



**The regional impact of irrigation water pricing in Greece under alternative scenarios of European policy: a multicriteria analysis**

Journal:	<i>Regional Studies</i>
Manuscript ID:	CRES-2005-0072.R3
Manuscript Type:	Main Section
JEL codes:	G13 - Contingent Pricing Futures Pricing < G1 - General Financial Markets < G - Financial Economics, Q2 - Renewable Resources and Conservation Environmental Management < Q - Agricultural and Natural Resource Economics, Q01 - Sustainable Development < Q0 - General < Q - Agricultural and Natural Resource Economics, Q00 - General < Q0 - General < Q - Agricultural and Natural Resource Economics
Keywords:	Irrigated agriculture, Water price scenario analysis, Economic, social and environmental impacts, Multicriteria model

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

# The regional impact of irrigation water pricing in Greece under alternative scenarios of European policy: a multicriteria analysis

## ABSTRACT

This study simulates the impact that various policies based upon the water price have on agricultural production and analyzes the economic, social and environmental implications of alternative irrigation water policies using a multicriteria model. For the purpose of scenario analysis, narratives and quantitative indicator values have been compiled. The results show that the increase of water price causes almost similar impacts with those that were observed in the status quo scenario. The results also stress that water pricing as a single instrument for controlling irrigation water use is not a satisfactory tool for significantly reducing water consumption in agriculture.

**Keywords:** Irrigated agriculture, Water price, Scenario analysis, Multicriteria model, Utility optimization, Economic, social and environmental impacts

**JEL Classifications:** Q0, Q1, Q2, G13

## INTRODUCTION

European irrigated agriculture is very important in terms of area, value of production and employment, especially in certain Mediterranean regions devoted to continental agriculture. The management and use of water and water resources have been the focus of EU water policy since the 1960s. The Water Framework Directive 2000/60/EC (WFD) established a structure of community action in the field of water policy. Several possibilities for water policy have been debated, in particular for the pricing of irrigation water. The discussion is related to the potential savings that might come along with charging additional water fees. This study, elaborated in the context of the European research project "European Irrigated Agriculture under Water Framework Directive-WADI" (BERBEL *et al.*, 2002), contributes to that discussion by simulating the impact that various policies based upon the price of water could have on agricultural production.

1  
2  
3 The analysis of the effects of water pricing on irrigated agriculture and farms behavior ought  
4 to be an important topic of research for European agricultural and environmental economists  
5 (ARRIAZA *et al.*, 2002; BERBEL and GOMEZ-LIMON, 2000; GOMEZ-LIMON *et al.*, 2002;  
6 GOMEZ-LIMON and BERBEL, 1995). Following this observation, this paper aims to analyze the  
7 regional impact of irrigation water pricing under the alternative scenarios of European water policy.  
8 Specifically, the study analyzes the economic, social and environmental implications of alternative  
9 irrigation water policies using a multicriteria model of farmers' behavior under different scenarios.  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17

18 The future agricultural and water scenarios are based on a global and national review of future  
19 scenarios developed by the UK foresight program (BERKHOUT *et al.*, 1998; DTI, 1999, 2002) in  
20 which water policy reflects a mix of governmental and social preference. The scenarios are further  
21 described in terms of the combination of policy instruments, policy style and configuration of actors.  
22 The links between the foresight type scenarios and the scenarios for European agriculture, together  
23 with a brief description of the agricultural policy regime are shown in Table 1.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

31 The methodology, based on Multicriteria Decision Making (MCDM) theory (ROMERO and  
32 REHMAN, 1989; REHMAN and ROMERO, 1993) will be implemented in a real irrigation system,  
33 enabling us to build a model to analyze how the recent CAP reform has influenced the water demand  
34 function and how hypothetical new reforms would affect the irrigation unit studied.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40 Specifically, we used an MCDM model in order to achieve better policy-making procedures  
41 and the simulation of the most realistic decision process. The MCDM model was chosen because of  
42 the variety of criteria taken into account by farmers when they plan their crop plans broadening in this  
43 way the traditional assumption of profit maximization. It also assembles the multifunctionality of  
44 irrigated agriculture involving variables related with economic, social and environmental aspects. The  
45 used MCDM model is actually a utility maximization model with multiple criteria.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

53 The utility MCDM approaches in comparison with other approaches as Linear Programming,  
54 Cost-Benefit analysis etc. can achieve optimum farm resource allocations (land, labor, capital, water  
55 etc.) that imply the simultaneous optimization of several conflicting criteria, such as the maximization  
56 of gross margin, the minimization of risk, the minimization of labor used etc. However, although  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 utility optimization is the core of the analysis in this study, the used MCDM model does not  
4  
5  
6 comply with others schools in MCDA like 'Social MCDM' which include extensive stakeholder  
7  
8 participation and seek compromise solutions.  
9

10 Both SUMPISI *et al.* (1997) and AMADOR *et al.* (1998) have developed methodologies for  
11  
12 the analysis and simulation of agricultural systems based on multi-criteria techniques applied to  
13  
14 irrigated agriculture. This methodology has been successfully implemented on real agricultural  
15  
16 systems (BERBEL and RODRIGUEZ, 1998; GOMEZ-LIMON and BERBEL, 1995). BERBEL and  
17  
18 GOMEZ-LIMON (2000); ARRIAZA, GOMEZ-LIMON and UPTON (2002); GOMEZ-LIMON *et al.*  
19  
20 (2002); ZEKRI and ROMERO (1993) have applied this methodology to analyze the local irrigation  
21  
22 water market in Spain.  
23  
24

## 25 26 CONSTRUCTION OF FUTURE SCENARIOS 27

28  
29 For the purpose of scenario analysis, narratives and quantitative indicator values have been compiled  
30  
31 for each scenario. The quantitative estimates are used as input values in the modeling of irrigation  
32  
33 systems under policy changes.  
34

35 The future agricultural and water scenarios are constructed on a global and national review of  
36  
37 future scenarios developed by the UK foresight program (DTI, 1999, 2002) as they were specialized in  
38  
39 WADI project (BERBEL *et al.*, 2002; MORRIS and VASILEIOU, 2003). Scenarios are not intended  
40  
41 to predict the future rather they are tools for thinking about the future, assuming that:

- 42 - the future is unlike the past, and is shaped by human choice and action.
- 43
- 44 - the future cannot be foreseen, but exploring the future can reform present decisions.
- 45
- 46 - there are many possible futures: scenarios map a 'possibility space'.
- 47
- 48 - scenario development involves a mix of rational analysis and subjective judgment.
- 49
- 50
- 51

52 Thus, scenarios are statements of what is possible; of prospective rather than predictive futures;  
53  
54 propositions of what could be. They are often made up of a qualitative storyline and a set of  
55  
56 quantitative indicators, which describe a possible future outcome. Scenarios arise as a consequence of  
57  
58 modeling drivers of economic and social change, new trends and innovation, and of unexpected  
59  
60 events.

