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1. **Introduction**

The post-pandemic surge of inflation to a four-decade high in many advanced and emerging markets has renewed interest in the drivers of aggregate inflation and prompted questions on the optimal response of the monetary authorities to deviations from target (ref: Chris Giles, FT). While the consensus is strong with respect to the need for curbing excess demand-pull inflation by means of monetary tightening, adverse supply shocks that push prices up and output down create difficult policy trade-offs (Klomp 2020). A key tenet of modern monetary policymaking under flexible average inflation-targeting (FIT) regimes is indeed to “look through” the first-round effects of supply shocks and to intervene only if their persistence threatens the stability of expectations and, so, inflation to become entrenched. On these lines, although the recent inflationary episode was mainly driven by a series of idiosyncratic developments - namely, supply-chain bottlenecks, changes in relative prices, and Russia’s invasion of Ukraine, possibly exacerbated by firms’ excessive market power (Stiglitz and Regmi 2022) – central banks eventually responded by sustaining high interest rates.

In the 2024 BIS Annual Economic Report, such forceful global tightening action is celebrated for it sent “a strong signal to markets, firms and workers that the central bank would do what it took to restore price stability” (BIS 2024, p. 46). As a result, “inflation is now again returning to the price stability region while economic activity and labour markets have proved resilient” (idib., p. 41). In academic circles, however, the firm adoption of a contractionary stance was generally seen as a blunt and unnecessarily costly revival of the monetarist doctrine, which overshadows alternative instruments of price stabilisation (see, for example, Stiglitz and Regmi 2022, Saraceno 2023, Weber and Wesner 2023). Correctly identifying the origins of inflation is key to tailoring an appropriate policy response.

As the bout of post-COVID19 inflation wanes, the debate on the appropriate response to trade-off inducing shocks remains appropriate in the context of another, increasingly concerning, source of future uncertainty. Climate change is an accelerating process that is expected to increase both the frequency and intensity of acute physical hazards (i.e., droughts, floods, wildfires, heatwaves, etc.) and the chronic deviation of meteorological variables from their historical means (i.e., rising averages in temperature, precipitation, and sea levels) (IPCC 2021). The physical risks deriving from these phenomena influence agents’ preferences and endowments with immediate implications for the price stability mandate of central banks around the world through a variety of supply- and demand-side channels (we review them in Section 2). In contrast to longer-run changes in climatic trends which influence the optimal monetary policy and r\*, extreme climatic events “are largely unpredictable and thereby bear resemblance to other shocks that unfold over the business cycle and to which monetary policymakers tend to adjust monetary policy” (NGFS 2024, p. 7). Either way, climate change is flaring up the debate over whether policymakers should respond to climate-related price shocks by looking through their early signs, by pre-emptive monetary tightening, or by loosening their stance. The answer depends on our understanding of the nature and the pattern of climate-related inflationary pressures.

This paper aims to contribute to this discussion by providing new evidence on the effect of extreme climatic events (DEFINE) on inflation, employing a global panel dataset of monthly country-sector inflation from 1980 to 2023. A number of authors have started contouring the subject (among others, Faccia et al. 2021, Kotz et al. 2024, Cevik and Jalles 2024) and we add to this growing body of cutting-edge empirical findings in several ways.

First, we disaggregate the price data – specifically looking at 12 Consumer Price sub-indexes[[1]](#footnote-2) and 6 PPI sub-categories – to disentangle the idiosyncratic nature of acute physical risks. Adopting a sectoral dimension allows us to zoom in on various market segments, distinguishing those immediately hit by the hazards by those affected at later stages, and therefore to identify the origins (cost-push vis a vis demand-pull) of aggregate inflation dynamics.

Secondly, we acknowledge the importance of the global production network in the propagation of price spillovers. While there is broad agreement that the degree to which sectoral prices respond to shocks is determined by the input-output structure of the economy, there is no evidence for the transmission mechanisms responsible for the inflationary effects of climate change. To fill this gap, we build upon the literature on sectoral propagation of shocks (…), recently applied to assess the impact of weather shocks and sectoral productivity by Zappalá (2024), to develop an input-output framework that factors in the indirect price spillover effects of weather shocks. We argue that omitting the sectoral, national and international, transmission would produce a bias in the estimation of the sectoral price effect of climate shocks

In addition, we account for possible moderating factors emerging in both the monetarist and structuralist theory of inflation, such as and the monetary policy stance and the role of sectoral competition in the price setting mechanism (Weber and Wasner 2023). Lastly, we follow Faccia et al. (2021) to check for the presence of tipping points and we also test whether the price effect has been increasing over time by restricting the sample.

