

Land-use and carbon cycle responses to moderate climate change: implications for land-based mitigation?

Florian Humpenöder^{1,2}, Alexander Popp¹, Miodrag Stevanovic^{1,2}, Christoph Müller¹,
Benjamin Leon Bodirsky^{1,2,3}, Markus Bonsch^{1,2}, Jan Philipp Dietrich¹, Hermann Lotze-
Campen^{1,4}, Isabelle Weindl^{1,4}, Anne Biewald¹ and Susanne Rolinski¹*

Affiliation of authors

¹ Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research (PIK), Potsdam, Germany

² Technische Universität Berlin (TU Berlin), Economics of Climate Change, Berlin, Germany

³ The Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO), Brisbane, Australia

⁴ Humboldt University of Berlin, Berlin, Germany

*Corresponding author

P.O. Box 60 12 03

14412 Potsdam


Email: humpenoeder@pik-potsdam.de

Phone: +49 331 288 2677

Abstract

Climate change has impacts on agricultural yields, which could alter cropland requirements and hence deforestation rates. Thus, land-use responses to climate change might influence terrestrial carbon stocks. Moreover, climate change could alter the carbon storage capacity of the terrestrial biosphere and hence the land-based mitigation potential. Here, we use a global spatially explicit economic land-use optimization model to a) estimate the mitigation potential of a climate policy that provides economic incentives for carbon stock conservation and enhancement, b) simulate land-use and carbon cycle responses to moderate climate change (RCP2.6), and c) investigate the combined effects throughout the 21st century. The climate policy immediately stops deforestation and strongly increases afforestation, resulting in a global mitigation potential of 191 GtC in 2100. Climate change increases terrestrial carbon stocks not only directly through enhanced carbon sequestration (62 GtC until 2100), but also indirectly through less deforestation due to higher crop yields (16 GtC until 2100). However, such beneficial climate impacts increase the potential of the climate policy only marginally, as the potential is already large under static climatic conditions. In the broader picture, this study highlights the importance of land-use dynamics for modelling carbon cycle responses to climate change in integrated assessment modelling.

TOC/Abstract figure for Environmental Science & Technology



Introduction

After fossil fuel combustion, deforestation is the second-largest source of anthropogenic carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions, currently accounting for about 12% of total anthropogenic CO₂ emissions^{1,2}. Land-based climate policies, such as the inclusion of CO₂ emissions from deforestation in carbon pricing mechanisms, could reduce deforestation and associated CO₂ emissions³. In addition to emission reductions, afforestation can enhance above- and belowground carbon stocks (hereafter summarized under the term *carbon stocks* unless indicated otherwise) since trees take up more CO₂ through photosynthesis than they respire and thereupon store the absorbed carbon in vegetation and soil (biological carbon sequestration and storage)^{4,5}. Therefore, afforestation can remove CO₂ from the atmosphere, which is also known as negative CO₂ emissions^{5,6}. Recent modelling studies show that feasibility and costs of ambitious climate targets, such as limiting the increase in global mean temperature to 2°C compared to preindustrial levels, strongly depend on the availability of carbon dioxide removal options, such as afforestation or bioenergy with Carbon Capture and Storage (CCS)^{7,8}.

The Representative Concentration Pathways (RCPs) describe future pathways for anthropogenic greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, atmospheric concentrations of GHGs and radiative forcing⁹. The RCP2.6, with a radiative forcing of 2.6 W/m² in 2100, is a scenario of moderate climate change and is consistent with the 2°C target¹⁰⁻¹². Even under the RCP2.6, current climatic conditions, such as temperature and precipitation, are subject to change in the course of the 21st century¹². Climate change is rather moderate under the RCP2.6 compared to scenarios with higher radiative forcing, such as the RCP8.5¹². Nevertheless, moderate climate change under the RCP2.6 has impacts on agricultural crop yields¹³. Rising temperatures and reduced precipitation typically have negative impacts on crop yields, while rising atmospheric CO₂ concentrations stimulate photosynthesis in C3 crops (CO₂ fertilization) and improve water use efficiency in all crops¹⁴⁻¹⁶. The net effect on crop productivity depends on the prevailing climatic conditions¹⁴. Changes in temperature, precipitation, radiation and CO₂ concentration (hereafter summarized under the term *climate change* unless indicated otherwise), can have positive effects on crop yields at low levels of climate change, especially in higher latitudes, while tropical regions are typically affected negatively even under low levels of warming^{13,17,18}. Increases in agricultural yields might reduce cropland requirements, which in turn could lower deforestation or free-up land for afforestation. Thus, direct effects of climate change on crop yields could indirectly affect carbon stocks through altered land management.

In addition, climate change has direct impacts on the carbon stocks of the terrestrial biosphere (in particular of forests). Similar to agricultural crops, climate change can reduce or increase carbon stocks, depending on the prevailing climatic conditions^{19,20}. Biophysical process models project that climate change increases global vegetation carbon stocks throughout the 21st century^{19,21}. Above 4°C additional global warming, the increase in global vegetation carbon stocks may stall or reverse²¹. Moreover, climate change affects not only actual carbon stocks but more general the carbon storage capacity of land, i.e. the potential of a unit of land to sequester and store carbon in vegetation and soil^{4,22}. The carbon storage capacity plays a central role for afforestation projects since it determines their mitigation potential. Hence, climate change could influence the mitigation potential of afforestation projects. Furthermore, climate impacts on carbon stocks are heterogeneous across the globe²¹. Thus, climate change could additionally alter the spatial suitability of land for afforestation.

Projecting the direct impacts of climate change on carbon stocks of the terrestrial biosphere is typically the domain of models that simulate carbon cycle feedbacks to climate change^{21,23}. However, such biophysical process models are not capable of simulating land-use responses

to climate change that might indirectly alter carbon stocks (e.g. less deforestation due to climate-change-induced crop yield gains). In principle, information from biophysical process models can be used in models with explicit land-use representation to account for both, direct and indirect carbon cycle responses to climate change. So far, detailed information on climate impacts from biophysical process models has been used in economic land-use models mainly with respect to crop yields^{24,25}, but associated carbon stock dynamics have not been addressed. With regards to land-based mitigation, economic land-use models and integrated assessment models (IAMs) with explicit land-use representation have been used to estimate the mitigation potential of deforestation avoidance and afforestation^{3,26–28}. However, none of these studies accounted for possible land-use responses to climate change (e.g. less deforestation due to climate-change induced crop yield increases that reduce cropland requirements) and their impacts on the terrestrial carbon balance. Few studies used an inverse approach by supplying time-series of land-use patterns derived from economic land-use models to biophysical process models for simulating the effects on carbon stocks^{29,30}.

