The AgBiz Today *E-Magazine* Vol. -3 Issue-2, April 2026: 011 -018
ISSN: 3049-2491 (Online)
https://sabm.scholics.in/

Cost–Benefit Analysis of Vertical Farming Compared to Conventional Farming

Naveen Chandra

Quantum School of Agricultural studies

Quantum University Roorkee, Uttarakhand

ABSTRACT

This chapter compares the costs, benefits and environmental trade-offs of controlled-environment vertical farming (VF) systems (indoor hydroponic/aeroponic plant factories) against conventional open-field production, with emphasis on leafy vegetables. It presents a CBA framework (financial metrics, externalities), a breakdown of CAPEX/OPEX, sensitivity to electricity pricing and grid carbon intensity, and policy/business recommendations. Key recent studies show VF's major advantages are land-use and water savings and supply-chain shortening, while its main weaknesses are high energy demand and capital investment; viability is case-dependent and highly sensitive to electricity price and source.

Keywords: *Vertical Farming; Cost–Benefit Analysis; Controlled Environment Agriculture; Energy Efficiency and Sustainability.*

1. Introduction

Vertical farming (VF) is an emerging form of controlled environment agriculture (CEA) in which crops are grown indoors in vertically stacked layers using artificial lighting, regulated temperature, humidity, and carbon dioxide levels, and usually soilless cultivation systems such as hydroponics, aeroponics, or aquaponics. Unlike conventional open-field agriculture, which is strongly influenced by climate, soil conditions, and seasonal variability, vertical farming seeks to create an optimized and predictable growing environment that allows year-round crop production independent of external weather conditions. Over the past decade, VF has attracted considerable attention from researchers, entrepreneurs, investors, and policymakers as a potential solution to the mounting challenges faced by global food systems. Rapid urbanization, population growth, climate change, land degradation, and increasing water scarcity have placed unprecedented pressure on conventional agricultural systems. Arable land per capita is declining, while extreme weather events such as droughts, floods, and heatwaves are becoming more frequent and severe. In this context, vertical farming is often promoted as a climate-resilient and resource-efficient alternative, particularly suited for urban and peri-urban areas. By stacking production vertically, VF dramatically increases yield per unit ground area compared to conventional farming, making it possible to produce significant quantities of fresh food within a very small land footprint. This feature is especially attractive in densely populated cities where land is scarce and expensive. Another frequently cited advantage of vertical farming is its high water-use efficiency. Closed-loop irrigation systems in VF facilities can recirculate nutrient solutions, resulting in water savings that may exceed 80–90% compared to traditional field irrigation for certain crops. Additionally, indoor production reduces or eliminates the need for chemical pesticides, as the controlled environment limits pest and disease pressure. Shortened supply chains are also a major benefit: by locating farms close to consumers, VF can reduce transportation distances, lower post-harvest losses, and deliver fresher produce with longer shelf life. These attributes align well with sustainability goals, urban food security initiatives, and consumer demand for locally produced, safe, and high-quality food. Despite these potential advantages, vertical farming is not without significant limitations. The most critical challenges relate to its high capital and operating costs, particularly energy consumption. VF systems require substantial upfront investment in infrastructure, including buildings or retrofitted warehouses, multi-tier racking systems, LED lighting, heating, ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC), sensors, and automation technologies. Operating expenditures are dominated by electricity use for artificial lighting and climate control, making VF highly sensitive to local energy prices and the carbon intensity of the electricity grid. In many regions, energy costs represent the largest share of total production costs and can undermine the economic viability of vertical farms if not carefully managed. Because of these contrasting advantages and constraints, the economic feasibility of vertical farming remains a subject of active debate. While some commercial VF enterprises have demonstrated profitability, especially for high-value leafy greens and herbs in premium urban markets, others have struggled or failed due to high costs, technical complexity, and overoptimistic assumptions about yields and market prices. Consequently, there is a growing need for systematic and transparent evaluation tools that can help decision-makers assess when and where vertical farming makes sense, and under what conditions it can outperform conventional farming systems. Cost–benefit analysis (CBA) provides a structured framework to address this need. CBA allows for the comparison of all relevant costs and benefits associated with a production system over a defined time horizon, expressed in monetary terms where possible. In the context of agriculture, CBA typically includes capital expenditure (CAPEX), operating expenditure (OPEX), revenues, and financial indicators such as net present value (NPV), internal rate of return (IRR), and payback period. Importantly, CBA can also be expanded to incorporate environmental and social externalities, such as water use, greenhouse gas emissions, land occupation, and reductions in food miles. This broader perspective is particularly relevant for vertical farming, which is often justified not only on financial grounds but also on sustainability and resilience arguments.