While the empirical analysis is global in essence, the econometric model will be also specified as a country-specific regression to examine the experience of a single economy: we choose South Africa. Southern Africa is a climate-sensitive region that is already experiencing significant deviations of rainfall and temperatures from long-term averages as well as severe droughts and floods (World Bank Climate Portal 2024), with implications for water availability and food security. From a socio-economic perspective, however, South Africa is the strongest country in the region, exhibiting a solid infrastructure and a well-diversified and emerging open economy fully integrated to global supply chains. Moreover, what makes South Africa a good case study is its high levels of market concentration and product regulation to validate the existence of profit-led inflation.

Notably, our sectoral approach does not downplay the macroeconomic relevance of climate risk. On the contrary, shedding light on how climate change affects specific segments of the economy and spills over to other sectors is key to understand macroeconomic processes and to envisage tailored policy responses. Relative price changes are also fundamental to the analysis of welfare costs, as heterogeneous households face different inflation rates depending on their income, wealth, and composition of their consumption basket. Thus, despite their merits, not only aggregate indexes can potentially smoothen out the variance from several inflation components, but they also conceal the true inflation costs that different consumers within the same country are susceptible to. Similarly, we are aware that a possible limitation of our study derives from the risk country-level data veil some of the local effects of changing weather conditions but, even so, the sectoral dimension should be sufficiently sensible.[[2]](#footnote-3)

Finally, the present analysis is limited to ‘climateflation’, first defined by Schnabel (2022) to conceptualise the ways in which physical risks caused by climate change put upside pressure on prices. Other aspects are important in determining the relation between weather and price movements, such as the impact of chronic rises in temperature averages, climate adaptation and mitigation policies, but these are beyond the scope of this paper.
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1. **Climateflation: a literature review**

The past few years have witnessed growing efforts of the research community towards the empirical assessment of the socio-economic effects of climate change, including the relation between climate and prices. For instance, Mukherjee and Ouattara (2021) and Kotz et al (2024) document that rising temperatures generate persistent inflation, especially in lower-income countries, whereas Parker (2018) and Cevik and Jalles (2024) highlight outcomes would depend on the type of climate disaster, the country’s level of development and fiscal space. The transmission channels can be multiple and convoluted, too: for example, price changes can result from supply or demand factors, directly or indirectly from the original shock, and they can travel upstream or downstream the economic system. This mix of possibilities means “no two physical hazard events have the same macroeconomic effects“ (NGFS 2024, p. 9) and that different weather shocks will likely hit different segments of the economy, often unevenly, causing volatility both in nominal and relative prices (Buelens 2024). We attempt to conceptualise the mechanisms behind climateflation here.

**Climate-induced supply shocks.** On the supply side, abrupt climatic deviations influence some of the characteristics and effective availability of productive factors – causing, for example, the impoverishment of natural resources, the depreciation of physical capital, or a reduction of the labour force.

Sectors characterised by an inherent exposure to weather-based risk are particularly sensitive to the **direct effect of local weather shocks**. In farming, for example, changes in weather conditions impact negatively on both crops and animal breeding through workers’ heat stress (De Lima et al. 2021), environmental degradation (Liang et al 2017) or increased use of pesticides and overall production costs (Savage 2024). The obvious relation between the weather and the food system has prompted many authors to examine food prices dynamics closely. Faccia et al. (2021) find that upward temperature anomalies have an immediate impact on food prices; Kotz et al (2024) observe that the effects of global warming are stronger in the food component of inflation; Roberts and Schlenker (2013) find that crop yields are humped-shaped, with higher temperatures increasing yields up until a threshold, before having increasingly negative effects. Finally, according to Parker (2016) storms and floods lead to a short-lived but upward effect on food price inflation.

