

Valuing Climate Impacts in Integrated Assessment Models: The MIT IGSM

John Reilly, Sergey Paltsev, Ken Strzepek, Noelle E. Selin, Yongxia Cai, Kyung-Min Nam, Erwan Monier, Stephanie Dutkiewicz, Jeffery Scott, Mort Webster and Andrei Sokolov



Report No. 219
May 2012

The MIT Joint Program on the Science and Policy of Global Change is an organization for research, independent policy analysis, and public education in global environmental change. It seeks to provide leadership in understanding scientific, economic, and ecological aspects of this difficult issue, and combining them into policy assessments that serve the needs of ongoing national and international discussions. To this end, the Program brings together an interdisciplinary group from two established research centers at MIT: the Center for Global Change Science (CGCS) and the Center for Energy and Environmental Policy Research (CEEPR). These two centers bridge many key areas of the needed intellectual work, and additional essential areas are covered by other MIT departments, by collaboration with the Ecosystems Center of the Marine Biology Laboratory (MBL) at Woods Hole, and by short- and long-term visitors to the Program. The Program involves sponsorship and active participation by industry, government, and non-profit organizations.


To inform processes of policy development and implementation, climate change research needs to focus on improving the prediction of those variables that are most relevant to economic, social, and environmental effects. In turn, the greenhouse gas and atmospheric aerosol assumptions underlying climate analysis need to be related to the economic, technological, and political forces that drive emissions, and to the results of international agreements and mitigation. Further, assessments of possible societal and ecosystem impacts, and analysis of mitigation strategies, need to be based on realistic evaluation of the uncertainties of climate science.

This report is one of a series intended to communicate research results and improve public understanding of climate issues, thereby contributing to informed debate about the climate issue, the uncertainties, and the economic and social implications of policy alternatives. Titles in the Report Series to date are listed on the inside back cover.

Ronald G. Prinn and John M. Reilly
Program Co-Directors

For more information, please contact the Joint Program Office

Postal Address: Joint Program on the Science and Policy of Global Change
77 Massachusetts Avenue
MIT E19-411
Cambridge MA 02139-4307 (USA)
Location: 400 Main Street, Cambridge
Building E19, Room 411
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Access: Phone: +1.617. 253.7492
Fax: +1.617.253.9845
E-mail: globalchange@mit.edu
Web site: <http://globalchange.mit.edu/>

 Printed on recycled paper

Valuing Climate Impacts in Integrated Assessment Models: The MIT IGSM

John Reilly^{*†}, Sergey Paltsev^{*}, Ken Strzepek^{*}, Noelle E. Selin^{*}, Yongxia Cai^{*},
Kyung-Min Nam^{*}, Erwan Monier, Stephanie Dutkiewicz^{*}, Jeffery Scott^{*}, Mort Webster^{*} and
Andrei Sokolov^{*}

Abstract

We discuss a strategy for investigating the impacts of climate change on Earth’s physical, biological and human resources and links to their socio-economic consequences. The features of the integrated global system framework that allows a comprehensive evaluation of climate change impacts are described with particular examples of effects on agriculture and human health. We argue that progress requires a careful understanding of the chain of physical changes—global and regional temperature, precipitation, ocean acidification and polar ice melting. We relate those changes to other physical and biological variables that help people understand risks to factors relevant to their daily lives—crop yield, food prices, premature death, flooding or drought events, land use change. Finally, we investigate how societies may adapt, or not, to these changes and how the combination of measures to adapt or to live with losses will affect the economy. Valuation and assessment of market impacts can play an important role, but we must recognize the limits of efforts to value impacts where deep uncertainty does not allow a description of the causal chain of effects that can be described, much less assigned a likelihood. A mixed approach of valuing impacts, evaluating physical and biological effects, and working to better describe uncertainties in the earth system can contribute to the social dialogue needed to achieve consensus—where it is needed—on the level and type of mitigation and adaptation actions that are required.

Contents

1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. THE CURRENT STRUCTURE OF THE MIT INTEGRATED FRAMEWORK.....	3
3. VALUING “NON-MARKET” IMPACTS IN A GENERAL EQUILIBRIUM FRAMEWORK.5	
3.1 Valuing Health Effects.....	7
3.2 Agriculture Effects.....	10
3.3 Challenges in Valuing Impacts on Terrestrial and Ocean Ecosystems.....	13
4. UNCERTAINTIES IN FUTURE CLIMATE.....	16
5. CONCLUSIONS.....	17
6. REFERENCES.....	18

1. INTRODUCTION

Integrated assessment models have proven useful for analysis of climate change because they represent the entire inhabited earth system, albeit typically with simplified model components. Valuation of impacts poses several challenges. Existing climate varies dramatically across the globe, and so how changes in precipitation, temperature and extremes will affect systems in different places varies widely. Warming may mean more frost-free days in some locations—

^{*} MIT Joint Program on the Science and Policy of Global Change, 77 Massachusetts Ave., Building E19, Cambridge, MA 02139.

[†] Corresponding Author: E-mail: jreilly@mit.edu. The MIT Joint Program on the Science and Policy of Global Change, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02139, USA

generally expanding potential for agriculture—while pushing temperatures beyond critical thresholds in other regions. More precipitation may be beneficial to drier areas, but an increase in heavy downpours can have very damaging effects—eroding soils and contributing to flash floods—even in areas that might benefit from more precipitation. Even if there is no change in precipitation over the year, but longer periods between events as suggested by general circulation models (GCM), results can lead to more of both damaging droughts and more flooding. Thus, impacts work requires relatively finely-detailed spatial resolution.

There are 3 broad challenges for valuing damages in integrated assessment models: Computational feasibility, uncertainty and “deep” uncertainty, and valuing physical changes. Briefly:

1. Computational feasibility. Highly resolved climate models are themselves computationally demanding, and the best models for representing crop growth, water resource management, or coastal infrastructure are often already computer intensive when used at a specific site or region. Operating such models for tens of thousands of grid cells is often not possible. And so, clever simplification of these models is needed to retain the basic responses over the range of potential climate impacts.
2. Uncertainty and “deep” uncertainty. Uncertainty in climate projections is critical, and long tails of distributions can mean that outcomes where the likelihood of occurrences is very small—such as less than 1%—may contribute far more to expected damage if the effects of such outcomes are truly catastrophic than the other 99% of the distribution of likely outcomes. We can characterize known uncertainties and conduct Monte Carlo studies to estimate likelihoods, but the hundreds of scenarios compound the computational demands (e.g., Sokolov, *et al.*, 2009). The presence of deep uncertainty—the very likely prospect of completely unknown relationships in the earth system—is more difficult to address (e.g., Weitzman, 2009). As we observe the climate changing, we have already been surprised by impacts we did not expect. Arctic ice seems to be disappearing faster than models would have predicted. The Greenland and West Antarctic ice sheets—once thought to be fairly stable—are now seen as more fragile, but due to processes not fully understood or yet modeled (e.g., Zwally *et al.*, 2002; Chen *et al.*, 2006). Only after the fact were we able to see that outbreaks of pests, such as the spruce budworm in western North America, were at least partly due to climate change (e.g., Volney and Fleming, 2000) or more broadly the complexities of pest interactions (Harrington *et al.*, 1999).
3. Valuation of physical effects. Valuation of crop yield loss, or even some ecosystem services, is fairly straightforward and can be based on market data (e.g., Antoine *et al.*, 2008). But many ecosystem services are hard to value with much confidence (Carpenter *et al.*, 2006). Contingent valuation methods that obtain willingness to pay estimates are controversial even for well-defined environmental goods, but when

experts do not fully understand how human existence depends on the functioning of these systems surveys the general population are unlikely to reveal these values.