Here, we use results from an energy-economy-climate model and a biophysical process model as input for an economic land-use optimization model. Both inputs, climate policy from the energy-economy-climate model and climate impacts from the biophysical process model, are consistent with the RCP2.6. Using these inputs, we simulate land-use and carbon stock dynamics throughout the 21st century with the Model of Agricultural Production and its Impacts on the Environment (MAGPIE)^{26,31–33}. We investigate three scenarios: a) a climate policy that provides economic incentives for deforestation avoidance and afforestation²⁶, b) climate impacts on crops yields and carbon densities following from the RCP2.6 and c) the combined effects of climate policy and climate impacts. After describing the MAGPIE model, input data and the study design, we present global projections for land-use change (cropland, pasture, forest and other land) and carbon stock dynamics (attributed to land management and direct climate change). Finally, we discuss the implications of our findings for future modelling of land-based climate policies and carbon cycle responses to climate change.

Methods

Land-use model MAGPIE

MAGPIE is an economic land-use optimization model that integrates several spatial scales^{26,31–33} (see Figure 1 for an overview of the model structure and the Supporting Information (SI) for details). The objective function of MAGPIE is the fulfilment of agricultural demand for ten world regions at minimum global costs. For meeting the demand, the model endogenously decides, based on cost-effectiveness, about the level of intensification (yield-increasing technological change), extensification (land-use change) and production relocation (international trade)^{34,35}. The model is solved in a recursive dynamic mode with a variable time step length of five or ten years on a timescale from 1995 to 2100.

For this study, MAGPIE is parameterized based on the Shared Socio-economic Pathway 2 (SSP2), a scenario for climate change research with medium challenges for adaptation and mitigation³⁶. In general, historic trends of recent decades with respect to demographics, economic development, environmental protection and technological development continue in SSP2. Food and material demand in MAGPIE is calculated using the SSP2 population and income projections^{37,38}. Global food and material demand increases from 30 EJ in 1995 to 65 EJ in 2100 (Figure S2 in the SI).

Land types in MAGPIE consist of cropland, pasture, forest and other land (e.g. non-forest natural vegetation, abandoned agricultural land, deserts, urban land)³⁹. In the initial year 1995, the global land area consists of 1438 Mha cropland, 2913 Mha pasture, 4235 Mha

forest and 4321 Mha other land (12907 Mha in total) (Figure S4 in the SI). The cropland covers cultivation of 18 different crop types (C3 and C4), both rainfed and irrigated systems. Biophysical yields for these crop types are derived from the Lund-Potsdam-Jena model for managed Land (LPJmL)^{40,41} (see the SI for model details and mapping of crops). In addition, carbon densities for each land type are derived from LPJmL (see SI for details). Biophysical information on crop yields, initial land-cover and carbon densities is spatially explicit (0.5 degree longitude/latitude). Due to computational constraints, spatially explicit data is aggregated to 600 simulation units for the optimization process. For each of the ten world regions in MAgPIE, the clustering algorithm combines grid cells to simulation units based on the similarity of data⁴².

MAgPIE calculates carbon stocks at the cell level as the product of land-type specific area and carbon density. If, for instance, forest is converted to cropland within the same simulation unit, the carbon stock of this unit decreases according to the difference in carbon density of forest and cropland. In case agricultural land is abandoned (other land pool) or intentionally used for afforestation (forest land pool), ecological succession leads to regrowth of natural vegetation carbon stocks along sigmoid growth curves²⁶. Growth of carbon stocks in MAgPIE is constrained by the LPJmL carbon density.

We validate the MAgPIE results by comparing model projections to historical data for a) cropland, pasture and forest area (Figures S12-S14), b) land-use change emissions (Figure S15) and c) agricultural yields (Figure S9). The validation includes evaluation of model projections with respect to trends in historical data. To some extent, model projections are directly validated against observed data, where the temporal overlap with historical data allows for it. In general, MAgPIE is capable of reproducing historical patterns and trends for the aforementioned variables.




Figure 1: Overview of methodology. Grey tones indicate the spatial resolution: dark grey (global), light grey (world regions), white (cell level). Italic font shows the usage of data from REMIND and LPJmL in MAgPIE.

Climate policy in MAgPIE

The energy-economy-climate model REMIND^{43,44} (REgional Model of Investments and Development) projects transformation pathways for a given climate target. These transformation pathways include regional bioenergy demand (1st and 2nd generation) and a globally uniform carbon price, which are taken as input by MAgPIE (see Figure 1). We here use results from REMIND that correspond to the RCP2.6 climate target (see Figures S2 and S3 in the SI). In such ambitious climate protection scenarios, a large share of 2nd generation bioenergy is used in combination with CCS for generating negative CO₂ emissions in the energy sector^{45,46}. Here, the MAgPIE simulations cover CO₂ emissions due to land expansion for bioenergy crop production, but do not account for emissions or emission savings due to bioenergy use in other sectors. The carbon price is applied to all carbon stock changes that originate from anthropogenic land-use change (hereafter referred to as Land Carbon Pricing

(LCP)). Technically, the product of released CO₂ to the atmosphere (tCO₂) and the carbon price (\$/tCO₂) enters the cost-minimizing objective function of the model as additional term on top of agricultural production cost. For carbon stock gains, which reflect negative CO₂ emissions, this additional term in the objective function becomes negative. Thus, LCP provides economic incentives for carbon stock conservation and enhancement through land management, such as deforestation avoidance and afforestation. A number of studies indicate that in high latitude regions a decrease in surface albedo due to afforestation (darker land-cover) could counteract the associated carbon sequestration effect^{47–50}. Accordingly, we assume that no afforestation should occur in high latitude regions above 50 degree North and South. Expansion of agriculture into boreal forests and all other land-use changes in high latitudes are still allowed in the model. Potential carbon emissions from peat lands are not modelled.

