


# Nitrogen use and the effects of nitrogen taxation under consideration of production and price risks

**Journal Article****Author(s):**

Finger, Robert 

**Publication date:**

2012-03

**Permanent link:**

<https://doi.org/10.3929/ethz-b-000047548>

**Rights / license:**

[Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International](#)

**Originally published in:**

Agricultural Systems 107, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2011.12.001>

1 **Postprint**

2

3

4

5 This is the accepted version of a paper published in *Agricultural Systems*. This paper has been peer-  
6 reviewed but does not include the final publisher proof-corrections or journal pagination.

7

8

9 **Citation for the original published paper:**

10

11 Finger, R. (2012). Nitrogen Use and the Effects of Nitrogen Taxation Under Consideration of Production  
12 and Price Risks. *Agricultural Systems* 107: 13-20 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2011.12.001>

13

14

15 Access to the published version may require subscription.

16

17

18 N.B. When citing this work, cite the original published paper

19

20

1                                    **Nitrogen Use and the Effects of Nitrogen Taxation**  
2                                    **Under Consideration of Production and Price Risks**

3  
4    **Abstract**

5  
6    Production and price risks affect optimal nitrogen use as well as the effects of nitrogen taxation if  
7    farmers' risk aversion is taken into account. We apply a bio-economic model to investigate the  
8    influence of risk aversion on nitrogen use in Swiss maize production. Income risks for farmers  
9    are expected to increase in the future, for instance, due to higher price variability caused by  
10   market liberalization or by higher yield variability caused by climate change. We investigate the  
11   influence of changes in these sources of risks on optimal levels of nitrogen use and its influence  
12   on the effects of nitrogen taxation. Our empirical analysis for Swiss maize production shows that  
13   risk-aversion leads to lower levels of nitrogen application than for risk-neutral farmers.  
14   Furthermore, nitrogen taxes lead to higher reductions of nitrogen use if farmers are risk-averse  
15   and these farmers face lower abatement costs. Thus, analyses on the effect of nitrogen taxes that  
16   are solely based on profit maximizing behaviour may underestimate nitrogen reductions and  
17   overestimate abatement costs. Taking expected shocks in price and yield variability into account,  
18   we find that these differences between risk neutral and risk-averse decision makers will increase  
19   further. External influences on production and price risks can thus influence the effects of  
20   agricultural policies on farmers' decision making. Thus, considering farmers' risk-preferences as  
21   well as potential increases in farmers' income risks can improve agricultural policy making.

22  
23   **Keywords:** nitrogen, nitrogen tax, risk aversion, bio-economic model, maize, Switzerland

# 1    **1    Introduction**

2

3    Crop production causes external effects that harm the environment. For instance, losses of  
4    applied nitrogen fertilizer, either gaseous or due to leaching, contribute to water pollution and  
5    climate relevant emissions (e.g. Pretty et al., 2001, von Blottnitz et al., 2006). Farmers usually do  
6    not have incentives to take these environmental externalities into account in their decision  
7    making process (Choi and Feinerman, 1995). As a consequence, the optimal levels of nitrogen  
8    use may differ substantially from the farmers', societal and environmental perspective,  
9    respectively (e.g. Zekri and Herruzo, 1994).

10    Governmental regulation and incentive schemes can help to reduce these differences. In  
11    particular, nitrogen taxes have been found to be a useful instrument to reduce nitrogen  
12    application and thus nitrogen losses to the environment (Rougoor et al., 2001). The effects of a  
13    nitrogen tax are often evaluated with regard to farmers' income losses (abatement costs) and  
14    reductions of nitrogen application. In the assessment of optimal rates of nitrogen application as  
15    well as in the assessment of nitrogen taxes, the representation of farmers' goal function in bio-  
16    economic models is often focused on (the maximization of) net farm profits (e.g. Berntsen et al.,  
17    2003, Hartmann et al., 2008, Kienzler et al., 2011, Kuhn et al., 2010, Meyer-Aurich et al., 2010,  
18    Rajsic and Weersink, 2008, Zekri and Herruzo, 1994).

19    While this is usually a valid assumption for many questions of field- and farm-level decision  
20    making, an augmentation of this model by taking risk considerations into account may be  
21    required in the modeling of nitrogen application decisions. This is due to the fact that nitrogen  
22    application represents a decision with uncertain outcome. More specifically, if making the  
23    fertilizer decision, the farmer faces uncertainty about the magnitude of yield increase due to  
24    nitrogen application and uncertainty about the price he will receive for this yield. Thus, farmers'  
25    risk preferences can affect the potential costs and environmental effects of agricultural policy  
26    measures toward reductions of nitrogen use (e.g. Chowdhury and Lacewell, 1996, Isik, 2002,  
27    Lambert, 1990, Rajsic et al., 2009, Semaan et al., 2007, Weersink et al., 1998). Ignoring risk  
28    considerations may therefore lead to erroneous predictions how farmers respond to nitrogen  
29    taxes (Chowdhury and Lacewell, 1996). Including risk considerations in the ex-ante policy

1 evaluation is therefore a useful and necessary extension of deterministic assessment methods  
2 (e.g. Isik, 2002, Rougoor et al., 2001, Swinton and Clark, 1994). A risk considering framework  
3 implies furthermore that exogenous increases in farmers' income risks can have implications for  
4 the effectiveness of policy measures.

5 Based on this background, this article aims to add a dimension to the discussion on nitrogen  
6 taxation by investigating the effects of policy measures in presence of risk aversion and in  
7 presence of shocks in the risk farmers' face. This is motivated by the fact that market  
8 liberalization and changing climatic conditions may change the risk environment in which policy  
9 measures affect farmers' decision making. To this end, we demonstrate the influence of price and  
10 yield risks on the effects of a nitrogen tax using a bio-economic model for maize (*Zea mays L.*)  
11 production in Switzerland. Maize is chosen as a case study because it is among the crops with the  
12 highest leaching potential.

13 In Switzerland, the introduction of nitrogen tax in Swiss agriculture is considered as a relevant  
14 policy option if other measures do not lead to the attainment of long-term targets of reducing the  
15 loss of harmful nitrogen compounds from agriculture (Hartmann et al., 2008). Currently, Swiss  
16 agricultural policy uses nitrogen use restrictions (formulated in kg/ha for each crop), which are  
17 part of the cross-compliance obligations that farmers have to fulfil to receive direct payments.  
18 Thus, the here presented results should contribute to the formulation of improved agri-  
19 environmental policies.

20 Furthermore, we apply in our analysis sensitivity analyses that reveal the influence of potential  
21 shocks in farmers' income risks due to market liberalization and climate change on the optimal  
22 levels of nitrogen use and the effect of nitrogen taxes. Currently, Swiss farmers face only small  
23 income variability: Firstly, the variability of crop yields is small because climatic conditions are  
24 favourable for crop production and extreme climatic events such as droughts are rare. Secondly,  
25 price variability is much lower than in other countries because currently tariffs, quotas and other  
26 trade regulations reduce the impact of volatile world market prices on Swiss markets. However,  
27 Swiss farmers are expected to face more risky production and market conditions in the future:  
28 Climate change is expected to increase yield variability, particularly for maize (Finger et al.,  
29 2011). Furthermore, likely market liberalization (e.g. due to a free trade agreement with the  
30 European Union) is expected to increase price variability (e.g. Mahul, 2003). Therefore, we

1 analyse the impact of increasing yield and price risks on the effects of a nitrogen tax. Because the  
2 policy relevance as well as the potential for shocks in farmers' income risks are also given in  
3 other countries, the here presented Swiss situation is much more generally applicable.

