Aumento della temperatura, carbon tax ed impatti economici regionali e nazionali

Marta Castellini Ph.D dSEA - UNIPD &FEEM marta.castellini@unipd.it

Keywords

- Economia
- Fonti Fossili
- Anidride Carbonica, Diossido di Carbonio, CO2
- · Incremento della temperatura
- Cambiamento climatico
- Valutazione danno economico
- Misure, politiche e strumenti



William D. Nordhaus

"for integrating climate change into long-run macroeconomic analysis"

Paul M. Romer

"for integrating technological innovations into long-run macroeconomic analysis"

THE ROYAL SWEDISH ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

Modelli di valutazione integrata (IAMs) di Clima ed Economia

Principali caratteristiche: modulo climatico integrato con modulo di crescita economica, esternalità negativa cambiamento climatico, crescita economica, carbon tax, adattamento, mitigazione

- → DICE Dynamic Integrated Climate-Economy model [Nordhaus, 1992]: modulo climatico e modulo economico globali.
- → RICE Regional Integrated Climate-Economy model [Nordhaus and Yang, 1996]: modulo climatico globale, modulo economico regionale.



Figure 1: RICE-96

Il ruolo dell'IPCC - Intergovermental Panel on Climate Change

Intergovernmental body of the UN dedicated to providing the world with objective, scientific information on:

- the Physical Science Basis (WGI)
- Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability (WGII)
- Mitigation (WGIII)

of Climate Change.

- $\rightarrow\,$ The IPCC informs the United Nation Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC).
- $\rightarrow\,$ UNFCCC aim: "stabilize GHG concentrations in the atmosphere at a level that would prevent dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system"

Latest publication: 6th Assessment Reports and several Special Reports (i.e. SR1.5)

Limiting warming to 1.5°C and 2°C involves rapid, deep and in most cases immediate greenhouse gas emission reductions

Net zero CO₂ and net zero GHG emissions can be achieved through strong reductions across all sectors





Annex III: Scenarios and Modelling Methods

IPCC AR6 WGIII direct link to the document

Let us look at pages 1843 - 1845.

Economic Sciences

Prize

Prize in Economic Sciences 1987

Robert M. Solow - Facts

The Sveriges Riksbank Prize in Economic Sciences in Memory of Alfred Nobel 1987

Robert M. Solow Facts

Robert M. Solow

Share this





Photo from the Nobel Foundation archive. Robert M. Solow The Sveriges Riksbank Prize in Economic Sciences in Memory of Alfred Nobel 1987

Born: 23 August 1924, Brooklyn, NY, USA

Died: 21 December 2023, Lexington, MA, USA

Affiliation at the time of the award: Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), Cambridge, MA, USA

Prize motivation: "for his contributions to the theory of economic growth"

Prize share: 1/1

Economic Sciences

Prize in Economic Sciences 1987

Robert M. Solow - Facts

Work

Robert Solow was awarded the Economic Sciences Prize for his important contributions to theories of economic growth. In the 1950s, he developed a mathematical model illustrating how various factors can contribute to sustained national economic growth. From the 1960s on, Solow's studies helped persuade governments to channel funds into technological research and development to spur economic growth.

Institute Professor Emeritus Robert Solow, pathbreaking economist, dies at age 99

Nobel-winning scholar changed his field, taught generations of students, and helped make MIT a global leader in economics research.

Natch Video

Peter Dizikes | MIT News December 22, 2023



RICE-MED: a Regional Integrated assessment modeling of Climate and the Economy for the Mediterranean Basin

Marta Castellini^{1,4} Chiara Castelli⁵ Camilla Gusperti¹ Veronica Lupi^{1,3} Sergio Vergalli^{1,2}

¹Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei (FEEM), Italy

²Department of Economics and Management, University of Brescia, Italy

³Institute for Environmental Studies, Vrije Universiteit, Netherlands

⁴Department of Economics and Management, University of Padua, Italy

⁵Wiener Institut fur Internationale Wirtschaftsvergleiche, Austria



Scan for the working paper

Motivation. Climate change in the Mediterranean Basin

Sixth Assessment Report IPCC 2022 - Cross-Chapter Paper 4



Mediterranean Region

Currently incomplete knowledge of climate impacts and risks in the southern and eastern part of the basin hinders the implementation of adaptation measures, creating a need for implementable plans with enhanced and cooperative research and monitoring capacities between the north, south and southeast countries (high agreement). - (Source: CCP4.4 - IPCC AR6 - 2022).

