

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT • OPEN ACCESS

## Implementing land-based mitigation to achieve the Paris Agreement in Europe requires food system transformation

To cite this article before publication: Heera Lee *et al* 2019 *Environ. Res. Lett.* in press <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/ab3744>

### Manuscript version: Accepted Manuscript

Accepted Manuscript is “the version of the article accepted for publication including all changes made as a result of the peer review process, and which may also include the addition to the article by IOP Publishing of a header, an article ID, a cover sheet and/or an ‘Accepted Manuscript’ watermark, but excluding any other editing, typesetting or other changes made by IOP Publishing and/or its licensors”

This Accepted Manuscript is © 2019 The Author(s). Published by IOP Publishing Ltd.

As the Version of Record of this article is going to be / has been published on a gold open access basis under a CC BY 3.0 licence, this Accepted Manuscript is available for reuse under a CC BY 3.0 licence immediately.

Everyone is permitted to use all or part of the original content in this article, provided that they adhere to all the terms of the licence <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0>

Although reasonable endeavours have been taken to obtain all necessary permissions from third parties to include their copyrighted content within this article, their full citation and copyright line may not be present in this Accepted Manuscript version. Before using any content from this article, please refer to the Version of Record on IOPscience once published for full citation and copyright details, as permissions may be required. All third party content is fully copyright protected and is not published on a gold open access basis under a CC BY licence, unless that is specifically stated in the figure caption in the Version of Record.

View the [article online](#) for updates and enhancements.

# Implementing land-based mitigation to achieve the Paris Agreement in Europe requires food system transformation

Heera Lee<sup>1</sup>, Calum Brown<sup>1</sup>, Bumsuk Seo<sup>1</sup>, Ian Holman<sup>3</sup>, Eric Audsley<sup>3</sup>, George Cojocaru<sup>4</sup>, and Mark Rounsevell<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, Institute of Meteorology and Climate Research, Atmospheric Environmental Research (IMK-IFU), Kreuzackbahnstr. 19, D-82467 Garmisch-Partenkirchen, Germany

<sup>2</sup> School of Geosciences, University of Edinburgh, Drummond Street, Edinburgh EH8 9XP, UK

<sup>3</sup> School of Water, Energy and Environment, Cranfield University, Vincent Building, Bedford MK43 0AL, UK

<sup>4</sup> Tiamasg Foundation, Sfintii Voievozi 6, 010963 Bucharest, Romania

E-mail: heera.lee@kit.edu

## Abstract.

Land-based mitigation, particularly through afforestation, reforestation and avoided deforestation, is an important component of the 'Paris Agreement' to limit average global temperature increases to between 1.5 and 2 °C. However, the specific actions that would ensure sufficient carbon sequestration in forests remain unclear, as do their trade-offs against other land-based objectives. We use a regional integrated assessment model to identify the conditions under which European forests reach the extent required by mitigation targets. We compare stylised scenarios of changes in meat demand, bioenergy crop production, irrigation efficiency, and crop yield improvement. Only 42 out of 972 model simulations achieved minimum levels of food provision and

## Land-based mitigation for the Paris target

forest extent without the need to change dietary preferences, but relied on crop yield improvements within Europe of at least 30%. Maintaining food imports at today's levels to avoid the potential displacement of food production and deforestation required at least a 15 % yield improvement, or a drastic reduction in meat consumption (avg. 57 %). The results suggest that the large-scale afforestation/reforestation planned in European targets is virtually impossible to achieve without transformation of the food system, making it unlikely that Europe will play its required role in global efforts to limit climate change without utilising land beyond its borders.

*Keywords:* the 1.5 °C Paris target, Negative emissions technologies, dietary change, reforestation, afforestation, carbon sequestration, food consumption

Submitted to: *Environ. Res. Lett.*

### 1. Introduction

Human-induced global CO<sub>2</sub> emissions reached 36.2 Gt CO<sub>2</sub> in 2016 [1] and global temperature averaged more than 1 °C above pre-industrial levels. At the present rate of increase of 0.1 to 0.2 °C per decade [2], temperatures will likely exceed 1.5 °C above pre-industrial levels around 2050 [3]. Limiting temperature increases to between 1.5 °C and 2 °C as planned in the 'Paris Agreement' [4], is therefore an enormous challenge, and one that requires immediate and substantial global emissions reductions as well as adaptation and mitigation in a wide range of human systems [5, 6, 7].

The Paris Agreement was established on the basis of fair, voluntary contributions to climate change mitigation, outlined in (Intended) Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs). The NDCs recognise the possibility of internationally transferable mitigation actions [4]. Land-based mitigation is among the most prominent strategies, being

1  
2  
3 *Land-based mitigation for the Paris target* 3

4  
5 13 included in 148 of 160 NDCs [8], and accounting for up to 30% of planned emissions  
6  
7 14 reductions (PERs) [9, 10, 11]. Within these, efforts to maximise the areal extent of  
8  
9 15 forests through afforestation, reforestation or avoided deforestation are central [12].  
10

11  
12 16 Increasing forest extent is challenging because it involves competition for land with  
13  
14 17 food production not only locally but also remotely [13, 14], and requires a reversal of  
15  
16 18 long-term trends of forest loss arising from agricultural expansion [15, 16]. In the absence  
17  
18 19 of institutional interventions, forest clearance for agriculture is expected to continue in  
19  
20 20 the near future, as population growth and dietary change steadily increase global food  
21  
22 21 demand [17, 18]. Previous attempts to control deforestation have included ‘sustainable  
23  
24 22 intensification’ of agriculture, which improves food provision by reducing yield gaps  
25  
26 23 [19, 20, 13, 21] and ‘forest conservation’, which places restrictions on agricultural  
27  
28 24 expansion [16]. In both cases, interventions on the production side of agriculture alone  
29  
30 25 were unsuccessful, either having limited effects or causing counter-productive ‘leakage’  
31  
32 26 of deforestation to displaced areas [19, 20, 16]. Increases in European forest extent have  
33  
34 27 largely occurred at the expense of deforestation elsewhere, in particular, with increasing  
35  
36 28 food imports from tropical countries [22, 23].  
37  
38  
39