4 In summary, the goal of this paper is to analyse the effects of risk aversion and nitrogen taxes on  
5 nitrogen use in Swiss maize production. To this end, a bio-economic decision model that  
6 accounts for price and yield risks is employed. Furthermore, sensitivity analyses outline the  
7 influence of potential (endogenous) shocks in price and yield variability on nitrogen use and the  
8 effects of fertilizer taxes.

9

## 10 **2 Methodology**

11

12 In this paper, we use a bio-economic model, i.e. a linkage of biophysical and economic models,  
13 to analyse farmers' nitrogen decisions under production and price risk. This type of model has  
14 proven to be useful for this kind of applications (e.g Kuhn et al., 2010, Semaan et al., 2007). In  
15 our bio-economic decision model we combines a crop growth model (CropSyst) with a non-  
16 linear economic model, representing a risk-averse decision maker, using crop production and  
17 yield variability functions. The here presented framework is based on the approaches presented  
18 in Finger et al. (2010, 2011). In this this section, the employed biophysical, statistical and  
19 economic models are presented. Note that information on the data generation process, other data  
20 sources and assumptions made in the economic model are presented in the subsequent section.

21

### 22 **2.1. Crop Simulation Model**

23

24 To simulate observations of maize yields for different levels of nitrogen application, the  
25 deterministic crop yield simulation model CropSyst is applied for the eastern Swiss Plateau  
26 region (Finger and Schmid, 2008). CropSyst models above- and below-ground processes (e.g.  
27 the soil water budget, soil-plant nitrogen budget, crop phenology, canopy and root growth, and

1 crop yield) on a daily time step (see Stöckle et al., 2003, for details). In CropSyst, these  
2 processes are simulated in response to crop and soil characteristics, daily weather data, and  
3 management options. Model calibration, validation and settings for Swiss maize production are  
4 presented in Torriani et al. (2007a). This model is used to simulate in an experimental design  
5 maize yields for different levels of N-application. Stochasticity is introduced in this modelling  
6 setup by considering a large and heterogeneous set of observed weather observations in the  
7 model. Observations simulated with CropSyst in this quasi-experimental design are used to  
8 estimate statistical relationships between nitrogen application and maize yields in a subsequent  
9 step.

10

## 11 **2.2 Production and Yield Variability Functions**

12

13 In our analysis, nitrogen-yield relationships are estimated using Just and Pope (1978, 1979)  
14 production functions in which inputs are allowed to influence the mean but also the variability of  
15 crop yields:

$$(1) \quad Yield = Y(N) + \sigma_y(N)\varepsilon$$

16 where  $Y(N)$  and  $\sigma_y(N)$  denote the expected yield (production function) and the standard  
17 deviation of yield (yield variation function), respectively (both conditional on N), and where we  
18 further assume that  $E(\varepsilon) = 0$  and  $\sigma(\varepsilon) = 1$ .

19 To specify both functions empirically, assumptions on specific functional forms are needed.  
20 Such an assumption, however, also affects model results. To minimize the potential error arising  
21 from this choice, Finger and Hediger (2008) estimated different functional forms to similar data  
22 as employed here and made comparisons based on potential costs of misspecification. Thus,  
23 using an economic approach to the comparison of production functions, the potential  
24 underestimation of net revenues that would arise from an improper specification of the functional  
25 form has been minimized. It showed that the square root specification leads to the smallest cost  
26 of misspecification, i.e. represents a good compromise between possible extreme solutions.

1 Based on this background, the production function estimation in our analysis assumes the  
2 following form:

$$(2) \quad Y(N) = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 N^{0.5} + \alpha_2 N$$

3 The function shows decreasing marginal productivity of nitrogen if  $\alpha_1 > 0$  and  $\alpha_2 < 0$ . If this is  
4 fulfilled, yields are monotonically increasing up to some point of nitrogen use and then  
5 monotonically decreasing, representing a unimodal function. In a second step, the absolute  
6 values of the regression residuals associated with the production function estimation, defined as  
7  $\hat{w} = Y - \hat{Y}$ , are used to estimate the yield variation function using the following specification  
8 (Finger and Schmid, 2008):

$$(3) \quad \sigma_Y(N) = |\hat{w}| = \beta_0 + \beta_1 N^{0.5}$$

10

11 The production and the yield variability function are estimated with the MM-estimator, a robust  
12 regression technique (see e.g. Finger, 2010, for descriptions), using the ‘robustbase’ package of  
13 R (R Development Core Team, 2008). The MM-estimator is used to reduce potential influences  
14 of outlying observations on estimation results.

15

### 16 **2.3. Estimation of price variability**

17

18 In addition to estimates for mean yields and yield variability, information on the variability of  
19 prices is required in our analysis. Estimating price variability based on raw price data would be  
20 misleading due to time trends and the lack of independency of observations. In particular, price  
21 variability might be over- or underestimated if the dependency structure (autocorrelation)  
22 between the observations is not considered. Thus, a time series approach is used to estimate price  
23 variability. Following Sarris (2000) and Johnston and DiNardo (1997), we find an autoregressive  
24 model of order 1, i.e. an AR(1) model, to be most adequate. This time series model is used to  
25 account for the dependency structure in the time series. To account for decreasing price levels



1 within the considered time period, first differences are used (i.e. we consider an integrated time  
2 series of order 1).

3 In an AR(1) model, the sample variance estimate is corrected for the dependency structure at lag  
4 1 as follows:  $\sigma_{PM}^2 = \sigma_{\varepsilon}^2 / (1 - \varphi_1^2)$ , where  $\sigma_{PM}^2$  is the variance of the maize price,  $\sigma_{\varepsilon}^2$  the variance  
5 of the error terms in the AR(1) model and  $\varphi_1^2$  is the squared first coefficient of the AR model.  
6 Thus, the higher the dependency (correlation) between subsequent price observations (i.e.  $\varphi_1$ ),  
7 the higher is the difference between the sample variance and the variance estimated in the AR  
8 model (Johnston and DiNardo, 1997).

9 An additional input required for our analysis is the level of correlation between maize yields and  
10 yield prices, i.e. the level of the so called “natural hedge”. To estimate this correlation, detrended  
11 time series of maize yields and maize prices are used. In order to test if this correlation observed  
12 at the national level is a valid assumption for farm level analysis, we employ and compare the  
13 analysis at the national and the farm-level.

