

1. INTRODUCTION 2. IMPACTS (MEASURED AND PROJECTTED) 3. VULNERABILITY ASSESSMENT APPROACH 4. CONSTRUCTING AN INDEX OF VULNERABILITY 5. CONCLUSIONS (SOME ADAPTATION STRATEGIES AND

MEASURES FOR AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY)









INTRODUZIONE

with the second

Anomali termiche dal 1906 al 2005 (fascia rossa) dai modelli MMD; e proiettati dal 2001 al 2100 dai modelli MMD per lo scenario IPCC A1B (fascia arancione) (IPCC FAR, 2007).



INTRODUZIONE



Figure 11.5. Temperature and precipitation changes over Europe from the MMD-A1B simulations. Top row: Annual mean, DJF and JJA temperature change between 1980 to 1999 and 2080 to 2099, averaged over 21 models. Middle row: same as top, but for fractional change in precipitation. Bottom row: number of models out of 21 that project increases in precipitation.

	1985	2007	Change 1985-2007, %
Utilised Agricultural Area, ha	15,601,000	12,707,486	-18.5
Forest land, ha	8,675,000	10,475,658	+20.8
Irrigable agric. area, ha	3,950,503	3,972,666	+0.6
GDP, %	4.7	2.3	-51.1
Farm holdings, #	3,123,344	1,677,766	-46.3

Gli impatti già osservati dei cambiamenti climatici riguardano:

•gli ecosistemi: distribuzione, composizione, struttura, funzione, fenologia, servizi ecosistemici;

•le specie: variazioni della distribuzione (migrazione verso nord e quote più elevate, contrazione del *range*), fenologia e crescita, della popolazione (temp., precipit., eventi estremi, competiz., patog. e parass., disponibilità di cibo, fecondità e riproduzione), estinzione;

•la diversità genetica.



an a direct appeal to our palates succeed where pleas to intellect and conscience have repeatedly

ensure that strict targets on carbon emissions be adopted at the UN climate summit this December in

Copenhagen. If not, they warned, the nation's vaunted wine industry will likely go up in smoke.

come up short? That's the hope of a group of French chefs, sommeliers, and chateau owners who

last week published an op-ed in the newspaper Le Monde calling on President Nicolas Sarkozy to

EXPLORE GOURMET.COM

FAVORITE FOOD AND TRAVEL SITES WEB-EXCLUSIVE RECIPES MY DAY ON A PLATE COCKTAIL OF THE WEEK RESTAURANTS NOW TRAVEL SMART VIEW ALL VIDEO

Celegraph.co.uk				SEARCH	Google	
Home News Sport Finance Lifestyle C	omment Trave	I Culture	Technology	Fashion	Motoring	Job
Health Property Gardening Food and Drink Fan	nily Outdoors	Relationships	Expat Anno	ouncements	Games	
Best British Recipes Jamie Oliver @ telegraph	Recipes Restau	ant Reviews	Pubs Win	e Wine Sh	op Food &	a Drir
HOME > FOOD AND DRINK > WINE						
Best wines will come from	n Scotlaı	nd if cli	mate		-	-
change is not stopped Er	ench ch	ofe eav		WINE OFFER	S	*
change is not stopped, it	CHOIL CH	sis say	523	() []		
Prominent French chers have given warning that the complexity and the best produce will come from S	ne country's wine Scotland if the effe	s will lose the	ir change	Red White	e Sparkling	22.200
are not tackled.			chunge	This week's	pest wine deals	from
				EL BUHO	12 bottles - £54.	99 - S
Bv Henry Samuel in Paris		Share	ৰ 🦝 তা	BATTANA.	Buy now 🕨	4.
Published: 7:00AM BST 17 Aug 2009				-	Chateau La Cro	oix Fo
		279 diggs	digg it	WSheet The	Emilion Grand 12 bottles - £143	6.00 - 1
		0 1	eet,		6 bottles - £71.5 Buy now	0 - Sa
		🖂 Email	🖨 Print	Lancester		
				The second		
	JK/	Toyl Qiv		wore wine	e offers (GOD))
	CHA V	T Text Size	• • •	More wine	offers GOD	
		T Text Size	• • •	More wine	Jie	İċ
		T Text Size	• • •		Jie	İċ
		T Text Size Wine News			Jle	İ¢
		T Text Size Wine News World News			Jie	i İċ
DOLUTION AND AND AND AND AND AND AND AND AND AN		T Text Size Wine News World News			Jie Jie	iċ
		T Text Size Wine News World News Europe			Jie Jie	