These considerations have led us to be relatively cautious about claiming to reduce all impacts to a dollar value. Our solution is to describe the chain of physical changes—global and regional temperature, ocean acidification, polar ice melting—and relate those to other physical and biological variables that help people understand risks to factors more relevant to their daily lives—crop yield, food prices, premature death, flooding or drought events, required land-use change—and then finally how societies may adapt, or not adapt, to these changes and how the combination of measures to adapt or to live with losses will affect the economy. An aggregate welfare change is an output of our economic model, but at this point we have not completed work to fully integrate even those damages we think we understand. Meanwhile, how the economic and social system might respond to extreme changes in climate is also not well understood.

This paper is organized in the following way. Section 2 describes the structure of the MIT Integrated Global System Model (IGSM) framework. Section 3 describes our approach to valuation within our computable general equilibrium (CGE) model and unfinished business in terms of valuing broader effects of climate change. Section 4 focuses on representation of uncertainty, and Section 5 concludes.

2. THE CURRENT STRUCTURE OF THE MIT INTEGRATED FRAMEWORK

The MIT IGSM framework has been developed to retain the flexibility to assemble earth system models of variable resolution and complexity. Human activities as they contribute to environmental change or are affected by it are represented in multi-region, multi-sector models of the economy that solves for the prices and quantities of interacting domestic and international markets for energy and non-energy goods as well as for equilibrium in factor markets, with the main component known as the MIT Emissions Predictions and Policy Analysis (EPPA) model (Paltsev *et al.*, 2005). The standard atmospheric component is a 2-D atmospheric (zonally-averaged statistical dynamics) model based on the Goddard Institute for Space Studies (GISS) GCM. The IGSM version 2.2 couples this atmosphere with a 2-D ocean model (latitude, longitude) with treatment of heat and carbon flows into the deep ocean (Sokolov *et al.*, 2005). Modeling of atmospheric composition for the 2-D zonal-mean model uses continuity equations for trace constituents solved in mass conservative or flux form for 33 chemical species (Wang *et*

al., 1998). A reduced-form urban chemical model that can be nested within coarser-scale models has been developed and implemented to better represent the sub-grid scale urban chemical processes that influence air chemistry and climate (Cohen and Prinn, 2009). This is critical both for accurate representation of future climate trends and for our increasing focus on impacts, especially to human health and down-wind ecosystems. The Global Land System (GLS) component (Schlosser *et al.*, 2007) links biogeophysical, ecological and biogeochemical components including: (1) the NCAR Community Land Model (CLM), which calculates the global, terrestrial water and energy balances; (2) the Terrestrial Ecosystems Model (TEM) of the Marine Biological Laboratory, which simulates carbon (CO₂) fluxes and the storage of carbon and nitrogen in vegetation and soils including net primary production and carbon sequestration or loss; and (3) the Natural Emissions Model (NEM), which simulates fluxes of CH₄ and N₂O, and is now embedded within TEM. We then link econometrically-based decisions regarding the spatial pattern of land use (from EPPA) and land conversion (from TEM) to examine impacts of land use change and greenhouse gas fluxes (Cai *et al.*, 2011; Gurgel *et al.*, 2011; Reilly *et al.*, 2012). Recently, we have adapted and developed a series of models to link the natural hydrological cycle to water use (Strzepek *et al.*, 2010; Hughes *et al.*, 2010). The IGSM version 2.3 (where 2.3 indicates the 2-D atmosphere/full 3-D ocean GCM configuration) (Sokolov *et al.*, 2005; Dutkiewicz *et al.*, 2005) is thus an Earth system model that allows simulation of critical feedbacks among its various components, including the atmosphere, ocean, land, urban processes and human activities.

A limitation of the IGSM2.3 in the above 2-D (zonally averaged) atmosphere model is that regional (i.e. longitudinal) detail necessary for impact analysis does not exist. In early studies we have used current patterns scaled by latitudinal changes. We have thus used the National Center for Atmospheric Research (NCAR) Community Atmosphere Model (CAM3), driven by the IGSM2.3 sea surface temperature (SST) anomalies, with a climatological annual cycle taken from an observed dataset (Hurrell *et al.*, 2008). With this we have developed an approach to alter the climate sensitivity of CAM, providing us with the capability to study global and regional climate change where climate parameters can be modified to span the range of uncertainty and various emissions scenarios can be tested (Sokolov and Monier, 2011; Monier *et al.*, 2012) as in **Figure 1**.




Figure 1. Surface air temperature changes between 1980–2000 and 2080–2100 based on the MIT IGSM-CAM framework for two emissions scenarios and three sets of climate parameters. The two emissions scenarios are (a) Median “business as usual” scenario where no policy is implemented after 2012 and (b) Policy scenario where greenhouse-gases are stabilized at 660 ppm of CO₂-equivalent by 2100. The ocean heat uptake rate is fixed at 0.5 cm²/s in all six simulations. The three sets of climate parameters chosen are a low climate sensitivity (CS) and net aerosol forcing (Fae) case (CS=2.0°C and Fae=-0.25 W/m²), a median case (CS=2.5°C and Fae=-0.55 W/m²) and a high case (CS=4.5°C and Fae=-0.85 W/m²).

3. VALUING “NON-MARKET” IMPACTS IN A GENERAL EQUILIBRIUM FRAMEWORK

Changes in climate are “non-market” in the sense that these changes are not directly priced anywhere. However, the non-market valuation literature has made much use of the fact that the non-market changes have traces in market goods. As noted at the outset, our efforts to incorporate damages are incomplete. Here we describe our basic approach to valuation and include two examples: economy-atmosphere-land-agriculture interactions and air pollution health effects. We integrate the climate effects into the economic component of the MIT IGSM framework, namely the MIT EPPA model (Paltsev *et al.*, 2005). The underlying approach we use is based on identifying where within each country’s or region’s Social Accounting Matrix (SAM) damages will be observed. The information contained in the SAM is the basis for the creation of a CGE model (Rutherford and Paltsev, 1999). A SAM describes the flows among the various sectors of the economy, and we expand it to represent household activities to capture

damages that are not fully reflected in market outcomes (**Figure 2**). It represents the value of economic transactions in a given period of time. Transactions of goods and services are broken down by intermediate and final use. A SAM also shows the cost structure of production activities—intermediate inputs, compensation to labor and capital, taxes on production. As expanded, we value non-work time and so, for example, illness or death that results in losses of non-paid work time are valued.