40  
41 29 The mitigation potential of changes in the demand side of agriculture has become  
42  
43 30 increasingly recognised in recent years [14, 24, 25]. Dietary change (i.e., changes in the  
44  
45 31 types of food commodities consumed) is especially important. It has been estimated  
46  
47 32 that global adoption of a ‘low meat’ diet could lead to emissions reductions up to 4.6  
48  
49 33 GtCO<sub>2</sub>e/year because agricultural land can instead be forested [26, 13, 27]. However,  
50  
51 34 relevant studies have focused either on a single sector (e.g., the livestock sector [27]) or  
52  
53 35 on generalised models and assumptions (e.g. trade levels, displacement effects, policy  
54  
55 36 options), potentially overlooking the multiple, cross-sectoral aspects of actual land use  
56  
57 37 changes [28]. Furthermore, while several studies have investigated the feasibility of  
58  
59  
60

*Land-based mitigation for the Paris target* 4

38 achieving afforestation/reforestation targets at a global scale [29, 6], none have done  
39 so at the regional scale, where decisions about afforestation/reforestation are made in  
40 practice. This also means that simulated pathways tend to place an unreasonable burden  
41 on areas such as the tropics, where substantial forest carbon sinks exist, but which  
42 are not necessarily best-placed to resist the pressures of agricultural expansion [30].  
43 To guide mitigation planning and policy, we therefore need more realistic analyses of  
44 regional pathways to achieving the Paris target within their global context.

45 Amongst world regions, the European Union (EU) presents a particularly  
46 compelling example. Historically, EU member states are among the largest greenhouse  
47 gas emitters and consequently have accepted responsibility for establishing robust and  
48 ambitious plans for emissions reductions [31]. In principle, the EU and its Member  
49 States act jointly to implement development trajectories and mitigation strategies  
50 that meet mandatory emissions reduction targets without further transferable harm  
51 outside Europe. Nevertheless, although the EU leadership played a significant role in  
52 developing global climate change policies including the Paris Agreement [32], practical  
53 implementation has been dissatisfying. The EU's NDC is notably vague and inexplicit,  
54 making it difficult to implement [30].

55 In this study, we investigate whether Europe can make a proportional contribution  
56 to the 1.5°C target through afforestation/reforestation while still producing sufficient  
57 food to feed the European population, and without relying on other world regions to  
58 make up shortfalls in either food production or carbon sequestration. In doing so,  
59 we explicitly do not account for potential 'win-win' arrangements that increase the  
60 efficiency of food production and climate mitigation overall, noting the dependency of  
61 such arrangements on accurate accounting of direct and indirect impacts, on stable,  
62 predictable political and economic relationships, and on an assumption that Europe

## *Land-based mitigation for the Paris target*

5

would have a legitimate claim to benefit from any spare capacity in the global land system. The European scale is also significant since the EU has the capacity to implement policy in support of land-based mitigation that member states apply. This is the first study to look at rigorous, regional strategies that are consistent with global achievement of the Paris Agreement, without shifting responsibilities to other regions. The study applies a regional integrated assessment platform (IAP) for Europe [33] to explore stylised future scenarios of the food system that cover both food supply (i.e., technological change) and food demand (i.e., calorific intake and dietary change focusing on meat consumption) with the aim of providing additional land for afforestation/reforestation.

## **2. Method and Materials**

### *2.1. The Integrated Assessment Platform (IAP)*

The IMPRESSIONS (Impacts and risks from high-end scenarios: strategies for innovative solutions) Integrated Assessment Platform (IAP) is an interactive web-based platform to assess climate change impacts, vulnerability and adaptation [34, 35, 28, 36, 33]. The platform integrates a series of interlinked meta-models representing urban development [37, 38], water resources [39], flooding [40], forests and agriculture [41], and biodiversity [42] (Supplementary Figure SF1). Land use is modelled on a 10-arcmin grid across the EU-28 plus Switzerland and Norway, resulting in a total of 23,871 grid cells. Each cell can contain multiple land uses proportionally. Hereafter we refer to the study region as the ‘EU28+2’.

In the IAP, land use is allocated based on both biophysical conditions such as soil type, climate suitability and water use, and economic aspects considering gross margins determined by prices, support rules and costs [43]. Modelled land use is first

### *Land-based mitigation for the Paris target*

6

constrained by non-agricultural land (urban, protected and flooded areas) and then divided into intensive agriculture, extensive agriculture, managed forest, unmanaged forest or unmanaged land based on their relative profitability, which depends on water availability, climate and potential yields. The IAP iterates prices to allow the allocated areas to expand or contract to meet net food demand. Food demand is simulated based on population, net imports (i.e., as a proportion of food demand), dietary preferences (for crops and different animal products), and bioenergy production [41]. If profit is above a threshold (set at €350/ha), land is allocated as intensive agriculture (e.g., crop or dairy agriculture). If profit meets a lower threshold (set at €150/ha), it is allocated as extensive agriculture or managed forest, depending on suitability. Otherwise, it is allocated either as unmanaged forest or unmanaged land [36]. Simulated crops include winter and spring wheat and barley, oilseed rape, potatoes, maize, sunflower, sugar beet, soya, and cotton. The IAP contains a subset of crops that are used to represent the range of crops that provide the major production across commodity groups (cereals, oils, roots, protein and fibre) and for livestock feed (continuing towards the production of meat and milk) in the EU28+2. Grass is simulated for livestock farming (e.g., meat and milk production). Managed forest areas are profitable forests that are used for timber production, whereas unmanaged forests undergo natural succession. In this study, managed and unmanaged forest areas were combined into a single forest category. A detailed description of the meta-models included in the IAP is provided in the Supplementary Material (Supplementary Table ST1).

Climate change was simulated based on a radiative forcing level (Representative Concentration Pathway: RCP) in different climate models. RCP 2.6 was used to simulate climate change consistent with the 1.5 °C target. Three available combinations of global and regional climate models were used (*NorESM1-M-RCA4*, *EC-EARTH-*

1  
2  
3 *Land-based mitigation for the Paris target* 7

4  
5 112 *RCA4* and *MPI-ESM-LR-REMO*). In this study, the IAP version 2 was used [33]. All  
6  
7 113 calculations were performed in R version 3.5.1 [44] using the packages *raster* [45], *rgeos*  
8  
9 114 [46], *rgdal* [47], and *Gmisc* [48].