Dates des vendanges depuis 1942



IMPACTS



No.	Rate*	Perturbation	Cause-effect chain	Strength†	Knowledge‡
1	Fast	[CO,]1	NPP $\uparrow \Rightarrow$ N demand $\uparrow \Rightarrow$ Soil N availability $\downarrow \Rightarrow$ NPP \downarrow	Strong	High
2	Fast	NÎ	NPP 1	Strong	High
3	Fast	ΤÎ	NPP $\uparrow \Rightarrow$ N demand $\uparrow \Rightarrow$ Soil N availability $\downarrow \Rightarrow$ NPP \downarrow	Strong	High
4	Fast	TÎ	Soil respiration $\uparrow \Rightarrow$ Soil carbon $\downarrow \Rightarrow$ Soil respiration \downarrow	Strong	High
5	Fast	[CO ₂]1	Allocation to roots and mycorrhiza $\uparrow \Rightarrow$ Soil respiration \uparrow	Medium	High
6	Fast	TÎ	Turnover of fine roots $\downarrow \Rightarrow$?	Medium	Medium
7	Intermediate	T↑	N mineralization $\uparrow \Rightarrow$ NPP $\uparrow \Rightarrow$ See mechanisms above	Strong	High
8	Intermediate	NÎ	Root allocation $\downarrow \Rightarrow$ Root litter $\downarrow \Rightarrow$ Soil C store \downarrow	Medium	Medium
9	Intermediate	NÎ	Mycorrhizal turnover $\uparrow \Rightarrow$ Litter input in soil $\uparrow \Rightarrow$ Soil C store \uparrow	Weak	Weak
10	Intermediate	NÎ	Litter N concentration $\uparrow \Rightarrow$ Litter decomposition rate $\uparrow ? \Rightarrow$ Soil C store \downarrow	Weak	Unclear
11	Intermediate	[CO ₂]1	Litter N concentration $\downarrow \Rightarrow$ Litter decomposition rate \downarrow ? \Rightarrow Soil C store \uparrow	Weak	Unclear
12	Intermediate	NÎ, [CO3]Î	NPP $\uparrow \Rightarrow$ Litter production $\uparrow \Rightarrow$ SOM \uparrow	Weak	High
13	Intermediate	NÎ	NPP \uparrow and root allocation $\downarrow \Rightarrow$ N uptake $\downarrow \Rightarrow$ NPP \downarrow	Medium	Medium
14	Intermediate	[CO,]1	NPP \uparrow and root allocation $\uparrow \Rightarrow$ N uptake $\uparrow \Rightarrow$ NPP \uparrow	Medium	Medium
15	Intermediate	NÎ	Soil respiration $\downarrow \Rightarrow$ N mineralization \downarrow ? \Rightarrow NPP \downarrow	Medium	Weak
16	Intermediate	NÎ	Litter decomposition rate $\uparrow \downarrow \Rightarrow$ Soil C store $\downarrow \uparrow$	Medium	Weak
17	Slow	NÎ	SOM decomposition rate $\downarrow \Rightarrow$ Soil C store \uparrow	Medium	Weak

Table 1 Important cause-effect chains for carbon cycling

*Rate at which cause-effect chains respond: fast, within-year; intermediate, a few years; slow, decades; very slow, centuries. +Strength of the effects.

‡Knowledge of the links in the chain.

NPP, net primary production; SOM, soil organic matter.

New Phytologist (2007) 173: 463-480

www.newphytologist.org © The Authors (2007). Journal compilation © New Phytologist (2007)





- ----

Climate change impacts can be roughly divided into two groups:

biophysical impacts:

- physiological effects on crops, pasture, forests and livestock (quantity, quality);
- changes in land, soil and water resources (quantity, quality);
- increased weed and pest challenges;
- shifts in spatial and temporal distribution of impacts;
- sea level rise, changes to ocean salinity;
- sea temperature rise causing fish to inhabit different ranges.

socio-economic impacts:

- decline production and supply of other ecosystem services;
- reduced marginal GDP from agriculture;
- exodus from rural areas food insecurity.



Fig. 4 Qualitative responses of net primary production (NPP), litterfall, heterotrophic respiration ($R_{\rm H}$), and plant and soil carbon pools to step changes in [CO₂], nitrogen and temperature (*T*).

Sectors and				Area		
Systems	Impact	North	Atlantic	Central	Mediterr.	East
	Floods	11	11	11	4	111
Water resources	Water availability	11	TT.	4	111	11
	Water stress	† †	ŤŤ	4	111	11
Forest, shrublands and	Forest NPP	<u> </u>	ŤŤ	🕇 to 🦊	4	🕇 to 🦊
	Northward/inland shift of tree species	† ††	ŤŤ	11	🕇 to 🦊	11
	Stability of forest ecosystems	44	4	4	111	111
	Shrublands NPP	111	111	1	111	11
gradulation	Natural disturbances (e.g., fire, pests, wind-storm)	4	4	1	111	11
	Grasslands NPP	111	TT.	1 to 🕹	111	1
	Suitable cropping area	†††	<u>††</u>	Ť	11	↓ U
	Agricultural land area	11	11	11	11	11
Agriculture and fisheries	Summer crops (maize, sunflower)	111	TT	Ť	111	11
	Winter crops (winter wheat)	†††	TT.	1 to 🕹	11	Ť
	Irrigation needs	na	1 to 🕹	11	111	1
	Energy crops	111	ŤŤ	Ť	44	1
	Livestock	1 to 🕹	4	11	11	11
	Marine fisheries	ŤŤ	Ť	na	4	na

Table 12.4. Summary of the main expected impacts of climate change in Europe during the 21st century, assuming no adaptation.

