

The Centre for Agricultural and Food Policy

# Land use projections for Southern Non-Black-Earth regions of Russia: coping with uncertainty

Prof. Dr. Nikolai M. Svetlov E-mail: svetlov-nm@ranepa.ru

The study is conducted in the framework of year 2017 State assignment to RANEPA



# MOTIVATION





## MOTIVATION

International dimension

Schierhorn et al. (2014): how much grain from abandoned agricultural land in Russia can flood world markets?

There are 56 million hectares of unused agricultural land in Russia (Shagaida, 2016)

How soon (if ever) will this happen?

National dimension

Can Russia gain from its unused agricultural land?

Methodological angle

The questions above depend on many uncertain factors

Can we give certain answers in the presence of unavoidable uncertainty?

This study focuses only on circa 0,25 million hectares of that 56 million

Located, however, at the edge of export-producing area



# **RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

Practical:

Can land abundancy in South Non-Black-Earth regions of Russia favour their expansion in agricultural markets?

If yes, how to launch this expansion?

If yes, can this expansion be harmful?

Methodological:

How (if possible) to achieve certainty answering the questions above?

What should be learned to make answers more precise?

Relevance to this section:

In particular, does the uncertainty about climate change matters?

Not yet addressed empirically



# LITERATURE (please drop more to nikolai.svetlov@gmail.com)

# Land abundancy in Russia

#### Estimates and causes of abundance

BOKUSHEVA & HOCKMANN (2006); SVETLOV & GATAULIN (2013); SHAGAIDA (2016)

#### Projections

Schierhorn et al. (2014); Saraikin, Uzun & Yanbykh (2014)

# Partial equilibrium

CONFORTI & LONDERO (2001), FOCK ET AL. (2000)

# Behaviour of DMU

MOISEEV (1981)

# **Policy priorities**

Promoting R&D

GULYAYEVA ET AL. (2016)

Improving the institutions

LIEFERT ET AL. (2003); SVETLOV (2009); LIEFERT & LIEFERT (2012)

Risk management

BOKUSHEVA & HOCKMANN (2006)

Import tariffs

LIEFERT & LIEFERT (2012)

Stochastic simulation

HARDAKER ET AL. (2004), ch. 8



The Centre for Agricultural and Food Policy

## METHODOLOGY AT THE GLANCE





## CORE MODEL





## CORE MODEL





## POLICY MODEL



#### Maximize

Gross sales of crop production

#### varying

investments in R&D, RM, institutions subsidies import tariffs subject to lump sum of investments and subsidies maximum import tariff

equilibrium conditions from the core model

Model time: 50 years

The year of projection is 20<sup>th</sup> (i.e. 2035)

## **UNCERTAINTY MODEL**



#### **Uncertain parameters**

Influence of R&D inv. on crop productivity Influence of R&D inv. on MC Influence of subsidies on crop productivity Influence of RM inv. on MC Influence of inv. in institutions on demand Influence of tariffs on demand Influence of tariffs on MC Influence of price on demand (price=MC) A share of production costs that depend on area Influence of cultivated area on MC (via rent) Total of investments and subsidies

## UNCERTAINTY MODEL



## Bounds of the uncertain parameters

Preliminary: zero to 1/variable mulitplier (rounded upwards to order)

The median is one order less than the upper bound

## Distribution

Beta with a + b = 10 (arbitrary)

# Tightening the bounds

Identifying the cases of obviously unrealistic dynamics of sales, yields and areas

Tightening the most influential parameter

Proceeding until

- (a) cannot identify a single parameter causing the unrealistic dynamics
- (b) the number of cases of unreal dynamics is small

### Finally, 1000 Monte-Carlo runs in GAMS



#### DATA

## Kaluga, Tula and Ryazan oblasts (the edge of the Black Earth area)

Year 2015 oblast level data

The source is the open access EMISS database

initial cultivated area

initial yields per hecatre (except remaining production)

revenue per unit of production (a proxy for initial price and MC, except r.p.)



#### **RESULTS: PROJECTIONS**





#### **RESULTS: PROJECTIONS**





## RESULTS: ROLE OF UNCERTAINTY



Pearson linear pairwise correlation coefficients between the parameters and variables at  $20^{\text{th}}$  year of the modelled period

	Correlation	Correlation
	with total	with total
	incremental	revenue
Parameter	land use	growth
$\alpha_{\rm S}$ influence of investments in R&D on crop productivity	0.026	0.179*
$\alpha_{\rm C}$ influence of investments in R&D on marginal costs	0.272*	0.258*
$\alpha_{\rm A}$ influence of 'amber box' subsidies on crop productivity	0.018	0.022
$\alpha_{\rm R}$ influence of investments in improving the risk management on		
marginal costs	0.001	-0.010
$\alpha_1$ influence of investments in improving institutions on the		
demand	0.063*	0.060
$\alpha_0$ influence of import tariff on the effective demand at the farm		
gate	0.008	0.011
$\alpha_{\rm T}$ influence of import tariff on marginal costs	-0.027	-0.034
$\alpha_{\rm M}$ influence of marginal cost on the demand	0.071*	0.092*
$\alpha_{\rm Z}$ influence of an incremental cultivated area on marginal costs	<b>-0.470</b> *	-0.439*
$m_0$ annual financial inflow	0.309*	0.423*
<i>r</i> opportunity cost of capital	0.029	0.025

\* The difference from zero is significant at  $\alpha = 0.05$ 



# CONCLUSIONS

- 1. The cultivated land area at the edge of Black Earths will grow
- 2. The grow is likely to be slow
- 3. The growth is almost due to cereals
- 4. Although worse lands are involved, the land productivity is more likely to grow than to decrease
- 5. The conclusions are robust to a very high degree of uncertainty
- 6. The uncertainty of the results can be diminished primarily by better knowledge about land rent change while changing area and impact of R&D on MC

Better knowledge of more than a half of highly uncertain parameters would not improve the certainty of the results

# THANK YOU FOR YOUR ATTENTION! QUESTIONS ARE WELCOME. PLEASE SPEAK SLOW!