Lecture Notes on Damages

John Hassler

IIES

May 2019

Purpose today

- Give examples of different approaches to measuring and aggregating damages of climate change.
- Climate change is a global phenomenon and affects the economy in a large number of ways.
- Two ways to estimate total effects:
  - bottom up – quantifying all potential effects and summing.
  - reduced form – looking at correlation between natural variation in climate to estimate effects on GDP and other variables.
- Approaches have different pros and cons. Complementary.

Nordhaus damages in RICE– a bottom up approach

- Divide effects into: 1. Agriculture, 2. Sea-level rise, 3. Other market sectors, 4. Health, 5. Non-market amenity impacts, 6. Human settlements and eco-systems, 7., Catastrophes.
- 13 regions; U.S., OECD Europe, Eastern Europe, Japan, Russia, China, Africa, India, Other high income, Other middle, Other low middle income, Low income, and High Income OPEC.

Functional specification

- For each sector and region, a damage function , measuring the damage or willingness to pay for non-market items as a % of GDP.
- Assume damages are proportional to GDP.
- For each region, sum over sectors.
- Produces a damage function.

Agriculture

- Most studied. Damage depends on; CO_2, temperature, precipitation and adaptation.
- Nordhaus summarize various studies of effects

Table 4-4.
Estimated Damages on Agriculture from CO2 Doubling

[Benefits are negative while damages are positive]

	Billions, 1990 US dollars	% of GDP
United States [a]	3.90	0.07
China [a, b]	-3.00	-0.51
Japan [a]	-17.20	-0.55
OECD Europe [a]	42.10	0.58
Russia [c]	-2.88	-0.87
India [d]	5.11	1.54
Other High Income [a, e]	-10.40	-1.14
High-Income OPEC [f]	0.00	0.00
Eastern Europe [g]	2.26	0.58
Middle Income [h]	19.51	1.43
Lower-Middle Income [I]	0.65	0.06
Africa [I]	0.10	0.06
Low Income [I]	0.30	0.06

- Positive effects if initial temperature is below 11.5 degrees. Suggests quadratic damage $\alpha_{ag}^{1}\left(T+T_{0}^{j}\right)+\alpha_{ag}^{2}\left(T+T_{0}^{j}\right)^{2}+\alpha_{ag}^{j}$.

Other sectors

- Similar approach but typically less studies to rely on.
- Does not add up to very much for a temperture increase of 2.5 degrees. Global population weighted values damages at 2.5 degrees, Ag =0.17%, Other m =0.23%, Coast =0.12%, Health 0.56%, Non-market -0.03, Settlem. 0.1.
- Large heterogeneity. Over 1% loss in agriculture in India and Lower middle Income (Brazil and others). 3% loss due to health in Africa.
- Total damage zero or negative in U.S. and China. Large (around 3%) in Africa and India.
- Catastropic impacts added.

Catastrophe

- Survey to experts. "What is the probability of permanent 25% loss in output if global warming is 3 and 6 degrees respectively?"
- Varied answers with mean 0.6 and 3.4%. (median 0.5 and 2.0). Arbitraly doubled and damage increased to 30% globally.
- Distributed over regions reflecting different vulnerability.
- Assuming risk aversion of 4 translated into willingness to pay to avoid risk.
- Leads to 1.02% and 6.94% WTP for 2.5 and 6 degrees warming globally.
- India twice as willing, US and China less than half.

Nordhaus 2000 Summary

- Damages as percent of GDP, described by $D(T) = 1 - \frac{1}{1+\theta_{j,1}T+\theta_{j,2}T^2}$ with region-specific $\theta_j's$, giving (Blue-USA, Red-Chi, Green-Eur, Black-LI)



Nordhaus (2013)

- Goes back to more ad hoc description. Global damages

$$D(T) = 1 - \frac{1}{1 + 0.00267T^2} \approx 0.023 \left(\frac{T}{3}\right)^2$$

- Also allows a term in T^3 producing more convex damages.
- Other models have included even larger exponents on T.
- The model FUND uses a *random exponent* from the interval 1.5-3.
- Nordhaus stresses that damage function for high temperatures (>3 or 4 degrees?) should not be taken very seriously.

Simplification of Nordhaus

- Nordhaus's aggregate damage function maps temperature into damages.
- Now consider the two steps from increased CO_2 concentration (S) to the change in global mean temperature (T) and from T to damages together.
- For the first step use Arrhenius $T(S) = \frac{3}{\ln 2} \ln \left(\frac{S+600}{600} \right)$ where S is GtC over the pre-industrial level (600 GtC).
- For the second $D(T)$ being the Nordhaus global damage function.
- Together, the two steps are $D(T(S))$ mapping additional atmospheric carbon to damages.

