



HAL
open science

Increasing food production and mitigating agricultural greenhouse gas emissions in the European Union: impacts of carbon pricing and calorie production targeting

Ancuta Isbasoiu, Pierre-Alain Jayet, Stéphane de Cara

► To cite this version:

Ancuta Isbasoiu, Pierre-Alain Jayet, Stéphane de Cara. Increasing food production and mitigating agricultural greenhouse gas emissions in the European Union: impacts of carbon pricing and calorie production targeting. *Environmental Economics and Policy Studies*, 2021, 23, pp.409-440. 10.1007/s10018-020-00293-4 . hal-03151982

HAL Id: hal-03151982

<https://hal.inrae.fr/hal-03151982v1>

Submitted on 25 Feb 2021

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial - ShareAlike 4.0 International License

Increasing food production and mitigating agricultural greenhouse gas emissions in the European Union: impacts of carbon pricing and calorie production targeting

Abstract

This study focuses on the links between food production and greenhouse gas emissions in the European Union. The analysis relies on two sets of simulations of AROPAj, a supply-side model of EU agriculture: (i) a carbon price affecting agricultural GHG emissions (from 0 to 200 EUR/tCO₂eq), and (ii) a lower limit on the net quantity of food calories provided by EU agriculture (200 to 450 Mt soft wheat equivalent). The model is calibrated on six annual datasets 2007-2012. The results show that a moderate increase in the price of carbon would lead to an increase in total areas and outputs of crops. Animal production decreases over the explored range of carbon price. At 200 EUR/tCO₂eq, the reduction in GHG emissions ranges from 25 to 35% depending on the year of calibration. The results also show that current net calorie production from food can be more than doubled, while simultaneously reducing GHG emissions by 10-15%. The compatibility between a reduction in GHG emissions and an increase in food calorie production relies on substantial changes in animal production and feed, which implies significant variations in grassland and fallow land. These effects are contrasted between the regions of the EU.

Keywords: greenhouse gas emissions; food production; carbon price; European Union; mathematical programming model

JEL Classification: Q18; Q54

1 Introduction

One of the major challenges of the 21st century is to ensure an appropriate and viable food system (United Nations, 2015) while simultaneously reducing negative impacts on the environment (Garnett, 2011). Relationships between agriculture, climate change, and the environment are at the center of these debates in the scientific literature (Foley et al., 2011; Godfray, 2014; Meijl et al., 2018; Rööös et al., 2017; Gregory et al., 2005; Ludi, 2009; Deering, 2014; Frank et al., 2017; Devereux & Edwards, 2004; Beddington et al., 2012; Wilkes et al., 2013). Agriculture is one of the productive activities most affected by climate change and, at the same time, must be an integral part of any strategy to mitigate global anthropogenic GHG emissions. To achieve the objective set by the Paris Agreement to limit global warming to 2°C, the analysis of the mutual relationship between climate change and agricultural production is of major interest. The dynamics of agricultural development are a result of the growing demand for food at the global level, with Europe being one of the main producers and suppliers of food globally. Therefore, a critical issue is to increase (or at least maintain) European agricultural production while preserving natural and environmental resources (European Commission, 2009, 2013, 2017; HLPE, 2012).

Agriculture, through its activities, emits substantial quantities of methane (CH₄) and nitrous oxide (N₂O) into the atmosphere, of which approximately 45% comes from enteric fermentation; 37% are from agricultural soils; 15% are linked to manure management; and, 3%

43 are from rice cultivation, field burning of agricultural residues, and other sources. In 2017, the
44 greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from European agriculture were 440 MtCO₂eq (European En-
45 vironment Agency, 2019). Carbon pricing plays an essential and indispensable role in achieving
46 substantial GHG emissions mitigation¹. The challenge lies in both addressing multiple environ-
47 mental and social objectives and in fostering an effective reduction in the costs of obtaining them
48 (World Bank and Ecofys, 2018; Aldy & Stavins, 2012; OECD, 2015; Vojtech, 2010).

49 Beyond the overall reduction in GHG emissions that may be achieved at a certain emis-
50 sion price, the quantity and quality of total output as well as the distribution of impacts across
51 farm types (e.g., crop vs. livestock production), land area allocation (food crops vs. feed crops vs.
52 grassland) are also of great importance for policy design (Leip et al., 2010; Olesen & Bindi, 2002).
53 Given that livestock represents one of the major sources of emissions, and, at the same time, ac-
54 counts for one-third of the protein in human food, climate mitigation policies involving livestock
55 play an essential role. Animal rearing involves using 30% of the global land surface, land saving
56 can be realized by increasing livestock productivity through feeding practices that require, among
57 other things, an improved grassland management, less grazing, and better quality feeds. Accord-
58 ing to Gerber et al. (2013), the livestock sector must be seen as a solution to climate change, and its
59 significant emissions can be reduced through mitigation measures that meet environmental objec-
60 tives. At the same time, the livestock sector plays a key role in food security, by 2050 the demand
61 for livestock products being projected to increase by 70%, which raises concerns about the impacts
62 of a potential imbalance between this growth and the economic and environmental effects that may
63 occur. The global-scale results obtained by Havlík et al. (2014) suggest that mitigation policies
64 targeting emissions from land-use change are more effective than those targeting emissions from
65 livestock only. Berners-Lee et al. (2018) argue that industrialized meat and milk production ac-
66 counts for 34% of global human calories but is highly inefficient in supplying energy, proteins,
67 iron, and zinc, indispensable to humans and that it is incompatible with a sustainable food system.
68 According to West et al. (2014), crops used for animal feed could produce a substantial gain in
69 calories (approximately 70%) if they were intended for direct consumption instead of being used
70 as animal feed to produce animal products, meat and milk.

71 The connection between mitigation of GHG emissions and food calorie target leads to the
72 need for an assessment that accounts for the impact of GHG emission pricing on food production
73 in the EU, the interactions between crop and livestock production activities, and the evaluation
74 of existing Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) policy instruments. To address the trade-offs
75 that may arise, FAO (2003b, 2009) highlights the importance of the costs needed to achieve food
76 production and climate change mitigation.

77 A quantitative evaluation of marginal abatement costs in the EU agricultural sector was
78 conducted by De Cara & Jayet (2011), underlining the effects of the EU burden-sharing agreement
79 on this sector. A 10% EU GHG abatement target can be achieved at an emission price range of
80 EUR 32-42/tCO₂, showing that the agricultural sector may represent an important share of the
81 reduction in a cost-effective way. Frank et al. (2017) highlight the substantial impacts that a global
82 uniform carbon price can have on food security and its inequitable effects across sectors of the
83 economy and regions. Thus, they show that food security is more strongly affected in countries
84 that do not engage in mitigation actions, with the costs of agricultural production rising with
85 inefficient mitigation.

86 According to Sonesson et al. (2010), a significant share of total GHG emissions at the
87 global level is linked to the food chain, stressing that the choice of products (i.e. diets) repre-
88 sents one the main elements aimed at reducing the impact of food on climate change. Bajzelj
89 et al. (2014) assess the environmental consequences of an increasing demand for food by 2050.
90 They emphasize the search for alternatives guaranteeing global food security without expanding

¹There are two main ways to introduce carbon pricing: carbon taxes and cap-and-trade systems. Both of these carbon pricing instruments have been presented as an important factor in incentivizing the mitigation of GHG emissions and promoting investment in low emission technologies and practices (OECD and WBG, 2015; Kossoy et al., 2015; The Grantham Research Institute, 2011).

91 crops or pastures and without increasing GHG emissions. In a reference scenario which considers
92 a population level of 9.6 billion by 2050, they estimate that the average food consumption per
93 capita would increase to 2710 kcal/day (including 470 kcal/day for livestock products). In such a
94 scenario, if emission mitigation strategies are not implemented, an intensification of livestock and
95 large-scale expansion of cropland would lead to an increase of about 77% in agricultural green-
96 house gas emissions, due to the increase in food demand, the share of emissions from livestock and
97 deforestation. Scenarios based on a healthy diet would have the effect of reducing cultivated areas
98 by around 5%, pastures by around 25% and greenhouse gas emissions by around 45%, mainly
99 linked to the reduction in herds. They point out that mitigation strategies could be based on eco-
100 nomic incentives such as a carbon tax. The need for mitigation strategies aimed at balancing food
101 production and GHG emissions is emphasized by [McAllister et al. \(2011\)](#), in order to make a
102 growing global demand for food partly satisfied by livestock products compatible with the control
103 of environmental impacts. According to [Tilman & Clark \(2014\)](#), other factors are necessary for
104 agriculture to become environmentally sustainable. The more efficient use of feed and pasture
105 for animal production and of fertilizer or irrigation for crops would increase food production and
106 decrease GHG emissions. With linear programming, [van Kernebeek et al. \(2016\)](#) propose a model
107 for optimizing land use including animal and plant production. They show that the optimal amount
108 of dietary protein from animals in the human diet depends on both the size of the population and
109 the relative share of land unsuitable for agricultural production.

