



HAL
open science

Demand-Side Strategies for CO₂ Emission Reductions: An Integrated Assessment Modeling Perspective

Rik van Heerden, Oreane Edelenbosch, Bernardo Luiz Baptista, Alice Di Bella, Vassilis Daioglou, Francesco Pietro Colelli, Johannes Emmerling, Panagiotis Fragkos, Thomas Le Gallic, Robin Hasse, et al.

► **To cite this version:**

Rik van Heerden, Oreane Edelenbosch, Bernardo Luiz Baptista, Alice Di Bella, Vassilis Daioglou, et al.. Demand-Side Strategies for CO₂ Emission Reductions: An Integrated Assessment Modeling Perspective. Sixteenth IAMC (Integrated Assessment Modeling Consortium) Annual Meeting 2023, Nov 2023, Venise, Italy. hal-04477717

HAL Id: hal-04477717

<https://hal.science/hal-04477717v1>

Submitted on 26 Feb 2024

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Demand-Side Strategies for CO2 Emission Reductions: An Integrated Assessment Modeling Perspective

Rik van Heerden^{1,*}; Oreane Edelenbosch^{1,2}; Luiz Bernardo Baptista³; Alice Di Bella⁴; Vassilis Daioglou^{1,2}; Francesco Pietro Colelli⁴; Johannes Emmerling⁴; Panagiotis Fragkos⁵; Thomas Le Gallic⁶; Robin Hasse⁷; Johanna Hoppe⁷; Paul Kishimoto⁸; Florian Leblanc⁹; Julien Lefèvre¹⁰; Gunnar Luderer⁷; Giacomo Marangoni¹¹; Alessio Mastrucci⁸; Robert Pietzcker⁷; Pedro Rochedo³; Bas van Ruijven⁸; Roberto Schaeffer³; Sonia Yeh¹²; Detlef van Vuuren^{1,2}

¹ PBL Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency, The Hague, The Netherlands

² Copernicus Institute for Sustainable Development, Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands

³ Energy Planning Program, COPPE, Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro (UFRJ), Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

⁴ RFF-CMCC European Institute on Economics and the Environment (EIEE), Centro Euro-Mediterraneo sui Cambiamenti Climatici, Milan, Italy

⁵ E3M-Modelling, Athens, Greece

⁶ SMASH – CIREN (International Research Center On the Environment and Development), Nogent-sur-Marne, France

⁷ Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research (PIK), Potsdam, Germany

⁸ Energy, Climate, and Environment Program, International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA), Laxenburg, Austria

⁹ CNRS, CIREN, Nogent-sur-Marne, France

¹⁰ AgroParisTech, CIREN, Nogent-sur-Marne, France

¹¹ TU Delft, Delft, The Netherlands

¹² Chalmers University of Technology, Gothenburg, Sweden

Summary

The decarbonization of energy end-use sectors, such as transportation and buildings, presents a significant challenge for mitigating the impacts of climate change. We conducted a model-intercomparison analysis to assess the potential for reducing CO2 emissions through demand-side strategies. The study focuses on the buildings and transport sectors and evaluates the effectiveness of three strategies: activity shifts, technological improvements, and electrification and fuel shifting. The results demonstrate that the intervention strategies can significantly reduce CO2 emissions. Moreover, combining approaches not only enhances emission reductions, but also alleviates stress on the energy system from individual demand-side changes, such as increased electricity demand.

Introduction

It has become increasingly clear that demand-side mitigation is a critical part of strategies to meet the Paris climate goals (IPCC, 2022; Mundaca et al., 2019). Demand side changes, including lifestyle choices, consumer technology choices, and energy-saving behavior, can aid in mitigating climate change in the short term and reduce the need for carbon dioxide removal technologies in the long term. Reduced energy demand also allows for more flexibility in technology choice in the supply sectors (IPCC, 2022). Also,

electrification of energy end uses can contribute substantially to emission reductions on the demand side and has synergies with the transition to renewables-based power systems (Luderer et al., 2022).

