

An Assessment of Crop Biotechnology in Agriculture at International Famina

Avadhesh Sharma

Research Scholar

Sai Nath University

Ranchi, Jharkhand

ABSTRACT

A key part of any assessment of the global value of crop biotechnology in agriculture is an examination of its economic impact at the farm level. This paper follows earlier annual studies which examined economic impacts on yields, key costs of production, direct farm income and effects, and impacts on the production base of the four main crops of soybeans, corn, cotton and canola. The commercialization of genetically modified (GM) crops has continued to occur at a rapid rate, with important changes in both the overall level of adoption and impact occurring in 2012. This annual updated analysis shows that there have been very significant net economic benefits at the farm level amounting to \$18.8 billion in 2012 and \$116.6 billion for the 17-year period (in nominal terms). These economic gains have been divided roughly 50% each to farmers in developed and developing countries. GM technology have also made important contributions to increasing global production levels of the four main crops, having added 122 million tonnes and 230 million tonnes respectively, to the global production of soybeans and maize since the introduction of the technology in the mid-1990s.

Although the first commercial genetically modified (GM) crops were planted in 1994 (tomatoes), 1996 was the first year in which a significant area of crops containing GM traits was planted (1.66 million hectares). Since then there has been a significant increase in plantings and by 2012, the global planted area reached over 160 million hectares.

INTRODUCTION

Since the mid-1990s, there have been many papers assessing the economic impacts associated with the adoption of this technology, at the farm level. The authors of this paper have, since 2005, engaged in an annual exercise to aggregate and update the sum of these various studies, and where possible and appropriate, to supplement this with new analysis. The aim of this has been to provide an up to date and as accurate as possible assessment of some of the key economic impacts associated with the global adoption of GM crops. It is also hoped the analysis contributes to greater understanding of the impact of this technology and facilitates more informed decision making, especially in countries where crop biotechnology is currently not permitted.

Therefore, integrating the data for 2012 into the context of earlier developments, this study updates the findings of earlier analysis into the global economic impact of GM crops since their commercial introduction in 1996. Earlier analysis by the current authors has been published in various journals, including Agbio Forum International Journal of Biotechnology, and GM Crops and Food. The methodology and analytical procedures in this present discussion are unchanged to allow a direct comparison of the new with earlier data. Readers should however, note that some data presented in this paper are not directly comparable with data presented in previous analysis because the current paper takes into account the availability of new data and analysis (including revisions to data for earlier years).

The analysis concentrates on farm income effects because this is a primary driver of adoption among farmers (both large commercial and small-scale subsistence). It also quantifies the (net) production impact of the technology. The authors recognize that an economic assessment could examine a broader range of potential impacts (e.g., on labor usage, households, local communities, and economies).

However, these are not included because undertaking such an exercise would add considerably to the length of the paper and an economic assessment of wider economic impacts would probably merit a separate assessment in its own right.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

HT crops

The primary impact of GM HT (largely tolerant to the broad spectrum herbicide glyphosate) technology has been to provide more cost effective (less expensive) and easier weed control for farmers. Nevertheless, some users of this technology have also derived higher yields from better weed control (relative to weed control obtained from conventional technology). The magnitude of these impacts varies by country and year, and is mainly due to prevailing costs of different herbicides used in GM HT systems vs. conventional alternatives, the mix and amount of herbicides applied, the cost farmers pay for accessing the GM HT technology, and levels of weed problems. The following important factors affecting the level of cost savings achieved in recent years should, however, be noted:

In the period 2008–2009, the average cost associated with the use of GM HT technology globally increased relative to earlier years because of the significant increase in the global price of glyphosate relative to changes in the price of other herbicides commonly used on conventional crops. This has abated since 2009 with a decline in the price of glyphosate to previous historic trend levels.

The amount farmers pay for use of the technology varies by country. Pricing of technology (all forms of seed and crop protection technology) varies according to the level of benefit that farmers are likely to derive from it. In addition, it is influenced by intellectual property rights (patent protection, plant breeders' rights, and rules relating to use of farm-saved seed). In countries with weaker intellectual property rights, the cost of the technology tends to be lower than in countries where there are stronger rights. This is examined further in the next bullet point.

