

Sea Level Rise and Urban Adaptation in Jakarta

Allan Hsiao
Princeton University

February 9, 2024



Jakarta

- By 2050, 35% below sea level (Andreas et al. 2018)
 - Land subsidence + sea level rise
 - Proposed sea wall at up to \$40B
- **How does government intervention complicate adaptation?**

This paper

- **Coastal moral hazard** as defense bails out development
 - If government is time-inconsistent
 - Delays inland migration at high social cost
- **Dynamic spatial model** of development and defense
 - Estimated with granular data for Jakarta

Results

① Severe moral hazard

- Coastal persistence without commitment (5x in 2200)
- Rationalizes high land prices despite future flood risk

② Policy options

- Direct: partial commitment, partial regulation
- Indirect: moving capital, slowing land subsidence

Contributions

- **Adaptation frictions** under endogenous government action
 - Desmet et al. 2021, Barreca et al. 2016, Costinot et al. 2016
 - Kydland & Prescott 1977, Kousky et al. 2006, Boustan et al. 2012
- **Sea level rise damages and policies**
 - Kocornik-Mina et al. 2020, Balboni 2021, Castro-Vincenzi 2022, Fried 2022, Patel 2023
- **Dynamic spatial model** of urban development
 - Kalouptsidi 2014, Hotz & Miller 1993, Arcidiacono & Miller 2011, Murphy 2018
 - Desmet et al. 2018, Caliendo et al. 2019, Kleinman et al. 2023, Bilal & Rossi-Hansberg 2023

Outline

① Theory

② Empirics

③ Policy

Theory

Fundamental trade-offs

- **Spatial:** adapt in-place at coast or migrate inland
- **Dynamic:** incur costs today or damages tomorrow
- **Moral hazard** introduces a market failure
 - Even with one location, one period

Coastal development and defense

- **Development** D at cost $C(D)$ (agent)
- **Defense** G at cost $E(G)$ (principal)
- Residential value $R(D, G)$ for $R_{DG} > 0$

$$\max_D \Pi = \max_D \{R(D, G) - C(D)\}$$

$$\max_G W = \max_G \{R(D, G) - C(D) - E(G)\}$$

- Moral hazard: time inconsistency + uninternalized cost

Coastal development and defense

- **Development** D at cost $C(D)$ (agent)
- **Defense** G at cost $E(G)$ (principal)
- Residential value $R(D, G)$ for $R_{DG} > 0$

$$\max_D \Pi = \max_D \{R(D, G) - C(D)\}$$

$$\max_G W = \max_G \{R(D, G) - C(D) - E(G)\}$$

- Moral hazard: time inconsistency + uninternalized cost

Coastal development and defense

- **Development** D at cost $C(D)$ (agent)
- **Defense** G at cost $E(G)$ (principal)
- Residential value $R(D, G)$ for $R_{DG} > 0$

$$\max_D \Pi = \max_D \{R(D, G) - C(D)\}$$

$$\max_G W = \max_G \{R(D, G) - C(D) - E(G)\}$$

- Moral hazard: time inconsistency + uninternalized cost

Coastal development and defense

- **Development** D at cost $C(D)$ (agent)
- **Defense** G at cost $E(G)$ (principal)
- Residential value $R(D, G)$ for $R_{DG} > 0$

$$\max_D \Pi = \max_D \{R(D, G) - C(D)\}$$

$$\max_G W = \max_G \{R(D, G) - C(D) - E(G)\}$$

- Moral hazard: time inconsistency + uninternalized cost

Coastal development and defense

- **Development** D at cost $C(D)$ (agent)
- **Defense** G at cost $E(G)$ (principal)
- Residential value $R(D, G)$ for $R_{DG} > 0$

$$\max_D \Pi = \max_D \{R(D, G) - C(D)\}$$

$$\max_G W = \max_G \{R(D, G) - C(D) - E(G)\}$$

- Moral hazard: time inconsistency + uninternalized cost

Coastal development and defense

- **Development** D at cost $C(D)$ (agent)
- **Defense** G at cost $E(G)$ (principal)
- Residential value $R(D, G)$ for $R_{DG} > 0$

$$\max_D \Pi = \max_D \{R(D, G) - C(D)\}$$

$$\max_G W = \max_G \{R(D, G) - C(D) - E(G)\}$$

- **Moral hazard:** time inconsistency + uninternalized cost

Agent and principal

- ① “Developers” vs. government
- ② Local vs. national government
- ③ Current vs. future government