As the weather becomes more extreme, disruptions in the water cycle are likely to hit water-intensive sectors, including not only agriculture but also electricity, manufacturing, and waterway transport (Buelens 2024), while damage to infrastructure, natural resources, and properties can undermine the provision of touristic services (NGFS 2023, [Duba 2024](https://theconversation.com/extreme-weather-in-south-africa-is-disrupting-tourism-research-tracks-the-impact-on-coastal-areas-232172))

Climate change can cause heat stress and impair health conditions that reduce labour productivity in non-agricultural sectors too, particularly in presence of outdoor work (e.g. construction, tourism) (Graff Zivin et al. 2018, ILO 2019, Nath 2020, Pinna Pintor et al. 2024). Acevedo et al. (2020) documents that higher temperatures significantly lower labour productivity in heat-exposed sectors but they have no significant effect in non-heat exposed industries, including in hot climate countries. Some authors additionallyhighlight the presence of seasonally heterogenous pressures, such that increases in hotter months and regions reduce the growth rate of labour productivity and GDP (Colacito et al. 2019) and possibly cause larger inflationary impacts, while warmer winter temperatures are associated with lower energy prices (Kotz et al. 2024). Reduction in total factor productivity via disrupting technology, financing conditions, and supply chains (Letta and Tol 2019, NGFS 2024) or damages and faster depreciation of capital assets (Bakkensen and Barrage 2018) have also been documented.

In all these cases, higher costs of production in the affected sectors are transmitted downstream as higher end-user and wholesale prices. There is a growing body of literature that highlights the role of economic networks in the shock transmission mechanism: shocks that hit sectors or firms in the early stages of the supply chain propagate to the rest of the economy through input-output linkages leading to “cascade effects” and aggregate changes.[[3]](#footnote-4) The international and intersectoral propagation of weather shocks has been assessed empirically **but only in terms of output and productivity**. De Winne and Peersman (2018) warn that harvest-induced spikes to agricultural commodity prices depress economic activity, including in high-income countries. Zappalá (2024) uses the input-output framework to examine the productivity shock transmission across sectors and shows that, although agriculture is harmed the most and earlier, downstream sectors – even if foreign - suffer from substantial and persistent losses as a result of network effects.

The price transmission mechanism occurs along similar lines, as changes in input prices – such as in agriculture and electricity - percolate downstream: “*The producer price of an industry depends on both the prices/volume of its input suppliers and sector-specific productivity shocks. (…) Price shocks in the machinery industry affects the price of motor vehicles because of the production network coefficient*.” (Bilgin 2022, p. 14) In contrast to production, in the inflation diffusion network the central nodes are the upstream industries that by supplying intermediate inputs to others lead to pipeline pressures and cost pass-through. The latter will be stronger if it originates in "salient" commodities (e.g. oil, food). In the euro area, Peersman (2022) estimates that shifts in international food prices between 1961 and 2016, caused by harvest shocks, explain 30% of euro-area inflation volatility. Also, Ciccarelli et al (2023) document that temperature increases raise EU inflation in food and services, possibly due to higher sensitivity of services, such as health and tourism, to food or weather. Di Giovanni et al. (2022) reveals that the Euro Area post-pandemic inflation was amplified by production networks. Moreover, the mechanism is **asymmetric** because prices tend to increase more rapidly and sizably than to decrease.

Depending on the inputs’ elasticity of substitution, the reallocation of expenditure can mitigate the ripple effect of the production cost shock. Otherwise, input price increases are passed on to consumers as cost-push inflation.[[4]](#footnote-5) Weber and Wasner (2023) posit that in advanced economies firms with big **market power** have contributed to recent inflation by amplifying the initial supply disruptions in essential sectors, such as food and energy: in other words, the initial cost-push dimension of the price rise unleashes a structural inflation component.

Even if weather events are temporary, they can generate durable implications that affect medium-run inflation, expectations, wages ("second-round effects"), and the conduct of monetary policy (Reis and Watson 2010, BIS 2022). For example, as noted by NGFS (2021), more frequent climate shocks will make it more difficult to disentangle permanent from transitory shocks. Moreover, food inflation is often perceived by households as a signal of future inflation, which will be then embedded in their expectation formation. All these factors induce central banks to intervene. According to Mukhejee and Ouattara (2021), in developing countries price effects persist several years after the initial shock. The reasons can be multiple: first, poor integration into global markets implies weak import substitution effects (i.e., a failed local harvest is not easily substituted with food imports) and, secondly, food prices in developing countries depend on weather more than in advanced countries where the relative contribution of wages, physical capital, energy, and transport costs is substantially higher.