Climate impacts in MAgPIE

General Circulation Models (GCMs) compute changes in climate variables, such as temperature and precipitation, for a given RCP. To account for uncertainty in climate projections, we use climate projections from five different GCMs (HadGEM2-ES, IPSL-CM5A-LR, MIROC-ESM-CHEM, GFDL-ESM2M and NorESM1-M) that have been bias-corrected for the Inter-Sectoral Impact Model Intercomparison Project (ISI-MIP)⁵¹. Consistent with the choice of climate policy, we here use climate projections for the RCP2.6. The dynamic global crop growth, vegetation and hydrology model LPJmL^{30,41} uses climate projections as input to simulate spatio-temporal biophysical impacts on crop yields (Figures S7 and S8 in the SI), carbon densities of natural vegetation (Figures S5 and S6 in the SI) and surface freshwater availability. LPJmL considers the impact of temperature, precipitation, radiation and CO₂ concentration. Elevated CO₂ concentrations enhance plant photosynthesis in C3 plants, which is known as CO₂ fertilization, and simultaneously increases water use efficiency in all plants^{15,16}. There is indication that the current generation of biophysical process models overestimates CO₂ fertilization due to missing feedback representations in photosynthetic activity^{52,53}. The current version of LPJmL does not explicitly represent nutrient dynamics and might therefore overestimate CO₂ fertilization⁴¹. Crop yields and carbon densities from LPJmL are harmonized for the initial MAgPIE time step (see SI for details). Finally, MAgPIE integrates the biophysical information derived from LPJmL into the cost-optimization of land-use patterns (see Figure 1).

Study setup

In order to investigate if land-use and carbon cycle responses to moderate climate change interact with a land-based climate policy throughout the 21st century, we analyse the isolated and combined effects of a LCP climate policy and RCP2.6 climate impacts with the MAgPIE model. For this purpose, we define reference cases for the LCP climate policy and the RCP2.6 climate impacts. In NoLCP, carbon stock changes are not priced, i.e. there is no incentive for deforestation avoidance and afforestation. In NoCC (No Climate Change), biophysical crop yields and carbon densities are assumed to be static at 1995 levels throughout the simulation period. The combinations of the two climate policy cases (LCP / NoLCP) and the two climate impact cases (RCP2.6 / NoCC) result in four scenarios: *reference* (NoLCP & NoCC), *LCP only* (LCP & NoCC), *RCP2.6 only* (NoLCP & RCP2.6) and the *combined setting* (LCP & RCP2.6). To account for uncertainty in climate projections, all scenarios with climate impacts are simulated with RCP2.6 biophysical climate impact projections from LPJmL that are based on climate projections from five different GCMs. Table 1 summarizes the study design.

Table 1: Summary of study design

Socio-economic setting, bioenergy demand and carbon price

The economic land-use optimization model MAgPIE is parameterized with a socio-economic setting for the 21st century based on SSP2 (e.g. population, income, food demand). Regional bioenergy demand (1st and 2nd generation) and a globally uniform carbon price derived from REMIND correspond to the RCP2.6 climate target.

Land-based climate policy

In the Land Carbon Pricing (LCP) case, the carbon price in MAgPIE is applied to all carbon stock changes that originate from anthropogenic land-use change. Hence, LCP provides economic incentives for deforestation avoidance and afforestation. NoLCP represents a reference case, in which carbon stock changes are not priced.

Climate impacts on the land system

In the RCP2.6 case, spatially explicit information on biophysical crop yields and carbon densities varies over time in MAgPIE according to LPJmL simulations for the RCP2.6. NoCC represents a reference case, in which biophysical crop yields and carbon densities are assumed to be static at 1995 levels.

Study setup

The combinations of the two climate policy cases (LCP / NoLCP) and the two climate impact cases (RCP2.6 / NoCC) result in four scenarios: *reference* (NoLCP & NoCC), *LCP only* (LCP & NoCC), *RCP2.6 only* (NoLCP & RCP2.6) and the *combined setting* (LCP & RCP2.6).

Results

Across all scenarios global land-use changes range from about -1500 Mha for pastureland to +1700 Mha for forestland by 2100 (Figure 2), associated with global carbon stock changes ranging from about -100 GtC to +200 GtC by 2100 (Figure 3). We report land-use and carbon stock changes for scenarios with RCP2.6 climate impacts as average over the five GCM-specific RCP2.6 climate projections, while the respective Figures 1 and 2 show the full range of results. In the SI, we show regional results in Figure S10 and Figure S11, and provide GCM-specific results at the global scale in Table S3 and Table S4 (land-use and carbon stock dynamics respectively).

Reference scenario

In the *reference* scenario (NoLCP & NoCC), global cropland increases by 698 Mha between 1995 and 2100 (Figure 2, left, dashed lines), which reflects a strong rise in 2nd generation bioenergy demand between 2030 and 2060 (Figure S2). The increase in cropland mainly comes at the cost of forest area, which decreases by 511 Mha in the same period. The remaining cropland increase of 187 Mha originates from the conversion of pastureland. In addition, 1025 Mha of pastureland are abandoned until 2100 (other land) due to efficiency improvements in the livestock sector and stagnating demand for livestock products in the 2nd half of the 21st century (Figure S2). In order to fulfil the agricultural demand, land-use intensification and changes in spatial production patterns complement agricultural expansion. In the *reference* scenario, global average agricultural yields increase from 3.1 tDM ha⁻¹ in 2005 to 5.0 tDM ha⁻¹ in 2100, which reflects average yield increases of about 0.5% per year

until 2100. Simulated agricultural yields in 2005 as well as the historical trend of yield-growth compare well to observed data on agricultural yields at the global scale (Figure S9).

The net effect of these land-use changes in the *reference* scenario is a loss of global terrestrial carbon of 90 GtC until 2100 (Figure 3, left, dashed lines; Table 2). Loss of terrestrial carbon largely coincides with deforestation, in particular between 2030 and 2060. In the *reference* scenario, carbon stocks are assumed to be unaffected by climate change (NoCC).




Figure 2: Time-series of global land-use change (Mha) for four major land types between 1995 and 2100. The combinations of climate policy (*NoLCP*, *LCP*; left vs. right column) and climate impacts (*RCP2.6*, *NoCC*; solid vs. dashed lines) result in four scenarios. Solid lines represent the average over individual model results for five GCM-specific RCP2.6 climate projections, while shaded areas indicate the full range of results.




Figure 3: Time-series of global terrestrial carbon stock change (GtC) between 1995 and 2100. The combinations of climate policy (*NoLCP*, *LCP*; left vs. right column) and climate impacts (*RCP2.6*, *NoCC*; solid vs. dashed lines) result in four scenarios. Colours indicate the attribution of changes in carbon stocks. *Land management* reflects carbon stock changes associated with the land-use dynamics shown in Figure 2 and includes indirect effects of climate change on carbon stocks through altered land management. *Direct climate change* reflects carbon stock changes due to direct impacts of climate change on carbon sequestration in the terrestrial biosphere. The *net effect* on carbon stocks is represented by the sum of *land management* and *direct climate change*. Solid lines represent the average over individual model results for five GCM-specific RCP2.6 climate projections, while shaded areas indicate the full range of results.

