



**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](mailto: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.*

# Potential Scrub Changes and Its Spatial Allocation under the New Zealand Emission Trading System

*by*

**Wei Zhang**

Motu Economic and Public  
Policy Research, Wellington,  
New Zealand  
Email:  
wei.zhang@motu.org.nz  
TEL: +64 4 9394250

**William Power**

GNS Science, Wellington  
New Zealand  
Email: w.power@gns.cri.nz  
TEL: +64 4 5704681

**Suzi Kerr**

Motu Economic and Public  
Policy Research, Wellington,  
New Zealand  
Email:  
suzi.kerr@motu.org.nz  
TEL: +64 4 9394250

**Contributed Paper prepared for presentation at the International Association  
of Agricultural Economists Conference, Beijing, China, August 16-22, 2009**

*Copyright 2009 by Wei Zhang, William Power and Suzi Kerr. 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.*

## Abstract

Under the New Zealand Emission Trading System (NZETS), post-1989 forestry land (the exotic or indigenous forest land that was not used for plantation on 31 December 1989) in New Zealand is eligible for reward for each tonne of CO<sub>2</sub>-eqv sequestered by reverting from pasture to indigenous scrub. We use the Land Use in Rural New Zealand (LURNZ) model to conduct 2 simulations assuming that one tonne of CO<sub>2</sub>-eqv costs \$25; The reference case is that no one has entered the NZETS, the other scenario is that the whole agriculture sector and indigenous forest (but not plantation) have entered the ETS. Each simulation estimates the amount of land use changes in dairy, sheep-beef and scrub from 2008 to 2015. By comparing these simulations, we identify the current use and the area of land that may revert to indigenous scrub. The results suggest that 224,000 more hectares of post-1989 forestry land will be protected into scrub under NZETS than without the system. After applying a land use allocation algorithm, the most likely reversion may take place on marginal sheep-beef land.

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Background and motivation

Efforts are being exerted globally to curb the green house gas emission. New Zealand has been committed to Kyoto Protocol to reduce its greenhouse gas emissions back to 1990 levels, on average, over the period 2008 to 2012. The NZEST has been developed to ensure meeting the international obligation while maintaining economic sustainability. It provides a flexible way of reducing the carbon footprint of New Zealanders at minimum cost and helps to put New Zealand on the path to a sustainable future (Kerr and Sweet (2008)).

Industry sectors will be introduced into the emissions trading scheme gradually over a period of five years, starting in 2008. The plantation forestry industry will be the first sector entering the NZETS. The emissions trading scheme has

been designed to encourage new planting and better management of forest estate. The New Zealand Units (NZUs) are entitled to post-1989 forest land and owners of pre-1990 forest land in the emissions trading scheme.

The reward to the post-1989 forest land<sup>1</sup> will create incentives for the landowners to revert their land uses that has been developed between 1990 to 2000 back to indigenous forest or scrub, which is a preparation stage for developing forest. The indigenous reversion is seen as an important mitigation option for those who suffer continuous profit loss in their current land uses.

The question is that for a given price of NZU how much land is likely to enter the NZETS as indigenous reversion and where it will mostly like to occur. We use the first version of Land Use in Rural New Zealand model (LURNZ) (Hendy et al. (2007)) to simulate land use changes with or without NZETS to find out the source and amount of land that will enter NZETS as indigenous reversion from 2008 to 2015. Using the marginal map and ownership map provided by Landcare Research, we identify the geographical locations of the possible reverting land. Finally, we allocate the amount of reverting land according to their land quality.

## 1.2 Land use theory embedded in LURNZ

We assume that landowners solve a dynamic optimisation problem and choose the land use that brings them the highest net present value of expected utility (Stavins and Jaffe (1990)). Based on this, we assume that landowners care about expected net returns, conversion costs from one use to another, and relative uncertainty. For simplicity, here we discuss the static optimisation problem.