110 Our study extends the vision of the connection between agricultural production and re-
111 ducing GHG emissions in the European Union (EU) through two different analysis perspectives.
112 First, we use a price approach targeting a reduction of GHG emissions through the introduction of
113 a carbon price. The second perspective constitutes a constraint approach, through the introduction
114 of a minimum supply of food calorie constraint imposed on European agriculture as a whole. In
115 addition, we take into consideration the economic context variability characterizing EU agricul-
116 ture, based on six years (2007-2012) marked by a strong variation in input and output prices.

117 On the production side, we focus on cereals. Let us recall that, in 2013 ([European Com-
118 mission, 2014](#)), one-third of the EU agricultural area was cultivated with cereals, whose value
119 represented one-eighth of the total value of EU agricultural products. The annual EU cereal pro-
120 duction varied significantly in time, between 266 and 321 Mt over 2007-2012, as a result of both
121 the economic and meteorological context, peaking in 2008².

122 Long-run climate policies should ensure that the strongly changing agricultural economy
123 is not disrupted beyond what pertains to the environmental target. The period from 2007-2012, on
124 which our study is based and against which the model is calibrated due to data availability, shows
125 how rapidly the economic context may change in terms of prices and productions.

126 By using the European agro-economic AROPAj model, we analyze the compatibility of
127 environmental objectives and food production, through two different approaches (pricing and bind-
128 ing), but with the same methodological framework. An accurate analysis of the GHG emission
129 reduction and, implicitly, the marginal abatement cost curves are conducted in a separate study.
130 Thereby, the objectives of this study are twofold: (i) to assess the consequences of a carbon price
131 introduction on the crop and livestock production in the EU, and (ii) to assess the effects of intro-
132 ducing a food production target on the EU agricultural GHG emissions.

133 In doing so, we consider the position of two decision-makers, one focused on the ob-
134 jective of food production and the other on direct emissions of N_2O and CH_4 from agriculture.
135 Among the major results of our article, we show that a carbon price has a different impact on plant
136 and animal production. A moderate increase in the price of carbon leads to an increase in crop
137 production - especially cereals and oilseeds -, the magnitude of which varies between products
138 and Member States. This increase concerns both the areas and the quantities of plant products,
139 whether marketed or used as animal feed on farms. On the other hand, the production of milk
140 and meat decreases with the price of carbon over the entire range explored. Then, calorie targets

²World Bank data <https://data.worldbank.org>

141 are introduced from 200 to 400Mt of soft wheat equivalent. For the respective values of 300, 350
142 and 400 Mt, the marginal costs associated with them vary from year to year in the ranges [20,
143 36], [27, 52] and [36, 94] euros per tonne of soft wheat equivalent. These effects reflect complex
144 substitutions in crops, grasslands and forages and are related to animal feed. The results show that
145 the reduction in GHG emissions is compatible with the increase in food production for the benefit
146 of agricultural products and to the detriment of livestock products. The impacts of pricing GHG
147 emissions (price-based approach) or a food calorie production target (threshold-based approach)
148 result in a sharp decrease in grass areas, partially offset by an increase in the area of crops sold but
149 also by a significant increase in fallow areas.

150 The rest of this article is organized as follows: section 2 begins with a brief presentation
151 of the AROPAj model, followed by a description of the two angles of analysis undertaken in the
152 study, namely the price approach with pricing of GHG emissions and the constraint approach with
153 the setting of a target for the production of food calories. The results obtained are examined in
154 section 3. The discussion on the scope of the results and their political implications is highlighted
155 in section 4. The concluding remarks are presented in section 5.

156 2 Methodological elements

157 2.1 General framework - AROPAj model

158 Our analysis is based on the use of a supply-side model capable of integrating both the
159 economic and technical connections between the agricultural sector, climate, and GHG emissions
160 as a tool for strategic decision-making. The European agro-economic model AROPAj is based on
161 linear programming (LP). It aims to simulate the EU agricultural supply by taking into consider-
162 ation the production derived from main crops and livestock³. The model has been widely used
163 in previous studies of agricultural and/or environmental policies (De Cara et al., 2005; Galko &
164 Jayet, 2011; De Cara & Jayet, 2011; De Cara et al., 2018).

165 The model parameters are estimated from the annual Farm Accountancy Data Network
166 (FADN), which allows using the model for all EU Member States. FADN possesses account-
167 ing information on approximately 80,000 agricultural holdings, totaling approximately 5 million
168 farms in the EU. The model covers approximately 85% of the holdings, 90% the total utilized agri-
169 culturalarea (UAA) and the EU total agricultural production.⁴ One of the strengths of the AROPAj
170 model is its capacity of simultaneously incorporating crops, livestock, grassland, and feed (both
171 on-farm and marketed feed).

172 To form a unit of the AROPAj model for a given year, a clustering method is employed,
173 allowing us to group the farms in the FADN into *representative farms*⁵. The number of farms
174 modeled is reduced due to the protection of individual data, the statistical quality of the parame-
175 ter estimation and calculation costs, while representing the great diversity of the EU agricultural
176 sector. According to the years, AROPAj is declined in 1800 to 1950 representative farms. Each of
177 them represents from a few tens to a few thousand real farms. Representativeness is determined
178 by the weighting system proposed in the FADN, which associates a weight with each farm in the
179 sample.

In the model, each representative farm k has the objective of maximizing the total gross

³An entire technical presentation of the model is available at https://www6.versailles-grignon.inra.fr/economie_publique/Media/fichiers/ArticlAROPAj

⁴For a detailed description of FADN data, see: <http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/rical/>

⁵Four key variables are used: FADN-defined type of farming (12 TF), altitude (3 levels), irrigation (share of area) and economic size (10 classes).

margin π_k :

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{x_k} \pi(x_k, \theta_k, \phi) \\ & \text{s.t. } x_k \in \mathcal{A}_k(\theta_k, \phi) \end{aligned}$$

180 where x_k represents the vector of endogenous activities depending, at the optimum, on specific
181 parameters θ_k and general parameters ϕ . Among many other activities, the vector x_k include crop-
182 specific variables such as areas, marketed quantities and on-farm used quantities. It also includes
183 animal activities broken down into several categories (more detailed for cattle) and the production
184 of meat and milk. The vector θ_k refers to k -specific parameters and the vector ϕ refers to common
185 parameters such as GHG price. The production set \mathcal{A}_k represents the combinations of values of the
186 x_k components respecting a set of inequalities expressed linearly against to components. Among
187 the set of constraints, we mention quasi-fixed factor limits such as UAA and livestock, crop rotation
188 constraints, animal feed requirements (met from on-farm produced cereals, purchased concentrates
189 and forage or meadows) and the implementation of the Common Agricultural Policy instruments.

190 The calibration of the AROPAj model consists in re-estimating the values of a subset of pa-
191 rameters for which the preliminary values are considered fragile. It sequentially combines Monte
192 Carlo-type random drawing methods and gradient methods. The principle consists in estimating
193 the value of the parameters θ_k which minimizes a criterion of distance between the LP solution
194 $x_k^*(\theta_k, \phi_0)$, given the present-time economic context ϕ_0 , and the “observed” values corresponding
195 to these variables (estimated directly from the FADN). In practice, the method involves a subset of
196 120 to 150 parameters mainly concerning animal feed (inputs and needs), and the criterion is the
197 sum of the squares of the deviations concerning in particular the areas for crops and the numbers
198 of different animal categories. It is applied for each representative farm and for each of the years
199 of the FADN.

200 AROPAj includes 32 crop productions and 28 animal productions. Crop producing activ-
201 ities utilize a large part of the EU agricultural land, the crops being divided into three categories:
202 (i) crops that can be either sold or consumed on-farm (i.e., cereals), (ii) crops that can be only
203 consumed on-farm (e.g., fodder and pastures), and (iii) crops intended for sale. As regards ani-
204 mal production, the model includes a large variety of animals (24 categories of cattle and 4 other
205 categories: sheep, pigs, goats, and poultry).

