

SOK-2014 . Fall 2023

Lecture note

Tapas Kundu

2023-08-25

[This lecture note covers materials from various sources. Supplementary reading materials includes GdR Chapters 2, 3, and some additional reading materials (Supl. ch 5, 7) that will be posted in Canvas. In addition, also consult the “[Veileder i samfunnsøkonomiske analyser](#)” section 3.3, and 3.4]

Quantifying effects in the impacted market

So far, we have considered a general framework to quantify the impact of a policy by measuring the changes in social surplus within a market.

Ignoring the non-price goods for the time being, we can broadly classify the impacted markets into three categories: the output market, the input market, and the secondary market.

Measuring the change in surplus critically depends on whether we are dealing with an efficient or an inefficient market.

Recall that a market is allocatively efficient if the output is produced up to the level at which the marginal benefit is equal to the marginal cost. Consequently, the social surplus is maximized at the equilibrium production level.

If the market is efficient, then there will be no deadweight loss before or after the policy/project is implemented. We can, therefore, rule out the possibility of measuring changes in the deadweight loss due to policy intervention.

Furthermore, in an efficient market, prices match the (social) marginal cost of production, thereby accurately mirroring the genuine opportunity cost of production. In contrast, in an inefficient market, prices fail to accurately represent the true opportunity costs. To quantify the cost of a project, it is customary to introduce the notion of a shadow price—a concept we will delve into later in our discussion.

Below, we will consider some simple examples to illustrate how we can quantify changes in consumer surplus, producer surplus, and net government revenue in these three types of markets for various policy interventions.

The output market

A project or policy has the potential to shift the demand or supply curve in the output market. Such shifts in the demand and/or supply curves can sometimes lead to changes in prices (resulting in a price effect), while at other times, they may leave the price unaffected (resulting in a case without a price effect).

However, to accurately assess the impact of these shifts, it's crucial to comprehend the origins of the changes. For example, a shift in the supply curve might stem from alterations in the underlying production costs or the introduction of additional (free) goods. Similarly, a shift in the demand curve might arise from changes in underlying benefits or simply from the demand of an additional set of consumers. These diverse sources of shifts in demand and supply curves have implications for how we measure changes in social surplus.

We will now illustrate these issues using two examples. These examples pertain to efficient markets, where prices accurately reflect the marginal cost of production.

Example 1

Project (a): Suppose the government possesses certain good in excess quantities that it can supply to the market at zero cost.

Then the supply curve shifts to the right, resulting in an increased availability of goods to consumers at various price levels. However, if this increase in supply is relatively insignificant compared to the overall market supply, price will not drop.

Let's initially examine the scenario where price remains unaffected. If the government chooses to sell the additional units of the goods at the prevailing market price, it will be treated akin to other competitors in an efficient market. In this context, it will encounter a horizontal demand curve labeled as D .

Consider Figure 1, illustrating a rightward shift in the supply curve while maintaining the price at P_0 .

What will be the extent of the surplus change resulting from a shift in the supply curve?

Given our exclusive focus on the output market, we can identify the affected parties as the consumers and producers within this market.




Figure 1: Shift of supply with no effect on price

The demand curve being horizontal, the change in consumer surplus is zero. The interpretation is that even if these additional quantities being sold, what the consumers pay are the same as what they are willing to pay.

The change in producer surplus is also zero; albeit with a more intricate rationale. Despite the rightward shift observed in the supply curve, there is no reduction in the marginal costs of production for the units sold earlier.

The government receives revenue equal to P_0 times q' , the area of rectangle q_0abq_1 . The revenues received by the government are the only benefits that accrue from the project selling q' units in the market.

Suppose the government instead of charging the price P_0 , offers the good for free. Then, the rectangle q_0abq_1 will constitute a positive change in consumer surplus with zero government revenue. Thus, whatever price government charges, the net gain from this shift of supply curve will remain unchanged and is measured by the area q_0abq_1 .

Here we ignore any additional costs of inputs to supply the surplus good to the market. Had there been any costs, it should be included in the calculation as well.