→ The *Mediterranean climate*: these territories - beyond the Mediterranean area - share same temperature paths, wet winters, hot, or warm dry, summers; dried periods and this trend is expected to persist in the long run.[Seager et al., 2019]

- a *Climate and Economy model* based on the Regional Climate and Economy model *RICE-99* by Nordhaus and Boyer [2000],
- All *world economies* relies on *energy produced with fossil fuels* and there is no international trade.
- *spatial granularity* of RICE-99 (world divided in 9 regions) is increased focusing on the *Mediterranean countries*.
- Original calibration: base year 1995 \rightarrow Updated to 2015.
- RICE- 99 Initialization process formalized analytically.
- *New figures* on the *social cost of carbon* in BAU, Social Optimimum and Temperature Limit scenarios.
- Golosov et al. [2014] damage function, with direct link with CO2 concentration.
- *RICE-MED-U*: *uncertainty* associated to climate-induced catastrophic event [*Castelnuovo et al., 2003*].

Literature: Mediterranean Basin

- JRC-PESETA [Ciscar et al., 2009, 2011]: EU disaggregated in 5 regions Climate data scenarios \rightarrow physical models \rightarrow CGE model (GEM-E3) \rightarrow consumer welfare and GDP
- Galeotti and Roson [2011]: use ENVISAGE model (World Bank), a recursive dynamic multi-sector multi-region CGE model with emissions and climate module, where the World is divided in 20 regions, of which several countries in the Mediterranean at national level
- Aaheim et al. [2012]: GRACE Global Responses to Anthropogenic Changes in the Environment- model (CGE model) is used to study the impact of adaptation on the EU
- **Paroussos et al. [2013**]: four alternative macroeconomic scenarios for the Southern and Eastern Mediterranean using the GEM-E3 CGE model
- Bosello and Standardi [2018]: regional version of the ICES model, a recursive dynamic multiregional CGE model to assess impacts of climate change + mitigation and adaptation policies for the European Mediterranean countries

Literature: IAMs - Rice type models

- —• 1: RICE-96 Nordhaus and Yang [1996] 10 regions no energy as an input
 - 2: Bosello and Moretto [1999] Uncertainty in different IAMs
- -• 3: Nordhaus and Boyer [2000] 8 regions energy as an input
- 4: Buonanno et al. [2001] ETC RICE, RICE-96 + end. tech, change
- 5: Castelnuovo et al. [2003] ETC-U-RICE= ETC-RICE + uncertainty Bosello and Moretto [1999]
- 6: Galeotti and Carraro [2004] RICE-99 + end.tech. change
- --- 7: Castelnuovo et al. [2005] RICE-96 + learning doing/research
- 8: Bosetti et al. [2006a] Policies based on Galeotti and Carraro [2004]
- 9: Bosetti et al. [2006b] carbon and energy intensity based on Galeotti and Carraro [2004]
- 10: Bosetti et al. [2006c] The WITCH model, energy as an input
- 11: Von Below and Persson [2008] RICE-99 update calibration (not as in the original)
- 12: Nordhaus [2009] Sea level rise
- 13: Bosello [2010] ETC-RICE + R&D + mitigation/adaptation
- 14: Nordhaus [2010] 12 regions adaptation + mitigation
- 15: De Bruin [2014] AD-RICE-99, focus on adaptation
- ---- 16: Nordhaus and Yang [2021] 16,12,6 regions RICE-2020, based on RICE-2010
- 17: Gazzotti [2022] RICE-50+: 57 regions (EU at country level)

The RICE-MED model. An overview.

A regional model in which *Mediterranean nations* are considered at country level, allowing the identification of the economic damage of climate change at a finer spatial level, while other countries in the world are grouped in macro-regions.



A regional model in which Mediterranean nations are considered at country level, allowing the identification of the economic damage of climate change at a finer spatial level, while other countries in the world are grouped in *macro-regions*.



The RICE-MED model. An overview.





In a **one-sector closed economy** *j*, the GDP $Y_j(t)$ is allocated between the aggregate consumption $C_j(n, t)$ and the investments $I_j(t)$

$$Y_j(t) = C_j(t) + I_j(t) \quad : \quad butget \ constraint, \tag{1}$$

while the capital stock accumulates as:

$$K_{j}(t) = K_{j}(t-1)(1-\delta_{K})^{10} + 10I_{j}(t-1).$$
(2)

The technological progress is exogenous and evolving as:

$$A_{j}(t+1) = A_{j}(t) e^{g_{j}^{A}(t)},$$
(3)

assuming to slow gradually over the next three centuries until eventually stopping. The **time step** (Δt) **is 10 years**. In the climate change literature: "is the average time it takes for a small increase in atmospheric CO2 concentration to have an effect on temperature after several years" [Pindyck, 2022].

The optimization problem of the j - th region

A representative agent (the **society**, she) is characterized by the **utility** function $U[c_j(t), L_j(t)]$, subject to existing resources and capital constraints. The objective of the optimization is thus the **social welfare** function W_i .

$$\max_{c_{j}(t)} W_{j} = \sum_{t} U[c_{j}(t), L_{j}(t)] R(t), \text{ with}$$
(4)
$$U[c_{j}(t), L_{j}(t)] = L_{j}(t) \frac{c_{j}(t)^{1-\alpha} - 1}{(1-\alpha)},$$
(5)

- R(t): the social preferences discount factor
- $c_j(t) = \frac{c(t)}{l(t)}$: the per-capita consumption and the decision variable.
- α : the willingness to reduce the welfare of high-consumption generations to improve the one of low-consumption generations

Population $L_i(t)$ evolves overtime according the exogenous path:

$$L_{j}(t+1) = L_{j}(t) \left(\frac{L(T)}{L(t)}\right)^{g_{j}^{L}(t)}.$$
 (6)

ightarrow assumptions: population equals labour; full employment.