206 Livestock may be adjusted within a chosen amplitude. The adjustment limit refers to a
207 few animal categories. These categories are, separately, swine, poultry, sheep, goats and four
208 bovine categories, namely dairy cows, non-dairy cows, bulls and oxen. Other animal categories
209 included in the model referring to calves and young animal differentiated by age, sex, and dairy
210 or non-dairy may freely adjust when accounting for the inter-age balance. Our results are derived
211 from simulations based on a amplitude limit of +/- 25% applying to FADN sourced estimates. For
212 the i -animal categories concerned, this limit (α), called livestock adjustment ratio thereafter, is
213 integrated into linear programming in the form $|L_i - L_{i0}| \leq \alpha L_{i0}$.

214 For ruminants (cattle, in particular), reducing GHG emissions involves the improvement
215 of the efficiency of animal husbandry through the use of fodder and better feed formulation that
216 can reduce the CH_4 generated during digestion, and the CH_4 and N_2O produced by manure de-
217 composition. Grasslands play an important role in mitigating GHG emissions and achieving food
218 security, given the fact that meat and milk production depends on ruminants feeding. Climatic
219 conditions, rainfall and temperature distribution, and soil characteristics are among the main fac-
220 tors influencing the grassland spatial distribution and productivity (O’Mara, 2012; Huyghe et al.,
221 2014). CH_4 emissions depend on the number of animals and the composition of animal feeding.
222 CH_4 from enteric fermentation depends directly on animal feeding, which must meet all the re-
223 quirements in terms of energy and proteins. This is achieved by including various types of feeds
224 in the model: concentrated feeds, crop products, and raw feeds. A certain intake of energy and
225 proteins is necessary for each animal species, depending on different factors, such as age, daily
226 activity, physical condition, and potential production. In the model, animal feeding is endogenous

227 and farmers have the choice to use either fodder feed from their own crops or purchased concen-
228 trates. The reduction in N₂O emissions from agriculture is mainly the result of improving the
229 efficiency of agricultural techniques related to manure application, storage, and management, as
230 well as that of soil and crop use techniques (Smith et al., 2008, 2013).

231 In the model, emissions are obtained according to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate
232 Change (IPCC) Guidelines (IPCC, 2006), allowing inter-country comparisons. In particular, the
233 model relies on country-specific activity data and emission factors. The IPCC parameters for each
234 EU Member State can be found in the respective National Report of GHG Inventories, submitted
235 on a yearly basis to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. AROPAj
236 relies on the following agricultural emission sources: N₂O emissions from agricultural soils and
237 manure management, and CH₄ emissions from manure management, enteric fermentation, and
238 rice cultivation (refining and updating the results of De Cara et al. (2005)). N₂O emissions from
239 agricultural soils are subdivided into: (i) *direct emissions*: use of synthetic fertilizers, manure
240 application, biological N fixation, crop residues and animal production; (ii) *indirect emissions*:
241 atmospheric deposition, and leaching and run-off. Our calculations depend on these 11 emission
242 sources, which are directly associated with the IPCC data.

243 Our results are based on the most recent version of the model calibrated against six sets of
244 annual data (FADN data for the period from 2007 to 2012). Each FADN year refers to a specific
245 farm clustering into representative farms⁶, which allows the representation of six economic situ-
246 ations of European agriculture. The six-year period on which our study is based is very diverse,
247 with agricultural and energy prices that exhibit strong variations.

248 2.2 Carbon price implementation

249 When a carbon tax is introduced, representative farms may behave in various ways to re-
250 duce their emissions, by reducing their number of animals or by changing area allocations among
251 crops or modifying animal feeding. We introduce a pricing of GHG emissions weighted accord-
252 ing to GHG Global Warming Potential, considering the direct emissions of N₂O and CH₄ from
253 agriculture. In AROPAj, the carbon price introduced ranges widely, from 0 to 10,000 €/tCO₂eq,
254 in gradual steps. Simulations are conducted by using 200 values selected from this range, when
255 the livestock adjustment ratio is of 25%. They are carried out for the six FADN years for which
256 the AROPAj model operates.

257 To obtain a relatively broad view of the impacts of emission taxing on the production
258 system and reach valid conclusions, we have decided to introduce a carbon price (expressed in
259 €/tCO₂ equivalent) ranging in the interval [0, 200], a relatively wide price range, but "realistic"
260 at the same time. These prices are in line with those in previous studies (De Cara et al., 2005;
261 De Cara & Jayet, 2011). At the same time, a price higher than 100 €/tCO₂ is relevant when
262 referring to climate policies. In Sweden, the carbon tax represents the most powerful instrument
263 of the Swedish climate policy since 1991 and is currently at 120 €/tCO₂ eq (Adelphi, 2018).

264 From this angle of analysis and, more precisely, in what we call the price approach,
265 the study aims to discover the potential impacts of an emission tax on agricultural commodi-
266 ties brought to the market, with the model applied to very diverse economic conditions, given the
267 strongly changing 2007-2012 prices of inputs and outputs. By using the AROPAj model, we assess
268 the potential effects on crop and livestock production in the EU when a carbon price is introduced
269 and analyze the trade-off between and within these type of productions at the European level and
270 the environment, as results of policies targeting GHG emissions.

⁶For each of the years, the model is delineated through more than 1,700 and up to more than 1,900 representative farms.

271 2.3 Implementation of food calorie target

272 The binding approach refers to the integration of a food calorie production target. For
 273 easier interpretation, the threshold introduced was based on calorie quantities expressed in tons
 274 of soft wheat equivalent (*tsweq*). Thus, the estimation of the food parameters was done by using
 275 the database provided by FAO (2003a). The calorie target is introduced as a bound affecting the
 276 net sum of calories emanating from marketed crops, milk, and meat related to sold animals, and
 277 from bought concentrated feed in all representative farms combined. The constraint binding all
 278 these representative farms was the calorie balance, including the calorie content of different crops
 279 and livestock productions (see Table 1). In the case of crop productions, the data were used in raw
 280 form. For animal productions, given that AROPAj takes into account live animals, it was necessary
 281 to convert meat into calories. We considered only exported or marketed animals and, thus, took
 282 into account the animals' lifetime, with the meat content weighted by referencing AROPAj units.
 283 Calories used in animal feed are counted negatively in the net balance of calories produced by the
 284 system. Simulations are performed for the years 2007-2012 when the livestock adjustment ratio is
 285 of 25%.

Table 1. Calorie content of products exported from farms (FAO, 2003a); the content is weighted by the life duration of animals in each category (in years), as estimated for the AROPAj model.

Crops	Calorie content [kcal/100g]	Animal category	Calorie content [kcal/100g]	Meat content [ton/animal/year]
oats	385	two-year-old males on-farm	250	0.48
durum wheat	334	female calves from dairy herd*	250	0.27
soft wheat	334	female calves from breeding herd*	250	0.27
maize	356	18-month-old bulls	250	0.4
other cereals	340	8-day old slaughtered calves	250	0.1
barley	332	two-month-old slaughtered calves	250	0.25
rye	319	dairy cows	250	0.036
rice	362	six-month-old calves (field)	250	0.27
A-sugar	70	suckler cows	250	0.080
B-sugar	70	goats	210	0.012
C-sugar	70	sheep	210	0.012
sugar beet	70	pigs	220	0.26
field vegetables	40	poultry	200	7.5
proteins	80	milk**	61	
potatoes	67			
soy	335			
protein fodder	387			
rapeseed	387	concentrated feed	350	
sunflower	387	raw feed	80	

* non reported on farm;

** distinct category, as animal product

286 We needed to modify some calculations in our programming tools, as the target affects
 287 the European farming system as a whole. The kernel of the model was improved to integrate and
 288 parameterize this threshold. We started from the reference level and we increased the value of the
 289 target to the maximum level allowing the existence of a solution. In this constraint approach, the
 290 target varies from the unbounded case up to the feasibility limit. From a technical point of view, the
 291 indexation of the representative farms was modified automatically. All these steps were based on a
 292 sub-aggregation of AROPAj representative farms by country, and a re-indexation of representative
 293 farms that allows dealing with the solution directly. We did preliminary work dedicated to script-
 294 writing and prepared code to obtain the results, with very large files processed in reasonable time,
 295 which allowed us to obtain the desired results.

296 Mathematical programming models make it possible to estimate the implicit value of a

297 resource, which is zero when it is not limiting and positive. If not, this will be used to evaluate the
 298 marginal value of calorie production.

299 3 Result

300 3.1 Carbon pricing impact

301 We focus on cereal area and production while distinguishing its marketed output and on-
 302 farm use as feed, oilseeds production and area, livestock, feed quantity, nitrogen fertilizer con-
 303 sumption, grasslands, and fallows.

