level, not only in agricultural enterprises, which makes

it difficult to collect data on it. From a statistical point of view, the recording of activities on farms has its own specificities in relation to legal entities. As a result, the perception of innovation in the agri-food system is difficult [8]. Precisely because of this, the unavailability of certain data is a limitation of this paper, especially

Table 6: The difference in terms of agricultural innovation in RS and countries that are innovative in the field of agriculture

Name	Country	Mean Rank	Name	Country	Mean Rank
ODA education in agriculture	Afghanistan	75.35	Fertilizer application - t	China	99.50
	Ethiopia	66.44		India	75.44
	China	55.08		USA	69.56
	Indonesia	31.95		Brazil	45.33
	Uganda	72.33		Indonesia	27.67
	Serbia	22.72		Serbia	9.50
Chi-Square		***43.179	Chi-Square		***101.273
Expenditure on research and development in agriculture (in US\$ 000)	India	44.00	Use of machines	China	89.67
	Korea	31.79		India	70.39
	China	19.20		USA	66.06
	Netherlands	33.71		Japan	38.61
	Australia	20.33		Poland	22.78
	Serbia	7.71		Serbia	6.50
Chi-Square		***34.418	Chi-Square		***89.773
ODA research and development in agriculture	Nigeria	45.24	Productivity in agriculture - GVA per worker	Slovenia	39.71
	Argentina	21.05		Bahrain	38.07
	India	83.95		Luxembourg	74.81
	Uganda	66.37		Belgium	80.10
	Ethiopia	71.48		Serbia	11.00
	Serbia	14.22	Chi-Square		***84.201
Chi-Square		***66.858	Export of agri-food products - mil. US \$	USA	55.50
Percentage of graduated students in agricultural sciences (calculation based on the share of graduated students in the field of agriculture, forestry, fisheries and veterinary science in the total number of graduated students of higher education, in %)	Ethiopia	40.14		Netherlands	44.20
	Uzbekistan	42.75		Germany	36.40
	Cambodia	16.00		Brazil	18.85
	Vietnam	35.13		China	16.55
	Albania	19.92		Serbia	11.50
	Serbia	12.82	Chi-Square		***50.502
Chi-Square		***30.346	Registered plant varieties - overall application	Netherlands	46.83
Loans to agriculture (calculation based on loans to agriculture in million US \$)	USA	80.57		China	40.17
	Germany	61.14		USA	36.00
	Australia	51.38		France	19.94
	France	81.88		Germany	17.06
	New Zealand	32.00		Serbia	5.00
	Serbia	6.50	Chi-Square		***46.509
Chi-Square		***65.125	Trademark - application in the agri-food sector (Nice classification)	China	86.13
Loans to agriculture (calculation based on participation in total US\$ loans, in %)	New Zealand	70.29		Korea	45.38
	Uruguay	60.52		Turkey	42.38
	Kyrgyzstan	55.52		Italy	63.88
	Tajikistan	75.25		Russia	44.63
	Bolivia	41.33		Serbia	8.63
	Serbia	16.83	Chi-Square		***68.131
Chi-Square		***32.467			

Source: Author's research, based on [11], [37], [38], [41], [43], [44]

Note: *, **, *** indicate statistical significance at the 10%, 5%, and 1% levels, respectively.

for precision agriculture, such as number of drones, multipurpose machines etc.

Conclusions

When researching innovation in agriculture, one of the main limitations is that there is no unique framework, nor a precise measure of innovation. In the GII framework, adapted to the agri-food sector, indicators are used do not reflect innovation in the best way, and even can show a negative impact on sustainable development, such as the use of inadequate mechanization, given that this indicator covers the use of all machines in agriculture, such as tractors, attachment machines, etc., which from the aspect of innovation should be replaced by new ones, for example, multipurpose machines with automatic guidance, drones, machines that use renewable energy sources and thus do not pollute the environment. Also, experts who are able to use these technologies and who can create them should be educated. The use of chemical fertilizers should be reduced and replaced with organic fertilizers, in line with sustainable development. This is the only way to change the currently used inputs in agriculture and to increase their productivity, in line with sustainable development. Also, only education in this direction can create experts capable of such technologies. On the other hand, many developed countries record a decrease in the use of agricultural machinery and fertilizers, which are replaced by modern technologies. Today, robotics, biotechnological and digital technologies are applied in the agri-food sector, especially in developed countries, and indicators of their application, which can be used to quantify these changes, are not entirely available.

