The Santaniello theorem of irreversible benefits

Wesseler, Justus

Wageningen University

January 2009

The *Santaniello* Theorem of Irreversible Benefits

Justus Wesseler[1]

[1]Environmental Economics and Natural Resources Group, Wageningen University, The Netherlands, e-mail: justus.wesseler@wur.nl

The *Santaniello* Theorem of Irreversible Benefits

Justus Wesseler

Wageningen University, The Netherlands

Abstract

Irreversible benefits do favor an earlier introduction of GM crops versus a later one. A non-trivial question is if they also do weigh more than reversible benefits similar to irreversible costs but in the opposite direction.

In this contribution I will show that indeed irreversible benefits do weigh more than reversible once and indeed do result in an irreversibility effect, albeit a positive one. The problem can be summarized by the following theorem:

Irreversible benefits do justify the immediate introduction of transgenic crops, even if future uncertainty about reversible benefits include negative benefits and traditional cost-benefit-analysis treating all benefits and costs as reversible would reject the introduction.

This theorem I call in honor of Vittorio Santaniello the "The *Santaniello* Theorem of Irreversible Benefits."

Keywords: GMOs, irreversible benefits, uncertainty.

The *Santaniello* Theorem of Irreversible Benefits

Justus Wesseler

Wageningen University, The Netherlands

The International Consortium on Agricultural Biotechnology Research (ICABR) holds annual meetings since 1997. Vittorio Santaniello was one of the founding fathers and main organizers of the conference (Pray et al., This Journal). He has been a strong supporter of agricultural biotechnologies, but was also aware and concerned about the social and political issues surrounding the technology (Santaniello, 2005). He in particular emphasized the irreversible benefits the technology provides in debates with people concerned about the irreversible costs of the technology.

Irreversible costs and their relevance for decision making, in general, is by now well known within the economic literature. The first authors explicitly mention that irreversible costs do matter differently than reversible costs for decision making are Arrow and Fisher (1974), introducing the concept of quasi-option value, and Henry (1974) introducing the irreversibility effect. The financial economics literature did provide the foundations for the real option value theory by presenting an approach that allows to derive the "fair price" for a call option (Black and Scholes, 1973, Merton, 1973).[1] The first application of the concept of valuing real investments using financial option models can be traced back to Myers (1977). While there are some subtle differences between the three concepts, the overall result - the possibility of postponing a decision including irreversible costs has an extra value that needs to be considered - holds for all three concepts. This extra value is present in all three approaches as over time additional information will become available and can be used by the decisions maker to up-date the expected benefits and costs and allows to reconsider previous decisions. It is a form of Bayesian learning with explicit consideration of time.

The concepts of quasi-option values, irreversibility effects, and real-option values have been applied to a number of problems. Merton (1998), Trigeorgis (1995), and Dixit and Pindyck (1994) provide an overview about the methods and their applications. Applications to issues surrounding transgenic crops include Beckmann et al. (2006), Demont et al. (2004, 2005), Knudson and Scandizzo (2000, 2001, 2002, 2006), Morel et al. (2003), Soregaroli and Wesseler (2005), Weaver and Wesseler

[1] An investment can be seen similar to a call option while the holder of the call has the right but not the obligation to exercise the call and receives if the call will be exercised in return a stock, the investor has the right but not the obligation to invest and receives against the payment of the investment the benefit stream generated by the investment. As it is not always optimal from an economic point of view to exercise a call option immediately even if the call option is "in the money", it is not optimal to invest immediately even if the expect benefit stream exceeds the investment costs.

(2004, 2006), Wesseler et al. (2007). Most of the applications have first been presented at one of the ICABR meetings.

The "*Santaniello* Theorem of Irreversible Benefits"

Vittorio Santaniello early on has pointed out that not only irreversible costs of the GM crop technology should be considered but irreversible benefits as well. This argument is less trivial than it seems for two reasons. First, obvious to many economists irreversible benefits do favor an earlier introduction of GM crops versus a later one, but this has been largely neglected within empirical studies on consumer attitudes towards GMOs. Second, less obvious is if irreversible benefits also do weigh more than reversible benefits similar to irreversible costs but in the opposite direction and by this introduce an asymmetry similar to the one of irreversible costs.

