

CHANGING LIVES IMPROVING LIFE

Distribution of Benefits and Adoption of Bt Cotton in Pakistan: Ex-ante Analysis

Copyrights 2010 by H. Nazli, R. Sarker, K. Meilke, D. Orden. All rights reserved. Readers may make verbatim copies of this document for non-commercial purposes by any means, provided this copyright notice appears on all such copies.

Hina Nazli, Rakhal Sarker, Karl Meilke Department of Food, Agricultural and Resource Economics, University of Guelph, Guelph, Canada **David Orden** International Food Policy Research Institute, Washington D.C, USA

Poster prepared for presentation at the Agricultural & Applied Economics Association's 2010 AAEA, CAES & WAEA Joint Annual Meeting, Denver, Colorado, July 25-27, 2010.

Contact : Hina Nazli Email: hnazli@uoguelph.ca Phone: 519-824 4120 x 53427



Distribution of Benefits and Adoption of Bt Cotton in Pakistan: Ex-ante Analysis Hina Nazli, Rakhal Sarker, Karl Meilke, David Orden Department of Food, Agricultural and Resource Economics, University of Guelph, Guelph, Canada and IFPRI, Washington D.C, USA

Introduction

- Among the four largest cotton producing countries, Pakistan is the only one that has not commercially adopted GM cotton.
- The Government of Pakistan (GOP) has been negotiating with Monsanto for the latest GM cotton seed since May 2008
- These negotiations have remained inconclusive due to a disagreement over the technology fee.
- The GOP argues that a high technology fee will transfer all of the benefits of GM cotton to Monsanto leaving none for cotton growers.
- Empirical evidence from other developing countries indicates that farmers receive a larger share of the benefits from GM cotton than the technology innovators.

Objectives

- Research gap:
- There is little empirical analysis to provide estimates of the size and distribution of potential benefits and expected costs of adopting GM cotton in Pakistan
- Objective
- To examine the potential economic impacts of introducing GM cotton in Pakistan by conducting an ex-ante evaluation of the size and distribution of economic benefits among producers, consumers, and technology innovators

Methods

- Adjusted Economic Surplus Model (Alston et al., 1995; Moschini and Lapan, 1997; Falck-Zepeda et al., 2000)
- Four hypothetical scenarios are developed and simulated: - commercial adoption of varieties developed by the private
 - sector in Pakistan;
 - commercial adoption of hybrid seed imported from India;
 - commercial adoption of the latest GM technology; and
 - irregular adoption of latest GM technology
- Values of parameters are based on interviews with experts
- Risk and uncertainty is incorporated by replacing single-point values with probability distributions for selected parameters

Poster prepared for presentation at the Agricultural & Applied Economics Association's 2010 AAEA, CAES & WAEA Joint Annual Meeting, Denver, Colorado, July 25-27, 2010.

Contact : Hina Nazli Email: hnazli@uoguelph.ca Phone: 519-824 4120 x 53427

Variable Assumptions

Variables	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3
Yield change (%)	$\Delta(0, 0.15, 0.25)$	$\Delta(0, 0.22, 0.35)$	$\Delta(0, 0.30, 0.40)$
Change in Pest			
expenditure (%)	∆ (0, 0.10, 0.15)	∆ (0, 0.13, 0.30)	<mark>∆</mark> (0, 0.20, 0.35)
Seed premium			
(US\$/hectare)	<mark>∆</mark> (6, 8, 10)	<mark>∆</mark> (34, 40, 49)	<mark>∆</mark> (27, 32, 42)
Adoption rate (%)	∆ (50, 65, 80)	<mark>∆</mark> (50, 70, 90)	<mark>∆</mark> (50, 70, 90)
Diffusion path (yrs)	21	21	22
R&D cost (US\$)	200,000	90,000	1,200,000
Cost of TF (US\$)			655,389,100

Area (million hectares)= 3,032, Cost of production (US\$/hectare) = 570.12 Yield of raw cotton (kg/hectare) ~ N(1962, 204) Price of raw cotton (Rs/40kg) ~ N(1034, 226)

Results: Benefits-Cost of Adoption



Results: Impact of Technology Fee



	Resu
	an
	4,000 - 3,500 - 3,000 - 2,000 - 1,500 - 500 - 0
• • Definitions the Fli	The common to produce Despite a constraint Contrary to Contrary to espite the hase cost to the - Pakista uctuating a
	- addres agricu techn
Als Ag Fa Int 36 M Ag	ston, J.M., G.W. <i>ricultural Resea</i> lck-Zeppeda, Jo roduction of a 9. oschini, G. and ricultural R&D.
	Institute for So Innovative De

ults: Irregular Adoption nd Economic Benefits



Conclusions

ercial adoption of Bt cotton can result in substantial benefits ers and consumers

decline in price, the share of the benefits going to farmers is

o popular belief, the share of benefits to innovators is small

Policy Implications

nigh technology fee, the total gross benefits are higher than he GOP .

tan should adopt the latest Bt cotton technology

adoption rates can reduce the economic benefits. Therefore: ss several technical and institutional issues (easy access to Iltural inputs and credit, proper training to use GM ology, extension, etc.)

References

. Norton, and P.G. Pardey. 1995. Science under scarcity: Principles and practice for earch Evaluation and Priority Setting. Ithaca NY: Cornell University Press, 1995. ose., B., G. Traxler, and R.G. Nelson. 2000. "Surplus Distribution from the Biotechnology Innovation". American Journal of Agricultural Economics. 82:360-

H. Lapan. 1997. "Intellectual Property Rights and the Welfare Effects on " American Journal of Agricultural Economics.79(November 1997):131-142.

Acknowledgements

ociety, Culture and Environment, University of Virginia Tech, Alexandria, Virginia, USA velopment Strategies, Islamabad, Pakistan Pakistan Agricultural Research Council, Islamabad, Pakistan Pakistan Institute of Development Economics, Islamabad, Pakistan