10  
11  
12  
13 115 *2.2. Stylised land-based mitigation scenarios.*

14  
15 116 To consider both the supply and demand sides of the food system, we constructed  
16  
17 117 stylised scenarios combining five variables: ruminant and non-ruminant meat demand,  
18  
19 118 bioenergy crop production, irrigation efficiency, and yield improvement under a radiative  
20  
21 119 forcing level of  $2.6 \text{ W/m}^2$  (RCP 2.6) in the 2050s (Table 1). On the supply side,  
22  
23 120 technological change is critical in increasing production without expanding arable land  
24  
25 121 areas. Technological change was applied here to improve irrigation efficiency and crop  
26  
27 122 yields. Irrigation efficiency improvements use less water for the same yield, while  
28  
29 123 crop yield improvement incorporates biotechnology (e.g., breeding technology [49]) and  
30  
31 124 intensification. In addition, bioenergy production is included in the supply side of the  
32  
33 125 food system as it can limit available land for food production. On the demand side,  
34  
35 126 dietary preferences were modelled to account for different levels of meat consumption.  
36  
37 127 We used a population projection of 8% increase by the 2050s compared to the base  
38  
39 128 year 2010 [50]. Net imports were fixed at today's levels to avoid displacement of food  
40  
41 129 production outside the EU28+2.

42  
43  
44  
45 130 We explored a range of changes in each variable from a 'no-change' condition to  
46  
47 131 a hypothetical maximum level of change (Table 1) and quantitatively evaluated the  
48  
49 132 consequences for land use relative to a 2010 baseline. As the bioenergy production  
50  
51 133 in the IAP is set as '0' by default (meaning no bioenergy production in Europe), we  
52  
53 134 set 4% as a baseline to approximate current production levels. To avoid the harmful  
54  
55 135 side-effects of bioenergy production on food supplies, the EU established a cap of 7% of  
56  
57 136 arable land being used for bioenergy production [51]. We included a higher maximum  
58  
59  
60



### *Land-based mitigation for the Paris target*

(12%) to reflect current projections suggesting that bioenergy production requires as much as 12.4% of cropland by the 2030s [52]. The impact of bioenergy production was additionally analysed in terms of directly-caused land use transitions. The maximum yield improvement level (= 75%) was set to match the maximum possible yield gap in Europe [53] and to allow yield improvement across all crops due to crop breeding [49]. All of these values were designed to provide broad limits within which simulated change could occur, rather than predictive ‘pathways’, in order to assess the scale of change required for simultaneous achievement of food security and climate mitigation targets.

For each combination of parameter values ( $n = 324$ ), the three climate model combinations were run, giving 972 individual model runs. Dietary energy production (kcal/capita/day) and corresponding forest areas for each scenario were quantified to assess the implications of each scenario. Indicators of land use change were selected to compare scenarios; these included the extent of intensive arable land, intensive grassland (dairy), extensive grassland (sheep and rough grazing), very extensive grassland (heath and moor), forest (managed forest for timber, unmanaged forest), unmanaged land (no productive purpose), and urban areas.

### *2.3. Normative targets.*

*Food security target* A global daily calorie intake of 2800 kcal/capita/day was used as a threshold for the food security target [13]. While nutritionally sufficient, this threshold is substantially below current consumption levels in Europe, and so we also used the current European average of 3300 kcal/capita/day as a secondary threshold to highlight how reducing food consumption from current levels could contribute to mitigation efforts.

1  
2  
3 *Land-based mitigation for the Paris target* 9  
4  
5

6 **Table 1.** Overview of the stylised scenarios as applied in the IAP. Each parameter  
7 scenario was combined with all others, giving 324 scenarios in total.

Category	Parameter	Scenario counts	Settings (+ % increase, - % decrease)
Demand side	Dietary preference (ruminant, non-ruminant)	9	(-100,+100), (-75, +75), (-50, +50), (-25, +25), (0, 0)
Supply side	Yield improvement	6	(-100, -100), (-75, -75), (-50, -50), (-25, -25) 0, +15, +30, +45, +60, +75
	Irrigation improvement	2	0, +25
	Bioenergy crop production	3	+4, +8, +12
Total number of scenario combinations		324	

160 *Afforestation/reforestation target* Afforestation and reforestation were combined into  
161 'forest area' targets. To translate global policy targets into European targets, we used  
162 the Bonn Challenge target of restoring 150 million ha of deforested and degraded land  
163 globally by 2020. The Bonn Challenge was extended to a target of restoring 350 million  
164 ha by 2030 by the New York Declaration on Forests at the 2014 UN Climate Summit  
165 [54]. This target would sequester up to 1.7 GtCO<sub>2</sub>e/year [55], which is equivalent to  
166 9.7 tCO<sub>2</sub>e/ha/year for 20 years. Currently, the EU contains 4.36% of the global forest  
167 area [56]. We linearly extrapolated the Bonn reforestation area target of 2030 to 2050  
168 and applied this proportionally to Europe on the basis of current (modelled) forest  
169 area. A target based on a global CO<sub>2</sub> reduction projection by [6] was also used for  
170 comparison. In this comparison, we assumed 30% of the CO<sub>2</sub> reduction attributed to  
171 afforestation/restoration actions [11].

### 3. Results


#### 3.1. Successful scenarios and the impacts on land cover in the 2050s.

Of the 972 simulations, 351 (36.1%) met both the minimum food security and forest area targets in the 2050s (Figure 1). These successful simulations could be divided into four groups based on dietary preferences: 42 with ‘no change’ in preferences, 6 with ‘beef substitution’, 215 with ‘less meat’ (with between 25 and 75% reduction in both ruminant and non-ruminant meat), and 88 with ‘no meat’ (both ruminant and non-ruminant meat consumption were reduced by 100%). The majority of the successful simulations (86.3%) belonged either to the ‘less meat’ or ‘no meat’ groups, highlighting the importance of dietary change in achieving food security and forest area targets. On average, to achieve these targets, a drastic reduction in meat demand is required; 57.5% and 56.7% of the ruminant and non-ruminant meat demand, respectively. All successful simulations also included at least 15% yield improvement (Figure 1). Critically, if meat demand was not reduced (the ‘no change’ group), at least 30% yield improvement was required. About 19% of successful runs required the maximum level of yield improvement ( $n = 67$ ). Average bioenergy production of the successful runs was 8.23% across groups. Competition between bioenergy and food crop production within arable areas was therefore not apparent, although the analysis of land use transitions with increasing bioenergy production showed additional loss of forest areas to arable land (Supplementary Figure SF4). Irrigation efficiency improvement was the least influential factor (Supplementary Figure SF2).