1  
2  
3 The baseline is the agricultural policy regime in 2003 (status quo), as determined by CAP at  
4 that time, which is used to provide a relative reference point for the definition of future scenarios. The  
5 baseline will also be extrapolated to 2010 based on predictions of agricultural markets and prices from  
6 EU, OECD and other sources. This extrapolated baseline is perceived to be different from the possible  
7 futures identified in Table 1, although it shows a tendency, due to predicted reform of CAP and greater  
8 influence of WFD, towards global sustainable agriculture.  
9

10  
11 The foresight program has constructed four possible futures that are distinguished in terms of  
12 social values and governance.  
13

14  
15 **World Markets** are characterized by an emphasis on private consumption and a highly developed and  
16 integrated world trading system.  
17

18  
19 **Global Sustainability** is characterized by more pronounced social and ecological values, which are  
20 evident in global institutions and trading systems. There is collective action to address social and  
21 environmental issues. Growth is slower but more equitably distributed compared to the world markets  
22 scenario.  
23

24  
25 **Provincial Enterprise** is characterized by emphasis on private consumption but with decisions made  
26 at national and regional level to reflect local priorities and interests. Although, market values  
27 dominate, this is at work only within the national/regional boundaries. Provincial agricultural markets  
28 are also characterized by protectionist regimes similar to that under pre-reform CAP.  
29

30  
31 **Local Stewardship** is characterized by strong local or regional governments, which emphasize social  
32 values, encouraging self-reliance, self-sufficiency, and conservation of natural resources and the  
33 environment. Local community agriculture, as the label implies, emphasizes sustainability at a local  
34 level.  
35

36  
37 These broad generic scenarios define the possible future scenarios in which sectors such as  
38 agriculture, and sub-sectors such as irrigated agriculture, would operate if the particular futures are  
39 realized.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

## AREA OF STUDY

Greece has arid climate that makes irrigated agriculture **more** productive than dry-land agriculture. Thus irrigation is one of the principal users of water. To analyze the consequences of the application of alternative pricing policies for irrigation water, we selected an irrigated area belonging to the prefecture of Xanthi in Northeastern Greece. The reason behind selecting this particular area is that it is a good representative irrigated area of North and Eastern Greece with high water consumption crops such as corn, cotton and tobacco as well as non-irrigated crops such as wheat, barley and hard wheat and is fairly homogeneous both in physical terms (soil and climate) and socio-economic conditions. **Most** irrigation in the concerned area is applied by sprinklers and is based on pressure. The climate is the usual Mediterranean one with special characteristic of dryness during the summer. The agricultural land is constituted by a combination of fertile and poor soils and the dominant system for all types of crops works to support irrigation from late spring to early autumn.

## DATA

The necessary data which refer to the period of 1995-2001, were gathered from the villages and municipalities that are located in the region, the prefectures of Xanthi, the Ministry of Agriculture, the Statistical Service of Greece, the regional government of East Macedonia and Thrace, etc. The technical and economic coefficients of crops were collected from 25 farms belonging to the irrigation region of Xanthi using a questionnaire (Table 2). We also used additional data that were provided by the Department of Agricultural Economics of Aristotle University of Thessaloniki in Greece.

In this study the possible prices for agricultural inputs and outputs under the alternative agricultural policy scenarios by 2010 are expressed as a % of the existing year 2001 at fixed values (Table 3).

### *Crops*

Cereals and industrial crops represent the largest proportion of irrigated production in the region selected for study. They can represent good indicators of the short-term behavior of farmers when

1  
2  
3 water policy is being changed. We also included alfalfa because of its significant share of land  
4  
5 utilization in the study area.

6  
7 As it is known, the European “Common Agricultural Policy” (CAP) obliges farmers devoted  
8  
9 to growing cereals and corn to set aside land if they wish to receive subsidies for agricultural  
10  
11 production.

### 12 13 14 *Yields*

15  
16 In order to give the system as much freedom as possible regarding land use and water allocation, each  
17  
18 activity (crop) was allocated to a range of different intensities of water usage (deficit watering), giving  
19  
20 farmers the opportunity to choose between different levels of water supply.  
21  
22

### 23 24 *Prices*

25  
26 Prices applied to crops are averages for the study region obtained from the official statistics of the  
27  
28 regional authorities. We used historical time series data for the 7-year period 1995-2001, after the  
29  
30 prices have been adjusted for inflation (2001).  
31  
32

### 33 34 *Subsidies*

35  
36 Subsidies depend upon the European Union’s CAP, and were obtained from official publications of  
37  
38 the regional authorities.  
39  
40

### 41 42 *Income*

43  
44 Income is an important attribute of the system as it defines total agricultural output. Income was  
45  
46 computed by the simple combination of yields and prices, plus subsidies where applicable.  
47  
48

### 49 50 *Variable costs*

51  
52 We took into account six categories of variable costs in order to describe the inputs: (i) seeds, (ii)  
53  
54 fertilizers, (iii) chemicals, (iv) machinery, (v) labor, and (vi) cost of water. Especially, the cost of  
55  
56 water includes the cost paid to the regional organization of irrigation networks, the electricity/fuel cost  
57  
58 of pumping and the simulated price of water (to be parameterized from zero to 0.15 €/m<sup>3</sup>).  
59  
60

### *Gross margin*

1  
2  
3 Gross margin can be computed using the data regarding prices, yields, subsidies and variable costs. It  
4  
5 was calculated from the total income minus total variable costs. We used this parameter as the best  
6  
7 estimator of profit and thus the function of the total gross margin of the production plan could be  
8  
9 considered as an objective for the model.  
10

11 To run the MCDM model, we need similar units for all inputs. For this reason we transferred  
12  
13 all the inputs into cost (Euro/ha) instead of keeping them in their initial natural units such as kg,  
14  
15 number, area, cubic cm, etc. The inputs were transferred to costs by multiplying each input used by the  
16  
17 corresponding per unit input price.  
18  
19

### 20 21 *Other attributes*

22  
23 We estimated the fertilizer use even if it was not a relevant attribute for farmers, since they considered  
24  
25 it as a cost and not as a decision variable. Nevertheless, this criterion was relevant for policy analysis,  
26  
27 as it might represent the environmental impact (non-point pollution caused by nitrogen fertilization).  
28  
29 There was also a detailed analysis of water demand and labor use, since both attributes were included  
30  
31 in the MCDM model in the objectives part (labor use) and in the constraints part (water demand).  
32  
33 Thus, the values of these variables would be known as outcomes of the system and would be used later  
34  
35 in policy analysis.  
36  
37

## 38 39 **THE UTILITY FUNCTION**

40  
41  
42 In the present study, we used utility functions where the ability to simulate real decision-makers'  
43  
44 preferences is based on the estimation of relative weightings. These utility functions are a good  
45  
46 approximation to the farmers' hypothetical utility functions.  
47