Where GM HT crops (tolerant to glyphosate) have been widely grown, some incidence of weed resistance to glyphosate has occurred and resistance has become a major concern in some regions. This has been attributed to how glyphosate was used; because of its broad-spectrum post-emergence activity, it was often used as the sole method of weed control. This approach to weed control put tremendous selection pressure on weeds and as a result contributed to the evolution of weed populations predominated by resistant individual weeds. It should, however, be noted that there are hundreds of resistant weed species confirmed in the International Survey of Herbicide Resistant Weeds. Worldwide, there are 25 weed species that are currently (accessed December 2013) resistant to glyphosate, compared with 135 weed species resistant to ALS herbicides (e.g., chlorimuron ethyl commonly used in conventional soybean crops) and 72 weed species resistant to photosystem II inhibitor herbicides (e.g., atrazine commonly used in corn production). In addition, it should be noted that the adoption of GM HT technology has played a major role in facilitating the adoption of no and reduced tillage production techniques in North and South America. This has also probably contributed to the emergence of weeds resistant to herbicides like glyphosate and to weed shifts toward those weed species that are not well controlled by glyphosate. As a result, growers of GM HT crops are increasingly being advised to be more proactive and include other herbicides (with different and complementary modes of action) in combination with glyphosate in their weed management systems, even where instances of weed resistance to glyphosate have not been found. This change in weed management emphasis also reflects the broader agenda of developing strategies across all forms of cropping systems to minimize and slow down the potential for weeds developing resistance to existing technology solutions. At the macro level, these changes have already begun to influence the mix, total amount, cost, and overall profile of herbicides applied to GM HT crops. Relative to the conventional alternative, however, the economic impact of the GM HT crop use has continued to offer important advantages. Also, many of the herbicides used in conventional production systems had significant resistance

issues themselves in the mid-1990s. This was, for example, one of the reasons why glyphosate tolerant soybeans were rapidly adopted, as glyphosate provided good control of these weeds. If the GM HT technology was no longer delivering net economic benefits, it is likely that farmers around the world would have significantly reduced their adoption of this technology in favor of conventional alternatives. The fact that GM HT global crop adoption levels have not fallen in recent years suggests that farmers must be continuing to derive important economic benefits from using the technology.

These points are further illustrated in the analysis below.

GM HT soybeans

The average impacts on farm level profitability from using this technology are summarized in Table 1. The main farm level gain experienced has been a reduction in the cost of production, mainly through reduced expenditure on weed control (herbicides). Not surprisingly, where yield gains have occurred from improvements in the level of weed control, the average farm income gain has tended to be higher, in countries such as Romania, Mexico, and Bolivia. A second generation of GM HT soybeans became available to commercial soybean growers in the US and Canada in 2009. This technology offered the same tolerance to glyphosate as the first generation (and the same cost saving) but with higher yielding potential. The realization of this potential is shown in the higher average farm income benefits.

GM HT soybeans have also facilitated the adoption of no tillage production systems, shortening the production cycle. This advantage has enabled many farmers in South America to plant a crop of soybeans immediately after a wheat crop in the same growing season. This second crop, additional to traditional soybean production, has added considerably to farm incomes and to the volumes of soybean production in countries such as Argentina and Paraguay.

Overall, in 2012, GM HT technology in soybeans has boosted farm incomes by \$4.8 billion, and since 1996 has delivered \$37 billion of extra farm income. Of the total cumulative farm income gains from using GM HT soybeans, \$13.9 billion (38%) has been due to yield gains and/or second crop benefits, and the balance, 62%, has been due to cost savings.

GM HT maize

The adoption of GM HT maize has mainly resulted in lower costs of production, although yield gains from improved weed control have arisen in Argentina, Brazil, and the Philippines. In 2012, the total global farm income gain from using this technology was \$1.2 billion with the cumulative gain over the period 1996–2012 being \$5.4 billion. Within this, \$1.4 billion (26%) was due to yield gains and the rest derived from lower costs of production.

GM HT cotton

The use of GM HT cotton delivered a net farm income gain of about \$147 million in 2012. In the 1996–2012 periods, the total farm income benefit was \$1.37 billion. As with other GM HT traits, these farm income gains have mainly arisen from cost savings (84% of the total gains), although there have been some yield gains in Brazil, Mexico, and Colombia.

Other HT crops

GM HT canola (tolerant to glyphosate or glufosinate) has been grown in Canada, the US, and more recently Australia, while GM HT sugar beet is grown in the US and Canada. The farm income impacts associated with the adoption of these technologies are summarized in Table 2. In both cases, the main farm income benefit has derived from yield gains. In 2012, the total global income gain from the adoption of GM HT technology was \$481 million and cumulatively since 1996, it was \$3.66 billion.