Alcamo, J., J.M. Moreno, B. Nováky, M. Bindi, R. Corobov, R.J.N. Devoy, C. Giannakopoulos, E. Martin, J.E. Olesen, A. Shvidenko, 2007: Europe. *Climate Change 2007: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, M.L. Parry, O.F. Canziani, J.P. Palutikof, P.J. van der Linden and C.E. Hanson, Eds., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 541-580.

IMPATTI

http://peseta.jrc.ec.europa.eu/



......

Figure 1. Vulnerability framework



Fonte: International Food Policy Research Institute, 2009

Vulnerability

Vulnerability is the degree to which a *system* is susceptible to, and unable to cope with, adverse effects of *climate change*, including *climate variability* and extremes. Vulnerability is a function of the character, magnitude, and rate of climate change and variation to which a system is exposed, its *sensitivity*, and its *adaptive capacity*.

Sensitivity

Sensitivity is the degree to which a system is affected, either adversely or beneficially, by *climate variability* or change. The effect may be direct (e.g., a change in crop yield in response to a change in the mean, range or variability of temperature) or indirect (e.g., damages caused by an increase in the frequency of coastal flooding due to *sea-level rise*).

Adaptive capacity (in relation to climate change impacts)

The ability of a system to adjust to *climate change* (including *climate variability* and extremes) to moderate potential damages, to take advantage of opportunities, or to cope with the consequences.

Adaptive capacity

The whole of capabilities, resources and institutions of a country or *region* to implement effective *adaptation* measures.

Exposure

Exposure relates to the degree of climate stress upon a particular unit of analysis.

In this work, exposure is represented by:

- 1. Frequency of climate extreme events (droughts and floods, episodes of high relative humidity, frost, and hail can also affect yield and quality of fruits and vegetables) and climate-related biotic and abiotic stresses (forest fire, etc.).
- 2. Predicted change in temperature and precipitation by 2050

Sensitivity

- 1. Irrigation rate
- 2. Land degradation index
- 3. Crop diversification index:
- 4. Percent small-scale holdings
- 5. Rural population density

Adaptive capacity

- 1. Inherent biological adaptive capacity of crops (annual crops better than perennial, gamic better than agamic)
- 2. Farm organization
- 3. Technical skills (percentage of agriculturalist living in the study area)
- 4. Access to credit
- 5. Farm income
- 6. Farm holding size
- 7. Share of agriculture GDP
- 8. Farm assets
- 9. Infrastructure index

Vulnerability of a given agricultural or sylvicultural system depends on its **exposure** and **sensitivity**, which combined provides the potential impact and the potential for effectively coping with the impacts and associated risks.

Vulnerability may be formulated mathematically as follows:

V = f (I - AC)

where V is vulnerability, I is potential impact, and AC is adaptive capacity.

A higher adaptive capacity is associated with a lower vulnerability, while a higher impact is associated with a higher vulnerability.

Having considered the theoretical determinants of local farming sector vulnerability and selected appropriate indicators, we must now carry out a form of **standardization** to ensure that all the **indicators are comparable**.

Based on the method in the UNDP's Human Development Index, all of the variables in the vulnerability indices are normalized to a range of 0 to 100.

The values of each variable are normalized to the range of values in the data set by applying the following **general formula**:

(Actual value - minimum value) * 100

Index value =

(Maximum value – minimum value)

To ensure that high index values indicate high vulnerability in all cases, we reverse the index values by using [100 – index value] for indicators hypothesized to decrease vulnerability.

After standardizing the data, we next attach weights to the vulnerability indicators.

A review of the literature indicates that **three methods are used to assign weights to indicators**:

1.expert judgment

2.arbitrary choice of equal weight and

3.statistical methods such as principal component analysis or factor analysis.





•Need to adapt to a changing climate (temperatures increases, changing amount of available water, increased frequency and intensity of extreme weather events and rises in sea level and saline intrusion in the coastal zones of the peninsula and islands)

•autonomous (ex.: reaction of a farmer) and planned adaptation (conscious policy options or response strategies

 adaptation is a risk-management strategy that has costs and is not failsafe

•adaptation measures that are able to incorporate biodiversity conservation and mitigation planning, to obtain 'win-win-win' strategies
•Assessment of vulnerability is key (exposure, sensitivity, and adaptive capacity).

•The environmental and socio-economic indicators to be identified have to reflect these three components of vulnerability.

•The approach to be followed should combine exposure with sensitivity to give the potential impact, which is then compared with the adaptive capacity to yield an overall measure of vulnerability

•Principal component analysis has to be used to generate weights for the different indicators, and an overall vulnerability index has to be proposed.





- mine