

## DOCTORAL THESIS

### The feasibility of carbon-subsidized afforestation projects: a case study of China

Hou, Guolong

*Date of Award:*  
2020

[Link to publication](#)

#### General rights

Copyright and intellectual property rights for the publications made accessible in HKBU Scholars are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners. In addition to the restrictions prescribed by the Copyright Ordinance of Hong Kong, all users and readers must also observe the following terms of use:

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from HKBU Scholars for the purpose of private study or research
- Users cannot further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- To share publications in HKBU Scholars with others, users are welcome to freely distribute the permanent URL assigned to the publication

## ABSTRACT

Afforestation projects in China have substantially contributed to national CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration and play an important role in international climate change mitigation. However, these nation-wide afforestation projects are usually funded by the national government, with very large and unsustainable investments. It is important to find alternative sources of funding to finance afforestation, and convince poor farmers to become involved in afforestation projects. Carbon-subsidized afforestation could be the solution.

The current study aims to find i) whether farmers need additional subsidies to reforest their marginal farmland; if so, ii) whether the value of carbon sequestration of afforestation can offset farmers' net costs. To do this, first I determine the amount of carbon sequestration through afforestation. Second, I assess the value of carbon sequestration, the costs and benefits of afforestation projects, and the costs and benefits of crop production. Third, I investigate the optimal rotation period of the plantations considering a joint production of timber and carbon, for different species.

Results show that total carbon sequestration through tree biomass and soil carbon following afforestation differs among tree species and stand age as well as across regions. Economic trees sequester less carbon than ecological trees and bamboo. Among economic trees, nut trees with an inedible hard shell sequester more carbon than fruit trees. The regional context significantly influences the carbon sequestration potential, with more carbon sequestered in southern and eastern regions than in northern regions. Bamboo also shows a remarkable carbon sequestration potential, which is even greater than Chinese fir and Poplar in northern regions.

Although afforestation programs have huge potential to store carbon, the voluntary acceptance by landowners crucially depends on their economic outcome. I found that usually carbon credits can compensate for the opportunity costs of alternative land uses, except i) when highly profitable croplands are afforested, in which case carbon credits are not sufficient, and ii) when croplands that generates low incomes are afforested, in which case carbon credits are not needed. Fruit trees are the most cost-effective option for afforestation. Bamboo afforestation is economically attractive if carbon revenues is included. The minimum price of carbon credit decreases with increasing project duration because more carbon is stored when time increases. This does not hold for fast-growing trees like Eucalyptus, for which the minimum price increases with extended project duration.

Given the temporal variations of joint production of timber and carbon sequestration, the carbon accounting regimes (tCER, temporary Certified Emission Reductions and ICER, long-term Certified Emission Reductions) have a significant impact on the optimal rotation as well as on the revenue. Forest managers have an incentive to use tCER accounting to finance slow-growing plantations, and ICER for fast-growing ones. I perform a sensitivity analysis detects the changes of rotation period with different

carbon prices and discount rates. While the optimal decision for slow-growing species (e.g. Chinese fir) is highly sensitive to changes in both variables under tCER accounting, the results concerning fast-growing species (e.g. Eucalyptus) are most sensitive under the ICER accounting regime. In contrast, carbon revenues have a minimal impact on the optimal rotation of Poplar plantations, no matter which regime is applied.

I conclude that carbon-subsidized afforestation is a feasible way to offset the opportunity costs of retired farmland and support the livelihood of farmers. The findings can contribute to the efficient and sustainable management of forestry projects using carbon sequestration, while the methodology can also be applied to other regions in the world.