Comparing vertical farming with conventional farming through a cost–benefit lens is inherently complex. Conventional agriculture generally benefits from lower capital requirements and, in many cases, lower energy inputs, but it is exposed to climatic risks, seasonal constraints, and variability in yields and quality. Vertical farming, by contrast, offers stability, high productivity per unit area, and resource efficiency, but at the expense of higher capital intensity and energy dependence. The balance between these systems depends on numerous factors, including crop type, scale of operation, local climate, electricity prices, labor costs, access to markets, and consumer willingness to pay a premium for locally produced or pesticide-free food. This chapter aims to contribute to the ongoing discussion by providing a clear and practical introduction to the cost–benefit analysis of vertical farming compared to conventional farming. It synthesizes findings from recent empirical studies, life cycle assessments, and techno-economic analyses to identify the main cost drivers and benefit streams of each system. An illustrative comparative example is presented to demonstrate how CBA can be applied in practice and how sensitive results are to key assumptions, particularly energy costs and yields. Finally, the chapter offers policy and practical recommendations for practitioners, investors, and policymakers seeking to evaluate or support vertical farming initiatives. By focusing on both financial performance and broader sustainability considerations, this chapter seeks to move beyond simplistic claims that portray vertical farming as either a universal solution or an inherently flawed concept. Instead, it emphasizes that vertical farming is a context-dependent technology whose success depends on careful economic evaluation, appropriate crop selection, and integration with efficient energy and resource management strategies.

2. Framework for Cost–Benefit Analysis

A rigorous comparison between vertical farming (VF) and conventional farming requires a clearly defined cost–benefit analysis (CBA) framework that integrates both financial performance and environmental externalities. Because VF is a capital- and energy-intensive production system, while conventional farming is land- and climate-dependent, a structured framework is essential to ensure transparency, comparability, and relevance of results. This section outlines the objective, scope, core metrics, and time horizon adopted for evaluating VF relative to conventional farming, with a particular focus on leafy vegetable crops such as lettuce.

2.1 Objective and Scope

The primary objective of the cost–benefit analysis is to evaluate and compare the economic viability and sustainability performance of vertical farming systems and conventional open-field farming for leafy vegetables. Leafy greens are selected as the focal crop group because they are among the most widely produced commodities in vertical farms, have short production cycles, and command relatively high market prices, making them suitable for indoor cultivation. Moreover, a substantial body of empirical and techno-economic data is available for these crops, enabling meaningful comparison.

The scope of the analysis includes two major dimensions. The first dimension focuses on **financial performance**, encompassing both capital and operational aspects of production. Key financial indicators include capital expenditure (CAPEX), operating expenditure (OPEX), total revenue, net present value (NPV), internal rate of return (IRR), payback period, and benefit–cost ratio. CAPEX accounts for initial investments such as infrastructure, equipment, and technology, while OPEX includes recurring costs such as energy, labor, inputs, and maintenance. These indicators together provide insight into profitability, investment risk, and the time required to recover initial capital.