GM IR crops

The main way in which these technologies have impacted on farm incomes has been through lowering the levels of pest damage and hence delivering higher yields. The greatest improvement in yields has occurred in developing countries, where conventional methods of pest control have typically been least effective (e.g., reasons such as less well-developed extension and advisory services and/or lack of access to finance to fund use of crop protection application equipment and products), with any cost savings associated with reduced insecticide use being mostly found in developed countries. These effects can be seen in the level of farm income gains that have arisen from the adoption of these technologies, as shown in.

At the aggregate level, the global farm income gains from using GM IR maize and cotton in 2012 were \$6.71 billion and \$5.3 billion respectively. Cumulatively since 1996, the gains have been \$32.3 billion for GM IR maize and \$36.3 billion for GM IR cotton.

Pocket K No. 5: Documented Benefits of GM Crops

The global area planted to GM crops has consistently increased over the past years. Substantial share of GM crops has been grown in developed countries. In the last few years, however, there has been a consistent increase in the number of hectares being planted to GM crops in the developing world. Fifty four percent (54%) of the total global GM crop area is now being grown in developing countries. A significant increase in GM crop area was reported in developing countries of Africa, Asia, and Latin America. Experiences from these countries show that resource-poor farmers can also benefit from this technology.

This Pocket K documents some of the GM crop experiences of selected developing countries.

Global Impact of GM Crops

Farm Income

Biotech crops have had a positive impact on farm income worldwide due to enhanced productivity and efficiency gains. In 2012, direct global farm income benefit was \$18.8 billion. Over the period of 17 years between 1996-2012, farm incomes have increased by \$116.6.

Table 1

Global farm income benefits from growing GM crops, 1996-2012 (US\$ million)

GM Trait	2012 increase in farm income	1996-2012 increase in farm income
HT Soybean	4,797.9	37,008.6
HT maize	1,197.9	5,414.7
HT cotton	147.2	1,371.6
HT canola	481.0	3,664.4
IR maize	6,727.8	32,317.2
IR cotton	5,331.3	36,317.2
Others	86.3	496.7
Totals	18,769.4	116,590.4

Note: HT = herbicide tolerant, IR = insect resistant, others = virus-resistant papaya and squash, rootworm-resistant maize. Figures in parentheses include second-crop benefits in Argentina.

Adopted from: G. Brookes and P. Barfoot, 2014

Pesticide Use

Since 1996, farmers planting biotech crops have reduced pesticide inputs in their fields by 8.8% or over 503 million kg which led to an overall reduction in the environmental footprint of biotech crops by 18.7%. Environmental footprint is a measure of the effect or impact a product, process, operation, an individual or corporation places on the environment, in this case, measuring the environmental effects of pesticides.

The largest environmental gain was recognized in fields where HT soybeans were planted. The volume of herbicides used by HT maize farmers has decreased by 203.2 million kg over the past 17 years. Similarly, significant reductions in pesticide loads were experienced by farmers planting insect resistant (IR) maize and cotton.

Table 2

Impact of changes in the use of herbicides and insecticides in GM crops globally, 1996-2012

GM Trait	Change in volume of AI used (million kg)	Change in EIQ (million EIQ/ha units)	Change in field impact use on GM crops	% change in environmental impact associated with herbicide and insecticide use on GM crops
HT Soybean	-4.7	-6,654	-0.2	-15.0
HT maize	-203.2	-6,025	-9.8	-13.3
HT canola	-15.0	-509	-16.7	-26.6
HT cotton	-18.3	-460	-6.6	-9.0
IR maize	-57.6	-2,215	-47.9	-45.1
IR cotton	-205.4	-9,256	-25.6	-28.2
HT sugar beet	+1.3	-1	+29.3	-2.0
Totals	-503.1	-25,121	-8.8	-18.7

Note: HT = herbicide tolerant, IR = insect resistant, Ai = active ingredient, EIQ = environmental impact quotient.

(Environmental Impact Quotient (EIQ), a universal indicator where the various environmental impacts of individual pesticides are integrated into a single field value per hectare. This EIQ value is multiplied by the amount of pesticide active ingredient (ai) used per hectare to produce a field EIQ value.)

Source: G. Brookes and P. Barfoot, 2014

Aggregated (global level) impacts

At the global level, GM technology has had a significant positive impact on farm income, with in 2012, the direct global farm income benefit being \$18.8 billion. This is equivalent to having added 6% to the value of global production of the four main crops of soybeans, maize, canola, and cotton. Since 1996, farm incomes have increased by \$116.6 billion.