First best with commitment

- ① Defense G
- ② Development $D(G)$

$$[\Pi_D] \quad R_D = C_D$$

$$[W_G] \quad R_G = E_G$$

- Same as social planner, who chooses (D, G) directly

Over-development without commitment

- ① Development D
- ② Defense $G(D)$

$$\begin{aligned} [\Pi_D] \quad R_D = C_D &\rightarrow \text{high } G, \text{ high } D \\ [W_G] \quad R_G = E_G &\rightarrow \text{high } D, \text{ high } G \end{aligned}$$

- Weak coordination on high (D, G) , given multiplicity ($R_{DG} > 0$)
 - If G unconstrained via domestic or foreign ability


Over-development without commitment

- ① Development D
- ② Defense $G(D)$


$$\begin{aligned} [\Pi_D] \quad R_D + R_G G_D &= C_D \\ [W_G] \quad R_G &= E_G \end{aligned}$$

- Strong coordination on high $(D, G(D))$, given $G_D > 0$ ($R_{DG} > 0$)
 - If G continuous via height, quality, maintenance, or expectation

Example



Example



Commitment is challenging

- Ex post, principal wants to defend (plus lobbying)
 - Time inconsistency magnifies moral hazard
 - Current government moves before future government
- Coastal defense crowds out inland migration (lock-in)
 - If inland migration is possible

Alternative solutions

- Regulation with tax or quota
 - But still need commitment to costly enforcement
- Local financing rules
 - But even locally, inland taxes subsidize coast
- Mandated insurance
 - But local risk is aggregate, so usually subsidized in practice
- Coasian bargaining
 - But large transfers are challenging and still bad for principal

JAKARTA GIANT SEA WALL



PIK 2 terlibat dalam Perencanaan JAKARTA GIANT SEA WALL
Proyek Pemerintah dalam pengembangan daerah pesisir

Profil Proyek NCICD

- Peletakan batu pertama: Oktober 2014
- Target rampung: 2022
- Tahapan pembangunan: 3 (Tahap A, B, dan C)
- Pelaksana: Kementerian PU dan Pemprov DKI
- Biaya investasi: Rp300 triliun
- Reklamasi lahan: 1.000 hektare

Sumber: Kementerian PU-Pera, berbagai sumber, diolah



Target Konstruksi

Tahap A

Konstruksi: 2014-2017
Flood safety: 2030

Tahap B

Konstruksi: 2018-2022
Flood Safety: 2030

Tahap C

Konstruksi: 2022

Empirics

Framework

$$R(D, G), \quad C(D), \quad E(G)$$

- **Development:** spatial demand, dynamic supply
- **Defense:** hydrological model, engineering costs
- **Moral hazard** from model, not data
 - *Potential* impact on adaptation
 - But can rationalize price data

Demand

$$u_{ijk} = \alpha r_k + \phi f_k + x_k \gamma + \varepsilon_k + \tau m_{jk} + \epsilon_{ijk}$$

- **Spatial choice:** renters i , locations k
 - Private cost of flooding
 - Moral hazard increasing in flood disutility
 - Moving inland abandons amenities, incurs migration costs
- **Estimation:** linear IV with 2015 population data
 - Rent endogeneity from unobserved amenities
 - Ruggedness as supply shifter
- No dynamics, agglomeration, uncertainty

Demand

$$u_{ijk} = \alpha r_k + \phi f_k + x_k \gamma + \varepsilon_k + \tau m_{jk} + \epsilon_{ijk}$$


