

# ECONOMIC IMPLICATIONS OF CLIMATE CHANGE FOR AGRICULTURE

**W. Neil Adger**

*School of Environmental Sciences and CSERGE, University of Anglia, U.K.*

**Keywords:** Agriculture, climate change, mitigation, adaptation, cost effectiveness, vulnerability

## Contents

1. Economics of Climate-Change Mitigation in Agriculture
    - 1.1. Land-Use Mitigation Options
    - 1.2. The Interaction of Agriculture and Mitigation through Afforestation
    - 1.3. Climate-Change Mitigation from Rice and Livestock Production
    - 1.4. Summary of Economic Impacts of Mitigation on Agriculture
  2. The Costs of Climate-Change Impacts
- Glossary  
Bibliography  
Biographical Sketch

## Summary

Agriculture is ultimately dependent on climate resources. Climate change poses major challenges for global food security over the twenty-first century. Natural sciences and economics analyze the causes and consequences of the climate change threat. Agriculture contributes to emissions of greenhouse gases, particularly through conversion of forest land to agriculture on a global scale. Agriculture is likely to face the severest impact from climate change, with implications for global food security and livelihoods. Mitigation strategies and the impacts of climate change both have economic dimensions. Feedbacks between mitigation and impacts mean that strategies for enhancing carbon sinks will directly affect the adaptive capacity of food-producing sectors. Economic studies of incentives for mitigation of greenhouse gases focus on land-use options, such as afforestation of agricultural land or biofuel crops. The economic assessments of the impact of climate change on agriculture use multi-sector economic models of climate impacts and demonstrate how agriculture is affected through production losses. Global assessments overlay future climate scenarios onto spatial estimates of the agricultural potential of agricultural land. They incorporate trade in agricultural commodities, and model adaptation. These analyses result in scenarios of global agricultural production and trade over century timescales. The same analyses are also undertaken for individual countries. Other approaches, such as Ricardian models, examine the capital value of land based on scenarios of demand and productivity affected by climate variables. Most economic analyses tend to examine the impacts of climatic changes on agricultural production, thereby failing to address the dynamics of food security and the distribution of food and other outputs from agriculture. Future research in this area is likely to focus on refining this understanding of vulnerability to climate change, adaptation strategies and the dynamics of food security.

## **1. Economics of Climate-Change Mitigation in Agriculture**

### **1.1. Land-Use Mitigation Options**

The feasibility of reducing agricultural emissions of greenhouse gases or enhancing sinks in agricultural land has been prominent in many studies of “solutions” to reduce greenhouse-gas emissions. There are many interactions of the terrestrial and oceanic parts of the biosphere with the atmosphere. Interventions at most of these points have been suggested. The major areas for serious consideration are in changing the use of energy resources and the use of land resources. Some energy-related mitigation policies, such as increasing hydro-electricity generation, also have implications for agriculture and land use. The primary interventions in the land-use sector are in stopping present deforestation, in afforestation, and in reduction of methane emissions from agricultural sources such as livestock and paddy-rice cultivation. The contentious issues of equity and responsibility cannot be avoided, particularly at the international level. But there should be scope for bringing about overall emissions in tandem with fulfilling other socially and environmentally desirable outcomes.

### **1.2. The Interaction of Agriculture and Mitigation through Afforestation**

The enhancement of sinks through afforestation, as with the land-use conflicts surrounding stemming deforestation, requires addressing the trade-offs and land-use priorities. Afforestation is not a simple feasible, equitable, or cost-effective strategy for reducing aggregate emissions or recovering the lost biomass carbon. In terms of timing, halting deforestation brings about immediate benefits where the enhancement of carbon sinks through afforestation has its effect on the global carbon cycle over a longer time frame. The rate at which carbon sink enhancement takes place has therefore to be compared with its alternatives such as reducing emissions, or offsetting fossil fuel emissions through biomass or biofuels.

Many studies show that a significant proportion of the world’s emissions of carbon could be offset by afforestation either in the tropics, or even in temperate regions. Afforestation may appear to be less costly in tropical countries because the market cost of agricultural land is assumed to be low in many developing countries, compared to agricultural land in the U.S. and Europe. The phenomenon of higher land prices is, however, simply an illustration of how political and economic support for agriculture distorts the markets related to land-use activities and hence distorts land-use decisions themselves. In reality, large-scale radical land-use change through afforestation in the tropics, particularly in plantation forestry, would have many social and economic consequences.