Land-based climate policy

In the *LCP only* scenario (*LCP* & *NoCC*), the carbon price creates a strong incentive to conserve and enhance carbon stocks (Figure 2, right, dashed lines). The introduction of the global carbon price in 2015 at 24 \$/tCO₂ immediately stops deforestation and strongly increases afforestation. In total, global forest area increases by 1489 Mha throughout the 21st century, which results in 2000 Mha more forest in 2100 compared to the *reference* scenario. About half of the increase in forest area is realized by cropland contraction. Global cropland area decreases in total by 319 Mha throughout the 21st century, which results in 1018 Mha less cropland in 2100 compared to the *reference* scenario. To facilitate such strong cropland contraction, agricultural yields have to rise much stronger throughout the 21st century than in the *reference* scenario. In *LCP only*, global average agricultural yields increase from 3.1 tDM ha⁻¹ in 2005 to 11.2 tDM ha⁻¹ in 2100, which reflects average annual yield increases until 2100 of about 1.36%, compared to 0.5% in the *reference* scenario (Figure S9). The remaining increase in forest area originates from abandoned pasture area. Pasture area decreases by 1390 Mha throughout the 21st century, which is similar to pasture contraction in the *reference* scenario (1212 Mha until 2100). But in contrast to the *reference* scenario, converted pastureland is primarily used for afforestation in *LCP only*, while just 220 Mha of converted pastureland are abandoned (other land). On-going afforestation throughout the 21st century in

LCP only increases global carbon stocks by 101 GtC until 2100 (Figure 3, right, dashed lines; Table 2). In addition, deforestation and other conversions of carbon-rich ecosystems that occur in the *reference* scenario are stopped. Therefore, the global mitigation potential attributable to a land-based climate policy that provides economic incentives for carbon stock conservation and enhancement is 191 GtC between 1995 and 2100. As in the *reference* scenario, carbon stocks are assumed to be not affected by climate change (NoCC) in *LCP only*.

RCP2.6 climate impacts

In general, land-use dynamics under static climatic conditions (NoCC) and moderate climate change (RCP2.6) are similar throughout the 21st century (Figure 2, left, solid vs. dashed lines). However, in the *RCP2.6 only* scenario (NoLCP & RCP2.6) global agricultural area (cropland and pasture) is 330 Mha smaller in 2100 compared to the *reference* scenario with static climatic conditions. The reduced land requirement for agriculture translates until 2100 into 62 Mha more forest (less deforestation) and 268 Mha more other land with potentially re-growing natural vegetation. This land-saving effect originates from the land-use response to higher agricultural yields under RCP2.6 climate projections: global average agricultural yields are 0.3 tDM ha⁻¹ higher in 2100 compared to the *reference* scenario (Figure S9).

Altered land management in *RCP2.6 only* results in 16 GtC higher global carbon stocks in 2100 compared to the *reference* scenario (Figure 3, left, solid vs. dashed lines). In addition to this indirect effect via land management, climate change has direct impacts on the carbon stocks of the terrestrial biosphere through altered plant photosynthesis and respiration. Due to direct impacts of climate change, global carbon stocks in *RCP2.6 only* are 62 GtC higher in 2100 compared to the *reference* scenario. The overall global carbon stock dynamics in *RCP2.6 only* follow the trajectory of the atmospheric CO₂ concentration for RCP2.6 climate projections: increase until mid-21st century followed by a smaller decrease until 2100¹¹. In total, global carbon stocks in *RCP2.6 only* are 78 GtC higher in 2100 compared to the *reference* scenario, which shows carbon losses of 90 GtC until 2100. Therefore, in absolute terms global carbon stocks still decrease by 12 GtC until 2100 in *RCP2.6 only*.

Overall, the uncertainties in land-use dynamics (Figure 2), carbon stock dynamics (Figure 3) and agricultural yields (Figure S9), which are introduced by the five GCM-specific RCP2.6 climate projections, do not change our results qualitatively.

Combined effects

In the *combined setting* of a LCP climate policy and RCP2.6 climate impacts (LCP & RCP2.6), overall land-use dynamics are similar to *LCP only* (Figure 2, right, solid vs. dashed lines). In the *combined setting*, however, agricultural land requirements are 267 Mha lower in 2100, which is similar to the identified land-saving effect for *RCP2.6 only* (330 Mha in 2100). Contrary to *RCP2.6 only*, most of the agricultural land released by the land-saving effect is immediately used for afforestation in the *combined setting* (235 Mha until 2100). Regrowth of natural vegetation with associated carbon stock gains takes place regardless of the allocation to forest or other land since afforestation is a managed re-growth of natural vegetation in the MAGPIE model²⁶. Accordingly, the climate-change-induced gain in global carbon stocks due to land management is similar to *RCP2.6 only* (Figure 3, left vs. right, solid vs. dashed lines). Also the increase in global carbon stocks due to direct impacts of climate change is similar to *RCP2.6 only*. Thus, RCP2.6 climate impacts seem to increase global carbon stocks independent from a LCP climate policy.

In the *combined setting*, the net effect of land management and climate change is an increase of global carbon stocks by 185 GtC until 2100 (Figure 3, right, solid lines; Table 2).

Since global carbon stocks decrease by 90 GtC until 2100 in the *reference* scenario, the full cumulative carbon mitigation effect in 2100 attributable to the *combined setting* is 275 GtC. This full effect is 191 GtC for *LCP only* and 78 GtC for *RCP2.6 only*. The sum of these isolated effects is 269 GtC in 2100. Thus, the additional carbon stock gain that emerges from the *combined setting* is 6 GtC throughout the 21st century (Table 2). If this gain is completely accounted to the mitigation potential of the *LCP only* scenario (191 GtC in 2100), the mitigation potential increases by just 3%. Therefore, land-use and carbon cycle responses to RCP2.6 climate impacts only marginally affect the mitigation potential that can be attributed to a land-based climate policy in the 21st century.

Table 2: Summary of scenario results. Carbon stock changes and full carbon mitigation effect in GtC. Carbon stock changes show the net effect of land management and direct climate change between 1995 and 2100 at the global scale (Figure 3). The full carbon mitigation effect reflects the difference in these carbon stock changes between the respective scenario and the *reference* scenario. To identify the interaction between a LCP climate policy and RCP2.6 climate impacts, we compare the sum of the full mitigation effects of the *LCP only* (191 GtC) and the *RCP2.6 only* scenario (78 GtC) to the full mitigation effect of the *combined setting* (275 GtC). The small difference of 6 GtC suggests that the interaction between a LCP climate policy and RCP2.6 climate impacts is low. This table shows average values over five GCM-specific RCP2.6 climate projections.