- **Spatial choice:** renters i , locations k
 - Private cost of flooding
 - Moral hazard increasing in flood disutility
 - Moving inland abandons amenities, incurs migration costs
- **Estimation:** linear IV with 2015 population data
 - Rent endogeneity from unobserved amenities
 - Ruggedness as supply shifter
- No dynamics, agglomeration, uncertainty

Demand


$$u_{ijk} = \alpha r_k + \phi f_k + x_k \gamma + \varepsilon_k + \tau m_{jk} + \epsilon_{ijk}$$

- **Spatial choice:** renters i , locations k
 - Private cost of flooding
 - Moral hazard increasing in flood disutility
 - Moving inland abandons amenities, incurs migration costs
- **Estimation:** linear IV with 2015 population data
 - Rent endogeneity from unobserved amenities
 - Ruggedness as supply shifter
- No dynamics, agglomeration, uncertainty

Population (global data)



Flooding (2013-2020, past → future)



Demand estimates (imply \$0.3B flood damages)

	IV		First stage	
	Estimate	SE	Estimate	SE
Rents	-0.032***	(0.004)		
Ruggedness			12.20***	(1.176)
Flooding	-0.490***	(0.097)	-15.53***	(2.485)
Residential amenities	0.110***	(0.018)	1.540***	(0.469)
District FE	x		x	
Observations	5,780		5,780	
F-statistic			108	

Supply

$$c_{kt} \quad \text{vs.} \quad \alpha(r_{kt} + \beta r_{kt+1} + \beta^2 r_{kt+2} + \dots)$$

- **Dynamic choice:** landowners i , locations k , time t , state $D_{ikt} \in \{0, 1\}$
 - Private cost of development
 - Moral hazard increasing in rent elasticity ($\alpha^s \neq \alpha^d$)
 - Moving inland incurs construction costs
- **Estimation:** linear IV with 2015 construction data
 - Rent endogeneity from unobserved costs
 - Residential amenities as demand shifter
- No market power, agglomeration, quality

Supply

$$c_{kt} \quad \text{vs.} \quad \alpha(r_{kt} + \beta r_{kt+1} + \beta^2 r_{kt+2} + \dots)$$

- **Dynamic choice:** landowners i , locations k , time t , state $D_{ikt} \in \{0, 1\}$
 - Private cost of development
 - Moral hazard increasing in rent elasticity ($\alpha^s \neq \alpha^d$)
 - Moving inland incurs construction costs
- **Estimation:** linear IV with 2015 construction data
 - Rent endogeneity from unobserved costs
 - Residential amenities as demand shifter
- No market power, agglomeration, quality

Supply

$$c_{kt} \quad \text{vs.} \quad \alpha(r_{kt} + \beta r_{kt+1} + \beta^2 r_{kt+2} + \dots)$$

- **Dynamic choice:** landowners i , locations k , time t , state $D_{ikt} \in \{0, 1\}$
 - Private cost of development
 - Moral hazard increasing in rent elasticity ($\alpha^s \neq \alpha^d$)
 - Moving inland incurs construction costs
- **Estimation:** linear IV with 2015 construction data
 - Rent endogeneity from unobserved costs
 - Residential amenities as demand shifter
- No market power, agglomeration, quality

Small, homogeneous landowners

$$w_t = \{r_{kt}, c_{kt}, P_{kt}^1, P_{kt}^0\}_k$$

- Take aggregate state as given: rents, costs, and property prices
 - 14k developers in Jakarta, 1k with \$3.5M annual revenue
 - Constant returns to scale
- Local government coordinates, developers react competitively
 - Market power lessens development
 - But also facilitates coordination

Choices

- **Developed plots:** sell or hold

$$① \quad V_{kt}^1 = \max\{\alpha P_{kt}^1, \tilde{V}_{kt}^1\}$$

$$② \quad \tilde{V}_{kt}^1 = \alpha r_{kt} + \beta \mathbb{E}[V_{kt+1}^1]$$

- **Empty plots:** sell, develop, or hold

$$③ \quad V_{kt}^0 = \max\{\alpha P_{kt}^0, \tilde{V}_{kt}^0\}$$

$$④ \quad \tilde{V}_{kt}^0 = \mathbb{E}[\max\{\beta V_{kt+1}^1 - c_{kt} + \varepsilon_{ikt}^1, \beta V_{kt+1}^0 + \varepsilon_{ikt}^0\}]$$

