

# AD-DICE: an implementation of adaptation in the DICE model

Kelly C. de Bruin<sup>1</sup>, Rob B. Dellink<sup>2,3</sup> and Richard S.J. Tol<sup>4,3,5</sup>.

1 Corresponding author, Environmental Economics and Natural Resources Group, Wageningen University, Hollandseweg 1, 6706KN, Wageningen, The Netherlands. Telephone: + 31 317 48 23 62, Fax: + 31 317 48 49 33, email: kelly.debruin@wur.nl .

2 Environmental Economics and Natural Resources Group, Wageningen University

3 Institute for Environmental Studies, Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

4 Economic and Social Research Institute, Dublin, Ireland

5 Department of Engineering and Public Policy, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA, USA

Working Paper FNU-126

## Abstract

Integrated Assessment Models (IAMs) have helped us over the past decade to understand the interactions between the environment and the economy in the context of climate change. Although it has also long been recognized that adaptation is a powerful and necessary tool to combat the adverse effects of climate change, most IAMs have not explicitly included the option of adaptation in combating climate change. This paper adds to the IAM and climate change literature by explicitly including adaptation in an IAM, thereby making the trade-offs between adaptation and mitigation visible. Specifically, a theoretical framework is created and used to implement adaptation as a decision variable into the DICE model. We use our new AD-DICE model to derive the adaptation cost functions implicit in the DICE model. In our set-up, adaptation and mitigation decisions are separable and AD-DICE can mimic DICE when adaptation is optimal. We find that our specification of the adaptation costs is robust with respect to the mitigation policy scenarios. Our numerical results show that adaptation is a powerful option to combat climate change, as it reduces most of the potential costs of climate change in earlier periods, while mitigation does so in later periods.

JEL classification: Q25, Q28

Keywords: Integrated assessment modelling, adaptation, climate change

# 1 Introduction

Global warming poses one of the biggest global environmental threats for current and even more so for future generations. There is a scientific consensus that human activities, through which greenhouse gases are emitted into the atmosphere, are changing our climate (IPCC, 2001a). Greenhouse gases have accumulated in the atmosphere for centuries and the decay of most greenhouse gases takes more than fifty years. Therefore, the global warming problem will persist for at least the next century. Climate change is expected to do damages to the economy, with estimates of, on average, 2% of GDP (IPCC, 2001b) by 2100 and perhaps much higher damages after that.

Consequently, it is important to design efficient long-term climate policies. There are two main options that a nation has in addressing climate change. Firstly it can try to limit climate change by reducing its greenhouse gas emissions or exploiting carbon sinks. This is referred to as mitigation. The other option is adaptation. Adaptation refers to adjustments in ecological, social or economic systems in response to actual or expected climate stimuli and their effects or impacts. It refers to changes in processes, practices and structures to moderate potential damages or to benefit from opportunities associated with climate change (Klein *et al.* 2001). Examples of adaptation are the building of dykes, the changing of crop types, and vaccinations. Adaptation can be private or public, anticipatory or reactive.

To understand the issue of climate change, Integrated Assessment Models (IAMs) have been developed that integrate the main causes and effects of climate change. IAMs models combine disciplines as to evaluate the whole cause and effect chain of climate change. In such a manner the effects of the economy on climate change and the effects of climate change on the economy are linked. The advantage of IAMs models is that they can deal with important issues such as the efficient allocation of abatement burdens and accepted damages, by specifying the costs and benefits of various abatement strategies, using a detailed description of both economic and environmental developments. IAMs, therefore, can analyse what the optimal climate strategy should be. Up to now, however, IAMs focus

on the trade-off between damages due to climate change and mitigation costs and ignore the option of adaptation or at best treat it implicitly as part of the damage estimate.<sup>i</sup> Tol and Fankhauser (1998) survey the IAM literature and conclude that in the majority of the models adaptation is not included; this situation has hardly improved since then. Furthermore, mostly when adaptation was included in a model, only induced adaptation and implicit adaptation were considered and not explicit adaptation. This means that adaptation is not modelled as a decision variable. The PAGE model (Hope et al., 1993; Plambeck et al., 1997, Hope, 2006) is an exception. However, adaptation is an exogenous decision variable that is, it is set by the modeller, and not on the basis of an optimisation.

Because of the private nature of most adaptation, it is sometimes argued that adaptation is not a decision variable for a region, as the adaptation decisions are not in the hands of the leaders of that region (Tol, 2005). However, besides the fact that many forms of adaptation are public, private adaptation is still a decision taken in a region, even if not by the leaders of that region. One may also argue that, under certain assumptions, the socially optimal adaptation (as calculated below) coincides with the adaptation provided by the market. This, however, is unlikely as the public lacks information on the effects of climate change and adaptation options, and adaptation often entails big scale projects that the market cannot provide. Studies have shown that the effects of adaptation can be enormous, decreasing gross damages by up to 80% (Mendelsohn, 2000). Therefore, to fully understand the effects of climate change and climate change policies adaptation also needs to be considered and modelled as a policy variable.

In this paper, we include adaptation as a policy variable in an IAM, namely the Dynamic Integrated model of Climate and the Economy (DICE), which was originally developed by Nordhaus (1994). The DICE model is a global model and includes economic growth functions as well as geophysical functions. The use of adaptation is assumed to be optimal and is already included in the damage function. We develop what we have named the Adaptation in DICE (AD-DICE) model that includes adaptation as a decision variable.

Estimates from empirical literature on the costs and benefits of adaptation are used to calibrate the model and derive the adaptation cost curve that is implicit in the DICE model. We then construct new policy scenarios with no adaptation to understand the effects of adaptation. We take a closer look at the effects of adaptation and mitigation on each other. This paper is structured as follows; in the next section the literature on adaptation in IAMs is reviewed. The third section lays out the AD-DICE model and its theoretical framework. In the fourth section the details of the calibration are described and the parameter values of the AD-DICE model are given. The fifth section presents the results with an analysis of the different policy options and the interactions of mitigation and adaptation. In the sixth section a sensitivity analysis is done. Finally we conclude and make a few suggestions for further research.

## 2 Literature review

There have been many articles calling for more research on adaptation, especially in the modelling context. Tol and Fankhauser (1998) specifically call for the introduction of explicit adaptation in IAMs. They survey 20 IAMs and find that adaptation is distinguished only in very few of the models. Furthermore, they find only one model, the PAGE model (Hope et al., 1993; Plambeck et al., 1997), where adaptation is considered as a policy variable. Since Tol and Fankhauser (1998), nothing has changed with regard to the inclusion of adaptation in IAMs.

Hope et al. (1993) is still the only paper to date, to our knowledge, that models adaptation as a policy variable for all sectors. Using the model for Policy Analysis of the Greenhouse Effect (PAGE), the authors look at two adaptation policy choices, namely no adaptation and aggressive adaptation. Aggressive adaptation decreases initial climate change impacts by up to 90%. Hope et al. (1993) say that this reduction will cost 0.5 trillion Euro and decrease impacts by 17.5 trillion Euro. These estimates do not seem realistic and contradict existing empirical literature on the costs and effects of adaptation (Reilly et al., 1994, Parry et al., 1998a/b, Fankhauser, 1998, Mendelsohn, 2000). The benefits of adaptation estimated by

Hope et al. (1993) are much higher than is found in this literature. Not surprisingly, Hope et al. (1993) find that an aggressive adaptation policy is beneficial and should be implemented. It should be noted that the authors of this article also call for incorporating improved information on adaptation in their model. Hope et al. (1993) model adaptation such that it decreases the “tolerable” rate of climate change, the “tolerable” absolute climate change and the impacts beyond these “tolerable” amounts. Although Hope et al. (1993) take a step in considering adaptation and how it may be implemented into IAMs, the values used are very unrealistic and teach us little about dynamics of adaptation or the trade-offs with mitigation. Furthermore, adaptation is not a continuous choice, but a discrete variable; and it is a scenario variable rather than a choice variable. Later versions of the PAGE model have been developed, however, the same specification of adaptation were used (Hope, 2006).

