



AgEcon SEARCH
RESEARCH IN AGRICULTURAL & APPLIED ECONOMICS

The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library

This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.

Help ensure our sustainability.

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search
<http://ageconsearch.umn.edu>
aesearch@umn.edu

*Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.*

Profitable cropland available in sub-Saharan Africa

Jing Liu^{1*} and Nelson Villoria²

¹ Purdue University

² Kansas State University

*Email: liu207@purdue.edu

*Selected Paper prepared for presentation at the 2016 Agricultural & Applied Economics Association
Annual Meeting, Boston, Massachusetts, July 31-August 2*

Copyright 2016 by Jing Liu and Nelson Villoria. All rights reserved. Readers may make verbatim copies of this document for non-commercial purposes by any means, provided that this copyright notice appears on all such copies.

Profitable Cropland Supply in Africa

Jing Liu¹ and Nelson Villoria²

¹Purdue University, ²Kansas State University

Africa is in lack of profitable land despite its abundance in arable land

- 400 Million ha of arable land in Guinea Savannah
- Less than 10% is cultivated
- Much of the remaining land is not readily usable due to developmental challenges

Disagreement on how much profitable land is available in Africa

- 451 Mha (Alexandratos and Bruinsma, 2012)
- 365 Mha (Deininger and Byerlee, 2011)
- 242-384 Mha (Chamberlin et al., 2014)
- The obstacle to measuring profitability is the unknown site-specific prices and land returns

Research objectives

- Model and empirically test the effect of market access on cultivation decisions at the grid-cell level
- Estimate cropland supply elasticity
- Estimate a cropland supply schedule as a function of market access increase

Theory and method: Grid-based cultivation decisions

- Land is cultivated only if net return is not negative

$$Y_i = f(i, S_i)$$
$$R_i^* = P_i Y_i^* - C_i f_i^* = r(S_i, P_i, C_i)$$

- Land return is a latent variable to be inferred from the probability of observing cultivation

$$Z_i = \begin{cases} 1 & R_i \geq 0 \\ 0 & R_i < 0 \end{cases}$$

$$P_i(Z_i = 1 | A_i, S_i) = \Lambda(\alpha_0 + \alpha_1 A_i + \alpha_2 \log(S_i) + \varepsilon_i)$$

- Prices follow a distance-decay function of market access (Chomitz and Gray, 1996)

$$P_i = \exp(\gamma_0 + \gamma_1 A_i), \gamma_1 > 0$$
$$C_i = \exp(\delta_0 + \delta_1 A_i), \delta_1 < 0$$

- Improved market access is equivalent to improved land profitability

$$dA_i = \frac{d \log(P_i) - d \log(C_i)}{\gamma_1 - \delta_1}, \gamma_1 - \delta_1 > 0.$$


- Marginal effect determines the transition elasticity ϵ_i
e.g. $\epsilon_i = 10$ means +1% market access \Rightarrow +10% cultivation probability

$$\epsilon_i = \frac{\partial \hat{P}_i(Z_i = 1)}{\partial A_i} \times \frac{A_i}{\hat{P}_i(Z_i = 1)}$$


- Updated cultivation status is,

$$\hat{P}_i' = \hat{P}_i \left[1 + \epsilon_i \times \frac{\partial A_i}{A_i} \right]$$

workflow




Finding 1: Remarkable variation in cropland supply elasticity within sub-Saharan Africa




- Transition elasticity =1 indicates +1% in market access increases the probability of observing cultivation by 1%

- Market access is an index [0,100] of traveling time to the nearest central market (sourced from Verburg et al., 2011)

- Market access increases by 100% indicates transportation time is cut by half
- Very inelastic cropland supply in SSA
- In the least developed countries, market access needs substantial improvement to bring new land into cultivation.



Finding 2: Market access needs to increase by more than ten folds to reach the lower bound of previous estimation



- Current Africa has much less profitable land than arable land

- Observed cropland expansion according to FAOSTAT:
 - 20 Mha (2011 vs. 2005)
 - 56 Mha (2010 vs. 1990)

Finding 3: A two-decade TFP growth in Africa can improve food security

- Improved food security in Africa

	E-Afr	S-Afr	C-Afr	W-Afr	RoW
Change in crop price (%)	-55	-44	-67	-71	-11
Change in crop consumption (%)	5.5	5.0	8.0	8.1	1.1
Change in cropland use (Mha)	-1.66	-0.13	-0.44	-0.60	-5.73

- Less cropland conversion and CO₂ emissions

Cropland saving, SSA (Mha)	2.84
Cropland saving, world (Mha)	8.57
Emission reduction, world (GtCO ₂ e)	2.52

- Borlaug hypothesis vs. Jevons' paradox

- TFP growth is land-sparing conditional on the inelastic food demand.

- If food demand is price elastic, the inelastic cropland supply means a smaller cropland expansion.

Data and empirical strategies

- Estimate a spatial Durbin (logit) model to correct for autoregressive errors and alleviate omitted variable bias

$$P(Z = 1 | \mathbf{X}) = \Lambda(\rho \mathbf{W} \mathbf{P} + \mathbf{X} \beta_1 + \mathbf{W} \mathbf{X} \beta_2 + \mu)$$

- Y: a binary based on the fraction of harvested area
- X: market access, land features (precip, irrigation, etc), region dummies, agro-ecological zone dummies

Application: Economic and environmental impacts of TFP growth

- Experiment: Faster crop TFP growth in SSA, 2004-2025
 - Exp1: TFP +18.3% everywhere
 - Exp2: TFP +38.4% in SSA, +18.3% everywhere else

- Impacts of Africa TFP growth = Exp2 - Exp1
- Model: Multi-region, multi-sector CGE model GTAP-AEZ, baseline 2004 world economy

- Use our estimated land supply elasticity to calibrate region-specific land transformation elasticity for SSA: -.077, -.117, -.084, -.062 for South, East, Central and West Africa respectively

Conclusions

- The evolving market access bridges two contradictory views on Africa's cropland expansion: land abundance (Deininger and Byerlee, 2011) and scarcity (Chamberlin et al., 2014).

- Given the current low land supply elasticity in SSA, barring major investments in market access, the broad-based ag-technological progress is unlikely to incentivize major land expansion.

Corresponding author: Jing Liu
liu207@purdue.edu