The role of global supply chains in the transmission of weather induced production shocks

Stefan Borsky

University of Graz

Martin Jury

University of Graz

COACCH Workshop "Addressing climate change in European supply chains", 19. March 2021



The work has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No. 776479 (COACCH project) and from the Austrian Climate and Energy Fund (ACRP Call 12th, project number: B670197).

Motivation

- Economies today are organized in fine interwoven networks of production units (Carvalho 2014).
- Idiosyncratic shocks, which are triggered for example by natural disasters, can be widely dispersed in the economy through inter-industry linkages.
 - 2011 flood in Thailand \rightarrow doubling of global hard-disk prices (Livermann 2016).
 - 2011 T
 T
 öhoku Earthquake in Japan → large, significant impacts on the US manufacturing industry (Barrot & Sauvagnat 2016, Boehm et al. 2019).
 - More recent examples: 2019 Corona Pandemic; Feb 2021 North American Cold Wave (Texas).
- The extend of this effect depends on the in- and outdegree distribution in the production network, i.e. the degree of connectivity between the production units.

- Classify each country's sector according to its degree of spatial connectivity.
 - 1990-2015; 172 countries; 12 sectors.
- ² Create a time series of extreme weather events for each country.
 - historic; future (2100) 5 global circulation models and two emission scenarios of climate futures.
- ³ Create 2 measures of supplier concentration based on the full network structure.
- ⁴ Combine this data in an econometric model which regresses supply chain shocks on sectoral export performance.
- ⁵ Project future exposure to supply chain shocks taking climate change induced changes in the occurrence of natural disasters into account.



Sectoral forward and backward linkages and disaster shocks (2005 and 2015)

- Supply chain disruptions, caused by large natural disasters abroad, significantly reduces a sector's export value.
 - A one percent increase in our supply chain shock measure reduces a sector's export value by around 0.3 percent.
 - A one standard deviation increase in our supply chain shock measure reduces a sector's export value by around 11 percent.
- Negative effect is mainly driven by the manufacturing sector.

- A large number of input suppliers can serve as a layer of protection as it enables firms to more easily find substitutes for suppliers affected by a disruption.
 - Extensive margin measure → number of suppliers.
 - Intensive margin measure \rightarrow concentration in the supply market.
- Large concentration in the supply markets leads to an increased adverse effect of supply chain shocks.
- Our results suggest that it is the availability of large suppliers that matters.
- Low-income and lower-middle income countries are in particularly negative affected by supplier concentration and by supply chain shocks.
 - No difference in the mediating role of supplier concentration compared to higher income groups.

Results III: Future projections (Frequencies)



Distribution of projected SCS impacts for three different time periods.

Results V: Country specific impact (EU countries)

	2020-2040		2041-2070		2071-2100	
	RCP 2.6	RCP 4.5	RCP 2.6	RCP 4.5	RCP 2.6	RCP 4.5
Austria	-5.79	-5.85	-6.63	-10.27	-7.09	-11.81
Belgium	-7.43	-5.74	-7.58	-10.61	-6.85	-11.60
Bulgaria	-10.40	-10.29	-12.67	-14.5	-13.29	-16.76
Croatia	-13.27	-10.90	-12.02	-14.98	-12.55	-17.58
Cyprus	-11.52	-9.15	-12.69	-12.76	-12.38	-14.78
Czech Rep.	-8.92	-5.24	-7.30	-9.03	-7.05	-12.08
Denmark	-8.19	-4.65	-6.10	-8.03	-5.00	-9.61
Estonia	-7.94	-8.01	-9.48	-11.03	-8.75	-13.50
Finland	-10.24	-10.51	-11.23	-11.98	-10.36	-15.01
France	-13.11	-12.41	-13.43	-14.75	-12.11	-15.75
Germany	-7.23	-6.86	-7.96	-9.36	-6.59	-12.34
Greece	-7.97	-7.25	-9.98	-11.89	-9.48	-13.33
Hungary	-6.25	-5.60	-6.84	-9.08	-7.94	-11.40
Ireland	-9.29	-7.26	-9.08	-11.31	-9.84	-12.77
Italy	-11.86	-9.64	-12.50	-14.22	-12.04	-15.14
Latvia	-11.15	-8.91	-12.53	-13.57	-11.05	-13.87
Lithuania	-9.89	-7.80	-10.55	-12.14	-9.23	-13.24
Luxembourg	-9.57	-6.38	-9.68	-11.29	-7.78	-11.73
Malta	-11.53	-11.89	-13.25	-14.25	-13.31	-16.63
Netherlands	-11.38	-12.04	-14.08	-15.04	-12.85	-16.30
Poland	-10.61	-6.03	-8.24	-9.92	-7.75	-10.44
Portugal	-10.49	-12.10	-11.87	-14.78	-10.95	-16.23
Romania	-11.04	-9.88	-12.11	-13.74	-13.03	-16.05
Slovakia	-9.39	-7.31	-8.96	-10.34	-8.42	-13.08
Slovenia	-5.45	-4.53	-6.00	-10.18	-6.54	-12.10
Spain	-11.53	-11.81	-14.72	-14.53	-11.96	-16.31
Sweden	-10.92	-10.72	-12.04	-13.86	-10.79	-15.09
UK	-10.98	-11.05	-12.52	-13.65	-11.65	-14.93

Notes: Predictions of impacts are based on the mean of all five global circulation models considered.

Projections: Country specific impact



Predicted export change (mean over 5 global circulation models) - left panel (RCP 2.6); right panel (RCP 4.5)

- The production of a final good in a country is based on numerous input-output interlinkages domestically as well as increasingly internationally.
- Disturbances in one country can be propagated over the supply chain leading indirectly to a change in other countries' macroeconomic outcomes.
- This paper gives evidence that these shocks leads to large negative effects on a sectors export activity today as well as in future.
- We show that some countries, which are regularly hit by natural disasters, are also strongly interdependent in global production networks.

- Firms and industries need to be made aware of the potential risk of supply chain disruptions.
- Geographical diversification as a (limited) adaptation choice.
- Storage facilities as adaptation options (trade off between storage costs and just in time production).

Thank you!

Stefan Borsky

stefan.borsky@uni-graz.at https://homepage.uni-graz.at/en/stefan.borsky/

Discussion Question

How do you see the increasing internalization of input sourcing regarding the supply chain risk of (European) industries?