At any point in time, returns per hectare to a particular land use on a farm are given by:

$$R = py - w'x, \tag{1}$$

where  $p$  is the output price,  $y$  is the yield per hectare,  $w$  is a vector of input prices,

---

<sup>1</sup>The definitions of "post-1989 forest land", "pre-1990 forest land" and "New Zealand Units" can be found <http://www.climatechange.govt.nz/glossary.html>

and  $x$  is a vector of input quantities. Landowners choose  $y^*$ , the optimal yield, to maximise their net future returns where  $y^*$  is constrained by the potential yield (or more technically the 'production function').

Potential yield depends on production technologies and the available inputs, which include land. Because land is heterogeneous, potential yield varies across space. The variation is driven by the variation of the natural capital of the land, where natural capital includes a mix of land characteristics such as soil type, climate, topography, altitude, and access to water. The variation in natural capital means it is possible to produce high yields on some pieces of land while no production is possible on others. In general, the better the natural capital of the land the more that can be potentially produced and vice versa.


The optimal yield,  $y^*$ , will be less than or equal to the potential yield. Like potential yield,  $y^*$  will depend on production technologies and the available inputs. But  $y^*$  also depends on input prices  $w$ .  $y^*$  and  $x^*$  will be jointly determined. The cost of production is then  $c = w'x^*$  and net returns are  $R = py^* - w'x^*$ .

Optimal yields and costs are jointly determined by the mix of natural capital and socioeconomic characteristics, which we refer to jointly as 'land quality'. The socio-economic characteristics of land include availability of local infrastructure, services, and information/support networks. For a given yield, the better the land quality, the lower the costs. The better is the quality of land and the lower are the costs, the higher is the yield chosen.

Thus spatial variation in land quality also drives spatial variation in optimal returns. Figure 1 illustrates the hypothesised heuristic relationship between optimal returns and land quality along one-dimension, land quality. The real relationships are multi-dimensional. The y-axis indicates the expected return to the landowner from each hectare of land. The x-axis represents land quality, moving from the 'best' land on the left, to the 'worst' land on the right. Each curve represents the optimal return on land of that land quality from one particular use. According to our model, the landowner will choose the land use that will give

the highest return. At the point where each curve intersects we can drop a line to the horizontal axis to indicate the transition point from one land use to another in terms of land quality.

**Figure 1: Economic returns and land use**




For example, point A in Figure 1 indicates a transition point between dairy and sheep-beef farms. On a land parcel of this land quality the returns to dairy and sheep-beef would be the same, so a farmer on this type of land would be indifferent between dairy and sheep/beef. Slightly to the left of point A, the land quality is better, the returns to dairy would be higher than the returns to sheep/beef, and so a farmer would choose dairying as the optimal land use. Slightly to the right, the land quality is worse and sheep-beef would give the highest returns. Point B illustrates another transition point, this time between sheep-beef and forestry.

If prices, production technologies, or costs change, the optimal returns functions will change. The points of intersection between the different curves will shift, and the optimal land use will change for land parcels that are near transition points.

Marginal land parcels are parcels that lie close to the transition points. Figure 2 illustrates the effect of a reduction in the output price for sheep-beef farming on the potential returns curves shown in Figure 1. The transition between sheep-beef

and forestry, which previously occurred on land with quality at point B, would shift to the left. Now forestry would be the optimal choice on the better land of quality between point B and point B'. Marginal land lies between these points.

**Figure 2: Economic returns and land use**



Similarly, the transition between sheep-beef and dairy, which previously occurred on the land quality at point A, would shift to the right to point A'. Now, dairy would be the optimal choice on the lower quality land between point A and point A'. The transition points between optimal land uses will alter in terms of land quality. The optimal use of marginal land will change.

## 2 Methodology

### 2.1 Simulation in LURNZ

LURNZ, developed by Motu, is a dynamic partial equilibrium model that predicts land-use changes based on a micro-economic theoretical model where landowners choose land use to maximise future expected utility to their land (Hendy et al. (2007)). For each land use—dairy, sheep-beef, plantation forest and scrub, the coefficients of response to prices and interest rates were estimated econometrically

from historical data (Kerr et al. (2007)), of which the functional form is

$$s_i = \alpha_i + \beta_i OL + \sum_j \gamma_{ij} \ln(p_j) + \delta_{1i} r + \delta_{2i} Year, \quad (2)$$

where, for each of the four land uses,  $i$ , we assume that the share of rural land in use  $i$ ,  $s_i$ , depends linearly on a constant, the share of 1974 rural land not used for the four major land uses,  $OL$  (to account for changes in total rural land) the output prices for each of the major land uses (milk solids from dairy land, a weighted average of lamb, mutton, wool and beef price and log prices),  $p_j$ , and the nominal interest rate  $r$ . Kerr and Hendy (2004) documents details of the estimation of (2).