		INTERMEDIATE USE				<i>Household Services</i>		FINAL USE				OUT-PUT
		by Production Sectors				<i>Mitigation of Pollution Health Effects</i>	<i>Labor-Leisure Choice</i>	Private consum.	Gov't consum.	Invest.	Export	
		1	2	...j...	n							
Domestic Production	1	A				<i>Medical Services</i>		B				C
	2											
	:											
	i											
	:											
	<i>Medical Services for Health Pollution</i>				<i>Health Services</i>							
	n											
Imports	1	D						E				F
	2											
	:											
	i											
	:											
	n											
<i>Leisure</i>						<i>Leisure</i>	<i>Leisure</i>					
Value added:	-labor	G				<i>Labor</i>	<i>Labor</i>	H				I
	-capital											
	- natural resources											
INPUT		J										

Added components are in bold italic

Figure 2. Social Accounting Matrix expanded to include health effects of air pollution. Source: Paltsev and Reilly, 2006.

To build a CGE model, the production technology and consumer preferences must be specified, and the key additional data elements required are elasticities of substitution between inputs in production and between goods in consumption. A SAM does not provide this information. We discuss further how our health effects and agricultural impacts components are integrated into the SAM, with examples of results, in the next sections.

3.1 Valuing Health Effects

The conventional approach to estimating health damage from air pollution is to multiply a predicted illness or death by a constant value meant to capture the value of lost life or the cost of the health care. However, health costs do not affect the overall economy equally. When people get sick and miss work, their lost productivity will negatively affect certain sectors. In addition, people buy medicine and use medical services, an expenditure that will require more resources to be used in the health sector at the expense of other sectors. People sometimes get ill, not due to air pollution levels in a single day or year, but rather due to their lifetime exposure to pollutants. When people die prematurely due to pollution exposure, their contribution to the workforce is lost in every year from their death until their normal retirement date. Illness and death also result in lost non-work time of the labor force population and children, elderly and others who are not part of the paid labor force.

Extending the model to include health effects involves valuation of non-wage time (leisure) and inclusion of a household production of health services—which we represent in an extended SAM, as shown in Figure 2, with the extensions of the model highlighted in *italic bold*. We add a household service sector that provides a “pollution health service” to final consumption to capture economic effects of morbidity and mortality from acute exposure. This household service sector is shown as “household mitigation of pollution health effects.” It uses “medical services” (i.e. hospital care and physician services) from the “services” sector of the EPPA model and household labor to produce a health service. The household labor is drawn from labor and leisure, and thus reduces the amount available for other uses (i.e. an illness results in the purchase of medical services and/or patient time to recover when the ill person cannot work or participate in other household activities). We use data from traditional valuation work to estimate the amount of each of these inputs for each health endpoint, as discussed in the following sections. Changed pollution levels are modeled as a Hick’s neutral technical change: higher pollution levels require proportionally more of all inputs to deliver the same level of health service, or lower levels require proportionally less. Mortality effects simply result in a loss of labor and leisure, and thus are equivalent to a negative labor productivity shock. Impacts on health are usually estimated to be the largest air pollution effects when measured in economic terms using conventional valuation approaches, dominating other losses such as damage to physical infrastructure, crops, ecosystems and loss of visibility.

The health effects of air pollution present themselves as both a loss of current well-being (i.e. an illness brought on by acute exposure to air pollution that results in temporary hospitalization or restricted activity) and as an effect that lasts through many periods (i.e. years of exposure that eventually lead to illnesses and deaths, where losses to society and the economy extend from the point of premature death forward until that person would have died of other causes had they not been exposed to pollution). Thus, we are faced with accounting both for stocks and flows of labor endowment in the economy and the population's exposure to pollution. Health effects also present themselves as both market and non-market effects. Death or illness of someone in the labor force means that person's income is no longer part of the economy, clearly a market effect. Illness also often involves expenditure on medical services, counted as part of the market economy. Death and illness also involve loss of non-paid work time, a non-market impact. This likely involves a loss of time for household chores or a loss of time spent on leisure activities. The health effects area thus is both a large component of total air pollution damages and provides an opportunity to develop methods to handle a variety of issues faced in valuing changes in environmental conditions.

Epidemiological relationships have been estimated for many pollutants, as they relate to a variety of health impacts from restricted activity days, cases of asthma for different age groups, and susceptibility to premature death from acute and chronic exposure to pollutants (Yang *et al.*, 2005; Matus *et al.*, 2008; Nam *et al.*, 2010; and Matus *et al.*, 2012). Here we focus on a forward-looking study on potential effects of ozone on human health, where we are able to separate the effects of increasing emissions of ozone precursors from the effects on climate on the chemistry of ozone formation (Selin *et al.*, 2009). Because the atmospheric component of the standard IGSM is only resolved vertically and by latitude, we use published results for 2000 and 2050 ozone concentrations from the GEOS-Chem Chemical Transport Model (CTM) based on IPCC SRES scenarios to generate more realistic emissions for different regions (Wu *et al.*, 2008a, 2008b). Our goal is to demonstrate how valuation of health impacts is accomplished within the IGSM and issues that arise. Here we focus only the effects of ozone on health. We do not adjust baseline population for other potential climate effects on health, of which there are many—from changes in different diseases (e.g., Dengue Fever, Malaria) and their vectors (e.g., mosquitos, standing water) to direct effects of extreme heat or cold. Since our approach is to follow the causal factors from climate through the mechanisms that lead to a variety of specific health

outcomes, there is no simple way to make such adjustments, absent a complete model of these health pathways.