		NoLCP		LCP	
NoCC		<i>Reference</i>		<i>LCP only</i>	
	Δ Carbon stock	Full effect	Δ Carbon stock	Full effect	
	-90 GtC	0 GtC	101 GtC	191 GtC	
RCP2.6		<i>RCP2.6 only</i>		<i>Combined setting</i>	
	Δ Carbon stock	Full effect	Δ Carbon stock	Full effect	
	-12 GtC	78 GtC	185 GtC	275 GtC	

$$191 \text{ GtC} + 78 \text{ GtC} = 269 \text{ GtC} \sim 275 \text{ GtC}$$

Discussion

Land-based climate policy

We find that the introduction of a carbon price in the land-use sector immediately stops deforestation and strongly increases afforestation throughout the 21st century. According to our results, current global forest area increases by about one third until 2100, associated with carbon stock gains of 101 GtC globally until 2100. A reference scenario without carbon pricing shows carbon losses of 90 GtC until 2100, mainly due to deforestation. Therefore, the cumulative mitigation potential attributed to the land-based climate policy analysed in this study is 191 GtC throughout the 21st century.

The reward for carbon sequestration entails strong intensification of the agricultural system to free up land for afforestation (see also *Humpenöder et al.*²⁶). Typically, rates of technological change leading to yield increases are exogenous to economic land-use models²⁵. MAgPIE, however, derives technological change rates endogenously as part of the cost-optimization³⁴, i.e. the model dynamically adjusts investments in yield-increasing technological change depending on the scenario. Using different rates of technological change would affect the land-use and carbon stock dynamics shown here as land-use intensification and land expansion are strongly interrelated.

In this study, we do not consider market feedback effects of afforestation with respect to bioenergy demand and carbon price, i.e. bioenergy demand and carbon price are exogenous to the model. Due to competition for land, afforestation might increase bioenergy prices, which in turn might lower bioenergy demand from the energy system. Moreover, carbon sequestration following from afforestation could lower carbon prices in the overall economy, potentially leading to less afforestation. Accounting for such market feedback effects is beyond the scope of this study but critical for the evaluation of afforestation as mitigation strategy.

According to previous modelling studies, competition for land between agricultural production and afforestation might more than double food prices throughout the 21st century^{27,54}. This gives reason to consider food security implications of land-based climate policies, such as the United Nations' REDD+ (*reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation*) mechanism, which aims to provide economic incentives for deforestation avoidance and afforestation^{55,56}. Keeping food consumption levels unaffected from such land-based climate policies, as we did for these model runs, would require substantial redistribution policies to assure food security for low-income households (see also *Edmonds et al.*²⁸). Analysis of the economic aspects of food security is critical for the implementation of land-based climate policies, but beyond the scope of this study.

Land-use and carbon cycle responses to RCP2.6 climate impacts

We find that accounting for RCP2.6 climate impacts in an economic land-use model increases global carbon stocks by 78 GtC until 2100, compared to a reference scenario with static climatic conditions. Enhanced carbon sequestration of the terrestrial biosphere under RCP2.6 causes the major part of this difference (62 GtC in 2100). However, 21% of the total climate-change-induced carbon stock gains originate from a land-saving effect due to higher agricultural yields under RCP2.6 (16 GtC in 2100). This finding highlights the importance of land-use dynamics for modelling carbon cycle responses to climate change

As already noted in the methods part, LPJmL estimates of CO₂ fertilization on crop yields are more positive than in many other global crop models¹³. Therefore, the projected gains in carbon stocks due to RCP2.6 climate impacts might be overestimated. On the other hand, atmospheric CO₂ concentrations in the RCP2.6 return to current levels in 2100 (383-385 ppm) after a peak caused by exceeding the climate target around mid-century (“overshooting”)^{10,11}. Thus, the choice of the RCP2.6 should limit the overall magnitude of CO₂ fertilization and associated nutrient demand. Higher levels of global warming, such as the RCP8.5, are projected to have strong negative effects on agricultural yields at low latitudes¹³. In this case land-use and carbon stock dynamics could reverse: lower agricultural yields might increase cropland requirements, causing more deforestation or hampering ecological succession. On the other hand, many regions at low latitudes are currently far away from closing the “yield gap”^{57,58}. The potential for yield increases in Africa, Asia, and Latin America, e.g. through better crop and soil management, irrigation or access to fertilizer, is considerable. Thus, improved agricultural productivity can potentially alleviate negative effects of climate change at low latitudes.

Why RCP2.6 climate impacts hardly affect a land-based climate policy

In this study, we project a) that the global mitigation potential of a land-based climate policy is 191 GtC in 2100, and b) that carbon stock gains due to RCP2.6 climate impacts cumulate to 78 GtC until 2100. The sum of these isolated effects (269 GtC) is just slightly lower than the actual result for the combined setting in 2100 (275 GtC), which suggests that moderate

climate change in the 21st century only marginally affects the mitigation potential that can be attributed to the land-based climate policy.

There are two reasons for this loose link between RCP2.6 climate impacts and a land-based climate policy. First, the carbon price creates a strong incentive for deforestation avoidance and afforestation already under static climatic conditions. Hence, beneficial impacts of climate change on crop yields and carbon storage capacity, as we project in this study for the RCP2.6, do not substantially increase the mitigation potential attributable to a land-based climate policy. Second, afforestation projects typically last for 20-60 years⁵⁹. Over such long periods, climate change might alter the carbon sequestration in forests²¹. Thus, owing to its long-term character, the mitigation potential of afforestation projects could increase or decrease due to climate change. In particular, negative impacts on the outcome of afforestation projects are critical. If negative climate impacts would offset re-growth of carbon stocks in future time steps, stopping an afforestation project and using the land for other purposes is only a limited option since a clear-cutting of the already existing forest comes with costs for the associated CO₂ emissions. Therefore, afforestation projects introduce a path dependency for land-use, which prevents abrupt changes in land-use due to climate change.