The importance of Vittorio Santaniello's comment can be stated in the following way:

"Irreversible benefits do justify the immediate introduction of transgenic crops, even if future uncertainty about reversible benefits include negative benefits and traditional cost-benefit-analysis treating all benefits and costs as reversible would reject the introduction."

In honor of Vittorio Santaniello for his contribution to the economics and policy of agricultural biotechnology I call this the "*Santaniello* Theorem of Irreversible Benefits".

The proof of the theorem can be found in the appendix.

Interpretation of the theorem

A numerical example may help to appreciate the implications of the theorem. Choosing a discount rate r of 10%, $NB_0 = 100$, $NB_1^h = 10$, $NB_1^l = -200$, and $q = 1-q = 0.5$ we get for B following equation 2 in the appendix:

$$B > -100 - 0.5 \cdot \frac{20}{0.1} + 0.5 \cdot \frac{200}{0.1} > 800$$

Following equation 4 in the appendix results in

$$B > -100 - 0.5 \frac{20}{0.1} > -200.$$

As the numerical example illustrates there is a difference in necessary irreversible benefits of 1000 units depending on the valuation approach being used. Applying the "*Santaniello* Theorem of Irreversible Benefits" the mere presence of positive irreversible benefits would in this case justify an immediate introduction, while following the standard benefit-costs-analysis the irreversible benefits have to be at least 800 units. As can be easily seen, even negative annual incremental reversible benefits can be tolerated in the presence of irreversible benefits.

The difference in the results with and without considering the irreversible benefits effect can be explained in the different treatment of future information. In the first case, the standard benefit-costs-analysis, future negative reversible net-benefits, $\left(NB_1^l < 0\right)$, still enter the valuation. In the second case, the arrival of future information is considered and in the case $\left(NB_1^l < 0\right)$ GM crops will be disadopted and do enter the valuation with zero value.

While in the first case a value of B > 800 would support immediate introduction and support the argument for subsidizing the technology in the second case considering the irreversible benefit effect for the same amount of irreversible benefits a much higher subsidy can be justified.[2]

The simple model presented in the appendix is sufficient for proving the irreversible benefit effects while a number of modifications are possible. This includes considering irreversible costs, uncertainty about irreversible benefits and costs, irreversible benefits and costs of changing from adoption to disadoption of the GM crop, decrease of incremental reversible benefits and more (e.g. Demont et al., 2005; Henessy and Moschini, 2005).

Evidence and Implications of Irreversible Benefits

The empirical evidence for irreversible benefits in the European Union is weak. The studies for Europe only indicate small amounts of irreversible benefits, which can be mainly explained by the low use of insecticides to control the European Corn Borer and the relatively low use of herbicides in sugar beets and corn and ban of a number of harmful pesticides. Demont et al. (2004) calculated irreversible benefits for herbicide tolerant sugar beets to be about 1.60€ per hectare and year while Wesseler et al. (2007) calculated irreversible benefits of about 0.81 to 1.08 € per hectare for Bt

[2] A cautious note is warranted for not getting misunderstood about the subsidy argument. The subsidy argument relates to supporting the introduction of GM crops through providing the appropriate infrastructure such as a seed distribution system. At farm level the technology has to pay to provide sufficient incentives for farmers using the technology.

corn and 1.69 to 2.62 € per hectare for herbicide tolerant crops in selected EU member states.

Vittorio Santaniello was more concerned about the irreversible benefits the introduction of GM crops will generate for developing countries in particular by the positive effect on malnourishment and farmers' health (Santaniello 2002, 2005). Malnourishment of young children for more than two years can result in stunted growth negatively affecting future mental capabilities. This effect is irreversible and can even be passed down to the next generation. Reducing malnourishment can amount to a considerable irreversible benefit effect acknowledging at least 400 million and more likely 600 million undernourished people in the world around 2015 (FAO, 2004). The "*Santaniello* Theorem of Irreversible Benefits" indicates that perhaps much more can be gained by the introduction of GM crops in developing countries than reported by most current studies.