**Keywords:** Carbon Sequestration, Afforestation, Carbon Price, Optimal Rotation Period, Carbon Accounting, Certified Emission Reductions

# Table of Contents

DECLARATION.....	i
ABSTRACT .....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iv
Table of Contents.....	vi
List of Figures.....	xi
List of Tables .....	xii
Symbols and Abbreviation.....	xiv
Chapter 1 Introduction.....	1
1.1 Research background.....	1
1.1.1 Deforestation and its drivers.....	1
1.1.2 Development of afforestation/reforestation (A/R) projects .....	2
1.1.3 CER trading scheme .....	3
1.1.4 Joint production of timber and carbon.....	4
1.2 Research objectives .....	6
1.3 Research flow .....	7
1.4 Organization of the thesis .....	7
Chapter 2 Methodology .....	10
2.1 Review of secondary soil data .....	10
2.2 Collection of primary soil data .....	11
2.3 Collection of economic data.....	15
2.4 Conclusions .....	17

Chapter 3 Grouping tree species to estimate afforestation-driven soil organic carbon sequestration	18
.....	.....
3.1 Introduction	18
3.2 Materials and methods	20
3.2.1 Data sources and compilation	20
3.2.2 Statistical analysis	22
3.3 Results	23
3.3.1 Descriptive statistics	23
3.3.2 Variations within the tree types of evergreen and broadleaf	25
3.3.3 Effects of different classifications of tree type on changes in SOC stock	25
3.4 Discussion	30
3.5 Conclusion	33
Chapter 4 Amount of carbon sequestered by tree biomass and soils through afforestation programs	35
.....	.....
4.1 Soil organic carbon sequestration	35
4.1.1 Introduction	35
4.1.2 Data sources and compilation	38
4.1.3 SOC estimation	38
4.1.4 Soil depth standardization and extrapolation	39
4.1.5 Statistical analysis	40
4.1.6 Descriptive statistics	41
4.1.7 Changes in SOC stocks for different tree types	41
4.1.8 Interactions between tree types and other influencing factors	43
4.1.9 Factors affecting SOC stocks after afforestation	47

4.1.10 Discussion and conclusions .....	48
4.2 Total carbon sequestration of the afforestation project.....	52
4.2.1 Method .....	52
4.2.2 Timber production and carbon sequestration of ecological trees .....	53
4.2.3 Carbon sequestration by economic trees .....	55
4.2.4 Carbon sequestration by bamboo .....	55
4.2.5 Determining the temporal patterns of carbon sequestration .....	56
4.2.6 Results and discussion.....	56
4.3 Limitations.....	61
4.4 Conclusions .....	62
Chapter 5 Total benefit from afforestation: a cost and benefit analysis.....	64
5.1 Introduction .....	64
5.2 Study area .....	68
5.3 Data sources .....	69
5.4 Economic analysis .....	69
5.4.1 Net income comparison of forest and cropland.....	69
5.4.2 Scenarios of afforestation .....	70
5.5 Results and discussion.....	72
5.5.1 Costs and benefits.....	72
5.5.2 Economic evaluation of converting cropland to forest.....	82
5.5.3 Sensitivity analysis .....	89
5.5.4 Uncertainty analysis .....	92
5.6 Conclusions .....	92
Chapter 6 Optimal rotation period considering a joint production of carbon and timber.....	95

6.1 Introduction .....	95
6.2 Data and Methods.....	100
6.2.1 Data source .....	100
6.2.2 Calculation of the optimal rotation periods .....	100
6.3 Results and Discussion.....	103
6.3.1 Total carbon sequestration.....	103
6.3.2 Differences between tCER and ICER accounting .....	104
6.3.3 Optimal rotation periods under different carbon accounting regimes .....	108
6.3.4 Impact of changes in carbon prices on rotation period.....	110
6.3.5 Impact of changes in discount rate on rotation period.....	114
6.4 Limitations.....	116
6.5 Conclusions .....	117
Chapter 7 Conclusions.....	120
7.1 Main findings .....	120
7.2 Contributions to knowledge .....	123
7.3 Policy recommendations .....	124
Appendices .....	127
A1. Dataset for SOC.....	127
A2. Questionnaire for economic data collection .....	157
A3. Soil depth standardization and extrapolation.....	159
A3.1 Depth functions developed by Jobbagy and Jackson (2000).....	159
A3.2 Polynomial trendline (order 2) .....	160
A3.3 Assessment of accuracy .....	161
Bibliography.....	163

PUBLICATIONS .....	187
CURRICULUM VITAE.....	188