48  
49 The relative methodology was developed by SUMPSI *et al.* (1993, 1997) and extended by  
50  
51 AMADOR *et al.* (1998). It is based upon Weighted Goal Programming and has previously been used  
52  
53 by BERBEL and RODRIGUEZ (1998); GOMEZ-LIMON and ARRIAZA (2000); GOMEZ-LIMON  
54  
55 and BERBEL (2000). With this methodology a surrogate utility function is estimated, which is used to  
56  
57 estimate the water demand for crop production.  
58

59 The following steps were followed:  
60



- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22
1. Establishment of a set of objectives  $f_1(x) \dots f_i(x) \dots f_n(x)$  that may be supposed to be the most important for farmers and represent the real objectives of the farmers (e.g. profit maximization, risk minimization).
  2. Calculation of the pay-off matrix for the above objectives, which has the following formulation:

<i>Objective / attributes</i>	$f_1(x)$	$f_2(x) \dots$	$\dots f_i(x) \dots$	$\dots f_q(x)$
$f_1(x)$	$f_{11}^*$	$f_{12}$	$f_{1i}$	$f_{1q}$
$f_2(x)$	$f_{21}$	$f_{22}^*$	$f_{2i}$	$f_{2q}$
$\dots f_i(x)$	$f_{i1}$	$f_{i2}$	$f_{ii}^*$	$f_{iq}$
$\dots f_q(x)$	$f_{q1}$	$f_{q2}$	$f_{qi}$	$f_{qq}^*$

(1)

23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

The elements of the matrix need to be calculated by optimizing one objective in each row. Thus,  $f_{ij}$  is the value of the  $i$ -th attribute when the  $j$ -th objective is optimized.

- 32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39
3. Estimation of a set of weights that optimally reflect farmers' preferences. Once the pay-off matrix has been obtained, the following system of  $q$  (number of objectives) equations is solved:

$$\sum_{j=1}^q w_j f_{ij} = f_i \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, q; \text{ and} \quad (2)$$

$$\sum_{j=1}^q w_j = 1$$

40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54

where,  $q$  is the number of relevant objectives that was fixed previously,  $w_j$  are the weights attached to each objective (the solution),  $f_{ij}$  are the elements of the pay-off matrix and  $f_i$  are the real values that show the observed behavior of farmers in the existing situation.

- 55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60
4. Since the above system does not result in a set of  $w_j$  (weights of each objective that reproduce the actual behavior of the farmer), it is necessary to search for the best possible solution by minimizing the sum of deviational variables that finds the closer set of weights. For this purpose (ROMERO, 1991) the following model of Linear Programming (Model (3)) has been solved:

$$\text{Min} \sum_{i=1}^q \frac{n_i + p_i}{f_i} \quad (3)$$

subject to:

$$\sum_{j=1}^q w_j f_{ij} + n_i - p_i = f_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, q$$

$$\text{and } \sum_{j=1}^q w_j = 1$$

where,  $p_i$  is the positive deviational variable that measures the difference between real value and optimum solution for the  $i$ -th objective, and  $n_i$  is the negative deviational variable.

## MODEL DEFINITION

### *Decision variables*

Each farmer of the region has a set of variables  $X_i$  (crops), such as: wheat, barley, corn, alfalfa, tobacco, cotton, sugar beets, tomatoes, hard wheat and set aside (no fruit trees) as described above and presented in Table 2. These are the decision variables that can assume any value belonging to the feasible set.

For each irrigated crop we considered two or three different levels of irrigation.

### *Objectives*

We selected 3 objectives to be considered as belonging to the farmers' decision-making process.

*Maximization of gross margin:* Gross margin (GM) is a good estimator of profit. Thus the maximization of profit in the short-run is equivalent to the maximization of gross margin. The objective function included in the model is determined as below:

$$GM = \sum_{i=1}^q GM_i \times X_i \quad (4)$$

where,  $X_i$  is the area of  $i$ -th crop in hectare (ha) and  $GM_i$  is the gross margin of  $i$ -th crop in euro per ha.

*Minimization of risk:* The variations of prices and yields play a very important role in the agricultural production and risk is therefore always present in any agricultural system. The farmers have a remarkable aversion to the risk, something that should be included in the model. In this case the risk is measured as the variance of the total GM. Thus the risk is calculated by the type:

$$\text{Total risk} = \bar{X}_i^t [Cov] \bar{X}_i \quad (5)$$

where, [Cov] is the variance/covariance matrix of gross margins during the period of 7 years, and  $X_i$  is the vector of areas of each crop in ha.

*Minimization of labor:* The minimization of labor implies not only a reduction of input cost, but also an increase of leisure time and reduction of administration and management processes. The farmers usually show an aversion to hiring labor. An explanation of this behavior is that this parameter is connected with the complexity of crops because the hired labor adds a degree of complexity to family farming. For this reason, labor is calculated as the sum of labor for all farm activities (TL), therefore the objective function will be:

$$\sum_{i=1}^q TL_i \times X_i = TL \quad (6)$$

#### *Constraints*

*Total cultivation area:* The total area of all crops ( $X_i$ ) should be equal to 100. This constraint is used in order to have the results of the model (decision variables  $X_i$ ) in percentages.

*Common agricultural policy (CAP):* A large proportion of agricultural income depends upon CAP subsidies. For this reason, the farmers cannot avoid the CAP regulations that influence most of the crops available for cultivation. Following the CAP rules, we must include a variable for the set aside (SA) activity that is related to the subsidized crops

$$\sum_{i=1}^q X_i + SA = 100 \quad (7)$$

SA must be at least the 10% of the land that is occupied by cereals and corn. Sugar beets, tobacco and cotton are also constrained to be less than the historical quota (period 1995-2001) plus 5% (for the new farmers).

*Market and other constraints:* Marketing channels and/or processing facilities put an upper limit on short-term variations of some crops. This is the case for alfalfa. We have fixed the upper limit for alfalfa on the basis of the maximum historical cultivation during the period 1995-2001 plus 20%.

*Rotational and agronomic considerations:* A rotational constraint limits the cultivated area for a crop to a maximum of 60% of the total available area, and applies to all crops except alfalfa. We also

1  
2  
3 applied a constraint for all other crops that their historical quota is less than 10% of the total area. We  
4  
5 consider that these crops can be cultivated to a maximum of 10% of the total available area.

6  
7 All this information has been included in the model that forms the basis for the MCDM simulation.

### 8 9 10 *Attributes*

11  
12 Attributes are useful indicators, which are deduced as functions of decision variables. From this  
13  
14 viewpoint we have considered several attributes that are relevant to policy makers but that are not  
15  
16 taken into consideration in the farmers' decision-making process. The analyzed attributes are:

17  
18 *a. Water consumption:* The projected consumption of water measured in m<sup>3</sup>/ha is the variable that  
19  
20 policy makers wish to control as a consequence of changes in water management policy.

21  
22 *b. Economic impact:* We measured the economic impact of changes in policy by measuring two  
23  
24 variables: farm income and public support from water pricing, both measured in €/ha.

