

Evaluation of Investment in Agricultural Technology

Eric A. DeVuyst
Agricultural Economics
Oklahoma State University



Oklahoma State University

Theory basis for decision making

- ▶ Economists' model of the rational man
 - No emotion!
 - The ability to process large amount of information
 - Use sophisticated statistical models in processing information
- ▶ All decisions are made rationally!

Oklahoma State University



But, in the real world:

Decision making is messy: Emotions interfere with rational processing!



Source: <http://img.rankmytattoos.com/top-20-outrageous-facial-tattoos.html>
Access: 21 June 2010

Decision theory

- ▶ Mathematically complex
- ▶ Relies on rationality
- ▶ Requires subjective probability density functions
 - Difficult/impossible to elicit when more than 1 or 2 random events
- ▶ Some events are ambiguous!
 - Cannot even assign probabilities to the event because of complexity or lack of familiarity
- ▶ Lots of published criticism

Oklahoma State University



Criteria for real-world decisions and decision tools

- ▶ Criteria related to decision theory concepts, but less formal
- ▶ **Relative scale:** How big is the investment relative to wealth (net worth)?
- ▶ **Perceived risk:** How risky is the investment?
- ▶ **Degree of reversibility:** How easily can the investment decision be "undone"?

Oklahoma State University



Relative scale

- ▶ Example 1: a 3000-acre US soybean farmer considering switching 160 to a new variety
 - Small relative scale
- ▶ Example 2: a 10-acre subsistence farmer consider switching 5 acres to a new variety
 - Large relative scale
- ▶ Scale matters because it is related to the *ability to take risks and survive adverse outcomes!*

Oklahoma State University



Perceived risk

- ▶ How risky does the decision maker believe a investment alternative is?
 - What are the *potential* adverse consequences?
 - How likely are these potential adverse outcomes?
- ▶ Needs to be weighed relative to
 - potential upside and likelihood
 - the ability to weather adverse outcomes (relative scale)

Perceived risk continued

- ▶ Example 1: 3000-acre soybean farmer could probably survive a lower yield on 160 acres.
 - Likely markets for the new variety
 - Familiar with soybean production
 - LOW RISK
- ▶ Example 2 : 10-acre subsistence farmer might not survive lower yield
 - Not be able to feed his family
 - Could lose home and farm
 - HIGH RISK!

Degree of reversibility

- ▶ Can the decision be reversed low-cost, short-time frame?
- ▶ Example: Decision to move to black-headed cattle
 - Spend large amount to buy new breeding stock
 - Breed in different hide color over several years
 - LOW degree of reversibility
- ▶ Soybean example: can switch back to old variety next year. HIGH degree of reversibility

Why does reversibility matter?

- ▶ Reversibility is a "real" option
- ▶ Just as with futures options (put and calls), real options have value
- ▶ Difficult to compute value
- ▶ But, ignoring can over/under the costs of investment
 - Consider the option to build a feedlot. Multi-million \$ investment. Very difficult to undue this decision once made!

Criteria

As a decision

- Increases in Relative scale
- Increases in Perceived risk
- Decreases in Degree of reversibility

Decision tools need to be more sophisticated.

And that means, require **more** information!

Tools discussed

- ▶ Partial budgeting
- ▶ Enterprise budgeting
- ▶ Whole farm budgeting
- ▶ Cashflow budgeting
- ▶ Capital budgeting
- ▶ Real option modeling

Partial budgeting

- ▶ Used for small-scale, low-risk, highly-reversible decisions (e.g., US soybean example)

Pros	Cons
Reduced costs (\$/acre or hd)	Increased costs (\$/acre or hd)
Increased revenue (\$/acre or hd)	Decreased revenue (\$/acre or hd)
Total (A)	Total (B)
If (A-B) > 0, appear advisable	

Enterprise budget

- ▶ Used for somewhat larger-scale, low-to-moderate risk decisions
 - E.g., comparing two competing enterprises
- ▶ Also need for breakeven analysis—so can consider the impacts of adverse outcomes
- ▶ List all revenues and costs that are allocated to a given enterprise
- ▶ See your state's Cooperative Extension Service for local budgets

Whole farm budgeting

- ▶ Impact of decisions on *whole farm profitability*
 - Fairly large-scale decisions
 - E.g., investment in livestock feeding facilities
- ▶ Risk and reversibility informally considered with "what-if" type questions
 - What if costs are 25% higher than expected?
 - What if we must liquidate the investment?

Cashflow budgeting

- ▶ Other budgeting tools look at the advisability (profitability) of an investment
- ▶ Cashflow budgeting looks at the feasibility of an investment (can it be done?)
- ▶ Compares all sources of cash with all uses of cash
- ▶ Regardless of scale, risk or reversibility, cashflow budgeting is a must do!

Capital budgeting

- ▶ Larger-scale, long-lived investments
- ▶ Net Present Value (NPV) of investment
 - Time-value of money
 - Sum discounted annual cashflows
 - Covert into annualized equivalent to compare investments of differing life
- ▶ Consider risk and reversibility by asking what-if questions

Real option pricing models

- ▶ Only tool to formally consider reversibility!
- ▶ Not yet accessible to a wide audience
 - Mathematically complex
 - Stochastic calculus to solve (if even possible!)
 - Often must use simulation to find value
- ▶ Few (if any) Extension tools available
- ▶ No published research looking at genetic selection as a real option model
- ▶ Testament to the difficulty in using this tool

Tools on the shelf

- ▶ Many land grants publish enterprise budgets
 - National Budget Library
<http://www.agrisk.umn.edu/Budgets/CustomSearch.aspx>
- ▶ Most state CES provide budgeting tools
- ▶ Examples from OSU www.beefextension.com
 - OSU Retained Ownership model
 - OSU RanchCalc
 - Wheat-stocker decision tools

Oklahoma State University



Questions?

- ▶ Eric DeVuyst
- ▶ 530 Ag. Hall
- ▶ Stillwater, OK 73061
- ▶ 405-744-6166
- ▶ Eric.devuyst@okstate.edu

Oklahoma State University