Project (b): Consider an alternative possibility in which the shift of the supply curve happens not due to the supply of some surplus goods, but because of an investment that reduces marginal costs of production. Such a reduction will move the supply curve downward and can be illustrated by a similar rightward shift as depicted in Figure 1.

In this case, measure the change in surplus for producer will be different. It will be represented by the trapezoid $abde$. No change in consumer surplus as before, due to the perfectly elastic horizontal demand curve at P_0 .

Example 2

Next, consider a possibility similar to the project (a) above but assume that price moves downward due to a shift of the supply curve. Figure 2 illustrates this scenario with a downward sloping demand curve D .




Figure 2: Shift of supply curve resulting in price reduction

Due to drop in price, there is an increase in consumer surplus, measured by the trapezoid P_0abP_1 .

The new equilibrium demand is q_1 . The production level comprises of two kinds of good, one was originally produced with an upward sloping marginal costs curve, of volume q_2 , and the surplus volume that the government supplies of $q_1 - q_2 = q'$ units.

As the shift of supply curve is not due to a reduction of the marginal costs, it implies that producer surplus must be going down on the earlier production volume q_2 , and this reduction is measured by the trapezoid P_0acP_1 .

And, there is an additional government revenue from selling the surplus good, measured by the rectangle q_2cbq_1 .

Adding these three changes, we can find that the total change in surplus will be the area of q_2cabq_1 .

As before, we assume that the surplus volume was available and could be supplied at zero costs. Otherwise, the cost of producing/supplying the additional goods should also be taken into account.

Project (b): We can also consider an alternative possibility in which the shift of the supply curve happens because of an investment that reduces marginal costs of production. Such a reduction will move the supply curve downward and can be illustrated by a similar rightward shift as depicted in Figure 2.

In this case, measure the change in surplus for producer will be different. The producer surplus before the project is the triangle P_0ae and the producer surplus after the project is the triangle P_1bd . Therefore the change in producer surplus is the trapezoid $ecbd$ - the trapezoid P_0acP_1 .

There will be a gain in consumer surplus, measured by the area of the trapezoid P_0abP_1 .

Adding all of them, the net change (gain) in surplus will be measured by the area $eabd$.

The above two examples illustrate the effects of a shift in the supply curve, either due to the supply of surplus volume or a reduction in marginal costs, within an efficient market.

In cases of market inefficiency, determining the changes in surplus can become more intricate. This complexity arises from the presence of deadweight loss at the market equilibrium, both prior to and following the implementation of a policy.

As we covered in the previous lecture, taxes or subsidies can lead to allocative inefficiency (resulting in deadweight loss) in an otherwise efficiently functioning perfectly competitive market.

Additionally, other factors can contribute to market inefficiency, such as monopoly, information asymmetry, and externalities, among others.

...

[The following will be discussed on 07.09]

...

The secondary markets

A project's effects can be extended to markets beyond the primary output market. Suppose that undertaking a project results in a lower price for a good.

It is expected that the demand for a complement product would increase. If this complementary product is in perfectly elastic supply, there will be no change in its price.

However, since the demand curve for the product has shifted right, the area of consumer surplus measured under the demand curve must have increased.

Should this increase in consumer surplus be measured and included in CBA?

In theory, the answer depends on whether the secondary market is efficient (such that the price there equals the marginal costs of production) or distorted.

Consider first the case of an efficient secondary market.

We refer to Figure 3(a), in which we consider a project that reduces marginal costs of production in the primary market resulting in a drop of price. In Figure 3(b), we observe a rightward shift of the demand curve of a complementary good.

Efficient market and no price change

Suppose the secondary market has a perfectly elastic supply curve, and therefore there will be no price change even after the demand shift. The question is whether we should include the apparent gain in consumer surplus, measured by the area $cdfe$ in our analysis?




Figure 3: Efficient secondary market with no price effect

The answer is no.

The shift in demand within the market for the complementary good reflects consumers reallocating their expenditures to capitalize on the lower price of the good provided by the project. The advantage of this lower price is comprehensively quantified by the change in consumer surplus, as measured in the project's output market.

