Available online at
http://agrospheresmagazine.vitalbiotech.org/

ISSN (E): 2582 – 7022

Agrospheres:e- Newsletter, (2025) *6*(10), 24-27

Article ID: 812

ICAR and Bayer Collaboration: Advancing Precision Agriculture Practices

Rita Fredericks

CEO, Precision Grow (A Unit of Tech Visit IT Pvt Ltd)

*Corresponding Author
Rita Fredericks*

Article History
Received: 26. 9.2025
Revised: 2. 10.2025
Accepted: 7. 10.2025

INTRODUCTION

Precision agriculture uses information, sensors, and controlled interventions to apply the right input, at the right place and right time. In a country like India — with diverse agroecologies, predominately smallholders, and rising climate stress — precision approaches can potentially improve input use efficiency (fertilisers, water, crop protection), reduce environmental footprints, and raise farm profitability. Recognizing these potentials, ICAR — India's premier agricultural research institution — entered into formal collaboration with Bayer Crop Science to jointly develop and deploy resource-efficient technologies and advisory services via ICAR's national network. This article unpacks the collaboration's aims, possible technological focus areas, likely farmer impacts, and governance concerns while proposing safeguards and practical recommendations for maximising public benefit.

2. Background: The MoU and Institutional Context

On 1 September 2023 ICAR and Bayer signed an MoU to cooperate on research, capacity building and technology transfer with emphasis on resource-efficient agronomic practices, water-positive measures, crop protection, and mechanization options. The MoU explicitly envisages leveraging ICAR's outreach network — especially Krishi Vigyan Kendra's (KVKs) — to scale demonstrations and farmer training. Subsequent press coverage and company communications expanded on pilot activities (drone trials, regenerative models, Forward Farm demonstrations) and later site- or crop-specific MoUs (e.g., bio-efficacy trials with floriculture research centres).

While the official framing emphasises farmer benefits and sustainability, civil-society groups and some scientists flagged concerns about the rapid proliferation of MoUs between ICAR and multinational agribusinesses, cautioning about transparency, research independence, and potential conflicts of interest. These critiques call for clear governance safeguards and open data/knowledge sharing clauses in public–private agreements.

Source: https://knnindia.co.in/news/newsdetails/sectors/icar-organizes-session-on-precision-agriculture

3. Precision Agriculture Practices Likely to Be Prioritised

From available official statements and Bayer's global focus areas, the partnership is likely to concentrate on the following precision practices and enabling technologies:

1. **Digital agronomic advisories and decision support:** sensor feeds, satellite/remote sensing-based crop monitoring, mobile advisory apps and localized recommendations through KVKs to tailor inputs by field.
2. **Drones and aerial applications:** scouting, multispectral imaging for stress detection, and precision spray systems — building on previous ICAR–Bayer–industry drone pilots.
3. **Soil and water efficiency tools:** soil moisture sensors, variable-rate irrigation strategies, and mechanisation for water-saving production methods (e.g., direct-seeded rice).
4. **Integrated pest management (IPM) and bioefficacy trials:** science-led validation of crop protection solutions and context-appropriate IPM packages. Recent MoUs at institute levels include bioefficacy studies (e.g., ornamental/rose crops).
5. **Regenerative and climate-smart practices:** demonstration farms and training (e.g., Bayer ForwardFarm, IICA-Bayer training initiatives) to mainstream soil health, diversified rotations, and carbon-sensitive measures
6. These elements together form a portfolio where digital sensing, validated inputs, and extension capacity combine to enable more precise recommendations and on-field actions.

Source:https://www.thebeacon.in/corporate-control-over-indian-farm-policy-bayer-icar-collaboration-raises-serious-concerns-bharat-dogra

4. Potential Benefits for Farmers and the Public Sector

When implemented with farmer participation and scientific rigour, the collaboration could produce measurable public benefits:

- **Improved input efficiency and reduced costs.** Variable-rate fertiliser and water management can lower input use while maintaining yields.
- **Faster translation of research to practice.** ICAR's network of research stations and KVKs paired with industry deployment capacities could accelerate field trials and scaled demonstrations.
- **Access to modern tools for smallholders.** If delivery models are farmer-centric (co-ops, service providers), precision tools (drones, sensors) can be accessed as services rather than costly capital purchase.
- **Evidence-based pest and crop protection.** Joint bioefficacy trials at ICAR centres can produce locally relevant IPM recommendations.
- **Climate and sustainability co-benefits.** Projects aimed at regenerative practices and water-positive methods support national climate-resilient agriculture objectives.

5. Risks, Criticisms and Governance Challenges

Despite the promise, several risks and legitimate concerns must be addressed:

1. **Conflict of interest and influence over public research agenda.** Critics argue that a public research body partnering with an agri-input multinational could shift research priorities toward proprietary solutions rather than open public goods. Several civil society statements and media pieces have raised this concern.
2. **Data ownership and privacy.** Precision tools generate farm-level data (yield histories, input use, geolocation). Without explicit data governance clauses, farmer data could be commercialised or used for targeted marketing. Public–private MoUs should specify data ownership, consent mechanisms, and anonymisation standards.
3. **Equity and access.** Precision technologies can widen inequities if only larger or better-off farmers obtain them. Service models must be explicitly designed for smallholder access (pay-per-use, aggregator services through KVKs or farmer producer organisations).
4. **Transparency and accountability.** MoUs should be publicly available, with clear deliverables, funding terms, intellectual-property (IP) arrangements, and independent monitoring/evaluation. Past MoU proliferation has fuelled calls for stronger transparency.
5. **Regulatory and ethical concerns.** Any joint trials involving crop protection require rigorous, peer-reviewed protocols, open data on bioefficacy and environmental impacts, and adherence to national regulatory standards.