14

## 15 **2.4 Economic Decision Model**

16

17 The before described information on yields and prices enter the economic model, that describes a  
18 farmers’ decision making process with regard to nitrogen use. More specifically, we use a non-  
19 linear certainty equivalent (CE) maximization approach. The CE denotes the non-random level  
20 of payoff which is rated by the farmer (in terms of utility) equivalent to an uncertain (i.e.  
21 random) level of payoff. For the risk-averse decision maker, the expected mean profit is reduced  
22 by the risk premium (RP), the amount of money the farmer is willing to pay to eliminate risk  
23 exposure:

$$(4) \quad CE = E(\pi) - RP$$

24 The expected (mean) profit ( $E(\pi)$ ) is defined as revenue (expected maize Yield,  $Y(N)$ ), times  
25 expected maize price,  $P_M$ ) minus fixed ( $C_F$ ) and variable costs. In our analysis, variable costs

1 comprise nitrogen costs (amount of nitrogen applied,  $N$ , times nitrogen price,  $p_N$ ) as well as  
 2 cleaning and drying costs (maize yield times price for cleaning and drying,  $p_D$ ):

$$(5) \quad E(\pi) = Y(N)p_M - C_F - Np_N - Y(N)p_D$$

3 The profit maximization framework is extended by assuming that profits are stochastic due to the  
 4 variability of maize yields (e.g. due to uncertain weather conditions and nitrogen application)  
 5 and due to the variability of crop prices. Moreover, the correlation between crop yield and crop  
 6 price has to be taken into account to calculate the variability of profits. In particular, low crop  
 7 yields might imply smaller supply and thus higher crop prices (“natural hedge”). The  
 8 consideration of variable cleaning and drying costs further strengthens this effect, e.g. costs are  
 9 smaller for low yield levels. Following Bhornsted and Goldberger (1969), we define the variance  
 10 of profit ( $\sigma_\pi^2$ ) as follows:

$$(6) \quad \sigma_\pi^2 = \sigma_Y^2(P_M - P_D)^2 + \sigma_{P_M}^2 Y^2 + 2Y(P_M - P_D)\text{Cov}(Y, P_M) + \sigma_Y^2 \sigma_{P_M}^2 + \text{Cov}(Y, P_M)^2$$

11 The covariance of yield and price is calculated as  $\text{Cov}(Y, P_M) = \text{corr}(Y, P_M)\sigma_{P_M}\sigma_Y$ , where  
 12  $\text{corr}(Y, P_M)$  denotes the correlation between yield and price, and  $\sigma_{P_M}$  and  $\sigma_Y$  denote the  
 13 standard deviation of maize price and maize yield, respectively. Following Di Falco et al. (2007),  
 14 the risk premium is defined as follows:

$$(7) \quad RP = 0.5 \sigma_\pi^2 \gamma / E(\pi)$$

15  $\gamma$  is the coefficient of relative risk aversion, representing the degree of risk aversion of the  
 16 farmer. In particular, a risk neutral farmer is represented by  $\gamma = 0$ , while risk averse behavior  
 17 implies  $\gamma > 0$ . The relative risk premium presented in equation (7) assumes constant relative risk  
 18 aversion that implies decreasing absolute risk aversion (i.e. risk aversion decreases with  
 19 increasing wealth). To derive optimal nitrogen allocation in this model, the certainty equivalent  
 20 is maximized with respect to nitrogen use:

$$(8) \quad \underset{N}{\text{Max}} CE = E(\pi) - RP$$

1 The optimization described above (equation 8) is conducted firstly for current climatic and  
2 market conditions. To analyse the effects of a fertilizer tax on nitrogen use, utility and profits, the  
3 fertilizer price is increased by 10%, 20% and 30%. These assumptions on possible nitrogen taxes  
4 are within the range of observed examples of nitrogen taxes in Europe (Rougoor et al., 2001).

5 To analyse potential effects of shocks in farm-income risks, sensitivity analyses of the above  
6 presented optimization problems (including the analysis of different nitrogen taxation levels) are  
7 conducted with regard to higher price and yield variability. The assumptions made in these  
8 sensitivity analyses are outlined in the data section.

9

## 10 **3 Data**

11

### 12 **3.1. Data Generation with CropSyst**

13

14 CropSyst is driven by daily weather data and management information. To introduce  
15 stochasticity of crop yields in this model, we use different sets of daily weather data, i.e.  
16 representative outcomes of current climate at the eastern Swiss Plateau for the years 1981-2003  
17 (see Finger and Schmid, 2008). More specifically, we consider daily weather data from six  
18 different locations on the Swiss Plateau as provided by the Swiss Federal Office of Meteorology  
19 and Climatology (MeteoSwiss). These locations are distributed over the eastern Swiss Plateau  
20 ranging from 06°57' to 08°54' longitude and are located at elevation levels between 422 and 565  
21 meter above sea level. In contrast to using only a single location, the use of observations from six  
22 different weather stations broadens the heterogeneity of weather observations within the bounds  
23 of current climate.

24 Besides weather data, details on crop and soil properties are important inputs for CropSyst. The  
25 assumed soil texture is characterized with 38% clay, 36% silt, and 26% sand. Soil depth amounts  
26 to 1.5 m and the soil organic matter content is at 2.6% weight in the top soil layer (5 cm) and

1 2.0% in lower soil layers, which follows Dubois et al. (1999). Specific assumptions made in  
2 CropSyst to reflect Swiss maize production are reported by Torriani et al. (2007a).

3

4 Regarding the crop management, only nitrogen fertilization was considered as flexible  
5 determinant in the model. More specifically, the total amount of fertilizer applied per year was  
6 varied randomly, ranging from 0 to 320 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>. The so derived amounts of annual nitrogen  
7 application are randomly allocated to different sets of observed weather years (i.e. model runs)  
8 described above, leading in total to 394 observations. Nitrogen applications are made 1, 30, and  
9 46 days after sowing (with a 25%, 25%, 50% distribution of the total nitrogen amount),  
10 respectively, following Dubois et al. (1998). The additional fourth application (if the total annual  
11 fertilizer amount exceeds 160 kg/ha) takes place 38 days after sowing (with a 20%, 20%, 20%,  
12 40% distribution of the total nitrogen amount on the 4 applications). For each simulation,  
13 identical starting conditions regarding soil composition and soil available nutrients are used.

14 Descriptive statistics of the resulting dataset are presented in Table 1. It shows that the yield  
15 response to additional fertilizer application shows an inverse U-shaped relationship: nitrogen  
16 first decreases, then decreases maize yields. A clear-cut relationship, however, is indicated for  
17 the influence of nitrogen application to yield variability: the higher the level of N-application, the  
18 higher is the variability of maize yields, though Table 1 suggests a saturated response for this  
19 relationship.

20

21 < Table 1. Descriptive statistics of data generated with CropSyst. >

22

### 23 3.2. Coefficient Estimates

24

25 In a subsequent step, the data shown in Table 1 is used to estimate production and yield variation  
26 functions (Equations 2 and 3). Coefficient estimates are presented in Table 2:

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

< **Table 2. Coefficient Estimates of Equations 2 and 3.** >

Supporting the relationships observed in the descriptive statistics, the coefficient estimates for the production function show that nitrogen application increases maize yield, however, with a saturating effect (i.e. nitrogen shows decreasing marginal productivity). The estimates for the yield variation function show that yield variability (i.e. production risks) increase with nitrogen application.

**3.2 Price Data and Price Variability**

The variability of maize prices is estimated using prices from 1991-2006, taken from the FAO database (FAO, 2010). Annual prices are chosen for this analysis because Swiss farmers do not use contracts and forwards yet, and so only the price after harvest is relevant. Though monthly prices are available, they usually do not differ within a year (SBV, 2010). In order to calculate coefficients of variation, the standard deviation derived from the AR(1) model is divided by the median crop price for the period 2002-2006. This period is chosen to estimate currently relevant median prices because crop prices have decreased significantly during the 1990s but remained relatively stable in the chosen period (FAO, 2010).