As scrub does not produce any valuable commodity, (2) omits the "scrub price" from the model. However, if NZETS starts to reward scrub owners for the amount of carbon sequestered, there will be a price for scrub land and the price may cause land-use changes. As there has never been a scrub price historically, the relationships between the shrub price and the other three land uses have to be modelled non-econometrically.

We modelled a reward for scrub by assuming that the dairy, sheep-beef and plantation land will respond to a price on scrub in the same way that scrub responds to a change in the return to these land uses. As the dairy industry has been highly profitable in the past 10 years (MAF (2007)), we assume that dairy land will not respond to a reward for scrub. In addition, we believe that under NZETS, no plantation forest will revert to scrub<sup>2</sup>. Therefore, we constrain the response of dairy land and plantation forest to scrub price to be zero. For sheep-beef land, we model the change in response to a reward to scrub in the following way.

$$\Delta s_{\text{scrub}} = \gamma_{ij} \Delta \ln(p_{\text{sheep-beef}}), \quad (3)$$

where  $\Delta s_{\text{scrub}}$  is the change in scrub land share.  $\gamma_{ij}$  is the coefficient in (2) when  $i = \text{scrub}$  and  $j = \text{sheep-beef commodity price}$ .

---

<sup>2</sup>We do not model the response of plantation forestry to rewards for carbon sequestration directly but assume it does not affect the land that is likely to revert to scrub



Given

$$\Delta \ln(x)_{x \rightarrow x + \Delta x} = \ln(x + \Delta x) - \ln(x) \approx \frac{\Delta x}{x} \quad (4)$$

(3) and (4) imply

$$\Delta s_{\text{scrub}} \approx \gamma_{ij} \frac{\Delta p_{\text{sheep-beef}}}{p_{\text{sheep-beef in 2007}}} \quad (5)$$

Assume that the intensity of production is relatively inelastic.

$$\frac{\Delta p_{\text{sheep-beef}}}{p_{\text{sheep-beef in 2007}}} = \frac{\Delta \text{Revenue per ha}_{\text{sheep-beef}}}{\text{Revenue per ha in 2007}_{\text{sheep-beef}}} \quad (6)$$

By assuming that the sheep-beef land will respond to a price on scrub in the same way that scrub responds to a change in the price of sheep-beef land (Slutsky symmetry), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta s_{\text{sheep-beef}} &\approx \gamma_{ij} \frac{\Delta \text{Revenue per ha}_{\text{scrub}}}{\text{Revenue per ha in 2007}_{\text{sheep-beef}}} \\ &\approx \frac{\gamma_{ij}}{\text{Revenue per ha in 2007}_{\text{sheep-beef}}} \Delta \text{Revenue per ha}_{\text{scrub}} \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

A constraint on total land area in New Zealand combined with (7) implies:

$$s_{\text{scrub}} \approx \frac{\gamma_{ij}}{\text{Revenue per ha in 2007}_{\text{sheep-beef}}} \text{Revenue per ha}_{\text{scrub}} \quad (8)$$

The last coefficient—the sheep-beef land's response to scrub price (per ha) is estimated by

$$\frac{\gamma_{ij}}{\text{Revenue per ha in 2007}_{\text{sheep-beef}}}, \quad (9)$$

where the revenue per hectare for sheep-beef land is calculated from the farm data provided by Meat and Wool Ltd; the national average of revenue per hectare is \$71 in 2007.

The coefficients are shown in Table 1, where the last row is calculated as described above.

