

THE POTENTIAL OF BEHAVIOURAL CHANGE FOR ACHIEVING CLIMATE CHANGE MITIGATION TARGETS IN THE EUROPEAN UNION

Authors: Dirk-Jan van de Ven¹, Mikel Gonzalez-Eguino¹, Iñaki Arto¹

Lifestyle changes to reduce emissions and improve wellbeing

The European Union has submitted ambitious greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction targets in the Paris Agreement, promising a 40% reduction of GHG emissions by 2030 and at least 80 by 2050, compared to 1990 levels. Achieving such high targets in a relatively short time-frame requires large-scale transformations of, predominantly, the energy system. However, such technological transformation paths might not be enough and come at very high marginal costs when approaching deep decarbonisation levels. Lifestyle changes might therefore be an attractive alternative for achieving climate change mitigation targets.

Throughout the past century, the surge in European living standards has developed alongside specific attributes in the average European lifestyle that can be seen as unsustainable. For example, the amount of animal-based calories in the average European diet, and the quantity of car-driven kilometres per person have surged to levels that might be incompatible with high GHG mitigation targets. Therefore, instead of aiming for the use of different technologies to do the same things in the same ways, we can also look at doing different things or the same things in a different way.

Several behavioural change options can be identified that reduce GHG emissions, without significantly affecting an individual's final energy service or final calorie consumption. Table 1 provides an overview of 16 such changes that are related to food, mobility and housing demand. It shows the average reduction in GHG emissions until 2050 if this lifestyle change was brought in practice immediately.

As can be seen in Table 1, behavioural options in food demand include diet changes and avoiding food waste. Most of the related GHG emission savings stem from avoided land use change and methane emissions, and only half to one-third of these emission savings come from within the European Union. Aside from saving significant amounts of emissions, changing diets is often good for people's health, while avoiding the consumption of animal products can reduce animal suffering in the husbandry industries.

Behavioural options in mobility demand generally focus on avoiding the use of cars and airplanes or using the existing car stock more intensively (carpooling or car sharing). The large majority of saved emissions (around 90%) due to changing mobility behaviour are carbon dioxide emissions within the European Union. Most of these behavioural changes significantly improve public health by improving air quality through a reduction of concentrations derived from car-related pollutants.

In housing, GHG emissions can be cut by slightly reducing home heating and cooling and by separating different categories of household waste. These behavioural changes effectively reduce emissions within the European Union. Separating household waste

Key points

- *Given the large challenge of reducing EU GHG emissions by 80-95% by 2050, green behaviour should be encouraged together with green technologies.*
- *Rigorous and instant behavioural change could mitigate up to one third of targeted greenhouse gas reductions until 2050, whereas more realistic and gradual changes in behaviour could reduce the burden by 20 to 25% without any upfront investment costs.*
- *Green behaviour in the form of changing preferences and attitudes in food, mobility and housing demand can yield multiple co-benefits: (i) improving personal health and well-being, (ii) improving society health by reducing ambient air pollution, (iii) significantly reducing GHG emissions related to avoiding deforestation and energy production outside the European Union, (iv) improving energy and food security within the European Union, (v) reducing animal suffering in husbandry industries*

THE POTENTIAL OF BEHAVIOURAL CHANGE FOR ACHIEVING CLIMATE CHANGE MITIGATION TARGETS IN THE EUROPEAN UNION

significantly helps the process of recycling materials and composting organic waste. This reduces the need for incineration or landfilling of household waste, and improves public health due to reduced pollutant emissions from these activities.

In short, small and costless behavioural changes can significantly reduce GHG emissions and improve well-being at the same time. Behavioural change alone is not enough to reach the European GHG emission targets, but it can help reduce the policy costs and increases the probability of reaching emission reduction targets.

In housing, GHG emissions can be cut by slightly reducing home heating and cooling and by separating different categories of household waste. These behavioural changes effectively reduce emissions within the European Union. Separating household waste significantly helps the process of recycling materials and composting organic waste. This reduces the need for incineration or landfilling of household waste, and improves public health due to reduced pollutant emissions from these activities.

In short, small and costless behavioural changes can significantly reduce GHG emissions and improve well-being at the same time. Behavioural change alone is not enough to reach the European GHG emission targets, but it can help reduce the policy costs and increases the probability of reaching emission reduction targets.

Behavioural option	GHG reduction		Co-benefits	
	Percentage of total GHG emissions from 2011 to 2050 *	Own health	Public health	Animal well-being
<i>Food:</i>				
Healthy diet	-5.3%	++	+	+
Vegetarian diet	-7.0%	~	+	++
Vegan diet	-8.2%	~	++	++
Avoiding consumer food waste	-2.4%		+	+
<i>Mobility:</i>				
Public transport commuting	-0.7%		+	
Carpool commuting	-1.2%		+	
Tele-working	-0.3%		+	
Urban Cycling	-0.6%	~	++	
Car sharing / Car club	-1.1%		+	
Avoid short flights	-0.5%			
Closer holidays	-0.5%			
Eco-driving	-0.6%	+	+	
<i>Housing:</i>				
Reduce home heating / cooling	-0.6%			
Organic waste recycling	-1.1%		+	
Paper waste recycling	-0.6%		+	
Plastic, Metal, Glass waste recycling	-1.7%		+	+
*: Includes all types of GHG emissions, both within and outside the EU, as a percentage of total GHG emissions within the EU in the absence of a climate policy ~: Co-benefit depending on specific details of behavioural change +: Certain co-benefit ++: High co-benefit				

Table 1. GHG reduction and co-benefits related with different behavioural options

The potential of lifestyle changes for GHG reduction targets

The full potential of behavioural change for GHG reduction targets is not easy to estimate and is subject to many uncertainties. Using the results in Table 1, some estimates can be made. However, the impacts of the different behavioural options in this table cannot be simply added up, as some options are mutually exclusive (for example the diet options), while other options limit the impact of each

THE POTENTIAL OF BEHAVIOURAL CHANGE FOR ACHIEVING CLIMATE CHANGE MITIGATION TARGETS IN THE EUROPEAN UNION

other (for example carpooling, teleworking and eco-driving). Instead, different lifestyle profiles can be created that include a selection of these behavioural options. Table 2 describes three possible lifestyle profiles, ranging from an active adoption of green lifestyle features to a more passive adoption.