The GDP of the economy Y_i (t) is obtained as follows:

$$Y_{j}(t) = \left[A_{j}(t) K_{j}(t)^{\gamma} L_{j}(t)^{1-\beta_{j}-\gamma} ES_{j}(t)^{\beta_{j}}\right] - c_{j}^{\mathsf{E}}(t) ES_{j}(t),$$

$$\tag{7}$$

where $ES_j(t) = \zeta_j(t)E_j(t)$: energy production function, (8)

the fossil fuels' (or carbon-energy) sector is included in the model as follows:

overall cost of producing energy services: regional unitary cost of energy: global wholesale price of energy: regional markup on energy costs:

 $c_{j}^{E}(t) ES_{j}(t)$ $c_{j}^{E}(t) = q(t) + Markup_{j}^{E}$ $q(t) = \xi_{1} + \xi_{2} \left(\frac{CumC(t)}{CumC^{*}}\right)^{\xi_{3}}$ $Markup_{j}^{E}$

The *regional output net of environmental damage* Q_i(t) is defined as:

$$Q_{j}(t) = \Omega_{j}(t) Y_{j}(t) = Y_{j}(t) - D_{j}(M_{AT}(t)) Y_{j}(t)$$
(9)

with
$$\Omega_j(t) = 1 - D_j(M_{AT}(t)) = exp(-\theta_j(M_{AT}(t) - \overline{M}_{AT})).$$
 (10)

following Golosov et al. [2014]

Production function of the j - th region: the energy sector and emissions

Considering the global wholesale price of energy $q(t) = \xi_1 + \xi_2 \left(\frac{CumC(t)}{CumC^*}\right)^{\xi_3}$

- $\xi_i = \{113, 700, 4\}$ with i = 1, 2, 3: parameters
- CumC*: inflection point beyond which the marginal cost of carbon-energy begins to rise sharply
- *CumC*(*t*): cumulative consumption, or world use, of carbon energy at the end of period *t* expressed in terms of industrial emissions, with dynamics:

$$CumC(t) = CumC(t - 1) + 10E(t)$$
(11)

thus a function of:

- \cdot CumC (t 1) the cumulative consumption at the previous time period
- *E*(*t*) the world use of carbon energy (and industrial emissions) at time *t*, which yields from:

$$E(t) = \sum_{j} E_{j}(t)$$
(12)

The model also accounts for *land use emissions* $LU_j(t)$, which are exogenous. Thus the global emissions ET(t) are:

$$ET(t) = \sum_{j} E_{j}(t) + LU_{j}(t)$$
(13)



Source: MIT Climate Portal/Radiative Forcings

The climate module of RICE-MED is the same of RICE-99 [Nordhaus and Boyer, 2000].

- Carbon-cycle equations:
 - $\rightarrow\,$ link between GHGs emissions from the economic activity and and reservoirs' stocks
- Radiative forcing equation:
 - $\rightarrow~$ link between the accumulation of GHGs and climate change.
- Climate change equation (e.g.,temperature)
 - \rightarrow link between radiative forcing and tempearature equations.
- Climate-damage relationship:
 - $\rightarrow\,$ It represents the impacts from climate change on the economic sectors (applied to the the production function).

We assume that there are three reservoirs for carbon:

• the atmosphere (AT), with $M_{AT}(t)$ being the related carbon stock at time t

$$M_{AT}(t) = 10ET(t-1) + \phi_{AT,AT}M_{AT}(t-1) + \phi_{UP,AT}M_{UP}(t-1)$$
(14)

• a quickly mixing reservoir in the upper oceans and the biosphere (UP), with M_{UP} (t) carbon stock at time t

$$M_{UP}(t) = \phi_{UP,UP}M_{UP}(t-1) + \phi_{AT,UP}M_{AT}(t-1) + \phi_{LO,UP}M_{LO}(t-1)$$
(15)

• the deep oceans (LO) with $M_{LO}(t)$ as the mass of carbon at time t.

$$M_{LO}(t) = \phi_{LO,LO} M_{LO}(t-1) + \phi_{UP,LO} M_{UP}(t-1)$$
(16)

with:

- \rightarrow ET (t 1) as the global CO2 emissions including those from land use changes a time t 1,
- $\rightarrow \phi_{i,j}$, the transfer rates from the reservoir *j* (per period), where *i*, *j* = AT, UP, LO