304 Large differences between the results in each year reflect the strong variation of agricul-
 305 tural prices and climatic conditions during the period. A moderate carbon price leads to a strong
 306 variation in the abatement rate (from 10% to 16% when the price is EUR 50, and from 16% to 25%
 307 when the price is EUR 100). However, the estimated emissions exhibit a narrower spread (13 Mt
 308 CO₂eq based on the interval [318,331] when the price is EUR 50, and 19 Mt based on [289,308]
 309 when the price is EUR 100). The spread of the abatement rate across the years ranges from 25%
 310 to 39%, with an emission spread of 34 Mt when the price is 200 €/tCO₂eq (see Table 2).

Table 2. EU aggregate values (initial emission level, emissions, and abatement level and rate), for each of the six years (2007-2012) and for different emission tax levels EUR 0, 50, 100, and 200.

Carbon price (€)		2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
0	Initial emission level [MtCO ₂ eq]	391.3	355.5	366.2	387.0	367.0	366.6
50	Emissions [MtCO ₂ eq]	327.2	320.0	318.1	323.3	331.2	331.0
	Abatement [MtCO ₂ eq]	64.1	35.6	48.2	63.8	35.8	35.7
	Abatement rate (%)	16%	10%	13%	16%	10%	10%
100	Emissions [MtCO ₂ eq]	294.0	296.8	289.4	291.4	307.7	307.8
	Abatement [MtCO ₂ eq]	97.3	58.8	76.9	95.6	59.3	58.9
	Abatement rate (%)	25%	17%	21%	25%	16%	16%
200	Emissions [MtCO ₂ eq]	239.1	260.5	239.0	240.0	267.2	273.4
	Abatement [MtCO ₂ eq]	152.2	95.0	127.3	147.5	99.8	93.2
	Abatement rate (%)	39%	27%	35%	38%	27%	25%

311 The annual changes in emission prices should be explained by contrasting annual sets of
 312 agricultural input and output prices, when quasi-fixed factors (UAA and livestock) are relatively
 313 stable (i.e., when the initial livestock spread is less than 3% of the six-year average and the UAA
 314 spread is approximately 1% of the six-year average).

315 For the EU, the variation of the main crop and livestock productions when the carbon
 316 price changes, as well as the envelope curve drawn for each of these agricultural productions,
 317 are illustrated in Figure 1. For each year, a series of simulations to account for the GHG price
 318 change are performed while keeping global economic and climatic conditions constant, based on
 319 the conditions of each FADN year. An increase in the carbon price expectedly leads to a decrease
 320 in GHG emissions and impacts agricultural supply differently.

321 The marketed cereal production varies in each FADN year as the carbon price increases,
 322 exhibiting a notable peak often appearing in the retained carbon price interval (Figure 1c). The
 323 peak strongly changes in terms of cereal quantity and price limit from one year to the other.
 324 The most significant result is that there is a peak in each of the six years (although it lies out of
 325 the price scope for three of them: 2007, 2011, and 2012). In 2009, for example, the marketed
 326 cereal production increases smoothly up to a price limit maximum (44 €/tCO₂) and then strongly
 327 decreases when the carbon price exceeds this limit.

328 By extending the analysis to cereal area⁷, we observe that, in each year, the peak's price

⁷In AROPAj, the cereal area includes the main cereal crops: durum wheat, soft wheat, barley, maize, oats, rye, and







Figure 1. Results from the AROPAj model version based on the six FADN years (2007-2012).




(e) Marketed oleoproteins production



(f) Marketed oleoproteins area



(g) Meat production



(h) Concentrated feed

— 2007 — 2008 — 2009 — 2010 — 2011 — 2012

Figure 1 continued. Results from the AROPAj model version based on the six FADN years (2007-2012).

329 limit here can differ substantially from the peak's price limit in the case of marketed production
330 (see Figure 1a). This result combines the effect of the relative change in the use of production
331 (on-farm vs market), the effect of the substantial change in the global price system and cross-price
332 effect between feed sources, and the effect of the annual change in meteorological conditions.
333 Figure 1a also provides the envelope interval for the six years curves. Given the carbon price,
334 when the six-year-based general conditions are assumed to occur with the same probability, the
335 peak for cereal area is obtained at a price of around 160 €/tCO₂ (see the blue curve, referring to
336 the value averaged over the years). This is far above the price observed in the CO₂ market over
337 the past years. The price level at which this change occurs depends on the year.

338 The key point here is that, on average, a peak in cereal land allocation and in the marketed
339 part of production is obtained when the carbon price is around 150 €/tCO₂eq, when the livestock
340 adjustment is substantial but moderate (+/- 25%). The peak shifts toward a higher carbon price
341 in the case of on-farm re-use of cereals for feed. This reflects the complex relationships between
342 cropping and breeding activities through feed and different parts of feed, typically on-farm cereals
343 (Figure 1d), fodders and meadows, and concentrated feed (Figure 1h). The cases of oleoproteins
344 area and production (Figures 1f and 1e) reinforce the statement that interference with animal feed
345 represents one of the aspects of the trade-off between crop and animal productions.

346 As shown above, the EU harvested cereal production, representing the sum of marketed
347 and on-farm used cereal productions, exhibited a strong variation during 2007-2012, with a peak
348 in 2008. If we introduce a carbon tax, the harvested cereal production increases until a certain
349 price level, after which it starts to decrease. For 2007, 2009, and 2010, this price level lies in the
350 range [125 €, 180 €] (see Figure 1b). For 2008, 2011 and 2012, this change occurs outside the
351 price scope.

352 Animal production decreases with the carbon price, with an impact on the demand for feed
353 (fodder, concentrated feed, and on-farm cereals). Therefore, in contrast to crop production, which
354 increases, animal production continuously decreases when the carbon price increases. Figure
355 1g illustrates the decline in the EU meat supply (expressed in carcass weight equivalent, teqcw
356 accounting for metric ton), with the same decreasing slope for each of the six years. Figure 1g
357 reveals that the reduction of meat production is characterized by an average decrease of about 2
358 Mteqcw over the entire carbon price range.

359 Figure 2 shows the effects of introducing a GHG emission tax of 200 €/tCO₂ on marketed
360 feed, marketed cereals, and on-farm used cereals in the EU for a livestock adjustment of 25% from
361 2007-2012. The quantity of on-farm used cereals, regardless of the carbon tax level, which had a
362 positive but insignificant influence, peaked in 2008 (77 Mt when there is no tax and 109 Mt for a
363 EUR 200 tax), after which it fell sharply to more than two-thirds in 2012 (24 Mt when there is no
364 tax and 26 Mt for a EUR 200 tax). In contrast, the quantities of marketed cereals and marketed
365 feed exhibited a large decrease in 2009, after which they started to increase again. This can be
366 explained by the fluctuation of global cereal prices (with a large decline in 2009 as a result of the
367 2008 crisis), a drop in animal numbers, and the water scarcity in 2008.

368 Changes in the area dedicated to major crops vs carbon price are illustrated in Figure
369 3 for the six years examined (2007-2012). A tax increase implies a decrease in grasslands and
370 fodders area in the EU and a strong increase in fallows area. Even if land allocations differ
371 across years, major crops resist carbon pricing to some extent, when fodders and more strongly
372 permanent meadows are dramatically affected. Animal production suffers from strong penalties
373 on fermentation-generated CH₄ emission involving ruminants, as well as manure-generated N₂O
374 emission involving cattle as a whole.

375 The spatial distribution of the areas cultivated with different crops is illustrated by the
376 maps of area proportions among all crops considered in AROPAj, for different emission tax lev-
377 els. Figures 4 and 5 illustrate the proportion of the areas cultivated with cereals, as well as the
378 permanent meadows, reported to the AROPAj UAA.

other cereals.




Figure 2. Marketed feed vs Marketed cereals vs On-farm used cereals (expressed in Mt), for the no tax situation and for a EUR 200 emission tax.




Figure 3. Trends in the areas of major crops vs CO₂ price in the EU (2007-2012 FADN years - AROPAj).




Figure 4. Proportion of total straw cereals area in the EU (2007-2012) for two carbon tax values: EUR 0 (on the left) and EUR 200 (on the right).

Figure 5. Proportion of permanent meadows area in the EU (2007-2012) for two carbon tax values: EUR 0 (on the left) and EUR 200 (on the right).

379 Marketed crops areas, and mainly cereals areas, resist almost homogenously across the en-
 380 tire European agricultural system when the carbon price increases, whereas meadows are strongly
 381 affected, due to their connection to animal productions, especially cattle. This would mainly affect
 382 the westernmost part of Europe as well as Central Europe. With the abandonment of grasslands
 383 being largely compensated by adoption of fallow land, the agricultural landscape could be substan-
 384 tially modified and differently so across different European regions. The analysis of the carbon
 385 price impact over the six years examined, highlights a form of robustness in the allocation of land
 386 across years, although the AROPAj typology is conducted completely independently in each year.