A more recent and detailed paper where adaptation is explicitly modelled is that of Tol (forthcoming). This model only considers sea-level rise and coastal protection. It models protection as a continuous decision variable, based on Fankhauser (1994), and gives insights into adaptation dynamics. Tol (forthcoming) shows that protection is a very important option to combat the impacts of sea level rise. Furthermore mitigation and adaptation need to be traded off as more mitigation will lead to less free resources for adaptation. This paper finds that investments increase over time. Tol (forthcoming) also points out that a too high level of abatement may actually have adverse effects as less adaptation can be undertaken, which leads to more net climate change damages. Tol and Dowlatabadi (2001) did a similar analysis looking at vector-borne diseases, focusing on malaria. They find that aggressive mitigation increases the adverse effects of climate change due to decreased adaptation.

Previous papers have taken the first steps to explicitly including adaptation in IAMs, but clearly do not exhaust the potential. Adaptation is an important policy option that needs to be included in IAM analyses for all climate change damages. This article adds to the IAM and climate change literature by doing that.

### 3 A framework with explicit adaptation decisions

In the DICE model, utility is maximized. Utility is calculated as the discounted natural logarithm of consumption. Consumption is the optimal share of income. Income is reduced by the costs of greenhouse gas mitigation and by the damage done by climate change. The climate change damages are represented by a damage function that depends on the temperature increase compared to 1900 levels.

Adaptation to climate change would decrease the initial damages of climate change. This is the mechanism we add to the DICE model. We define gross damages as the initial damages by climate change if no changes were to be made in ecological, social and economic systems. If these systems were to change to limit climate change damages (i.e. adapt) the damages would decrease. We refer to these “left-over” damages as residual damages. Reducing gross damages, however, comes at a cost, i.e. we need to invest resources in adaptation. These costs are referred to as protection costs or adaptation costs. Thus, the net damages in DICE are the total of the residual damages and the protection costs.

In the DICE model the net damage function is a combination of the optimal mix of protection costs and residual damages.<sup>ii</sup> Thus the net damage function given in DICE can be unravelled into residual damages and protection costs. We do this as follows. The original damage function in DICE is given as

$$(1) \frac{D_t}{Y_t} = a_1 TE_t + a_2 TE_t^2,$$

where  $D_t$  represents the net damages,  $Y_t$  the output and  $TE_t$  the temperature change compared to the 1900 temperature. We split the net damages into residual damages ( $RD_t$ ) and protection costs ( $PC_t$ ).

$$(2) \frac{D_t}{Y_t} = \frac{RD_t(GD_t, P_t)}{Y_t} + \frac{PC_t(P_t)}{Y_t}$$

Here we assume that the protection costs and the residual damages are separable, and can be represented as a fraction of income. They both depend on protection ( $P_t$ ) but the costs

are independent of each other. Residual damages depend on both the gross damages ( $GD_t$ ) and the level of protection ( $P_t$ ). Effectively, this makes the decisions on the levels of protection and mitigation separable.

We assume that the gross damage function takes the form given in:

$$(3) \frac{GD_t}{Y_t} = \alpha_1 TE_t + \alpha_2 TE_t^{\alpha_3}, \text{ where } \alpha_2 > 0 \text{ and } \alpha_3 > 1.$$

This is the most commonly used form for damage costs of climate change in IAMs, where  $\alpha_3$  generally takes a value between 1 and 3 (Tol and Fankhauser 1998). This is also the same form as used in the DICE model, however,  $\alpha_3$  is not assumed to be 2 as in the DICE model, but is left to be determined through calibration.

We use the following function to express  $RD_t$  as a function of  $P_t$  and  $GD_t$ ; <sup>iii</sup>

$$(4) RD_t = GD_t * (1 - P_t), \text{ where } 0 \leq P_t \leq 1.$$

The main advantage of using the form given in (4) is that  $P$  has an intuitive interpretation. Protection is then given on a scale from 0 to 1, where 0 represents no protection: none of the gross climate change damages are decreased through protection. A value of 1 would mean that all gross climate change damages are avoided through adaptation. Thus,  $P$  gives

$$\text{the fraction by which gross damages are reduced: } P_t = \frac{GD_t - RD_t}{GD_t}.$$

Protection costs are given as a function of the level of protection. We assume that this function is increasing at an increasing rate, as cheaper and more effective adaptation options will be applied first, and more expensive and less effective options will be used after these, thus

$$\frac{\partial PC_t}{\partial P_t} > 0 \text{ and } \frac{\partial^2 PC_t}{\partial P_t^2} > 0.$$

There are many types of functions that fit these criteria. We assume this function takes the form of a power function <sup>iv</sup>

$$(5) \frac{PC_t}{Y_t} = \gamma_1 P_t^{\gamma_2}, \text{ where } \gamma_1 > 0 \text{ and } \gamma_2 > 1.$$

We assume that the level of protection is chosen every time period (10 years). The protection in one time period does not affect damages in the next period, thus each decade the same problem is faced, and the same trade-off holds. Equation (5) gives us an adaptation cost curve. Combined with Equation (4), it compares the reduced damages (as a fraction of gross damages) with the costs of the adaptation (as a fraction of output).

## 4 Calibration of the AD-DICE model

In our analysis we use the DICE99 model. We calibrate the AD-DICE model using the optimal control scenario of DICE. We calibrated the model in such a way that it best replicates the results of the original DICE model. To do this we constructed a model that minimized the discounted squared difference between net damages ( $D_t$ ) in the original DICE and net damages ( $RD_t + PC_t$ ) in AD-DICE, holding  $TE_t$  at the level obtained in the DICE optimal control scenario.

We use additional information for the calibration of the parameters:  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \gamma_1$  and  $\gamma_2$ .

Firstly, the  $P_t$  chosen must be optimal. Thus for all  $P_t$ ,  $\frac{\partial D_t}{\partial P_t} = 0$  must hold,

or  $\frac{\partial RD}{\partial P} = \frac{\partial PC}{\partial P}$ . Next, we have to identify a point on the protection cost curve to be able to

calibrate the function. We chose to calibrate on the same point as used to calibrate the damages in the original DICE model: a doubling of CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations. This is assumed to occur after 130 years ( $t=13$ ), this corresponds in the DICE model to a temperature rise of 2.3 degrees ( $TE=2.3$ ) compared to 1900. The second condition states that  $PC$  takes a value of 7-25% of total damages in the calibration point. This condition is taken from an estimate by Tol et al. (1998b), which is based on an extensive review of impact assessment literature. We also restrict the parameter  $P$  based on literature (Parry 1994, Reilly 1994, Fankhauser 1997 and Mendelsohn 2000) at a level between 0.3 and 0.8 at the calibration



point. Furthermore, according to Tol et al. (1999),  $PC$  should lie between 0.1 and 0.5 % of GDP at the calibration point; this restriction was also implemented.

Our AD-DICE model, when calibrated with these restrictions, is well able to reproduce the damages of the DICE model. To test the significance of our models we regress the DICE damages on the AD-DICE and test the hypothesis that they are equal using an F-test. The p-value, which may be interpreted as the chance that they are indeed equal, is given in Table 1, along with the parameter estimates.

#### **Insert Table 1 here**

The very high p-value indicates that DICE and AD-DICE are almost identical. Figure 1 depicts the net damages estimated by AD-DICE and those estimated by DICE, for both the optimal control scenario and for the scenario without mitigation. For both scenarios, our calibration fits well with some small diversions in later periods (the present value of these differences are negligible due to the positive discount rate used). This shows that our parameter values are valid for both scenarios.