Radiative forcing is what happens when the amount of energy that enters the Earth's atmosphere is different from the amount of energy that leaves it. If more radiation is entering Earth than leaving—as is happening today—then the atmosphere will warm up. (MI climate portal)

$$F(t) = \eta \left\{ log \left[\frac{M_{AT}(t)}{M_{AT}(1750)} \right] \frac{1}{log(2)} \right\} + \mathcal{O}(t)$$
(17)

where

- F(t) is the change in the total radiative forcings of GHGs since 1750 from anthropogenic source such as CO2.
- η : forcings of equilibrium CO2 doubling (Wm-2)
- M_{AT} is the carbon in the atmosphere, which depends on M_{UP} , the the mass of carbon in the upper reservoir (UP). The latter is in turn affected by the mass of carbon in the lower oceans M_{LO} (Carbon cycle).
- \cdot M_{AT}(1750) is the preindustrial level of atmospheric concentration of CO2.
- \mathcal{O} (t) is the forcing of other GHGs (CFCs, CH4, N20 and ozone) and aerosols (exogenous).

The link between radiative forcing and temperature change is provided by:

Temperature increase equation,

$$T(t) = T(t-1) + \sigma_1 \{F(t) - \lambda T(t-1) - \sigma_2 [T(t-1) - T_{LO}(t-1)]\}$$
(18)

where

- T(t) is the increase in the globally and seasonally averaged temperature in the atmosphere and at the upper level of the ocean since 1900.
- \cdot F(t) is the radiative forcing
- σ_i are the transfer coefficients reflecting the rates of flow and the thermal capacities of the different sinks.
- + T_{LO} is the increase in temperature in the deep oceans
- $\cdot \,\,\lambda$ is a feedback parameter

The RICE-MED-U model. Dealing with uncertainty [Castelnuovo et al., 2003].

The society is not able to identify the global temperature level at which the catastrophic event may occur, but is aware of that.

It assign two different levels of utility, one before the event (BC) and the other after (AC), duly weighted for a survival probability SP(t) (in BC) and a catastrophe probability (1 - SP(t)), in AC. In BC a utility loss defined by the share *b* is introduced.



The RICE-MED welfare maximization problem is revised as follows:

$$\max_{c_{j}(t)} W_{j} = \sum_{t} U[c_{j}(t), L_{j}(t)] R(t)$$
(19)
with $U[c_{j}(t), L_{j}(t), SP(t)] = SP(t) U[c_{j}(t), L_{j}(t)]_{BC}$

$$+[1 - SP(t)] U[c_{j}(t), L_{j}(t)]_{AC}$$
(20)
and $U[c_{j}(t), L_{j}(t)]_{AC} = (1 - b) U[c_{j}(t), L_{j}(t)]_{BC},$
(21)

The survivor probability is a function of the endogenous temperature variation:

$$SP(t) = \exp\left[-HR(t)\right] \tag{22}$$

through the HR(t) is the hazard rate function HR(t):

$$HR(t) = \begin{cases} HR(t-1) + \left[\varphi_0 + \varphi_1 T(t)\right] \eta \left[\max\left(0; T(t) - T_0\right)\right]^{\eta - 1} & \text{if } T(t) > 0, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$
(23)
and $T(t) = \frac{\Delta T(t)}{T(t-1)}, \quad \text{with } \frac{\partial HR(t)}{\partial T(t)} > 0.$ (24)

Policy insights.

- The effect of increasing societal awareness of the impact of a potential climate-related disaster is found in all model results: better performance in temperature increase at the end of the century.
- This demonstrates the importance of *society correctly recognising and valuing* a survivor probability determined by the temperature change and the potential loss of utility associated with the disaster.

- **BAU Business as Usual**. It assumes no change in climate-related policies. This scenario represents the cost implications of unmitigated climate damage.
- OPT Social Optimum. The social welfare function is maximized under the economic (regional) and climate (global) constraints, identifying the optimal pathways of consumption, production and emissions reduction in each point in time. Such paths allow the identification of the optimal carbon tax to achieve such benchmarks.
- TL Temperature Limit: The OPT scenario runs under an additional constraint that limits the temperature increase below 2°C.
- \rightarrow *Time horizon*: 2015-2305 (time step: 10 years).
- → *Time range of results*: 2015-2105

Outcomes of the RICE-MED model

For each country *i*, with $i \in j - th$ region,

- $\rightarrow A_i(0)$, the total factor productivity $A_i(0)$,
- $\rightarrow K_i(0)$, the capital stock,
- $\rightarrow \beta_i(0)$, the elasticity of output respect to the energy input,
- \rightarrow Markup^E_i(0), the markup on the wholesale price of energy,

are calibrated so that at the base year the GDP, industrial emissions $E_i(t)$ and the interest rate match respective historical observations.