**Climate-induced demand shocks.** Beyond driving cost-push inflation up, acute physical hazards can also shift household preferences and human needs and by extension demand patterns. For example, the higher demand for energy for cooling and warming can increase its price, as well as the chances of power shortages (Mukherjee and Ouattara 2021). If consumption shifts across sectors, such as from hospitality to technology, then excess demand in the latter can push sectoral prices up – especially in the presence of structural rigidities. Furthermore, Ferrante et al (2023) note that the post-pandemic inflationary effects of the consumption reallocation from services to goods were amplified by the heterogeneous price rigidities across sectors: industries that produce goods have more flexible prices than those that produce services and so the reduction in service supply was accompanied by only modest declines in prices. Thus, another important question is whether climate change spurs demand in sectors with relatively more flexible prices than shrinking sectors.

Another way climate change affects demand is through Keynesian supply shocks: when extreme weather depresses economic activity, declining real disposable incomes, wealth, and confidence might also cause a fall in demand and consequently prices for non-tradable sectors (Kamber et al 2013). In a cross-country analysis of 48 advanced and emerging economies, Faccia et al. (2021) find that upward temperature anomalies have a swift upward effect which turns insignificant or even negative in the medium term, possibly due to the negative demand effect. Distinguishing by type and intensity of climate shocks, Kabundi et al (2022) find that, while droughts tend to push inflation up because of rising food prices, floods curb demand and so inflation. The second-round deflationary effect of Keynesian-type supply shocks depends not only on the size of the initial negative impact on output but also on the income and wealth elasticity of demand. Particularly in developing countries where food constitutes the largest share of the consumer basket, higher food prices reduce the money available for other items, stifling broader consumer spending.

* 1. **A conceptual map**

Figure 1 summarises the price and spillover effects that follow a weather shock. The upper diagram shows the case of a weather shock hitting the end of the supply chain (i.e., downstream). The shock can either shift consumer preferences away from the focal sector with deflationary but localised effects (*Effect A, Figure 1*), or push sectoral inflation up through higher demand or production costs (*Effect B*).. Regardless of whether the shock alters demand- or supply-side forces, it will affect the price in the focal sector directly, without propagating up the supply chain (from customers to suppliers).[[5]](#footnote-6) For example, if an extreme weather event depresses tourism, lower prices in the hospitality sector shall not affect the price of its suppliers (i.e. food or construction industry).

The lower diagram represents the transmission mechanism of a weather shock hitting an upstream sector (i.e.., energy or agriculture). An acute physical hazard is not expected to decrease demand for salient commodities – so the negative demand effect is not contemplated in this case. Yet, an upstream weather shock can translate into inflation via either higher demand or higher production costs in the focal sector. In both cases, the aggregate price effect results from two channels of transmission: a direct channel, whereby the weather shock changes the price in the focal sector directly through sector-specific supply or demand forces (*Effect C*), and one indirect channel, whereby the price change travels downstream to any other sector that purchases inputs from the focal sector (*Effect D*: network weather shock). The cross-sector sum of these effects will result into aggregate inflation. At this point, the adverse supply shock can propagate further via a Keynesian-type propagation to the demand side, with subsequent deflationary effects (*Effect E*)

**Figure 1**. Flow chart of price propagation from weather shocks
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Given the complex interplay of upward and downward forces on prices, the overall reaction of inflation to weather shocks depends on which countervailing dynamic dominates the sum of the marginal effects. If the shock hits sectors downstream only, the aggregate effect on inflation (A + B) will not be clear a priori, although it is expected to remain confined to the focal sectors. If the shock hits the upstream supply chain, then the aggregate effect (C + D) is most likely inflationary and could turn deflationary with a lag and under certain conditions. Moreover, “a negligible or null effect of local weather shocks on a given sector may be amplified or mitigated by weather shocks hitting other sectors with strong commercial interlinkages” (Zappalá 2024, p. 15). Climate change is therefore highly sectoral by nature.

Our aim is to distinguish weather shocks based on the assessment of their sectoral price propagation. Do different types of acute weather events (namely, deviations from temperature and precipitation averages, climate-related disasters, … ) result in specific patterns of economic fallout?

If our understanding is correct, we expect to observe one or several of the five patterns described in the table below.