387 3.2 Food calorie target impact

388 We introduced different calorie quantity thresholds, ranging from 165 to 555 Mtsweq, and
 389 conducted the calculations for the six years against which the model is calibrated. As expected, a
 390 feasible solution of the mathematical programming model depends on the year. For a dual price
 391 of 0, the quantities of calories from 2007 to 2012 vary between 166 Mt and 227 Mt (see Table 3).
 392 Applying an increasing threshold of calories leads to an increase in the dual price. If we introduce
 393 the different targets of calorie quantities of 300, 350, and 400 Mtsweq, the dual price varies in
 394 the ranges [20 €,36 €], [27 €,52 €], and [36 €,94 €], respectively. The dual price rises to a
 395 maximum value corresponding to the maximum production thresholds, beyond which the solution
 396 obtained is no longer feasible. Figure 6 illustrates the net quantity of food, as the dual price rises
 397 to EUR 250. These dual prices can be compared to marketed soft wheat prices, which, for French
 398 representative farms in cereal regions, were, on average, EUR 170, EUR 140, EUR 110, EUR 170,
 399 EUR 180, EUR 210 per ton, respectively, for 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, and 2012. Differences
 400 between years reflect the heterogeneous economic and meteorological conditions prevailing each
 401 year in the period from 2007 to 2012.

Table 3. Calorie quantities (Mt soft wheat equivalent) and other calorie indicators for the six FADN years (2007-2012).

FADN year	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
unconstrained estimate (Mtsweq*)	166	227	219	183	218	204
feasibility limit (Mtsweq)	450	530	550	500	505	505
dual price limit (€/tsweq)	1920	1244	1889	1284	1525	1974
dual price for 300 Mtsweq threshold	25	26	20	25	29	36
dual price for 350 Mtsweq threshold	52	32	27	30	34	44
dual price for 400 Mtsweq threshold	94	49	36	51	72	83
reference soft wheat price** (€/t)	170	140	110	170	180	210
limit/reference ratio	2.6	3.8	5	2.9	2.8	2.4

* Million tons of soft wheat equivalent.

** reference price: average of soft wheat prices in the French Centre region.

402 In Figure 7, we illustrate how the land sharing among the different groups of crops (on the
 403 y-axis) varies from the quantities of human calories provided by the EU farming system (on the
 404 x-axis) in the six years. The results differ significantly across the years, when considering the gaps
 405 between the unbounded case and the feasibility limit case on the one hand, and between years in
 406 terms of the quantity shift from left to right (on the x-axis) on the other hand. However, the trends
 407 in land allocation when changing the calorie quantity limit appear robust across the six years. It
 408 should be noted that the EU potential calorie limit estimated by the AROPAj model varies from
 409 450 Mt up to 550 Mt, expressed in equivalent soft wheat over the six years, rising from 2.5 to 5
 410 times the basic calibrated case level.

411 The gain in calorie production is mainly due to transfers from animal sources (milk and
 412 meat) toward cereals, oilseeds, and protein crops. Another key aspect emerges through changes




Figure 6. Net quantity of food vs dual price.

413 in the animal diet by recalling that, in the model, on-farm cereals, concentrate feed, and pasture
 414 account for feeding.

415 We detail the analysis regarding livestock (see Figures 8 and 9). In our simulations, live-
 416 stock is allowed to be adjusted within a limit of $\pm 25\%$ with respect to the basic case. Considering
 417 that unchanged prices may be in favor of some animal categories in the unbounded calorie thresh-
 418 old case, the gap of concerned livestock categories may reach 50% over the interval of calorie
 419 targets from the unbounded case to the upper limit case. We illustrate changes for two emblematic
 420 categories, namely, beef cows and milk cows. Although the number of beef cows varies regularly
 421 as the calorie target increases, the number of milk cows follows a different path of weaker am-
 422 plitude and decreases irregularly. The milk quota system associated with guaranteed prices and
 423 premiums, applied in the period from 2007 to 2012 matters substantially.

424 The impact of introducing a calorie production target on total GHG emissions highlights
 425 a regular decrease of emissions as the calorie target increases (see Figure 10). Depending on the
 426 year, an increase of the food production target from 230 Mtsweq to 435 Mtsweq, would lead to a
 427 decrease in emissions ranging from 26 MtCO₂eq (7%) to 75 MtCO₂eq (20%).

428 Given the diversity of farming systems across the EU, we investigate the results at the
 429 regional level. To this end, we consider areas dedicated to straw cereals on the one hand and
 430 to permanent meadows on the other hand. Proportions of the area shared between these two
 431 categories are mapped for each of the six years and for two cases: the reference case and a calorie
 432 target of 435 million tons of soft wheat equivalent (Figure 11 refers to cereals and 12 to meadows).

433 Supporting the aggregated land sharing illustrated in Figure 7, there is no apparent differ-
 434 ence between the regions across the EU in terms of land dedicated to straw cereals (Figure 11).
 435 None or almost none of the regions decrease the land dedicated to cereals. However, focusing on
 436 the land occupied by meadows reveals that regions differ significantly in terms of land sharing
 437 when calorie targets are ambitious. Some western and central European regions may suffer from
 438 a cattle decline revealed through a decrease in grassland (e.g., northwest France and southeast
 439 England, and south Germany and Austria). Knowing that fallows should replace grasslands (as
 440 shown in Figure 7), increasing the target of net calorie production may affect the activity in some
 441 rich agricultural regions.




Figure 7. Trends in areas of major crops by calorie quantity threshold




Figure 8. Trends in the number of milk cows as the calorie threshold increases.

Figure 9. Trends in the number of beef cows as the calorie threshold increases.




Figure 10. Trends in the total GHG emissions as the calorie threshold increases.

4 Discussion for policy implications

4.1 Scope of results

Our methodological framework relies on the principle "simulate and average", unlike many other models, whose simulations assume the use of the average values of the parameters. The analysis is conducted for six-years of diverse economic and meteorological contexts, as an example remarkably characterized by the doubling of cereal prices over the period. That does not prevent against the lack of all feedback effects that could enrich the analysis. The first type of feedback would be price changes resulting from market clearing, and the other would be climate feedback and technical progress induced by a large change in the European agricultural supply. Nevertheless, the amplitude of observed economic changes for which the model accounts makes our analysis valuable. The important point is that results are provided in technically and economically viable (observed) conditions.

The six versions are each based on a classification of samples into representative farms carried out independently of each other. The same applies to the calibration of each version. The structure of the agricultural system represented appears stable, despite the biases still attributable to the quality of the FADN samples and despite the biases inherent in the AROPAj model. For example, the UAA represented by AROPAj, of the order of 131 Mha, offers an interannual relative standard deviation of 0.7 %, and the livestock, of 101 MLU, a standard deviation of 0.9 %. This structural stability does not prevent greater variability in the areas occupied by the different activities, from 2.1% for common wheat to 26.2% for soybeans (and 3.9% for all 9 cereals represented by the model, for an average surface of 64.4 Mha). This variability, partly accentuated because it is a mathematical programming model, mainly reflects the variability of prices and weather conditions. And still realistically, the production of net food calories and greenhouse gas emissions accentuate the effects of the economic and meteorological environment. In the calibration solution for the 6 years, the calorie production is on average 186.5 Mt common wheat equivalent, with a relative standard deviation of 10.6 %, and the total direct GHG emissions are estimated on average at 364.1Mt CO₂ with a standard deviation of 2.5 % (210.5 and 153.6 respectively for methane and nitrogen oxide, with 1.4 % and 5.2 % as standard deviations, respectively). The results used in our analysis are based on the hypothesis of the inter-age balance of the cattle herd with an adjustment




Figure 11. Proportion of total straw cereals area in the EU (2007-2012) for no threshold (on the left), and after the introduction of a threshold of 435 Mtsweq (on the right).



Figure 12. Proportion of permanent meadows area in the EU (2007-2012) for no threshold (on the left), and after the introduction of a threshold of 435 Mtsweq (on the right).

471 of the animal capital varying in an interval fixed as a percentage of the initial capital. At zero
472 carbon price and in the absence of any calorie production threshold, the livestock lag resulting
473 from an adjustment rate of 25% is 1.3%.