6. Implementation Considerations — Making the Collaboration Work for Farmers

To realise benefits while minimizing risks, implementers and policymakers should adopt the following practical measures:

1. **Public disclosure and open MoUs.** Publish full MoU texts, financial commitments, and expected outputs. Independent stakeholders (farmers' unions, researchers, civil society) should have access to these documents.
2. **Data governance framework.** Define clear rules: farmer ownership of primary data, informed consent for data collection, limits on commercial reuse, and requirements for aggregated/anonymised datasets for public research.
3. **Inclusive delivery models.** Use KVKs, service providers, and FPOs to provide precision tools as shared services. Subsidies or grant support can target the most vulnerable farmers to prevent digital divides.
4. **Independent monitoring and evaluation (M&E).** Establish third-party M&E to assess agronomic outcomes (productivity, input efficiency), socio-economic impacts (income, labour), and environmental metrics (water use, pesticide load). Results should be publicly available.
5. **Open science and IP safeguards.** Ensure that research outputs critical for public agriculture (best-practice protocols, algorithms for advisory systems) are published under open licences or accessible through ICAR repositories.
6. **Capacity building for extension.** Strengthen KVK staff with training on digital tools, ethics of data, and participatory demonstration design so that local extension remains farmer-centred.
7. **Stakeholder consultations.** Periodically convene farmer representatives, researchers, regulators, and civil society to review progress and resolve grievances.

7. Case Examples and Early Initiatives

Public reporting indicates several early activities consistent with precision goals:

- **Drone trials and aerial scouting:** Previous multi-party pilots (ICAR–Bayer–industry) tested drone-based scouting and spray recommendations in potato and other crops, generating operational learnings on payloads and dosing.
- **Forward Farm demonstrations:** Bayer's Forward Farm initiative and global training partnerships (e.g., with IICA) emphasise regenerative practices and farmer training; such programmes can complement ICAR's outreach if adapted to local cropping systems.
- **Crop-specific MoUs:** Institute-level agreements (e.g., floriculture bioefficacy trials) demonstrate how ICAR centres can provide experimental rigour for input evaluation. Transparency in trial protocols and publication of results will be critical.

8. Recommendations (Policy and Practice)

1. **Mandate public disclosure** of MoU terms and any deliverables funded or co-funded by private partners.
2. **Adopt a national precision-agriculture data policy** that defines rights, consent processes, anonymisation, and penalties for misuse.
3. **Prioritise open, interoperable advisory tools** — ICAR should insist that algorithms and decision-rules used in public advisories are auditable and interoperable with public systems.
4. **Support shared-service models** for expensive hardware (drones, sensors) through KVKs, FPOs, and private service aggregators regulated to ensure fair pricing.
5. **Set up an independent oversight committee** including farmer representatives, scientists, ethicists and civil society to review public–private collaboration outcomes annually.
6. **Require publication of trial data and impact assessments** in public repositories or peer-reviewed outlets within a defined timeframe post-trial completion.

CONCLUSION

The ICAR–Bayer collaboration offers a pragmatic pathway to accelerate the translation of precision-agriculture innovations into field practice in India. If governed transparently, centred on farmer rights, and coupled with strong public interest safeguards (data governance, equitable access, open science), such partnerships can deliver improved resource efficiency, resilience, and livelihoods for many farmers. Conversely, without transparent contracts, independent evaluation, and protections for public research independence, the risks of capture, inequitable access, and erosion of public trust are real and material. The long-term success of the collaboration will therefore hinge on implementation principles: openness, accountability, and farmer empowerment.

REFERENCES

Kumar, A., & Veeranjaneyulu, K. (2018). Digital Initiatives for Agricultural Research and Education under ICAR in India. *BS Publications*, 1.

Mishra, R., Devi, M. P., Gupta, S., & Kumar, D. Smart Farming Beyond Boundaries: global Collaboration and Innovation. In *Agriculture 4.0* (pp. 391-405). CRC Press.

Nayak, Swati, Mosharaf Hossain, Subhasmita Mohapatra, Neeraj Kumar Tyagi, Anirban Nath, Vikas Kumar Singh, Sarvesh Shukla et al. "Seed Accelerator Meet 2.0." (2025).

Pal, S. (2023). Leveraging Science, Technology and Innovations for Transformation and Sustainability of Indian Agriculture. *Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics*, *78*(1), 1-25.

Sankati, J., Bharti, P., Mishra, A. K., Durgam, V., Gakhar, S., & Sharma, S. (2025). Digital Agriculture in South Asia: Innovations in Farming for Enhanced Productivity. In *Transition to Regenerative Agriculture: Principles and Indicators of Soil Health Management* (pp. 111-140). Singapore: Springer Nature Singapore.