For the scrub price, we assume that landowners receive value equivalent to three tonnes of New Zealand units per year per ha. This smoothes out their cash-

**Table 1: Coefficient values for the long-term model (2)**

	Dairy	Sheep-beef	Plantation	Scrub
$OL$	-0.08578	-0.44417	-0.02788	-0.44216
$\ln(\text{Price}_{\text{dairy}})$	0.01988	-0.01567	0.00684	-0.01105
$\ln(\text{Price}_{\text{sheep-beef}})$	-0.00079	0.01951	-0.00166	-0.01706
$\ln(\text{Price}_{\text{plantation}})$	0.00000	0.04229	0.00252	-0.04481
Interest rate	-0.00124	0.00123	-0.00034	0.00035
Year	0.00172	-0.00238	0.00324	-0.00257
Constant	-0.03336	0.26217	-0.02048	0.79167
$\ln(\text{Price}_{\text{scrub}})$	0	-0.00024	0	0.00024

flow even though actual carbon sequestration rates vary considerably across the years. This could correspond either to the government offering a stable flow of credits or to a private calculation by a landowner without a credit constraint. This figure takes into account several factors:

- A carbon sequestration yield curve from Landcare Research<sup>3</sup> combined with a sigmoidal evolution of forest cover. We assumed that it takes 10 years to reach canopy cover (see Hendy and Kerr (2005))
- The likely upward bias of this yield curve if used as a national average curve given that it was developed based on East Cape mānuka/kānuka forest

We used LURNZ to do two simulations. The first simulation (reference case) simulates land use changes in absence of NZETS. In the second simulation, we assume that government solely rewards for scrub reversions under NZETS. The result from these two simulations give us net changes in all land uses and separates response to NZETS from the reference case.

## 2.2 Spatially allocating land use change in response to NZETS

This section will explain how to identify the geographical location of the sheep-beef lands that can be rewarded. These are defined by:

- Sheep beef land

<sup>3</sup>[www.landcareresearch.co.nz/research/globalchange/carbon\\_calc/carboncalc.aspx](http://www.landcareresearch.co.nz/research/globalchange/carbon_calc/carboncalc.aspx)

- Capable of regenerating to forest (as defined by Kyoto)
- On marginal erosion-prone lands
- Privately owned so land use decisions can be made

Because sheep beef land has steadily contracted since 1990, we assume that all current sheep beef land was not forested in 1990 and hence is eligible for Kyoto rewards. Landcare Research (Shepherd et al. (2009)) has provided two GIS maps. One map shows the geographical location of marginal erosion-prone land that could potentially regenerate. The second map shows the ownership of New Zealand land. We overlap the two maps provided by Landcare research with a map identifying sheep-beef land.

Our spatial allocation rule to select land within this subset (private marginal sheep beef land that can revert) is based purely on an assumption that farmers will retire their least productive land. We are unable to predict the idiosyncratic characteristics of individual landowners that will lead some to retire land that is not of such bad quality either because they find native bush attractive and believe it will add to the value of their property, or because they are personally committed to environmental goals. These factors could lead to more, smaller patches of regeneration on the poor land within more highly productive areas - even potentially within dairy farms where farmers may also need to create riparian boundaries for water quality reasons. Because we use a 25 ha grid we assume that the regeneration occurs on a reasonable scale so do not worry about the transaction costs associated with claiming a reward.

### **3 Data**

We have used the first version of LURNZ model to simulate land use changes. The source data for the model is documented in Hendy et al. (2007).

We need several GIS maps to identify the geographical location of the new scrub. These maps are raster maps with 25 ha pixels.

We use Agribase-Enhanced-LCDB2 map to identify the location of sheep-beef land in New Zealand. The marginal land map and ownership map provided by Landcare Research gives the information of where the marginal grassland is and who owns them. The land quality map, which derived by first nest sorting the Land Use Capability map (LUC) and then the Pastoral productivity map, ranks each pixel of land by its quality. The details of all GIS maps information are documented in the Appendix.