Another example is the control of "black Sigatoka" in bananas in places where they are a staple crop such as Uganda. Concerns about the irreversible costs of introducing GM banana cost the economy of Uganda range from about 180 to 365 million USD a year (Kikulwe et al., 2008). The results presented by Kikulwe et al. (2009) show the delayed introduction in particular harms less wealthier households in rural areas as they express the highest willingness-to-pay for the technology.

Research on HIV/AIDS in Africa shows the number and quantity of crops grown in the home garden increases among HIV/AIDS affected households (Gebreselassie, 2009). This opens-up the possibility for HIV/AIDS mitigation through improved nutritional value via biofortification of home garden crops. Irreversible health benefits can be gained by Bt-corn with lower levels of mycotoxins (Wu, 2006). The research on pesticide use in Bt cotton (Kuosmanen et al., 2006; Huang et al., 2002; Pray et al., 2001) and insect-resistant rice in China (Huang et al., 2005, 2007) show a huge decrease in pesticide use. The pesticide use among Bt cotton farmers decreased by about 58% as reported by Huang et al. (2002) and among rice farmers by about 80% as reported by Huang et al. (2005).

While the assessment of productivity and health affects of GM crops is more complex than illustrated by the numbers being presented (Scatasta and Wesseler, 2004; Waibel et al., 2003) the positive irreversible health effects can hardly be denied.

Skepticism Towards Considering Irreversibilities

Many colleagues have been skeptical about using a real option approach for analyzing the irreversible benefits and costs of GM crops. The standard criticisms are "there are no irreversible costs", the approach is "complicated" and "uses many assumptions".

The “there are no irreversible costs” argument misses the point that more than half of the population all over the world shows reservations towards the technology, because of subjectively perceived irreversibilities. Ignoring those concerns does not help to increase trust in the economic analysis of costs and benefits of the technology.

In particular in the European Union concerns about irreversible environmental effects of GM crops have been put forward as an argument for postponing the introduction (Commission of the European Communities, 1999). Actually, if there were no concerns about irreversible effects, there would nothing be against an immediate introduction. This holds even under uncertainty, as benefits and costs are supposed to be reversible and if the future turns out to be not as favorable as expected growing of the GM crop could be stopped without any additional costs after. As Paarlberg (2008) in his seminal contribution has shown those concerns are also important for decision makers in Africa.

Research explicitly considering potential irreversible costs (Demont et al., 2004; Scatasta et al., 2006; Wesseler et al., 2007) actually casts doubts about irreversible costs as being sufficiently large to postpone immediate introduction of herbicide tolerant sugar beets, herbicide tolerant corn, and Bt-corn in the EU. The result of the case study from Portugal (Skevas et al., this journal) actually indicates the reversible incremental benefits for Portugal being even larger than predicted in Wesseler et al. (2007).

The “complicated” argument reflects a misunderstanding about the approach being used. The different specifications of real option models almost all try to investigate the value of a technology under uncertainty. The irreversibility effect often enters the analysis very much in a standard fashion by calculating the value of a call option with an uncertain underlying asset, the GM crop. The valuation of the GM crop is complicated and by this the real option value. But the value of the GM crops will be needed whether or not the real option value or a different valuationapproach will be used.

The same holds for the widely shared view the real option approach “uses many assumptions”. This view misses the point that having made one assumption is not having made a different one. By this, rejecting an approach by the number of assumptions is an empty argument. The more relevant question is whether or not the assumptions being made are reasonable. Space does not allow to discuss this in detail and I refer the interested reader to the book by Shreve (2005) discussing all the details of the approach. At least, the assumptions and the approach in general seems to be convincing to many economists. The “founding fathers” have been awarded with the Noble prize in economics for the call option pricing formula (Robert C. Merton and Myron S. Scholes in 1997) and for pricing assets under uncertainty (Harry M. Markowitz, Merton H. Miller, William F. Sharpe in 1990) as well as the AERE

Publications of Enduring Quality Award for decision making under uncertainty and irreversibility (Kenneth Arrow and Anthony C. Fisher in 1995).

