



Economics of species change under risk of climate change and increasing information : a (Quasi-)Option value analysis

Marielle Brunette, Sandrine Costa, Franck F. Lecocq

► To cite this version:

Marielle Brunette, Sandrine Costa, Franck F. Lecocq. Economics of species change under risk of climate change and increasing information : a (Quasi-)Option value analysis. Tackling climate change : the contribution of forest scientific knowledge, Groupement d'Intérêt Public "Ecosystèmes Forestiers" (GIP ECOFOR). Paris, FRA., May 2012, Tours, France. 11 diapositives. hal-01000307

HAL Id: hal-01000307

<https://hal.science/hal-01000307>

Submitted on 5 Jun 2020

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Economics of Species Change under Risk of Climate Change and Increasing Information: A (Quasi-)Option Value Analysis

Marielle Brunette (LEF, Nancy)
Sandrine Costa (MOISA, Montpellier)
and Franck Lecocq (CIRED, Paris)

“Tackling climate change: the contribution of forest scientific knowledge”,
Tours,
21-24 May 2012



Context

- Impact of climate change on :

Forest Ecosystems

- Increase temperature from 1.5°C to 5°C
- More intense precipitations during winter and longer droughts during summer
- Impact on phenology and reproduction of trees, on growth, on prevalence of risks

Forest Species

- Scots Pine (Kint et al., 2009)
- Norway Spruce (Briceno-Elizondo et al., 2006)
- Oak (Becker et al., 1994)
- European Beech (Nigh, 2006)

- Characteristics of forest sector : long-term and irreversible decisions.
- One solution to adapt forest to CC : shifts to climatically more robust species
 - Studied from a biophysical point of view but economic assessment are scarce : Hanewinkel et al. (2010), Yousefpour et al. (2010).
 - No consideration of : 1/ uncertainty about impact of CC on forest ecosystem ; 2/ increasing information

Objective

- Objective : to study the question of species choice in the context of climate change taking into account uncertainty about impact of CC on forest ecosystem and increasing information
- Methodology : Cost-Benefit Analysis + Quasi-option value (Arrow and Fisher (1974), Henry (1974))
 - Benefit to get information earlier, with implications both for private decision-making and public policies
 - Mitigation decisions on climate change
 - Forestry : management decisions under timber price volatility
- Framework : conversion of Norway spruce stands to Douglas-fir.
- Results : conditions under which species shifts make sense, optimal timing of species shifts, value of additional information.

The Case study

- Norway spruce (NS) : commonplace in Europe, resistant to cold, not very sensitive to last frosts, sensitive to water stress and droughts.
 - Adaptation strategies :
 - uneven-aged system
 - conversion towards tree species more adapted to future climatic condition : European beech in German Black Forest, Scots Pine in Northern Finland, Douglas-fir in French Black Mountain.
- ⇒ We explore the economics of replacing NS with Douglas-fir in the context of the French Black Mountain
- Assumptions : monospecific, even-aged NS stand that has just been clear-cut, and in which natural regeneration is present.
 - Continuation of past practices would call for a new cycle of NS based on regeneration
 - An alternative silvicultural trajectory would be to clear the stand and plant Douglas-fir.
 - Two scenarios regarding the impact of CC on NS : either there is a high mortality of NS (with probability p) over the next spruce rotation (70 years) or there is not (with $(1 - p)$)
 - Increasing information : uncertainty on the CC effects on NS will be resolved in n years ($n = 5$ or $n = 10$)
 - ↔ we assume that in one century, NS will not be adapted to the stand anymore (it will be necessary to shift to Douglas-fir for the second rotation).

Immediate choice

Strategy 1 : regenerating NS now with view to shifting to Douglas-fir after end of rotation

Strategy 2 : planting Douglas-fir now with natural regeneration of Douglas-fir in subsequent rotation

A. Analysis of strategy 2

Operations (years)	Benefit (€/ha)	
	Plantation	Natural regeneration
Initial cost	Plantation(0) : -2132	Clearing(3) : -1212
Thinning (14) "dépressage"	-920	-1170
Thinning (24)	885	885
Thinning (37)	1305	1305
Thinning (51)	2989	2989
Thinning (68)	10584	10584
Thinning (71)	5170	5170
Harvest (74)	18315	18315
Net Present Value	NPV(DF,plant) = 452	NPV(DF,rege) = 1362