In order to estimate likely impacts of market liberalization on price volatility, we used the same methodology and data source to estimate price variability for Germany and France, which represent neighbouring countries of Switzerland and the most important trade partners, as well as for the USA, representing the world market.

It shows that the coefficient of variation (CV) for Swiss maize prices is 0.13. For France, Germany and the USA, much higher values are indicated: 0.23, 0.24 and 0.24, respectively. The relative price variability for Switzerland is much smaller, in particular because tariffs, quotas and other trade regulations are intensively used to control national price levels.

1 To estimate price-yield correlations at the national level, maize price and yield information for  
2 the period 1991-2006 are taken from the FAO database and detrended. This procedure leads to  
3  $\text{corr}(Y, P_M) = -0.25$ . In order to test if this correlation observed at the national level is a valid  
4 assumption for farm level analysis, we used Swiss farm-level yield and price data (see Lehmann,  
5 2010, for a description). 158 available farms that reported sufficient yield and price data in the  
6 respective period are employed for this analysis. We find that the median of these farm-level  
7 correlations is -0.24, and significantly smaller than zero. In addition, no statistical significant  
8 differences to the correlation derived at the national level (-0.25) is indicated. Thus, we conclude  
9 that the national level estimate is, in this case, a valid assumption for farm level analysis.

### 11 **3.3 Assumptions on Costs, Prices and Benefits**

13 In order to solve the optimization problem presented in Equation (8), the assumptions with  
14 regard to costs, benefits, prices and risk aversion have to be specified. Fixed costs, including  
15 costs for seeds, plant protection, insurance, machinery costs and fertilizer costs (except for  
16 nitrogen), as well as direct payments and prices for maize and nitrogen are taken from Swiss  
17 agricultural profit margin calculations (AGRIDEA and FiBL, 2009). Variable cleaning and  
18 drying costs are taken from Torriani et al. (2007b). All assumptions on costs, benefits and prices  
19 are presented in Table 3.

21 < **Table 3. Specification of Costs and Benefits.** >

23 The maximization of CE's (Equation 8) is conducted for a risk neutral ( $\gamma = 0$ ) as well as for a  
24 risk averse farmer. A moderate level of relative risk aversion,  $\gamma = 2$ , is assumed for risk averse  
25 farmers (cp. Gardebroek, 2006, for an overview of observed risk preferences).

### 27 **3.4 Assumptions for Sensitivity Analyses**

1

2 To analyse potential effects of shocks in farm-income risks, sensitivity analyses of the above  
3 presented optimization problems are conducted with regard to higher price and yield variability.  
4 Based on the above described differences of price variability between Switzerland and other  
5 countries, a scenario for higher price variability is integrated in the model by assuming a doubled  
6 coefficient of variation of maize prices ( $CV=0.26$ ). This sharp increase represents higher price  
7 volatility in a less protected market environment, e.g. due to a free trade agreement with the  
8 European Union, and is in the range of maize price variability in the neighbouring countries  
9 France and Germany. Market liberalization is also likely to decrease output prices, which will  
10 further impact nitrogen use (e.g. Weersink et al., 1998), but is beyond the scope of this paper that  
11 focuses on the effects of increasing price volatility on fertilizer use.

12 A second sensitivity analysis assumes higher production risks due to climate change. Finger and  
13 Schmid (2008) estimate an increase of maize yield variability of about 15%, while no effect of  
14 climate change on the relationship between nitrogen use and maize yield variability has been  
15 indicated. Thus, we assume that only the intercept of the yield variation function,  $\beta_0$  in Equation  
16 3, increases by 15% from 0.43 to 0.50. We are aware that climate change might also affect price  
17 variability (Battisti and Naylor, 2009). This relationship is, however, beyond the scope of this  
18 paper and thus not considered.

19

## 20 **4 Results from the Optimization**

21

22 Results of the certainty maximization for risk neutral and risk-averse farmers for the initial  
23 situation are presented in the upper panel of Table 4. It shows that the results regarding, optimal  
24 nitrogen use, profits and maize yields are within the range of currently observed practices  
25 (AGRIDEA and FiBL, 2009). In comparison to risk neutral farmers (i.e. the profit maximization  
26 problem), risk averse farmers use less nitrogen fertilizer, face smaller but less variable profits  
27 and have smaller maize yields. Certainty equivalents for risk-averse farmers are markedly  
28 smaller, because income risks reduce utility levels. The risk premium (RP, Equation 7) is about

1 82 CHF, or about 4% in relative terms. Though risk aversion leads to a clear reduction of optimal  
2 nitrogen application, the differences for expected profit, profit standard deviation and crop yields  
3 are small. A possible explanation is the fact that the production function shows only small yield  
4 decreases for reduced nitrogen applications (leading to a flat payoff function) due to the above-  
5 average available soil fertility in the here used CropSyst simulations. In particular, the here  
6 assumed soil organic matter content, which follows Dubois et al. (1999), probably over-estimates  
7 average values for the Swiss Plateau region (Torriani et al., 2007a). This will restrict the  
8 quantitative results to the specific assumptions underlying this analysis, but the qualitative  
9 interpretation will be applicable without loss of generality.

10

11 **< Table 4. Optimization Results. >**

12

13 Results for the assumptions that a nitrogen tax would be applied show that an increasing nitrogen  
14 tax, ceteris paribus, decreases nitrogen use, maize yields and profits, irrespectively of farmers'  
15 risk attitudes. A 10%, 20% and 30 % nitrogen tax would reduce the nitrogen use of a risk neutral  
16 farmer by about 5.01%, 9.65% and 13.95%, respectively. For a risk-averse farmer, the effect of a  
17 nitrogen tax on nitrogen application levels is – though slightly – higher: For instance, a nitrogen  
18 tax of 30% reduces the nitrogen use of the risk-averse farmer by about 14.56%. This higher  
19 relative reduction of the applied nitrogen amount is reached with lower costs: While for the risk  
20 neutral farmer the 30% nitrogen tax induces a reduction of certainty equivalents (or profits) is  
21 27.36 CHF, the risk-averse farmers' reduction of certainty equivalents is slightly lower, 26.98  
22 CHF. Note that also in relative terms (reduction from the initial wealth situation), the utility loss  
23 of risk averse decision makers is smaller.

24 The total financial welfare effects, taking into account farmers utility reduction and the revenue  
25 from the nitrogen tax, are negative. These welfare losses are higher (in absolute terms) for  
26 increasing level of the nitrogen tax. However, this loss of financial welfare could be outweighed  
27 by reductions of external (non-financial) environmental effects of nitrogen application.



1 In summary, the analysis of farmers' decision making with regard to nitrogen use in Swiss grain  
2 maize production shows that a) risk averse farmer use less nitrogen fertilizer; b) the relative  
3 reduction of nitrogen use due to a nitrogen tax is larger for risk averse farmers; c) the nitrogen  
4 tax and the associated reduction of nitrogen application imply smaller abatement costs for risk-  
5 averse farmers. The latter results can be explained with a smaller value of marginal product of  
6 nitrogen for risk averse than for risk neutral farmers. This is due to the fact, that the marginal risk  
7 premium of nitrogen is positive for risk-averse but is zero for risk neutral decision makers (cp.  
8 Ramaswami, 1992). However, under current yield and price risks, these differences between risk  
9 neutral and risk-averse decision makers are small.