**Table 1.** The price effect of weather shocks

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Aggregate effect | Shock type | Disaggregated effect | Observed effects | Interpretation |
| Inflationary | Demand-pull inflation | B > A |  | Increased demand in one or multiple downstream sectors (D1), due to shift in preferences, implies opposite effects coexist.  If the positive effect dominates, core inflation rises too. |
| Traditional supply shock | B |  | Decreased productivity in one or multiple downstream sectors in push prices up.  If the shock hits multiple sectors, it can give rise to core inflation. |
| Cost-push inflation | C + D |  | Higher prices in salient commodities percolate downstream through direct and network effects.  Headline inflation rises. |
| Deflationary | Negative demand shock | A > B |  | Decreased demand in one or multiple downstream sectors (D1), due to shift in preferences, implies opposite effects coexist.  If the negative effect dominates, core inflation goes down too. |
| Keynesian supply shock | E | -with a lag | The initial supply shock is followed by depressed demand (especially in downstream sector) |

1. **Data**
   1. **Prices**

We build a global dataset of monthly Consumer Price Indexes and sectoral sub-indexes sourced from Haver Analytics. We use non-seasonally adjusted data due to better coverage and we remove seasonal effects. Inflation is calculated as the annualized growth rate of price levels in the last three months relative to the previous three months,[[6]](#footnote-7) as follows:

By matching the 12 CPI categories[[7]](#footnote-8) which classify consumer expenditure to the standard taxonomy of industrial sectors ([UN 2008](https://unstats.un.org/unsd/publication/seriesm/seriesm_4rev4e.pdf)), we derive sectoral retail prices – see Table 2. Our sample covers 151 countries from January 1980 to December 2023; however, to make the panel more balanced, we restrict the analysis to the period …-2023 (details on data availability per country-sector are in Table A1 in the Appendix).

**Table 2.** Matching price categories to industrial sectors

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | CPI category | Industry classification |
| 1 | Headline | All economic activities |
| 2 | Energy | Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply |
| 3 | Food and Beverages | Agriculture, forestry and fishing |
| 4 | Clothing | Manufacturing |
| 5 | Housing | Real estate activities |
| 6 | Household goods | Manufacturing |
| 7 | Transport | Transportation and storage |
| 8 | Health | Human health and social work activities |
| 9 | Recreation | Arts, entertainment and recreation |
| 10 | Education | Education |
| 11 | Communication | Information and communication |
| 12 | Hotels | Accommodation and food service activities |

**3.2 Weather shocks (Xolani)**

- use temperature and precipitation data from the global reanalysis ERA- 5 dataset compiled by the European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts (Mu˜noz Sabater, 2019). ERA-5 is available on a 0.25×0.25 resolution grid cell, at hourly frequency, from 1950 to the present.

- To preserve as much variability as possible, transformation are computed at grid cell level and only then averaged over country using weights (Hsiang, 2016), also accounting for fractional grid cells that partially fall within a country. The last step involves summing or averaging over days within coarser time intervals.

To account for the **sector-specific weather exposure**, Zappalá (2024) weighs grid-cell data by the proportion of agricultural and non-agricultural economic activities. Hence, to measure the exposure of the agricultural sector, grid-cell data is weighted by the proportion of each grid cell under cropland using the Global Agricultural Lands dataset (Ramankutty et al., 2010). In all other sectors, such granular information is not available and so exposure is accounted by aggregating grid-cell level information weighted by population weights from the Landscan dataset (Bright and Coleman, 2001).

* I compute the annual number of days that belongs to the top/bottom pth-percentile of each grid-specific distribution over the fifty-year period (where p ∈ {1; 5; 10}). These events should be interpreted as abnormally cold and hot, or dry and wet, compared to the country-specific climatic norm and so they should implicitly account for the influence of long-run adaptation to climatic conditions

**3.3 Input-output linkages**

The intersectoral (including international) propagation of shocks is another crucial channel identified in the inflation network. To measure sectoral linkages, we use Input-Output (IO) data from the EORA26 (Kanemotoetal 2011; Lenzen et al. 2012), which is the largest dataset with information on 26 sectors for 189 countries from 1990 to 2023. We aggregate the 26 sectors to match the ten sectors described in Table 2. We then build a 5-year moving average of the IO data, is a slowly time-variant measure that smooths shorter-term noise.