Concluding

Vittorio Santaniello has been one of the few colleagues I met who immediately understood the relevance and implications of irreversible benefits and costs within the debate about the economics and politics of GM crops. By stressing the irreversible benefits Vittorio Santaniello has always reminded us and in particular those concerned about the technology, those irreversible benefits and costs are the two sides of the same coin.

The ICABR meetings have always been a place where different scholars have presented work including irreversibilities including, just to name a few Volker Beckmann, Matty Demont, Joze Falck-Zepeda, Richard Gray, Enoch Kikulwe, Odin Knutsen, Pasquale Scandizzo, Sara Scatasta, Claudio Soregaroli, Robert D. Weaver, David Zilberman and myself. The presentations always have resulted in a lively debate. By this, Vittorio Santaniello has contributed another irreversible benefit.

References:

Arrow, K. and A. Fisher (1974): Environmental preservation, uncertainty, and irreversibility. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 88: 312-319.

Black, F. and M. Scholes (1973): The Pricing of Options and Corporate Liabilities. *Journal of Political Economy* 81(3) 125-146.

Commission of the European Communities (1999): *2194th Council meeting – ENVIRONMENT – Luxembourg, 24/25 June*. C/99/203.

Demont, Matty, Justus Wesseler, Erik Tollens (2005): Irreversible costs and benefits of transgenic crops: what are they? In J. Wesseler (ed.): *Environmental Costs and Benefits of Transgenic Crops*, 113-122. Wageningen UR Frontis Series Vol. 7, Springer, Dordrecht.

Demont, M., J. Wesseler, and E. Tollens (2004): Biodiversity versus transgenic sugar beets – the one Euro question. *European Review of Agricultural Economics* 31(1):1-18.

Dixit, A. K. and Pindyck, R. S. (1994): *Investment under Uncertainty.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Gebreselassie, Kidist (2009): HIV/AIDS, Labor Organization and Agrobiodiversity. PhD-Thesis, Wageningen University.

Henry, C. (1974). Investment decision under uncertainty: the irreversibility effect. *American Economic Review* 64: 1006-1012.

Huang, Jikun, Ruifa Hu, Scott Rozelle, Carl Pray (2008): Genetically Modified Rice, Yields, and Pesticides: Assessing Farm-Level Productivity Effects in China. *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 241-263.

Huang, Jikun, Ruifa Hu, Scott Rozelle, Carl Pray (2005): Insect-Resistant GM Rice in Farmers' Fields: Assessing Productivity and Health Effects in China. Science 308 (29 April):688-690.

Huang, Jikun, Ruifa Hu, Scott Rozelle, Fangbin Qiao, Carl Pray (2002): Transgenic varieties and productivity of smallholder cotton farmers in China. Australian *Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics* 46(3):367-387.

Kikulwe, E., E. Birol, J. Falck-Zepeda, and J. Wesseler. *Forthcoming (2009)*. Rural consumers' preferences for banana attributes in Uganda: Is there a market for GM staples? In J.W. Bennett and E. Birol, eds. *Choice experiments in developing countries: Implementation, challenges and Implications,* Cheltenham: Edward-Elgar Publishing, UK.

Kikulwe, E., J. Wesseler, J. Falck-Zepeda (2008): GM Banana in Uganda: Social Benefits, Costs, and Consumer Perceptions. *EPTD Discussion Paper 00767*. Washington, DC: IFPRI.

Knudson, Odin and Pasquale L. Scandizzo (2000): Uncertainty and the economics of patents for biotechnology. Paper presented at the 4th International Consortium on Agricultural Biotechnology Research (ICABR) Conference: Economics of Agricultural Biotechnology, Ravello, Italy, August.

Knudson, Odin and Pasquale L. Scandizzo (2001): Evaluating biotechnology: The precautionary principle and the social standard. Paper presented at the 5th International Consortium on Agricultural Biotechnology Research (ICABR) Conference: Biotechnology, Science and Modern Agriculture: a New Industry at the Dawn of the Century, Ravello, Italy, June.