At the country level, US farmers have been the largest beneficiaries of higher incomes, realizing over \$53.2 billion in extra income between 1996 and 2012. This is not surprising given that US farmers were first to make widespread use of GM crop technology and for several years the GM adoption levels in all four US crops have been in excess of 80%. Important farm income benefits (\$25.4 billion) have occurred in South America (Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Paraguay, and Uruguay), mostly from GM technology in soybeans and

maize. GM IR cotton has also been responsible for an additional \$29.8 billion additional income for cotton farmers in China and India.

In 2012, 46.6% of the farm income benefits were earned by farmers in developing countries. The vast majority of these gains have been from GM IR cotton and GM HT soybeans. Over the 17 years, 1996–2012, the cumulative farm income gain derived by developing country farmers was \$58.15 billion, equal to 49.9% of the total farm income during this period.

The cost to farmers for accessing GM technology, across the four main crops, in 2012, was equal to 23% of the total value of technology gains. This is defined as the farm income gains referred to above plus the cost of the technology payable to the seed supply chain. Readers should note that the cost of the technology accrues to the seed supply chain including sellers of seed to farmers, seed multipliers, plant breeders, distributors, and the GM technology providers.

In developing countries, the total cost was equal to 21% of total technology gains compared with 25% in developed countries. While circumstances vary between countries, the higher share of total technology gains accounted for by farm income in developing countries relative to developed countries reflects factors such as weaker provision and enforcement of intellectual property rights in developing countries and the higher average level of farm income gain per hectare derived by farmers in developing countries compared with those in developed countries.

Crop production effects

Based on the yield impacts used in the direct farm income benefit calculations above and taking account of the second soybean crop facilitation in South America, GM crops have added important volumes to global production of corn, cotton, canola, and soybeans since 1996. The GM IR traits, used in maize and cotton, have accounted for 96.1% of the additional maize production and 99.3% of the additional cotton production. Positive yield impacts from the use of this technology have occurred in all user countries pest control previously obtained with intensive insecticide use were very good; the main benefit and reason for adoption of this technology in Australia has arisen from significant cost savings and the associated environmental gains from reduced insecticide use) when compared with average yields derived from crops using conventional technology (such as application of insecticides and seed treatments). The average yield impact across the total area planted to these traits over the 17 years since 1996 has been +10.4% for maize and +16.1% for cotton.

As indicated earlier, the primary impact of GM HT technology has been to provide more cost effective (less expensive) and easier weed control, as opposed to improving yields, the improved weed control has, nevertheless, delivered higher yields in some countries. The main source of additional production from this technology has been via the facilitation of no tillage production systems, shortening the production cycle and how it has enabled many farmers in South America to plant a crop of soybeans immediately after a wheat crop in the same growing season. This second crop, additional to traditional soybean production, has added 106.4 million tonnes to soybean production in Argentina and Paraguay between 1996 and 2011 (accounting for 96.6% of the total GM-related additional soybean production).

METHODOLOGY

The report is based on extensive analysis of existing farm level impact data for GM crops, much of which can be found in peer reviewed literature. While primary data for impacts of commercial cultivation were not available for every crop in every year and for each country, a substantial body of representative research and analysis is available and this has been used as the basis for the analysis presented. In addition, the authors have undertaken their own analysis of the impact of some trait-crop combinations in some countries (notably GM herbicide tolerant [HT] traits in North and South America) based on herbicide usage and cost data over the last five years.

As indicated in earlier papers, the economic impact of this technology at the farm level varies widely, both between and within regions and/or countries. Therefore the measurement of impact is considered on a case-by-case basis in terms of crop and trait combinations and is based on the average performance and impact recorded in different crops by the studies reviewed. Where more than one piece of relevant research (e.g., on the impact of using a GM trait on the yield of a crop in one country in a particular year) has been identified, the findings used in this analysis reflect the authors assessment of which research is most likely to be reasonably representative of impact in the country in that year. For example, there are many papers on the impact of GM insect resistant (IR) cotton in India. Few of these are reasonably representative of cotton growing across the country, with many papers based on small scale, local, and unrepresentative samples of cotton farmers. Only the reasonably representative research has been drawn on for use in this paper; readers should consult the references to this paper to identify the sources used.