* Possibility that production network endogenously responds to the shock itself - Kunze (2021) shows a small and negligible shift of sectoral interlinkages after tropical cyclones.

**4. Methodology**

We build on the network econometrics methodology of AAK (2016), who develop an empirical framework to study the impact of various types of domestic shocks, and the applications by Zappalá (2024) and Das et al. (2021).

**4.1 Identification of climate-induced network shocks.**

In our analysis of inflation propagation, network shocks are computed from the interaction of the vector of weather shocks hitting a specific sector in the global production network and a vector of downstream weights reflecting the focal sector’s input purchases from other sectors *j*. Hence, these network shocks can be domestic () and foreign () based on the supplier’s origin with respect to the focal sector and they will only propagate downstream.

(1)

(2)

and are coefficients of the Leontief matrix, defined as the input share going from sector *𝑗* in country *c* or *k* (depending on whether the weather shock is foreign or domestic) to the focal sector 𝑠 in country 𝑐 at time *t*. Thus, each network shock can affect the focal sector to the extent of its input purchases from the affected sector. The sectoral transmission depends, therefore, on the relative importance of each supplier sector for the focal sector.

Finally, the *total* network shock is defined as the sum of the network shocks:

**4.2 Econometric modelling.** We quantify the relative importance and persistence of the two channels of transmission of the weather shock - direct and network – on sectoral inflation by estimating a heterogeneous 3D fixed-effect model (Equation 3) and impulse response functions by local projections (Equation 4):

(3)

(4)

The dependent variable is inflation in product category (or sector) *s* in country *c* and time *t*, measured as the growth rate of the price level, such that *s* = (PPI and sub-indices, CPI and sub-indices).

On the RHS, the first term is past inflation (given inflation expectations are not available at sectoral level); the variable measures the weather shock hitting country 𝑐 at time 𝑡, while the coefficients are heterogeneous slopes – which are estimated jointly in a fully saturated model – representing the sector-specific *direct effect* of weather shocks on inflation and allow us to observe the differential responses by sector; in other words, if is statistically significant, then the weather shock has a direct price effect on the focal sector 𝑠 in country 𝑐 at time 𝑡.

The second term on the RHS captures the spillover or *network effect*, that is the response of sectoral inflation to the weather shock working through the global production network. In the regressions, we consider each of the three network shocks defined above, such that n = 𝐷, F, 𝑇𝑜𝑡. The relative impact that shocks originating in different parts of the network have on a sector’s inflation are given by the estimates of . In order to make meaningful comparisons across those coefficients, each shock variable is divided by its own standard deviation.

We include country-sector fixed effects to account for the time-invariant unobserved heterogeneity of each sector in each country, like the capacity constraints of electricity production in South Africa and the labour productivity of the manufacturing sector in China, that influence countries’ average sectoral inflation; the inclusion of spatial effects also allows us to disentangle plausibly random weather fluctuations from long-term climate, which is likely correlated with other socioeconomic characteristics. Sector-month fixed effects instead capture sector-specific time trends, such as technological innovations, or shocks, such as the 2008 financial crisis, Russia’s invasion of Ukraine, or El Niño events.

Standard errors are clustered at the country level to account for spatial correlation of the error terms across sectors in the same country over time. Finally, is the error term.

For robustness purposes, additional specifications of equation 3 and 4 will include country time trends while another version will exclude network shocks and other controls to gauge the importance of both in the estimate of direct effects.

**4.3 Extensions**

The effect of **monetary policy** can also be accounted for by dividing our sample into inflation-targeting and non-inflation-targeting countries using the information from Fratzscher and others (2020). Alternatively, the moderating effect of monetary policy on aggregate inflation can be integrated by multiplying the weather shock by the real interest rate change.

**4.4 Climateflation in South Africa**

In the last step, we repeat the above estimations by narrowing down the focus on South Africa. To this end, we adjust Equation 2 and 3, such that *c = South Africa* and Equation 5 and 6 are cross-sector panel data regressions.

(5)

(6)

To test whether sectoral **market competition/concentration** influences the extent to which weather shocks impact prices (Weber and Wasner 2023), we will extend the above by interacting the weather variable with a measure of industry concentration in South Africa, such as the Herfindahl-Hirschman Index, or sectoral profits-to-GVA.

**6. Conclusions**

- Inform MP

- Sectoral distribution of economic effects of climate physical risk

- Limits
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