Knudson, Odin and Pasquale L. Scandizzo (2002): Environmental liability and research and development in biotechnology: A real options approach. Paper presented at the 6th International Consortium on Agricultural Biotechnology Research (ICABR) Conference: Agricultural Biotechnology: New Avenues for Production, Consumption and Technology Transfer, Ravello, Italy, July.

Knudson, Odin and Pasquale L. Scandizzo (2006): Biotechnology Risks and Project Interdependence. In R.E. Evenson and V. Santaniello (eds.) *International Trade and Policies for Genetically Modified Products*, pp. 1-11. Wallingford: CABI.

Kuosmanen, Timo, Diemuth Pemsl, and Justus Wesseler (2006): Specification and Estimation of Production Functions Involving Damage Control Inputs: A Two-Stage, Semi-Parametric Approach. American Journal of Agricultural Economic 88(2): 499-511.

McDonald R. and D. Siegel (1986): The Value of Waiting to Invest. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 101(4):707-728.

Merton, R. C. (1973): Theory of Rational Option Pricing. *Bell Journal of Economics and Management Science* 4: 141-183.

Merton, R. C. (1998). Application of option pricing theory: twenty-five years later. *American Economic Review*, 88: 323-349.

Morel, Benoit, R. Scott Farrow, Felicia Wu, and Elizabeth Casman (2003): Pesticide Resistance, the precautionary Principle, and the Regulation of BT Corn: Real

Option and Rational Option Approaches to Decision Making. In R. Laxminarayan (ed.) *Battling Resistance to Antibiotics. An Economic Approach*, 184-213. Washington, D.C.: Resources for the Future.

Myers, S. C. (1977): Determinants of Corporate Borrowing. *Journal of Financial Economics* 5: 147-175.

Paarlber, Robert (2008): Starved for Science. How Biotechnology Is Being Kept Out of Africa. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Pray, Carl, Pasquale L. Scandizzo, and David Zilberman (2009):

Pray, Carl, Danmeng Ma, Jikun Huang, Fangbin Qiao (2001): Impact of Bt Cotton in China. World Development 29(5):813-825.

Santaniello, Vittorio (2005): Agricultural biotechnology: implications for food security. Agricultural Economics 189-197.

Scatasta Sara and Justus Wesseler (2004): A Critical Assessment of Methods for Analysis of Environmental and Economic Cost and Benefits of Genetically Modified Crops in a Survey of Existing Literature. Paper presented at the 8th International Consortium on Agricultural Biotechnology Research (ICABR) Conference: Agricultural Biotechnology – International Trade and Domestic Production, Ravello, Italy, July.

Skevas, Theodoros, Pedro Fevereiro, and Justus Wesseler (2009): Benefits and Costs of Coexistence Regulations in Portugal. *AgBioForum* (forthcoming)

Shreve, S. (2005): *Stochastic Calculus for Finance I: The Binomial Asset Pricing Model*. Berlin: Springer.

Soregaroli, Claudio and Justus Wesseler (2005): Minimum distance requirements and liability: implications for coexistence. In J. Wesseler (ed.): *Environmental Costs and Benefits of Transgenic Crops*, 165-182. Wageningen UR Frontis Series Vol. 7, Springer, Dordrecht.

Trigeorgis, L. (1995): *Real Options*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Waibel, Hermann, Jan C. Zadoks, and Gerd Fleischer (2003): What Can We Learn from the Economics of Pesticides. In R. Laxminarayan (ed.) *Battling Resistance to Antibiotics. An Economic Approach*, 137-157. Washington, D.C.: Resources for the Future.

Weaver, Robert, Justus Wesseler (2006): Restricted Monopoly R&D Pricing: uncertainty, irreversibility and non-market effects. In R.E. Evenson and V. Santaniello (eds.) *International Trade and Policies for Genetically Modified Products*, pp. 12-21. Wallingford: CABI.