The second dimension addresses **environmental externalities**, which are increasingly important in agricultural decision-making and policy formulation. Environmental indicators include energy consumption per unit output (kWh/kg), greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions expressed as kilograms of CO_2 equivalent per kilogram of produce, water consumption (liters per kilogram), land footprint (square meters per kilogram), and avoided logistics and post-harvest losses. These metrics capture the broader sustainability implications of each system and allow the analysis to extend beyond purely financial outcomes.

An important feature of the framework is the inclusion of **sensitivity analysis**. Given the high variability and uncertainty associated with key parameters—particularly electricity price, crop yield, and market price premiums—sensitivity analysis is essential to test the robustness of results. By systematically varying these parameters, the analysis can identify threshold values at which VF becomes economically viable or unviable compared to conventional farming. This approach also helps decision-makers understand risk exposure and critical cost drivers.

2.2 Core Metrics and Time Horizon

The financial component of the framework relies on standard investment appraisal metrics commonly used in agricultural economics and project finance. **Capital expenditure (CAPEX)** includes all upfront costs incurred before production begins, such as buildings or retrofitting, vertical racks, LED lighting systems, heating, ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC), irrigation systems, sensors, and automation equipment in VF systems. In conventional farming, CAPEX is typically lower and may include land preparation, irrigation infrastructure, machinery, and storage facilities.

Operating expenditure (OPEX) covers all recurring costs during the production cycle. For VF, OPEX is dominated by electricity consumption for lighting and climate control, followed by labor, nutrient solutions, water, maintenance, and replacement of components. In conventional farming, OPEX generally includes labor, seeds, fertilizers, pesticides, irrigation water, fuel, and machinery operation. **Revenue** is calculated based on total marketable yield and prevailing market prices, including any price premium for locally produced or pesticide-free products.

To assess long-term financial feasibility, **net present value (NPV)** and **internal rate of return (IRR)** are used. NPV measures the present value of net cash flows over the project life, discounted at an appropriate rate, while IRR represents the discount rate at which NPV equals zero. The **payback period** indicates the time required to recover the initial investment, and the **benefit–cost ratio** provides a simple measure of economic efficiency by comparing the present value of benefits to costs.

Environmental metrics complement financial indicators by capturing resource efficiency and ecological impacts. **Cradle-to-gate GHG emissions** account for emissions associated with production inputs and energy use up to the farm gate. **Lifecycle energy use** measures total energy consumed per unit of output, while **water consumption** and **land use** reflect resource intensity. Avoided logistics and post-harvest losses are particularly relevant for VF, as proximity to urban markets can reduce transportation distance, cold-chain requirements, and spoilage.

The **time horizon** for the financial analysis is typically set at **5–10 years**, reflecting the economic life of major components such as LED lighting systems, climate-control equipment, and automation technologies. This time frame balances the need to capture long-term costs and benefits with the uncertainty inherent in projecting prices, technology performance, and market conditions far into the future. Selecting an appropriate time horizon is critical, as it strongly influences NPV, IRR, and overall conclusions regarding the comparative performance of vertical and conventional farming systems.

Together, these objectives, metrics, and temporal boundaries form a comprehensive framework for evaluating the cost–benefit dynamics of vertical farming relative to conventional agriculture.

3. Costs: CAPEX and OPEX Breakdown

A detailed understanding of cost structure is central to any cost–benefit analysis of vertical farming (VF). Unlike conventional farming systems, where variable costs often dominate, VF is characterized by high upfront investment and relatively high recurring operational costs. This section disaggregates the major cost components into capital expenditure (CAPEX) and operating expenditure (OPEX), highlighting how they differ from conventional farming and why they are critical determinants of economic viability.

3.1 Capital Expenditure (CAPEX)

Capital expenditure in vertical farming encompasses all fixed investments required to establish and commission the production facility. A major component of VF CAPEX is the **building envelope or retrofit cost**, which includes construction or adaptation of warehouses, industrial buildings, or purpose-built structures capable of supporting controlled environments. These facilities must provide adequate insulation, structural strength for vertical loads, and space for climate control and automation systems.