10 This contrasts the results for increased price volatility, i.e. assuming an increase of the  
11 coefficient of variation of maize prices to increase from 0.13 to 0.26, which are presented in the  
12 middle panel Table 4. It shows that an increase of price volatility leads to a sharp increase in the  
13 variability of profits, the coefficient of variation of profits for a risk neutral farmer increases  
14 from 0.21 in the initial situation to 0.40. This increase in the variability of returns has particular  
15 implications for the risk-averse farmers: The risk premium increases to about 313 CHF (or from  
16 about 4% to 16% in relative terms), and the differences between risk neutral and risk-averse  
17 decision makers with respect to nitrogen use, profits, and crop yields become much more  
18 pronounced. In contrast to the initial (current) situation, an increase of price volatility implies  
19 that risk considerations become much more relevant. For risk-averse farmers, the increase of  
20 price variability, ceteris paribus, leads to a decrease of nitrogen application of about 8 kg/ha  
21 (equivalent to 11% of the initially applied nitrogen amount).

22 Furthermore, the increased price variability leads to larger differences in the effects of the  
23 nitrogen tax between risk averse and risk neutral farmers. In particular, the relative reductions of  
24 nitrogen use for the risk-averse decision makers are getting larger, while the utility losses  
25 associated with the tax are getting smaller. For instance, the 30 % nitrogen tax would reduce the  
26 nitrogen use by 16.70%, reducing the CE by 26.55 CHF, compared to a reduction of nitrogen use  
27 of 14.56% and a CE reduction of 26.98 CHF in the initial, current-risk situation.

28 For the case of increased yield variability (lower panel of Table 4), the results are, in general,  
29 similar to those for the increased price volatility. However, the effects of an expected 15%  
30 increase in yield variability due to climate change seem to be negligible compared to a sharp

1 increase in price risks. Thus, agricultural policy in Switzerland towards reductions of nitrogen  
2 applications should – in the medium-term perspective – especially take changes in price risks  
3 into account.

4 In summary, endogenous shocks in income risks (either due to increases yield or increases price  
5 variability) emphasize the findings for the initial situation: risk-averse farmers further reduce  
6 their nitrogen applications; a nitrogen tax leads to higher relative reductions of nitrogen  
7 application. Furthermore, endogenous shocks in income risks further reduce the abatement costs  
8 for risk-averse farmers. These effects can be explained by the fact that the higher price or yield  
9 volatility further reduces the value of marginal product (i.e. further increases the marginal risk  
10 premium) of nitrogen for risk-averse farmers.

11

## 12 **4 Discussion**

13

14 We find risk-averse farmers to use less nitrogen than their risk neutral counterparts, which is in  
15 agreement with other studies (e.g. Chowdhury and Lacewell, 1996, Isik, 2002). This result is  
16 based on the findings that nitrogen increases the yield variability, which is in agreement with  
17 other studies (e.g. Moschini and Hennessy, 2001, Rajsic et al., 2009). A different argumentation  
18 is used by Babcock (1992) and Babcock and Blackmer (1992), who show that in particular if soil  
19 available nutrients are unknown, applying more nitrogen than necessary can be a risk reducing  
20 strategy (following the decision rule “apply extra fertilizer just in case it is needed”, Babcock and  
21 Blackmer, 1992). Due to the availability of extension services, technologies and high levels of  
22 education, we think that farmers in western countries have a good awareness of soil conditions  
23 and available nutrients in the soil (Babcock and Blackmer, 1992). Accordingly, we assume in our  
24 model that soil organic matter content (i.e. available nutrients in the soil) are known by the  
25 farmer. Thus, our finding that risk-averse farmers use less nitrogen is not in contrast to the results  
26 of Babcock (1992) and Babcock and Blackmer (1992).

27 More general, we assumed in our analysis that farmers are aware of expected levels of maize  
28 yield and yield variability as well as of the effect of nitrogen application on these variables. In

1 order to validate these assumptions, further research should investigate farmers' decision making  
2 processes with regard to fertilizer use (cp. e.g. Kienzler et al., 2011). The here presented analysis  
3 of relationships between maize yield and the amount of nitrogen application is based on  
4 generated data with the crop simulation model CropSyst and is thus restricted on the employed  
5 model- and soil-specifications. We are aware that more site specific modelling approaches are  
6 needed to account for the spatial heterogeneity of soil conditions in Switzerland, especially  
7 regarding soil fertility (BLW, 2000). Thus, further bio-economic assessment of nitrogen response  
8 functions and nitrogen taxation should be considered in a spatially explicit modelling approach.

9 The elasticities of optimal nitrogen use to changes in nitrogen costs indicated in our analysis are  
10 about -0.5, i.e. a 1% increase in nitrogen costs (e.g. due to a tax) decreases nitrogen use by about  
11 0.5%. Though this estimate is in the range of elasticities reported in other studies (cp. Burrell,  
12 1989, for an overview), we expect that the presented estimates likely overestimate real-world  
13 elasticities. This is, for instance, due to the fact that also non-economic drivers (e.g. habits,  
14 preferences for good looking crops) can be very important for input use decisions (Rajsic et al.,  
15 2009). Observed reactions of nitrogen use of farmers to changes in nitrogen prices over time  
16 could be used to analyse potential mismatches between model assumptions and real behaviour.  
17 For our analysis this is, however, not possible due to the lack of data available.

18 Furthermore, our analysis may overestimate nitrogen use elasticities because inter-seasonal  
19 adjustments of input applications are not considered directly. Hyytiäinen et al. (2011) show that  
20 nitrogen taxes may also induce an adjustment in the amount of fertilizer application within the  
21 season. In contrast to the analysis of Hyytiäinen et al. (2011), where the starting point was a  
22 single nitrogen application per season, our analysis assumes 3-4 fertilizer application events per  
23 season, which reflects current practises in Swiss crop production. Thus, the potential for  
24 adjustment in this respect may be limited in our application. Along these lines, Lehmann et al.  
25 (2011) showed that even the optimal timing of fertilizer application within the growing season  
26 may change under changing (climatic and economic) boundary conditions.

27 We are aware that even though risk preferences are important for farmers' utility (risk premiums  
28 indicated in our analysis range from 4% to 16%), the sensitivity of optimal input use, reflecting  
29 the extent of risk avoidance, to changing risk preferences may be smaller (e.g. Pannell et al.,  
30 2000). In addition, some assumptions of our modelling approach may cause an overestimation of

1 the effects of risk preferences on nitrogen use decisions. For instance, we restricted the here  
2 presented analysis on a single agricultural activity, grain maize production, in order to clearly  
3 illustrate the effects of risk aversion and nitrogen taxes on nitrogen use. However, if more on-  
4 and off-farm activities would be taken into account, the introduction of risk aversion might also  
5 imply shifts towards less risky activities (e.g. Weersink et al., 1998). Thus, the optimal farm  
6 program response to increasing price or production risks may not only be the reduction of input  
7 use but also the switch to less risky production programs (e.g. less risky crops) or an increased  
8 share of off-farm activities. Moreover, also the introduction of a nitrogen tax can imply, besides  
9 reductions of fertilizer use for specific crops, adjustments in the optimal whole farm program.