474 In the EU, a carbon price of EUR 200 would reduce GHG emissions from 273 Mt to
475 239 Mt and increase the abatement rates from 25 % to 39 %, depending on the year, given that
476 the annual base emissions also vary significantly (from 356 Mt to 391 Mt). By letting this price
477 vary across the entire interval considered, [0,200], crop productions increase to some extent, and
478 eventually decrease but much less than animal productions, which decline normally when the CO₂
479 price increases. This result is reinforced when we assign to the sector an increasing production
480 of food calories. The food objective is achieved by reducing GHG emissions, to the detriment of
481 animal production and by considerably modifying the mode of animal feeding. This translates into
482 a sharp reduction in the area under grass, partially offset by an increase in the area under marketed
483 crops, but also by a significant increase in the area under fallow. By striving to reach an ambitious
484 goal of producing food calories, it could be more costly to maintain animal productions consuming
485 plants than to suppress these productions, at least in certain regions, including regions dominated
486 by animal husbandry. The regional analysis (mapping) carried out above (see Figures 11 and 12)
487 illustrates this result. If it appears possible, in the light of the results, to double the production of
488 calories on average without upsetting the balance between animal and vegetable production too
489 much, an additional effort still possible of around 50% (compared to reference production) very
490 substantially alters this balance, and in all cases animal feed is the key to change.

491 **4.2 Policy implications**

492 We investigated the compatibility of two goals frequently supported by policy-makers,
493 underlined in European Commission guidelines and boosted as general common objectives. The
494 goals, namely, stabilizing or even increasing food production and decreasing agricultural impact
495 on the environment are expressed in our analysis via the net supply of calories for the human diet
496 on the one hand and via the abatement of GHG emissions on the other hand.

497 The margin offered to secure the production of calories in the EU is potentially significant,
498 the net production of calories being able to be two and a half times higher while remaining within
499 the framework of the economic and technical environment of the years 2007-2012. It is therefore
500 technically and economically realistic. But to reach this level, one would have to expect major
501 changes in terms of agricultural land use associated mainly with changes and especially with the
502 decrease in the quantities of food ingested by a declining herd.

503 Even if it can always be argued that a significant change in agricultural production con-
504 cerning 130 Mha would significantly impact the physical and economic environment in the ab-
505 sence of economic regulation, it should be noted that (i) with regard to the physical environment
506 through the lens of climate change, the significant reduction in GHG emissions associated with
507 the disruption of production resulting from simulations is both explained and realistic; (ii) with
508 regard to the economic environment, in particular the reaction of agricultural prices to changes in
509 European supply, it is important to remember that agricultural prices have been framed for several
510 decades of agricultural policy, proving that political will would make an ambitious quantitative
511 goal of producing food calories possible.

512 The evolution of food consumption under the effect of changes in consumer choices, ac-
513 companied or amplified by public health policies, is a determining factor for the future of the
514 agricultural sector. It is also a determining factor in terms of human impact on the global envi-
515 ronment, in particular the climate via agricultural GHG emissions. Even if our study only focuses
516 on the supply of the agricultural sector alone and its direct GHG emissions, it intersects the field
517 covered by three policies, namely food policy, agricultural policy, climate policy. We can assess,
518 even briefly, some of the terms of social welfare taken into account by the public decision-makers
519 in charge of these policies.

520 In this regard, let us specify the basic elements of the calculation. The European agricul-
521 tural gross margin, from one year to another over the period 2007-2012, varies from EUR 126.0
522 to 165.8 billion, with an average of EUR 149.6 billion (relative standard deviation of 9.2%), in-
523 cluding support for CAP size from EUR 40.8 to 44.6 billion (on average 43.4, with a standard
524 deviation of 3.4%).

525 Consider the year 2012, to fix things. Under the technical and economic conditions of
526 the year, it is mathematically possible to go from a production of food calories from 200 to 500
527 *Mtsweq*, which would result in a reduction in GHG emissions of 97 MtCO_2 , going from 367 to
528 270 MtCO_2eq . The remaining emissions, valued at EUR 210 (which is the price of CO_2 allowing
529 this reduction, all other things being equal), the “valuation” of emissions at the marginal cost of
530 reduction is EUR 57 billion. By implementing a CO_2 pricing policy, the livestock adjustment
531 ratio being 25%, the gross margin is reduced by EUR 66 billion. The marginal value of the last
532 calorie produced, when producing 500 *Mtsweq*, is greater than 1000 €/t*sweq*, about five times the
533 price of common wheat paid to the producer in France in 2012, while the European gross margin
534 goes from EUR 176 to 110 billion, and GHG emissions from 367 to 270 MtCO_2 . To lower GHG
535 emissions by 97 MtCO_2 only by “taxing” GHG emissions (when no calorie production threshold
536 applies), the price per tonne of CO_2eq would be EUR 210, with a loss of EUR 65 billion in gross
537 margin (from 175.6 to 110.6), and a tax proceeds of EUR 57 billion. In this case, the net cost
538 (gross margin difference increased by the tax proceeds) would be EUR 8 billion, logically lower
539 than the loss of gross margin of EUR 31 billion which would result from an obligation to produce
540 500 *Mtsweq* in net food calories.

541 At a more moderate level of dual food calorie price, close in soft wheat equivalent to the
542 price of common wheat in French production, the potential for calorie production is estimated at
543 470 *Mtsweq*, and the associated fall in emissions of GHG to around 52 MtCO_2eq . The correspond-
544 ing decrease in gross margin is estimated at EUR 16 billion. Achieving the same level of reduction
545 in GHG emissions of 52 MtCO_2eq by carbon pricing would be obtained with a CO_2 -price of 81.5
546 €/t CO_2eq . At this price, GHG emissions are “valued” at EUR 25.7 billion (the carbon tax pro-
547 ceeds), with a drop in gross margin of EUR 27.5 billion, and a net social cost (margin differential
548 increased by the differential of tax proceeds) of EUR 1.8 billion. From an environmental point
549 of view, for a reduction in GHG emissions of 52 MtCO_2 (or approximately 15 % of emissions
550 estimated for 2012), the difference in social cost between the “food calorie target” option and the
551 “carbon price” option (the least expensive because it directly targets GHG emissions) is EUR 14
552 billion. The decline in livestock, all animal categories combined, is significant. It is 12% with the
553 “food calorie target” option and 8.5% with the “carbon policy” option.

554 Table 4 summarizes the elements making it possible to compare the effects of a policy
555 aimed at increasing the production of food calories and a policy of pricing GHG emissions leading
556 to an equivalent reduction in GHG emissions. The calculations are made for two levels of calorie
557 production, respectively 500 *Mtsweq* (close to the technically feasible maximum) and 470 *Mtsweq*,
558 based on the year 2012.

559 Within the European Union, a policy aimed at reducing agricultural GHG emissions as a
560 priority would therefore have a significant effect on animal production, just like a policy aimed
561 at increasing net production of food calories. The public health policy is outside the scope of
562 this study, it would therefore remain to assess what could be the social benefits of a human diet
563 in balance with an agricultural offer evolving towards crop production while diverting somewhat
564 from animal production . What is shown here is an example of the positive cross-effects that a
565 policy can have on a domain other than its own. If positive results clearly emerge at European level,
566 at local level the negative effects on agricultural activity could be very significant, in particular in
567 regions where few alternatives to animal production exist. To mitigate these negative effects,
568 among the political options that could emerge, in addition to promoting the quality of animal
569 products (viable if prices rise substantially), we find the promotion of bio-energies from plants
570 that are difficult to transform into human food. Switchgrass is a candidate plant to be transformed

Table 4. Targeting calorie production vs pricing GHG emissions given first the calorie target and second the level of GHG emissions (computations for 2012, in millions of tonnes of CO_2 equivalent) for two calorie targets (in millions of tonnes of soft wheat equivalent); quantity surplus estimated in billion €; livestock deviation estimated in % of the average.

calorie target	470	500	(Mt_{sweq})
dual price related to the calorie target	202	1080	(€/t _{sweq})
GHG emissions related to the calorie target	315	270	(Mt CO_2 eq)
GHG abatement related to the calorie target	52	97	(Mt CO_2 eq)
CO_2 price corresponding to the GHG emission abatement without calorie target limit	81.5	210.	(€/t CO_2 eq)
gross margin loss (food calorie policy)	16	31	(billion €)
gross margin loss (CO_2 pricing policy)	27.5	65.0	(billion €)
CO_2 tax receipt (CO_2 pricing policy)	25.7	56.7	(billion €)
net loss when CO_2 pricing	1.8	8.3	(billion €)
livestock decrease (food calorie policy)	12.0	22.3	(%)
livestock decrease (CO_2 policy)	8.5	14.7	(%)
net production of food calorie (CO_2 pricing policy)	205	184	(Mt_{sweq})

571 into liquid agrofuels, while other productions are the preferred substrates for anaerobic digestion
572 plants.