#### **Insert Figure 1 here**

As can be seen in Figure 2, the AD-DICE levels of mitigation are slightly lower in later periods. Mitigation is essentially the same in DICE and AD-DICE. This is because the decisions to mitigate and adapt are separable. In DICE, mitigation is set by the marginal damage cost. In AD-DICE, mitigation is set by the marginal residual damage plus adaptation cost. As the net damage profiles in DICE and AD-DICE are practically identical, so are the marginals. Thus our model will give the same results as the DICE model if we keep adaptation at its optimal level.

#### **Insert Figure 2 here**

Using the parameter values found in ad-dice we can draw an adaptation cost curve, given in figure 3. We see that the protection costs of the first 15% of gross damage reduction are extremely low after which they rise. The optimal level of adaptation varies from 0.09 to

0.45, with an average of 0.33, that is 33 percent of gross damages are reduced due to adaptation.

**Insert Figure 3 here**

## 5 Results

In this section we present our results. We first look at how climate change costs are composed. Then we compare different policy options. Finally we look at the dynamics of adaptation and mitigation and how they affect each other.

### 5.1 Costs of climate change

The costs of climate change include residual damages, protection costs and abatement costs. In Figure 4, we see that a large part of climate change costs consist of residual damages in the optimal control scenario. Mitigation costs increase relatively steeply over time.

**Insert Figure 4 here**

### 5.2 Climate policy options

Now we compare different policy options using the ad-dice model. We take two climate change policy scenarios created by Nordhaus (1994) as a starting point. We revise these scenarios by including non-optimal adaptation. We then compare the effects of the different scenarios on the basis of utility.

The two scenarios of Nordhaus(1996) are the no control baseline scenario and the optimal control scenario. In the no control scenario, adaptation is chosen at its optimal level, thus in such a way as to maximise utility, but the level of mitigation is set at zero. In the optimal control scenario both adaptation and mitigation are chosen at their optimal levels. We use four scenarios in ad-dice: optimal control, no control, only adaptation and only mitigation. Our optimal case is the same as that of Nordhaus (1996). In our no control scenario, adaptation and mitigation levels are set at zero. In the only adaptation scenario, the

adaptation is at its optimal level while the mitigation level is zero. In the only mitigation scenario, the mitigation is at its optimal level while the adaptation level is zero.

We first look at the utility of the different scenarios. We use no control as the base case and show the percentage difference of the utility compared to the base case. This is given in Figure 5. As mentioned earlier, the ad-dice results concerning scenarios with optimal adaptation are the same as those of dice.

Logically we see that the optimal control is the best scenario, followed by the only adaptation scenario. This is followed by the only mitigation scenario. Finally the scenario that creates the lowest utility is the no control scenario. Thus only adapting results in a higher utility than only mitigating and adaptation is a more cost effective control. These results confirm the importance of adaptation.

**Insert Figure 5 here**

In Figure 6, we compare the distribution of costs of climate change over time with the different policy scenarios. The different scenarios distribute the cost of climate change quite differently over time. Thus changes in the discount rate will also change the ranking of the scenarios.

We see that in the only-mitigation scenario damages in the last periods are much smaller than in the no control scenario. The only-adaptation scenario damages are smaller in the beginning periods compared to the no control scenario. The optimal scenario distributes the damages more evenly over time. At certain points in time it is less beneficial than a scenario with only adaptation, but overall this scenario has the least discounted damages.

**Insert Figure 6 here**

### 5.3 Mitigation and adaptation

To examine the dynamics of adaptation and mitigation in more detail, we look at the net benefits of adaptation and mitigation over time (both as a percentage of output) in Figure 7. We see that adaptation has higher benefits until 2140 than does mitigation. After that, however, mitigation becomes much more beneficial than adaptation. Thus even though it is optimal to invest in mitigation, few of these benefits will be felt in the first 60 years – largely because of the slow workings of the energy sector, carbon cycle and climate.

**Insert Figure 7 here**

We now look at how adaptation and mitigation affect each other. In Figure 8, the net benefits of mitigation are given for the case when only mitigation is an option and for the case where adaptation is also possible. We see that including adaptation as an option increases the benefits of the optimal path of mitigation until 2120 but decrease the benefits later. This is because adding adaptation as a control option will decrease the optimal level of mitigation. Because of this costs of mitigation in the beginning periods will be avoided but this also entails that benefits of mitigation in later periods are lost.

**Insert Figure 8 here**

There is a chance that policymakers do not look at the optimal control over time but only consider the near future that is the world has a myopic view. In this case because the benefits of adaptation are higher in earlier years, there may be an overinvestment in adaptation and an underinvestment in mitigation. This is a problem of inter generational externalities, that is the burdens of mitigation are felt in earlier periods, while the benefits are reaped in later periods (or more accurately the benefits of a high level of consumption are reaped now, while the burdens are felt by later generations in the form of climate change damages). However, a side benefit in this respect is that the net damages of the optimal level of mitigation in the earlier periods are lower and even become benefits when adaptation is included as a control option.

We see that mitigation only has a “negative” effect on adaptation. In Figure 9 we see that adaptation is less beneficial when mitigation is also an option. This is because mitigation reduces gross damages reducing the potential benefits of adaptation. The difference between benefits of adaptation with optimal mitigation and without mitigation increases over time, because the effect of mitigation becomes more pronounced over time.

**Insert Figure 9 here**

## 6 Sensitivity analysis

In this section we conduct a sensitivity analysis. We have already seen that our model is robust to changes in the scenario used in the calibration, see Figure 1. AD-DICE replicates DICE in all scenarios where adaptation is optimal. Next we check if our model is robust to changes in the climate sensitivity and the discount rate used.

### 6.1 Discount rate

We run both the DICE and AD-DICE model with 3 alternative utility discount rates, namely a low level, an original, middle level and a high level. The original discount rate is 0.03 and decreases over time, the low level discount rate is 50% of the original level (0.015) and the high level is 150% of the original level (0.045). The corresponding climate change costs and mitigation are shown in Figure 10 and 11. We see that the AD-DICE model adjusts to changes in the discount rate in the same way as the DICE for all relevant variables, here we show the total climate change costs and the mitigation level. Again we see that the AD-DICE model has slightly lower levels of mitigation.

**Insert Figure 10 here**

**Insert Figure 11 here**

**Insert Figure 12 here**

In Figure 11 and 12, we see that a higher (lower) discount rate increases (decreases) the level of adaptation but decreases (increase) the level of mitigation. This is quite intuitive as the benefits of mitigation are only felt in later periods. A higher (lower) discount rate would shift policy from mitigation (adaptation) to adaptation (mitigation).

## 6.2 Climate sensitivity

We do the same with 3 levels of climate sensitivity i.e. the equilibrium warming for a doubling of the atmospheric concentration of carbon dioxide. The original climate-equation coefficient, that is the effect of radiative forcing on the atmospheric temperature, is 0.226, the low level coefficient is 50% of the original level (0.113) and the high level is 150% of the original level (0.339). Again we see that AD-DICE adjusts in the same manner as DICE with lower mitigation levels in later periods. This is shown in Figures 13 and 14.

**Insert Figure 13 here**

**Insert Figure 14 here**

**Insert Figure 15 here**

In Figure 14 we see that lower (higher) climate sensitivity will decrease (increase) mitigation. In Figure 15 we see that lower (higher) climate sensitivity will decrease (increase) adaptation until the year 2190 and increase (decrease) it after that. This is because if emissions cause less climate change, there will be lower damages. This will lead to lower levels of mitigation and adaptation. After some time due to the lower level of mitigation, damages will reach a level where a high level of adaptation will again become optimal.