Simplification of Nordhaus

- It turns out that $1 - D\left(T\left(S\right)\right)$, i.e., how much is left after damages as a function of S, is well approximated by the function $e^{-\gamma S}$ for $\gamma = 5.3 * 10^{-5}$ (black) and $1 - D\left(T\left(S\right)\right)$ (red dashed) as seen in the figure.



Exponential function very convenient

- Define Y_{net} as output net of damages and Y as gross output, implying $Y_{net} = (1 - D(T(S)))Y$.
- Using the approximation $(1 - D(T(S))) \approx e^{-\gamma S}$, $Y_{net} = e^{-\gamma S} Y$.
- Then, $\frac{\partial Y_{net}}{\partial S} \frac{1}{Y_{net}}$ is the marginal loss of net output from additional GtC in the atmosphere expressed as a share of net output.
- Using our approximation, we have $\frac{\partial Y_{net}}{\partial S} \frac{1}{Y_{net}} = \frac{\partial \left(e^{-\gamma S} Y \right)}{\partial S} \frac{1}{e^{-\gamma S} Y} = -\gamma$, i.e., marginal losses are a constant proportion of GDP!
- Marginal damage flow independent of GDP and CO_2 concentration.
- With $\gamma = 5.3 * 10^{-5}$ one GtC extra in the atmosphere gives extra damages at 0.0053%.Recall the rate of accumulation of S_t.
- Robust?

Ciscar et al. PNAS Feb 2011

- Another bottom-up studie, but for Europe only.
- Sums the impact for 5 types of damages; agriculture production, river floods, coastal effects, tourism (market) and health.
- Use different high-resolution models 50x50 km, and use distribution of weather outcomes, not only temperature.
- Compare different scenarios for year 2080 to baseline of no climate change.
- For EU as a whole yearly damages equivalent to 1% of consumption for 5.4 degree heating in EU. Small positive effects on tourism and substantial positive effects on Northern Europe.
- Relative to growth rate over 70 years ($1.02^{70} \approx 4$), these effects seem fairly small.



Figure: Metastudy of studies on effects of climate change. Area of ball indicates reliability judged by Nordhaus and Moffat.

Reduced form

- Idea is to use natural temporal variation in climate and correlate with economic outcomes – natural experiments.
- Microstudies on agriculture, labor productivity, industrial output, health and mortality, conflicts and stability, crime, ... See Dell, Jones and Olken, "What Do We Learn from the Weather? The New Climate-Economy Literature," (Journal of Economic Literature, 2014)
- Microstudies yield credible identification but little external validity and no genereral equilibrium effects.
- Less aggregate aggregate reduced form. One of few: Dell, Jones and Olken. American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics (2008).
- Monthly data on weather from 1900, 0.5 degree spatial resolution (interpolation) (use 50 last yearly obs). Economic data from Penn World Tables, 136 countries.



Blue circle (red plus) is mean temp in 1950-1959 (1996-2005). Gray lines is range of annual temperature over sample period.

Methodology Dell, Jones and Olken (2008)

- Assume

$$
\begin{aligned}
Y_{it} &= e^{\beta T_{it}} A_{it} L_{it};\ \beta \text{ captures level damage} \\
\frac{\Delta A_{it}}{A_{it}} &= g_i + \gamma T_{it};\ \gamma \text{ captures growth rate damage}
\end{aligned}
$$

- Strong effects on growth – a degree higher temperature leads to 1% less growth.
- But only in poor countries (below median at start).
- Persists for at least 10 years.
- Similar results for industrial output, aggregate investment and political stability.
- Tentative conclusion – climate change is a big problem for countries that do not become sufficiently rich.
- Krusell and Smith (prel.) find other results – only level effects and no difference between poor and rich.

Temperature - GDP with high resolution data

- Unit of analysis: $1^\circ \times 1^\circ$ global grid (land). 19,000 regions (cells).
- Nordhaus G-Econ database: GDP and population for all cells in 1990, 1995, 2000 and 2005.
- Produces nice charts!





Climate data and projections

- Temperature data exists on same $1^\circ \times 1^\circ$ global grid.
- Assume relation between GDP and temperature is not random but reflects causal relationship. Use to assess consequences of changes in temperature.
- Obvious *pros* as well as *cons* with this methodology.

Share of Global GDP vs Yearly Mean Temp



Share of Global Population vs Yearly Mean Temp



- Climate change affects regions very differently. Stakes big at regional level.
- Though a tax on carbon would affect welfare positively in some average sense, huge disparity of views: 55% of regions hurt, 45% benefit from climate change.
- Strong migration pressures from climate change.

Conclusion

- Empirical support for substantial effects on the economy from climate change.
- Effects can be large in particular regions.
- Evidence does not point towards very large effects for moderate heating (<4 degrees). But substantial uncertainty.
- Very little is known for more extreme scenarios.
- At least for moderate heating marginal damage per unit of extra ton in atmosphere may by approximately constant.
- Much to be learnt from further research.