- Douglas-fir is assumed suited both to current and future climate, so that the yields and financial payoffs of strategy 2 are independent of the NS mortality scenario.
- Discount rate : 4%
- $$LEV(DF) = NPV(DF, plant) + \frac{NPV(DF, rege)}{(1+r)^{74}} \times \frac{(1+r)^{74}}{(1+r)^{74}-1} = 531\text{€/ha}$$


Strategy 1 with and without CC

B. Analysis of strategy 1 without CC

Operations (years)	Benefit (€/ha)
Clearing (0)	-597
Thinning (20) "dépressage"	-1023
Thinning (40)	1242
Thinning (50)	1518
Thinning (60)	2139
Harvest (70)	19417
Net Present Value	NPV(NS) = 859

- $LEV(NS) = NPV(NS) + \frac{LEV(DF)}{(1+r)^{70}} = 888\text{€/ha}$
- $LEV(NS) > LEV(DF) \rightarrow$ without CC, the best strategy would be to keep NS for one more rotation and then after to change to DF.

C. Analysis of strategy 1 with CC




- $LEV(\text{Strat1}) = p(-597 + \frac{LEV(DF) - 100}{(1+r)^n}) + (1 - p)(NPV(NS) + \frac{LEV(DF)}{(1+r)^{70}})$
- For $n = 5$, if $p < 31.9\%$ then it is better to regenerate NS
- For $n = 10$, if $p < 30.2\%$, then it is better to regenerate NS

Sequential decision making

Strategy 3 : choice between regenerating NS and planting DF is delayed until the information about p is provided.


- Assumptions concerning this waiting period : no investment, thicker vegetation establishes
 - Clearing cost of NS regeneration = 800€/ha for $n = 5$ and 900€/ha for $n = 10$
 \hookrightarrow NPV(NS, delay = 5) = 702€/ha ; NPV(NS, delay = 10) = 655€/ha
 - Clearing cost before DF plantation increases of 100€/ha.
- Strategy tree becomes :



$$\begin{aligned}
 &LEV(Strat3) \\
 &= p \left(\frac{LEV(DF) - 100}{(1+r)^n} \right) \\
 &+ (1 - p) (NPV(NS, delay = n) + \frac{LEV(DF)}{(1+r)^{70}})
 \end{aligned}$$

Comparison of the 3 strategies for $n=5$

Figure 3. Value of the “Delay” scenario (for $n = 5$) relative to the best scenario among spruce regeneration and planting Douglas-fir.



- for $n = 5$: $p < 20.8\%$ = strategy 1 ; for $n = 10$: $p < 25.4\%$ = strategy 1
- for $n = 5$: $20.8\% < p < 53.8\%$ = strategy 3 ; for $n = 10$: $p < 39.9\%$ = strategy 3
- for $n = 5$: $p > 53.8\%$ = strategy 2 ; for $n = 10$: $p > 39.9\%$ = strategy 2


Quasi-option value

QOV is a way to measure the benefit of flexibility in an uncertain context :

$$QOV = LEV(Strat3) - \text{Max}(LEV(Strat1), LEV(Strat2)).$$

↪ positive QOV means that it is profitable to delay the decision


Figure 4. Quasi Option Value.



QOV gets smaller when the information comes later.

Expected Value of Earlier Information (EVEI)

$$EVEI = \text{Max}(LEV_5(\text{Strat1}), LEV_5(\text{Strat2}), LEV_5(\text{Strat3})) - \text{Max}(LEV_{10}(\text{Strat1}), LEV_{10}(\text{Strat2}), LEV_{10}(\text{Strat3}))$$



- $p \leq 0.2$ (low probabilities) : lower value of earlier information ($< 12\text{€}/\text{ha}$).
- $p \geq 0.6$ (high probabilities) : lower value of earlier information ($< 12\text{€}/\text{ha}$).
- $0.2 < p < 0.6$ (in-between probabilities) : higher value of earlier information comes from strategy 3 which is the best strategy for these intermediate probabilities ($12\text{€}/\text{ha} < \text{EVEI} < 52\text{€}/\text{ha}$).

⇒ EVEI is low for low or high probabilities ; in-between, EVEI is between around 10 and 50€/ha, it increases the LEV by 2 to 9%.

Conclusion

- QOV approach may be very useful to analyse decision making in species choice
- Summary of the results :
 - without CC Strategy 1 dominates
 - with CC, the dominating strategy depends on p , the probability of high mortality of NS
 - ↪ if the probability is low or high, it is more profitable to choose now
 - ↪ for intermediate value of the probability, it is more profitable to delay
- Value of information belongs to the interval [6-52]€/ha in our case study
- Some limits : DF is not perfectly adapted to CC, delay of 5 or 10 years seem to be optimistic