Furthermore, not every GII indicator has the same indicator adapted for the agri-food sector, which is why the GII framework for the agri-food sector is incomplete, but there is no better generally accepted framework. On the other hand, in this research, it was not possible to point out to the agriculturally innovative countries within one sample, like innovative countries, because, depending on the observation indicators, these are different countries. In contrast to the innovative countries of the world that can be more simply ranked, this cannot be also refers to

agriculturally innovative countries, so it was therefore not possible to draw a single conclusion as to which country is the most innovative in agriculture.

The special contribution of this paper, which is based on the author's PhD thesis, is that the innovativeness of the agri-food sector of RS was investigated in a new way and compared with other innovative countries in this sector, which gave clear recommendations for the creators of the agrarian policy of RS and other countries. Also, for the first time, with this framework, the impact and importance of innovation in agri-food sector on the sustainable development of countries was examined. The introduction of new and sustainable approaches in agricultural development is a topic that has not been sufficiently researched, especially empirically. At the same time, measuring agricultural innovation represents an important challenge, because a unique system for measuring innovation in the agri-food sector has not yet been developed. It is a topic that, as it is estimated, will be increasingly relevant in the future, and accordingly, it will require new approaches and knowledge, applicable in practice. The measurement of innovation, both in the primary and in other economic sectors, is a recommendation for future research, given the unexplored nature of this topic and its great importance.

Measuring innovation in agriculture is a challenge, and the GII framework adapted to the agri-food sector was used to prove hypotheses and measure innovation. Regarding the first hypothesis, the research indicated that the agricultural indicators used to show the introduction of innovation in agriculture have a positive impact, both on economic and sustainable development, except the agriculture inputs. That is why it is important to innovate inputs, in order to increase their productivity, and not only increase their number, which can often create additional costs and have a negative impact on productivity, as well as on economic and sustainable development. Also, it is important to introduce innovative approaches in agricultural production, such as precision agriculture, considering the positive impact on sustainable development, as well as increasing the productivity of inputs, considering that the productivity of agriculture inputs also has a positive impact on both the economic

and sustainable development of the observed countries. All of this is especially important to apply and introduce more intensively in RS, considering that it lags significantly behind more agriculturally innovative countries, which also proves the second hypothesis.