Implications for future modelling

In general, our results stress that land-use responses to climate change should be considered in simulations of carbon cycle feedbacks to climate change. This could be of particular importance for IAMs, which are typically used for estimating mitigation efforts and costs across economic sectors for a specific climate target¹¹. Currently, several IAMs use the Model for the Assessment of Greenhouse-gas Induced Climate Change (MAGICC) to account for the feedbacks between the carbon cycle and the climate system¹¹. MAGICC simulates simplified CO₂ fertilization and temperature feedbacks on the terrestrial biosphere without consideration of land-use dynamics^{11,23}. Accordingly, carbon stock changes that result from land-use responses to climate change are disregarded. For instance, our results suggest global carbon stocks gains of 16 GtC until 2100 due to land-saving effects under RCP2.6. Depending on potential carbon prices of several hundred dollars by 2100, as projected by several IAMs^{7,10,11}, the net present value of these 16 GtC could be huge. A more sophisticated representation of the interactions between climate, terrestrial biosphere and anthropogenic land-use dynamics with respect to carbon stocks could therefore play a vital role for improving estimates of mitigation efforts and costs in IAMs.

Acknowledgments

The research leading to these results has received funding from the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme FP7 under grant agreement n° 603542 (LUC4C) and 265104 (Volante).

Funding from Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) in the SPP ED 178/3-1 (CEMICS) is gratefully acknowledged.

Supporting Information (SI)

Additional model description and detailed results. This material is available free of charge via the Internet at <http://pubs.acs.org>.

References

- (1) Houghton, R. A.; House, J. I.; Pongratz, J.; van der Werf, G. R.; DeFries, R. S.; Hansen, M. C.; Le Quéré, C.; Ramankutty, N. Carbon emissions from land use and land-cover change. *Biogeosciences* **2012**, *9* (12), 5125–5142.
- (2) Van der Werf, G. R.; Morton, D. C.; DeFries, R. S.; Olivier, J. G. J.; Kasibhatla, P. S.; Jackson, R. B.; Collatz, G. J.; Randerson, J. T. CO₂ emissions from forest loss. *Nat. Geosci.* **2009**, *2* (11), 737–738.
- (3) Kindermann, G.; Obersteiner, M.; Sohngen, B.; Sathaye, J.; Andrasko, K.; Rametsteiner, E.; Schlamadinger, B.; Wunder, S.; Beach, R. Global cost estimates of reducing carbon emissions through avoided deforestation. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **2008**, *105* (30), 10302–10307.
- (4) Mackey, B.; Prentice, I. C.; Steffen, W.; House, J. I.; Lindenmayer, D.; Keith, H.; Berry, S. Untangling the confusion around land carbon science and climate change mitigation policy. *Nat. Clim. Change* **2013**, *3* (6), 552–557.
- (5) Tavoni, M.; Socolow, R. Modeling meets science and technology: an introduction to a special issue on negative emissions. *Clim. Change* **2013**, *118* (1), 1–14.
- (6) McLaren, D. A comparative global assessment of potential negative emissions technologies. *Process Saf. Environ. Prot.* **2012**, *90* (6), 489–500.
- (7) Edenhofer, O.; Pichs-Madruga, R.; Sokona, Y.; Kadner, S.; Minx, J. C.; Brunner, S.; Agrawala, S.; Baiocchi, G.; Bashmakov, I. A.; Blanco, G.; et al. Technical Summary. In *Climate Change 2014: Mitigation of Climate Change. Contribution of Working Group III to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*; Edenhofer, O., Pichs-Madruga, R., Sokona, Y., Farahani, E., Kadner, S., Seyboth, K., Adler, A., Baum, I., Brunner, S., Eickemeier, P., et al., Eds.; Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, 2014.
- (8) Kriegler, E.; Weyant, J. P.; Blanford, G. J.; Krey, V.; Clarke, L.; Edmonds, J.; Fawcett, A.; Luderer, G.; Riahi, K.; Richels, R.; et al. The role of technology for achieving climate policy objectives: overview of the EMF 27 study on global technology and climate policy strategies. *Clim. Change* **2014**, *123* (3-4), 353–367.
- (9) Van Vuuren, D. P.; Edmonds, J. A.; Kainuma, M.; Riahi, K.; Weyant, J. A special issue on the RCPs. *Clim. Change* **2011**, *109* (1-2), 1–4.
- (10) Calvin, K.; Edmonds, J.; Bond-Lamberty, B.; Clarke, L.; Kim, S. H.; Kyle, P.; Smith, S. J.; Thomson, A.; Wise, M. 2.6: Limiting climate change to 450 ppm CO₂ equivalent in the 21st century. *Energy Econ.* **2009**, *31*, Supplement 2, S107–S120.
- (11) Van Vuuren, D. P.; Stehfest, E.; Elzen, M. G. J. den; Kram, T.; Vliet, J. van; Deetman, S.; Isaac, M.; Goldewijk, K. K.; Hof, A.; Beltran, A. M.; et al. RCP2.6: exploring the possibility to keep global mean temperature increase below 2°C. *Clim. Change* **2011**, *109* (1-2), 95–116.
- (12) Field, C. B.; Barros, V. R.; Mach, K. J.; Mastrandrea, M. D.; Aalst, M. van; Adger, W. N.; Arent, D. J.; Barnett, J.; Betts, R.; Bilir, T. E.; et al. Technical Summary. In *Climate Change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability. Part A: Global and Sectoral Aspects. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*; Field, C. B., Barros, V. R., Dokken, D. J., Mach, K. J., Mastrandrea, M. D., Bilir, T. E., Chatterjee, M., Ebi, K. L., Estrada, Y. O., Genova, R. C., et al., Eds.; Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, 2014.
- (13) Rosenzweig, C.; Elliott, J.; Deryng, D.; Ruane, A. C.; Müller, C.; Arneth, A.; Boote, K. J.; Folberth, C.; Glotter, M.; Khabarov, N.; et al. Assessing agricultural risks of

