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Background

- Western Australia (WA) wheat yields have shown a high variance. From 2006 to 2010, the average shire wheat yield varied between 0.92 t/ha to 2.03 t/ha.
- Yield variations are due to the randomness of growing conditions such as weather, pests and disease and the limited scope and high cost of mitigating adverse conditions.
- It has been found that Australian farmers are risk averse in response to the yield volatility.
- Therefore, accurate estimation of the yield distribution is of interest of farmers and policy makers.
- In the literature, yield distribution has been assessed as a precursor to risk management. A number of distributions have been tested to identify the best crop yield distribution, such as Just and Weninger (1999) and Sherrick et al. (2004)
Do these results apply to wheat yield distribution in Western Australia?
Methodology

There are three steps to estimate wheat revenue risk.

• First, detrend historical wheat yield.

• Second, formally measures the goodness-of-fit candidate distributions.

• Third, estimates the yield risk and the revenue risk.

This work assesses the wheat yield distribution and estimates the yield risk and revenue risk in the shire level. Both graphical evidence and statistical evidence are provided to select the best distribution.
Methodology

--Detrend

Deterministic trend model is applied to each shire. The polynomial time function is defined as (1):

\[ y_t = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{time} + \beta_2 \text{time}^2 + \beta_3 \text{time}^3 + \beta_4 \text{time}^4 + \beta_5 \text{time}^5 + \varepsilon_t \]

\[ \varepsilon_t \sim N(0, \sigma^2) \]

- \( \text{time} = 1, 2, \ldots, 82 \), starting at 1 in year 1929 and ending at 82 in year 2010.

- \( \varepsilon_t \) is assumed to be independently identically distributed with 0 mean and \( \sigma^2 \) variance.

- The order of the polynomial trend is chosen based on the \( F \)-statistic.
Methodology

---Goodness-of-Fit

Anderson-Darling (AD) test is used to measures the distance between each sample point in the empirical CDF and the fitted probability at the point. Distribution has lower AD statistics fits the yield better. The AD test is defined as (2):

\[
AD_n = n \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} [F_n(y) - \hat{F}_n(y)]^2 \Psi(y) \hat{f}(y) \, dx
\]

- \( \Psi(y) \) is the weight function: \( \Psi(y) = \frac{1}{\hat{F}_n(y)[1-\hat{F}_n(y)]} \)
- \( \hat{f}(y) \) is the PDF of the fitted distribution
- \( F_n(y) \) is the fitted cumulative cumulative distribution
- \( n \) is the size of the sample
Yield risk is defined as the expected yield value below expected yield, which is defined as the average yield of previous years. Yield risk exposure is given by the gray area to the left of expected yield:

\[ \bar{y} \]

\( \bar{y} \) is the full sample average yield.

\[ \hat{y} \]

\( \hat{y} \) is the average yield of previous 4 years.
Methodology

---Yield Risk and Revenue Risk

- Yield risk exposure equals to the integration from 0 to \( \hat{y} \) (3):

\[
E(Y) = \int_{0}^{\hat{y}} (\hat{y} - y)f(y)dy
\]

where \( y \) is actual wheat yield, \( \hat{y} \) is the expected yield, \( f(y) \) is the probability density.

- Revenue risk is calculated by the expected yield and the hedged price at the beginning of the season (May) (4):

\[
E(R) = p_h \int_{0}^{\hat{y}} (\hat{y} - y)f(y)dy
\]

\( p_h \) is the price of WA wheat futures contract at May.
Data

---Positive Yield Trend

- Mullewa Yield
- Detrended Mullewa Yield
Data

---Structure Break of Wheat Yield

Mullewa
## Data

### Detrended Yields Summaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shire</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Coefficient of Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.805</td>
<td>0.288</td>
<td>-0.081</td>
<td>3.928</td>
<td>0.169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.503</td>
<td>1.333</td>
<td>0.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min</td>
<td>0.847</td>
<td>0.215</td>
<td>-0.939</td>
<td>2.187</td>
<td>0.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>2.845</td>
<td>0.471</td>
<td>1.751</td>
<td>9.149</td>
<td>0.391</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data

Coefficients of Variance of Wheat Yields

Coefficients of Variance

Average Yield (t/ha)
Results

— Moment Ratio Diagrams of Shires 1929-2010
Results—
CDF, PDF and empirical distributions of Wheat yields in Albany
Results—CDF, PDF and empirical distributions of Wheat yields in Albany
Results—
CDF, PDF and empirical distributions of Wheat yields in Albany
## Results

AD Test Measures Goodness-of-Fit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Normal</th>
<th>Logistic</th>
<th>Weibull</th>
<th>Lognormal</th>
<th>Beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Results

### Summary of Expected Yield Loss

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yield Risk</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>Weibull</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>0.097 (t/ha)</td>
<td>5.46%</td>
<td>0.109 (t/ha)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>3.20%</td>
<td>0.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min.</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.53%</td>
<td>0.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max.</td>
<td>0.246</td>
<td>15.77%</td>
<td>0.255</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Revenue Risk

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>20.943 (AUD/ha)</td>
<td>5.46%</td>
<td>23.678 (AUD/ha)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
<td>11.329</td>
<td>3.20%</td>
<td>11.770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min.</td>
<td>2.163</td>
<td>0.53%</td>
<td>4.974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max.</td>
<td>53.396</td>
<td>15.77%</td>
<td>55.343</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions

- This work has evaluated the wheat yield distribution in WA and applied the result to estimate yield risk and revenue risk.

- Normal distribution outperforms than Logistic, Lognormal, Weibull and Beta distribution.

- Taking 2010 as an example, farmers in WA are facing revenue risk of more than 5.47% of the benchmark revenue, and about half of their operating surplus in 2009.

- Future research should consider more candidate distributions and apply this procedure into other crops.
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