Emissions of country *i* E_i^d (0) are a function of:

- \rightarrow X_{s,i} (0), the consumption of the *the carbon energy inputs, or energy source, s, namely coal, oil, gas, for their different purposes,* and
- $ightarrow \gamma_{
 m S}$, the emissions per unit of consumption for the energy source s, .

$$E_{i}^{d}(0) = \sum_{s} X_{s,i}(0) \gamma_{s} = \sum_{s} \omega_{s,i}(0) \left[\frac{P_{s,i}(0)}{P_{s,i}(0) + \tau_{j}(0) \gamma_{s}} \right]^{\eta_{s}} \gamma_{s}$$
(25)

- + $\omega_{{
 m S},i}$ (0) is the consumption of energy source s in the first period,
- $P_{s,i}(0)$ is its the price at the same time
- + $\eta_{\rm S}$ is the price elasticity of demand for carbon energy source s.

The unknown values of $A_i(0)$, $K_i(0)$, $\beta_i(0)$ and $Markup_i^E$ yields from the resolution of this **system of equations**, representing all the assumptions previously mentioned.

$$\begin{cases}
Q_{i}(0) = A_{i}(0)K_{i}(0)^{\gamma}L_{i}(0)^{1-\beta_{i}-\gamma}E_{i}(0)^{\beta_{i}} - C_{i}^{E}(0)E_{i}(0); \\
E_{i}(0) = \frac{1}{\zeta_{i}(0)}\left\{\left[c_{i}^{E}(0) + \frac{h(0)}{\zeta_{i}(0)} + \frac{\tau_{i}(0)}{\zeta_{i}(0)}\right]\frac{1}{\beta_{i}(0)A_{i}(0)K_{i}(0)^{\gamma}L_{i}(0)^{1-\beta_{i}-\gamma}}\right\}^{\frac{1}{\beta_{i}-1}}; \\
(1+r_{i})^{10} = \frac{\partial Q_{i}(0)}{\partial K_{i}(0)} + \frac{\partial K_{i}(1)}{\partial K_{i}(0)}; \\
\underbrace{E_{i}(0, \tau = 0) - E_{i}(0, \tau = 50)}_{Change in emissions} \underbrace{E_{i}^{d}(0, \tau = 0) - E_{i}^{d}(0, \tau = 50)}_{Disaggregated Energy Model}.
\end{cases}$$
(26)



Initial conditions: outcomes.

Italy				
Input	Value	Source	Output	Value
$L_{i}(0)$	61(mln)	World Bank	A _i (0)	0.084
$Q_i(0)$	1.642 (trillUSD2015)	World Bank	K _i (0)	2.18 (trillUSD2015)
E _i (0)	0.09 (GtC)	ENERDATA	β _i (0)	0.047
			Markup ^E (0)	807.304 (thousandsUSD2015/tC)



From countries to regional aggregation:

- $K_i(0)$ yields from the aggregation of country specific values $K_i(0)$.
- $A_j(0)$, $\beta_j(0)$ and $Markup_j^E(0)$ yield from average values defined on the basis of countries specific ones.

Global results: scenarios overview



RICE-MED: Temperature increase and carbon tax

Variables / Scenario	2015	2025	2035	2055	2105	Average
Temperature increase (°C from 1900)						
Business as Usual	1.10	1.19	1.31	1.60	2.36	
Optimal	1.10	1.19	1.31	1.58	2.29	
Temperature limit ≤ 2.0	1.10	1.19	1.31	1.53	1.96	
Carbon Tax (USD/tC)						
Optimal	38.94	133.87	157.29	209.45	406.42	231.32
Temperature limit ≤ 2.0	39.76	617.36	788.72	1268.63	4104.60	1728.41

RICE-MED-U: the survivor probability and catastrophic event probability

Variable / Scenario	2015	2025	2035	2055	2105
RMU0.30-BAU	0.999 <mark>(0.001)</mark>	0.998 (0.002)	0.997 <mark>(0.003)</mark>	0.990 (0.010)	0.938 (0.062)
RMU0.50-BAU	0.999 <mark>(0.001)</mark>	0.998 (0.002)	0.997 (0.003)	0.991 (0.009)	0.942 (0.058)
RMU0.70-BAU	0.999 <mark>(0.001)</mark>	0.998 (0.002)	0.997 (0.003)	0.991 (0.009)	0.942 (0.054)
RMU0.30-OPT	0.999 <mark>(0.001)</mark>	0.998 (0.002)	0.997 (0.003)	0.991 <mark>(0.009)</mark>	0.942 (0.058)
RMU0.50-OPT	0.999 <mark>(0.001)</mark>	0.998 (0.002)	0.997 (0.003)	0.991 <mark>(0.009)</mark>	0.946 <mark>(0.054)</mark>
RMU0.70-OPT	0.999 <mark>(0.001)</mark>	0.998 <mark>(0.002)</mark>	0.997 (0.003)	0.991 <mark>(0.009)</mark>	0.949 (0.051)
RMU0.30-TL ≤2.0	0.999 <mark>(0.001)</mark>	0.998 <mark>(0.002)</mark>	0.997 <mark>(0.003)</mark>	0.991 <mark>(0.009)</mark>	0.955 <mark>(0.045)</mark>
RMU0.50-TL ≤2.0	0.999 <mark>(0.001)</mark>	0.998 (0.002)	0.997 <mark>(0.003)</mark>	0.991 <mark>(0.009)</mark>	0.956 <mark>(0.044)</mark>
RMU0.70-TL ≤2.0	0.999 <mark>(0.001)</mark>	0.998 <mark>(0.002)</mark>	0.997 <mark>(0.003)</mark>	0.991 <mark>(0.009)</mark>	0.956 <mark>(0.044)</mark>

Text in blue brackets refers to the probability of a catastrophic event.