- climate change in the 21st century in a global gridded crop model intercomparison. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **2014**, *111* (9), 3268–3273.
- (14) Lobell, D. B.; Gourdji, S. M. The Influence of Climate Change on Global Crop Productivity. *Plant Physiol.* **2012**, *160* (4), 1686–1697.
- (15) Ainsworth, E. A.; Long, S. P. What have we learned from 15 years of free-air CO₂ enrichment (FACE)? A meta-analytic review of the responses of photosynthesis, canopy properties and plant production to rising CO₂. *New Phytol.* **2005**, *165* (2), 351–371.
- (16) Leakey, A. D. B.; Ainsworth, E. A.; Bernacchi, C. J.; Rogers, A.; Long, S. P.; Ort, D. R. Elevated CO₂ effects on plant carbon, nitrogen, and water relations: six important lessons from FACE. *J. Exp. Bot.* **2009**, *60* (10), 2859–2876.
- (17) Easterling, W. E.; Aggarwal, P. K.; Batima, P.; Brander, K. M.; Erda, L.; Howden, S. M.; Kirilenko, A.; Morton, J.; Soussana, J.-F.; Schmidhuber, J.; et al. Food, fibre and forest products. In *Climate Change 2007: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*; Parry, M. L., Canziani, O. F., Palutikof, J. P., Linden, P. J., Hanson, C. E., Eds.; Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2007; pp 273–313.
- (18) Porter, J. R.; Xie, L.; Challinor, A. J.; Cochrane, K.; Howden, S. M.; Iqbal, M. M.; Lobell, D. B.; Travasso, M. I. Food security and food production systems. In *Climate Change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability. Part A: Global and Sectoral Aspects. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*; Field, C. B., Barros, V. R., Dokken, D. J., Mach, K. J., Mastrandrea, M. D., Bilir, T. E., Chatterjee, M., Ebi, K. L., Estrada, Y. O., Genova, R. C., et al., Eds.; Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, 2014.
- (19) Huntingford, C.; Zelazowski, P.; Galbraith, D.; Mercado, L. M.; Sitch, S.; Fisher, R.; Lomas, M.; Walker, A. P.; Jones, C. D.; Booth, B. B. B.; et al. Simulated resilience of tropical rainforests to CO₂-induced climate change. *Nat. Geosci.* **2013**, *6* (4), 268–273.
- (20) Houghton, R. A. Keeping management effects separate from environmental effects in terrestrial carbon accounting. *Glob. Change Biol.* **2013**, *19* (9), 2609–2612.
- (21) Friend, A. D.; Lucht, W.; Rademacher, T. T.; Keribin, R.; Betts, R.; Cadule, P.; Ciais, P.; Clark, D. B.; Dankers, R.; Falloon, P. D.; et al. Carbon residence time dominates uncertainty in terrestrial vegetation responses to future climate and atmospheric CO₂. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **2014**, *111* (9), 3280–3285.
- (22) Keith, H.; Mackey, B. G.; Lindenmayer, D. B. Re-evaluation of forest biomass carbon stocks and lessons from the world's most carbon-dense forests. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **2009**, *106* (28), 11635–11640.
- (23) Meinshausen, M.; Raper, S. C. B.; Wigley, T. M. L. Emulating coupled atmosphere-ocean and carbon cycle models with a simpler model, MAGICC6 – Part 1: Model description and calibration. *Atmos Chem Phys* **2011**, *11* (4), 1417–1456.
- (24) Nelson, G. C.; Valin, H.; Sands, R. D.; Havlík, P.; Ahammad, H.; Deryng, D.; Elliott, J.; Fujimori, S.; Hasegawa, T.; Heyhoe, E.; et al. Climate change effects on agriculture: Economic responses to biophysical shocks. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **2014**, *111* (9), 3274–3279.
- (25) Schmitz, C.; van Meijl, H.; Kyle, P.; Nelson, G. C.; Fujimori, S.; Gurgel, A.; Havlik, P.; Heyhoe, E.; d' Croz, D. M.; Popp, A.; et al. Land-use change trajectories up to 2050: insights from a global agro-economic model comparison. *Agric. Econ.* **2014**, *45* (1), 69–84.

- (26) Humpenöder, F.; Popp, A.; Dietrich, J. P.; Klein, D.; Lotze-Campen, H.; Bonsch, M.; Bodirsky, B. L.; Weindl, I.; Stevanovic, M.; Müller, C. Investigating afforestation and bioenergy CCS as climate change mitigation strategies. *Environ. Res. Lett.* **2014**, *9* (6), 064029.
- (27) Calvin, K.; Wise, M.; Kyle, P.; Patel, P.; Clarke, L.; Edmonds, J. Trade-offs of different land and bioenergy policies on the path to achieving climate targets. *Clim. Change* **2014**, *123* (3-4), 691–704.
- (28) Edmonds, J.; Luckow, P.; Calvin, K.; Wise, M.; Dooley, J.; Kyle, P.; Kim, S. H.; Patel, P.; Clarke, L. Can radiative forcing be limited to 2.6 Wm⁻² without negative emissions from bioenergy AND CO₂ capture and storage? *Clim. Change* **2013**, *118* (1), 29–43.
- (29) Gumpenberger, M.; Vohland, K.; Heyder, U.; Poulter, B.; Macey, K.; Rammig, A.; Popp, A.; Cramer, W. Predicting pan-tropical climate change induced forest stock gains and losses—implications for REDD. *Environ. Res. Lett.* **2010**, *5* (1), 014013.
- (30) Müller, C.; Eickhout, B.; Zaehle, S.; Bondeau, A.; Cramer, W.; Lucht, W. Effects of changes in CO₂, climate, and land use on the carbon balance of the land biosphere during the 21st century. *J. Geophys. Res. Biogeosciences* **2007**, *112* (G02032).
- (31) Lotze-Campen, H.; Müller, C.; Bondeau, A.; Rost, S.; Popp, A.; Lucht, W. Global food demand, productivity growth, and the scarcity of land and water resources: a spatially explicit mathematical programming approach. *Agric. Econ.* **2008**, *39* (3), 325–338.
- (32) Popp, A.; Lotze-Campen, H.; Bodirsky, B. Food consumption, diet shifts and associated non-CO₂ greenhouse gases from agricultural production. *Glob. Environ. Change* **2010**, *20* (3), 451–462.
- (33) Popp, A.; Krause, M.; Dietrich, J. P.; Lotze-Campen, H.; Leimbach, M.; Beringer, T.; Bauer, N. Additional CO₂ emissions from land use change — Forest conservation as a precondition for sustainable production of second generation bioenergy. *Ecol. Econ.* **2012**, *74*, 64–70.
- (34) Dietrich, J. P.; Schmitz, C.; Lotze-Campen, H.; Popp, A.; Müller, C. Forecasting technological change in agriculture—An endogenous implementation in a global land use model. *Technol. Forecast. Soc. Change* **2014**, *81*, 236–249.
- (35) Schmitz, C.; Biewald, A.; Lotze-Campen, H.; Popp, A.; Dietrich, J. P.; Bodirsky, B.; Krause, M.; Weindl, I. Trading more food: Implications for land use, greenhouse gas emissions, and the food system. *Glob. Environ. Change* **2012**, *22* (1), 189–209.
- (36) O’Neill, B. C.; Kriegler, E.; Ebi, K. L.; Kemp-Benedict, E.; Riahi, K.; Rothman, D. S.; van Ruijven, B. J.; van Vuuren, D. P.; Birkmann, J.; Kok, K.; et al. The roads ahead: Narratives for shared socioeconomic pathways describing world futures in the 21st century. *Glob. Environ. Change* **2015**.
- (37) IIASA. *SSP Database (version 0.93)*; International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis: Laxenburg, 2013.
- (38) Valin, H.; Sands, R. D.; van der Mensbrugge, D.; Nelson, G. C.; Ahammad, H.; Blanc, E.; Bodirsky, B.; Fujimori, S.; Hasegawa, T.; Havlik, P.; et al. The future of food demand: understanding differences in global economic models. *Agric. Econ.* **2014**, *45* (1), 51–67.
- (39) Krause, M.; Lotze-Campen, H.; Popp, A.; Dietrich, J. P.; Bonsch, M. Conservation of undisturbed natural forests and economic impacts on agriculture. *Land Use Policy* **2013**, *30* (1), 344–354.
- (40) Bondeau, A.; Smith, P. C.; Zaehle, S.; Schaphoff, S.; Lucht, W.; Cramer, W.; Gerten, D.; Lotze-Campen, H.; Müller, C.; Reichstein, M.; et al. Modelling the role of agriculture for the 20th century global terrestrial carbon balance. *Glob Change Biol* **2007**, *13* (3), 679–706.