25  
26 *c. Social impact:* Since irrigated agriculture is one of the main sources of employment in Greece,  
27  
28 any change in policy will significantly affect the social structure of rural areas. This attribute is  
29  
30 measured also by two variables: farm employment (man-days/ha) and seasonality (man-days/month).

31  
32 *d. Environmental impact:* We used two variables to measure the environmental impact of irrigated  
33  
34 agriculture: the demand for fertilizers measured in kilograms of nitrogen added per ha and the energy  
35  
36 balance (10<sup>5</sup> kcal/ha).

37  
38 *e. Landscape and biodiversity:* Finally, we used two variables in order to measure the impact of  
39  
40 irrigated agriculture on landscape and biodiversity: the genetic diversity (number of crops of the farm  
41  
42 plan) and soil covered by crops (months/year).

43  
44 We included above the minimization of labor as an objective in MCDM model. At the time of  
45  
46 analysis, when labor is minimized, labor cost item is dropped from the constraints of the model. Thus  
47  
48 double counting effects of labor are avoided.

49  
50 Moreover, the problem of double counting of water costs during the simulation procedure is  
51  
52 overcome by adding only the extra cost of increased water prices to the initial variable cost for each  
53  
54 crop. This increased variable cost is subtracted from the gross return to get the new gross margin. We  
55  
56 run the MCDM model using the new gross margin in order to estimate the effect of water price  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 changes on the economy, society and environment under different scenarios.  
4  
5

### 6 MODEL APPLICATION

7  
8  
9 The application of the MCDM model includes four steps. In the first step, three objectives  $f_i(x)$ ,  $i =$   
10  
11 1, 2, 3 were selected that were described above with their respective mathematical functions  
12  
13 (maximum gross margin, minimum variance and minimum labor).  
14

15 In the second step, the pay-off matrix was obtained by solving each time the Linear or  
16  
17 Quadratic (when the variance is considered) Programming model using correspondingly the software  
18  
19 LINDO or LINGO. The pay-off matrix for the study region is presented in Table 4. The values in the  
20  
21 second, third and fourth columns of this table correspond to the values of objective functions  $f_{ij}$  (see  
22  
23 model 3). The last column shows the existing farm plan in the study region. These are the values of  $f_i$   
24  
25 that show the actual crop distribution in the region (for 100 ha) and the relation among different  
26  
27 crops and the objectives considered. Thus we can see how far the existing situation is from each  
28  
29 separate optimum. This prompts us to try a combination of the three objectives for a better  
30  
31 simulation of farmers' behavior.  
32  
33

34 In the third step, the set of weights was obtained that best reflects farmers' preferences and  
35  
36 minimizes deviations from the present real values. More specifically, taking the above values  $f_i$  and  
37  
38  $f_{ij}$  from the solution of model (3) the following weights were resulted:  $W_1$  (maximization of gross  
39  
40 margin) = 0.88,  $W_2$  (minimization of risk) = 0.00 and  $W_3$  (minimization of Labor) = 0.12. The  
41  
42 calculation of these weights was based on the existing situation, where the water price was zero.  
43  
44

45 From these weights we may deduce that the farmers' utility function is

$$46 \quad U = 0.88 \text{ GM} - 0.12 \text{ TL}$$

47  
48  
49 This function shows that farmers in the region behave according to an additive utility function, in  
50  
51 which the most important criterion appears to be the total gross margin and then the labor used.  
52  
53

54 In the fourth step, the estimated utility function was used as objective function of the  
55  
56 MCDM model in order to obtain the optimum production plan for each scenario and the  
57  
58 simulation procedure.  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 In the fourth step, each variable is multiplied by the above obtained weights. Thus,  
4  
5 each time a new utility function was used as objective function of the MCDM model. The  
6  
7  
8 new utility function was maximized 9 times for each one scenario separately, in order to  
9  
10 obtain the simulated optimum production plans in the study region.  
11

## 12 13 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### 14 15 16 *Water use ( $m^3/ha$ ) and crop plan*

17  
18 The results show firstly the farmers' responses for water demand in relation to its price changes among  
19 alternative policy scenarios. Table 5 shows the changes in the crop plan in status quo scenario, as an  
20 adaptation to the rising cost of water resources; low water prices imply high water consumption crops,  
21 but as the price of water increases, irrigated crops are replaced by non-irrigated crops. The water price  
22 until  $0.03 \text{ €/m}^3$  threshold is characterized by a relatively stable crop plan without significant difference  
23 in water demand. On the other hand, above this price threshold, the crop plans change, bringing about  
24 a large fall in the demand for water. Finally, from the price  $0.11 \text{ €/m}^3$  the crop plan is characterized  
25 again by a relative stability without significant difference in water demand (Figure 1 and Table 5).  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

35  
36 From the comparison among all future scenarios (Table 6), we can conclude that the crop  
37 plans are stable in all scenarios except the world market scenario. As we can see in Table 6, the area  
38 for cotton is replaced by hard wheat in world market scenario production plan, keeping all other crops  
39 stable in farmers' crop plan decisions.  
40  
41  
42  
43

44  
45 We can also conclude that the increase of water prices reduces the water consumption in all  
46 future scenarios. The water demand curves for all scenarios are very similar except the world market  
47 scenario curve. World market scenario has the lowest demand for water until being supplanted by the  
48 status quo scenario at the  $0.05 \text{ €/m}^3$  water price. In the water price  $0.11 \text{ €/m}^3$  and above, the world  
49 market water consumption becomes lower than status quo scenario as well as than all other scenarios  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55 (Figure 1).  
56

### 57 58 *Economic impact*

1  
2  
3 As regards the impact of new water policies on the farm income, we observe that in the study region  
4 there is a reduction of farm income in all scenarios. Farmers respond to water price increases by  
5 reducing the water consumption through changes in production plans, introducing less profitable crops  
6 as substitutes to the more valuable water-intensive crops. These changes significantly decrease  
7 farmers' incomes. As a result of increasing water price from zero to 0.15 €/m<sup>3</sup> the farm income  
8 reduces by 15.0%, 15.6%, 17.3% and 11.3% in world market, global sustainability, provincial  
9 enterprise and local stewardship scenario respectively compared to 23.8% in status quo scenario  
10 (Figure 2).  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

20  
21 In the local stewardship scenario, farm income is the lowest of all types of scenarios in each  
22 level of water price. Farm income is the highest for global sustainability followed by provincial  
23 enterprise scenario, status quo and world market scenario for all water prices (Figure 2).  
24  
25  
26

27 On the other hand, in zero water price level, the world market and global sustainability had no  
28 remarkable effect on public support. The provincial enterprise and local stewardship had little effect  
29 on public support compared to other scenarios (Table 7).  
30  
31  
32