To illustrate this point (refer to supplementary material Chapter 7 for further discussion), let's consider the example of stocking a lake near a city with fish, which subsequently reduces fishing costs for residents. As depicted in Figure 3(a), this leads to an increase in the number of fishing days for residents and results in a gain in consumer surplus.

The market for fishing equipment constitutes a secondary market and has witnessed an upswing in demand, as indicated in Figure 3(b). However, accounting for this surplus gain in the secondary market would result in duplicating the benefits.

To understand why, let's recognize two types of consumers that could potentially comprise the additional consumer base in the primary market: those who already possess the equipment and thus would not contribute to the supplementary demand for equipment, even if their valuation for it has increased; and those who previously lacked the equipment and could now join the augmented demand in the secondary market.

Nonetheless, for the second type of consumer, their willingness to pay for fishing days in the primary market has already factored in the potential benefits and costs of acquiring the equipment in the secondary market. Consequently, their net benefits are encompassed in our calculation of the change in consumer surplus in the primary market.

Efficient market but with price change

Suppose the price changes in the secondary market. Can we still disregard the change in surplus there to avoid double counting? The answer is yes, but the argument is somewhat more intricate.

Figures 4(a) and 4(b) build upon the previous example illustrating the cost reduction in the primary market for fishing. This extension considers a potential secondary market involving golfing activities, which can be viewed as a substitute for fishing activities.

To understand these figures, first observe the effect in the primary market. Stocking the lake with fish reduces the marginal cost of fishing, and a movement along the demand curve D_{F_0} from the point a to the point b . This movement is equivalent to a reduction of price from P_{F_0} to P_{F_1} in the primary market.

A consequence of the price reduction in the primary market implies a leftward/downward shift of the demand curve for the substitute good, golfing activities. This movement is captured in Figure 4(b) by the shift of demand curve from D_{G_0} to D_{G_1} . Assuming an upward-sloping supply in this secondary market implies a drop in price there, in particular, from P_{G_0} to P_{G_1} .




Figure 4: Efficient secondary market with price effect

What is the measure of change in surplus in the secondary market? And, should we include that in our CBA?

As we discussed in the previous example (no price change), had there been no changes to the price, the downward shifting of the demand curve would not constitute any additional loss to consumer surplus that is not captured in the calculation of change of surplus in the primary market.

However, in this case, the drop in price in the secondary market implies existing consumers there would have a gain in surplus (they are paying less than what they were paying previously) and a drop in producer surplus (they are receiving less than what they were getting before).

But some of these changes are simply transfer between producers and consumers and should not constitute as a change of social surplus. To have a better estimate of the change, observe first what consumers might be gaining: the area $P_{G_0}efP_{G_1}$ - this is because the existing q_{G_1} consumers are experiencing the lower price (in addition to a lower willingness to pay).

In contrast, the producers would losing the area $P_{G_0}gfP_{G_1}$ - this is because the price drops and the consumer base is also shrinking.

The net effect is a loss of surplus the area efg in the secondary market, arising from the change in price and shrinking of the consumer base.

Should we take it into account in CBA?

This effect is solely a first-order price effect in the secondary market. Any alteration in the price of the substitute good within the secondary market should also impact the primary market. How do we assess the second-order feedback effect in the primary market?

A decline in price for the substitute good indicates a corresponding decrease in demand for fishing activities. This, in turn, results in a downward or leftward shift in the demand curve, leading to a reduction in prices within the primary market.

Given that we can anticipate a series of feedback effects between these two markets due to price changes, let's consider, for the purpose of our analysis, that the equilibrium price in the secondary market stabilizes at P_{F_1} , causing a corresponding shift in the demand curve to D_{F_1} in Figure 4(a). It's important to note that these demand schedules signify the demand for fishing activities while keeping prices in other markets constant. In particular, D_{F_0} and D_{F_1} represent the demands in the primary market when the price in the secondary market is held at P_{G_0} and P_{G_1} , respectively.

The initial equilibrium in the primary market is at point a and after the project is implemented, it moves to point c in Figure 4(a). Upon connecting these two points, we arrive at what we commonly refer to as an observed demand schedule D^* —representing the demand curve in the primary market without the assumption of constant prices in other markets.

