## MIDS WORKING PAPER NO. 213

# Economics of Adaptation to Climate Change: Learning from Impact and Vulnerability Literature

## Chandra Sekhar Bahinipati

Research Scholar Madras Institute of Development Studies



Studies

### MIDS Working Paper No. 213, January 2011

*Economics of Adaptation to Climate Change:* 

Learning from Impact and Vulnerability Literature

by Chandra Sekhar Bahinipati Rs.25.00

> Madras Institute of Development Studies 79, Second Main Road, Gandhi Nagar Adyar, Chennai 600 020 Tel.: 2441 1574/2589/2295/9771 Fax : 91-44-24910872 pub@mids.ac.in http://www.mids.ac.in

### Learning from Impact and Vulnerability Literature

#### Abstract

In the international arena, two broad policy responses have emerged to deal with negative impact of climate change, i.e. 'mitigation' and 'adaptation'. Though adaptation is required to reduce un-mitigated climatic impact, the ongoing international climate conventions and scholarly studies have given less emphasis to it in comparison to mitigation. In climate change economics literature, the notion adaptation has been used in two discourses: 'impact' and 'vulnerability', and both are different in the context of not only addressing research question but also assessing adaptive capacity. Assuming adaptation as 'static or end-point' approach, the impact studies have estimated potential impact cost, which involves both adaptation and residual or un-mitigated impact cost, based on projected emission scenarios now and forever. The vulnerability studies, in contrast, have presumed adaptation as 'starting-point' approach, and assessed risk of an entity within the broader social, economic, political and environmental context. In the context of adaptation, the former (impact) assumes clairvoyant farmer hypothesis, and hence, suggests climate specific adaptations. The later (vulnerability), on the other hand, views adaptation as the current ability of a person to cope with risk and secure livelihoods, which in particular assessing vulnerability, who adapts and his/ her risk attitude behaviour, and process of occurring adaptations. Though the purpose of both is to reduce negative impact through adaptation, the present study surveys both the sets of studies based on two questions: how the notion of adaptation is being articulated and to what extent their findings are useful for implementing and facilitating adaptations.

*Key Word:* climate change, adaptation, impact, and vulnerability

Acknowledgement: I am grateful to my Ph.D. supervisor Dr. L Venkatachalam for sincere guidance, support and also correction on an earlier manuscript, and I am therefore able to make an effort to write this paper. I would like to sincerely thank Prof. K.S. Kavi Kumar for giving me an opportunity to prepare a review on 'cost of adapting to climate change: concepts, issues and estimates', which has provided useful inputs to write this paper. I am also grateful to S Arvind, Ajit Menon, G. Uma, Vani Joseph and Nirmal Roy for comments on an earlier draft, and Roseliz Francis for language correction.

#### 1. Introduction

### Learning from Impact and Vulnerability Literature

#### Abstract

In the international arena, two broad policy responses have emerged to deal with negative impact of climate change, i.e. 'mitigation' and 'adaptation'. Though adaptation is required to reduce un-mitigated climatic impact, the ongoing international climate conventions and scholarly studies have given less emphasis to it in comparison to mitigation. In climate change economics literature, the notion adaptation has been used in two discourses: 'impact' and 'vulnerability', and both are different in the context of not only addressing research question but also assessing adaptive capacity. Assuming adaptation as 'static or end-point' approach, the impact studies have estimated potential impact cost, which involves both adaptation and residual or un-mitigated impact cost, based on projected emission scenarios now and forever. The vulnerability studies, in contrast, have presumed adaptation as 'starting-point' approach, and assessed risk of an entity within the broader social, economic, political and environmental context. In the context of adaptation, the former (impact) assumes clairvoyant farmer hypothesis, and hence, suggests climate specific adaptations. The later (vulnerability), on the other hand, views adaptation as the current ability of a person to cope with risk and secure livelihoods, which in particular assessing vulnerability, who adapts and his/ her risk attitude behaviour, and process of occurring adaptations. Though the purpose of both is to reduce negative impact through adaptation, the present study surveys both the sets of studies based on two questions: how the notion of adaptation is being articulated and to what extent their findings are useful for implementing and facilitating adaptations.

*Key Word:* climate change, adaptation, impact, and vulnerability

Acknowledgement: I am grateful to my Ph.D. supervisor Dr. L Venkatachalam for sincere guidance, support and also correction on an earlier manuscript, and I am therefore able to make an effort to write this paper. I would like to sincerely thank Prof. K.S. Kavi Kumar for giving me an opportunity to prepare a review on 'cost of adapting to climate change: concepts, issues and estimates', which has provided useful inputs to write this paper. I am also grateful to S Arvind, Ajit Menon, G. Uma, Vani Joseph and Nirmal Roy for comments on an earlier draft, and Roseliz Francis for language correction.