RMUb-Scenario: where b is the share sizing the utility loss. The higher is b the wider is the utility loss.

Castelli, Castellini, Gusperti, Lupi, Vergalli

- As the *temperature* continues to *rise* over time, the *probability of facing a disaster highers* too;
- such proportion is *mitigated by the scenarios stringency* and the in the *size of* the utility loss (*i.e* b highers) associated to the consequences of the disaster.
- As we get closer to the end of the century, changes across scenarios become apparent: the more environmentally binding the policy scenario becomes, the smaller the positive variation in the disaster probability overtime.

Global results: the effect of uncertainty introduction

RICE-MED vs RICE-MED-U

Variables / Scenario	2015	2025	2035	2055	2105	
Temperature increase (°C from 1900)						
RM-Ontimal	1 10	1 1 9	1 3 1	1 5 8	2.29	
RMII0 30-Ontimal	1 10	1.10	1.31	1.56	2.29	
PMU0.50-Optimal	1 10	1 10	1.31	1.50	2.10	
RMU0.30-Optimal	1.10	1.19	1.31	1.55	2.12	
PM-Tomporature limit <2.0	1.10	1.10	1.31	1.50	1.06	
$\frac{1}{2}$	1.10	1.19	1.31	1.53	1.90	
$RM00.50$ -remperature limit ≤ 2.0	1.10	1.19	1.31	1.55	1.95	
RM00.50-Temperature limit ≤ 2.0	1.10	1.19	1.31	1.52	1.94	
RM00.70-Temperature timit 52.0	1.10	1.19	1.31	1.52	1.94	
Corbon Toy (UCD /tC)						A
Carbon Tax (USD/IC)	20.07	122.07	157.20	200 / 5	406 40	average
RM-Optimat	20.02	100.07	200.05	209.43	400.42	231.32
RMUU.30-Optimal	39.02	263.98	299.85	369.79	558.07	3/1.31
RMU0.50-Optimal	39.30	3/3.3/	423.50	521.68	/83.04	521.45
RMU0.70-Optimal	39.40	486.09	551.38	680.90	1031.71	681.66
RM-Temperature limit ≤2.0	39.76	617.36	788.72	1268.63	4104.60	1728.41
RMU0.30-Temperature limit ≤2.0	39.76	714.03	885,57	1348.86	3961.38	1752.02
RMU0.50-Temperature limit ≤2.0	39.76	782.20	788.72	1268.63	3890.40	1778.67
RMU0.70-Temperature limit ≤2.0	39.76	853.29	1028.28	1479.04	3838.53	1814.11

Social Rate of Time Preference (SRTP) is 1.5%. RM: RICE-MED. RMUb: RICE-MED-U model with $b = \{0.3, 0.50\}$.

<u>Outline</u>

- 1. Model outcomes at regional level
- 2. Regional economic damage



RICE-MED

Regional results

egy colour — BAU — OPT — TL

Avera	ge loss across	scenarios	Group ave	rage loss	Group vo	ariance
	BAUvsOPT	BAUvsTL	BAUvsOPT	BAUvsTL	BAUvsOPT	BAUvsTL
ALB	0.13%	0.29%				
HRV	0.01%	0.27%	0.00%	0.22%	0.07%	0.00%
MNE	0.16%	0.45%	0.0976	0.3376	0.07 %	0.00%
GRC	0.05%	0.32%				
CYP	0.23%	0.40%				
ISR	0.10%	0.19%				
LBN	0.08%	0.24%	0.19%	0.55%	0.17%	0.58%
SYR	0.46%	1.58%				
TUR	0.06%	0.32%				
DZA	0.25%	1.08%				
EGY	0.24%	0.75%				
ETH	0.35%	0.31%				
LBY	0.24%	2.21%	0.27%	0.90%	0.06%	0.63%
MAR	0.27%	0.46%				
SDN	0.35%	0.61%				
TUN	0.19%	0.86%				
FRA	-0.01%	0.06%				
ITA	0.01%	0.17%	0.07%	0.1 E 9/	0.129/	0.0629/
MLT	0.27%	0.21%	0.07%	0.15%	0.13%	0.002%
ESP	0.03%	0.17%				