Weaver, Robert D. and Justus Wesseler (2004): Monopolistic pricing power for transgenic crops when technology adopters face irreversible benefits and costs. *Applied Economics Letters* 11(15):969-973.

Wesseler, J., S. Scatasta, E. Nillesen (2007): The Maximum Incremental Social Tolerable Irreversible Costs (MISTICs) and other Benefits and Costs of Introducing Transgenic Maize in the EU-15. *Pedobiologia* 51(3):261-269.

Wu, F. (2008): Mycotoxin reduction in Bt corn: potential economic, health, and regulatory impacts. *Transgenic Research* 15:277-289.

Appendix

Proof: For proofing the theorem consider a two period model with t_0 indicating the present and $t_{1,\dots,\infty}$ indicating the future, one and more years from now. The annual incremental reversible net-benefits of introducing a new GM crop will be denoted by NB_t. NB_0 is known but $NB_{t>0}$ is uncertain. For simplifying the proof uncertainty will be fully resolved at an infinitesimal time step before t_1. At t_1 NB_1 can reach two states of nature, either NB_0 has changed with probability q to NB_1^h or with probability (1-q) to NB_1^l. For avoiding triviality assume $NB_1^l < 0$. The appropriate discount rate will be denoted by r. The objective of the decision maker is to maximize the total benefit of introducing the GM crop.

The strategy is to first develop the decision criterion ignoring the irreversibility effect of irreversible benefits and than to compare the result with the one including the effect.

The total incremental reversible net-benefits of introducing the new GM crop at farm level will be

$$NB_0 + q\frac{NB_1^h}{r} + (1-q)\frac{NB_1^l}{r}$$

and by considering external constant irreversible benefits B immediate introduction would be justified if

$$B + NB_0 + q\frac{NB_1^h}{r} + (1-q)\frac{NB_1^l}{r} > 0 \tag{1}$$

or the decision will be choosing

$$\max\left\{B + NB_0 + q\frac{NB_1^h}{r} + (1-q)\frac{NB_1^l}{r}, 0\right\} \tag{2}$$

Here, we can already observe, irreversible benefits do have a positive affect and increase the likelihood of introduction in comparison to the situation where they are not present. But what is also obvious, they have the same affect as an increase in NB_0.

The value of introducing the new GM crop one year from now considering using additional information, assuming $\left(B + NB_1^l + \frac{NB_1^l}{r}\right) < 0$, again to avoid triviality, and considering that growing the GM crop is reversible:

$$\max\left\{q\left(B+NB_1^h+\frac{NB_1^h}{r}\right),0\right\} \text{ at } t=1. \tag{3}$$

From this directly follows the value of introducing the GM crop immediately considering the arrival of future information with $NB_0 > 0$:

$$\max\left\{B+NB_0+q\frac{NB_1^h}{r},0\right\} \tag{4}$$

Comparing equation 2 and equation 4 we immediately observe for $NB_1^l < 0$:

$$q\frac{NB_1^h}{r} > q\frac{NB_1^h}{r}+\left(1-q\right)\frac{NB_1^l}{r} \blacksquare \tag{5}$$

The "*Santaniello* Theorem of Irreversible Benefits" implies an irreversibility effect in a two states two times model of $\left(1-q\right)\frac{NB_1^l}{r}$. By this factor necessary irreversible benefits can be smaller in comparison to an approach that does not consider the arrival of future information. Following standard dynamic optimization procedures moving from discrete time to continuous time and assuming future incremental reversible benefits following a binomial distribution converging to continuous state under infinity provides the following result for irreversible benefits:

$$B^* = \frac{NB_0/\rho}{\dfrac{\beta_1}{\beta 1-1}}, \quad \text{with } \beta_1 = \frac{1}{2}-\frac{r-\delta}{\sigma^2}\sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{r-\delta}{\sigma^2}\right)^2+\frac{2r}{\sigma^2}}$$

assuming appropriate boundary conditions, where β_l is the solution of a second order homogeneous equation, δ the convenience yield and σ the variance rate of a geometric Brownian motion. For the details see, e,g., Dixit and Pindyck (1994) or McDonald and Siegel (1986).