#### 1. Introduction

## Learning from Impact and Vulnerability Literature

#### Abstract

In the international arena, two broad policy responses have emerged to deal with negative impact of climate change, i.e. 'mitigation' and 'adaptation'. Though adaptation is required to reduce un-mitigated climatic impact, the ongoing international climate conventions and scholarly studies have given less emphasis to it in comparison to mitigation. In climate change economics literature, the notion adaptation has been used in two discourses: 'impact' and 'vulnerability', and both are different in the context of not only addressing research question but also assessing adaptive capacity. Assuming adaptation as 'static or end-point' approach, the impact studies have estimated potential impact cost, which involves both adaptation and residual or un-mitigated impact cost, based on projected emission scenarios now and forever. The vulnerability studies, in contrast, have presumed adaptation as 'starting-point' approach, and assessed risk of an entity within the broader social, economic, political and environmental context. In the context of adaptation, the former (impact) assumes clairvoyant farmer hypothesis, and hence, suggests climate specific adaptations. The later (vulnerability), on the other hand, views adaptation as the current ability of a person to cope with risk and secure livelihoods, which in particular assessing vulnerability, who adapts and his/ her risk attitude behaviour, and process of occurring adaptations. Though the purpose of both is to reduce negative impact through adaptation, the present study surveys both the sets of studies based on two questions: how the notion of adaptation is being articulated and to what extent their findings are useful for implementing and facilitating adaptations.

*Key Word:* climate change, adaptation, impact, and vulnerability

Acknowledgement: I am grateful to my Ph.D. supervisor Dr. L Venkatachalam for sincere guidance, support and also correction on an earlier manuscript, and I am therefore able to make an effort to write this paper. I would like to sincerely thank Prof. K.S. Kavi Kumar for giving me an opportunity to prepare a review on 'cost of adapting to climate change: concepts, issues and estimates', which has provided useful inputs to write this paper. I am also grateful to S Arvind, Ajit Menon, G. Uma, Vani Joseph and Nirmal Roy for comments on an earlier draft, and Roseliz Francis for language correction.

#### 1. Introduction

Addressing the drivers of vulnerability, e.g. activities that seek to reduce poverty	Building adaptive capacity, e.g. improving literacy	Managing climate risk, e.g. providing weather forecasts and early warnings to	Addressing climate change risks, e.g. providing seed varieties that withstand wide
< farmers Vulnerability Focus			temperature Impact fluctuations Focus >

Figure 1: Viewing of adaptation in both the impact and vulnerability literature

Source : Adopted from McGray et al. (2007)

### **Economics of Adaptation to Climate Change:**

## Learning from Impact and Vulnerability Literature

#### Abstract

In the international arena, two broad policy responses have emerged to deal with negative impact of climate change, i.e. 'mitigation' and 'adaptation'. Though adaptation is required to reduce un-mitigated climatic impact, the ongoing international climate conventions and scholarly studies have given less emphasis to it in comparison to mitigation. In climate change economics literature, the notion adaptation has been used in two discourses: 'impact' and 'vulnerability', and both are different in the context of not only addressing research question but also assessing adaptive capacity. Assuming adaptation as 'static or end-point' approach, the impact studies have estimated potential impact cost, which involves both adaptation and residual or un-mitigated impact cost, based on projected emission scenarios now and forever. The vulnerability studies, in contrast, have presumed adaptation as 'starting-point' approach, and assessed risk of an entity within the broader social, economic, political and environmental context. In the context of adaptation, the former (impact) assumes clairvoyant farmer hypothesis, and hence, suggests climate specific adaptations. The later (vulnerability), on the other hand, views adaptation as the current ability of a person to cope with risk and secure livelihoods, which in particular assessing vulnerability, who adapts and his/ her risk attitude behaviour, and process of occurring adaptations. Though the purpose of both is to reduce negative impact through adaptation, the present study surveys both the sets of studies based on two questions: how the notion of adaptation is being articulated and to what extent their findings are useful for implementing and facilitating adaptations.