Another significant CAPEX component is **multi-tier racking and growing infrastructure**, which enables vertical stacking of crops and directly contributes to higher yield per unit ground area. **LED lighting systems** represent one of the most expensive technological elements, as high-quality horticultural LEDs are required to deliver sufficient photosynthetically active radiation with optimal spectral composition. In addition, **heating, ventilation, air conditioning (HVAC), and dehumidification systems** are essential to maintain precise temperature and humidity conditions, particularly in fully enclosed VF systems.

Further capital investments include **irrigation and nutrient delivery systems**, **sensors and monitoring equipment**, and varying levels of **automation and control software** for lighting, climate, and fertigation. Collectively, these components make VF highly capital-intensive. On a per-square-metre basis, CAPEX for VF is commonly several times higher than that of greenhouse systems and significantly higher than open-field farming, where capital requirements are largely limited to land preparation, basic irrigation, and machinery. This high initial investment represents a major barrier to entry and increases financial risk, particularly for small- and medium-scale operators.

3.2 Operating Expenditure (OPEX): Where the Money Is Spent

Operating expenditure in VF includes all recurring costs associated with day-to-day production and maintenance. Among these, **energy consumption is the dominant cost component**. Electricity is required for artificial lighting, which typically accounts for the largest share of energy use, as well as for HVAC systems, dehumidification, water circulation pumps, and control systems. Energy costs can constitute the single largest portion of OPEX and vary dramatically depending on local climate conditions and electricity tariffs. Techno-economic studies demonstrate that the energy cost per kilogram of lettuce produced in VF can differ substantially across locations, highlighting strong sensitivity to climate and electricity price [1].

Labor and maintenance represent another important OPEX category. Although VF systems are often highly automated, they still require skilled operators for crop management, system monitoring, harvesting, cleaning, and maintenance. Routine replacement of components such as LED modules, filters, pumps, and sensors adds to recurring costs. While automation can reduce labor intensity compared to conventional farming, it does not eliminate labor requirements and may increase the need for technically trained personnel.

Input costs in VF primarily include seeds, nutrient solutions, water, and packaging materials. While fertilizer use is often more efficient due to precise nutrient delivery and recirculation, these inputs still contribute to overall OPEX. In contrast to conventional farming, VF generally avoids pesticide costs, which can partially offset higher expenditures elsewhere.

An important economic advantage of VF lies in **logistics savings**. By locating production close to urban consumers, VF can reduce transportation distance, cold-chain requirements, and post-harvest spoilage. These savings can translate into lower distribution costs and support a marketable freshness or local-production premium. Overall, techno-economic analyses and life cycle assessment studies indicate that while VF offers efficiency gains in logistics and input use, high energy and capital costs remain the primary challenges to its cost competitiveness [1,2].

4. Benefits: Productivity, Resource Use, and Quality

While the cost structure of vertical farming (VF) is often cited as a major limitation, its potential benefits in terms of productivity, resource efficiency, and product quality form the core justification for its adoption. These benefits are particularly relevant for leafy vegetables and herbs, which dominate current VF production systems. This section examines the main benefit streams of VF and explains how they contribute to overall cost–benefit performance when compared with conventional farming.

4.1 Productivity and Yield

One of the most significant advantages of vertical farming is its ability to dramatically increase productivity per unit of ground area. By stacking crops in multiple vertical layers, VF multiplies the effective growing area within the same footprint, allowing yields per square meter of land to exceed those of conventional open-field systems by several times. This spatial efficiency is especially valuable in urban and peri-urban environments, where land availability is limited and land prices are high.

In addition to spatial stacking, **controlled environmental conditions** play a crucial role in enhancing productivity. Precise regulation of light intensity and spectrum, temperature, humidity, and carbon dioxide concentration allows crops to grow under optimal conditions throughout their life cycle. As a result, VF systems can achieve faster growth rates and shorter production cycles than conventional farming, leading to higher annual output per unit area. The absence of seasonal constraints enables **year-round production**, which stabilizes supply and reduces yield variability associated with climate and weather fluctuations.

