Uncertainty in land resource projection associated with constant, bioclimatic land units in an integrated assessment model

Alan V. Di Vittorio Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory

With special thanks to Page Kyle and Pralit Patel

Joint LMWG/SDWG Meeting Boulder, CO, 4 March 2015



CLIMATE & CARBON SCIENCES PROGRAM



Global distributions of Paddy Rice Production

PaddyRice production cumulative distribution comparison



AEZ boundaries affect projected land use/cover



3

IAMs have different regions/land units

 Unquantified spatial uncertainty confounds intermodel comparison and ensemble analysis

Model	Regions	Land units for projection
IMAGE (RCP 2.6)	26	half-degree grid
MiniCAM (RCP 4.5)	14	GCAM: 151 land units
AIM (RCP 6.0)	24	half-degree grid
MESSAGE (RCP 8.5)		half-degree grid

Land cover inconsistencies across IAMs and ESMs can alter the global carbon cycle



Different land use/cover representations in ESMs obscure land use change effects on regional climate

• Uncertainty chain:

Ð

- IAM land use spatial uncertainty
- Land use/cover translation
- ESM land cover



Temperature effect of RCP 8.5 land use change for 2071-2100 (Brovkin et al. 2013)



In the context of coupled whole earth system modeling

 How do we make robust projections of land resources in the context of projected climate change?

 How do spatial boundaries influence land resource projection?

SDWG principles

Uncertainty in CESM inputs fosters dialogue

 Highlights need for CESM land use/cover/ management development



¹⁰ Current land units become heterogeneous

ECHAM 2100 AEZs – original baseline AEZs



Workflow to create new AgLU crop and land rent inputs

77



¹² Data required to create new AgLU crop and land rent inputs

Spatially explicit data
VMAP0 countries (246)
AEZ countries (160)

- •SAGE data:
 - crop yield, area
 - cropland
 - pasture
 - land area
 - potential vegetation
- •HYDE3.1 data:
 - urban
 - land area
- AEZ boundaries

Tabular data

- •GTAP countries (226, 87)
- •FAO countries (241)
- •GTAP (SAGE) crops
- •GTAP use sector
- •GTAP land rent
- •FAO crops
- FAO crop production
- •FAO producer prices
- •FAO crop yield, area
 - for recalibration

<u>New land data system is robust</u> <u>e.g., Paddy Rice for 226 countries</u>

PaddyRice production cumulative distribution comparison

PaddyRice % production difference histogram comparison



13

New land data system is robust

14

e.g., forest land rent



15 Each crop is uniquely affected by new land units

Wheat production cumulative distribution comparison

PaddyRice production cumulative distribution comparison



16 <u>AEZ boundaries affect projected land use/cover</u>

SE Asia percent change in land area (new minus old)



AEZ boundaries affect crop production

Global percent change in crop production (new minus old)



AEZ boundaries affect crop prices

Global percent change in crop prices (new minus old)

18



AEZ boundaries affect biomass energy

Percent change in biomass energy (new minus old)



AEZ boundaries affect LULCC emissions

Change in LULCC emissions (MtC/yr) (new minus old)



20

<u>Summary</u>

- Reproducibility: New land data system performs better than GTAP with respect to FAO data
- Global distributions of crop production, harvested area, and forest land rent are different between the original and new land units
- Global and regional land resource projections are different between original and new land units
- •Feedbacks: climate, impact, and land use

 Reproducibility: New land data system performs better than GTAP with respect to FAO data

 Global distributions of crop production, harvested area, and forest land rent are different between the original and new land units

 Global and regional land resource projections are different between original and new land units

•Feedbacks: climate, impact, and land use

- Reproducibility: New land data system performs better than GTAP with respect to FAO data
- Global distributions of crop production, harvested area, and forest land rent are different between the original and new land units
- Global and regional land resource projections are different between original and new land units
- •Feedbacks: climate, impact, and land use

- Reproducibility: New land data system performs better than GTAP with respect to FAO data
- Global distributions of crop production, harvested area, and forest land rent are different between the original and new land units
- Global and regional land resource projections are different between original and new land units
- •Feedbacks: climate, impact, and land use

- Reproducibility: New land data system performs better than GTAP with respect to FAO data
- Global distributions of crop production, harvested area, and forest land rent are different between the original and new land units
- Global and regional land resource projections are different between original and new land units
- Feedbacks: climate, impact, and land use

ECHAM 2071–2100 climate agro–ecological zones

This work is supported by the Director, Office of Science, Office of Biological and Environmental Research of the U.S. Department of Energy under Contract No. DE-AC02-05CH11231 as part of their Integrated Assessment Research Program.

Global distributions of Paddy Rice Production

14 regions

E 1

32 regions

E2 <u>AEZ boundaries affect projected land use/cover</u>

Global change in land area (percent; new minus old)

E3 Current land units become heterogeneous

Length of growing period (LGP): ECHAM 2100 – original

Current AEZs become heterogeneous

E-4-

Temperature zone (TZ): ECHAM 2100 – original

Current AEZs become heterogeneous

25

Length of growing period (for no TZ change): ECHAM 2100 – original

E6 <u>Current AEZs become heterogeneous</u>

Length of growing period (for +1 TZ change): ECHAM 2100 – original