References

- Andrade, D., Pasini, F., & Scarano, F. R. (2020). Syntropy and innovation in agriculture. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, 45, 20-24. doi:10.1016/j.cosust.2020.08.003
- Birovljev, J., Četković, B., & Vukmirović, G. (2013). Prospects of improving the competitiveness of Serbian agriculture in (re) industrialization process. *Ekonomika preduzeća*, 61(5-6), 364-372.
- Constantin, M., Strat, G., Deaconu, M. E., & Pătărlăgeanu, S. R. (2021). Innovative agri-food value chain management through a unique urban ecosystem. *Management Research and Practice*, 13(3), 5-22.
- Costa, L., Kunwar, S., Ampatzidis, Y. et al. (2022). Determining leaf nutrient concentrations in citrus trees using UAV imagery and machine learning. *Precision Agriculture*, 23, 854-875. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11119-021-09864-1
- Coteur, I., Marchand, F., Debruyne, L. & Lauwers, L. (2019). Understanding the myriad of sustainable development processes in agri-food systems: a case in Flanders. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 209(1), 472-480. doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.10.066.
- Crusiol, L.G., Sun, L., Sibaldelli, R. N. et al. (2022). Strategies for monitoring within-field soybean yield using Sentinel-2 Vis-NIR-SWIR spectral bands and machine learning regression methods. *Precision Agriculture*, 23, 1093-1123. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11119-022-09876-5
- Dadi, V., Nikhil, S. R., Mor, R. S., Agarwal, T., & Arora, S. (2021). Agri-food 4.0 and innovations: Revamping the supply chain operations. *Production Engineering Archives*, 27(2), 75-89. https://doi.org/10.30657/pea.2021.27.10
- Dutta, S., Lanvin, B., & Wunsch-Vincent, S. (2017). *The Global Innovation Index 2017: Innovation Feeding the World*. Ithaca, Fontainebleau, and Geneva: Cornell University, INSEAD, and the World Intellectual Property Organization.
- Eurostat (2020). *Data*. Retrieved from https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/main/data/database
- Falguera, V., Aliguer, N. & Falguera, M. (2012). An integrated approach to current trends in food consumption: Moving toward functional and organic products? *Food Control*, 26(2), 274-281. doi:10.1016/j.foodcont.2012.01.051
- FAOstat (2020). *Data*. Retrieved from http://www.fao.org/faostat/en/#data
- Hernández, M., Borges, A.A. & Francisco-Bethencourt, D. (2022). Mapping stressed wheat plants by soil aluminum effect using C-band SAR images: implications for plant growth and grain quality. *Precision Agriculture*, 23, 1072-1092. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11119-022-09875-6
- Kafetzopoulos, D., Vouzas, F., & Skalkos, D. (2020). Developing and validating an innovation drivers' measurement instrument in the agri-food sector. *British Food Journal*, 122(4), 1199-1214. https://doi.org/10.1108/BFJ-09-2019-0721
- Lajoie-O'Malley, A., Bronson, K., van der Burg, S., & Klerkx, L. (2020). The future(s) of digital agriculture and sustainable food systems: An analysis of high-level policy documents. *Ecosystem Services*, 45, 101183. doi:10.1016/j.ecoser.2020.101183
- Lowenberg-DeBoer, J., Behrendt, K., Ehlers, M., Dillon, C., Gabriel, A., Huang, I. Y., ... Rose, D. (2021). Lessons to be learned in adoption of autonomous equipment for field crops. *Applied Economic Perspectives and Policy*. doi:10.1002/aep.13177
- Maritan, E., Lowenberg-DeBoer, J., Behrendt, K., & Franklin, K. (2023). Economically optimal farmer supervision of crop robots. *Smart Agricultural Technology*, 3, 100110. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atech.2022.100110
- Miranda, J., Ponce, P., Molina, A., & Wright, P. (2019). Sensing, smart and sustainable technologies for Agri-Food 4.0. *Computers in Industry*, 108, 21-36. doi:10.1016/j.compind.2019.02.002
- Molina-Maturano, J., Speelman, S., & De Steur, H. (2019). Constraint-based innovations in agriculture and sustainable development: A scoping review. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 246, 119001. doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.119001
- Muscio, A., & Sisto, R. (2020). Are Agri-Food Systems Really Switching to a Circular Economy Model? Implications for European Research and Innovation Policy. *Sustainability*, 12(14), 5554. doi:10.3390/su12145554
- Nguyen, L.H., Robinson, S. & Galpern, P. (2022). Medium-resolution multispectral satellite imagery in precision agriculture: mapping precision canola (*Brassica napus* L.) yield using Sentinel-2 time series. *Precision Agriculture*, 23, 1051-1071. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11119-022-09874-7
- Oltra-Mestre, M. J., Hargaden, V., Coughlan, P., & Segura-García del Río, B. (2020). Innovation in the Agri-Food sector: Exploiting opportunities for Industry 4.0. *Creativity and Innovation Management*. 30(1), 198-210. doi:10.1111/caim.12418
- Ponta, L., Puliga, G., Manzini, R., & Cincotti, S. (2022). Sustainability-oriented innovation and co-patenting role in agri-food sector: Empirical analysis with patents. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 178, 121595. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2022.121595
- Rabadán, A., González-Moreno, Á., & Sáez-Martínez, F. J. (2019). Improving Firms' Performance and Sustainability: The Case of Eco-Innovation in the Agri-Food Industry. *Sustainability*, 11(20), 5590. doi:10.3390/su11205590
- Rabadán, A., Triguero, Á., & Gonzalez-Moreno, Á. (2020). Cooperation as the Secret Ingredient in the Recipe to Foster Internal Technological Eco-Innovation in the Agri-Food Industry. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(7), 2588. doi:10.3390/ijerph17072588
- Radosavljević, K., Vučić, I., & Plavšić, M. (2019). Expansion of marketing channels and their influence on trade in agri-food products: International experiences. *Ekonomika preduzeća*, 67(5-6), 370-383.
- Rahmann, G., Reza Ardakani, M., Bàrberi, P., Boehm, H., Canali, S., Chander, M., ... Zanolli, R. (2017). Organic Agriculture 3.0 is innovation with research. *Organic Agriculture*, 7(3), 169-197. doi:10.1007/s13165-016-0171-5
- Rose, D. C., & Chilvers, J. (2018). Agriculture 4.0: Broadening Responsible Innovation in an Era of Smart Farming. *Frontiers in Sustainable Food Systems*, 2, 1-7. doi:10.3389/fsufs.2018.00087

