

# **GLOBIOM**

Understanding uncertainty in market-mediated responses to US oilseed biodiesel demand

Niklas Hinkel (IIASA)

Forestry and Agriculture Greenhouse Gas Modeling Forum Session 4: Mitigation (Part 2) - Agriculture and Bioenergy Raleigh, NC, March 5-7<sup>th</sup>, 2024





### 1. GLOBIOM overview

- 2. GLOBIOM recent publications and developments
- 3. Understanding uncertainty in market-mediated responses to US oilseed biodiesel demand (paper under review)

1. GLOBIOM overview

# The economic model GLOBIOM simulates land-use change and related emissions of multiple sectors



- Bio-economic land use **partial equilibrium** model integrating global agriculture, bioenergy, and forestry sectors
- **Recursively dynamic**: 10-year time steps (2000 calibration, 2000-2020 validation, up to 2100 projections)
- Bottom-up (spatially explicit land cover, land use, management systems and economic cost information) to the top (regional commodity markets)
- Major, globally cultivated crops modelled (ca. 85% of crop-derived calorie supply, ca. 84% of total harvested cropland)
- Comprehensive and detailed representation of global livestock sector
- Food demand drivers: population, income, response to prices and income, and price changes
- Various **bioenergy feedstocks** represented incl. their **co-products** (e.g., DDGS)

2. GLOBIOM recent publications and developments 1/3

# Huge media echo for GLOBIOM impact analysis of potential substitution of animal products by plant-based foods



2. GLOBIOM recent publications and developments 2/3



# New agricultural CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration options in GLOBIOM





2. GLOBIOM recent publications and developments 3/3



preliminary

## Importance of ag. CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration for AFOLU mitigation



- FOLU emission reduction remains most cost-effective AFOLU mitigation options (60% of abatement by 2050)
- Carbon sequestration on agricultural land may deliver an important contribution to land-based mitigation efforts (20% by 2050)
- Represents around 30-35% of anticipated AFOLU abatement requirement in existing 1.5 C scenarios in 2050
  - Across regions, highest potentials in Sub-Saharan Africa and Latin America

Understanding uncertainty – introduction

## preliminary IIASA investigated uncertainties of soy-based biofuel ILUC values in cooperation with RTI International and the EPA

Understanding uncertainty in market-mediated under responses to US oilseed biodiesel demand



Neus Escobar<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Hugo Valin<sup>1</sup>, Stefan Frank<sup>1\*</sup>, Diana Galperin<sup>3</sup>, Christopher M. Wade<sup>4</sup>, Leopold

Ringwald<sup>1</sup>, Daniel Tanner<sup>3</sup>, Niklas Hinkel<sup>1</sup>, Petr Havlík<sup>1</sup>, Justin S. Baker<sup>5</sup>, Sharvn Lie<sup>3</sup>, and

Christopher Ramig<sup>3</sup>

- Demand for oilseed-based biofuels is associated with particularly complex market and supply chain dynamics
- ILUC = induced land-use change = direct + indirect land-use change
- Investigation of market mediated impacts and ILUC emission uncertainty of increasing demand for soy-biodiesel in the USA over the coming decades

Forestry and Agriculture GHG Modeling Forum, Raleigh, NC, March 5-7th, 2024 | Niklas Hinkel: GLOBIOM

3. Understanding uncertainty – methods

## Multiple techniques are combined to assess uncertainties

- **Baseline:** global biofuel volumes constant at 2020 levels
- Shock: increased demand for soybean biodiesel in US 2020-2050, reaching total additional demand of 126.9 PJ/year in 2030 (= 1 BGGE ≈ current US consumption)



preliminary

• Assessing influence of varying key economic (7) and biophysical (4) parameters:

Central Case	<ul> <li>model default</li> <li>central values of varied parameters</li> </ul>
One-at-a-time (OAT) sensitivity analysis	<ul> <li>individual effects of analyzed parameters</li> <li>4 values below, 4 above default → 89 combinations</li> </ul>
Monte Carlo (MC) simulation	<ul> <li>ILUC impact ranges from simultaneous variation (distributions) of analyzed parameters</li> <li>1000 runs (baseline and shock)</li> </ul>

- Assessing **uncertainty development** of ILUC **over time** by comparing two approaches:
  - **comparative-static** for 2030  $\rightarrow$  short term response to shock
  - recursive-dynamic through 2050  $\rightarrow$  development of response to shock over time

Understanding uncertainty – results 1/3

## preliminary Central case compares baseline vs. biofuel shock scenario, given GLOBIOM default parameter values



Soya oil

- ↑ 3.5 Mt of US fuel use
  - ↑ 1.9 Mt US production
  - ↓ 1.2 Mt US net trade
  - ↓ 0.3 Mt US non-fuel use
- $\uparrow$  6% (3% other veg. oil) price globally
- ↓ 3.1 Mt global non-fuel use
- 1.8 Mt of palm and rapeseed oil use globally