Uniformity of growing conditions also contributes to **consistent yield and quality**. In conventional farming, variability in soil properties, microclimate, and pest pressure can result in uneven crop performance. Vertical farming minimizes these sources of variability, producing uniform crops that meet market standards more reliably. From a cost–benefit perspective, predictable yields reduce production risk and improve the accuracy of financial planning.

4.2 Resource Efficiency

Vertical farming is widely recognized for its high efficiency in the use of certain key resources, particularly water and land. Most VF systems rely on **recirculating irrigation methods**, such as hydroponics or aeroponics, in which nutrient solutions are reused and losses due to runoff and deep percolation are minimized. Combined with low evaporation in enclosed environments, this approach can result in water savings exceeding 80–90% compared to conventional field irrigation for leafy crops. Such efficiency is a major advantage in regions facing water scarcity and increasing competition for freshwater resources.

The **land footprint** of VF is also substantially smaller than that of conventional farming due to vertical stacking and high yields per unit area. This allows food production to be decoupled from agricultural land availability and opens opportunities for integrating food production into urban infrastructure.

However, resource efficiency in VF presents a more complex picture when **energy use and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions** are considered. Lifecycle assessments indicate that VF often has higher energy consumption per kilogram of produce than conventional farming, primarily due to artificial lighting and climate control. Consequently, GHG emissions depend strongly on the electricity source and the carbon intensity of the local power grid. VF systems powered by renewable or low-carbon electricity can achieve substantially lower emissions, whereas reliance on fossil-fuel-based grids may negate some environmental benefits [3,4].

4.3 Market and Product Quality

Vertical farming offers important market-related benefits that influence its economic performance. Proximity to urban consumers allows VF operations to supply **fresher produce with shorter delivery times**, reducing post-harvest losses and extending shelf life. The ability to produce consistently throughout the year enables reliable supply contracts with retailers and food service providers.

Additionally, VF produce is often marketed as locally grown, pesticide-free, and high quality, attributes that can justify **price premiums** in certain markets. From a CBA perspective, these premiums can significantly enhance revenues and partially offset higher production costs. Overall, life cycle assessments and field case studies suggest that productivity gains, water and land efficiency, and market advantages constitute the primary benefit streams of vertical farming, although their realization depends strongly on local energy systems and market conditions [3,4].

5. Evidence from Recent Studies (Highlights)

A growing body of empirical research, techno-economic analyses, and life cycle assessment (LCA) studies has examined the performance of vertical farming (VF) systems in comparison with greenhouse and conventional open-field agriculture. These studies provide valuable quantitative evidence on energy use, environmental impacts, and economic sensitivity, helping to clarify the conditions under which VF may be advantageous or disadvantageous.

Arcasi et al. (2023) present a detailed energy and cost analysis of crop production in a vertical farming system and identify artificial lighting as the dominant contributor to electricity consumption. Their results indicate that lighting alone accounts for approximately **65–85% of total electricity use** in VF operations, with the remainder attributed to heating, ventilation, air conditioning, dehumidification, and auxiliary systems. Importantly, the study demonstrates that **specific energy consumption and energy cost per kilogram of produce are highly dependent on climate and location**. Facilities located in hot climates experience substantially higher cooling and dehumidification loads than those in cooler regions, leading to significantly higher energy costs per unit of output. This finding underscores the critical role of geographic context in determining the economic feasibility of VF [1].

Complementing this work, a critical review of VF energy budgets highlights that **overall energy use in vertical farming commonly exceeds that of greenhouse and open-field systems by large margins**. The review emphasizes that while VF is often promoted as a climate-smart technology, such claims must be evaluated carefully in light of its high electricity demand. The authors argue that the environmental performance of VF is strongly contingent on system design, operational efficiency, and especially the **carbon intensity of the electricity supply**. Without low-carbon energy sources and optimized lighting and climate control, VF may result in higher greenhouse gas emissions than conventional alternatives [2].