### 33 34 *Social impact*

35  
36 Pricing of water brings about a severe reduction in farm labor inputs in the short term as a result of  
37 responses to price increases by reducing water consumption through changes in crop plans,  
38 substituting higher-value/higher labor or water-intensive crops with less profitable crops. This implies  
39 that less water demanding or dry crops and more mechanized crops will replace water intensive crops,  
40 which will result in a continuous reduction of employment. This reduction reaches 12.0%, 8.7%, 9.5%  
41 and 8.2% in world market, global sustainability, provincial enterprise and local stewardship scenario,  
42 respectively; compared to 14.4% in status quo scenario in response of increased water prices from zero  
43 to 0.15 €/m<sup>3</sup>. The result shows that except water price 0.03 €/m<sup>3</sup> in case of all prices farm employment  
44 is the lowest for world market compared to other scenarios. In zero water price level, farm  
45 employment remains the same (421.85 man-days/ha) in case of all scenarios except world market  
46 scenario (Figure 3).  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 In Table 7, it is depicted that seasonality was the lowest in world market and the highest in  
4 provincial enterprise and local stewardship scenarios. In case of global sustainability it was the same  
5 as status quo scenario.  
6  
7  
8  
9

### 10 *Environmental impact*

11  
12 Figure 4 shows that water pricing leads to a significant reduction in fertilizer use as a result of  
13 modifications of crop plans and the introduction of less productive crops in case of all scenarios.  
14 Obviously, as farmers substitute crops in order to save water, fertilizer use directly decreases.  
15  
16  
17  
18

19 In zero water price, fertilizer use remains the same (647.14 kg/ha) in case of all scenarios  
20 except the world market scenario. As a result of increasing water price from zero to 0.15 €/m<sup>3</sup> the rate  
21 of reduction reaches the highest in world market (15.9%) and the lowest in local stewardship scenario  
22 (10.9%) (Figure 4). From the figure it is noticed that in water price level zero until 0.03 €/m<sup>3</sup> and from  
23 0.13 €/m<sup>3</sup> and above, a smaller reduction in fertilizer use is observed in case of all scenarios. The rate  
24 of reduction is higher in all scenarios within the water price 0.05 to 0.11€/m<sup>3</sup>.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

32 It is very important to note that the energy balance was almost static for all types of scenarios  
33 including status quo scenario. This indicates that in case of each scenario there was no effect on  
34 energy balance in the region of Xanthi. The nitrogen balance is the highest for status quo scenario  
35 compared to other scenarios that are almost the same (Table 7).  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

### 41 *Landscape and biodiversity*

42  
43 In the water price level zero €/m<sup>3</sup>, landscape and biodiversity differ in different scenarios. The result  
44 suggested by the global sustainability is the highest in case of genetic diversity than other scenarios as  
45 well as status quo. Except the global sustainability, genetic diversity is the same for all types of  
46 scenarios. On the other hand, farmers followed almost the same cropping mix (soil cover) as status  
47 quo scenario, in world market and global sustainability scenarios. The soils were covered by 6 months  
48 both for provincial enterprise and local stewardship, which are smaller than status quo (Table 7).  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55

56 The results obtained are consistent with other studies based on the estimation of water price  
57 elasticities conducted by different authors. The findings of the research by GOMEZ-LIMON and  
58 BERBEL (2000) concluded that the price of water would have to be increased to as much as 0.049  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 €/m<sup>3</sup> (4.9%) in Spain if it is to have a significant impact on water consumption (10% reduction), with a  
4  
5 26% reduction in farm income. PERRY (1995) estimated that inducing a 15% reduction in water  
6  
7 demand in Egypt through volumetric pricing would decrease farm incomes by 25%. YANG *et al.*  
8  
9 (2003) showed that under the current setting of irrigation institutions, the price elasticity of water  
10  
11 demand was bound to be low and the adverse effect on rural welfare was large in China. NOÉME and  
12  
13 FRAGOSO (2004) concluded that in Portuguese region of Alentejo, the water demand was inelastic  
14  
15 when the water prices were relatively reduced, up to 0.02 €/m<sup>3</sup> (2%). At this price level there was not  
16  
17 any decrease either of the water consumption or of the watering area and crops replacement was not  
18  
19 made. When the price 0.02 €/m<sup>3</sup> was exceeded, the demand becomes more elastic, and noticeable  
20  
21 reductions in the consumption and in the watering area could be seen. Research results concerning  
22  
23 irrigation demand elasticities showed that depending on the used methods water demand elasticity for  
24  
25 low water price ranges and medium water price ranges lies in -0.06 and -1.00, -0.12 and -0.48, -0.09  
26  
27 and -0.26, and -0.00 and -0.03 in Andalusia, Spain (GARRIDO *et al.*, 1997), and -0.04 and -0.27 in La  
28  
29 Charente, France (MONTGINOUL and RIEU, 1996). The study by GOMEZ-LIMON *et al.* (2002)  
30  
31 concluded that at low water prices, demand did not decrease because farmers did not change their crop  
32  
33 areas: water payments did not achieve their objective, as water consumption was not reduced. Results  
34  
35 suggested that the threshold would be between 0.019 and 0.049 € depending on which agricultural  
36  
37 policy was implemented. Once a certain threshold had been passed, demand behaved with an elastic  
38  
39 response to price rises, by substituting water-intensive crops with others that demand less water. The  
40  
41 low-medium level of water prices implied that farmers would reduce their income (gross margin) by  
42  
43 15-25% before water use starts to decrease.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

49 Unfortunately, there are very few studies in Greece concerning the irrigation water pricing.  
50  
51 LATINOPOULOS *et al.* (2004) utilized the hedonic price method to reveal the implicit value of  
52  
53 irrigation water by analyzing agricultural land values in Halkidiki, a typical rural area in Greece.  
54  
55 Results showed that, apart from typical value attributes, the agricultural characteristics of the land,  
56  
57 including irrigation water availability, had a significant influence on land prices. The marginal value  
58  
59 of water for irrigation in Halkidiki was estimated as high as 0.06 € for a cubic meter. Another study by  
60  
LEKAKIS (1998) showed that access to water resources had not yet been fully regulated in Greece,

1  
2  
3 and the organization of the water management agencies and water suppliers is essentially governed by  
4  
5 the civil code. This institutional framework, together with the remarkable hydrologic complexity,  
6  
7 which exists in Greece, make impossible to identify any common trends in Greek agricultural water  
8  
9 pricing systems.  
10

## 11 12 **CONCLUSIONS**

13  
14  
15 Given that agricultural production in Greece is limited by the availability of water, the results show  
16  
17 that the region has implications in contributing to the policy debate for the Greek agriculture.  
18

19  
20 Some conclusions were made extending the model in long-term level, which would be useful  
21  
22 for the policy makers. Specifically, we applied an MCDM model to the region of Xanthi in Greece  
23  
24 under four different scenarios: a) World Markets, b) Global Sustainability, c) Provincial Enterprise,  
25  
26 and d) Local Stewardship.  
27

28  
29 The results show that the increase of water price causes almost similar impacts with those that  
30  
31 observed in the status quo scenario (CAP 2003). The water demand is inelastic for low prices and does  
32  
33 not become the price responsive until higher prices are attained under all scenarios.  
34