- (41) Müller, C.; Robertson, R. D. Projecting future crop productivity for global economic modeling. *Agric. Econ.* **2014**, *45* (1), 37–50.
- (42) Dietrich, J. P.; Popp, A.; Lotze-Campen, H. Reducing the loss of information and gaining accuracy with clustering methods in a global land-use model. *Ecol. Model.* **2013**, *263*, 233–243.
- (43) Leimbach, M.; Bauer, N.; Baumstark, L.; Edenhofer, O. Mitigation Costs in a Globalized World: Climate Policy Analysis with REMIND-R. *Environ. Model. Assess.* **2010**, *15* (3), 155–173.
- (44) Luderer, G.; Leimbach, M.; Bauer, N.; Kriegler, E.; Aboumahboub, T.; Curras, T. A.; Baumstark, L.; Bertram, C.; Giannousakis, A.; Hilaire, J.; et al. *Description of the REMIND Model (Version 1.5)*; SSRN Scholarly Paper ID 2312844; SSRN Working Paper 2312844, 2013.
- (45) Popp, A.; Rose, S. K.; Calvin, K.; van Vuuren, D. P.; Dietrich, J. P.; Wise, M.; Stehfest, E.; Humpenöder, F.; Kyle, P.; Vliet, J. V.; et al. Land-use transition for bioenergy and climate stabilization: model comparison of drivers, impacts and interactions with other land use based mitigation options. *Clim. Change* **2014**, *123* (3–4), 495–509.
- (46) Rose, S. K.; Kriegler, E.; Bibas, R.; Calvin, K.; Popp, A.; van Vuuren, D. P.; Weyant, J. Bioenergy in energy transformation and climate management. *Clim. Change* **2014**, *123* (3–4), 477–493.
- (47) Schaeffer, M.; Eickhout, B.; Hoogwijk, M.; Strengers, B.; van Vuuren, D.; Leemans, R.; Opsteegh, T. CO₂ and albedo climate impacts of extratropical carbon and biomass plantations. *Glob. Biogeochem. Cycles* **2006**, *20* (GB2020).
- (48) Bala, G.; Caldeira, K.; Wickett, M.; Phillips, T. J.; Lobell, D. B.; Delire, C.; Mirin, A. Combined climate and carbon-cycle effects of large-scale deforestation. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **2007**, *104* (16), 6550–6555.
- (49) Jackson, R. B.; Randerson, J. T.; Canadell, J. G.; Anderson, R. G.; Avissar, R.; Baldocchi, D. D.; Bonan, G. B.; Caldeira, K.; Diffenbaugh, N. S.; Field, C. B.; et al. Protecting climate with forests. *Environ. Res. Lett.* **2008**, *3* (4), 044006.
- (50) Jones, A. D.; Collins, W. D.; Edmonds, J.; Torn, M. S.; Janetos, A.; Calvin, K. V.; Thomson, A.; Chini, L. P.; Mao, J.; Shi, X.; et al. Greenhouse Gas Policy Influences Climate via Direct Effects of Land-Use Change. *J. Clim.* **2013**, *26* (11), 3657–3670.
- (51) Hempel, S.; Frieler, K.; Warszawski, L.; Schewe, J.; Piontek, F. A trend-preserving bias correction - the ISI-MIP approach. *Earth Syst. Dyn.* **2013**, *4* (2), 219–236.
- (52) Norby, R. J.; Warren, J. M.; Iversen, C. M.; Medlyn, B. E.; McMurtrie, R. E. CO₂ enhancement of forest productivity constrained by limited nitrogen availability. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **2010**, *107* (45), 19368–19373.
- (53) Piao, S.; Sitch, S.; Ciais, P.; Friedlingstein, P.; Peylin, P.; Wang, X.; Ahlström, A.; Anav, A.; Canadell, J. G.; Cong, N.; et al. Evaluation of terrestrial carbon cycle models for their response to climate variability and to CO₂ trends. *Glob. Change Biol.* **2013**, *19* (7), 2117–2132.
- (54) Wise, M.; Calvin, K.; Thomson, A.; Clarke, L.; Bond-Lamberty, B.; Sands, R.; Smith, S. J.; Janetos, A.; Edmonds, J. Implications of Limiting CO₂ Concentrations for Land Use and Energy. *Science* **2009**, *324* (5931), 1183–1186.
- (55) UNFCCC. The Cancun Agreements Dec 1/CP.16. *U. N. Framew. Conv. Clim. Change* **2011**, 1–31.
- (56) UNFCCC. *Report of the Conference of the Parties on its nineteenth session, held in Warsaw from 11 to 23 November 2013*; FCCC/CP/2013/10; United Nations Office: Geneva, Switzerland, 2013.

- (57) Sayer, J.; Cassman, K. G. Agricultural innovation to protect the environment. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **2013**, *110* (21), 8345–8348.
- (58) Godfray, H. C. J.; Beddington, J. R.; Crute, I. R.; Haddad, L.; Lawrence, D.; Muir, J. F.; Pretty, J.; Robinson, S.; Thomas, S. M.; Toulmin, C. Food Security: The Challenge of Feeding 9 Billion People. *Science* **2010**, *327* (5967), 812–818.
- (59) United Nations. *Standard: Clean development mechanism project standard*; CDM-EB65-A05-STAN; Framework convention on climate change, 2013.