10 To overcome this drawback, multi-output production systems can be estimated that represent  
11 farmers explicitly as portfolio managers and directly consider interactions between different  
12 activities (e.g. Tveteras et al., 2011). Furthermore, bio-economic models could be developed  
13 further to address these points. More specifically, the biophysical spatial explicit modelling of  
14 whole farm programs, taking risk considerations and other adjustment strategies towards  
15 increasing risks and fertilizer prices (e.g. tillage intensities, fertilizer application techniques and  
16 site specific farming practices) into account, is necessary for scientifically based policy  
17 recommendations on optimal taxation of nitrogen fertilizer.

18 Analysing the effects of nitrogen taxes, we find that a smaller tax is required to reach desired  
19 reductions of nitrogen applications for risk-averse farmers than for risk neutral agents. Moreover,  
20 the abatement costs of nitrogen reduction are smaller for risk-averse farmers. Because a high  
21 heterogeneity with regard to risk preferences among farmers within a country can be expected  
22 (e.g. Rosenzweig and Binswanger, 1993), nitrogen taxes will thus have heterogeneous effects.  
23 Moreover, spatial heterogeneity of soil fertility will further increase the heterogeneity of nitrogen  
24 tax effects. Sheriff (2005) shows that these heterogeneities can be a particular positive argument  
25 for nitrogen taxation, because the reductions of nitrogen use due to the tax will be allocated  
26 across farms in a cost efficient way: For instance, those farmers that have the smallest abatement  
27 costs (e.g. due to high risk-aversion) will reduce their nitrogen applications more than those  
28 farmers that face high abatement costs. This ‘sorting effect’ of nitrogen reductions according to  
29 marginal costs based on heterogeneous risk preferences is furthermore an argument against a  
30 uniform nitrogen use restriction, which is currently applied in Switzerland via cross-compliance

1 obligations (El Benni and Lehmann, 2010). Given a heterogeneous distribution of marginal  
2 nitrogen abatement costs, input use restrictions might imply higher costs to reach a specific  
3 nitrogen reduction goal (Sheriff, 2005).

4 In summary, a tax solution to internalize external effects of nitrogen application and to reduce  
5 nitrogen application seems to be superior to uniform nitrogen use restrictions, in particular if risk  
6 considerations are taken into account. However, different interest groups may have low  
7 incentives for changes towards a tax-based system (O'Shea, 2002), which may hamper its  
8 implementation. An additional problem is that, if price elasticities of input use are small, a tax  
9 may not necessarily lead to the desired changes in nitrogen use (Falconer and Hodge, 2000). If a  
10 tax does not imply environmental benefits, however, it can induce welfare reductions. To  
11 overcome problems of acceptance and impacts, such policy measure should be accompanied by a  
12 set of measures. In particular, education, training and awareness creation may contribute to  
13 higher efficacy of agri-environmental policy intervention (Falconer and Hodge, 2000).  
14 Furthermore, a tax system may be combined with specific standards designed to prevent  
15 environmental damages above very critical thresholds (O'Shea, 2002).

16

## 17 **5 Summary and Conclusion**

18

19 Using the example of Swiss grain maize production, we show that risk-averse farmers use less  
20 nitrogen fertilizer than risk neutral decision makers. This result is based on the empirical finding  
21 that nitrogen increases yield variability and thus the marginal risk premium of nitrogen is  
22 positive for risk-averse but zero for risk neutral decision makers. Due to this relationship, a  
23 smaller nitrogen tax is required to reach desired reductions of nitrogen applications for risk-  
24 averse farmers than for risk neutral agents. Moreover, these nitrogen reductions imply lower  
25 abatement costs for risk-averse farmers. These results imply that ex-ante assessments of the  
26 effects of a nitrogen tax that are based on profit-maximizing behaviour might under-estimate the  
27 nitrogen reduction and over-estimate the total abatement costs due to a tax on the national level.

1 The analysis of endogenous shocks in income risks due to increasing yield and price variability  
2 shows that the above described effects become more pronounced because differences in optimal  
3 input allocation between risk neutral and risk-averse farmers increase. Thus, agri-environmental  
4 policy should take into account effects of further market liberalization on price volatility and its  
5 implications on nitrogen use and the effects of nitrogen taxation in crop production. Because this  
6 effect of more liberalized markets may be also evident in other countries, this finding is also  
7 relevant at a larger scale. In the long run, also effects of climate change on yield variability have  
8 to be taken into account if effective nitrogen reduction policies are designed.

## 9 **Acknowledgements**

10

11 This work was supported by the Swiss National Science Foundation in the framework of the  
12 National Centre of Competence in Research on Climate (NCCR Climate) and the National  
13 Research Programme 61. We would like to thank the Agroscope Reckenholz-Tänikon Research  
14 Station for providing the FADN data, the Swiss Federal Office of Meteorology for providing  
15 access to the meteorological database, Stéphanie Schmid for CropSyst data provision, and the  
16 editor, two anonymous reviewers as well as Nadja El Benni for helpful comments on an earlier  
17 version of the manuscript.

18

## 19 **References**

- 20 AGRIDEA, FiBL, 2009. Deckungsbeiträge 2009. Swiss Association for the Development of  
21 Rural Areas (AGRIDEA) and Research Institute for Organic Agriculture, Switzerland.
- 22 Babcock, B.A., 1992. The Effects of Uncertainty on Optimal Nitrogen Applications. *Rev. Agric.*  
23 *Econ.* 14, 271-280.
- 24 Babcock, B.A., Blackmer, A.M., 1992. The Value of Reducing Temporal Input Nonuniformities.  
25 *J. Agric. Res. Econ.* 17, 335-347.
- 26 Battisti, D.S., Naylor, R.L., 2009. Historical Warnings of Future Food Insecurity with  
27 Unprecedented Seasonal Heat. *Science* 323, 240 – 244.

- 1 Berntsen, J., Petersen, B.M., Jacobsen, B.H., Olesen, J.E., Hutchings N.J., 2003. Evaluating  
2 nitrogen taxation scenarios using the dynamic whole farm simulation model FASSET. *Agric.*  
3 *Syst.* 76, 817–839.
- 4 Bhornsted, G.W., Goldberger, A.S., 1969. On the exact Covariance of Products of Random  
5 Variables. *J. Am. Stat. Assoc.* 64, 1439-1442.
- 6 BLW, 2000. Bodeneignungskarte der Schweiz. Bundesmat für Landwirtschaft (BLW) – Swiss  
7 Federal Office for Agriculture, Bern, Switzerland.
- 8 Burrell, A., 1989. The demand for fertilizer in the United Kingdom. *J. Agric. Econ.* 40, 1–20.
- 9 Choi, E.K., Feinerman, E., 1995. Regulation of Nitrogen Pollution: taxes versus Quotas. *J. Agric.*  
10 *Res. Econ.* 20, 122-134.
- 11 Chowdhury, M.E., Lacewell, R.D., 1996. Implications of Alternative Policies on Nitrate  
12 Contamination of Groundwater. *J. Agric. Res. Econ.* 21, 82-95.
- 13 Di Falco, S., Chavas, J.-P., Smale, M., 2007. Farmer management of production risk on degraded  
14 lands: the role of wheat variety diversity in the Tigray region, Ethiopia. *Agric. Econ.* 36, 147-  
15 156.
- 16 Dubois, D., Zihlmann, U., Fried, P.M., 1999. Burgrain: Erträge und Wirtschaftlichkeit dreier  
17 Anbausysteme. *Agrarforschung* 6, 169–172.
- 18 Dubois, D., Scherrer, C., Gunst, L., Jossi, W., Stauffer, W., 1998. Effect of different farming  
19 systems on the weed seed bank in long-term trials Chaiblen and DOK. *J. Plant Dis. Protect.*  
20 16, 67-74.
- 21 El Benni, N., Lehmann, B., 2010. Swiss agricultural policy reform: landscape changes in  
22 consequence of national agricultural policy and international competition pressure. In: J.  
23 Primdahl and S. Swaffield, eds., *Globalisation and Agricultural Landscapes, Change Patterns*  
24 *and Policy trends in Developed Countries.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 73-93.
- 25 Falconer, K., Hodge, I., 2000. Using economic incentives for pesticide usage reductions:  
26 responsiveness to input taxation and agricultural systems. *Agric. Syst.* 63, 175-194.
- 27 Finger, R., 2010. Revisiting the Evaluation of Robust Regression Techniques for Crop Yield  
28 Data Detrending. *Am. J. Agric. Econ.* 92, 205-211.

