



**AgEcon** SEARCH  
RESEARCH IN AGRICULTURAL & APPLIED ECONOMICS

*The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library*

**This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.**

**Help ensure our sustainability.**

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search  
<http://ageconsearch.umn.edu>  
[aesearch@umn.edu](mailto:aesearch@umn.edu)

*Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.*

# **Climate Change Impacts on Agriculture: Understanding Global Effects on Yield and Welfare**

**Frances C. Moore**

*Selected Paper prepared for presentation at the International Agricultural Trade Research Consortium's (IATRC's) 2016 Annual Meeting:  
Climate Change and International Agricultural Trade in the Aftermath of COP21, December 11-13, 2016, Scottsdale, AZ.*

*Copyright 2016 by Frances C. Moore. All rights reserved. Readers may make verbatim copies of this document for non-commercial purposes by any means, provided that this copyright notice appears on all such copies.*

# Climate Change Impacts on Agriculture: Understanding Global Effects on Yield and Welfare

Frances C. Moore

University of California Davis

IATRC Theme Day Presentation, December 11<sup>th</sup> 2016

# Outline

- Motivation
- Global, multi-crop, multi-method yield response functions
- Welfare changes
- Implications for the social cost of carbon

# Outline

- **Motivation**
- Global, multi-crop, multi-method yield response functions
- Welfare changes
- Implications for the social cost of carbon

# Motivation – The Gap

- Climate change will have direct impacts on the agricultural sector
- Substantial scientific effort directed toward understanding how crop yield responds to changing temperature, rainfall, and CO<sub>2</sub>
- Less work on understanding more policy-relevant impacts such as production, prices, consumption, and welfare
- This requires global, multi-crop estimates of productivity response to climate change
- Aggregating, synthesizing, and extrapolating results from the agronomic literature is extremely challenging

# Motivation – The Need


- Global and regional welfare impacts are needed to improve estimates of the social cost of carbon (SCC)
- SCC is the marginal cost of an additional ton of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions
- Since 2010 used at the federal level for regulatory analysis of climate and energy policies, and increasingly at the state level
- Estimated using three integrated assessment models – DICE, PAGE, and FUND

# Motivation – The Need

Damages capped at  
current fraction of  
agriculture in the  
economy

Universal benefits  
up to ~4-5 degrees  
of warming

**References:** Fischer, Frohberg,  
Parry, & Rosenzweig, 1996; Kane,  
Reilly, & Tobey, 1992; Morita et al.,  
1994; Reilly, Hohnmann, & Kane,  
1994; Tsigas, Frisvold, & Kuhn, 1996



FUND Damage Functions, Agriculture Sector



# Methodology Overview

Yield-Temperature  
Response  
(Ensemble Meta-  
Model and AgMIP)



Economic Response  
to Yield Shocks  
(GTAP)




Consequences for  
SCC (FUND Damage  
Module)

# Outline

- The research challenge
- **Global, multi-crop, multi-method yield response functions**
- Welfare changes
- Implications for the social cost of carbon







# The Landscape of Climate-Crop Modeling

$$Yield = f(Temperature, Rainfall, CO_2 | Inputs, Soil \dots etc)$$



# 1. Meta-Analysis

- Database of 1,010 point-estimates of yield change in response to temperature change compiled for IPCC AR5
- From 53 studies
- Wheat, rice, maize, soybeans
- Process-based and empirical
- Data on: temp change, rainfall change, CO2 change, adaptation, region
- Merge with average growing season temperature data



Challinor et al. (2014) and IPCC (2014)

# Ensemble Response Estimation

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta Y_{ijk} = & \beta_{1j} \Delta T_{ijk} * Crop_j + \beta_{2j} \Delta T_{ijk}^2 * Crop_j \\ & + \beta_{3j} \Delta T_{ijk} * Crop_j * \bar{T}_{jk} + \beta_{4j} \Delta T_{ijk}^2 * Crop_j * \bar{T}_{jk} \\ & + \beta_5 f(\Delta CO_{2ijk}) + \beta_6 \Delta P_{ijk} + \beta_7 \Delta T_{ijk} * Adapt_{ijk} + \beta_8 Adapt_{ijk} + \varepsilon_{ijk}\end{aligned}$$