28. Saetta, S., & Caldarelli, V. (2020). How to increase the sustainability of the agri-food supply chain through innovations in 4.0 perspective: a first case study analysis. *Procedia Manufacturing*, 42, 333–336. doi:10.1016/j.promfg.2020.02.083
29. Savić, N., Pitić, G., & Lazarević, J. (2018). Innovation-driven economy and Serbia. *Ekonomika preduzeća*, 66(1-2), 139-150.
30. Sgroi, F., & Marino, G. (2022). Environmental and digital innovation in food: The role of digital food hubs in the creation of sustainable local agri-food systems. *Science of The Total Environment*, 810, 152257. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.152257>
31. Silvestre, B. S., & Țircă, D. M. (2019). Innovations for sustainable development: Moving toward a sustainable future. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 208, 325–332. doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.09.244
32. Solarte-Montufar, J. G., Zartha-Sossa, J. W., & Osorio-Mora, O. (2021). Open Innovation in the Agri-Food Sector: Perspectives from a Systematic Literature Review and a Structured Survey in MSMEs. *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity*, 7(2), 161. doi:10.3390/joitmc7020161
33. Stafford, J. V. (2000). Implementing Precision Agriculture in the 21st Century. *Journal of Agricultural Engineering Research*, 76(3), 267–275. doi:10.1006/jaer.2000.0577
34. Trbovich, A. S., Vučković, A., & Drašković, B. (2020). Industry 4.0 as a lever for innovation: Review of Serbia's potential and research opportunities. *Ekonomika preduzeća*, 68(1-2), 105-120.
35. UN Comtrade Database (2020). *International Trade Statistics Database*. Retrieved from <https://comtrade.un.org/data/>
36. UNDP (2020). *Human Development Reports*. Retrieved from <http://hdr.undp.org/en/indicators/137506>
37. UNESCO (2020). *Education*. Retrieved from <http://data.uis.unesco.org/>
38. USDA (2020). *International Agricultural Productivity - Agricultural total factor productivity growth indices for individual countries, 1961-2016*. USA: Economic Research Service United States Department of Agriculture. Retrieved from <https://www.ers.usda.gov/data-products/international-agricultural-productivity/>
39. Vermunt, D. A., Negro, S. O., Van Laerhoven, F. S. J., Verweij, P. A., & Hekkert, M. P. (2020). Sustainability transitions in the agri-food sector: How ecology affects transition dynamics. *Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions*, 36, 236–249. doi:10.1016/j.eist.2020.06.003
40. Vujović, D. (2022). Innovations, productivity and growth: Reform and policy challenges for Serbia. *Ekonomika preduzeća*, 70(3-4), 161-178.
41. WIPO (2020). *Statistics Data Center*. Retrieved from <https://www3.wipo.int/ipstats/keyindex.htm>
42. WIPO (2020a). *Global Innovation Index 2020*. Retrieved from https://www.wipo.int/edocs/pubdocs/en/wipo_pub_gii_2020.pdf
43. World Bank (2020). *Indicators*. Retrieved from <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator>
44. WTO (2020). *Statistics on merchandise trade-Data Portal*. Retrieved from <https://data.wto.org/>
45. Zečević, A., & Radosavljević, K. (2014). Web-based business applications as the support for increased competitiveness in agribusiness. *Ekonomika preduzeća*, 62(7-8), 405-418.
46. Zhang, J., Wang, W., Krienke, B. et al. (2022). In-season variable rate nitrogen recommendation for wheat precision production supported by fixed-wing UAV imagery. *Precision Agriculture*, 23, 830–853. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11119-021-09863-2>