### 6.3 Protection costs

Finally we look at the results if we use another specification for the protection costs function. We give the  $PC_t$  function as

$$(9) \frac{PC_t}{Y_t} = \gamma_1 \left( \frac{1}{1 - P_t} \right)^{\gamma_2}, \text{ where } \gamma_1 > 0 \text{ and } \gamma_2 > 1.$$

This full analysis is given in the Appendix, here we discuss the results only. The adaptation curves of both specifications are not identical, see figure A1 in Appendix. Using the alternative specification leads to a higher lying adaptation cost curve that translates into higher protection costs. The curve also becomes very steep at  $P=0.3$  with extremely high costs at adaptation levels above that.

We again look at the policy scenarios with the new specification. The results are given in Figure 16. The results show the same order of policies; however, the utility of the scenarios with no adaptation are slightly higher than before.

**Insert Figure 16 here**

We also check to see whether the costs of climate change under the different control options develop in the same way as before and if the results are not sensitive to changes in specifications. In Figure 17, we see that the climate cost curves of the different options have the same form as before. The only adaptation curve is slightly higher in this specification because adaptation is more expensive. Also because adaptation is less beneficial in this specification the no control curve is slightly lower than before. We thus can conclude that our results on the policy options are robust to these changes.

**Insert Figure 17 here**

Adaptation and mitigation are still affected by each other in the same way as in the original  $PC_t$  specification. Adaptation increases the benefits of mitigation then decreases them. Mitigation decreases the benefits of adaptation.

## Conclusions

In this paper we set up a framework that can model adaptation as a decision variable in IAMs. We then use this framework to create a model AD-DICE that includes adaptation as a decision variable in the DICE model of Nordhaus (1994). In the DICE model adaptation is assumed to be optimal and included in the damage function. Relaxing this assumption, several conclusions with regard to adaptation can be made.

We adopt a framework in which adaptation and mitigation decisions are separable: the adaptation level is chosen to minimise net damages plus adaptation costs, while the mitigation level is chosen to minimise the aggregate of net damages and adaptation costs plus mitigation costs. We find that in our specification, AD-DICE can mimic the original DICE model. This holds by definition for the optimal control scenario, as the AD-DICE model parameters are calibrated to this end. But our specification is robust with respect to the other mitigation policy scenarios employed in DICE as well. This shows the generality of our approach and illustrates that our framework can be used for other models and settings as well.

Our results show that both adaptation and mitigation can reduce a large amount of the costs of climate change. When applied optimally, adaptation will reduce gross damages of climate change by on average 33% (as calibrated). We see that applying only adaptation is more beneficial than applying only mitigation, illustrating the importance of adaptation as a control option in combating climate change. We also conclude that adaptation is the main climate change cost reducer in the first periods (up to the year 2100) after which mitigation reduces the bulk of the damages. Thus to combat climate change in the cost effective way,



the short term optimal policy consists of a mixture of adaptation measures and investments in mitigation, even though the latter will only decrease damages in later periods. If policy makers focus on the short run benefits and costs an underinvestment in mitigation and overinvestment in adaptation may take place as benefits of adaptation are higher than those of mitigation until 2130. Adding adaptation as a control option however, does have the positive side effect on mitigation that the optimal mitigation path becomes beneficial earlier than without adaptation. These results are robust to variations in key parameters.

The results in this paper by and large confirm the main policy conclusions of the DICE model. This shows that while adaptation may not be explicitly represented in most existing Integrated Assessment models, there are no grounds to reject the policy conclusions from these models. That is, while these models cannot be used to investigate optimal adaptation strategies, there are not necessarily biased in their analysis of mitigation strategies. To challenge the conclusions from AD-DICE and other IAMs, more research is needed. Firstly, we ignore uncertainty. However, the way we calibrated the gross damage and adaptation functions makes them respond in the same way to key parameter variations as the original DICE model. This suggests that the behaviour of AD-DICE would be similar to that of DICE, also under uncertainty. Secondly, we ignore irreversibility. Should greenhouse gas emissions set in motion a shutdown of the thermohaline circulation or a collapse of the Greenland or West-Antarctic Ice Sheet, adaptation may be the only policy option. Thirdly, we use perfectly functioning markets and one aggregate impact function, rather than making a distinction between different sectors. In some sectors, adaptation is relatively easy. In other sectors, it is more difficult. Fourthly, we use a single region model. Like sectors, different countries may have a qualitatively different response to climate change, and adaptation may be very different. Furthermore, with different countries, countries may cooperate on mitigation, on adaptation, or both – while the original RICE model has only one instrument of international cooperation. All this is deferred to future work, which can build upon the framework developed in this paper.

## Appendix: An alternative specification of the adaptation cost function

In this appendix we show the calibration of the AD-DICE model using another specification of the  $PC_t$  function. This specification is based on the idea that the  $RD_t$  function takes another form, i.e.

$$(7) RD_t = \frac{GD_t}{PR_t}, \text{ where } PR_t > 1. \text{ The level of protection is given by } PR_t. \text{ Thus, instead of}$$

assuming that protection directly reduces gross damages on a one to one basis, we assume that adaptation becomes less effective as the level of adaptation rises. The costs of this protection we assume to be given by a power function:

$$(8) \frac{PC_t}{Y_t} = \gamma_1 PR_t^{\gamma_2}, \text{ where } \gamma_1 > 0 \text{ and } \gamma_2 > 1.$$

To be able to use the logical interpretation of  $P_t$  and to thus keep the original  $RD_t$  function

(3), we rewrite (8) as a function of  $P_t$ , this results in the following  $PC_t$  function:

$$(9) \frac{PC_t}{Y_t} = \gamma_1 \left( \frac{1}{1 - P_t} \right)^{\gamma_2}, \text{ where } \gamma_1 > 0 \text{ and } \gamma_2 > 1.$$

The results of the calibration with this specification are given in table 4. In figure A1 the adaptation curves under both specifications are given.

**Insert Table A1 here**

**Insert Figure A1 here**

## Notes

<sup>i</sup> Examples of such models are: MERGE (Manne et al 2005), FUND (Tol, 2006) and IGSM (Sokolov et al 2005)

<sup>ii</sup> According to Nordhaus and Boyer (2000), adaptation is included in the damage estimates and it is implicitly assumed that this is the optimal adaptation

<sup>iii</sup> We assume in this paper that net climate change damages are positive, that is climate change will have a negative effect. Note that this may not be the case for several regions of the world (e.g. Tol, 2001).

<sup>iv</sup> In the Appendix another representation is presented and used to calibrate the AD-DICE model.


## References

- Alcamo, J (1994) IMAGE 2.0- Integrates Modelling of Global Climate Change. Kluwer, Dordrecht, The Netherlands.
- Barnett, T.P., Hasselmann, K., Chelliah, M., Delworth, T., Hegerl, G., Jones, P., Rasmusson, E. Roeckner, E., Ropelewski, C., Santer, B., and Tett, S. (1999) Detection and Attribution of Recent Climate Change: A Status Report. Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society 80(12).
- Burton, I. (1992). Adapt and Thrive. Canadian Climate Centre, Downsview, unpublished manuscript. Cited from Klein and Tol 1997.
- Fankhauser, S. (1994) Protection vs. Retreat – The Economic Costs of Sea Level Rise. Environment and Planning A. 27: 299-319.
- Fankhauser, S.(1998) The costs of adapting to Climate Change. GEF Working Paper Series 16, Global Environmental Facility, ISBN 1-884122-14-0.
- Hope, C.W., Anderson, J., Wenman, P. (1993) Policy analysis of the greenhouse effect-an application of the PAGE model. Energy Policy 15: 328-338.
- Hope, C.W. (2006) The marginal impact of CO<sub>2</sub> from PAGE2002: an integrated assessment model incorporating the IPCC's five reasons for concern. The Integrated Assessment Journal 6 (1): 19-56.