573 5 Conclusion

574 Diet trends could be powerful drivers of change in the agricultural production sector. Ac-
575 cording to the [European Public Health Association \(2017\)](#), while European food consumption
576 varies from country to country, most countries are trying to move towards a healthy diet that re-
577 spects the environment. Although meat remains an important item in the food basket, the amount
578 of meat consumed has decreased since the 1980s⁸. If the average EU diet were to approach health-
579 ier levels, animal production and therefore pasture and concentrated food would be reduced and
580 land would be freed up for agricultural production. Our analysis even shows that a significant part
581 of the land could become fallow when animal production systems offer few prospects for recon-
582 version. In addition, reducing food waste would further reduce pressure on the land, and work
583 in progress shows that increased agricultural production could widen outlets for bio-energy. The
584 evolution of the diet and the pressure exerted by securing the production of food calories or the
585 wider outlets offered for the energy recovery of agricultural products and co-products have signif-
586 icant impacts on the environment. Greenhouse gas emissions from agriculture could decrease by
587 25 to 30% if the farming system were called upon to maximize the production of food calories.

588 Conversely, seeking to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by pricing GHG emissions will
589 obviously have significant impacts on the production of agriculture and livestock. Up to a high
590 level of this price – let's keep 200 euros per tonne of GHG in carbon dioxide equivalent – plant
591 production increases or decreases slightly while animal production (mainly meat, then milk) de-
592 creases significantly. Our results show that here again animal feed plays a key role, while pricing
593 greenhouse gas emissions impacts the consumption of synthetic nitrogen fertilizers in a direction
594 and in a different amplitude than what is obtained in seeking to increase the production of calories.
595 The importance of livestock in the adjustment of agricultural production systems is also verified
596 with GHG emissions, since, up to € 200 per tonne of CO_2 equivalent, the reduction in methane
597 emissions is twice as high as reduction of nitrous oxide emissions.

⁸<https://www.insee.fr/fr/statistiques>

598 Increasing European production of food calories would result in an increase in plant pro-
599 duction and a decrease in animal production in significant proportions, with a significant reduction
600 in European agricultural GHG emissions. Putting a price on agricultural GHG emissions obviously
601 leads to a reduction in GHG emissions, by affecting the production of livestock systems while al-
602 lowing crop production to be maintained, at least as long as the price of GHG remains below EUR
603 200 per tonne of CO_2 -equivalent. The objective of increasing calorie production and the objective
604 of reducing GHG emissions are therefore compatible, one appearing as a co-benefit of the other.
605 Our results are one contribution among others to the multi-criteria evaluation of different compo-
606 nents of public policies. We can illustrate the entanglement and the complexity of the political
607 choice through the criteria that the AROPAj model makes it possible to assess, by focusing on the
608 gross agricultural margin and some criteria that can be associated with the challenges of public
609 health and environment.

610 Let us retain the emblematic value of EUR 100 per tonne of CO_2 -equivalent that we
611 would apply to methane and nitrous oxide emissions, in a scenario where the number of animals
612 in the main categories of livestock can vary over the interval from -25% to + 25% of the initial
613 value. Based on 2012 FADN data, the fall in emissions is 16% (-59Mt CO_2 eq), the value of the
614 remaining emissions is EUR 30.8 billion (tax revenue), the fall in agricultural gross margin is 19%
615 (-33.3 billion) and the loss of gross margin less tax revenue is EUR 2.5 billion. The associated
616 impacts are an increase in the net production of food calories by 1%, a fall in livestock by 9.8%,
617 a drop in area devoted to permanent meadows by 44%, and a decrease in the consumption of
618 synthetic fertilizers by 3.3 %. The reductions in GHG emissions are respectively 9.3% for N_2O
619 and 20.5% for CH_4 . Let us now consider, with the same range of variation in livestock, the level of
620 food calories corresponding to a drop in GHG emissions of 16%, a level estimated at 480 million
621 tonnes of common wheat in calorie equivalent (+ 240%). In return for this production effort, the
622 drop in gross margin is estimated at 18 billion euros (-10.3%). The herd decreases by 13.7% and
623 the area under permanent meadows by 53%. The consumption of synthetic fertilizers increased
624 by 9.7%.

625 For a given level of GHG emissions, the two options lead to very contrasting values on
626 the criteria of agricultural gross margin, production of food calories, animal production, allocation
627 of land and consumption of synthetic fertilizers. These different criteria, among others, should
628 be taken into account to integrate the impacts on health and the environment into public choices.
629 The interest of the economic model of European agriculture used in the analysis is to be able
630 to estimate these criteria under realistic economic and technical conditions. Although costly in
631 computing, the analysis will be enriched by determining the frontier of what European agriculture
632 can offer in terms of production of food calories, production of bio-energies, GHG emissions and
633 consumption of synthetic fertilizers.

634 **References**

635 Adelphi (2018). *The Carbon Tax in Sweden*. Technical report, Fact sheet for: Federal Ministry for
636 the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU).

637 Aldy, J. E. & Stavins, R. N. (2012). The Promise and Problems of Pricing Carbon: Theory and
638 Experience. *The Journal of Environment and Development*, 21(2).

639 Bajzelj, B., Richards, K., Allwood, J., Smith, P., Dennis, J., Curmi, E., & Gilligan, C. (2014).
640 Importance of food-demand management for climate mitigation. *Nature Climate Change*, 4,
641 924–929.

642 Beddington, J., Asaduzzaman, M., Fernández, A., Clark, M., Guillou, M., Jahn, M., Erda, L.,
643 Mamo, T., Van Bo, N., Nobre, C., Scholes, R., Sharma, R., & Wakhungu, J. (2012). *Achieving*

- 644 *food security in the face of climate change: Final report from the Commission on Sustainable*
645 *Agriculture and Climate Change*. Technical report, CGIAR Research Program on Climate
646 Change, Agriculture and Food Security (CCAFS). Copenhagen, Denmark.
- 647 Berners-Lee, M., Kennelly, C., Watson, R., & Hewitt, C. N. (2018). Current global food pro-
648 duction is sufficient to meet human nutritional needs in 2050 provided there is radical societal
649 adaptation. *Elem Sci Anth*, 6(1).
- 650 De Cara, S., Henry, L., & Jayet, P.-A. (2018). Optimal coverage of an emission tax in the pres-
651 ence of monitoring, reporting, and verification costs. *Journal of Environmental Economics and*
652 *Management*, 89, 1–13.
- 653 De Cara, S., Houzé, M., & Jayet, P.-A. (2005). Methane and Nitrous Oxide Emissions from
654 Agriculture in the EU: A Spatial Assessment of Sources and Abatement Costs. *Environmental*
655 *& Resource Economics*, 32, 551–583.
- 656 De Cara, S. & Jayet, P.-A. (2011). Marginal abatement costs of greenhouse gas emissions from
657 European agriculture, cost effectiveness, and the EU non-ETS burden sharing agreement. *Eco-*
658 *logical Economics*, 70, 1680–1690.
- 659 Deering, K. (2014). *Stepping up to the challenge – Six Issues facing global climate change and*
660 *food security*. Technical report, Copenhagen, Wageningen: CARE, CGIAR Research Program
661 on Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security (CCAFS), Technical Centre for Agricultural
662 and Rural Cooperation (CTA).
- 663 Devereux, S. & Edwards, J. (2004). Climate Change and Food Security. *IDS Bulletin*, 35(3),
664 22–30.
- 665 European Commission (2009). *EU 2009 Report on Policy Coherence for Development*. Technical
666 report, European Commission.
- 667 European Commission (2013). *Agriculture in the European Union - statistical and economic*
668 *information*. Technical report, European Commission, Directorate General for Agriculture and
669 Rural Development.
- 670 European Commission (2014). *EU cereal farms report 2013 based on FADN data*. Technical
671 report, European Commission.
- 672 European Commission (2017). *EU Agricultural Outlook for the EU Agricultural Markets and*
673 *Income 2017-2030*. Technical report, European Commission.
- 674 European Environment Agency (2019). *Annual European Union greenhouse gas inventory*
675 *1990–2017 and inventory report 2019. Submission under the United Nations Framework Con-*
676 *vention on Climate Change and the Kyoto Protocol*. Technical report, EEA/PUBL/2019/051.
- 677 European Public Health Association (2017). *Healthy and Sustainable Diets for European Coun-*
678 *tries*. Technical report, EUPHA.
- 679 FAO (2003a). *Les bilans alimentaires*. Organisation des Nations Unies pour l'alimentation et
680 l'agriculture.
- 681 FAO (2003b). *Trade reforms and food security: conceptualizing the linkages*. Technical report,
682 Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.
- 683 FAO (2009). *Food Security and Agricultural Mitigation in Developing Countries: Options for*
684 *Capturing Synergies*. Technical report, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Na-
685 tions.