Various studies have attempted to estimate the global potential for carbon sequestration through afforestation, either assuming that all land deforested in the late twentieth century could potentially be reforested; that all areas not “required” for agricultural

production could be afforested; or some other criterion. Estimating land availability, although often taking on board population aspects of future land use, relies on the carrying capacity concept to incorporate all the necessary social forces driving land use. To estimate carrying capacity requires knowledge of not only the physical attributes of land and the level of technology that combine to determine the productivity of land but also knowledge of the land requirement, which is influenced by urbanization and non-agricultural income of land users. The demand for land is also fundamentally determined by localized institutions and cultural norms, such as inheritance law and practice.

	<b>Temperate afforestation (U.S.)</b>	<b>Tropical afforestation</b>
Area required to sequester total global emissions	465 million ha	465 million ha
Establishment costs	\$230 per ha	\$400 per ha
Land costs	\$400 per ha	\$0 per ha
Total costs for 465 million ha	\$372 billion	\$186 billion

Note: Area required removes 2.9 billion tons of carbon (btC), which they take as being added annually to the atmosphere, based on an average yield class of  $15 \text{ m}^3/\text{ha}^{-1}/\text{yr}^{-1}$  ( $= 6.24 \text{ tC}/\text{ha}^{-1}/\text{yr}^{-1}$ )

Table 1. Estimated costs (US\$) of afforestation in the U.S. and tropics to offset global carbon emissions

(Source: Adapted from R.A. Sedjo, Forests to offset the greenhouse effect, *Journal of Forestry* **87**(7) (1989), 12–15)

The costs of establishing forests to sequester the estimated world emissions of carbon each year in the United States have been estimated as the sum of the actual costs incurred in planting the trees and the cost of purchasing the land (see Table 1). This gives an estimate of US\$372 billion, equivalent to 8% of the gross national product of the U.S., as a lower bound estimate and purely financial cost of afforestation. The cost is likely to be higher because the scale of forestry required would mean bringing productive agricultural land into forestry, with correspondingly much higher land costs. Further, the real cost of forestry includes the opportunity cost: the cost of the next-best foregone alternative. Although agricultural production is higher than it would be under free market conditions due to distorting price support in both the U.S. and Europe, the costs of agricultural production foregone is not included in the above calculation, and hence the figure represents a lower bound estimate.

-  
-  
-

TO ACCESS ALL THE 10 PAGES OF THIS CHAPTER,  
[Click here](#)

## Bibliography

Adger W.N. and Brown K. (1994). *Land Use and the Causes of Global Warming*, 271 pp. Chichester, U.K.: John Wiley. [Comprehensive analysis of greenhouse gas sources and sinks and potential policy responses.]

Bohle H.G., Downing T.E. and Watts M.J. (1994). Climate change and social vulnerability: toward a sociology and geography of food insecurity. *Global Environmental Change* **4**, 37–48. [Outlines how vulnerability is created and how food security is threatened by climate change.]

Gitay H., Brown S., Easterling W. and Jallow B. (2001). Ecosystems and their goods and services. *Climate Change 1995: Impacts, Adaptations and Mitigation of Climate Change* (ed. J.J. McCarthy, O. Canziani, N.A. Leary, D.J. Dokken and K.S. White), pp. 237–342. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

Kaiser H.M. and Crosson P. (1995). Implications of climate change for U.S. agriculture. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* **77**, 734–740. [Agro-economic approach to farm-level responses to climate change such as crop switching.]

Mendelsohn R., Nordhaus W.D. and Shaw D. (1994). The impact of global warming on agriculture: a Ricardian analysis. *American Economic Review* **84**, 753–771. [Outlines results for the U.S. showing that farmer adaptation may reduce projected economic costs associated with climate change.]

Parry M., Rosenzweig C., Iglesias A., Fischer G. and Livermore M. (1999). Climate change and world food security: a new assessment. *Global Environmental Change* **9**, S51–S67. [Provides projections of numbers of people potentially at risk from changes in global food production as a result of climate change.]

Reilly J. (1999). What does climate change mean for agriculture in developing countries? A comment on Mendelsohn and Dinar. *World Bank Research Observer* **14**, 295–305. [Cautions that farmers are constrained in their adaptation and that food security issues are most important.]

## Biographical Sketch

**W. Neil Adger** is a reader in environmental economics at the University of East Anglia, Norwich, U.K. He is manager of the adaptation research theme in the Tyndall Centre for Climate Change Research, and is a senior research fellow in the Centre for Social and Economic Research on the Global Environment, all at the University of East Anglia. He was a lead author for the Third Assessment Report of the IPCC on impacts of climate change on Asia. His ongoing research has focused on defining social vulnerability and resilience to climate change, migration, land use, coastal resources and property rights, and environmental justice. He was awarded a Philip Leverhulme Prize for research achievement in 2001. His books include *Living with Environmental Change: Social Vulnerability, Adaptation and Resilience in Vietnam* (Routledge, 2001) and *Making Waves: Integrating Coastal Conservation and Development* (Earthscan 2002).