Figure 3 has four panels that show economic welfare impacts for ozone-related health effects, comparing the change in 2050 to 2000 levels. Figure 3a shows the effects of climate changed, but there was not change on precursor emissions of ozone. The result is areas where there are health benefits, and other areas where there are additional health costs. This is not surprising, as changes in climate—including increasing temperature and other changing meteorological variables—have a complex effect on ozone concentrations (Mickley, 2007). While there is substantial variability among models of the climate impact of ozone, most models predict a decrease in surface ozone background due to the effect of water vapor, and surface ozone increases of 1–10 ppb driven primarily by temperature in polluted mid-latitude regions (Jacob and Winner, 2009). The net effect on global welfare is less than \$1 billion (year 2000 constant). The combination of some losers and some gainers emphasizes the importance of considering distributional impacts. In addition, because the economic model is a market based model, it evaluates labor loss and other costs of damage at prices relevant to each region. And so, where wages are lower, illness or death is valued at a lower wage rate. The wage rates are changing over time as the economies grow and labor productivity improves. One must thus be cautious about using the global aggregate to judge the potential value of emissions reductions, as it raises issues of interpersonal comparison of welfare among individuals in different regions. Such aggregation is justified under the Pareto-improving assumption that if climate change were avoided, and so these damages, it is possible to compensate losers so that no one is worse off.

Figure 3c shows the change in welfare (2050–2000) from just the change in ozone concentrations, calculated for 16 world regions of EPPA-HE using population-weighted ozone concentrations. This shows damages in most areas, but some improvement in areas of North America where precursor emissions are lower. The world aggregate impact is over \$1 trillion of net additional welfare cost. This is the combined result of both higher levels of precursor emissions in each region, and higher wage rates because of higher productivity—a main source of economic growth that underlies the economic scenario. Figure 3b shows the combined effects. Not surprisingly it is little different than the upper right panel because the climate effects are dwarfed by the effects on increasing precursor emissions. Finally, Figure 3d shows the damages associated with the anthropogenic contribution to ozone above preindustrial background

concentrations. In this case, there are costs everywhere, and the total damage estimate is nearly \$6 trillion. Note that in this panel the color scale is an order of magnitude larger. Selin *et al.* (2011), Matus *et al.* (2008, 2012), and Nam *et al.* (2010) investigated uncertainty in results as they relate to atmospheric chemistry models, dose-response relationships, and parameters of the economic model—an advantage of integrated approach.




Figure 3. Change in economic welfare (consumption + leisure) from ozone-related health impacts due to (a) climatic change (with 2000 precursor emissions); (b) emission changes (2050 climate); (c) climate and precursor emission changes in 2050; and (d) ozone enhancements in 2050 above pre-industrial exposures (10 ppb).

3.2 Agriculture Effects

Agriculture is another area where environmental change is likely to have important effects. Multiple changes that may occur over the next century will affect vegetation and thus crop, forest productivity and pasture productivity. Some of these effects are likely to be positive (e.g., CO_2 fertilization), some negative (e.g., tropospheric ozone damage), and some may be either positive or negative (temperature and precipitation). Climate effects differ across regions (i.e. more

precipitation in some areas and less in others) and warming may increase growing season lengths in cold-limited growing areas while acting as a detriment to productivity in areas with already-high temperatures. For this work, we have augmented the EPPA model by further disaggregating the agricultural sector. This allows us to simulate economic effects of changes in yield (i.e. the productivity of cropland) on the regional economies of the world, including impacts on agricultural trade. In terms of the SAM in Figure 2, we do not need to add any additional sectors—agricultural sectors already exist in the market economy. Among the value added inputs are natural resources—here cropland, pastureland and forestland—used in market sectors (matrix G) and used in the crops, livestock, and forest sectors (in matrix A). We alter the productivity of land in these sectors based on changes in yield from the Terrestrial Ecosystem Model (TEM) component of the IGSM. A yield loss of, for example, 10% is represented as an effective reduction of the land input by 10% into that sector. The EPPA model includes multiple channels of market-based adaptation, including input substitution. Productivity of land in all regions are affected, and so, these are transmitted via imports shown in the SAM as matrix D. We are thus able to examine the extent to which market forces contribute toward adaptation, and thus modify the initial yield effects.

As an example of climate change impacts on agriculture, we examine multiple scenarios where tropospheric ozone precursors are controlled or not, and where greenhouse gas emissions are abated or not (Reilly *et al.*, 2007). This allows us to consider how these policies interact. The impacts on yield are shown in **Figure 4**, both mapped at the 0.5°x 0.5° lat., long. resolution of TEM and aggregated to the EPPA regions for scenarios (see Figure title) with and without climate policy, ozone policy and ozone damage.

Global effects of these yield changes (Figure 4) can be summarized as follows. Positive yield effects of environmental change lead to positive agricultural production effects, and vice versa. However, the production effects are far smaller than the yield effects. The global yield effects range from an increase of over 60% (Climate and GHGs only) to a decline of nearly 40% (High pollution), while the crop production effects are no larger than $\pm 8\%$. This reflects relative inelastic demand for crops because of a relatively inelastic demand for food, the ability to substitute other inputs for land (adapt), and the ability to shift land into or out of crops. The livestock production results bear little relationship to the yield effects for pasture. The pasture results are all positive, whereas several of the scenarios show reductions in livestock production.

In fact, the scenarios mirror closely the production effects on crops. This reflects the fact that feed grains are more important inputs into livestock production than pasture. A reduction in crop production is reflected in higher prices for feed grains and other crops used in livestock. This tends to lead to a reduced production of livestock. The percentage differences in livestock production are relatively small compared with the crop production changes, even in cases where production increases are driven both by an increase in crop production and an increase in pasture productivity.

An important result of the general equilibrium modeling of these impacts is that effects can be felt beyond the agricultural sector. The macroeconomic consumption effect was bigger in absolute terms than the agricultural production effect (Reilly *et al.*, 2007). This is because food consumption is relatively inelastic, and in order to offset the yield reduction more resources (i.e. labor, capital, intermediate inputs) are used in the agricultural sectors—and so, fewer are available elsewhere in the economy. Partial equilibrium approaches would not easily pick up all of these interactions—and so, may misestimate the impacts. For example, researchers often point to the tremendous adaptation response of agriculture. We see evidence of that in our results, but that adaptation also comes at a cost to the rest of the economy.




Figure 4. Change in yield between 2000 and 2100 (gC/m²/year). Regional level percent changes in yield (crops) and NPP (pasture, forestry): ●—crops, ▲—pasture, ■—forestry. (a) High Pollution scenario—no CO₂ or pollution controls. (b) Climate and GHGs only scenario—ozone damages removed (c) Capped pollution scenario—ozone precursors at 2000 levels (d) GHGs capped scenario—consistent with 550 CO₂-eq. stabilization (e) GHGs capped-no ozone scenario. (f) GHGs and pollution capped scenario. Source: Reilly, *et al.*, 2007.