The level of food production and forest areas varied across the different scenario groups (Figure 1 and Table 2). Interestingly, less or no meat diets produce the highest level of food energy, showing a trade-off between calorific intake and meat consumption. By producing more meat, more land is allocated to produce fodder crops and grassland,

## Land-based mitigation for the Paris target

11



**Figure 1.** Modelled daily dietary energy production and forest area in scenario simulations that resulted in forest areas at least as large as those of the present day and in an average calorie intake at least as large as the current global average ( $n = 434$ ). The size and shape of the symbols refers to the level of yield improvement. The grey box refers to the afforestation/reforestation targets in the 2050s. The symbols above the grey box were considered as successful simulations ( $n = 351$ ). The envelope lines of the groups are drawn (dotted lines) to highlight the ‘frontiers’ of each dietary change

197 which reduces the efficacy of the food supply. For this reason, scenarios with high  
 198 meat demand resulted in meat dominating consumption. The ‘beef substitution’ group  
 199 produced the lowest level of food energy, which is largely because cereals are used to feed  
 200 monogastric livestock, resulting in a reduction of total food calories. For 351 successful  
 201 simulations, only 29 (8.2%) produced food calories at or above the current European  
 202 average level, and all but one required the ‘no-meat’ diet. There was also a clear positive  
 203 relationship between agricultural intensification and forest areas (Figure 1) with more  
 204 intensification providing more available area for forests.

205 Changing dietary preferences changed land use considerably. Reduced ruminant  
 206 meat demand drastically decreased grassland areas from 11.8 % to 3.7% of the land  
 207 system in the EU28+2 between 2010 and the 2050s on average. The increase in forest

*Land-based mitigation for the Paris target*

12

**Table 2.** Successful scenarios and the average corresponding daily dietary energy and total forest area projections for Europe (2050).

Group	Description	Daily dietary energy production kcal/capita/day (avg. (s.d.))	Forest area size Million <i>ha</i> (avg. (s.d.))
No change	No change in dietary preference	2896.3 (75.8)	191.9 (20.8)
Beef substitution	Ruminant meat is substituted by non-ruminant meat	2861.2 (62.3)	179.4 (11.4)
Less meat	Reduce both ruminant and non-ruminant meat consumption	3035.9 (127)	206.8 (23.5)
No meat	Eliminate both ruminant and non-ruminant meat consumption	3246 (118.1)	212.3 (25.5)


area was largely driven by decreases in the area of land used to produce food. When both ruminant and non-ruminant demands were decreased, intensive arable land and grasslands were converted to forest areas (Figure 2). The area of unmanaged land also increased from 17.8% to 22.3% of the EU28+2, mainly from very extensive grassland (unmanaged land in the IAP represents land that is unsuitable or not needed for either agricultural production or grassland). The impact varied spatially (Figure 3), with intensive arable land mainly increasing in Poland, producing a corresponding decrease in managed forest areas. Intensive grassland increased in the northern UK and France at the expense of forests.

#### 4. Discussion

Land systems around the world need to make substantial contributions to climate mitigation if high-end climate change is to be avoided. A proportional contribution by the EU28+2 to land-based mitigation (on the basis of area, rather than emissions) will require immediate and dramatic changes. Meeting the forest area target consistent

## Land-based mitigation for the Paris target

13




**Figure 2.** Average land cover transitions between 2010 and 2050 in successful simulations ( $n = 351$ ).

222 with the Paris Agreement requires an expansion of forest area of approximately 23%  
 223 by the 2050s (compared to 2010) according to the Bonn Challenge. Given the fact  
 224 that afforestation and reforestation have the maximum mitigation potential and cost-  
 225 effectiveness of land-based measures [57, 58], other strategies would likely require even  
 226 greater levels of land conversion.

*Land-based mitigation for the Paris target*

14



**Figure 3.** Comparison of the simulated distribution of (a) intensive arable land, (b) intensive grassland, (c) managed forest and (d) unmanaged forest for the 2050s with the baseline simulation (2010).

227 Historically, Europe has expanded its forest areas by about 30% from 1900 to 2010  
228 due to agricultural intensification and increasing imports [59, 60]. At the same time,  
229 there is concern that the rate of forest expansion in Europe has slowed during the last  
230 decade due to increased deforestation [61]. Previous studies suggest that there is still  
231 potential to mitigate 441 Mt CO<sub>2</sub>/year in Europe through afforestation on abandoned

*Land-based mitigation for the Paris target* 15

232 farmland (15 Million ha) and improving forest management [62]. This suggests that  
233 better integration of forest regrowth within the EU climate policy framework should be  
234 a priority [62]. However, the projected extent of abandoned farmland is still insufficient  
235 to achieve the normative afforestation target as shown in our study (Figure 1), and is  
236 largely driven by increased food imports; something that is unlikely to be consistent  
237 with global climate mitigation efforts, and which is precluded here [63, 64].

238 In our analysis, we fix the level of proportional net import as constant in the  
239 2050s with increasing population, which led to reduced available abandoned farmland  
240 for reforestation. Although trade could potentially improve on this outcome if it were  
241 to reliably shift production to more efficient land, or spare other land more capable of  
242 providing carbon sequestration (e.g. the tropics), an assumption of fixed net imports  
243 ensures that European progress towards global targets is not at the expense of other  
244 countries. While this is a simplification, it avoids the need for assumptions about  
245 developments in the rest of the world and their effect on international trade, introducing  
246 a number of other contingencies and uncertainties.

247 Increasing forest area will therefore undoubtedly be difficult without major changes  
248 in agriculture [65], including changes in both the supply and demand sides of the food  
249 system. By simulating scenarios that meet both food security and forest area targets,  
250 we found dietary change to be the most critical factor in achieving these targets. The  
251 consequences of these scenarios were complex. For instance, the impacts of human diets  
252 on the land system vary widely because different types of meat production have different  
253 implications for land use [18].

254 In the IAP, intensive grassland is land not suitable for arable use, but highly  
255 productive for dairy. Extensive grassland is land not suitable for arable or dairy, and  
256 considered as land for beef or sheep grazing. We assumed that 50% of cereals from arable



*Land-based mitigation for the Paris target* 16

land is for livestock feed. Monogastrics are more efficient to produce than ruminant meat for a unit of calorific consumption [66]. Changing preferences from the consumption of ruminant to non-ruminant meat also decreases the demand for grassland substantially, but may increase the area and intensity of arable land for fodder crops. This result is, however, sensitive to uncertainties in grassland productivity in different regions [67].