- 
- IPCC, (2001a) Climate Change. Working group 1: The Scientific Basis, J.T. Houghton et al., (Eds.) Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.
- IPCC, (2001b) Climate Change. Working Group II: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability, J.J. McCarthy et al., (Eds.) Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.
- Klein et al. (2001) Adaptation to Climate Change in the Context of Sustainable Development and Equity, in Climate Change 2001, impacts adaptation and vulnerability.
- Manne, A.S., Mendelsohn, R., Richels, R.G. (1995) MERGE: A Model for Evaluating Regional and Global Effects of GHG reduction policies. Energy Policy 23(1):17-34.
- Mendelsohn, R. (2000) Efficient adaptation to climate change. Climatic Change 45: 583-600.
- Nordhaus, W.D. (1994). Managing the Global Commons: The Economics of the Greenhouse Effect. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Nordhaus, W.D., Boyer, J (2000) Warming the World: Economic Models of Global Warming. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Parry, M.L., Carter, T.R., Konijn, N.T., (Eds) (1998a) The impact of Climate Variations on Agriculture. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht.
- Parry, M.L., Arnell, N.W., Hulme, M., Nicholls, R.J., Livermore, M. (1998b) Adaptation to the inevitable. Nature 395 (741).
- Plambeck, E.L., Hope, C.W. and Anderson, J. (1997). The PAGE95 Model: Integrating the Science and Economics of Climate Change. Energy Economics 19: 77-101.

- 
- Reilly, J., Hohnmann, N., Kane, S. (1994) Climate Change and Agricultural Trade: who benefits, who loses? *Global environmental Change* 4(1): 24-36.
- Sokolov, A. P, Schlosser, C. A. Dutkiewicz, S. Paltsev, S., Kicklighter, D.W., Jacoby, H. D. Prinn, R.G., Forest, C.E., Reilly, J. M., Wang, C., Felzer, B. S., Sarofim, M.C., Scott, J. Stone, P.H. (2005) MIT Integrated Global System Model (IGSM) Version 2: Model Description and Baseline Evaluation, MIT Joint Program on the Science and Policy of Global Change, Report no. 124.
- Tol, R.S.J., Fankhauser, S. (1998) On the Representation of Impact in Integrated Assessment Models of Climate Change. *Environmental Modelling and Assessment*, 3: 63-74.
- Tol, R.S. J., Fankhauser, S., Smith, J.B. (1998) The Scope for adaptation to climate change: what can we learn from the impact literature? *Global Environmental Change*, 8(2): 109-123.
- Tol, R.S.J., Dowlatabadi, H. (2001) Vector-borne Diseases, Climate Change, and Economic Growth. *Integrated Assessment* 2: 173-181.
- Tol, R.S.J. (2002) Estimates of the Damage Costs of Climate Change. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 21: 47-73.
- Tol, R.S.J., (2005) Adaptation and Mitigation: Trade-Offs in Substance and Methods. *Environmental Science and Policy*, 8 (6): 572-578.
- Tol, R.S.J. (2006) Exchange Rates and Climate Change: An Application of FUND, *Climatic Change*, **75**: 59-80.
- Tol, R.S.J., (forthcoming) The Double Trade-Off between Adaptation and Mitigation for Sea Level Rise: An Application of FUND. *Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies for Global Change*.


## Figures




**Figure 1: net climate change costs estimated by AD-DICE and DICE: optimal scenario, no mitigation scenario**




**Figure 2: mitigation level in the AD-DICE and DICE models.**




**Figure 3: the adaptation cost curve implicit in the DICE model (range 0.15-0.4).**



**Figure 4: composition of climate change costs in the optimal scenario.**




**Figure 5: The differences in utility of the different scenarios compared to the base case.**




**Figure 6: climate change costs of different policy scenarios**







**Figure 7: net benefits of adaptation and mitigation over time.**




**Figure 8: The net benefits of mitigation as a % of output with and without adaptation.**




**Figure 9: The net benefits of adaptation as a % of output with and without mitigation.**




**Figure 10: climate change costs as % of output with different discount rates.**




**Figure 11: mitigation level with different discount rates.**




**Figure 12: adaptation level with different discount rates**




**Figure 13: climate change costs as % of output with different climate sensitivities.**




**Figure 14: mitigation level with different climate sensitivities.**




**Figure 15: adaptation level with different climate sensitivities.**



**Figure 16: utility of different scenarios with each specification of protection costs.**



**Figure 17: Climate change costs of different scenarios with each  $PC_t$  specification.**



**Figure A1 Adaptation curves for both PC specifications**

---

## Tables

parameter	$\alpha_1$	$\alpha_2$	$\alpha_3$	$\gamma_1$	$\gamma_2$	p-value
value	0.0012	0.0023	2.32	0.115	3.60	0.99

**Table 1: parameter values from AD-DICE in the optimal scenario calibration.**

Scenario	$\alpha_1$	$\alpha_2$	$\alpha_3$	$\gamma_1$	$\gamma_2$	p-value
Optimal	0.00058	0.0027	2.20	0.000082	8.19	0.99

**Table A1: Parameter values from AD-DICE using the PC(1/(1-P)) specification**

---

**Working Papers**  
**Research Unit Sustainability and Global Change**  
**Hamburg University and Centre for Marine and Atmospheric Science**

- Anthoff, D. and R.S.J. Tol (2007), *On International Equity Weights and National Decision Making on Climate Change*, **FNU-127** (submitted).
- de Bruin, K.C., R.B. Dellink and R.S.J. Tol (2007), *AD-DICE: An Implementation of Adaptation in the DICE Model*, **FNU-126** (submitted).
- Tol, R.S.J. and G.W. Tol (2007), *The Stern Review: A Deconstruction*, **FNU-125** (submitted).
- Keller, K., L.I. Miltich, A. Robinson and R.S.J. Tol (2007), *How Overconfident Are Current Projections of Anthropogenic Carbon Dioxide Emissions?*, **FNU-124** (submitted).
- Cowie, A., U.A. Schneider and L. Montanarella (2006), *Potential synergies between existing multilateral environmental agreements in the implementation of Land Use, Land Use Change and Forestry activities*, **FNU-123** (submitted).
- Kuik, O.J., B. Buchner, M. Catenacci, A. Gorla, E. Karakaya and R.S.J. Tol (2006), *Methodological Aspects of Recent Climate Change Damage Cost Studies*, **FNU-122** (submitted).
- Anthoff, D., C. Hepburn and R.S.J. Tol (2006), *Equity Weighting and the Marginal Damage Costs of Climate Change*, **FNU-121** (submitted).
- Tol, R.S.J. (2006), *The Impact of a Carbon Tax on International Tourism*, **FNU-120** (forthcoming, *Transportation Research D: Transport and the Environment*).
- Rehdanz, K. and D.J. Maddison (2006), *Local Environmental Quality and Life Satisfaction in Germany*, **FNU-119** (submitted).
- Tanaka, K., R.S.J. Tol, D. Rokityanskiy, B.C. O'Neill and M. Obersteiner (2006), *Evaluating Global Warming Potentials as Historical Temperature Proxies: An Application of ACC2 Inverse Calculation*, **FNU-118** (submitted).
- Berrittella, M., K. Rehdanz and R.S.J. Tol (2006), *The Economic Impact of the South-North Water Transfer Project in China: A Computable General Equilibrium Analysis*, **FNU-117** (submitted).
- Tol, R.S.J. (2006), *Why Worry about Climate Change? A Research Agenda*, **FNU-116** (submitted, *Review of Environmental Economics and Policy*).
- Hamilton, J.M. and R.S.J. Tol (2006), *The Impact of Climate Change on Tourism in Germany, the UK and Ireland: A Simulation Study*, **FNU-115** (submitted, *Regional Environmental Change*).
- Schwoon, M., F. Alkemade, K. Frenken and M.P. Hekkert (2006), *Flexible transition strategies towards future well-to-wheel chains: an evolutionary modelling approach*, **FNU-114** (submitted).
- Ronneberger, K., L. Criscuolo, W. Knorr and R.S.J. Tol (2006), *KLUM@LPJ: Integrating dynamic land-use decisions into a dynamic global vegetation and crop growth model to assess the impacts of a changing climate. A feasibility study for Europe*, **FNU-113** (submitted).
- Schwoon, M. (2006), *Learning-by-doing, Learning Spillovers and the Diffusion of Fuel Cell Vehicles*, **FNU-112** (submitted).
- Strzepek, K.M., G.W. Yohe, R.S.J. Tol and M. Rosegrant (2006), *The Value of the High Aswan Dam to the Egyptian Economy*, **FNU-111** (submitted).
- Schwoon, M. (2006), *A Tool to Optimize the Initial Distribution of Hydrogen Filling Stations*, **FNU-110** (forthcoming, *Transportation Research D: Transport and the Environment*).
- Tol, R.S.J., K.L. Ebi and G.W. Yohe (2006), *Infectious Disease, Development, and Climate Change: A Scenario Analysis*, **FNU-109** (forthcoming, *Environment and Development Economics*).
- Lau, M.A. (2006), *An analysis of the travel motivation of tourists from the People's Republic of China*, **FNU-108** (submitted).



