
GETTING REAL:
**Real Options Analysis of land use change
in a world of price, yield and climate
uncertainty.**

Courtney M. Regan

School of Biological Sciences

University of Adelaide

OCTOBER 2016

A thesis submitted to The University of Adelaide in fulfilment of the
requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Table of Contents

TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	ii
ABSTRACT.....	v
DECLARATION.....	viii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	ix
LIST OF PUBLICATIONS.....	x
LIST OF TABLES.....	xi
LIST OF FIGURES.....	xx
1 CHAPTER ONE: Introduction	1
1.1 Introduction	2
1.2 References	9
2 CHAPTER TWO: Further context	14
2.1 Biomass industry in Australia	15
2.2 Choice of real options model	18
2.3 References	21
3 CHAPTER THREE: Real options analysis for land use management: methods, application, and implications for policy.	23
Statement of Authorship	24
3.1 Introduction	27
3.2 Discounted cash flow	28
3.2.1 Concepts	28
3.2.2 Application in land use and management	29
3.2.3 A critique	29
3.3 Real options analysis	30
3.3.1 Concepts	30
3.3.2 Methods	32
3.4 Application in land use management	35
3.4.1 Challenges in real options modelling of land use change	36
3.4.2 Unrealised opportunity: ROA simulation for policy	37

3.5	A case study	38
3.5.1	Decision scenario	38
3.5.2	Data and model assumptions	39
3.5.3	Biomass energy price	39
3.5.4	Results and discussion	40
3.6	Implications for land use policy and future research	41
3.7	Conclusion	43
3.8	References	45
4	CHAPTER FOUR: Spatial real options analysis: informing better incentive policy for motivating biomass agroforestry in agricultural land.	53
	Statement of Authorship	54
4.1	Introduction	57
4.2	Methods	60
4.2.1	Study area	60
4.2.2	Biomass production in Australia	61
4.2.3	Modelling of biomass and wheat yields	62
4.2.4	Commodity price time-series	64
4.2.5	Calculation of economic returns	65
4.2.6	Investment decision using discounted cash flow	68
4.2.7	Investment decision using ROA	70
4.2.8	Policy analysis	73
4.3	Results	74
4.4	Discussion	77
4.4.1	Effect of policy on land use change	77
4.4.2	Implications for policy	79
4.4.3	Innovation and limitations	80
4.5	Conclusion	81
4.6	References	83
5	CHAPTER FIVE: Real options analysis of land use change in a world of price, yield and climate uncertainty.	90
	Statement of Authorship	91
5.1	Introduction	94
5.2	Methods	96
5.2.1	Study area	96

5.2.2	Climate scenarios	97
5.2.3	Representing spatial diversity	98
5.2.4	Methodology overview	99
5.2.5	Biomass production scenario	100
5.2.6	Biomass productivity	100
5.2.7	Wheat productivity	101
5.2.8	Commodity price time series	101
5.2.9	Investment decision using discounted cash flow	102
5.2.10	Investment decision using ROA	104
5.3	Results	105
5.3.1	Regional primary productivity	105
5.3.2	Economic returns to production for NPV analysis	106
5.3.3	Returns required to trigger land use change using NPV	107
5.3.4	Returns required to trigger land use change using real options	108
5.3.5	Climate change impacts on land use conversion economics	108
5.3.6	Comparison of real options and net present value results	109
5.3.7	Viable areas for land use change to biomass	111
5.4	Discussion	112
5.5	Conclusion	115
5.6	References	117
6	CHAPTER SIX: Conclusions	123
6.1	Key findings and conclusions	124
6.2	Future research	129
6.3	References	133
	Appendix A	136
	Appendix B	142
	Appendix C	155

ABSTRACT

The de-carbonisation of electricity generation systems will be vital in mitigating the worst effects of global climate change. This will involve the substitution of fossil fuel based generation with renewable and carbon neutral energy sources such as photovoltaics, wind and biomass.