3.3 Challenges in Valuing Impacts on Terrestrial and Ocean Ecosystems

Impacts on ecosystems offer some of the biggest challenges to valuation. Some ecosystem goods and services can be reflected in market goods and services. In one set of work, we have introduced data on hunting, fishing and wildlife viewing into the SAM underlying the EPPA model (Antoine *et al.*, 2008). Here the work was based on traditional travel cost methods that identified market goods used in conjunction with these recreation activities, as well as government expenditures on park and preserves maintenance. This creates some scarcity value

on forest resources. As income grows in the model, demand for both protected public- and privately-held forests for recreation increased. The increased demand for recreation services is a competitive pressure that limits conversion of these lands to cropland or other managed uses. Depending on parameter choices, the land conversion rates were similar to other work by Gurgel *et al.*, (2007) that imposed an elasticity of “willingness to convert” that was benchmarked to observed conversion rates and land price changes. Adding an explicit consumer value to not converting offers a welfare-based reason for the limited conversion. Otherwise in the Gurgel *et al.*, (2007) work, an ever-growing price wedge exists between natural lands and managed land types. Gurgel *et al.*, (2011) extended ecosystem service pricing to include its carbon value in a mitigation scenario. Thus, potential losses or gains of carbon storage due to climate change are valued in terms of the impact on reaching the designated carbon limit or carbon price. Antoine *et al.*, (2007) demonstrated that land conversion was strongly affected by choices for elasticities of substitution among recreation goods and between recreation goods and other goods, and hence the value of recreation services. In almost all conventional ecosystem valuation exercises the per-unit-value of service is assumed to be constant, and there is no attempt to evaluate willingness to substitute other goods for the recreation goods. In principle, this method could be used to evaluate climate change impacts as it might affect the amount of forest or other natural land, but what is probably more critical and uncertain is to understand how climate change would affect the quality of forest resources for recreation purposes.

Valuing changes in oceans due to climate change also poses challenges. In principle, recreation values of coral reefs and food value of fisheries can be addressed in a fashion similar to how we have addressed agriculture and forest recreation services. However, climate effects on oceans will change in many ways. Habitats of marine species will shift with the warming surface ocean (see e.g., Boyd and Doney, 2002), and shifts in ocean circulation and mixing will reduce the supply of the nutrients to the surface ocean with ramifications to the base of the marine food web (e.g., Dutkiewicz *et al.*, 2005). These will most certainly affect fisheries, but relating changes in nutrients to fish populations remains speculative. Additionally, reduced oxygen content of the ocean (a result of warming and lower mixing) will lead to more frequent anoxic (no oxygen) and hypoxic (low oxygen) events with fish and benthic organism (e.g., crab) kill-offs that will also impact the ocean's supply of food. While we have not yet related such changes

to economic valuation, we have made progress in examining the first level of biological impacts in the IGSM framework (Dutkiewicz *et al.*, 2005; Dutkiewicz *et al.*, 2012).

Yet another threat to the oceans is the increased acidity (lower pH) caused by the flux of anthropogenic carbon dioxide into the oceans. The oceans are currently absorbing about 1/3 of the emitted CO₂ (Sabine and Feely, 2007), which has already led to a 0.1pH drop since pre-industrial times (Royal Society, 2005)—a result that is captured in our simulations with the IGSM (**Figure 5**). With the IGSM we can explore the potential pH drops in future scenarios (Prinn *et al.*, 2011). Unprecedentedly, low pH will occur even under strong policy-restricted emissions, but the picture will be much worse with a business-as-usual scenario. The reduction in pH will strongly affect the marine biota (Doney *et al.*, 2009), with economic implications for fisheries (Cooley and Doney, 2009). Calcifying organism (e.g., corals, molluscs) will be particularly vulnerable. Corals are likely to cease to exist with pH around 7.7 (likely in a no-policy scenario), but will change in type and diversity with even small changes (Fabricius *et al.*, 2011). The impact on coral reef-driven tourism (a crucial component of the GDP for some nations) could be significant. But, these changes in the ocean acidity, temperature and circulation are so profound that we really do not know how they may affect life on earth as we know it. In that sense, focusing on a few market impacts—while important for some sectors and countries—may be missing the big picture and have far more threatening effects.




Figure 5. Simulations of changes to the surface ocean pH (lower pH indicates a more acidic ocean) using the IGSM with a 3-dimensional ocean with biogeochemistry. Panels show (a) 1860 pH levels, and (b) 1990 pH levels. Runs reflect (d) business-as-usual (no policy) versus (c) policy-restricted emissions scenarios, using a specified middle-of-the-road choice for climate sensitivity (approx. 2.3K). The year 2100 atmospheric CO₂ concentration for these two runs was 558 ppmv (policy) and 928 ppmv (no policy).

4. UNCERTAINTIES IN FUTURE CLIMATE

Uncertainty is one of the key challenges for valuing impacts. Ideally, estimates of social cost of carbon should at a minimum reflect an expected value outcome. In general, however, the expected value of damage \neq Damage (expected value climate outcome). If damages associated with mean climate outcomes are relatively mild, but the damages associated with extreme outcomes are catastrophic, then these catastrophic damages may dominate expected value calculations. In addition, an added weight on extreme outcomes may be required to reflect risk aversion and irreversibilities (e.g., Weitzman, 2009). To value these extreme s requires robust climate models that can accurately describe details of the climate under extreme conditions and robust impact models that can address extreme conditions. Making progress toward valuing extreme outcomes and quantifying likelihoods of them occurring is a tall order. Our modest contribution has been to quantify that part of climate and economic uncertainty where there are known relationships and we can draw on estimates of uncertainty in underlying parameters of our IGSM to provide climate outcome likelihoods. Our estimates of quantifiable uncertainties

(Figure 6) used formal Monte Carlo simulation methods and estimated climate uncertainty conditional on five different policy scenarios (Sokolov *et al.*, 2009; Webster *et al.*, 2009). Analysis focused on adaptation needs to consider the likelihood that mitigation policy may be partially effective at avoiding climate change. In that regard, such studies might consider the likelihood that the world will adopt measures like those represented in Level 1 (median 560 ppm CO₂-eq.) scenarios. Or, if there is failure to achieve agreement on emissions reductions soon, something in between the temperature increases in the Level 1 policy case and those where emissions are unconstrained may occur. Another benefit of this approach is that we show the transient probabilities of climate change and, for adaptation studies, what happens in the next 10, 20, or at most, 30 years is far more relevant than projects for 100 years.




Figure 6. Time evolving 95% probability limits for different policy scenarios. Level 1 through Level 4, constrain global GHGs from human activities to no more than 2.3, 3.4, 4.5 and 5.4 trillion tons of CO₂-equivalent emissions, respectively, over the century. Source: Webster *et al.*, 2009.