Lifestyle profile	Enthusiastic	Conscious	Convenient
<i>Food options</i>	- Vegan diet - Avoiding food waste	- Healthy diet - Avoiding food waste	- Avoiding food waste
<i>Mobility options</i>	- Public transport commuting - Tele-working - Urban Cycling - Car sharing / Car club - Avoid short flights - Closer holidays - Eco-driving	- Public transport commuting - Tele-working - Car sharing / Car club - Avoid short flights - Eco-driving	- Carpool commuting - Tele-working - Eco-driving
<i>Housing options</i>	- Reduce home heating / cooling - Organic waste recycling - Paper waste recycling - Plastic, Metal, Glass waste recycling	- Organic waste recycling - Paper waste recycling - Plastic, Metal, Glass waste recycling	- Paper waste recycling - Plastic, Metal, Glass waste recycling
<i>GHG emission savings *</i>	16.2 % of which 12.1 % within EU-27	12 % of which 8.5 % within EU-27	5.9 % of which 4.5 % within EU-27
<i>EU NDC policy cost savings **</i>	29.7%	22.4%	13.6%
<p>* Includes all types of GHG emissions, as a percentage of total baseline GHG emissions within the EU up to 2050 if lifestyles were to be adopted immediately</p> <p>** On total of 2 trillion €(2010) of policy costs to reach 80 % GHG emission savings by 2050, as promised in the Paris Agreement</p>			

Table 2: Description of lifestyle profiles and impact on GHG emissions and policy costs

This table shows that the most ambitious package of lifestyle changes, called the enthusiastic profile, would reduce GHG emissions by 16.2%. A relatively passive form of lifestyle changes, represented as the convenient profile, reduces GHG emissions by 6%, while an intermediate form of lifestyle changes, representing a typology of a citizen who is conscious of climate change and their personal footprint, reduces GHG emissions by 12.5%. On overall, about three-quarters of these emission savings are from within the EU.

Many of these behavioural changes reduce emissions in sectors where GHG emission abatement is relatively expensive. For example, from a technological point of view mitigating one ton of carbon in the electricity sector is significantly less costly than mitigating one ton of carbon in the food, transport or waste sector. Therefore, as Table 2 shows, relatively small domestic GHG reductions (i.e. within the EU) lead to significant savings in the policy costs of an 80% GHG emission reduction by 2050. In other words, combining technological and behavioural measures seems an efficient way to reach GHG mitigation targets.

Policy potential to boost pro-environmental behaviour

Boosting Pro-Environmental Behaviour (PEB) is not a straightforward task, since execution is in the hands of individual citizens. A traditional way for policymakers to influence individual choices is by consumer taxes, making 'bad' products or services relatively more expensive. For example, EU-wide consumer taxes on energy are already in place, which should boost behavioural change around car usage and home heating. In a similar way, consumer taxes could be applied on GHG-intensive food products, such as meat and dairy. However, such taxes could have a disproportionate impact on low income groups (1) and be subject to significant societal resistance. Ultimately being taxed away from the consumption of a certain good is not the same as a preference change.

Alternatively, consumers could be convinced to change their preferences. There is a great quantity of academic literature about the psychological factors and barriers that determine the adoption of PEB. Apart from sociodemographic variables, adoption of PEB seems to be strongly determined by environmental attitudes. These are in turn influenced by environmental awareness and risk perception, and also by personal and social values such as social justice, community, frugality and personal integrity.

Public awareness campaigns about climate change could help to raise awareness and risk perception. It is important that such campaigns are not based on encouraging fear, but rather link to individuals' everyday emotions and concerns in the context of climate change. In terms of mitigation, it has been shown that a way of doing this is by relating climate change to local environmental

issues and personal concerns, emphasising the additional benefits of PEB. Voluntary mitigation by the public via behavioural change can be maximised only if the general public and other stakeholders see the benefits of such sacrifices, which requires legislative and regulatory measures from industry, commerce, and government (Semenza et al. 2008). Ultimately, effective mitigation of climate change requires both structural (technological and institutional) and behavioural changes towards a more sustainable society. Therefore, the significant potential of behavioural change for climate change mitigation should not be ignored and policies targeted to raise public awareness on climate change in a consistent way could significantly reduce the costs to reach the climate change mitigation targets of the European Union.

This Policy Briefings is based on the work of Van de Ven, D. J., González-Eguino, M., and Arto, I. (2017). The potential of behavioural change for climate change mitigation: a case study for the European Union. *Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies for Global Change*, 1-34.

References

1. García-Muros X, Markandya A, Romero-Jordán D, González-Eguino M (2017) The distributional effects of carbon-based food taxes. *J Clean Prod* 140:996–1006
2. Semenza JC, Hall DE, Wilson DJ, Bontempo BD, Sailor DJ, George LA (2008) Public perception of climate change: voluntary mitigation and barriers to behavior change. *Am J Prev Med* 35(5):479–487