## 4 Results

### 4.1 Land use changes simulated from LURNZ

**Table 2: Land use change under 2 scenarios**

Land use	Scenario	Land area <sup>(000ha)</sup>		Change in area	
		2008	2015	%	000 ha
<b>Dairy</b>	S I	1462	1646	13	184
	S II	1462	1646	13	184
<b>Sheep-beef</b>	S I	6878	6654	-3	-223
	S II	6878	6431	-6	-447
<b>Scrub</b>	S I	1188	901	-24	-287
	S II	1188	1125	-5	-63

Table 4.1 summarizes the results from the two simulations (with and without NZETS). Both scrub and sheep-beef land areas are predicted to fall in the reference case. The NZETS exacerbates the decline in sheep/beef and reduces the decline in scrub.

Our results suggest a substantial increase in scrub relative to the reference case. The reference case predicts a net loss of around 223,000 ha of scrub. Applying the NZETS policy almost reverses that net effect. Because the scrub land that is lost in the reference case is most likely to be converting to plantation forestry, these losses are unaffected by the NZETS scenario. The response to the scrub policy must involve new scrub on land that is currently sheep-beef (and is hence

likely to be eligible for the NZETS). Around 224,000 ha of sheep/beef land is predicted to reverse to scrub between 2007 and 2015.


## **4.2 Identifying geographical location of new scrub**

Once we had an estimate of the likely area of regeneration in response to the scrub reward we explored where this would be likely to occur. We used the Agribase-Enhanced-LCDB2 map to create a map of land use, which includes the sheep-beef. We then used the two maps created by Landcare Research - ownership and areas of potential change from marginal grass land that is eligible for reward and likely to revert to forest - to identify potential locations for new scrub in response to the NZETS. These are private sheep/beef farms with eligible land that can potentially revert to gorse, indigenous broadleaved shrubland and other indigenous.

We then ranked each 25-ha pixel of land in these categories from best to worst land using a nested-sort where land is first sorted by Land Use Capability class and then, within each class, by the value of a pasture productivity variable (Baisden (2006)). Figure 3 shows the areas that are most likely to revert in blue.

The spatial allocation rule we used is based purely on an assumption that farmers will retire their least productive land. Because we used a 25 ha grid we already assume that the regeneration occurs on a reasonable scale. This reduces the likelihood that transaction costs would make it necessary to have several patches of regeneration on the same property. We are unable to predict the idiosyncratic characteristics of individual landowners that will lead some to retire land that is not of such bad quality either because they find native bush attractive and believe it will add to the value of their property, or because they are personally committed to environmental goals. These factors could lead to more, smaller patches of regeneration on the poor land within more highly productive areas - even potentially within dairy farms where farmers may also need to create riparian boundaries for water quality reasons.

**Figure 3: Mapping scrub reversion**



Our predictions suggest that the introduction of NZETS may result in 224,000 ha of scrub reversion. Public land is not expected to respond to NZETS directly. Unless transaction costs are low, and there are acceptable ways of minimising risks (e.g. loss of carbon stock) and maintaining options for future land use change, we may be overpredicting responsiveness to change in these areas, at least in the short term.

### 4.3 Caveats

There are several reasons to interpret these results with caution. First, we need to assume symmetry between the response of sheep-beef land to a scrub price (reward to regeneration) and scrub to a sheep-beef price. While this is plausible, we have no evidence of actual responses to rewards for regeneration on any scale.

Second, the results are estimated from historical relationships between land

use and prices. This assumes that farmers will interpret a regulatory reward in the same way that they respond to a change in a market price. If the reward has different risk characteristics or if it involves transaction costs, responses may well differ. Case study research suggests that some Māori land owners may find it difficult to coordinate to make a decision to allow regeneration, in part because of concerns about future liability and being 'locked in' to a given land use. Other farmers are also concerned about loss of options particularly when the long-term returns to native regeneration seem highly uncertain. Indigenous reversion may also be seen as more attractive than plantation forestry when landowners cannot afford the capital outlay associated with new plantations.

Third, historically, at a national level both scrub and sheep-beef land has been in fairly steady decline. This means we have estimated our responses over a period where scrub has been declining and have applied those results to simulate an increase in scrub. It is not clear that the factors that cause a decline in scrub are completely symmetrical with those that cause increase.