From an empirical perspective, we frequently estimate the observed demand schedule rather than the demand schedule that presumes constant prices in other markets. However, quantifying surplus based on the observed demand schedule under-represents the change in consumer surplus in the primary market. It's measured by the area $P_{F_0}acP_{F_1}$ instead of the area $P_{F_0}abP_{F_1}$, which signifies the surplus gain in the primary market. The disparity is depicted by the triangle area abc —a measure of the underestimation when estimates are drawn from the observed demand schedule D^* .

The underestimation of surplus in the primary market, as determined by the area abc , is often a practical approximation for not estimating the loss in producer surplus within the secondary market, represented by the triangle area efg .

In fact, this approach of estimating surplus change based on the observed equilibrium demand schedule in the primary market, while disregarding the corresponding change in the secondary market (assuming the secondary markets are efficient), is recommended. This recommendation stems from the empirical difficulties involved in identifying all conceivable substitutes or complements for the primary good.

Taking into consideration our observation from the scenario where no price changes occur, as previously discussed, we can formulate a guiding principle here: *Irrespective of whether price adjustments occur in the secondary market, when measuring change of surplus in the primary market through empirically derived demand schedules that were estimated without holding prices constant in secondary markets, it is advisable to disregard effects in efficient secondary markets.*

Distorted secondary markets

If the secondary market has distortion or inefficiency, meaning that the price does not accurately represent the (social) marginal cost, the estimation of the surplus change in the primary market even using the observed equilibrium demand schedule will unfortunately overlook certain pertinent effects within the secondary market. This is because the changes in deadweight losses before and after the project will not be reflected in the measure of change in surplus in the primary market.

The following example, which is an extension of the previous example of stocking a lake with fish, can illustrate this possibility.

Suppose in the secondary market for fishing equipment, there is some negative externality from production, because of which the social marginal cost is higher than the private marginal cost of production. In this case, even in absence of the project, there will be excessive (socially costly) production. However, now with the implementation of the project, as the demand curve shifts further to the rights (because the market for fishing equipment faces a higher demand due to a drop in cost of fishing at the lake), there will be an additional deadweight loss, measured by the shaded area in Figure 5.

Similar distortionary effects can also be found in the secondary markets, due to government intervention, such as taxes, subsidies, quotas etc.

However, in practice, obtaining an accurate estimate of the surplus change in the secondary market, beyond what we can capture through our measurements in the primary market, is typically challenging and empirically complex. Estimation issues arise when attempting to gauge the extent of demand shifts in secondary markets, as well as when measuring the magnitude of these distortions.

If price fluctuations in secondary markets are expected to be minor, it is reasonable to anticipate that significant demand shifts are unlikely to occur in those markets. Consequently, even in cases where secondary markets experience distortions, disregarding these markets may lead to relatively minimal bias in CBA.

Other sources of indirect effects

In the previous examples, the indirect effects in secondary markets stem from shifts in the demand for complementary or substitute goods due to price changes in the primary market. Additional sources of indirect effects may also be present; for example, a shift in the cost curve within markets where the primary good is used as an input.

While this effect differs in nature, a similar question arises: Can the change in surplus within these indirectly affected markets be adequately captured by concentrating solely on the change in surplus within the primary market?

In both scenarios, the recommendation remains consistent. If the indirectly affected markets are free from distortions, then we can disregard the indirect effects. However, in cases of distortion, it is important to acknowledge them, although we can anticipate that neglecting these markets might introduce relatively minimal bias, particularly if substantial price changes are not observed within those markets.

The argument unfolds as follows: Let's consider a situation where a policy intervention in the primary market leads to a reduced cost of input in another market. Naturally, this circumstance would likely increase producer surplus in the second market. Nevertheless, the degree to which producers can retain this surplus hinges on the competitive pressure within the second market. When competition is intense, producers are inclined to transfer this surplus to consumers by lowering prices (or if the goods are intermediary, it will raise consumer surplus in subsequent markets as well). However, as we've previously discussed in examples of demand shifts in secondary markets, such indirect increases in consumer surplus are already captured within the direct surplus gain achieved in the primary market. Our argument, however, relies on the efficient operation of secondary markets.