Choices

- **Developed plots:** sell or hold

$$① \quad V_{kt}^1 = \max\{\alpha P_{kt}^1, \tilde{V}_{kt}^1\}$$

$$② \quad \tilde{V}_{kt}^1 = \alpha r_{kt} + \beta \mathbb{E}[V_{kt+1}^1]$$

- **Empty plots:** sell, develop, or hold

$$③ \quad V_{kt}^0 = \max\{\alpha P_{kt}^0, \tilde{V}_{kt}^0\}$$

$$④ \quad \tilde{V}_{kt}^0 = \mathbb{E}[\max\{\beta V_{kt+1}^1 - c_{kt} + \varepsilon_{ikt}^1, \beta V_{kt+1}^0 + \varepsilon_{ikt}^0\}]$$

Equilibrium prices

- Rents clear rental markets: $D_{kt}^{\text{res}}(r_t; f_t) = D_{kt}^{\text{dev}}(r_{kt}, r_{kt+1}, \dots)$
- REITs arbitrage property prices
 - Can buy assets and collect rents
 - Observed prices capture continuation values (Kalouptsidi 2014)

$$\begin{aligned} ① \quad V_{kt}^1 &= \max\{\alpha P_{kt}^1, \tilde{V}_{kt}^1\} & V_{kt}^1 &= \alpha P_{kt}^1 \\ ③ \quad V_{kt}^0 &= \max\{\alpha P_{kt}^0, \tilde{V}_{kt}^0\} & V_{kt}^0 &= \alpha P_{kt}^0 \end{aligned}$$

$$P_{kt}^1 = \sum_{t'=0}^{\infty} \beta^{t'} \mathbb{E}[r_{kt+t'}], \quad P_{kt}^0 = \frac{1}{\alpha} \log \left(\exp(\beta V_{kt+1}^1 - c_{kt}) + \exp(\beta V_{kt+1}^0) \right)$$

Equilibrium prices

- Rents clear rental markets: $D_{kt}^{\text{res}}(r_t; f_t) = D_{kt}^{\text{dev}}(r_{kt}, r_{kt+1}, \dots)$
- REITs arbitrage property prices
 - Can buy assets and collect rents
 - Observed prices capture continuation values (Kalouptsidi 2014)

$$\begin{aligned} ① \quad V_{kt}^1 &= \max\{\alpha P_{kt}^1, \tilde{V}_{kt}^1\} & V_{kt}^1 &= \alpha P_{kt}^1 \\ ③ \quad V_{kt}^0 &= \max\{\alpha P_{kt}^0, \tilde{V}_{kt}^0\} & V_{kt}^0 &= \alpha P_{kt}^0 \end{aligned}$$

$$P_{kt}^1 = \sum_{t'=0}^{\infty} \beta^{t'} \mathbb{E}[r_{kt+t'}], \quad P_{kt}^0 = \frac{1}{\alpha} \log \left(\exp(\beta V_{kt+1}^1 - c_{kt}) + \exp(\beta V_{kt+1}^0) \right)$$

Equilibrium prices

- Rents clear rental markets: $D_{kt}^{\text{res}}(r_t; f_t) = D_{kt}^{\text{dev}}(r_{kt}, r_{kt+1}, \dots)$
- REITs arbitrage property prices
 - Can buy assets and collect rents
 - Observed prices capture continuation values (Kalouptsidi 2014)

$$\begin{aligned} ① \quad V_{kt}^1 &= \max\{\alpha P_{kt}^1, \tilde{V}_{kt}^1\} & V_{kt}^1 &= \alpha P_{kt}^1 \\ ③ \quad V_{kt}^0 &= \max\{\alpha P_{kt}^0, \tilde{V}_{kt}^0\} & V_{kt}^0 &= \alpha P_{kt}^0 \end{aligned}$$

$$P_{kt}^1 = \sum_{t'=0}^{\infty} \beta^{t'} \mathbb{E}[r_{kt+t'}], \quad P_{kt}^0 = \frac{1}{\alpha} \log \left(\exp(\beta V_{kt+1}^1 - c_{kt}) + \exp(\beta V_{kt+1}^0) \right)$$