This approach may still both overstate and/or understate the impact of GM technology for some trait, crop, and country combinations, especially in cases where the technology has provided yield enhancements. However, as impact data for every trait, crop, location, and year data are not available, the authors have had to extrapolate available impact data from identified studies to years for which no data are available. In addition, if the only studies available took place several years ago, there is a risk that basing current assessments on comparisons from several years ago may not adequately reflect the nature of currently available alternative (non GM seed or crop protection) technology. The authors acknowledge that these factors represent potential methodological weaknesses. Therefore to reduce the possibilities of overstating and/or understating impact due to these factors, the analysis:

The analysis focuses on changes in farm income in each year arising from impact of GM technology on yields, key costs of production (notably seed cost and crop protection expenditure but also impact on costs such as fuel and labor). Inclusion of these costs is, however, more limited than the impacts on seed and crop protection costs because only a few of the papers reviewed have included consideration of such costs in their analysis. Therefore, in most cases the analysis relates to impact of crop protection and seed cost only, crop quality (e.g., improvements in quality arising from less pest damage or lower levels of weed impurities which result in price premiums being obtained from buyers), and the scope for facilitating the planting of a second crop in a season (e.g., second crop soybeans in Argentina following wheat that would, in the absence of the GM HT seed, probably not have been planted). Thus, the farm income effect measured is essentially a gross margin impact (impact on gross revenue less variable costs of production) rather than a full net cost of production assessment. Through the inclusion of yield impacts and the application of actual (average) farm prices for each year, the analysis also indirectly takes into account the possible impact of GM crop adoption on global crop supply and world prices.

CONCLUSIONS

During the past 17 years, the adoption of crop biotechnology (by 17.3 million farmers in 2012) has delivered important economic benefits. The GM IR traits have mostly delivered higher incomes through improved yields in all countries. Many farmers, especially in developed countries, have also benefited from lower costs of production (less expenditure on insecticides). The gains from GM HT traits have come from a combination of effects. The GM HT technology-driven farm income gains have mostly arisen from reduced costs of production, though in South America, it facilitated the move away from conventional to low and/or no-tillage production systems and enabled many farmers to plant a second crop of soybeans after wheat in the same season.

Over-reliance on the use of glyphosate and the lack of crop rotation by some farmers, in some regions, has contributed to the development of weed resistance. As a result, farmers are increasingly adopting a mix of reactive and proactive weed management strategies incorporating a mix of herbicides. This has added cost to the GM HT production systems compared with several years ago, although relative to the conventional alternative, the GM HT technology continues to offer important economic benefits in 2012.

Overall, there is a considerable body of evidence in peer reviewed literature and summarized in this paper, that quantifies the positive economic impacts of crop biotechnology. The analysis in this paper therefore provides insights into the reasons why so many farmers around the world have adopted and continue to use the technology. Readers are encouraged to read the peer reviewed papers cited and the many others who have published on this subject and to draw their own conclusions.

REFERENCES

1. Brookes G, Barfoot P. Global impact of biotech crops: socio-economic effects 1996-2007. *Agbioforum* 2009; 12:184 - 208
2. Brookes G, Barfoot P. The income and production effects of biotech crops globally 1996-2009. *Int J Biotechnol* 2011; 12:1 – 49.
3. Brookes G, Barfoot P. The income and production effects of biotech crops globally 1996-2010. *GM Crops Food* 2012.
4. Brookes G, Barfoot P. The income and production effects of biotech crops globally 1996-2010.
5. Brookes G. The farm level impact of using Roundup Ready soybeans in Romania. *Agioforum* 2005; 8: 1 - 27
6. Monsanto Romania. (2007) Unpublished results of farmer survey amongst soybean growers in 2006.
7. Qaim M, Traxler G. Roundup Ready soybeans in Argentina: farm level & aggregate welfare effects. *Agric Econ* 2005; 32:73 – 86.
8. Trigo E, Cap E. (2006) Ten years of GM crops in Argentine Agriculture, *ArgenBio*.
9. Marra M, Pardey P, Alston J. (2002) The pay-offs of agricultural biotechnology: an assessment of the evidence. *International Food Policy Research Institute*; Washington, USA.
10. Carpenter J, Gianessi L. (2002) *Agricultural Biotechnology: updated benefit estimates*. National Centre for Food and Agricultural Policy (NCFAP); Washington, USA.
11. Sankala S, Blumenthal E. Impacts on US agriculture of biotechnology-derived crops planted in 2003- an update of eleven case studies, NCFAP, Washington. Washington (DC): NCFAP: c2003 [cited 2 Jan 2014].
12. Gonzales LA, Javier EQ, Ramirez DA, Cariño FA, Baria AR. *Modern Biotechnology and Agriculture: a history of the commercialization of biotechnology maize in the Philippines*. Los Banos, Philippines; Strive Foundation; 2009.
13. Hudson D. (2013) Evaluation of agronomic, environmental, economic and co-existence impacts following the introduction of GM canola in Australia 2010-2012. Paper presented to the 2012 GMCC conference, Lisbon, Portugal, November 2013.