Average reduction across scenarios by type of variable in regions

	Energy s	ervices	Emissions	intensity	Investments		
	BAUvsOPT	BAUvsTL	BAUvsOPT	BAUvsTL	BAUvsOPT	BAUvsTL	
USA	0.31%	4.80%	0.22%	3.42%	0.07%	0.43%	
CHINA	0.45%	6.19%	0.25%	3.47%	0.04%	0.36%	
EE	0.40%	6.40%	0.34%	3.85%	-0.01%	0.34%	
EUROPE	0.35%	4.94%	0.30%	3.84%	0.06%	0.33%	
LI	1.00%	8.11%	0.31%	4.06%	0.26%	0.50%	
LMI	0.74%	6.86%	0.29%	3.92%	0.15%	.45%	
MI	0.85%	6.73%	0.40%	4.21%	0.14%	0.39%	
ОНІ	0.79%	5.42%	0.43%	4.22%	0.20%	0.28%	

Castelli, Castellini, Gusperti, Lupi, Vergalli

Average reduction in Energy Services between scenarios for MED countries

Averag	ge $\Delta\downarrow$ across	scenarios	Group ave	rage loss	Group variance		
	BAUvsOPT	BAUvsTL	BAUvsOPT	BAUvsTL	BAUvsOPT	BAUvsTL	
ALB	0.59%	6.61%					
HRV	0.18%	4.18%	0 4 2 9/	E 20.9/	0.26%	1 50%	
MNE	0.71%	6.56%	0.43%	J.29 /0	0.20%	1.30 %	
GRC	0.24%	3.80%					
CYP	0.95%	6.98%					
ISR	0.52%	6.08%					
LBN	0.68%	5.48%	0.87%	7.02%	0.29%	1.56%	
SYR	1.26%	9.57%					
TUR	0.96%	6.98%					
DZA	0.56%	6.57%					
EGY	0.69%	7.55%					
ETH	1.10%	8.66%					
LBY	0.97%	8.43%	0.95%	7.53%	0.56%	1.17%	
MAR	2.09%	8.28%					
SDN	0.83%	7.84%					
TUN	0.40%	5.40%					
FRA	0.44%	5.35%					
ITA	0.21%	3.77%	0 4 7 9/	1. 06.0/	0.200/	0.70%	
MLT	0.86%	5.53%	0.47%	4.00%	0.28%	0.79%	
ESP	0.37%	4.79%					

	Scenario	2015	2025	2035	2055	2105
Furana	Ontimal	0.25	0.04	0.02	0.90	1 20
Europe		0.55	0.94	0.02	0.69	1.30
(∆% to Baseline)	Temp Limit	0.35	0.94	0.12	-0.51	-1.41
LMI	Optimal	-1.31	-2.39	-2.19	-3.60	-4.86
$(\Delta\%$ to Baseline)	Temp Limit	-1.31	-4.40	-5.48	-6.71	-9.54
Egypt	Optimal	-1.14	-2.14	-2.62	-3.23	-4.28
($\Delta\%$ to Baseline)	Temp Limit	-1.14	-4.67	-5.80	-7.21	-11.08
Sudan	Ontimal	174	2.00	2 70	4.61	6.27
Suuali		-1.74	-3.00	-3.70	-4.01	-0.57
(∆% to Baseline)	Temp Limit	-1./4	-4.58	-5.63	-6.83	-9.51
Tunisia	Ontimal	-0.93	- 1.80	-2.26	-2.80	-3.64
$(\Lambda\%$ to Baseline)	Tomp Limit	-0.93	-4.87	-6.22	-8.00	-13.80
(Δ/o to basetine)	Temp Linne	-0.93	-4.07	-0.22	-0.00	-13.09

Overtime difference in Output w.r.t. Business As Usual (%)

Conclusions

Results visualization for policy is another challenge

GDPmean%var - b=0.30

Castelli, Castellini, Gusperti, Lupi, Vergalli

RICE-MED

Results visualization for policy is another challenge

RICE-MED, an integrated assessment model for the Mediterranean basin: assessing the climate-economy-agriculture nexus

Chiara Castelli, Wiener Institut fur Internationale Wirtschaftsvergleiche, Austria

Marta Castellini, DSEA-UNIPD and Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Italy

Camilla Gusperti, Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Italy

Veronica Lupi, Institute for Environmental Studies, Vrije Universiteit, Netherlands and Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Italy

Sergio Vergalli, Dept. of Economics and Management, University of Brescia and Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Italy

The paper in brief.

- Updated calibration of the RICE-99 of Nordhaus and Boyer [2000] to year 2015.
- Analytical formalization of the model initialization process.
- New regionalization, with Mediterranean nations at country level.
- New damage function [Golosov et al., 2014].
- RICE-MED-U: Uncertainty [Castelnuovo et al., 2003].
- RICE-MED-AGRI: economic damages linked to climate change to the agricultural sector.

Scan here to read the working paper.

This work has been developed within the AWESOME-Project funded by PRIMA-EU Program

RICE-MED

Thank you for your time!