- 1 Finger, R., Hediger, W., 2008. The Application of Robust Regression to a Production Function  
2 Comparison. *Open Agric. J.* 2, 90-98.
- 3 Finger, R., Schmid, S., 2008. Modeling Agricultural Production Risk and the Adaptation to  
4 Climate Change. *Agric. Fin. Rev.* 68, 25-41
- 5 Finger, R., Lazzarotto, P., Calanca, P., 2010. Bio-economic assessment of climate change  
6 impacts on managed grassland production. *Agric. Syst.*, 103, 666-674.
- 7 Finger, R., Hediger, W., Schmid, S., 2011. Irrigation as adaptation strategy to climate change: a  
8 biophysical and economic appraisal for Swiss maize production. *Climatic Change* 105, 509-  
9 528.
- 10 Gardeboek, C., 2006. Comparing risk attitudes of organic and non-organic farmers with a  
11 Bayesian random coefficient model. *Eur. Rev. Agric. Econ.*, 33,485–510
- 12 Hartmann, M., Hediger, W., Peter, S., 2008. Reducing nitrogen losses from Agricultural systems  
13 - an integrated economic assessment. *Schriften der Gesellschaft für Wirtschafts- und*  
14 *Sozialwissenschaften des Landbaus e.V. (GEWISOLA)* 43, 335-344.
- 15 Hyytiäinen, K., Niemi, J.K., Koikkalainen, K., Palosuo, T., Salo, T., 2011. Adaptive  
16 optimization of crop production and nitrogen leaching abatement under yield uncertainty.  
17 *Agric. Syst.* 104, 634-644.
- 18 Isik, M., 2002. Resource Management under Production and Output Price Uncertainty:  
19 Implications for Environmental Policy. *Am. J. Agric. Econ.* 84, 557-571.
- 20 Johnston, J., DiNardo, J. 1997. *Econometric Methods*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- 21 Just, R.E. Pope, R.D., 1978. Stochastic Specification of Production Functions and Economic  
22 Implications. *J. of Econom.* 7, 67-86.
- 23 Just, R.E., Pope, R.D., 1979. Production Function Estimation and Related Risk Considerations.  
24 *Am. J. Agric. Econ.* 61, 276-284.
- 25 Kienzler, K.M., Djanibekov, N., Lamers, J.P.A., 2011. An agronomic, economic and behavioral  
26 analysis of N application to cotton and wheat in post-Soviet Uzbekistan. *Agric. Syst.* 104,  
27 411-418.
- 28 Kuhn, A., Gaiser, T., Gandonou, E., 2010. Simulating the effects of tax exemptions on fertiliser  
29 use in Benin by linking biophysical and economic models. *Agric. Syst.* 103, 509-520.



- 1 Lambert, D.K., 1990. Risk Considerations in the Reduction of Nitrogen Fertilizer Use in  
2 Agricultural Production. *Western J. Agric. Econ.* 15, 234-244.
- 3 Lehmann, N., 2010. Regional Crop Modeling: How future Climate may impact Crop Yields in  
4 Switzerland. Master Thesis, ETH Zurich.
- 5 Lehmann, N., Finger, R., Klein, T., 2011. Optimizing Wheat Management Towards Climate  
6 Change: A Genetic Algorithms Approach. IASTED International Conference on Applied  
7 Simulation and Modelling. 22-24 June 2011, Crete, Greece.
- 8 Mahul, O., 2003. Hedging price risk in the presence of crop yield and revenue insurance. *Europ.*  
9 *Rev. Agric. Econ.* 30, 217-239.
- 10 Meyer-Aurich, A., Weersink, A., Gandorfer, M., Wagner, P., 2010. Optimal site-specific  
11 fertilization and harvesting strategies with respect to crop yield and quality response to  
12 nitrogen. *Agric. Syst.* 103, 478-485.
- 13 Moschini, G., Hennessy, D.A., 2001. Uncertainty, risk aversion, and risk management for  
14 agricultural producers. In: L.B. Gardner and G.C. Rausser, eds. *Handbook of Agricultural*  
15 *Economics 1, Part 1, Agricultural Production*, Amsterdam: Elsevier, 88-153.
- 16 O'Shea, L., 2002. An economic approach to reducing water pollution: point and diffuse sources.  
17 *The Science of the Total Environment* 282 & 283, 49-63.
- 18 Pannell, D.J., Malcolm, B., Kingwell, R.S., 2000. Are we risking too much? Perspectives on risk  
19 in farm modelling. *Agr. Econ.* 23, 69-78.
- 20 Pretty, J., Brett, C., Gee, D., Hine, R., Mason, C., Morison, J., Rayment, M., Van Der Bijl, G.,  
21 Dobbs, T., 2001. Policy Challenges and Priorities for Internalizing the Externalities of  
22 Modern Agriculture. *J. Env. Plan. Manag.* 44, 263 - 283
- 23 R Development Core Team, 2008. R: a language and environment for statistical computing. R  
24 Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria
- 25 Ramaswami, B., 1992. Production Risk and Optimal Input Decisions. *Am. J. Agric. Econ.* 74,  
26 860-869.
- 27 Rajsic, P., Weersink, A., 2008. Do farmers waste fertilizer? A comparison of ex post optimal  
28 nitrogen rates and ex ante recommendations by model, site and year. *Agric. Syst.* 97, 56-67.