Internationally, the use of biomass to produce electricity has maintained a market share of approximately 2% of total global generation over the past 20 years (Evans et al., 2010). However, for the biomass share of electricity generation to increase, dedicated biomass crops will likely be necessary on land currently used for traditional agricultural production. Understanding the returns required by landholders from alternative land uses such as biomass is an important first step in determining a) the viability of such an industry in any particular region and; b) how policy setting can facilitate new industries and land use change.

The economics of land use change from agriculture to agro-forestry based biomass production has been broadly examined in Australia. However, these studies have largely employed discounted cash flow analysis (DCF) to determine the profitability of biomass enterprises. Discounted cash flow analysis is an established way to value land use and management investments which accounts for the time value of money. However, it provides a static view and assumes passive commitment to an investment strategy when real world land use and management investment decisions are characterised by uncertainty, irreversibility, change, and adaptation. Real options analysis (ROA) has been proposed as a better valuation method under uncertainty and where the opportunity exists to delay investment decisions, pending more information. When uncertainty and flexibility are considered, the rates of return required for investing in a new land use can be substantially higher than suggested by DCF calculations. This has obvious implications for investors and policy makers alike. However, while investments in biomass agro-forestry are characterised by uncertainties, risk and large upfront (mostly sunk) costs, the application of ROA to this land use change question in Australia has been scarce.

A previous limitation to the uptake of ROA has been model complexity and dimensionality. Established analytical methods demand advanced mathematical skills of the practitioner and can only be applied to limited range of problems, as solutions only exist for rather simple situations considering limited sources of uncertainty. However, investments in alternative land uses, unlike investment questions in financial markets (to which established analytical methods were designed to be applied), will involve multiple sources of uncertainty such as commodity prices, spatially varying risks like crop yields and emerging risks such as climate change. This poses challenges to the application of ROA to these types of investment questions. Newer Monte Carlo simulation methods

provide opportunity to investigate land use change problems where investment decisions are likely to involve multiple sources of uncertainty, spatially variable risks such as crop yields and long investment horizons.

This research aimed to adapt a Monte Carlo based ROA simulation model to investigate [1] the effect of multiple uncertainties on the investment decision to switch land use from agriculture to biomass agro-forestry in a climatically diverse region of southern Australia, [2] Understand the effect of spatially varying yield uncertainty across the study area, [3] explore the role potential climate change may have on the returns required to encourage land use change to biomass agro-forestry and [4] provide mapped estimates of viable areas for biomass agroforestry at a range of price points across the study area.

The results show that the consideration of price and yield uncertainty adds substantially to the returns required to trigger land use change from wheat to biomass when compared to results from the DCF analysis. Results indicate that uncertainty over returns to agroforestry, high upfront (largely sunk) costs, and loss of flexibility associated with agroforestry provide the landholder with a valuable option to delay reforestation and wait for uncertainties to resolve. Our results showed that for the lower Murray study area, the value of this option can be substantial, ranging from 1.45 – 2.32 times the present value of expenditures (DCF break-even point).

Landholders often cite the lack of certainty of government policies, and the longevity of incentive schemes as barriers to investment in reforestation. This research investigated the effect of incentive payments and incentive payment uncertainty on returns required to trigger land use change. This research found that a \$25/t CO₂-e carbon payment reduced the trigger price substantially but that this impact varied spatially. While the effect of an uncertain carbon payment policy was to increase the conversion trigger returns when compared to a fixed carbon payment, the effect of added uncertainty was found to be small. The small effect of payment uncertainty reflects that the additional payment acted more as an additional top up payment, not a main source of revenue from conversion to biomass. This highlights a need to understand the role of incentive payments in the overall revenue stream created from any land use change. For example, when a large proportion of revenue from land use change is reliant on government policy, not market demand, policy risks are higher.

Future climate change is anticipated to be the principal source of risk affecting long term economic viability of rain-fed agricultural systems. This research specifically modelled land use change from agriculture to biomass production in a spatially explicit framework across a broad region accounting

for impacts of climate change on yield variability. The effect of climate change on trigger returns shows substantial spatial heterogeneity not only between high and low rainfall areas as one would intuitively expect, but within similarly classified areas. In broad terms climate change reduced returns required for land use change to biomass in low and medium rainfall zones (-76%) and increased them in the higher rainfall areas (25%). The results of this research show that even under severe climate change comparatively small areas are economically viable for conversion to biomass under \$200/ DM t (930,986 ha), and it is not until prices exceed \$200/DM t that significant areas become profitable for conversion to biomass (up to 2,738,463 ha).