Simple IV estimation

$$④ \quad \tilde{V}_{kt}^0 = \mathbb{E}[\max\{\beta V_{kt+1}^1 - c_{kt} + \varepsilon_{ikt}^1, \beta V_{kt+1}^0 + \varepsilon_{ikt}^0\}]$$

$$\begin{aligned}\ln \pi_{kt}^1 - \ln \pi_{kt}^0 &= \beta \mathbb{E}[V_{kt+1}^1 - V_{kt+1}^0] - c_{kt} \\ &= \alpha \beta \mathbb{E}[P_{kt+1}^1 - P_{kt+1}^0] - c_{kt} \\ &= \alpha \beta (P_{kt}^1 - P_{kt}^0) - c_{kt}\end{aligned}$$

- **Policy-invariant:** can invert to infer policy
 - Market expectations capitalize into prices
 - Developers respond to prices as if statically
- Alternatives: full-solution, two-step, Euler CCP

Simple IV estimation

$$④ \quad \tilde{V}_{kt}^0 = \mathbb{E}[\max\{\beta V_{kt+1}^1 - c_{kt} + \varepsilon_{ikt}^1, \beta V_{kt+1}^0 + \varepsilon_{ikt}^0\}]$$

$$\begin{aligned}\ln \pi_{kt}^1 - \ln \pi_{kt}^0 &= \beta \mathbb{E}[V_{kt+1}^1 - V_{kt+1}^0] - c_{kt} \\ &= \alpha \beta \mathbb{E}[P_{kt+1}^1 - P_{kt+1}^0] - c_{kt} \\ &= \alpha \beta (P_{kt}^1 - P_{kt}^0) - c_{kt}\end{aligned}$$

- **Policy-invariant:** can invert to infer policy
 - Market expectations capitalize into prices
 - Developers respond to prices as if statically
- Alternatives: full-solution, two-step, Euler CCP

Simple IV estimation

$$④ \quad \tilde{V}_{kt}^0 = \mathbb{E}[\max\{\beta V_{kt+1}^1 - c_{kt} + \varepsilon_{ikt}^1, \beta V_{kt+1}^0 + \varepsilon_{ikt}^0\}]$$

$$\begin{aligned}\ln \pi_{kt}^1 - \ln \pi_{kt}^0 &= \beta \mathbb{E}[V_{kt+1}^1 - V_{kt+1}^0] - c_{kt} \\ &= \alpha \beta \mathbb{E}[P_{kt+1}^1 - P_{kt+1}^0] - c_{kt} \\ &= \alpha \beta (P_{kt}^1 - P_{kt}^0) - c_{kt}\end{aligned}$$

- **Policy-invariant:** can invert to infer policy
 - Market expectations capitalize into prices
 - Developers respond to prices as if statically
- Alternatives: full-solution, two-step, Euler CCP

Simple IV estimation

$$④ \quad \tilde{V}_{kt}^0 = \mathbb{E}[\max\{\beta V_{kt+1}^1 - c_{kt} + \varepsilon_{ikt}^1, \beta V_{kt+1}^0 + \varepsilon_{ikt}^0\}]$$

$$\begin{aligned}\ln \pi_{kt}^1 - \ln \pi_{kt}^0 &= \beta \mathbb{E}[V_{kt+1}^1 - V_{kt+1}^0] - c_{kt} \\ &= \alpha \beta \mathbb{E}[P_{kt+1}^1 - P_{kt+1}^0] - c_{kt} \\ &= \alpha \beta (P_{kt}^1 - P_{kt}^0) - c_{kt}\end{aligned}$$