*Key Word:* climate change, adaptation, impact, and vulnerability

Acknowledgement: I am grateful to my Ph.D. supervisor Dr. L Venkatachalam for sincere guidance, support and also correction on an earlier manuscript, and I am therefore able to make an effort to write this paper. I would like to sincerely thank Prof. K.S. Kavi Kumar for giving me an opportunity to prepare a review on 'cost of adapting to climate change: 
 Table 1: Adaptation - Definition in Climate Change Context

Source : Fankhauser (1998); Schipper (2007); Ulsrud et al. (2008) and Smit et al. (2009)

### Learning from Impact and Vulnerability Literature

#### Abstract

In the international arena, two broad policy responses have emerged to deal with negative impact of climate change, i.e. 'mitigation' and 'adaptation'. Though adaptation is required to reduce un-mitigated climatic impact, the ongoing international climate conventions and scholarly studies have given less emphasis to it in comparison to mitigation. In climate change economics literature, the notion adaptation has been used in two discourses: 'impact' and 'vulnerability', and both are different in the context of not only addressing research question but also assessing adaptive capacity. Assuming adaptation as 'static or end-point' approach, the impact studies have estimated potential impact cost, which involves both adaptation and residual or un-mitigated impact cost, based on projected emission scenarios now and forever. The vulnerability studies, in contrast, have presumed adaptation as 'starting-point' approach, and assessed risk of an entity within the broader social, economic, political and environmental context. In the context of adaptation, the former (impact) assumes clairvoyant farmer hypothesis, and hence, suggests climate specific adaptations. The later (vulnerability), on the other hand, views adaptation as the current ability of a person to cope with risk and secure livelihoods, which in particular assessing vulnerability, who adapts and his/ her risk attitude behaviour, and process of occurring adaptations. Though the purpose of both is to reduce negative impact through adaptation, the present study surveys both the sets of studies based on two questions: how the notion of adaptation is being articulated and to what extent their findings are useful for implementing and facilitating adaptations.

*Key Word:* climate change, adaptation, impact, and vulnerability

Acknowledgement: I am grateful to my Ph.D. supervisor Dr. L Venkatachalam for sincere guidance, support and also correction on an earlier manuscript, and I am therefore able to make an effort to write this paper. I would like to sincerely thank Prof. K.S. Kavi Kumar for giving me an opportunity to prepare a review on 'cost of adapting to climate change: concepts, issues and estimates', which has provided useful inputs to write this paper. I am also grateful to S Arvind, Ajit Menon, G. Uma, Vani Joseph and Nirmal Roy for comments on an earlier draft, and Roseliz Francis for language correction.

#### 1. Introduction

## Learning from Impact and Vulnerability Literature

#### Abstract

Table 2 thest international material two larged applications as parses idea of the Worldmerged to deal with negative impact of climate change, i.e. 'mitigation' and 'adaptation'. Though adaptation is required to reduce un-mitigated climatic impact, the ongoing international climate conventions and scholarly studies have given less emphasis to it in comparison to mitigation. In climate change economics literature, the notion adaptation has been used in two discourses: 'impact' and 'vulnerability', and both are different in the context of not only addressing research question but also assessing adaptive capacity. Assuming adaptation as 'static or end-point' approach, the impact studies have estimated potential impact cost, which involves both adaptation and residual or un-mitigated impact cost, based on projected emission scenarios now and forever. The vulnerability studies, in contrast, have presumed adaptation as 'starting-point' approach, and assessed risk of an entity within the broader social, economic, political and environmental context. In the context of adaptation, the former (impact) assumes clairvoyant farmer hypothesis, and hence, suggests climate specific adaptations. The later (vulnerability), on the other hand, views adaptation as the current ability of a person to cope with risk and secure livelihoods, which in particular assessing vulnerability, who adapts and his/ her risk attitude behaviour, and process of occurring adaptations. Though the purpose of both is to reduce negative impact through

Note-dapte giobal than Brocket logget up to the point of the segred matter in origin expediated on two aquestions in how the inotion roof acting that we apply that Mender and the aquestions in how the inotion roof acting the segreg are apply to regions by Tol (2008) for reasons of comparability: e Maddison only considers market apply on house of the second different models e.g. Parallel Climate Model (MeXM) Mother for a general action of both experimental and crosssectiation abolisty (CGCM1); and g Estimation of both experimental and crosssectiation and an article in the second of the second of the second actions of the second actions of the second action of both experimental and crosssectiation abolisty (CGCM1); and g Estimation of both experimental and crosssectiation action of the second of t

Venkatachalam for sincere guidance, 44 support and also Source Mendelsonn et al. 2008; 165, and 161 (2008, 441) point and therefore able to make an effort to write this paper. I would like to sincerely thank Prof. K.S. Kavi Kumar for giving me an opportunity to prepare a review on 'cost of adapting to climate change: concepts, issues and estimates', which has provided useful inputs to write this paper. I am also grateful to S Arvind, Ajit Menon, G. Uma, Vani Joseph and Nirmal Roy for comments on an earlier draft, and Roseliz Francis for language correction.

#### 1. Introduction