On an energy equivalence basis, to be competitive with an oil price of AU\$41/barrel (current at the time of writing) biomass would have to be priced at less than AU\$130/DM t. Similarly, to be competitive with coal at AU\$68/t, the energy equivalent price of biomass would have to be less than AU\$52/DM t. Whether or not these prices are ultimately achievable is speculative, however, for substantial biomass industry development to occur in the study area, the synchronisation of products and services derived from mallee (oil, biomass, charcoal and carbon) and the development of markets will be paramount.

DECLARATION

I certify that this work contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in my name, in any university or other tertiary institution and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference has been made in the text. In addition, I certify that no part of this work will, in the future, be used in a submission in my name, for any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution without the prior approval of the University of Adelaide and where applicable, any partner institution responsible for the joint-award of this degree.

I give consent to this copy of my thesis when deposited in the University Library, being made available for loan and photocopying, subject to the provisions of the Copyright Act 1968. The author acknowledges that copyright of published works contained within this thesis resides with the copyright holder(s) of those works.

I also give permission for the digital version of my thesis to be made available on the web, via the University's digital research repository, the Library Search and also through web search engines, unless permission has been granted by the University to restrict access for a period of time.

Courtney Regan

April 2016

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

When I first started along this road it was hard to believe I would ever be at the point where I was writing this section. But after chipping away little by little I find myself, obligatory coffee in hand, sitting at my computer (who I affectionately call old Bertha; a fine example of artificial intelligence who has tried to give me a heart attack on more than one occasion) wanting to thank all of those people that have helped me in my continuing journey to become an educated and enlightened human being. I hope the following does you all justice.

I firstly need to thank my wonderful parents. For constantly sacrificing to give their child the best possible chance in life. You have supported me beyond measure and have believed in me when no one else did, not even myself. If I have achieved anything, it is because you believed I could, and eventually it was infectious. If I am ever so blessed as to become a parent, I have the best examples to follow. Thank you.

I want to acknowledge my primary supervisor Professor Wayne Meyer, who gave me this opportunity. Thank you Wayne for that, I have thoroughly enjoyed our long talks on the future of science and especially our discussions on our shared passions of bees and agriculture. It is always great to know there are kindred spirits in the world.

I wish to thank my other supervisors Dr. Brett Bryan, Associate Professor Bertram Ostendorf, Dr. Jeff Connor and also Dr. Zili Zhu. When I turned up in your office I was pretty unsure and overly ambitious. Thank you for moulding that naive lump of clay in to something resembling an academic. You have all provided me with an outstanding example of how one builds integrity and respect in a career. I sincerely hope I can work with you in future and keep learning from you, you are all amazing at what you do.

To my friends, who are numerous because I am very popular, thanks for the fun we've had during this time, it has kept me sane. A special mention needs to go to the Wizard Council. So to you all thank you! There are, however, a few names among that list that need special mention. Thank you Nick Koch for being my never wavering friend, for being a constant in my life for so many years and for your brave honesty. You are like a brother to me. To my brother Myles and Lintern Fairbrother. You both gave me the confidence to start this thing, assured me I could do it, supported me and guided me through the toughest parts. I will have your advice, Lintern, chiselled on my grave "just keep turning up like an A*#@hole". Although I think that advice originated with Ramesh!? To Ramesh Raja Segaran, you are one Zen mofo. On so many occasions your advice, help, calm and friendship saved me from a nervous breakdown. Thank you brother, I don't know if I can ever repay the favour!

To all the folks in the Davies building, it has been a great privilege to work with you all. You are all doing such amazing work, many of you in a crazy language that isn't your own and so far from the supports that I know I have needed. I don't know how you do it but you have my greatest respect and admiration and you are a constant source of inspiration.