Marta Castellini, PhD. marta.castellini@unipd.it marta.castellini@feem.it

References

William D. Nordhaus. An optimal transition path for controlling greenhouse gases. Science, 20(5086):1315–1319, nov 1992. doi: 10.1126/science.258.5086.1315.

- William D. Nordhaus and Zili Yang. A regional dynamic general-equilibrium model of alternative climate-change strategies. The American Economic Review, 86(4):741–765, 1996. ISSN 00028282. URL http://www.jstor.org/stable/2118303.
- Richard Seager, Timothy J Osborn, Yochanan Kushnir, Isla R Simpson, Jennifer Nakamura, and Haibo Liu. Climate variability and change of mediterranean-type climates. *Journal of Climate*, 32(10):2887–2915, 2019.
- William Nordhaus and Joseph Boyer. Warming the world: Economic models of global warming. MIT press, 2000.
- Mikhail Golosov, John Hassler, Per Krusell, and Aleh Tsyvinski. Optimal taxes on fossil fuel in general equilibrium. Econometrica, 82(1):41–88, 2014.
- Efrem Castelnuovo, Michele Moretto, and Sergio Vergalli. Global warming, uncertainty and endogenous technical change. Environmental Modeling & Assessment, 8(4):291–301, 2003.
- Juan-Carlos Ciscar, Antonio Soria, Clare M Goodess, Ole B Christensen, Ana Iglesias, Luis Garrote, Marta Moneo, Sonia Quiroga, Luc Feyen, Rutger Dankers, et al. Climate change impacts in europe. final report of the peseta research project. 2009.
- Juan-Carlos Ciscar, Ana Iglesias, Luc Feyen, László Szabó, Denise Van Regemorter, Bas Amelung, Robert Nicholls, Paul Watkiss, Ole B Christensen, Rutger Dankers, et al. Physical and economic consequences of climate change in europe. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 108(7):2678–2683, 2011.
- Marzio Galeotti and Roberto Roson. Economic impacts of climate change in italy and the mediterranean: updating the evidence. Available at SSRN 1935280, 2011.
- Asbjørn Aaheim, Helene Amundsen, Therese Dokken, and Taoyuan Wei. Impacts and adaptation to climate change in european economies. *Global Environmental Change*, 22(4):959–968, 2012.

- Leonidas Paroussos, Kostas Fragkiadakis, Ioannis Charalampidis, Stella Tsani, and Pantelis Capros. Macroeconomic scenarios for the euro-mediterranean area: Quantification based on the gem-e3 model. 2013.
- Francesco Bosello and Gabriele Standardi. A sub-national cge model for the european mediterranean countries. In The New Generation of Computable General Equilibrium Models, pages 279–308. Springer, 2018.
- Francesco Bosello and Michele Moretto. Dynamic uncertainty and global warming risk. FEEM Working Paper Series, (80.99), 1999.
- Paolo Buonanno, Carlo Carraro, Efrem Castelnuovo, and Marzio Galeotti. Emission trading restrictions with endogenous technological change. International Environmental Agreements, 1(3):379–395, 2001.
- Marzio Galeotti and Carlo Carraro. Does endogenous technical change make a difference in climate policy analysis? a robustness exercise with the feem-rice model. 2004.
- Efrem Castelnuovo, Marzio Galeotti, Gretel Gambarelli, and Sergio Vergalli. Learning-by-doing vs. learning by researching in a model of climate change policy analysis. *Ecological Economics*, 54(2-3):261–276, 2005.
- Valentina Bosetti, Marzio Galeotti, and Alessandro Lanza. How consistent are alternative short-term climate policies with long-term goals? *Climate Policy*, 6(3):295–312, 2006a.
- Valentina Bosetti, Carlo Carraro, and Marzio Galeotti. The dynamics of carbon and energy intensity in a model of endogenous technical change. *The Energy Journal*, (Special Issue# 1), 2006b.
- Valentina Bosetti, Carlo Carraro, Marzio Galeotti, Emanuele Massetti, and Massimo Tavoni. A world induced technical change hybrid model. *The Energy Journal*, Special Issue n2, 2006c.
- David Von Below and Torsten Persson. Uncertainty, climate change and the global economy. 2008.
- William D Nordhaus. Alternative policies and sea-level rise in the rice-2009 model. 2009.
- Francesco Bosello. Adaptation, mitigation and'green'r&d to combat global climate change. insights from an empirical integrated assessment exercise. 2010.
- William D Nordhaus. Economic aspects of global warming in a post-copenhagen environment. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 107(26):11721–11726, 2010.
- Kelly Chloe De Bruin. Calibration of the ad-rice 2012 model. 2014.
- W. D. Nordhaus and Z. Yang. The new dice2020/rice2020 modeling platform. mimeo, 2021.
- Paolo Gazzotti. Rice50+: Dice model at country and regional level. Socio-Environmental Systems Modelling, 4: 18038–18038, 2022.
- Robert S Pindyck. Climate future: Averting and adapting to climate change. 2022.