- 
- Lau, M.A. and R.S.J. Tol (2006), *The Chinese are coming – An analysis of the preferences of Chinese holiday makers at home and abroad*, **FNU-107** (submitted, *Tourism Management*).
- Röckmann, C., R.S.J. Tol, U.A. Schneider, and M.A. St.John (2006), *Rebuilding the Eastern Baltic cod stock under environmental change - Part II: The economic viability of a marine protected area*, **FNU-106** (submitted)
- Ronneberger, K., M. Berrittella, F. Bosello and R.S.J. Tol (2006), *HKLUM@GTAPH: Introducing biophysical aspects of land-use decisions into a general equilibrium model. A coupling experiment*, **FNU-105** (submitted).
- Link, P.M. and Tol, R.S.J. (2006), *Economic impacts on key Barents Sea fisheries arising from changes in the strength of the Atlantic thermohaline circulation*, **FNU-104** (submitted).
- Link, P.M. and Tol, R.S.J. (2006), *The economic impact of a shutdown of the Thermohaline Circulation: an application of FUND*, **FNU-103** (submitted).
- Tol, R.S.J. (2006), *Integrated Assessment Modelling*, **FNU-102** (submitted).
- Tol, R.S.J. (2006), *Carbon Dioxide Emission Scenarios for the USA*, **FNU-101** (submitted, *Energy Policy*).
- Tol, R.S.J., S.W. Pacala and R.H. Socolow (2006), *Understanding Long-Term Energy Use and Carbon Dioxide Emissions in the USA*, **FNU-100** (submitted).
- Sesabo, J.K, H. Lang and R.S.J. Tol (2006), *Perceived Attitude and Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) establishment: Why households' characteristics matters in Coastal resources conservation initiatives in Tanzania*, **FNU-99** (submitted).
- Tol, R.S.J. (2006), *The Polluter Pays Principle and Cost-Benefit Analysis of Climate Change: An Application of FUND*, **FNU-98** (submitted, *Environmental and Resource Economics*)
- Tol, R.S.J. and G.W. Yohe (2006), *The Weakest Link Hypothesis for Adaptive Capacity: An Empirical Test*, **FNU-97** (forthcoming, *Global Environmental Change*)
- Berrittella, M., K. Rehdanz, R.Roson and R.S.J. Tol (2005), *The Economic Impact of Water Pricing: A Computable General Equilibrium Analysis*, **FNU-96** (submitted)
- Sesabo, J.K. and R. S. J. Tol (2005), *Technical Efficiency and Small-scale Fishing Households in Tanzanian coastal Villages: An Empirical Analysis*, **FNU-95** (submitted)
- Lau, M.A. (2005), *Adaptation to Sea-level Rise in the People's Republic of China – Assessing the Institutional Dimension of Alternative Organisational Frameworks*, **FNU-94** (submitted)
- Berrittella, M., A.Y. Hoekstra, K. Rehdanz, R. Roson and R.S.J. Tol (2005), *The Economic Impact of Restricted Water Supply: A Computable General Equilibrium Analysis*, **FNU-93** (forthcoming, *Water Research*)
- Tol, R.S.J. (2005), *Europe's Long Term Climate Target: A Critical Evaluation*, **FNU-92** (*Energy Policy*, **35** (1), 424-434)
- Hamilton, J.M. (2005), *Coastal Landscape and the Hedonic Price of Accommodation*, **FNU-91** (submitted)
- Hamilton, J.M., D.J. Maddison and R.S.J. Tol (2005), *Climate Preferences and Destination Choice: A Segmentation Approach*, **FNU-90** (submitted)
- Zhou, Y. and R.S.J. Tol (2005), *Valuing the Health Impacts from Particulate Air Pollution in Tianjin*, **FNU-89** (submitted)
- Röckmann, C. (2005), *International Cooperation for Sustainable Fisheries in the Baltic Sea*, **FNU-88** (forthcoming, in Ehlers,P./Lagoni,R. (Eds.): *International Maritime Organisations and their Contribution towards a Sustainable Marine Development.*)
- Ceronsky, M., D. Anthoff, C. Hepburn and R.S.J. Tol (2005), *Checking the price tag on catastrophe: The social cost of carbon under non-linear climate response* **FNU-87** (submitted, *Climatic Change*)