All three reasons suggest that the level of response may be lower than simulated. We do not simulate the effects of a \$50 carbon charge because we believe this is too far outside the sampling range of the model we used here to make those results robust.

## References

- Baisden, T. (2006). Agricultural and forest productivity for modelling policy scenarios: Evaluating approaches for new zealand greenhouse gas mitigation. *Journal of the Royal Society of New Zealand*, 36:1–25.
- Froude, V. (1999). Review of national databases relating to land, water and biodiversity. Webpage report Ref. TR89, Ministry for the Environment, New Zealand, <http://www.mfe.govt.nz/publications/ser/metadata/land-rep/index.html>.
- Hendy, J. and Kerr, S. (2005). Greenhouse gas emission factor module: Land use in rural new zealand - climate version 1. Working Paper 05-10, Motu Economic and Public Policy Research, New Zealand.
- Hendy, J., Kerr, S., and Baisden, T. (2007). The land use in rural new zealand model version 1 (LURNZv1): Model description. Working Paper 07-07, Motu Economic and Public Policy Research, New Zealand.
- Kerr, S. and Hendy, J. (2004). Drivers of rural land use in new zealand: Estimates from national data. Draft working paper, Motu Economic and Public Policy Research, New Zealand.
- Kerr, S., Hendy, J., Lock, K., and Liang, Y. (2007). Estimating the drivers of regional rural land use change in new zealand. Draft working paper, Motu Economic and Public Policy Research, New Zealand.
- Kerr, S. and Sweet, A. (2008). Inclusion of agriculture and forestry in a domestic emissions trading scheme: New zealand's experience to date. Working Paper 08-04, Motu Economic and Public Policy Research, New Zealand.
- Leathwick, J., Morgan, F., Wilson, G., Rutledge, D., McLeod, M., and Johnston, K. (2002). Land environments of new zealand: a technical guide. Technical report, Ministry for the Environment and Landcare Research, New Zealand.



- MAF (2007). Pastoral monitoring report 2007. Report, Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, New Zealand, <http://www.maf.govt.nz/mafnet/rural-nz/statistics-and-forecasts/farm-monitoring/2007/pastoral/full-report.pdf>.
- Shepherd, J. D., Sutherland, A. M., Payton, I., Kerr, S., Zhang, W., and Power, W. (2009). Nature and scale of eligible post-1989 non-planted forests. Contract Report LC0809/033, Landcare Research, New Zealand.
- Stavins, R. N. and Jaffe, A. B. (1990). Unintended impacts of public investments on private decisions: The depletion of forested wetlands. *American Economic Review*, 83:337–352.
- Waikato, E. (2006). Managing land and soil. On-line material, Environment Waikato, New Zealand, <http://www.ew.govt.nz/enviroinfo/land/management/index.htm>.

# Appendix

## Agribase-Enhanced-LCDB2 map

Agribase is a national spatial farm database. It was originally developed by MAF Quality Management (now AgriQuality New Zealand Ltd) to provide core information to be used during major animal health emergencies such as a foot-and-mouth disease (FMD) epidemic. Development of the system began in late 1988 and national data capture began in earnest in 1993.

In Agribase, farms are the primary objects. Farms are the management units that utilise New Zealand's rural land on a day-to-day basis (irrespective of who owns or indeed pays rates on the land). Each farm has a unique farm identifier (the `farm_id`) and the types of information stored include:

- Name and address (contact details) of the key personnel on the farm
- Homestead and gate locations as GPS coordinates
- Dominant farm type
- Total farm size
- Animal numbers by livestock class
- Planted areas of crops/orchards /vineyards (including exotic and native forests)

The New Zealand Land Cover Database (LCDB) is a Crown database that translates satellite images of New Zealand into information on the different types of land cover that exist on the ground. This information can be used, over time, to monitor and report on the changes to the state of our environment and provide the basis for better resource management decisions, more efficient use of natural resources and improved environmental management.

However, for many of the land cover classes, only broad inferences on possible land use can be made. These include the extensive grass and tussock covered

areas of New Zealand, and the other horticultural classes. There simply was not enough spatial resolution in the imagery to derive actual land use. It therefore requires access to additional data sources to provide information on the true land use within these class polygons. The AgriBase enhanced LCDB2 map has utilized AgriBase, a land-based register of farms and orchards owned and maintained by AgriQuality Limited, to embed real land use information within the LCDB2 map.