Evidence from life cycle assessment further illustrates this variability. A commercial-scale LCA of a large vertical farm in Sweden found that, under the specific conditions of the study, **GHG emissions per kilogram of lettuce were lower for the vertical farm than for some conventional supply**

chains, particularly those involving long-distance transport. However, the analysis also identified major environmental "hotspots" within the VF system, notably electricity consumption, packaging materials, and infrastructure construction. Sensitivity analysis revealed that changes in electricity mix or packaging assumptions could substantially alter the comparative results, reinforcing the context-dependent nature of VF sustainability outcomes [3].

Benchmarking studies and broader reviews provide additional insight into the range of energy performance observed in practice. Reported **specific energy intensities for lettuce production in VF systems span from tens to several hundreds of kilowatt-hours per kilogram**, depending on factors such as system maturity, lighting efficiency, crop density, and management practices. Importantly, these studies also highlight significant potential for improvement. Advances in LED efficacy, optimized light spectra and photoperiods, improved climate control strategies, and better system integration have been shown to reduce energy demand per unit of output. Such efficiency gains are critical for improving both the economic and environmental performance of vertical farming in the future [4,5].

Collectively, these studies demonstrate that vertical farming outcomes cannot be generalized across contexts. Instead, energy use, costs, and environmental impacts are highly sensitive to location, technology choice, and operational efficiency, reinforcing the need for site-specific cost–benefit and life cycle assessments [1–5].

6. Illustrative Comparative Cost–Benefit Analysis (Worked Example)

To demonstrate how a cost–benefit analysis (CBA) can be applied in practice, an illustrative comparison is presented between a vertical farming (VF) facility and conventional open-field production. The example is conceptual and intended to highlight the structure of analysis and the sensitivity of results to key assumptions. Actual project appraisal should replace the assumed values with location-specific data.

Scenario Description

The scenario considers a **1,000 m² indoor vertical farming facility** producing leafy vegetables (e.g., lettuce) using a multi-layer hydroponic system and compares it with an equivalent ground footprint of conventional field production. The VF system is assumed to operate year-round under controlled environmental conditions, while the field system is subject to seasonal constraints typical of temperate climates.

Assumptions

For the VF system, **capital expenditure (CAPEX)** is assumed to be approximately **USD 500,000**, covering building retrofit, vertical racks, LED lighting, HVAC and dehumidification systems, irrigation infrastructure, and automation. In contrast, **field CAPEX** is estimated at **USD 25,000**, reflecting land preparation, basic irrigation infrastructure, and limited machinery.

Electricity cost for VF is assumed at a **base case of USD 0.12 per kWh**, with sensitivity analysis performed over a range of **USD 0.06–0.30 per kWh** to reflect variability across regions and energy markets. The VF system is assumed to achieve a **yield multiplier of 6–10 times** that of open-field production due to vertical stacking and continuous production cycles.

Annual **operating expenditure (OPEX)** for VF is dominated by energy costs, estimated at **USD 50,000–80,000** per year depending on electricity price and system efficiency. Labor costs are assumed at **USD 20,000–30,000** per year, reflecting the need for skilled operators and harvesting labor, while input costs (seeds, nutrients, water, packaging) are estimated at **USD 8,000–12,000** annually. Conventional farming OPEX is assumed to be lower, consisting mainly of labor, irrigation, fertilizers, and fuel.

On the revenue side, VF produce is assumed to command a **market price premium of 15–30%** due to freshness, local production, and pesticide-free attributes. Conventional produce is sold at standard wholesale prices with greater seasonal variability.

Results and Interpretation

Under the base-case assumptions, the VF system generates substantially higher annual revenue than the field system due to higher yields and price premiums. When electricity prices remain moderate and the premium market is accessible, the VF system can achieve a **positive net present value (NPV)**, an **internal rate of return (IRR) sufficient to attract investment**, and a **payback period of approximately 1–5 years**. In contrast, the field system shows lower absolute returns but also significantly lower financial risk due to minimal capital requirements.

