# On the palm oil - biodiversity tradeoff: Environmental performance of smallholder producers

### Bernhard Dalheimer, Fabian Brambach, Juanita Mirawati, Holger Kreft, Bernhard Brümmer bernhard.dalheimer@uni-goettingen.de

University of Goettingen Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Development

AAEA & WAEA Joint Annual Meeting, Austin, TX August 2, 2021





## Palm oil boom: Economic success and ecological desaster









## Palm oil in Indonesia: Developmental success & ecological disaster





#### Figure 1: Forest area over time

Figure 2: Food insecurity over time

(FAOSTAT, 2020)

2015

## Research gaps & questions



#### What we do know...

- Biodiversity threatened in Indonesia
- Macro relationships
- Trade-offs in large estates
- mosaic-type spatial arrangements of smallholders: exceptional opportunities for biodiversity conservation
- Smallholders provide 40% of palm oil output
- Yields are low, expansion driven

### What we do not know...

- Micro-level trade-offs
- Smallholders' environmental performance
- How to conserve biodiversity during commodity booms?

Data



- Ongoing oil palm farm survey in Jambi province of Sumatra, Indonesia
- Short unbalanced panel of 3 waves (2012, 2015, 2018)
- 123 observations
- Conventional input-output, socio economics, agricultural practices, plot plant species abundance and richness data



## Restricted (hybrid) hyperbolic distance function



Environmental restricted hyperbolic distance function

$$D_R(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{b}) = \min\Big\{\theta : \Big(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \mathbf{x}\theta, \frac{\mathbf{y}}{\theta}, \mathbf{b}\theta\Big) \in \mathcal{T}\Big\},\tag{1}$$

hybrid of enhanced hyperbolic and hyperbolic functions

- ▶  $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$  Fixed inputs (·)
- ➤ x Variable inputs (↓)
- ▶ y Good output (↑)
- ▶ b Bad output(↓)





#### Figure 3: Environmental hyperbolic distance function

## Environmental (In)efficiency





Mean efficiency:0.78Potential good output expansion:28%Potential bad output contraction:22%Manual and chemical weeding among drivers



- Eliminating weeding: 3% (19) more species and 2,4% more palm oil (practice based PES)
- Abating biodiversity loss by one species amounts to 340\$ per farm, 173\$ per ha or 16% of annual farm palm oil income, on average
- Design PES to target
  - (i) Social inclusivity of conservation
  - (ii) Uniform biodiversity
  - (iii) Cost minimizing

## Results and policy implications







Sizable conservation potential in smallholder sectors



- Sizable conservation potential in smallholder sectors
- Abatement cost for conserving are high



- Sizable conservation potential in smallholder sectors
- Abatement cost for conserving are high
- Practice based PES to lower abatement cost without trade-off



- Substantial environmental inefficiency among smallholders
- Sizable conservation potential in smallholder sectors
- Abatement cost for conserving are high
- Practice based PES to lower abatement cost without trade-off
- Outcome-PES to incentivize conservation require target dimension

## Thank you for your attention!







## FAOSTAT (2020). FAOSTAT statistical database. Data retrieved online at http://www.fao.org/faostat/en/.

## Back up





Empirical specification (translog hyperbolic production function)



Restricted hyperbolic distance function

$$-lny_{i} = \alpha_{0} + \sum_{k=1}^{3} \alpha_{k} ln(x_{ki}) + \alpha_{4} ln(x_{4i}^{*}) + \beta_{1} ln(b_{i}^{*}) + \sum_{k=1}^{3} \beta_{1k} ln(b_{i}^{*}) ln(x_{i})$$
$$+ \beta_{14} ln(b_{i}^{*}) ln(x_{4i}^{*}) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{3} \sum_{l=1}^{3} \alpha_{kl} ln(x_{ki}) ln(x_{li}) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{3} \alpha_{k4} ln(x_{k}^{*}) ln(x_{4}) + \frac{1}{2} \alpha_{44} ln(x_{i})^{2} + \frac{1}{2} \beta_{11} ln(b_{i}^{*})^{2} + \rho_{0} t_{i} + u_{i} + v_{i}, \quad (2)$$

▶  $\mathbf{y}_i$ : Oil palm,  $\mathbf{b}_i$ : Biodiversity loss,  $\mathbf{x}_i$ : Inputs,  $\mathbf{b}_i^* = \mathbf{y}_i * \mathbf{b}_i$ ,  $\mathbf{x}_i^* = \frac{\mathbf{x}_i}{\mathbf{y}_i}$ 

## Empirical specification (Inefficiency model)

For the error component  $u_i + v_i$  we assume

Homoskedastic symmetric noise:

$$v_i \sim N(0, \sigma_v^2)$$
 (3)

Heteroskedastic one sided inefficiency:

$$\mu_i \sim N^+(\mu, \sigma_{u,i}^2)$$
 (4)

and

$$\sigma_{u,i}^2 = \exp(\tau \mathbf{z}_i) \tag{5}$$

1