5. CONCLUSIONS

Valuing impacts of climate change and reducing them to a single value, such as the social cost of carbon, is an extremely challenging task. In this paper we discuss our general strategy for investigating impacts of climate change; describe features of the MIT IGSM that allow us to

estimate physical and biological changes caused by climate change; and briefly go through the needed steps to incorporate effects in a CGE model where valuation in equivalent variation is an output. We begin with the basic data that supports CGE models: the Social Accounting Matrix (SAM), which includes the input-output tables of an economy, the use and supply of factors, and the disposition of goods in final consumption. We identify where environmental damage appears in these accounts, estimate the physical loss, and value the loss within this accounting structure. Our approach is an exercise in environmental accounting—augmenting the standard national income and product accounts to include environmental damage. We are still some ways off from comprehensively estimating even those impacts that have been well-described (water and coasts, for example). We have also yet to utilize our capabilities for conducting uncertainty analysis to better understand the range of potential future impacts. We, like others in the field, face the problem that consequences that may have significant social cost may not be evident until we witness them.

Acknowledgements

The MIT Integrated Global System Model (IGSM) and its economic component used in the analysis, the MIT Emissions Prediction and Policy Analysis (EPPA) model, is supported by a consortium of government, industry, and foundation sponsors of the MIT Joint Program on the Science and Policy of Global Change. (For a complete list of sponsors, see: <http://globalchange.mit.edu>).

6. REFERENCES

- Antoine, B., A. Gurgel, J. M. Reilly, 2008: Will Recreation Demand for Land Limit Biofuels Production? *Journal of Agricultural & Food Industrial Organization*, 6(2): Article 5
<http://www.bepress.com/jafio/vol6/iss2/art5>.
- Boyd, P.W. and S.C. Doney, 2002: Modeling regional responses by marine pelagic ecosystems to global climate change. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 29: 53–57.
- Carpenter, S.R., R. DeFries, T. Dietz, H. A. Mooney, S. Polasky, W.V. Reid, R. J. Scholes, 2006: Millennium Ecosystem Assessment: Research Needs, *Science*, 314: 257–258.
- Chen, J.L, C.R. Wilson and B.D. Tapley, 2006: Satellite Gravity Measurements Confirm Accelerated Melting of Greenland Ice Sheet, *Science*, 313: 1958–1960.
- Cohen, J., and R. Prinn, 2009: Development of a Fast and Detailed Model of Urban-Scale Chemical and Physical Processing. MIT JPSPGC *Report 181*, October, 68 p.
http://globalchange.mit.edu/files/document/MITJPSPGC_Rpt181.pdf).
- Cooley, S.R. and S.C. Doney, 2009: Anticipating ocean acidification's economic consequences for commercial fisheries. *Environmental Research Letters*, 4: 024007.
- Doney, S.C., V.J. Fabry, R.A. Feely and J.A. Kleypas, 2009: Ocean Acidification: The Other CO₂ Problem. *Annual Review of Marine Science*, 1: 169–192.

- Dutkiewicz, S., A. Sokolov, J. Scott and P. Stone, 2005: A Three-Dimensional Ocean-Seaice-Carbon Cycle Model and its Coupling to a Two-Dimensional Atmospheric Model: Uses in Climate Change Studies. MIT JPSPGC Report 122, May, 47 p. (http://globalchange.mit.edu/files/document/MITJPSPGC_Rpt122.pdf).
- Dutkiewicz, S., J. Scott, and M.J. Follows, 2012: Response of Phytoplankton Habitats to a Warmer World. MIT JPSPGC Report (forthcoming).
- Fabricius, K.E., C. Langdon, S. Uthicke, C. Humprey, A. Noonan, G. De'ath, R. Okazaki, N. Muehllehner, M.S. Glas and J.M. Lough, 2011: Losers and winners in coral reefs acclimatized to elevated carbon dioxide concentrations. *Nature Climate Change*, doi:10.1038/NCLIMATE1122.
- Follows, M., T. Ito and S. Dutkiewicz, 2006: On the solution of the carbonate chemistry system in ocean biogeochemistry models. *Ocean Modeling*, 12: 290–301.
- Gurgel, A., J.M. Reilly and S. Paltsev, 2007: Potential Land Use Implications of a Global Biofuels Industry. *Journal of Agricultural & Food Industrial Organization*, 5(2): Article 9.
- Gurgel, A., T. Cronin, J.M. Reilly, S. Paltsev, D. Kicklighter and J. Melillo, 2011: Food, Fuel, Forests, and the Pricing of Ecosystem Services. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 93(2): 342–348.
- Harrington, R., I. Woiwod and T. Sparks, 1999: Climate change and trophic interactions. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, 14(4): 146–150.
- Hughes, G., P. Chinowsky and K. Strzepek, 2010: The Costs of Adaptation to Climate Change for Water Infrastructure in OECD Countries. *Utilities Policy*, 18(3): 142–153.
- Hurrell, J.W., J.J. Hack, D. Shea, J.M. Caron and J. Rosinski, 2008: A New Sea Surface Temperature and Sea Ice Boundary Dataset for the Community Atmosphere Model. *J. Climate*, 21: 5145–5153.
- Jacob D. J. and D.A. Winner, 2009: Effect of climate change on air quality, *Atmospheric Environment*, 43: 51–63.
- Kim, D., C. Wang, A.M.L. Ekman, M.C. Barth and P. Rasch, 2008: Distribution and direct radiative forcing of carbonaceous and sulfate aerosols in an interactive size-resolving aerosol-climate model. *J. Geophysical Research*, 113: D16309.
- Lee, E., C.A. Schlosser, B.S. Felzer and R.G. Prinn, 2009: Incorporating plant migration constraints into the NCAR CLM-DGVM model: Projections of future vegetation distribution in high latitudes. *Eos*, 90(52), Fall Meeting Supplement, Abstract B41C-0336.
- Marshall, J., A. Adcroft, C. Hill, L. Perelman, and C. Heisey, 1997: A finite-volume, incompressible Navier Stokes model for studies of the ocean on parallel computers. *J. Geophysical Research*, 102 (C3): 5753–5766.
- Matus, K., T. Yang, S. Paltsev, J. Reilly and K.-M.Nam, 2008: Toward integrated assessment of environmental change: Air pollution health effects in the USA. *Climatic Change*, 88(1): 59–92.
- Matus, K., K.-M. Nam, N.E. Selin, L.N. Lamsal, J.M. Reilly and S. Paltsev, 2012: Health Damages from Air Pollution in China. *Global Environmental Change*, 22(1): 55–66.
- Melillo, J., J. Reilly, D. Kicklighter, A. Gurgel, T. Cronin, S. Paltsev, B. Felzer, X. Wang, A. Sokolov and C. A. Schlosser, 2009: Indirect Emissions from Biofuels: How Important?, *Science*, 326: 1397–1399.