# Ensemble Response Estimation

Change in yield, data-point  $i$ , crop  $j$ , country  $k$

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta Y_{ijk} = & \beta_{1j} \Delta T_{ijk} * Crop_j + \beta_{2j} \Delta T_{ijk}^2 * Crop_j \\ & + \beta_{3j} \Delta T_{ijk} * Crop_j * \bar{T}_{jk} + \beta_{4j} \Delta T_{ijk}^2 * Crop_j * \bar{T}_{jk} \\ & + \beta_5 f(\Delta CO_{2ijk}) + \beta_6 \Delta P_{ijk} + \beta_7 \Delta T_{ijk} * Adapt_{ijk} + \beta_8 Adapt_{ijk} + \varepsilon_{ijk} \end{aligned}$$

# Ensemble Response Estimation

Crop-specific quadratic warming  
response


$$\begin{aligned}\Delta Y_{ijk} = & \beta_{1j} \Delta T_{ijk} * Crop_j + \beta_{2j} \Delta T_{ijk}^2 * Crop_j \\ & + \beta_{3j} \Delta T_{ijk} * Crop_j * \bar{T}_{jk} + \beta_{4j} \Delta T_{ijk}^2 * Crop_j * \bar{T}_{jk} \\ & + \beta_5 f(\Delta CO_{2ijk}) + \beta_6 \Delta P_{ijk} + \beta_7 \Delta T_{ijk} * Adapt_{ijk} + \beta_8 Adapt_{ijk} + \varepsilon_{ijk}\end{aligned}$$

# Ensemble Response Estimation

Impact of warming differs depending  
on baseline temperature

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta Y_{ijk} = & \beta_{1j} \Delta T_{ijk} * Crop_j + \beta_{2j} \Delta T_{ijk}^2 * Crop_j \\ & + \beta_{3j} \Delta T_{ijk} * Crop_j * \bar{T}_{jk} + \beta_{4j} \Delta T_{ijk}^2 * Crop_j * \bar{T}_{jk} \\ & + \beta_5 f(\Delta CO_{2ijk}) + \beta_6 \Delta P_{ijk} + \beta_7 \Delta T_{ijk} * Adapt_{ijk} + \beta_8 Adapt_{ijk} + \varepsilon_{ijk}\end{aligned}$$



# Ensemble Response Estimation

$$\Delta Y_{ijk} = \beta_{1j} \Delta T_{ijk} * Crop_j + \beta_{2j} \Delta T_{ijk}^2 * Crop_j$$

$$+ \beta_{3j} \Delta T_{ijk} * Crop_j * \bar{T}_{jk} + \beta_{4j} \Delta T_{ijk}^2 * Crop_j * \bar{T}_{jk}$$

$$+ \beta_5 f(\Delta CO_{2ijk}) + \beta_6 \Delta P_{ijk} + \beta_7 \Delta T_{ijk} * Adapt_{ijk} + \beta_8 Adapt_{ijk} + \varepsilon_{ijk}$$

Concave function of CO<sub>2</sub> allows for declining marginal effect

$$f(\Delta CO_{2ijk}) = \frac{\Delta CO_{2ijk}}{\Delta CO_{2ijk} + 100}$$

# Ensemble Response Estimation

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta Y_{ijk} = & \beta_{1j} \Delta T_{ijk} * Crop_j + \beta_{2j} \Delta T_{ijk}^2 * Crop_j \\ & + \beta_{3j} \Delta T_{ijk} * Crop_j * \bar{T}_{jk} + \beta_{4j} \Delta T_{ijk}^2 * Crop_j * \bar{T}_{jk} \\ & + \beta_5 f(\Delta CO_{2ijk}) + \beta_6 \Delta P_{ijk} + \beta_7 \Delta T_{ijk} * Adapt_{ijk} + \beta_8 Adapt_{ijk} + \varepsilon_{ijk}\end{aligned}$$