- 686 Foley, J., Ramankutty, N., Brauman, K., Cassidy, E., Gerber, J., Johnston, M., Mueller, N.,
687 O'Connell, C., Ray, D., West, P., Balzer, C., Bennett, E., Carpenter, S., Hill, J., Monfreda,
688 C., Polasky, S., Rockström, J., Sheehan, J., Siebert, S., & Zaks, D. (2011). Solutions for a
689 Cultivated Planet. *Nature*, 478, 337–342.
- 690 Frank, S., Havlík, P., Soussana, J.-F., Levesque, A., Valin, H., Wollenberg, E., Kleinwechter,
691 U., Fricko, O., Gusti, M., Herrero, M., Smith, P., Hasegawa, T., Kraxner, F., & Obersteiner, M.
692 (2017). Reducing greenhouse gas emissions in agriculture without compromising food security?
693 *Environ. Res. Lett.*, 12, 105004.
- 694 Galko, E. & Jayet, P.-A. (2011). Economic and environmental effects of decoupled agricultural
695 support in the EU. *Agricultural Economics*, 42, 605–618.
- 696 Garnett, T. (2011). Where are the best opportunities for reducing greenhouse gas emissions in the
697 food system (including the food chain)? *Food Policy*, 36.
- 698 Gerber, P., Steinfeld, H., Henderson, B., Mottet, A., Opio, C., Dijkman, J., Falcucci, A., & Tempio,
699 G. (2013). *Tackling climate change through livestock – A global assessment of emissions and
700 mitigation opportunities*. Technical report, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United
701 Nations (FAO), Rome.
- 702 Godfray, H. C. J. (2014). The challenge of feeding 9–10 billion people equitably and sustainably.
703 *The Journal of Agricultural Science*, 152, 2–8.
- 704 Gregory, P., Ingram, J., & Brklacich, M. (2005). Climate change and food security. *Philosophical
705 transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B, Biological sciences*.
- 706 Havlík, P., Valin, H., Herrero, M., Obersteiner, M., Schmid, E., Rufino, M., Mosnier, A., Thornton,
707 P., Böttcher, H., Conant, R., Frank, S., Fritz, S., Fuss, S., Kraxner, F., & Notenbaert, A. (2014).
708 Climate change mitigation through livestock system transitions. *PNAS*, 111(10), 3709–3714.
- 709 HLPE (2012). *Food security and climate change. A report by the High Level Panel of Experts on
710 Food Security and Nutrition of the Committee on World Food Security*. Technical report, High
711 Level Panel of Experts on Food Security and Nutrition (HLPE).
- 712 Huyghe, C., De Vlieghe, A., van Gils, B., & Peeters, A. (2014). *Grasslands and herbivore
713 production in Europe and effects of common policies*. Éditions Quæ.
- 714 IPCC (2006). *2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories Volume 4: Agri-
715 culture, Forestry and Other Land Use. Chapter 5: CROPLAND*. Technical report, Intergovern-
716 mental Panel on Climate Change.
- 717 Kossoy, A., Peszko, G., Oppermann, K., Prytz, N., Gilbert, A., Klein, N., Lam, L., & Wong, L.
718 (2015). *Carbon pricing watch 2015 : an advance brief from the state and trends of carbon
719 pricing 2015 report, to be released late 2015. State and Trends of Carbon Pricing*. Technical
720 report, Washington, D.C. : World Bank Group.
- 721 Leip, A., Weiss, F., Wassenaar, T., Perez, I., Fellmann, T., Loudjani, P., Tubiello, F., Grandgirard,
722 D., Monni, S., & Biala, K. (2010). *Evaluation of the livestock sector's contribution to the EU
723 greenhouse gas emissions (GGELS)*. Technical report, European Commission, Joint Research
724 Centre.
- 725 Ludi, E. (2009). Climate change, water and food security. *Overseas Development Institute*.
- 726 McAllister, T., Beauchemin, K., McGinn, S., Hao, X., & Robinson, P. (2011). Greenhouse gases
727 in animal agriculture—Finding a balance between food production and emissions. *Animal Feed
728 Science and Technology*, 166-167, 1–6.

- 729 Meijl, v., Havlik, P., Lotze-Campen, H., Stehfest, E., Witzke, P., Dominguez, I. P., Bodirsky, B.,
730 Dijk, v., Doelman, J., Fellmann, T., Humpenoder, F., Koopman, J., Muller, C., Popp, A., Tabeau,
731 A., Valin, H., & van Zeist, W. (2018). Comparing impacts of climate change and mitigation on
732 global agriculture by 2050. *Environ. Res. Lett.*, 13(064021).
- 733 OECD (2015). *Agriculture and Climate Change*. Technical report, OECD.
- 734 OECD and WBG (2015). *The FASTER Principles for Successful Carbon Pricing: An approach*
735 *based on initial experience*. Technical report, Organisation for Economic Cooperation and
736 Development (OECD) and World Bank Group (WBG).
- 737 Olesen, J. & Bindi, M. (2002). Consequences of climate change for European agricultural pro-
738 ductivity, land use and policy. *European Journal of Agronomy*, 16, 239–262.
- 739 O'Mara, F. (2012). The role of grasslands in food security and climate change. *Annals of Botany*,
740 110, 1263–1270.
- 741 Rööös, E., Bajželj, B., Smith, P., Patel, M., Little, D., & Garnett, T. (2017). Greedy or needy? Land
742 use and climate impacts of food in 2050 under different livestock futures. *Global Environmental*
743 *Change*, 47.
- 744 Smith, P., Haberl, H., Popp, A., Erb, K.-h., Lauk, C., Harper, R., Tubiello, F. N., de Siqueira Pinto,
745 A., Jafari, M., Sohi, S., Masera, O., Böttcher, H., Berndes, G., Bustamante, M., Ahammad,
746 H., Clark, H., Dong, H., Elsiddig, E. A., Mbow, C., Ravindranath, N. H., Rice, C. W., Rob-
747 ledo Abad, C., Romanovskaya, A., Sperling, F., Herrero, M., House, J. I., & Rose, S. (2013).
748 How much land-based greenhouse gas mitigation can be achieved without compromising food
749 security and environmental goals? *Global Change Biology*, 19, 2285–2302.
- 750 Smith, P., Martino, D., Cai, Z., Gwary, D., Janzen, H., Kumar, P., McCarl, B., Ogle, S., O'Mara,
751 F., Rice, C., Scholes, B., Sirotenko, O., Howden, M., McAllister, T., Pan, G., Romanenkov, V.,
752 Schneider, U., Towprayoon, S., Wattenbach, M., & Smith, J. (2008). Greenhouse gas mitigation
753 in agriculture. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B*.
- 754 Sonesson, U., Davis, J., & Ziegler, F. (2010). *Food production and emissions of greenhouse gases*
755 *- An overview of the climate impact of different product groups*. Technical report, SIK – the
756 Swedish Institute for Food and Biotechnology.
- 757 The Grantham Research Institute (2011). *Briefing Note: The case for carbon pricing*. Technical
758 report, The Grantham Research Institute on Climate Change and the Environment.
- 759 Tilman, D. & Clark, M. (2014). Global diets link environmental sustainability and human health.
760 *Nature*, 515.
- 761 United Nations (2015). *Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*.
762 Technical report, United Nations.
- 763 van Kernebeek, H. R. J., Oosting, S. J., van Ittersum, M. K., Bikker, P., & Boer, I. J. M. D. (2016).
764 Saving land to feed a growing population: consequences for consumption of crop and livestock
765 products. *Int J Life Cycle Assess*, 21, 677–687.
- 766 Vojtech, V. (2010). *Policy Measures Addressing Agrienvironmental Issues*. Technical report,
767 OECD Food, Agriculture and Fisheries Papers, No. 24, OECD Publishing, Paris.
- 768 West, P. C., Gerber, J. S., Engstrom, P. M., Mueller, N. D., Brauman, K. A., Carlson, K. M.,
769 Cassidy, E. S., Johnston, M., K., G., MacDonald, Ray, D. K., & Siebert, S. (2014). Leverage
770 points for improving global food security and the environment. *Science*, 345.

- 771 Wilkes, A., Tennigkeit, T., & Solymosi, K. (2013). *National planning for GHG mitigation in*
772 *agriculture: A guidance document*. Technical report, Food and Agriculture Organization of the
773 United Nations (FAO).
- 774 World Bank and Ecofys (2018). *State and Trends of Carbon Pricing 2018*. Technical report, World
775 Bank, Washington, DC.