IASA

comparative-

static 2030

### Soya meal (co-product)

- ↑ 7.7 Mt US production
- $\downarrow$  8% (3%) price in US (globally)
- ↓ production by other major producers, i.e.,
  - slower expansion from 2020 onwards in SAM

### Livestock rebound effect

- ↑ livestock intensification
- ↑ 1.3 Mt complementary grains for feed

9

3. Understanding uncertainty – results 2/3

# OAT shows variabilities in ILUC estimates and increases of these variabilities over time

#### **Comparative-static**

Largest variations (mean  $\pm$  std. dev. in gCO<sub>2</sub>e/MJ):

 $35.8 \pm 13.6$  trade elasticity of veg. oils

 $29.4 \pm 12.3$  expansion response of palm into peatland

 $29.9 \pm 12.3 \text{ EF}$  for C sequestration in BIOM of palm

### **Recursive-dynamic**

- · uncertainty mostly increases over time
  - ILUC factor ranges widen in recursive-dynamic setting
  - especially for economic parameters
     e.g., 44.2 ± 18.8 trade elasticity of veg. oils
- Substitution elasticity among veg. oils matters less
- Parameters determining the size of the livestock rebound gain influence (yield elasticity, demand elasticity for animal products)



 $\Delta$  from central ILUC factor ( gCO<sub>2</sub>e/MJ )

-20 -10 0 10 20 30 40 50 60

#### Comparative-static

preliminary





#### Recursive-dynamic

Trade elasticity – vegetable oils Expansion response of palm into peatland C sequestration in biomass on palm plantations Demand elasticity – vegetable oils Substitution elasticity – vegetable oils Land expansion into natural vegetation Yield elasticity Emission factors from forest biomass loss Peatland emission factor on pristine forest Demand elasticity – animal products Exogenous yield projection – corn and soy



Boxes represent the 10<sup>th</sup> and 90<sup>th</sup> percentile. Whiskers represent the minimum and maximum values. Standard deviations are decomposed by emission source. Forestry and Agriculture GHG Modeling Forum, Raleigh, NC, March 5-7th, 2024 Niklas Hinkel: GLOBIOM

3. Understanding uncertainty – results 3/3

## Monte Carlo simulations show ranges of ILUC estimates



- ILUC factors in gCO<sub>2</sub>e/MJ for US soybean biodiesel range from 10<sup>th</sup> to 90<sup>th</sup> percentiles (total min. to max. excl. outliers)
  - comparative-static: 15.1 to 67.7 (-17.0 to 98.7)

- recursive-dynamic: 8.4 to 77.4 (-23.7 to 112.8)
- Emissions from natural land conversion and peatland oxidation are most influential and have widest distributions
- Agricultural biomass changes leads to net sequestration, mostly in palm plantations
- Spreads and means are slightly higher in recursive-dynamic
  - comparative-static: 40.8 ± 20.5

preliminary

- recursive-dynamic: 42.4 ± 25.9
- mostly due to peatland oxidation
- Simulations show almost always **positive ILUC** 
  - 98.8% of simulations for 2030
  - 94.7% of simulations for 2050

3. Understanding uncertainty – conclusion

## **Conclusion and discussion**



- 1. Major market-mediated responses related to vegetable oil markets require systemic analysis of uncertainty when estimating ILUC emissions
  - modeled soybean biodiesel ILUC factors are highly sensitive to economic and biophysical parameters
  - a strong driver of results is oil palm expansion in Southeast Asia
  - spillovers from US shock to Southeast Asia and South America depend strongly on vegetable oil substitution elasticity and vegetable oil demand elasticity

### 2. Methodological considerations

- similar effects may be expected for other oilseeds with meal co-production (e.g., rapeseed)
- further efforts are needed to better estimate biophysical parameters (e.g., emission factors)
- Monte Carlo simulations varied a limited amount of parameters
  - crucial parameters might have been overlooked
  - including more parameters does not always change results as many parameters interact
- other factors impact ILUC estimates (e.g., chosen modelling framework, amortization periods)



# Thank you for your time.

## **Questions?** Comments?



We would like to acknowledge the funding of this working paper by the Transportation and Climate Division (Office of Transportation and Air Quality) of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, as part of the Framework Contract 10-312-0217117-66567L and Contract No. EP-C-16-021. Contractors' roles did not include establishing Agency policy.

Niklas Hinkel (hinkel@iiasa.ac.at)

Integrated Biosphere Futures (IBF) Research Group Biodiversity and Natural Resources (BNR) Program www.iiasa.ac.at