- **Policy-invariant:** can invert to infer policy
 - Market expectations capitalize into prices
 - Developers respond to prices as if statically
- Alternatives: full-solution, two-step, Euler CCP

Simple IV estimation


$$④ \quad \tilde{V}_{kt}^0 = \mathbb{E}[\max\{\beta V_{kt+1}^1 - c_{kt} + \varepsilon_{ikt}^1, \beta V_{kt+1}^0 + \varepsilon_{ikt}^0\}]$$

$$\begin{aligned}\ln \pi_{kt}^1 - \ln \pi_{kt}^0 &= \beta \mathbb{E}[V_{kt+1}^1 - V_{kt+1}^0] - c_{kt} \\ &= \alpha \beta \mathbb{E}[P_{kt+1}^1 - P_{kt+1}^0] - c_{kt}\end{aligned}$$

$$\ln \pi_{kt}^1 - \ln \pi_{kt}^0 = \alpha \beta (P_{kt}^1 - P_{kt}^0) - c_{kt}$$


- **Policy-invariant:** can invert to infer policy
 - Market expectations capitalize into prices
 - Developers respond to prices as if statically
- Alternatives: full-solution, two-step, Euler CCP

Building construction (global data)




Real estate prices (urban data)

Property





Land



Supply estimates



	IV		First stage	
	Estimate	SE	Estimate	SE
Prices	0.171***	(0.041)		
Residential amenities			0.182***	(0.043)
Flooding	0.064	(0.044)	-0.842***	(0.216)
Ruggedness	-0.143***	(0.054)	1.268***	(0.103)
District FE	x		x	
Observations	5,780		5,780	
F-statistic			18.14	

Flooding (under SLR + subsidence)



Predicted vs. observed monthly flooding (2013-2020)

Flooding (under SLR + subsidence)



3m vs. 5m sea wall

Sea wall costs

$$E(G) = \underbrace{10.67 * G * 60}_{\text{onshore}} + \underbrace{10.78 * (2G + 16) * 32}_{\text{offshore}} \quad (\$1M)$$

- \$9.5B for 3m wall, \$12B for 5m wall
 - Matches official estimates from 2014 and 2020
 - Simple linear model (Lenk et al. 2017)


Counterfactuals

Solving the model


$$D^*(G) = \arg \max \Pi(D; G)$$
$$[G^*(D) = \arg \max W(G; D)]$$

- Solving across locations and periods
 - In spatial equilibrium, by backward induction
 - Need expectational assumptions
- Sea wall construction every 40 years
 - Typical lifespan of 30 to 50 years


Moral hazard delays adaptation




Moral hazard delays adaptation (55% loss)




Moral hazard can rationalize observed prices




Moral hazard can rationalize observed prices




Flood risk cannot rationalize observed prices




Flood risk cannot rationalize observed prices




Partial commitment helps, subject to politics (53% vs. 63% loss)




Partial commitment helps, subject to politics (53% vs. 63% loss)




Partial commitment helps, subject to politics (53% vs. 63% loss)




Partial enforcement helps, if consistent (79% loss)




Partial enforcement helps, if consistent (79% loss)




Moving the capital reduces moral hazard (26% loss)




Moving the capital reduces moral hazard (26% loss)



Slowing subsidence reduces moral hazard (6% loss)



Slowing subsidence reduces moral hazard (6% loss)



Policy recommendations

① Partial commitment

- Persistence: benefits of short-run policy
- Anticipation: benefits of phased-in policy

② Indirect policy

- Moving capital, as is already happening
- Less efficient, but more politically feasible

Conclusion

Summary

- **Moral hazard can impede climate adaptation**
- Jakarta foreshadows the future for other coastal cities

1	Miami	6	Mumbai
2	Guangzhou	7	Tianjin
3	New York City	8	Tokyo
4	Kolkata	9	Hong Kong
5	Shanghai	10	Bangkok

Hanson et al. (2011)