‘Beef substitution’ scenarios were not effective in increasing forest areas as the area of land used for feed crops for other livestock increased. Instead, the successful scenarios mostly contained less or no meat consumption. As highlighted elsewhere, reduced beef consumption reduces not only greenhouse gas emissions, but also environmental impacts such as nitrogen pollution [68, 69, 70]. The level of the EU’s food self-sufficiency also increases with less or no meat consumption because of the increased availability of land for food production [69]. In our results, increased monogastric meat demand produced the least calorific intake. Furthermore, plant-based diets within the EU decrease the footprint of food production in the rest of the world as, currently, the majority of the outsourced emissions is from feed production [71]. Even though the trend in Europe is for decreasing meat consumption, European diets are still largely dependent on animal products. The average per capita annual meat consumption in Europe is 80 kg, which is about 1.9 times higher than the global average (43 kg) [72]. Compared to the Indian diet, European meat intakes are six times higher [73]. While meat intakes provide necessary nutrients for human, reductions in meat consumption as modelled in our study can be associated with health benefits especially in the US and Europe by reducing total and cancer mortality [74]. It should be noted however that major socio-economic impacts would arise from less or no meat diets, with significant changes in the rural economy, socio-ecological systems, and cultural norms. For example, a drastic reduction in livestock production would lead to a loss of grassland associated with high

*Land-based mitigation for the Paris target*

17

value biodiversity and cultural landscapes [75].

On the supply side, technological change is critical in increasing food production without expanding arable land areas [17]. Generally, yield improvements have been realised through the intensive use of fertiliser and technological changes. In the IAP, the role of biotechnology and fertiliser use improvement were considered in the technological improvement for yield gain across crops. Yet, it is also important to note that the EU had reached its peak of fertiliser use intensification in 1961 [76]. Also, the average yield gap (difference between actual gain and estimated potential gain) in Europe for cereal crops is about 42%, with a range between 10 and 70% depending on the region, making simulated yield improvements of up to 75% by the 2050s in the scenarios reported here questionable. There is, nevertheless, potential for large increases in crop yields in Eastern Europe including Romania, Ukraine and Poland [53]. This is in line with our result of a large-scale yield improvement occurred in Poland (Figure 3). Another aspect of technological improvement considered in this study was irrigation efficiency, but this was found to have the least influential effect on the model results. Nevertheless, a warming climate will likely affect water availability, especially in Southern Europe [77], requiring widespread application of irrigation water. This is likely to depend, however, on farmers' knowledge and capacity to adapt [78, 79].

While the impact of bioenergy production was not clearly separable in our study, we did find evidence in modelled land use transitions (Supplementary Figure SF4) that increasing bioenergy production occurred at the expense of forest areas. This is in line with several studies that have shown substantial negative impacts of bioenergy production when full, cross-sectoral or cross-locational impacts are considered [14, 80].

Furthermore, bioenergy production typically takes place on land that was previously used for food or feed crop farming. Growing more bioenergy crops in Europe could

*Land-based mitigation for the Paris target* 18

307 cause the displacement of food production from Europe to the rest of the world or lead  
308 to the expansion of bioenergy crops into European grassland or forest. In addition, the  
309 IAP only considers a sub-set of bioenergy (crop-based, within integrated production  
310 systems) on arable land. Further research is needed to investigate the trade-off between  
311 food and bioenergy crops and the various bioenergy feedstocks.

312 While our analyses provide an illustrative envelope in which the selected targets  
313 can be achieved, uncertainties remain. Model uncertainty in integrated modelling  
314 frameworks is an important aspect of land cover projections [81, 36]. For example, the  
315 baseline forest area in the IAP is relatively low compared to the current forest extent [56].  
316 To account for this, we adjusted the forest target according to the modelled baseline. In  
317 addition, as meta-models represent a simplification of reality, they inevitably introduce  
318 uncertainties [82, 83]. However, they also enable the exploration of multiple scenarios  
319 in a short period of time by improving simulation efficiency [84]. For example, the  
320 IAP enables exploration of cross-sectoral interactions by improving simulation efficiency,  
321 and removing the very large biases associated with single-sector analyses [28]. Finally,  
322 uncertainties and sensitivities in each of the 10 models included in the IAP, and in the  
323 integrated IAP itself, have been extensively tested in previous studies [83, 39, 41, 85, 86],  
324 showing limited and non-biased uncertainties.

**5. Conclusion**

326 Land-based mitigation commitments for achieving the Paris target require considerable  
327 expansion of forest areas, yet large-scale afforestation/reforestation conflicts with other  
328 land use objectives. This study has shown that satisfying food security and forest  
329 area targets requires substantial changes in both the supply and demand sides of the  
330 European food system. While technological improvements (through yield and irrigation

## *Land-based mitigation for the Paris target*

19

331 efficiency improvements) may be achievable in some regions of Europe, shifting to diets  
332 with less or no meat consumption will be most critical and challenging in practice.  
333 Furthermore, this leads to land use changes and regional trade-offs in the 2050s, with  
334 Eastern Europe increasing agricultural land areas, but decreasing forest areas, and  
335 central Europe producing less food. Our regional, model-based experiments highlight  
336 that increasing forest areas in Europe will require a fundamental transformation of the  
337 food system to avoid shifting responsibilities to other regions. This study can contribute  
338 to the current EU Land Use, Land Use Change and Forestry (LULUCF) policy which  
339 lacks a comprehensive overview on the necessary action for the afforestation, or the role  
340 of dietary change in the food system. Decision making should also take account of the  
341 potential trade-offs for ecosystem services and biodiversity of increasing forest areas.

## **Acknowledgments**

This research was financially supported by the Helmholtz Association and the EU-funded IMPRESSIONS project (Grant Agreement 603416). We acknowledge support by the KIT-Publication Fund of the Karlsruhe Institute of Technology.