The enhanced LCDB2 map enables distinguishing the 4 types of land uses LURNZ - dairy, sheep-beef, plantation and scrub. As the potential new scrub is assumed to come from sheep-beef land, the map helps to identify the geographical location of those land areas. The categories named "BEF", "SHP" and "SNB" (beef farm, sheep farm and sheep-beef mixed farm) in the AgriBase enhanced LCDB2 map database are classified as sheep-beef land in 2002.

### **Marginal land map and ownership map**

The marginal land map is provided by Landcare Research Ltd as a GIS shape file. This map contains information on the geographical location for marginal grasslands that are able to revert to gorse, indigenous broadleaved scrub and other indigenous vegetation types.

Ownership map is also provided by Landcare Research Ltd as a GIS shape file. This map contains land ownership information across New Zealand

### **Land use capacity map**

Landcare Research developed a GIS database that classifies land based on its limitations for productive use measured by climate and geology. This classification, referred to as Land Use Capability (LUC), gives an indication of what uses the land is capable of supporting in the long term.

To make the classification, areas of land that are essentially homogeneous in rock type, soil unit, and slope were identified; these areas were defined as homogeneous polygons. Experts then intuitively assessed each polygon in the database

using aerial photographs, existing information (e.g. soil information) and additional fieldwork Froude (1999). They based their assessment on physical characteristics, which, in addition to rock type, soil type, slope group, included erosion, vegetation, and climate information, past land-use effects, and the potential for erosion.

Each polygon was classified on a discrete scale from 1 to 8, with class 1 land being the best for sustained agricultural production and class 8 being land with severely limited uses (Froude (1999)). Classes 1 to 4 are suitable for cultivation. Classes 5 to 7 are not suitable for cultivation, but may be better suited to farming or forestry. Class 8 is not suitable for any productive use (Waikato (2006)).

The database consists of about 100,000 polygons, with the minimum polygon resolution equal to 25 hectares and average polygon size approximately equal to 300 hectares Leathwick et al. (2002). The database covers the North and South Island and inshore islands, but excludes Stewart Island. The database began in 1973 and new information is added when it comes available (Froude (1999)). We acquired it in May 2003.

The LUC is part of a larger database that has been used primarily by regional councils as a basis for guiding soil management and other related functions (Froude (1999)). A number of councils have also used the LUC as a basis for rules within statutory plans. LUC provides well-tested and widely used information on where dairy, sheep/beef, and plantation forestry, are likely to be feasible and to be best suited.

## **Pastoral productivity map**

Baisden (2006) developed indices designed to estimate the biological productivity of land when used for pastoral and forestry production. He used a 'Storie Index' approach, where indices of co-limiting soil and climate factors are multiplied together to give a productivity index. The Storie Index approach has been actively in use in California for over 60 years and has been a useful tool for determining

rural land values.

Indices that help describe spatial variation in biological productivity already exist in the Land Environments in New Zealand (LENZ) GIS database; an example is the LUC map. However, the average size of a polygon in the LENZ database is approximately equal to 300 hectares and thus the maps of these indices are not detailed enough to describe spatial variation within farms. Baisden's aim was to create indices that give greater spatial detail. He reinterpreted data layers from LENZ, to design productivity indices that give sensible results at 1 ha.

To create the indices, Baisden correlated soil and climate indices with recently updated Storie Index rating tables reported for parts of northern California, using areas that are suitably similar to New Zealand. Each of the underlying indices was measured as a percentage where 100% corresponds to no limitations. The indices were recalibrated against a map of average biological Net Primary Production (NPP) in New Zealand, derived from data from the NASA MODIS sensor averaged over the years 2000 to 2003. The process is described in detail in Baisden (2006).

The final Forestry Storie Index is the product of slope, soil water deficit, and drainage indices. The Agricultural Storie Index is the product of slope, soil moisture deficit, drainage, particle size, and growing-degree-day indices.