Lastly but by no means least. To my dearest Chevaun. Without your love, support, humour and constant encouragement I would have fallen by the wayside long ago. We have walked a hard road together over the past few years and it seems that our paths now diverge. No amount of thank you can express the gratitude I have for having had you in my life. There will always be a part of my heart that belongs to you. My sincerest wish is that someday we again can be friends. Thank you. XX

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS

Regan, C.M., Bryan, B.A., Connor, J.D., Meyer, W.S., Ostendorf, B., Zhu, Z., Bao, C., 2015. Real options analysis for land use management: Methods, application, and implications for policy. *Journal of Environmental Management* 161, 144-152.

Regan, C.M., Connor, J.D., Bryan, B.A., Meyer, W.S., Ostendorf, B., 2016. Spatial real options analysis: informing better incentive policy for motivating biomass agroforestry in agricultural land. *Land Use Policy*. Submitted, manuscript ID LUP_2016_139.

Regan, C.M., Connor, J.D., Raja Segaran, R., Meyer, W.S., Bryan, B.A., Ostendorf, B., 2016. Climate change and the economics of biomass energy feedstocks in semi-arid agricultural landscapes: A spatially explicit real options analysis. *Journal of Environmental Management*. Submitted, manuscript ID JEMA-S-16-01136.

List of Tables

3.1	Summary of common options analysed in ROA.	32
3.2	Model Parameters.	40
3.3	Trigger GMs for conversion of land from wheat production using NPV and ROA.	41
4.1	Historical growing season and annual rainfall for the study location.	61
4.2	Modelled biomass yields, below-ground carbon sequestration and wheat yields for each location 1891 to 2005.	64
4.3	Model parameters.	68
4.4	Summary of ROA scenario treatments.	73
4.5	Trigger GM/ha' critical present values of returns and investment multiples needed for land use conversion using DCF and ROA for Scenario 1.	75
5.1	Climate scenario description.	98
5.2	Overview of assumed parameters applicable to both NPV and ROA calculations.	104
5.3	Summary of mean economic profitability of wheat and biomass production across the study area under baseline and two climate change futures.	107
5.4	Summary of ROA trigger returns required from across the study area under baseline climate and two climate change futures.	109

List of Figures

2.1	Schematic representation of the processes in an integrated tree biomass and oil processing plant.	18
2.2	Optimal exercise frontier for NPV and ROA showing diminishing time value of the investment option under the assumption of a finite investment horizon.	20
3.1	Boundaries of applicability for NPV and ROA.	31
3.2	The evolution of underlying asset value in a binomial lattice.	34
4.1	Location of lower Murray-Darling Basin study area.	60
4.2	Derived biomass prices 1970–2013 and a sample of development of future biomass prices using an ARIMA(0,1,1) model in A\$/t.	74
4.3	Wheat prices 1970–2013 and sample of development of future wheat prices using an ARIMA(0,1,1) in A\$/t.	74
4.4	Trigger gross margins and investment multiples calculated using ROA required for land use change from wheat to biomass in the 5 study locations in Scenario 1, 2 and 3.	76
5.1	Location map of the Lower Murray study area.	97
5.2	Classification of the study area in to low, medium and high rainfall zones according to long-term annual rainfall data and rainfall zone delineations.	99
5.3	Mean wheat and biomass productivity in the low, medium and high rainfall zones of the study area under baseline (S0) climate and two climate change scenarios.	106
5.4	Returns (\$/ha) from biomass required to trigger land use change from conventional agriculture (wheat) to biomass under NPV investment rational, under baseline climate conditions and 2 climate change scenarios.	107
5.5	Returns (\$/ha) from biomass required to trigger land use change from conventional agriculture (wheat) to biomass using ROA under baseline climate conditions and 2 climate change scenarios.	108
5.6	The effect of uncertainty, as measured by IM, on the returns required to trigger land use change to biomass using ROA.	110
5.7	Areas economically viable for land use change to biomass, calculated from the ROA trigger returns, at biomass prices of up to \$200/DM t and up to \$300/DM t.	112