Recent estimates (IPCC, 2022) suggest that shifting and reducing activity, together with improving efficiency in end-use sectors, could potentially lead to sectoral emission reductions of 40-70% by 2050. However, these estimates only consider individual assessments and fail to account for the interactions between various interventions. To overcome this limitation, our study takes a comprehensive approach by employing multiple integrated assessment models (IAMs) to analyze the combined effects of various demand-side intervention strategies in the buildings and transport sectors.

Methods and scenarios

The study uses multiple IAMs (COFFEE, IMACLIM-R, IMAGE, MESSAGE¹, PROMETHEUS, REMIND and WITCH¹) to analyze a set of demand-side intervention scenarios, examining specifically the area of buildings and transport, including personal mobility and international transport. The use of a wide range of models enables the derivations of a robust signal as well an indication of uncertainty. By gathering input from stakeholders through a survey, we identified a comprehensive list of measures with both high impact and feasibility. Broadly speaking, these measures can be grouped into activity reductions and behavioral shifts, technology improvements and electrification of end-uses. Consequently, we translated them into the following scenarios each representing distinct intervention strategies:

1. **Activity reduction and activity shift (ACT)** *involves redesigning service-provisioning systems to either reduce or shift consumption of services.* People live in smaller spaces, work in shared buildings with flexible use, and adjust their thermostat settings to lower (heating) or higher (cooling) setpoints. Active modes of transportation are encouraged, and public transport and shared mobility options are improved. Air travel is discouraged, while advancements in freight logistics and speed restrictions in maritime transport enable more efficient transport of goods.
2. **Technological improvements - energy efficiency (TEC)** *focuses on improvements in the efficiency of existing technologies.* Higher levels of energy efficiency are achieved in both new constructions and existing buildings through increased renovation rates, improved insulation, and more efficient heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) systems. Efficiency standards for road vehicles, aircrafts and ships are implemented and environmental certification is required for using airports and ports.
3. **Electrification and fuel shift (ELE)** *focuses on switching to low-carbon technologies.* Heat pumps and electricity-based heating systems are widely adopted in buildings. Non-clean heating fuels are phased out and new natural gas connections are banned in the Global North. Passenger vehicles, light-duty trucks, and ports transition to full electrification. Heavy-duty vehicles abandon diesel engines, and biofuels and electrofuels are increasingly used in aviation and shipping.
4. **All interventions (ALL)** *combines all of the strategies above.*

While related to the ASI (Avoid-Shift-Improve) framework developed by (Creutzig et al., 2022), our framework allows for a cleaner separation between intervention strategies and related impacts on the energy system and emissions.

¹ Scenario results for MESSAGE and WITCH are not yet available and are not included in the results.

We compare the results to a reference scenario (REF) where none of the above strategies are implemented. The scenario ensemble is further diversified by adding another dimension considering different *climate pathways* that limit (or do not limit) global warming by means of carbon pricing: continuation of current national policies (NPI), and climate policies consistent with 1.5°C global warming targets (1.5C).

Results

In the reference current policy scenario, global emissions from buildings and transport are projected to increase on average with 20 % (16-27%) in 2030 and 34% (26-50%) in 2050 compared to 2015 levels (Figure 1). All intervention strategies acting on top of current policies lead to reduced emission growth in the coming decades compared to the reference. The models project that the current trend of emission growth in the transport and buildings sectors can be reversed into emission reductions when combining all the measures.




Figure 1: Growth of (direct) CO₂ emissions from fuel combustion in the energy demand sectors in 2030 and 2050 with respect to 2015 in a current policies scenario. The left panel shows the total of the buildings and transport sectors. Bars indicate model-averages and black lines depict the model ranges.