- Mickley L. J., 2007: A Future Short of Breath? Possible Effects of Climate Change on Smog. *Environment*, 49: 34–43.
- Monier, E., J. Scott, A.P. Sokolov, C.A. Schlosser, and C.E. Forest, 2012: The MIT IGSM-CAM Framework for Uncertainty Studies in Global and Regional Climate Change, MIT JPSPGC Report (forthcoming).
- Nam, K.-M., N. Selin, J. Reilly, S. Paltsev, 2010: Measuring Welfare Loss Caused by Air Pollution in Europe: A CGE Analysis. *Energy Policy*, 38: 5059–5071.
- Paltsev, S., J. Reilly, H. Jacoby, R. Eckaus, J. McFarland, M. Sarofim, M. Asadoorian and M. Babiker, 2005: The MIT Emissions Prediction and Policy Analysis (EPPA) Model: Version 4. MIT JPSPGC Report 125, August, 22 p.
(http://globalchange.mit.edu/files/document/MITJPSPGC_Rpt125.pdf).
- Paltsev, S. and J. Reilly, 2006: Incorporating Climate Change Feedbacks into a General Economic Equilibrium Model, *Global Trade Analysis Project*, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN. (<https://www.gtap.agecon.purdue.edu/resources/download/2587.pdf>).
- Prinn, R., S. Paltsev, A. Sokolov, M. Sarofim, J. Reilly and H. Jacoby, 2011: Scenarios with MIT Integrated Global Systems Model: Significant Global Warming Regardless of Different Approaches. *Climatic Change*, 104(3-4): 515-537.
- Reilly, J., S. Paltsev, B. Felzer, X. Wang, D. Kicklighter, J. Melillo, R. Prinn, M. Sarofim, A. Sokolov and C. Wang, 2007: Global economic effects of changes in crops, pasture, and forests due to changing climate, carbon dioxide, and ozone. *Energy Policy*, 35: 5370–5383.
- Reilly, J., J. Melillo, Y. Cai, D. Kicklighter, A. Gurgel, S. Paltsev, T. Cronin, A. Sokolov, A. Schlosser, 2012: Using land to mitigate climate change: hitting the target, recognizing the tradeoffs. *Environmental Science and Technology*, in press.
- Royal Society, 2005: *Ocean acidification due to increasing atmospheric carbon dioxide*. London: The Royal Society: London, UK, pp. 57.
- Rutherford T. and S. Paltsev, 1999: From an Input-Output Table to a General Equilibrium Model: Assessing the Excess Burden of Indirect Taxes in Russia. Department of Economics, University of Colorado: Boulder, CO, mimeo.
(<http://web.mit.edu/paltsev/www/docs/exburden.pdf>).
- Schlosser, C.A., D. Kicklighter and A. Sokolov, 2007: A Global Land System Framework for Integrated Climate-Change Assessments, MIT JPSPGC Report 147, May, 60p.
(http://globalchange.mit.edu/files/document/MITJPSPGC_Rpt147.pdf)
- Sabine C.L., and R.A. Feely, 2007: The Oceanic Sink for Carbon Dioxide. In *Greenhouse Gas Sinks*, D. Reay, N. Hewitt, J. Grace and K. Smith, eds., CABI Publishing: Oxfordshire, UK, Chapter 3, pp. 31–49.
- Selin, N.E., S. Wu, K.-M. Nam, J.M. Reilly, S. Paltsev, R.G. Prinn and M.D. Webster, 2009: Global Health and Economic Impacts of Future Ozone Pollution. *Environmental Research Letters*, 4(4): 044014.
- Selin, N. E., S. Paltsev, C. Wang, A. van Donkelaar and R. V. Martin, 2011: Global Aerosol Health Impacts: Quantifying Uncertainty. MIT JPSPGC Report 203, August, 20 p.
(http://globalchange.mit.edu/files/document/MITJPSPGC_Rpt203.pdf).
- Sokolov, A.P., C.A. Schlosser, S. Dutkiewicz, S. Paltsev, D.W. Kicklighter, H.D. Jacoby, R.G. Prinn, C.E. Forest, J. Reilly, C. Wang, B. Felzer, M.C. Sarofim, J. Scott, P.H. Stone, J.M. Melillo and J. Cohen, 2005: The MIT Integrated Global System Model (IGSM)

- Version 2: Model Description and Baseline Evaluation. MIT JPSPGC *Report 124*, July, 40 p. (http://globalchange.mit.edu/files/document/MITJPSPGC_Rpt124.pdf).
- Sokolov, A., P. Stone, C. Forest, R. Prinn, M. Sarofim, M. Webster, S. Paltsev, C.A. Schlosser, D. Kicklighter, S. Dutkiewicz, J. Reilly, C. Wang, B. Felzer, J. Melillo and H. Jacoby, 2009: Probabilistic Forecast for 21st Century Climate Based on uncertainties in emissions (without policy) and climate parameters. *J. Climate*, 22(19): 5175–5204.
- Sokolov, A. and E. Monier, 2011: Implementation of a Cloud Radiative Adjustment Method to Change the Climate Sensitivity of CAM3. MIT JPSPGC *Report 204*, August, 22 p. (http://globalchange.mit.edu/files/document/MITJPSPGC_Rpt204.pdf).
- Strzepek, K. and B. Boehlert, 2010: Competition for water for the food system. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society*, 365(1554): 2927–2940.
- Strzepek, K., C.A. Schlosser, W. Farmer, S. Awadalla, J. Baker, M. Rosegrant and X. Gao, 2010: Modeling the Global Water Resource System in an Integrated Assessment Modeling Framework: IGSM-WRS. MIT JPSPGC *Report 189*, September, 34 p. (http://globalchange.mit.edu/files/document/MITJPSPGC_Rpt189.pdf).
- Volney, W.J.A and R. A. Fleming, 2000: Climate change and impacts on boreal forest insects. *Agriculture, Ecosystems, & Environment*, 82: 283–294.
- Wang, C., 2004: A modeling study on the climate impacts of black carbon aerosols. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 109(D3): D03106.
- Wang, C., R. G. Prinn and A. Sokolov, 1998: A global interactive chemistry and climate model: Formulation and testing. *J. Geophysical Research*, 103(D3): 3399–3418.
- Webster, M., A. Sokolov, J. Reilly, C. Forest, S. Paltsev, A. Schlosser, C. Wang, D. Kicklighter, M. Sarofim, J. Melillo, R. Prinn and H. Jacoby, 2009: Analysis of Climate Policy Targets Under Uncertainty. MIT JPSPGC *Report 180*, September, 53 p. (http://globalchange.mit.edu/files/document/MITJPSPGC_Rpt180.pdf).
- Weitzman, M.L., 2009: On Modeling and Interpreting the Economics of Catastrophic Climate Change. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 91(1): 1–19.
- Wu, S.L., L.J. Mickley, D.J. Jacob, D. Rind and D.G. Streets, 2008a: Effects of 2000–2050 changes in climate and emissions on global tropospheric ozone and the policy-relevant background surface ozone in the United States. *J. Geophysical Research—D: Atmospheres*, 113: D18312.
- Wu, S.L., L.J. Mickley, E.M. Leibensperger, D.J. Jacob, D. Rind and D.G. Streets, 2008b: Effects of 2000–2050 global change on ozone air quality in the United States. *J. Geophysical Research—D: Atmospheres*, 113: D06302.
- Yang, T., J. Reilly and S. Paltsev, 2005: Air Pollution Health Effects: Toward an Integrated Assessment, in *The Coupling of Climate and Economic Dynamics*, A. Haurie and L. Viguier (eds.), Springer: The Netherlands, pp. 267-294.
- Zwally, H.J., W. Abdalati, T. Herring, K. Larson, J. Saba and K. Steffen, 2002: Surface Melt-Induced Acceleration of Greenland Ice-Sheet Flow. *Science*, 297: 218-222.