Sensitivity analysis reveals that results are highly dependent on electricity price and market conditions. If electricity costs double or if the VF product fails to achieve a price premium, operating margins decline sharply, and the payback period may become unattractive or even negative. Conversely, access to low-cost or renewable electricity and stable premium markets significantly improves VF performance.

Conclusion

This illustrative example highlights that **location, electricity price, yield performance, and market premium are decisive factors** in determining the comparative economic viability of vertical farming. While VF can outperform conventional farming under favorable conditions, it is not universally competitive, underscoring the importance of site-specific cost–benefit analysis before investment decisions are made.

7. Sensitivity and Risk Analysis

Sensitivity and risk analysis are essential components of the cost–benefit evaluation of vertical farming (VF), given the high uncertainty and variability associated with its key cost and revenue drivers. Unlike conventional farming, where risks are often dominated by climatic variability and yield uncertainty, VF is primarily exposed to economic, technological, and energy-related risks. Understanding how changes in critical parameters affect financial and environmental outcomes is therefore central to informed decision-making.

The **electricity price and carbon intensity of the energy supply** represent the single most important sensitivity factor for VF systems. Electricity costs directly influence operating expenditure, as artificial lighting and climate control account for the majority of energy demand. Even small increases in electricity tariffs can significantly reduce profit margins and extend payback periods. From an environmental perspective, the carbon intensity of the electricity grid strongly determines greenhouse gas emissions per kilogram of produce. Facilities operating on fossil-fuel-dominated grids may exhibit higher lifecycle emissions than conventional systems, whereas access to low-carbon electricity can substantially improve environmental performance.

Yield performance and crop selection constitute the second major sensitivity. Vertical farming is currently best suited to high-value, fast-growing leafy greens and herbs, which offer short production cycles and high turnover. Extending VF to staple crops with lower market value and longer growth periods generally leads to unfavorable cost–benefit outcomes due to high energy requirements relative to revenue. Variability in realized yields due to technical inefficiencies, crop failures, or suboptimal management can quickly erode expected returns, highlighting the importance of operational expertise.

Market willingness to pay a price premium is another critical risk factor. Many VF business models rely on consumers valuing freshness, local production, and pesticide-free attributes. If market access is limited or consumer acceptance declines, revenue assumptions may not be met, reducing financial viability. Similarly, **CAPEX financing terms**, including interest rates, loan tenures, and access to subsidies or incentives, significantly affect net present value and payback periods, particularly given the high upfront investment required for VF.

Labor availability and cost also influence risk, as VF requires skilled operators for system management and maintenance. Rising labor costs or shortages of trained personnel can increase OPEX and operational risk.

Integration with **renewable energy sources**, whether through on-site generation or long-term power purchase agreements, can mitigate several of these risks simultaneously. Renewable integration reduces exposure to electricity price volatility, lowers lifecycle emissions, and stabilizes operating costs, thereby improving both financial and environmental outcomes [1,3,5].

8. Policy and Business Recommendations

The cost–benefit evidence presented in this chapter indicates that vertical farming (VF) can be economically and environmentally viable under specific conditions, but its success is not guaranteed. Targeted strategies are therefore required from both entrepreneurs and policymakers to reduce risks, enhance efficiency, and maximize the benefits of VF systems. The following recommendations are derived from economic analyses, empirical studies, and observed best practices.

Recommendations for Entrepreneurs

Entrepreneurs considering investment in vertical farming should **begin with high-value, short-cycle crops**, particularly leafy greens and culinary herbs. These crops offer rapid turnover, consistent demand, and relatively high market prices, allowing producers to recover capital investment more quickly. Attempting to grow low-value or staple crops in early-stage VF operations significantly increases financial risk due to high energy costs and long production cycles.