35  
36 Focusing on the goals of this research, we stress that water pricing, as a single instrument for  
37  
38 controlling water use, is not a valid means of significantly reducing agricultural water consumption.  
39  
40 This is because consumption does not fall until prices reach such a level that farm income and  
41  
42 agricultural employment are negatively affected. If water pricing is selected as a policy tool, a  
43  
44 significant decrease in water demand and farm income will characterize the agricultural sector. The  
45  
46 impact of this decrease on rural areas that are dependent on irrigated agriculture will be catastrophic.  
47  
48 Second, when water consumption decreases as a consequence of substitution of crops with high water  
49  
50 demands (cotton, sugar beets, and tobacco), there will be a significant loss of employment both  
51  
52 directly on farms and indirectly on processing facilities.  
53

54  
55 The water pricing leads to a significant reduction in fertilizer use as a result of reduced water  
56  
57 consumption through changes in crop plans, as less productive crops are introduced. This will  
58  
59 obviously have a positive impact on the reduction of non-point chemical pollution by agriculture. But  
60

1  
2  
3 the environmental impact of fertilizer use could also be reduced significantly by improved agricultural  
4  
5 practices.  
6

7  
8 For the reduction of consumption of irrigated water, a sufficient water pricing policy is  
9  
10 proposed in combination with the adoption of new irrigation methods and technologies taking into  
11  
12 account the particular characteristic of the region (structural factors, agronomic conditions, and  
13  
14 financial constraints), and in accordance with the water framework directive and the national water  
15  
16 policy. Accompanied measures to reduce and/or efficiently use the irrigated water are regulatory  
17  
18 policies such as water metering, licenses and time-limited abstraction permits, and the promotion of  
19  
20 appropriate technologies through advice, training and demonstrations of best practice.  
21

22  
23 Although the study has not included an analysis of the impact of “full cost recovery” prices, it  
24  
25 is generally assumed that this would prompt a considerable reduction in the use of irrigation water and  
26  
27 a more limited program of investment in new schemes in the future. At the same time, there is a clear  
28  
29 scope for improving existing irrigation technology without affecting their selection of crops. A more  
30  
31 detailed analysis could help to set priorities for investments in irrigation and associated rural  
32  
33 infrastructure in the coming years. Moreover, European Member States have an obligation to exercise  
34  
35 a detailed and thorough environmental scrutiny in their local, regional and national appraisal systems  
36  
37 to identify potential negative environmental impacts and to take appropriate actions. We think that this  
38  
39 area of study constitutes an interesting and important horizon for future research.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

#### 45 REFERENCES

- 46  
47  
48 AMADOR F., SUMPSI J.M. and ROMERO C. (1998) A non-interactive methodology to assess  
49  
50 farmers' utility functions: an application to large farms in Andalusia, Spain, *European Review of*  
51  
52 *Agricultural Economics* 25, 95 -109.  
53  
54  
55 ARRIAZA M., GOMEZ-LIMON J. A. and UPTON M. (2002) Local water markets for irrigation in  
56  
57 southern Spain: a multicriteria approach, *The Australian Journal of Agricultural and Resource*  
58  
59 *Economics* 46, 21-43.  
60

- 1  
2  
3 BERBEL J. and GOMEZ-LIMON J. A. (2000) The impact of water pricing policy in Spain: an  
4  
5 analysis of three irrigated areas, *Agricultural Water Management* 43, 219-238.  
6  
7  
8 BERBEL J. and RODRIGUEZ A. (1998) An MCDM approach to production analysis: An application  
9  
10 to irrigated farms in Southern Spain, *European Journal of Operational Research* 107, 108-118.  
11  
12  
13 BERBEL J., MORRIS J., BOYMANNS D., BAZZANI G., GALLERANI V., VIAGGI D., GOMEZ  
14  
15 G., TWITE C. and WEATHERHEAD E.K. (2002) *WADI Project: Proposal for Joint*  
16  
17 *Agricultural and Water Policy Scenarios*, WADI Project Working Document.  
18  
19  
20 BERKHOUT F., EAMES M. and SKEA J. (1998) *Environmental Futures Scoping Study*, Final  
21  
22 Report, Science and Technology Policy Research Unit: Brighton. (<http://www foresight.gov.uk>)  
23  
24  
25 DTI (1999) *Environmental Futures*, PB 4475, Department of Trade and Industry.  
26  
27 (<http://www foresight.gov.uk>)  
28  
29  
30 DTI (2002) *Foresight Futures 2020 Revised Scenarios and Guidance*, Department of Trade and  
31  
32 Industry, HMSO, UK.  
33  
34  
35 GARRIDO A., VARELA O. C. and SUMPSI J.M. (1997) *The interaction of agricultural pricing*  
36  
37 *policies and water districts' modernization programs: a question with unexpected answers*,  
38  
39 Paper Presented to the Eighth Annual Conference of the European Association of  
40  
41 Environmental and Resource Economists, Tilburg, The Netherlands, June 26-28.  
42  
43  
44 GOMEZ-LIMON J. A. and BERBEL J. (1995) Aplicacion de una metodologica multicriterio para la  
45  
46 estimacion de los objetivos de los agricultores del regadon cordobens, *Investigacion Agraria:*  
47  
48 *Economia* 10, 103-123.  
49  
50  
51 GOMEZ-LIMON J. A. and BERBEL J. (2000) Multicriteria analysis of derived water demand  
52  
53 functions: a Spanish case study, *Agricultural Systems* 63, 49-72.  
54  
55  
56 GOMEZ-LIMON J. A., ARRIAZA M. and BERBEL J. (2002) Conflicting implementation of  
57  
58 agricultural and water policies in irrigated areas in the EU, *Journal of Agricultural Economics*  
59  
60 53, 259-277.