REPORT SERIES of the MIT Joint Program on the Science and Policy of Global Change

FOR THE COMPLETE LIST OF JOINT PROGRAM REPORTS:
<http://globalchange.mit.edu/pubs/all-reports.php>

174. **A Semi-Empirical Representation of the Temporal Variation of Total Greenhouse Gas Levels Expressed as Equivalent Levels of Carbon Dioxide** *Huang et al.* June 2009
175. **Potential Climatic Impacts and Reliability of Very Large Scale Wind Farms** *Wang & Prinn* June 2009
176. **Biofuels, Climate Policy and the European Vehicle Fleet** *Gitiaux et al.* August 2009
177. **Global Health and Economic Impacts of Future Ozone Pollution** *Selin et al.* August 2009
178. **Measuring Welfare Loss Caused by Air Pollution in Europe: A CGE Analysis** *Nam et al.* August 2009
179. **Assessing Evapotranspiration Estimates from the Global Soil Wetness Project Phase 2 (GSWP-2) Simulations** *Schlosser and Gao* September 2009
180. **Analysis of Climate Policy Targets under Uncertainty** *Webster et al.* September 2009
181. **Development of a Fast and Detailed Model of Urban-Scale Chemical and Physical Processing** *Cohen & Prinn* October 2009
182. **Distributional Impacts of a U.S. Greenhouse Gas Policy: A General Equilibrium Analysis of Carbon Pricing** *Rausch et al.* November 2009
183. **Canada's Bitumen Industry Under CO₂ Constraints** *Chan et al.* January 2010
184. **Will Border Carbon Adjustments Work?** *Winchester et al.* February 2010
185. **Distributional Implications of Alternative U.S. Greenhouse Gas Control Measures** *Rausch et al.* June 2010
186. **The Future of U.S. Natural Gas Production, Use, and Trade** *Paltsev et al.* June 2010
187. **Combining a Renewable Portfolio Standard with a Cap-and-Trade Policy: A General Equilibrium Analysis** *Morris et al.* July 2010
188. **On the Correlation between Forcing and Climate Sensitivity** *Sokolov* August 2010
189. **Modeling the Global Water Resource System in an Integrated Assessment Modeling Framework: IGSM-WRS** *Strzepek et al.* September 2010
190. **Climatology and Trends in the Forcing of the Stratospheric Zonal-Mean Flow** *Monier and Weare* January 2011
191. **Climatology and Trends in the Forcing of the Stratospheric Ozone Transport** *Monier and Weare* January 2011
192. **The Impact of Border Carbon Adjustments under Alternative Producer Responses** *Winchester* February 2011
193. **What to Expect from Sectoral Trading: A U.S.-China Example** *Gavard et al.* February 2011
194. **General Equilibrium, Electricity Generation Technologies and the Cost of Carbon** *Abatement Lanz and Rausch* February 2011
195. **A Method for Calculating Reference Evapotranspiration on Daily Time Scales** *Farmer et al.* February 2011
196. **Health Damages from Air Pollution in China** *Matus et al.* March 2011
197. **The Prospects for Coal-to-Liquid Conversion: A General Equilibrium Analysis** *Chen et al.* May 2011
198. **The Impact of Climate Policy on U.S. Aviation** *Winchester et al.* May 2011
199. **Future Yield Growth: What Evidence from Historical Data** *Gitiaux et al.* May 2011
200. **A Strategy for a Global Observing System for Verification of National Greenhouse Gas Emissions** *Prinn et al.* June 2011
201. **Russia's Natural Gas Export Potential up to 2050** *Paltsev* July 2011
202. **Distributional Impacts of Carbon Pricing: A General Equilibrium Approach with Micro-Data for Households** *Rausch et al.* July 2011
203. **Global Aerosol Health Impacts: Quantifying Uncertainties** *Selin et al.* August 2011
204. **Implementation of a Cloud Radiative Adjustment Method to Change the Climate Sensitivity of CAM3** *Sokolov and Monier* September 2011
205. **Quantifying the Likelihood of Regional Climate Change: A Hybridized Approach** *Schlosser et al.* October 2011
206. **Process Modeling of Global Soil Nitrous Oxide Emissions** *Saikawa et al.* October 2011
207. **The Influence of Shale Gas on U.S. Energy and Environmental Policy** *Jacoby et al.* November 2011
208. **Influence of Air Quality Model Resolution on Uncertainty Associated with Health Impacts** *Thompson and Selin* December 2011
209. **Characterization of Wind Power Resource in the United States and its Intermittency** *Gunturu and Schlosser* December 2011
210. **Potential Direct and Indirect Effects of Global Cellulosic Biofuel Production on Greenhouse Gas Fluxes from Future Land-use Change** *Kicklighter et al.* March 2012
211. **Emissions Pricing to Stabilize Global Climate** *Bosetti et al.* March 2012
212. **Effects of Nitrogen Limitation on Hydrological Processes in CLM4-CN** *Lee & Felzer* March 2012
213. **City-Size Distribution as a Function of Socio-economic Conditions: An Eclectic Approach to Down-scaling Global Population** *Nam & Reilly* March 2012
214. **CliCrop: a Crop Water-Stress and Irrigation Demand Model for an Integrated Global Assessment Modeling Approach** *Fant et al.* April 2012
215. **The Role of China in Mitigating Climate Change** *Paltsev et al.* April 2012
216. **Applying Engineering and Fleet Detail to Represent Passenger Vehicle Transport in a Computable General Equilibrium Model** *Karplus et al.* April 2012
217. **Combining a New Vehicle Fuel Economy Standard with a Cap-and-Trade Policy: Energy and Economic Impact in the United States** *Karplus et al.* April 2012
218. **Permafrost, Lakes, and Climate-Warming Methane Feedback: What is the Worst We Can Expect?** *Gao et al.* May 2012
219. **Valuing Climate Impacts in Integrated Assessment Models: The MIT IGSM** *Reilly et al.* May 2012