## **Data availability**

The model used in this study (The IMPRESSIONS IAP2) is publicly available at [http://impressions-project.eu/show/IAP2\\_14855](http://impressions-project.eu/show/IAP2_14855). The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

## **References**

- [1] Quéré C L, Andrew R M, Friedlingstein P, Sitch S, Pongratz J, Manning A C, Korsbakken J I, Peters G P, Canadell J G, Jackson R B, Boden T A, Tans P P, Andrews O D, Arora V K, Bakker D C E, Barbero L, Becker M, Betts R A, Bopp L, Chevallier F, Chini L P, Ciais P,

1  
2  
3 *Land-based mitigation for the Paris target* 20

- 4 Cosca C E, Cross J, Currie K, Gasser T, Harris I, Hauck J, Haverd V, Houghton R A, Hunt  
5 C W, Hurtt G, Ilyina T, Jain A K, Kato E, Kautz M, Keeling R F, Goldewijk K K, Körtzinger  
6 A, Landschützer P, Lefèvre N, Lenton A, Lienert S, Lima I, Lombardozzi D, Metz N, Millero F,  
7 Monteiro P M S, Munro D R, Nabel J E M S, ichiro Nakaoka S, Nojiri Y, Padin X A, Peregon  
8 A, Pfeil B, Pierrot D, Poulter B, Rehder G, Reimer J, Rödenbeck C, Schwinger J, Séférian R,  
9 Skjelvan I, Stocker B D, Tian H, Tilbrook B, Tubiello F N, van der Laan-Luijkx I T, van der  
10 Werf G R, van Heuven S, Viovy N, Vuichard S, Walker A P, Watson A J, Wiltshire A J, Zaehle  
11 S and Zhu D 2018 *Earth System Science Data* **10** 405–448
- 12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19 [2] Hausteijn K, Allen M R, Forster P M, Otto F E L, Mitchell D M, Matthews H D and Frame D J  
20 2017 *Scientific Reports* **7**
- 21  
22 [3] Matthews H D, Zickfeld K, Knutti R and Allen M R 2018 *Environmental Research Letters* **13**
- 23  
24 [4] United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change 2016 Report of the Conference of  
25 the Parties on its twenty-first session, held in Paris from 30 November to 13 December 2015  
26 Tech. rep. United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change accessed May 2018 URL  
27 <https://unfccc.int/node/9099>
- 28  
29  
30  
31 [5] Rogelj J, den Elzen M, Höhne N, Fransen T, Fekete H, Winkler H, Schaeffer R, Sha F, Riahi K  
32 and Meinshausen M 2016 *Nature* **534** 631–639
- 33  
34  
35 [6] van Vuuren D P, Stehfest E, Gernaat D E H K, van den Berg M, Bijl D L, de Boer H S, Daioglou  
36 V, Doelman J C, Edelenbosch O Y, Harmsen M, Hof A F and van Sluisveld M A E 2018 *Nature*  
37 *Climate Change* **8** 391–397
- 38  
39  
40 [7] IPCC 2018 Global warming of 1.5 °C - an IPCC special report on the impacts of  
41 global warming of 1.5 °C above pre-industrial levels and related global greenhouse gas emission  
42 pathways, in the context of strengthening the global response to the threat of climate change,  
43 sustainable development, and efforts to eradicate poverty *Summary for Policymakers* ed Masson-  
44 Delmotte V, Zhai P, Pörtner H O, Roberts D, Skea J, Shukla P R, Pirani A, Moufouma-Okia  
45 W, Péan C, Pidcock R, Connors S, Matthews J B R, Chen Y, Zhou X, Gomis M I, Lonnoy E,  
46 Maycock T, Tignor M and Waterfield T (IPCC)
- 47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52 [8] Forsell N, Turkovska O, Gusti M, Obersteiner M, den Elzen M and Havlik P 2016 *Carbon Balance*  
53 *Manage* **11**
- 54  
55  
56 [9] Dowell N M and Fajardy M 2017 *Environmental Research Letters* **12**
- 57  
58  
59 [10] Grassi G, House J, Dentener F, Federici S, den Elzen M and Penman J 2017 *Nature Climate*  
60

*Land-based mitigation for the Paris target*

21

*Change* **7** 220–226

- [11] Grassi G, House J, Kurz W A, Cescatti A, Houghton R A, Peters G P, Sanz M J, Vinas R A, Alkama R, Arneth A, Bondeau A, Dentener F, Fader M, Federici S, Friedlingstein P, Jain A K, Kato E, Koven C D, Lee D, Nabel J E M S, Nassikas A A, Perugini L, Rossi S, Sitch S, Viovy N, Wiltshire A and Zaehle S 2018 *Nature Climate Change*
- [12] Harper A B, Powell T, Cox P M, House J, Huntingford C, Lenton T M, Sitch S, Burke E, Chadburn S E, Collins W J, Comyn-Platt E, Daioglou V, Doelman J C, Hayman G, Robertson E, van Vuuren D, Wiltshire A, Webber C P, Ciais A B P, Devaraju N, Jain A K, Krause A, Boysen L, Poulter B and Shu S 2018 *Nature Communications* **9**
- [13] Smith P, Haberl H, Popp A, Erb K H, Lauk C, Harper R, Tubiello F N, de Siqueira Pinto A, Jafari M, Sohi S, Masera O, Böttcher H, Berndes G, Bustamante M, Ahammad H, Clark H, Dong H, Elsiddig E A, Mbow C, Ravindranath N H, Rice C W, Abad C R, Romanovskaya A, Sperling F, Herrero M, House J I and Rose S 2013 *Global Change Biology* **19** 2285–2302
- [14] Bajželj B, Richards K S, Allwood J M, Smith P, Dennis J S, Curmi E and Gilligan C A 2014 *Nature Climate Change* **4**
- [15] DeFries R S, Rudel T, Uriarte M and Hansen M 2010 *Nature Geoscience* **3** 178–181
- [16] Popp A, Humpenöder F, Weindl I, Bodirsky B L, Bonsch M, Lotze-Campen H, Müller C, Biewald A, Rolinski S, Stevanovic M and Dietrich J P 2014 *Nature Climate Change* **4** 1095–1098
- [17] Tilman D, Balzer C, Hill J and Befort B L 2011 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **108** 20260–20264
- [18] Alexander P, Rounsevell M, Dislich C, Dodson J, Engstrom K and Moran D 2015 *Global Environmental Change* **35** 135–147
- [19] Garnett T, Appleby M C, Balmford A, Bateman I J, Benton T G, Bloomer P, Burlingame B, Dawkins M, Dolan L, Fraser D, Herrero M, Hoffmann I, Smith P, Thornton P K, Toulmin C, Vermeulen S J and Godfray H C J 2013 *Science* **341** 33–34
- [20] Smith P 2013 *Global Food Security* **2** 18–23
- [21] Aleksandrowicz L, Green R, Joy E J M, Smith P and Haines A 2016 *PLoS ONE* **11** e0165797
- [22] DeFries R and Rosenzweig C 2010 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **107** 19627–19632
- [23] West P C, Gibbs H K, Monfreda C, Wagner J, Barford C C, Carpenter S R and Foley J A 2010 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **107** 19645–