- 
- Zandersen, M. and R.S.J. Tol (2005), *A Meta-analysis of Forest Recreation Values in Europe*, **FNU-86** (submitted, *Journal of Environmental Management*)
- Heinzow, T., R.S.J. Tol and B. Brümmer (2005), Offshore-Windstromerzeugung in der Nordsee - eine ökonomische und ökologische Sackgasse? **FNU-85** (*Energiewirtschaftliche Tagesfragen*, **56** (3), 68-73)
- Röckmann, C., U.A. Schneider, M.A. St.John, and R.S.J. Tol (2005), *Rebuilding the Eastern Baltic cod stock under environmental change - a preliminary approach using stock, environmental, and management constraints*, **FNU-84** (forthcoming, *Natural Resource Modeling*)
- Tol, R.S.J. and G.W. Yohe (2005), *Infinite uncertainty, forgotten feedbacks, and cost-benefit analysis of climate policy*, **FNU-83** (submitted, *Climatic Change*)
- Osmani, D. and R.S.J. Tol (2005), *The case of two self-enforcing international agreements for environmental protection*, **FNU-82** (submitted)
- Schneider, U.A. and B.A. McCarl, (2005), *Appraising Agricultural Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Potentials: Effects of Alternative Assumptions*, **FNU-81** (submitted)
- Zandersen, M., M. Termansen, and F.S. Jensen, (2005), *Valuing new forest sites over time: the case of afforestation and recreation in Denmark*, **FNU-80** (submitted)
- Guillerminet, M.-L. and R.S.J. Tol (2005), *Decision making under catastrophic risk and learning: the case of the possible collapse of the West Antarctic Ice Sheet*, **FNU-79** (submitted, *Climatic Change*)
- Nicholls, R.J., R.S.J. Tol and A.T. Vafeidis (2005), *Global estimates of the impact of a collapse of the West Antarctic Ice Sheet: An application of FUND*, **FNU-78** (submitted, *Climatic Change*)
- Lonsdale, K., T.E. Downing, R.J. Nicholls, D. Parker, A.T. Vafeidis, R. Dawson and J.W. Hall (2005), *Plausible responses to the threat of rapid sea-level rise for the Thames Estuary*, **FNU-77** (submitted, *Climatic Change*)
- Poumadère, M., C. Mays, G. Pfeifle with A.T. Vafeidis (2005), *Worst Case Scenario and Stakeholder Group Decision: A 5-6 Meter Sea Level Rise in the Rhone Delta, France*, **FNU-76** (submitted, *Climatic Change*)
- Olsthoorn, A.A., P.E. van der Werff, L.M. Bouwer and D. Huitema (2005), *Neo-Atlantis: Dutch Responses to Five Meter Sea Level Rise*, **FNU-75** (submitted, *Climatic Change*)
- Toth, F.L. and E. Hizsnyik (2005), *Managing the inconceivable: Participatory assessments of impacts and responses to extreme climate change*, **FNU-74** (submitted, *Climatic Change*)
- Kasperson, R.E. M.T. Bohn and R. Goble (2005), *Assessing the risks of a future rapid large sea level rise: A review*, **FNU-73** (submitted, *Climatic Change*)
- Schleupner, C. (2005), *Evaluation of coastal squeeze and beach reduction and its consequences for the Caribbean island Martinique*, **FNU-72** (submitted)
- Schleupner, C. (2005), *Spatial Analysis As Tool for Sensitivity Assessment of Sea Level Rise Impacts on Martinique*, **FNU-71** (submitted)
- Sesabo, J.K. and R.S.J. Tol (2005), *Factors affecting Income Strategies among households in Tanzanian Coastal Villages: Implication for Development-Conservation Initiatives*, **FNU-70** (submitted)
- Fisher, B.S., G. Jakeman, H.M. Pant, M. Schwoon. and R.S.J. Tol (2005), *CHIMP: A Simple Population Model for Use in Integrated Assessment of Global Environmental Change*, **FNU-69** (*Integrated Assessment Journal*, **6** (3), 1-33)
- Rehdanz, K. and R.S.J. Tol (2005), *A No Cap But Trade Proposal for Greenhouse Gas Emission Reduction Targets for Brazil, China and India*, **FNU-68** (submitted, *Climate Policy*)
- Zhou, Y. and R.S.J. Tol (2005), *Water Use in China's Domestic, Industrial and Agricultural Sectors: An Empirical Analysis*, **FNU-67** (*Water Science and Technology: Water Supply*, **5** (6), 85-93)

- 
- Rehdanz, K. (2005), *Determinants of Residential Space Heating Expenditures in Germany*, **FNU-66** (forthcoming, *Energy Economics*)
- Ronneberger, K., R.S.J. Tol and U.A. Schneider (2005), *KLUM: A Simple Model of Global Agricultural Land Use as a Coupling Tool of Economy and Vegetation*, **FNU-65** (submitted, *Climatic Change*)
- Tol, R.S.J. (2005), *The Benefits of Greenhouse Gas Emission Reduction: An Application of FUND*, **FNU-64** (submitted, *Global Environmental Change*)
- Röckmann, C., M.A. St.John, U.A. Schneider, F.W. Köster, F.W. and R.S.J. Tol (2006), *Testing the implications of a permanent or seasonal marine reserve on the population dynamics of Eastern Baltic cod under varying environmental conditions*, **FNU-63-revised** (submitted)
- Letsoalo, A., J. Blignaut, T. de Wet, M. de Wit, S. Hess, R.S.J. Tol and J. van Heerden (2005), *Triple Dividends of Water Consumption Charges in South Africa*, **FNU-62** (forthcoming, *Water Resources Research*)
- Zandersen, M., Termansen, M., Jensen, F.S. (2005), *Benefit Transfer over Time of Ecosystem Values: the Case of Forest Recreation*, **FNU-61** (submitted)
- Rehdanz, K., Jung, M., Tol, R.S.J. and Wetzel, P. (2005), *Ocean Carbon Sinks and International Climate Policy*, **FNU-60** (*Energy Policy*, **34**, 3516-3526)
- Schwoon, M. (2005), *Simulating the Adoption of Fuel Cell Vehicles*, **FNU-59** (submitted)
- Bigano, A., J.M. Hamilton and R.S.J. Tol (2005), *The Impact of Climate Change on Domestic and International Tourism: A Simulation Study*, **FNU-58** (submitted)
- Bosello, F., R. Roson and R.S.J. Tol (2004), *Economy-wide estimates of the implications of climate change: Human health*, **FNU-57** (*Ecological Economics*, **58**, 579-591)
- Hamilton, J.M. and M.A. Lau (2004) *The role of climate information in tourist destination choice decision-making*, **FNU-56** (forthcoming, Gössling, S. and C.M. Hall (eds.), *Tourism and Global Environmental Change*. London: Routledge)
- Bigano, A., J.M. Hamilton and R.S.J. Tol (2004), *The impact of climate on holiday destination choice*, **FNU-55** (*Climatic Change*, **76** (3-4), 389-406)
- Bigano, A., J.M. Hamilton, M. Lau, R.S.J. Tol and Y. Zhou (2004), *A global database of domestic and international tourist numbers at national and subnational level*, **FNU-54** (forthcoming, *International Journal of Tourism Research*)
- Susandi, A. and R.S.J. Tol (2004), *Impact of international emission reduction on energy and forestry sector of Indonesia*, **FNU-53** (submitted)
- Hamilton, J.M. and R.S.J. Tol (2004), *The Impact of Climate Change on Tourism and Recreation*, **FNU-52** (forthcoming, Schlesinger et al. (eds.), Cambridge University Press)
- Schneider, U.A. (2004), *Land Use Decision Modelling with Soil Status Dependent Emission Rates*, **FNU-51** (submitted)
- Link, P.M., U.A. Schneider and R.S.J. Tol (2004), *Economic impacts of changes in fish population dynamics: the role of the fishermen's harvesting strategies*, **FNU-50HH** (submitted)
- Berritella, M., A. Bigano, R. Roson and R.S.J. Tol (2004), *A General Equilibrium Analysis of Climate Change Impacts on Tourism*, **FNU-49HH** (*Tourism Management*, **27** (5), 913-924)
- Tol, R.S.J. (2004), *The Double Trade-Off between Adaptation and Mitigation for Sea Level Rise: An Application of FUND*, **FNU-48** (forthcoming, *Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies for Global Change*)
- Erdil, E. and Yetkiner, I.H. (2004), *A Panel Data Approach for Income-Health Causality*, **FNU-47**
- Tol, R.S.J. (2004), *Multi-Gas Emission Reduction for Climate Change Policy: An Application of FUND*, **FNU-46** (forthcoming, *Energy Journal*)
- Tol, R.S.J. (2004), *Exchange Rates and Climate Change: An Application of FUND*, **FNU-45** (*Climatic Change*, **75**, 59-80)