- 1  
2  
3 GOMEZ-LIMON J.A. and ARRIAZA M. (2000) Socio-economic and environmental impact of agenda  
4  
5 2000 and alternative policy choices for market liberalization on an irrigated area in northwestern  
6  
7 Spain, *Agricultural Economics Review* 1, 18-30.  
8  
9
- 10 LATINOPOULOS P., TZIAKAS V. and MALLIOS Z. (2004) Valuation of irrigation water by the  
11  
12 hedonic price method: a case study in Halkidiki, Greece, *Water, Air, and Soil Pollution:*  
13  
14 *Focus* 4, 253–262.  
15  
16
- 17 LEKAKIS J. (1998) Personal communication, Greece.  
18
- 19 MONTGINOUL M. and RIEU T. (1996) Instruments de gestion de l'eau d'irrigation en France:  
20  
21 exemple de la Charente, *Ingénieries-EAT* 8, 3-12.  
22
- 23 MORRIS J. and VASILEIOU K. (2003) *WADI scenario analysis: descriptions and estimations*,  
24  
25 Contribution to Workpackage Qualitative Analysis, WADI Project Working Document,  
26  
27 Bedford, UK.  
28
- 29 NOËME C. and FRAGOSO R. (2004) *Evaluation of alternative policies of water price for the*  
30  
31 *agricultural use in Alentejo region.* ([http://cigr-](http://cigr-ejournal.tamu.edu/submissions/volume6/LW%2004%20006%20Fragoso%20final%203Feb2005.pdf)  
32  
33 [ejournal.tamu.edu/submissions/volume6/LW%2004%20006%20Fragoso%20final%203Feb2005.pdf](http://cigr-ejournal.tamu.edu/submissions/volume6/LW%2004%20006%20Fragoso%20final%203Feb2005.pdf))  
34  
35
- 36 PERRY C.J. (1995) *Alternative approaches to cost sharing for water service to agriculture in Egypt.*  
37  
38 Research Report 2. Colombo, IIMI. (<http://www.cgiar.org/iwmi/pubs/pub002/body.htm>).  
39
- 40 REHMAN T. and ROMERO C. (1993) The application of the MCDM paradigm to the management of  
41  
42 agricultural systems: some basic considerations, *Agricultural Systems* 41, 239-255.  
43  
44
- 45 ROMERO C. (1991) *Handbook of Critical Issues in Goal Programming*. Pergamon Press, Oxford.  
46
- 47 ROMERO C. and REHMAN T. (1989) *Multiple Criteria Analysis for Agricultural Decisions*.  
48  
49 Elsevier, Amsterdam.  
50
- 51 SUMPSI J.M., AMADOR F. and ROMERO C. (1993) *A research on the Andalusian farmers'*  
52  
53 *objectives: methodological aspects and policy implication.* In: *Aspects of the Common*  
54  
55 *Agricultural Policy*, VIIth EAAE Congress, Stresa, Italy.  
56  
57
- 58 SUMPSI J.M., AMADOR F. and ROMERO C. (1997) On farmers' objectives: A multi-criteria  
59  
60 approach, *European Journal of Operational Research* 96, 1-8.

1  
2  
3 YANG H., ZHANG X. and ZEHNDER A.J.B. (2003) Water scarcity, pricing mechanism and  
4  
5 institutional reform in northern China irrigated agriculture, *Agricultural Water Management* 61,  
6  
7 143–161.  
8

9  
10 ZEKRI S. and ROMERO C. (1993) Public and private compromise in agricultural water management,  
11  
12 *Journal of Environmental Management* 37, 281-293.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

For Peer Review Only

**Table 1. Links between Foresight and agricultural policy scenarios**

'Foresight' scenario	Agricultural policy scenario	Intervention regime
Status Quo	Baseline (CAP 2003)	Moderate: Existing price support, export subsidies, with selected agri-environment schemes
World markets	World Agricultural Markets (without CAP)	Zero: Free trade: no intervention
Global sustainability	Global Sustainable Agriculture (Reformed CAP)	Low: Market orientation with targeted sustainability 'compliance' requirements and programs
Provincial enterprise	Provincial Agricultural Markets (Similar to pre-reform CAP)	Moderate to high: price support and protection to serve national and local priorities for self-sufficiency, limited environmental concern.
Local stewardship	Local Community Agriculture	High: Locally defined support schemes reflecting local priorities for food production, incomes and environment

Sources: UK foresight program (DTI, 1999, 2002); WADI project (BERBEL et al., 2002; MORRIS and VASILEIOU, 2003)

Table 2: Technical and economic coefficients of crops during 1995-2001

Crop	Wheat	Barley	Corn	Alfalfa	Tobacco	Cotton	Sugar beet	Tomato	Hard wheat	Set aside
Variable	X1	X2	X31	X41	X51	X61	X71	X81	X91	SA
Year										
<b>Prices perceived by farmers (euro/kg)</b>										
1995	0.13	0.13	0.10	0.10	3.64	0.82	0.03	0.08	0.13	-
1996	0.14	0.14	0.14	0.12	3.64	0.84	0.05	0.08	0.15	-
1997	0.12	0.12	0.12	0.12	3.22	0.67	0.05	0.07	0.12	-
1998	0.12	0.13	0.12	0.12	3.35	0.70	0.06	0.07	0.12	-
1999	0.12	0.13	0.12	0.12	3.49	0.73	0.06	0.08	0.12	-
2000	0.13	0.14	0.13	0.13	3.64	0.76	0.06	0.08	0.13	-
2001	0.15	0.15	0.14	0.16	3.33	0.28	0.05	0.08	0.15	-
<b>Yield (kg/ha)</b>										
1995	3,400	3,300	11,000	13,000	1,500	2,600	65,600	56,000	3,300	0
1996	3,400	2,900	12,000	13,000	1,500	2,800	65,700	56,500	3,100	0
1997	3,400	2,900	11,000	13,000	1,900	2,900	65,700	56,500	3,100	0
1998	3,400	2,900	11,000	13,000	1,900	2,900	65,700	56,500	3,100	0
1999	3,400	2,900	11,000	13,000	1,900	2,900	65,700	56,500	3,100	0
2000	3,400	2,900	11,000	13,000	1,900	2,900	65,700	56,500	3,100	0
2001	3,500	3,500	11,000	15,000	1,900	3,400	75,000	55,000	3,000	0
<b>Subsidies (euro/ha)</b>										
1995	56.4	56.4	221.9	-	4.0	-	-	-	334.4	124.7
1996	119.3	119.3	431.8	-	4.0	-	-	-	438.0	152.0
1997	126.7	126.7	448.2	-	4.0	-	-	-	509.2	195.6
1998	132.0	132.0	466.8	-	4.0	-	-	-	530.4	203.8
1999	137.5	137.5	486.3	-	4.0	-	-	-	552.5	212.3
2000	143.2	143.2	506.6	-	4.0	0.2	-	-	575.6	221.1
2001	155.5	155.5	563.2	-	4.0	0.6	0.01	-	501.8	221.1
<b>Income (euro/ha)</b>										
1995	498	485	1,322	1,300	11,475	2,132	3,280	4,480	763	221
1996	595	525	2,112	1,560	11,475	2,352	3,285	4,520	903	221
1997	518	486	1,713	1,495	12,776	2,463	3,488	3,999	866	196
1998	539	506	1,785	1,558	13,308	2,566	3,633	4,166	902	204
1999	562	527	1,859	1,622	13,862	2,673	3,784	4,339	939	212
2000	585	549	1,937	1,690	14,440	2,784	3,942	4,520	979	221
2001	681	681	2,103	2,400	13,946	2,958	4,235	4,400	952	221
<b>Variable costs (euro/ha)</b>										
1995	218	186	655	408	6,415	822	1,100	1,951	235	16
1996	254	208	629	503	6,516	965	1,252	1,825	271	16
1997	275	257	796	411	6,625	1,023	1,342	1,902	277	19
1998	286	268	829	428	6,901	1,066	1,398	1,981	289	19
1999	298	279	864	446	7,189	1,110	1,456	2,063	301	20
2000	310	291	900	465	7,488	1,156	1,517	2,149	313	21
2001	323	303	937	484	7,800	1,205	1,580	2,238	326	22
<b>Gross margin current (euro/ha)</b>										
1995	280	300	667	892	5,060	1,310	2,180	2,529	529	205
1996	341	317	1,483	1,057	4,959	1,387	2,033	2,656	632	205
1997	243	229	917	1,084	6,151	1,440	2,145	2,097	589	177
1998	253	238	955	1,129	6,407	1,500	2,235	2,185	613	184
1999	264	248	995	1,176	6,674	1,563	2,328	2,276	639	192
2000	275	258	1,037	1,225	6,952	1,628	2,425	2,371	665	200
2001	357	378	1,166	1,916	6,146	1,754	2,654	2,161	626	199
<b>Mean</b>	288	281	1,031	1,211	6,050	1,511	2,098	2,325	613	195
<b>Labor (hours/ha)</b>										
	25	25	150	130	3,200	230	250	360	25	10
<b>Fertilizers (kg/ha)</b>										
	500	500	900	1000	700	650	1500	900	500	0