*Land-based mitigation for the Paris target*

22

19648

- [24] Erb K H, Lauk C, Kastner T, Mayer A, Theurl M C and Haberl H 2016 *Nature Communications* **7**
- [25] Rööß E, Bajželj B, Smith P, Patel M, Little D and Garnett T 2017 *Global Environmental Change* **47** 1–12
- [26] Stehfest E, Bouwman L, van Vuuren D P, den Elzen M G J, Eickhout B and Kabat P 2009 *Climatic Change* **95** 83–102
- [27] Herrero M, Henderson B, Havlík P, Thornton P K, Conant R T, Smith P, Wirsenius S, Hristov A N, Gerber P, Gill M, Butterbach-Bahl K, Valin H, Garnett T and Stehfest E 2016 *Nature Climate Change* **6**
- [28] Harrison P A, Dunford R W, Holman I P and Rounsevell M D A 2016 *Nature Climate Change* **6** 885–890
- [29] Wolff S, Schrammeijer E A, Schulp C J and Verburg P H 2018 *Global Environmental Change* **52** 259–272
- [30] Brown C, Alexander P, Arneith A, Holman I and Rounsevell M D 2019 *Nature Climate Change* **in press**
- [31] Geden O, Scott V and Palmer J 2018 *WIREs Climate Change* **9** e521
- [32] Parker C F, Karlsson C and Hjerpe M 2017 *Journal of European Integration* **39** 239–252
- [33] Harrison P A, Dunford R W, Holman I P, Cojocaru G, Madsen M S, Chen P Y, Pedde S and Sandars D 2018 *Regional Environmental Change* **13** 1–15
- [34] Harrison P A, Holman I P, Cojocaru G, Kok K, Kontogianni A, Metzger M J and Gramberger M 2013 *Regional Environmental Change* **13** 761–780
- [35] Harrison P A, Holman I P and Berry P M 2015 *Climatic Change* **128** 153–167
- [36] Holman I, Brown C, Janes V and Sandars D 2017 *Agricultural Systems* **151** 126–135
- [37] Reginster I and Rounsevell M 2006 *Environment and Planning B: Urban Analytics and City Science* **33** 619–636
- [38] Terama E, Clarke E, Rounsevell M D A, Fronzek S and Carter T R 2017 *Regional Environmental Change* **19** 667–677
- [39] Wimmer F, Audsley E, Malsy M, Savin C, Dunford R, Harrison P A, Schaldach R and Flörke M 2015 *Climatic Change* **128** 229–244
- [40] Mokrech M, Kebede A S, Nicholls R J, Wimmer F and Feyen L 2015 *Climatic Change* **128** 245–260

*Land-based mitigation for the Paris target*

23

- [41] Audsley E, Trnka M, Sabateé S, Maspons J, Sanchez A, Sandars D, Balek J and Pearn K 2015 *Climatic Change* **128** 215–227
- [42] Sitch S, Smith B, Prentice I C, Arneth A, Bondeau A, Cramer W, Kaplan J O, Levis S, Lucht W, Sykes M T *et al.* 2003 *Global change biology* **9** 161–185
- [43] Holman I and Harrison P 2011 Report describing the development and validation of the sectoral meta-models for integration into the IA platform Tech. rep. CLIMSAVE Deliverable 2.2. accessed 16 May 2019 URL [http://www.climsave.eu/climsave/doc/Report\\_on\\_the\\_Meta-models.pdf](http://www.climsave.eu/climsave/doc/Report_on_the_Meta-models.pdf).
- [44] R Core Team 2018 *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing* R Foundation for Statistical Computing Vienna, Austria URL <https://www.R-project.org/>
- [45] Hijmans R J 2016 raster: Geographic data analysis and modeling. Tech. rep. R package version 2.5-8. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=raster>
- [46] Bivand R and Rundel C 2018 *rgeos: Interface to Geometry Engine - Open Source (GEOS)* R package version 0.3-28
- [47] Bivand R, Keitt T and Rowlingson B 2017 *rgdal: Bindings for the Geospatial Data Abstraction Library* R package version 1.2-8 URL <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=rgdal>
- [48] Gordon M 2017 *Gmisc: Descriptive Statistics, Transition Plots, and More* R package version 1.5 URL <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=Gmisc>
- [49] Watson A, Ghosh S, Williams M J, Cuddy W S, Simmonds J, Rey M D, Hatta M A M, Hinchliffe A, Steed A, Reynolds D, Adamski N M, Breakspear A, Korolev A, Rayner T, Dixon L E, Riaz A, Martin W, Ryan M, Edwards D, Batley J, Raman H, Carter J, Rogers C, Domoney C, Moore G, Harwood W, Nicholson P, Dieters M J, DeLacy I H, Zhou J, Uauy C, Boden S A, Park R F, Wulff B B H and Hickey L T 2018 *Nature Plants* **4** 23–29
- [50] EUROSTAT Statistics 2017 *People in the EU - population projections* URL <https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat>
- [51] European Union 2015 Directive (EU) 2015/1513 of the European Parliament and of the Council Tech. rep. European Parliament
- [52] de Schutter L and Giljum S 2014 A calculation of the EU bioenergy land footprint Tech. rep. Institute for the Environment and Regional Development, Vienna University of Economics and Business
- [53] Schils R, Olesen J E, Kersebaum K C, Rijk B, Oberforster M, Kalyada V, Khitrykau M, Gobin



*Land-based mitigation for the Paris target*

24

A, Kirchev H, Manolova V, Manolov I, Trnka M, Hlavinka P, Palosuo T, Peltonen-Sainio P, Jauhainen L, Lorgeou J, Marrou H, Danalatos N, Archontoulis S, Fodor N, Spink J, Roggero P P, Bassu S, Pulina A, Seehusen T, Uhlen A K, Żyłowska K, Nieróbca A, Kozyra J, Silva J V, Maçãs B M, Coutinho J, Ion V, Takáč J, Mínguez M I, Eckersten H, Levy L, Herrera J M, Hiltbrunner J, Kryvobok O, Kryvoshein O, Sylvester-Bradley R, Kindred D, Topp C F, Boogaard H, de Groot H, Lesschen J P, van Bussel L, Wolf J, Zijlstra M, van Loon M P and van Ittersum M K 2018 *European Journal of Agronomy* **101** 109 – 120 ISSN 1161-0301 URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S116103011830491X>

[54] IUCN 2018 <http://www.bonnchallenge.org> accessed in 22nd Oct 2018

[55] IUCN 2017 <https://www.iucn.org/news/forests/201711/iucn-enhance-countries\OT1\textquoteright-restoration-efforts-under-paris-climate-agreement-bonn-challenge-passes-160-million-hectares> accessed in 22nd Oct 2018