- 1 Rajsic, P., Weersink, A., Gandorfer, M., 2009. Risk and Nitrogen Application Levels. *Can. J.*  
2 *Agric. Econ.* 57, 223-239.
- 3 Rosegrant, M.W., Roumasset, J.A., 1985. The effect of fertilizer on risk: A heteroscedastic  
4 production function with measurable stochastic inputs. *Austral. J. Agric. Econ.* 29, 107-121.
- 5 Rosenzweig, M.R., Binswanger, H.P., 1993. Wealth, Weather Risk and the Composition and  
6 Profitability of Agricultural Investments. *Econ. J.* 103, 56-78
- 7 Rougoor, C.W., Van Zeijts, H., Hofreither, M.F., Bäckman, S., 2001. Experiences with Fertilizer  
8 Taxes in Europe. *J. Env. Plan. Manag.* 44, 877-887.
- 9 Sarris, A.H., 2000. Has world cereal market instability increased? *Food Policy* 25, 337-350.
- 10 SBV, 2010. *Landwirtschaftliche Monatszahlen*. Swiss Farmers Union (SBV). Brugg,  
11 Switzerland.
- 12 Semaan J., Flichman G., Scardigno A., Steduto P., 2007. Analysis of nitrate pollution control  
13 policies in the irrigated agriculture of Apulia Region (Southern Italy): A bio-economic  
14 modelling approach. *Agric. Syst.* 94, 357–367
- 15 Sheriff, G., 2005. Efficient Waste? Why Farmers Over-Apply Nutrients and the Implications for  
16 Policy Design. *Appl. Econ. Persp. Policy* 27, 542-557.
- 17 Stöckle, C.O., Donatelli, M., Nelson, R., 2003. CropSyst, a cropping systems simulation model.  
18 *Europ. J. Agron.* 18, 289-307.
- 19 Swinton, S.M., Clark, D.S., 1994. Farm-Level Evaluation of Alternative Policy Approaches to  
20 Reduce Nitrate Leaching from Midwest Agriculture. *Agric. Res. Econ. Rev.* 23, 66-74.
- 21 Torriani, D.S., Calanca, P., Schmid, S., Beniston, M., Fuhrer, J., 2007a. Potential effects of  
22 changes in mean climate and climate variability on the yield of winter and spring crops in  
23 Switzerland. *Climate Res.* 34, 59-69.
- 24 Torriani, D.S., Calanca, P., Lips, M., Ammann, H., Beniston, M., Fuhrer, J. 2007b. Regional  
25 assessment of climate change impacts on maize productivity and associated production risk in  
26 Switzerland. *Reg. Environ. Change* 7, 209-221.
- 27 Tveteras, R., Flaten, O., Lien, G., 2011. Production risk in multi-output industries: estimates  
28 from Norwegian farms. *Appl. Econ.* 43, 4403-4414.

- 1 Von Blottnitz, H., Rabl, A., Boiadjiev, D., Taylor, T., Arnold, S., 2006. Damage costs of  
2 nitrogen fertilizer in Europe and their internalization. *J. Env. Plan. Manag.* 49, 413 – 433.
- 3 Weersink, A., Dutka, C., Goss, M., 1998. Crop price and Risk Effects on Farm Abatement Costs.  
4 *Can. J. Agri. Econ.* 46, 171-190.
- 5 Zekri, S., Herruzo, A. C., 1994. Complementary instruments to EEC nitrogen policy in non-  
6 sensitive areas: a case study in southern Spain. *Agric. Syst.* 46, 245–255.

1

2

**Table 1. Descriptive statistics of data generated with CropSyst**

Level of N-application in kg/ha	Median Yield in t/ha	Median of absolute deviation (MAD) <sup>1</sup> of yields in t/ha	Number of N-applications within a season	Distribution of N-applications (in %)
<b>0-80</b>	6.8	0.62	3	25:25:50
<b>81-160</b>	8.89	1.33	3	25:25:50
<b>161-240</b>	8.29	1.38	4	20:20:20:40
<b>241-320</b>	8.16	1.58	4	20:20:20:40

3

<sup>1</sup> The MAD is based on the median of absolute deviations from the sample median. To ensure constancy and comparability with, for instance, the standard deviation, a correction factor (1.4826) is used.

4

5

6

**Table 2. Coefficient Estimates of Equations 2 and 3.**

Variable	Production Function (Eq. 2)	Yield Variation Function (Eq. 3)
Intercept	6.61 (143.69)***	0.43 (16.19)***
$N^{0.5}$	0.33 (10.07)***	0.03 (6.35)***
$N$	-0.01 (-5.97)***	----
$R^2$	0.38	0.42
df	391	392

7

Note: Statistics in parentheses are t statistics. \*\*\* indicates significance at the 1% level.

8

9

10

1  
2

**Table 3. Specification of Costs and Benefits.**

---

<b>Revenue</b>	
Sale of production	Price (365 CHF/t) * tons of Yield per ha
Direct Payment	1660 CHF/ha
<b>Fixed costs</b>	
Seeds	268 (CHF/ha)
Plant Protection	228 (CHF/ha)
Insurance	134 (CHF/ha)
Machinery costs	990 (CHF/ha)
Other fertilizer costs	193 (CHF/ha)
<b>Variable Costs</b>	
Fertilizer	1.25 CHF/kg N
Cleaning and drying	107 CHF/ tons of Yield per ha

3  
4

---

Source: AGRIDEA and FiBL (2009), Torriani et al. (2007b).

1  
2

**Table 4. Optimization Results.**

	N (kg/ha)	Expected Profit (CHF/ha)	Profit Standard Deviation (CHF/ha)	CE (CHF/ha)	Yield (t/ha)
<b>Scenario 1: Initial Conditions</b>					
<b>Situation w/o tax</b>					
Risk Neutral	79	1929.45	397.47	1929.45	8.45
Risk Averse	75	1929.20	396.25	1847.81	8.43
<b>N-Tax of 10%</b>					
Risk Neutral	75	1919.86	396.26	1919.86	8.43
Risk Averse	71	1919.60	394.95	1838.34	8.41
<b>N-Tax of 20%</b>					
Risk Neutral	71	1910.76	395.05	1910.76	8.41
Risk Averse	67	1910.48	393.67	1829.36	8.39
<b>N-Tax of 30%</b>					
Risk Neutral	68	1902.09	393.86	1902.09	8.39
Risk Averse	64	1901.80	392.41	1820.83	8.37
<b>Scenario 2: Higher Price Risk (assuming a doubling of price variability)</b>					
<b>Situation w/o tax</b>					
Risk Neutral	79	1929.45	779.74	1929.45	8.45
Risk Averse	67	1927.11	773.61	1616.56	8.39
<b>N-Tax of 10%</b>					
Risk Neutral	75	1919.86	777.89	1919.86	8.43
Risk Averse	63	1917.28	771.08	1607.17	8.36

---

<b>N-Tax of 20%</b>					
Risk Neutral	71	1910.76	776.02	1910.76	8.41
Risk Averse	59	1907.93	768.56	1598.33	8.33
<b>N-Tax of 30%</b>					
Risk Neutral	68	1902.09	774.13	1902.09	8.39
Risk Averse	56	1899.03	766.06	1590.01	8.30

---

**Scenario 3: Higher Production Risk (assuming a 15% increase of yield variability)**

**Situation w/o tax**

Risk Neutral	79	1929.45	401.69	1929.45	8.45
Risk Averse	74	1929.17	400.34	1846.09	8.43

**N-Tax of 10%**

Risk Neutral	75	1919.86	400.43	1919.86	8.43
Risk Averse	71	1919.57	398.99	1836.64	8.40

**N-Tax of 20%**

Risk Neutral	71	1910.76	399.17	1910.76	8.41
Risk Averse	67	1910.45	397.66	1827.68	8.39

**N-Tax of 30%**

Risk Neutral	68	1902.09	397.93	1902.09	8.39
Risk Averse	64	1901.77	396.34	1819.17	8.35

---