- 
- Gaitan, B., Tol, R.S.J. and Yetkiner, I. Hakan (2004), *The Hotelling's Rule Revisited in a Dynamic General Equilibrium Model*, **FNU-44** (submitted)
- Rehdanz, K. and Tol, R.S.J (2004), *On Multi-Period Allocation of Tradable Emission Permits*, **FNU-43** (submitted)
- Link, P.M. and Tol, R.S.J. (2004), *Possible Economic Impacts of a Shutdown of the Thermohaline Circulation: An Application of FUND*, **FNU-42** (*Portuguese Economic Journal*, **3**, 99-114)
- Zhou, Y. and Tol, R.S.J. (2004), *Evaluating the costs of desalination and water transport*, **FNU-41** (*Water Resources Research*, **41** (3), W03003)
- Lau, M. (2004), *Küstenzonenmanagement in der Volksrepublik China und Anpassungsstrategien an den Meeresspiegelanstieg*, **FNU-40** (*Coastline Reports*, Issue 1, pp.213-224.)
- Rehdanz, K. and Maddison, D. (2004), *The Amenity Value of Climate to German Households*, **FNU-39** (submitted)
- Bosello, F., Lazzarin, M., Roson, R. and Tol, R.S.J. (2004), *Economy-wide Estimates of the Implications of Climate Change: Sea Level Rise*, **FNU-38** (submitted, *Environmental and Resource Economics*)
- Schwoon, M. and Tol, R.S.J. (2004), *Optimal CO<sub>2</sub>-abatement with socio-economic inertia and induced technological change*, **FNU-37** (submitted, *Energy Journal*)
- Hamilton, J.M., Maddison, D.J. and Tol, R.S.J. (2004), *The Effects of Climate Change on International Tourism*, **FNU-36** (*Climate Research*, **29**, 255-268)
- Hansen, O. and R.S.J. Tol (2003), *A Refined Inglehart Index of Materialism and Postmaterialism*, **FNU-35** (submitted)
- Heinzow, T. and R.S.J. Tol (2003), *Prediction of Crop Yields across four Climate Zones in Germany: An Artificial Neural Network Approach*, **FNU-34** (submitted, *Climate Research*)
- Tol, R.S.J. (2003), *Adaptation and Mitigation: Trade-offs in Substance and Methods*, **FNU-33** (*Environmental Science and Policy*, **8** (6), 572-578)
- Tol, R.S.J. and T. Heinzow (2003), *Estimates of the External and Sustainability Costs of Climate Change*, **FNU-32** (submitted)
- Hamilton, J.M., Maddison, D.J. and Tol, R.S.J. (2003), *Climate change and international tourism: a simulation study*, **FNU-31** (*Global Environmental Change*, **15** (3), 253-266)
- Link, P.M. and R.S.J. Tol (2003), *Economic impacts of changes in population dynamics of fish on the fisheries in the Barents Sea*, **FNU-30** (*ICES Journal of Marine Science*, **63** (4), 611-625)
- Link, P.M. (2003), *Auswirkungen populationsdynamischer Veränderungen in Fischbeständen auf die Fischereiwirtschaft in der Barentssee*, **FNU-29** (*Essener Geographische Arbeiten*, **35**, 179-202)
- Lau, M. (2003), *Coastal Zone Management in the People's Republic of China – An Assessment of Structural Impacts on Decision-making Processes*, **FNU-28** (*Ocean & Coastal Management*, No. 48 (2005), pp. 115-159.)
- Lau, M. (2003), *Coastal Zone Management in the People's Republic of China – A Unique Approach?*, **FNU-27** (*China Environment Series*, Issue 6, pp. 120-124;  
<http://www.wilsoncenter.org/topics/pubs/7-commentaries.pdf> )
- Roson, R. and R.S.J. Tol (2003), *An Integrated Assessment Model of Economy-Energy-Climate – The Model Wiagem: A Comment*, **FNU-26** (*Integrated Assessment*, **6** (1), 75-82)
- Yetkiner, I.H. (2003), *Is There An Indispensable Role For Government During Recovery From An Earthquake? A Theoretical Elaboration*, **FNU-25**
- Yetkiner, I.H. (2003), *A Short Note On The Solution Procedure Of Barro And Sala-i-Martin for Restoring Constancy Conditions*, **FNU-24**
- Schneider, U.A. and B.A. McCarl (2003), *Measuring Abatement Potentials When Multiple Change is Present: The Case of Greenhouse Gas Mitigation in U.S. Agriculture and Forestry*, **FNU-23** (submitted)

- 
- Zhou, Y. and Tol, R.S.J. (2003), *The Implications of Desalination to Water Resources in China - an Economic Perspective*, **FNU-22** (*Desalination*, **163** (4), 225-240)
- Yetkiner, I.H., de Vaal, A., and van Zon, A. (2003), *The Cyclical Advancement of Drastic Technologies*, **FNU-21**
- Rehdanz, K. and Maddison, D. (2003) *Climate and Happiness*, **FNU-20** (*Ecological Economics*, **52** 111-125)
- Tol, R.S.J., (2003), *The Marginal Costs of Carbon Dioxide Emissions: An Assessment of the Uncertainties*, **FNU-19** (*Energy Policy*, **33** (16), 2064-2074).
- Lee, H.C., B.A. McCarl, U.A. Schneider, and C.C. Chen (2003), *Leakage and Comparative Advantage Implications of Agricultural Participation in Greenhouse Gas Emission Mitigation*, **FNU-18** (submitted).
- Schneider, U.A. and B.A. McCarl (2003), *Implications of a Carbon Based Energy Tax for U.S. Agriculture*, **FNU-17** (submitted).
- Tol, R.S.J. (2002), *Climate, Development, and Malaria: An Application of FUND*, **FNU-16** (forthcoming, *Climatic Change*).
- Hamilton, J.M. (2003), *Climate and the Destination Choice of German Tourists*, **FNU-15** (revised and submitted).
- Tol, R.S.J. (2002), *Technology Protocols for Climate Change: An Application of FUND*, **FNU-14** (*Climate Policy*, **4**, 269-287).
- Rehdanz, K (2002), *Hedonic Pricing of Climate Change Impacts to Households in Great Britain*, **FNU-13** (forthcoming, *Climatic Change*).
- Tol, R.S.J. (2002), *Emission Abatement Versus Development As Strategies To Reduce Vulnerability To Climate Change: An Application Of FUND*, **FNU-12** (forthcoming, *Environment and Development Economics*).
- Rehdanz, K. and Tol, R.S.J. (2002), *On National and International Trade in Greenhouse Gas Emission Permits*, **FNU-11** (*Ecological Economics*, **54**, 397-416).
- Fankhauser, S. and Tol, R.S.J. (2001), *On Climate Change and Growth*, **FNU-10** (*Resource and Energy Economics*, **27**, 1-17).
- Tol, R.S.J. and Verheyen, R. (2001), *Liability and Compensation for Climate Change Damages – A Legal and Economic Assessment*, **FNU-9** (*Energy Policy*, **32** (9), 1109-1130).
- Yohe, G. and R.S.J. Tol (2001), *Indicators for Social and Economic Coping Capacity – Moving Toward a Working Definition of Adaptive Capacity*, **FNU-8** (*Global Environmental Change*, **12** (1), 25-40).
- Kemfert, C., W. Lise and R.S.J. Tol (2001), *Games of Climate Change with International Trade*, **FNU-7** (*Environmental and Resource Economics*, **28**, 209-232).
- Tol, R.S.J., W. Lise, B. Morel and B.C.C. van der Zwaan (2001), *Technology Development and Diffusion and Incentives to Abate Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, **FNU-6** (submitted).
- Kemfert, C. and R.S.J. Tol (2001), *Equity, International Trade and Climate Policy*, **FNU-5** (*International Environmental Agreements*, **2**, 23-48).
- Tol, R.S.J., Downing T.E., Fankhauser S., Richels R.G. and Smith J.B. (2001), *Progress in Estimating the Marginal Costs of Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, **FNU-4**. (*Pollution Atmosphérique – Numéro Spécial: Combien Vaut l’Air Propre?*, 155-179).
- Tol, R.S.J. (2000), *How Large is the Uncertainty about Climate Change?*, **FNU-3** (*Climatic Change*, **56** (3), 265-289).
- Tol, R.S.J., S. Fankhauser, R.G. Richels and J.B. Smith (2000), *How Much Damage Will Climate Change Do? Recent Estimates*, **FNU-2** (*World Economics*, **1** (4), 179-206)
- Lise, W. and R.S.J. Tol (2000), *Impact of Climate on Tourism Demand*, **FNU-1** (*Climatic Change*, **55** (4), 429-449).