[56] World Bank 2018 The World Bank database: Forest area <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/AG.LND.FRST.K2> accessed in Feb 2019

[57] Griscom B W, Adams J, Ellis P W, Houghton R A, Lomax G, Miteva D A, Schlesinger W H, Shoch D, Siikamäki J V, Smith P, Woodhury P, Zganjar C, Blackman A, Campari J, Conant R T, Delgado C, Elias P, Gopalakrishna T, Hamsik M R, Herrero M, Kiesecker J, Landis E, Laestadius L, Leavitt S M, Minnemeyer S, Polasky S, Potapov P, Putz F E, Sanderman J, Silvius M, Wollenberg E and Fargione J 2017 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **114** 11645–11650

[58] Minx J C, Lamb W F, Callaghan M W, Fuss S, Hilaire J, Creutzig F, Amann T, Beringer T, de Oliveira Garcia W, Hartmann J, Khanna T, Lenzi D, Luderer G, Nemet G F, Rogelj J, Smith P, Vicente J L V, Wilcox J and del Mar Zamora Dominguez M 2018 *Environmental Research Letters* **13**

[59] Fuchs R, Herlod M, Verburg P H, Clevers J G and Eberle J 2015 *Global Change Biology* **21** 299–313

[60] Naudts K, Chen Y, McGrath M J, Ryder J, Valade A, Otto J and Luysaert S 2016 *Science* **351** 597–600

[61] Nabuurs G J, Lindner M, Verkerk P J, Gunia K, Deda P, Michalak R and Grassi G 2013 *Nature Climate Change* **3** 792–796

[62] Nabuurs G J, Delacote P, Ellison D, Hanewinkel M, Hetemäki L and Lindner M 2017 *Forests* **8**

*Land-based mitigation for the Paris target*

25

- [63] Renwick A, Jansson T, Verburg P, Revoredo-Giha C, Britz W, Gocht A and McCracken D 2013 *Land Use Policy* **30** 446–457
- [64] Terres J M, Scacchiafichi L N, Wania A, Ambar M, Anguiano E, Buckwell A, Coppola A, Gocht A, Källström H N, Pointereau P *et al.* 2015 *Land Use Policy* **49** 20–34
- [65] Frank S, Havlík P, Soussana J F, Levesque A, Valin H, Wollenberg E, Kleinwechter U, Fricko O, Gusti M, Herrero M, Smith P, Hasegawa T, Kraxner F and Obersteiner M 2017 *Environmental Research Letters* **12**
- [66] Buckwell A and Nadeu E 2018 What is the safe operating space for eu livestock Tech. rep. RISE Foundation Brussels
- [67] Tramberend S, Fischer G, Bruckner M and van Velthuisen H 2019 *Ecological Economics* **157** 332–341
- [68] Bellarby J, Tirado R, Leip A, Weiss F, Lesschen J P and Smith P 2012 *Global Change Biology* **19** 3–18
- [69] Westhoek H, Lesschen J P, Rood T, Wagner S, Marco A D, Murphy-Bokern D, Leip A, van Grinsven H, Sutton M A and Oenema O 2014 *Global Environmental Change* **26** 196–205
- [70] Bryngelsson D, Wirsenius S, Hedenus F and Sonesson U 2016 *Food Policy* **59** 152–164
- [71] Sandström V, Valin H, Krisztin T, Havlík P, Herrero M and Kastner T 2018 *Global Food Security* **19** 48–55
- [72] Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) 2017 *Food Balance Sheets: Meat-Food supply quantity (kg/capita/yr)* URL <http://www.fao.org/faostat/en/?#data/>
- [73] Searchinger T, Waite R, Hanson C and Ranganathan J 2018 Creating a sustainable food future: a menu of solutions to feed nearly 10 billion people by 2050 Tech. rep. World Resources Institute Washington DC
- [74] Sinha R, Cross A J, Graubard B I, Leitzmann M F and Schatzkin A 2009 *Archives of internal medicine* **169** 562–571
- [75] Buscardo E, Smith G F, Kelly D L, Freitas H, Iremonger S, Mitchell F J G, O'Donoghue S and McKee A M 2008 The early effects of afforestation on biodiversity of grasslands in Ireland *Plantation Forests and Biodiversity: Oxymoron or Opportunity?* vol 9 ed Brockerhoff E, Jactel H, Parrotta J, Quine C, Sayer J and Hawksworth D (Dordrecht: Springer) pp 133–148 ISBN 978-90-481-2807-5
- [76] Pellegrini P and Fernández R J 2018 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United*

1  
2  
3 *Land-based mitigation for the Paris target*

26

4  
5 *States of America* **115** 2335–2340

6  
7 [77] Wriedt G, der Velde M V, Aloe A and Bouraoui F 2009 *Journal of Hydrology* **373** 527–544

8  
9 [78] Gold A, Parker D, Waskom R, Dobrowolski J, O'Neill M, Groffman P, Addy K, Barber M, Batie  
10 S, Benham B *et al.* 2013 *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation* **68** 337–348

11  
12 [79] Levidow L, Zaccaria D, Maia R, Vivas E, Todorovic M and Scardigno A 2014 *Agricultural Water*  
13 *Management* **146** 84–94

14  
15 [80] Searchinger T D, Beringer T and Strong A 2017 *Energy Policy* **110** 434–446

16  
17 [81] Alexander P, Prestele R, Verburg P H, Arneith A, Baranzelli C, Batista e Silva F, Brown C, Butler  
18 A, Calvin K, Dendoncker N *et al.* 2017 *Global change biology* **23** 767–781

19  
20 [82] Ackerman F, DeCanio S J, Howarth R B and Sheeran K 2009 *Climatic change* **95** 297–315

21  
22 [83] Brown C, Brown E, Murray-Rust D, Cojocar G, Savin C and Rounsevell M 2015 *Climatic change*  
23 **128** 293–306

24  
25 [84] Jin R, Du X and Chen W 2003 *Structural and Multidisciplinary Optimization* **25** 99–116

26  
27 [85] Dunford R, Harrison P and Rounsevell M 2015 *Climatic change* **132** 417–432

28  
29 [86] Kebede A, Dunford R, Audsley E, Harrison P, Holman I, Mokrech M, Nicholls R, Rickebusch S,  
30 Rounsevell M, Sabaté S *et al.* 2015 *Climatic Change* **128** 261–277  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60