Linear precip control

# Ensemble Response Estimation

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta Y_{ijk} = & \beta_{1j} \Delta T_{ijk} * Crop_j + \beta_{2j} \Delta T_{ijk}^2 * Crop_j \\ & + \beta_{3j} \Delta T_{ijk} * Crop_j * \bar{T}_{jk} + \beta_{4j} \Delta T_{ijk}^2 * Crop_j * \bar{T}_{jk} \\ & + \beta_5 f(\Delta CO_{2ijk}) + \beta_6 \Delta P_{ijk} + \beta_7 \Delta T_{ijk} * Adapt_{ijk} + \beta_8 Adapt_{ijk} + \varepsilon_{ijk}\end{aligned}$$



True adaptation term – how does  
adaptation moderate the effects of  
warming

# Ensemble Response Estimation

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta Y_{ijk} = & \beta_{1j} \Delta T_{ijk} * Crop_j + \beta_{2j} \Delta T_{ijk}^2 * Crop_j \\ & + \beta_{3j} \Delta T_{ijk} * Crop_j * \bar{T}_{jk} + \beta_{4j} \Delta T_{ijk}^2 * Crop_j * \bar{T}_{jk} \\ & + \beta_5 f(\Delta CO_{2ijk}) + \beta_6 \Delta P_{ijk} + \beta_7 \Delta T_{ijk} * Adapt_{ijk} + \beta_8 Adapt_{ijk} + \varepsilon_{ijk}\end{aligned}$$

“Adaptation Illusion” term –  
‘adaptations’ that are beneficial  
today and in future climates

# Ensemble Response Estimation


$$\begin{aligned}\Delta Y_{ijk} = & \beta_{1j} \Delta T_{ijk} * Crop_j + \beta_{2j} \Delta T_{ijk}^2 * Crop_j \\ & + \beta_{3j} \Delta T_{ijk} * Crop_j * \bar{T}_{jk} + \beta_{4j} \Delta T_{ijk}^2 * Crop_j * \bar{T}_{jk} \\ & + \beta_5 f(\Delta CO_{2ijk}) + \beta_6 \Delta P_{ijk} + \beta_7 \Delta T_{ijk} * Adapt_{ijk} + \beta_8 Adapt_{ijk} + \varepsilon_{ijk}\end{aligned}$$

Errors estimated from 750 block-bootstraps, blocking at study level to allow for correlation between data-points from the same study


# Ensemble Response Estimation

In summary, our approach allows for:

1. Non-linear, crop-specific impacts of warming
2. Variation in the impact of warming depending on baseline temperature
3. Declining marginal effect of increasing CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations
4. Inclusion of on-farm, agronomic adaptations




Temperature response, including adaptation  
(not CO<sub>2</sub>)





# CO<sub>2</sub> Response




12% yield benefit from doubling of CO<sub>2</sub> from pre-industrial



## Free Air Carbon Exchange (FACE) Experiments

- Good match for C<sub>3</sub> crops but high for C<sub>4</sub> crops
- Meta-analysis results that follow include CO<sub>2</sub> fertilization for C<sub>3</sub> but not for C<sub>4</sub> crops

# Agronomic Adaptation



- Our results show evidence for the “adaptation illusion” described by Lobell (2014)
- Agronomic adaptations can be divided into:
  1. Increasing inputs that increase yields under present and future climates
  2. “True” adaptations that improve yields more in future climates than in the present
- Our results suggest most of what has been included in studies so far is the former rather than the latter

# Statistical vs Process-Based Studies


- Distinction between process-based and empirical yield models much discussed but very few direct comparisons
- Conventional wisdom seems to be that process-based models tend to be more optimistic than statistical models
- Comparison is difficult because the former often include CO<sub>2</sub> fertilization whereas the latter do not
- We can use our database to test for differences between type of study, controlling for CO<sub>2</sub> fertilization

# Statistical vs Process-Based Studies

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta Y_{ijk} = & \beta_{1j} \Delta T_{ijk} * Crop_j + \beta_{2j} \Delta T_{ijk}^2 * Crop_j \\ & + \beta_{3j} \Delta T_{ijk} * Crop_j * \bar{T}_{jk} + \beta_{4j} \Delta T_{ijk}^2 * Crop_j * \bar{T}_{jk} \\ & + \beta_5 f(\Delta CO_{2ijk}) + \beta_6 \Delta P_{ijk} + \beta_7 \Delta T_{ijk} * Adapt_{ijk} + \beta_8 Adapt_{ijk} \\ & + \beta_9 \Delta T_{ijk} * Stat_{ijk} + \beta_{10} \Delta T_{ijk}^2 * Stat_{ijk} + \varepsilon_{ijk}\end{aligned}$$