Sources: Statistical Yearbooks of Greece 1995-2001; Field and processed data



**Table 3: Existing and possible prices for agricultural inputs and outputs under alternative agricultural policy scenarios by 2010 (expressed as a % of existing year 2001 at constant values)**

	Existing (2001)	World agricultural markets	Global agricultural sustainability	Provincial agriculture	Local community agriculture
<b>Crops:</b>					
Grains and oil	100	85-95	95-105	105-115	115-125
Wheat	100	85-95	95-105	105-115	115-125
Barley	100	0	95	100	100
Cereal area subsidy	100	90-100	100-110	105-115	105-115
Maize	100	0	75-85	90-100	85-95
Maize area subsidy	100	85-95	95-105	110-110	110-120
Rice	100	80	100	100	110-120
Set aside subsidy	100	0	95	100	105
Set aside quota	100	85-95	90-95	95-105	105-110
<b>Roots:</b>					
Sugar beet	100	85-95	110-120	100-110	120-130
Vegetable and Salad	100	90-100	100-110	105-115	125-135
Tomatoes	100	90-100	100-110	105-115	125-135
<b>Tree fruits:</b>					
Apples	100	90-100	100-110	105-115	125-135
Pears	100	85-95	90-100	90-100	105-115
Peaches	100	75-85	85-95	80-90	105-115
Tobacco	100	0	85	90	105
Cotton	100	85-100	130-140	100-110	150-170
Cotton subsidy	100	85-95	135-145	100-110	140-150
<b>Inputs prices:</b>					
Fertilizers	100	85-100	140-150	100-110	150-160
Pesticides	100	110-120	100-105	105-115	95-100
Energy	100	85-95	120-130	100-110	130-140
Seeds	100	100-110	110-120	120-130	130-140
Machinery	100	100-115	115-135	100-115	120-140
Contractor services	100	130-135	120-130	130-140	110-120
Water prices	100	100-110	115-130	100-110	120-140
Irrigation	100	100-110	120-130	115-125	130-150
Labor	100	90-100	100-110	95-105	110-120
Land	100	110-120	110-125	100-110	85-95
Other inputs	100	85-95	125-135	85-95	130-140
Crop yield changes due to technology	100	110-120	100-115	100-105	85-105
Restriction on chemical use	100	130-140	120-130	110-120	100-110

Source: Survey and extrapolated data

**Table 4: Pay-off matrix for the selected region**

Values	Optimum			Real (existing farm plan)
	GM	VAR	LAB	
Gross margin (GM)	186828	100553	95670	155615
Minimization of risk (VAR)	170494752	29915124	35563420	192800310
Minimization of labor (LAB)	41092	10043	7594	36358

Source: Results of the study

**Table 5. Crop distributions in response to changes in water price in status quo**

Crops	Variable	Water price (€/m <sup>3</sup> )									
		0.00	0.01	0.02	0.03	0.05	0.07	0.09	0.11	0.13	0.15
Soft wheat	X1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Barley	X2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Maize	X31	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	X32	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	X33	36.80	36.80	36.80	36.80	-	-	-	-	-	-
Alfalfa	X41	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	X42	-	-	-	-	11.50	11.50	11.50	11.50	11.50	11.50
	X43	11.50	11.50	11.50	11.50	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tobacco	X51	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	X52	8.20	6.37	5.83	5.29	8.03	7.52	7.02	8.20	8.20	8.20
	X53	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cotton	X61	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	X62	15.30	15.30	15.30	15.30	15.30	15.30	15.30	5.86	3.78	1.97
	X63	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sugar beet	X71	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	X72	2.20	2.20	2.20	2.20	2.20	2.20	2.20	2.20	2.20	2.20
Tomato	X81	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	X82	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00
Hard wheat	X91	11.20	12.87	13.36	13.85	48.15	48.62	49.08	56.58	58.47	60.00
Set aside	SA	4.80	4.97	5.02	5.06	4.82	4.86	4.91	5.66	5.85	6.13

Source: Results of the study

**Table 6. Crop distributions by scenario at zero €/m<sup>3</sup> water price level**

Simulated crops areas (100 ha)	Status quo	World market	Global sustainability	Provincial enterprise	Local stewardship
Wheat	-	-	-	-	-
Barley	-	-	-	-	-
Corn	36.8	36.8	36.8	36.8	36.8
Alfalfa	11.5	11.5	11.5	11.5	11.5
Tobacco	8.2	8.2	8.2	8.2	8.2
Cotton	15.3	2.10	15.3	15.3	15.3
Sugar beet	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.2
Tomato	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0
Hard wheat	11.2	23.2	11.2	11.2	11.2
Set Aside	4.8	6.0	4.8	4.8	4.8

Source: Results of the study

**Table 7. Indicators-scenario for the farmers at water price level zero €/m<sup>3</sup>**

Scenario	Economic balance		Social impact		Landscape and biodiversity		Water use (m <sup>3</sup> /ha)	Environmental impact	
	Farm income (€/ha)	Public support (€/ha)	Farm employment (man-days/ha)	Seasonality (man-days/month)	Genetic diversity (no. of crops)	Soil cover (month/year)		Nitrogen balance (kg/ha)	Energy balance (10 <sup>5</sup> kcal/ha)
Status quo	2103.8	200.89	421.85	60.26	7	7	4462.0	4.00	175.56
World market	1822.6	200.94	355.1	50.73	7	7	3515.0	3.93	175.57
Global sustainability	2424.4	200.89	421.85	60.26	8	7	4462.0	3.93	175.56
Provincial enterprise	2280.3	209.54	421.85	70.31	7	6	4462.0	3.90	177.51
Local stewardship	1561.34	209.54	421.85	70.31	7	6	4462.0	3.90	177.51

Source: Results of the study




Figure 1. Water demand (m³/ha) among scenarios in relation to water price (€/m³)




Figure 2. Farm income (€/ha) among scenarios in relation to water price (€/m³)




Figure 3. Farm employment (man-days/ha) among scenarios in relation to water price (€/m³)




Figure 4. Fertilizer use (kg/ha) among scenarios in relation to water price (€/m³)