Feasibility assessment should be grounded in a **location-specific cost–benefit analysis**. Local electricity tariffs, climate conditions, labor costs, and realistic yield estimates must be incorporated into financial models. Overreliance on optimistic assumptions regarding yields or market prices has been a common cause of VF project underperformance. Accurate, conservative modeling improves decision-making and investor confidence.

Energy efficiency should be treated as a strategic priority rather than a secondary consideration. Investment in **high-**

efficacy LED lighting, optimized light spectra and photoperiods, **heat recovery systems**, and **smart climate control** technologies can substantially reduce operating costs. Continuous monitoring and data-driven optimization are essential to maintaining energy efficiency over time.

Finally, entrepreneurs should actively explore **renewable energy solutions**, including on-site solar generation, energy storage, or long-term power purchase agreements. These approaches reduce exposure to volatile electricity prices, stabilize operating expenditure, and improve environmental performance, thereby strengthening the overall business case for VF.

Recommendations for Policymakers

Policymakers play a crucial role in shaping the enabling environment for vertical farming. Governments should **support pilot and demonstration projects** to generate local performance data, reduce uncertainty, and facilitate knowledge transfer. Providing **renewable energy incentives** or preferential tariffs for controlled environment agriculture can significantly lower lifecycle emissions and improve economic viability.

Urban planning and regulatory frameworks should **facilitate urban-agriculture zoning**, adaptive reuse of buildings, and local procurement programs. Guaranteed or preferential access to institutional buyers such as schools, hospitals, and public food programs can help stabilize demand for VF produce.

Finally, sustained **public investment in research and development** is needed to advance low-energy lighting, automation, and system integration. Such investments can reduce capital and operating costs over time, enhancing the long-term competitiveness and scalability of vertical farming systems.

9. Conclusions

Vertical farming represents a promising approach for the production of high-value, perishable crops in urban and peri-urban environments. Its key strengths lie in exceptionally high land-use efficiency, substantial water savings achieved through recirculating irrigation systems, reduced dependence on long supply chains, and the ability to deliver consistent, year-round production. These attributes make vertical farming particularly attractive in regions facing land scarcity, water stress, and growing urban demand for fresh, locally produced food.

At the same time, this chapter demonstrates that the economic and environmental performance of vertical farming is highly context dependent. High capital investment and substantial energy requirements, especially for artificial lighting and climate control, remain the primary constraints to widespread adoption. As a result, competitiveness relative to conventional farming is strongly influenced by electricity price and the carbon intensity of the power supply. Crop choice also plays a decisive role: vertical farming is currently best suited to leafy greens and herbs with short growth cycles and high market value, whereas staple crops remain economically unattractive under existing technologies. The analysis highlights the importance of transparent, location-specific cost–benefit analyses that incorporate both financial metrics and environmental externalities. Decision makers should avoid generalized assumptions and instead rely on realistic local data for energy costs, yields, and market premiums. Integration with renewable energy sources emerges as a critical strategy for improving both financial stability and environmental outcomes. With careful planning, appropriate policy support, and continued technological innovation, vertical farming can become a valuable complement to conventional agriculture rather than a direct replacement.

Reerences

1. A. Arcasi, A. W. Mauro, G. Napoli, F. Tariello, and G. P. Vanoli, “Energy and cost analysis for a crop production in a vertical farm,” *Appl. Therm. Eng.* **223**, 122129 (2023).
2. C. Stanghellini, “The dark side of lighting: A critical analysis of vertical farms’ environmental impact,” *J. Clean. Prod.* (2024).
3. M. A. Martin and M. Elnour, “Environmental Life Cycle Assessment of a Large-Scale Commercial Vertical Farm,” SSRN (May 31, 2023), https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4465401.
4. L. Miserocchi, *Benchmarking energy efficiency in vertical farming*, Energy & Buildings / Conference article (2024).
5. M. Gargaro et al., “A cradle-to-customer life cycle assessment case study of lettuce production in a commercial vertical farm,” *J. Cleaner Production* (2024).

* * *