Allow effect of warming to vary between  
statistical and process-based studies

# Statistical vs Process-Based Studies




- Not strong evidence that results from statistical studies are different from process-based modeling studies
- Important to control for CO<sub>2</sub> fertilization when comparing across studies
- Limited number of empirical results in database, clustered around 1°C warming

# Gridded Global Yield Change


- Our continuous response functions allow us to extrapolate yield response to warming
- Spatial variability in the yield response depends on:
  1. Baseline growing season temperature
  2. Scaling between local and global temperature change (CMIP5 Model Ensemble)

# Gridded Global Yield Change


1 Degree Warming




2 Degree Warming



3 Degree Warming




Yield  
Change(%)



Gridded wheat  
yields, including  
adaptation and  
CO<sub>2</sub> fertilization

# The Landscape of Crop-Response Modeling

$$Yield = f(Temperature, Rainfall, Inputs, etc)$$






## 2. Global Gridded Crop Model Inter-comparison

- Part of the Agricultural Modeling Inter-comparison and Improvement Project (AgMIP)
- 6-7 process-based crop models run on 0.5° global grid with 5 climate models
- Extract yield changes for specified levels of global temperature change
- Average over crop and climate models for GGCMi ensemble average

# Comparison of Meta-Analysis and AgMIP



Blue = Meta-analysis more positive than AgMIP  
Red = Meta-analysis more negative than AgMIP

# Outline


- Motivation
- Global, multi-crop, multi-method yield response functions
- **Welfare changes**
- Implications for the social cost of carbon



# Welfare Consequences of Yield Changes

- GTAP run with 140 regions, 14 commodities (9 agricultural)
- Yield shocks aggregated to regional level (production-weighting) and introduced as Hicks-neutral technical change – both meta-analysis and AgMIP
- Report welfare changes as equivalent variation (EV)
- Economic adaptations (crop switching, intensification, trade adjustments, product substitution) are accounted for here

# Welfare Consequences of Yield Changes




- Uncertainties from uncertain yield response are large
- Price increases in most sectors at 3°C warming (meta-analysis)
- Much more moderate price changes (AgMIP)




# Welfare Consequences of Yield Changes

- We decompose welfare changes into three parts following Hertel and Randhir (2000):
  1. Direct productivity effect
  2. Terms of trade effect
  3. Allocative efficiency
- Welfare changes are normalized by the value of affected sectors to give % change



Welfare Change, 3° Warming (Meta-Analysis)



Welfare Change, 3° Warming (AgMIP)




# Outline

- Motivation
- Global, multi-crop, multi-method yield response functions
- Welfare changes
- **Implications for the social cost of carbon**


# Implications for the SCC

- Given regional changes in welfare, we can create new damage functions for the agricultural sector to improve SCC estimates




# Implications for the SCC

- Given regional changes in welfare, we can create new damage functions for the agricultural sector to improve SCC estimates
- Use a damage module that replicates FUND damages connected to a standardized climate model and BAU emissions scenario
- Calculate total SCC and decompose by region and sector



- Existing FUND damages show global net benefits from climate change impacts on agriculture
- Both updated damage functions show net costs



- This has a large effect on the total SCC
- Increases between 43% (AgMIP) and 143% (Meta-Analysis)
- Error bars include the AgMIP estimate but not the FUND result
- FUND consistently produces the lowest SCC – this change would bring it closer in line to other two models

# Conclusion

1. New comprehensive meta-analysis of the scientific literature shows negative effects of warming for most regions and crops
2. Very small potential for agronomic adaptations to offset yield declines
3. Welfare consequences are negative in almost all regions. Smaller in net exporters and largest in importers
4. Direct effects and terms-of-trade effects both important components of welfare changes
5. Results differ from the AgMIP GGCM ensemble, which shows larger potential for yield gains in temperate regions
6. Both new damage functions differ substantially from existing FUND damages that show benefits for all regions up to ~4-5 degrees of warming
7. Updating just the agriculture damage function increases the total SCC by between 43% and 143%
8. Demonstration of how scientific information can be incorporated into IAM damage functions in a timely and transparent manner