Electrification and fuel shifts can play a pivotal role in reducing demand-side CO₂ emissions in both sectors, but they also result in a substantial surge in electricity demand (Figure 2). Conversely, activity reductions and technological improvements help decrease electricity demand. As a result, the combined intervention scenarios (ALL) exhibit lower electricity demand compared to scenarios focused solely on electrification (ELE), even under a 1.5°C climate target. This implies that a comprehensive approach can reduce the need for emission-reducing technologies, large-scale electricity storage and investments in electricity infrastructure.




Figure 2: Electricity demand in the energy demand sectors in 2030 and 2050 under two different climate pathways. The left panel shows the total in all energy demand sectors combined (also including industry emissions). Bars indicate model-averages and black lines depict the model ranges.

Our findings highlight the significance of demand-side changes in addressing emissions in the building and transport sectors. Demand-side changes can facilitate the achievement of climate targets and reduce the need for other mitigation measures. Combining different approaches proves particularly advantageous in this context. This approach not only leads to the greatest reduction in emissions but also helps alleviate the stress on the energy system that may arise from individual demand-side changes, such as an increase in electricity demand due to electrification.

References

- Akimoto, K., Sano, F., & Oda, J. (2022). Impacts of ride and car-sharing associated with fully autonomous cars on global energy consumptions and carbon dioxide emissions. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 174, 121311. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2021.121311>
- Ang, B. W. (2005). The LMDI approach to decomposition analysis: a practical guide. *Energy Policy*, 33(7), 867-871. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2003.10.010>
- Averchenkova, A., Fankhauser, S., & Nachmany, M. (2017). *Trends in Climate Change Legislation*. Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781786435781>
- Barzkar, A., & Ghassemi, M. (2020). Electric Power Systems in More and All Electric Aircraft: A Review. *IEEE Access*, 8, 169314-169332. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2020.3024168>
- Berrill, P., & Hertwich, E. G. (2021). Material flows and GHG emissions from housing stock evolution in US counties, 2020–60. *Buildings and Cities*. <https://doi.org/10.5334/bc.126>
- Bouman, E. A., Lindstad, E., Riialand, A. I., & Strømman, A. H. (2017). State-of-the-art technologies, measures, and potential for reducing GHG emissions from shipping – A review. *Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment*, 52, 408-421. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trd.2017.03.022>
- Cabeza, L. F. a. B. Q. a. B. P. a. K. J. M. a. L. A. F. P. a. M. É. a. M. S. a. N. (2022). *Cross-Chapter Paper 9: Buildings*, booktitle = *Climate Change 2022: Mitigation of Climate Change. Contribution of Working Group III to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*.
- Creutzig, F., Niamir, L., Bai, X., Callaghan, M., Cullen, J., Díaz-José, J., . . . Ürge-Vorsatz, D. (2022). Demand-side solutions to climate change mitigation consistent with high levels of well-being. *Nature Climate Change*, 12(1), 36-46. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-021-01219-y>
- Cunha, B. S., Garaffa, R., & Gurgel, Á. C. (2020). TEA Model documentation.
- Daiglou, V., Rose, S. K., Bauer, N., Kitous, A., Muratori, M., Sano, F., . . . van Vuuren, D. P. (2020). Bioenergy technologies in long-run climate change mitigation: results from the EMF-33 study. *Climatic Change*, 163(3), 1603-1620. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-020-02799-y>
- de Boer, P., & Rodrigues, J. F. D. (2020). Decomposition analysis: when to use which method? *Economic Systems Research*, 32(1), 1-28. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09535314.2019.1652571>
- Deason, J., & Borgeson, M. (2019). Electrification of Buildings: Potential, Challenges, and Outlook. *Current Sustainable/Renewable Energy Reports*, 6(4), 131-139. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40518-019-00143-2>
- Edelenbosch, O. Y., Hof, A. F., Nykvist, B., Girod, B., & van Vuuren, D. P. (2018). Transport electrification: the effect of recent battery cost reduction on future emission scenarios. *Climatic Change*, 151(2), 95-108. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-018-2250-y>
- Edelenbosch, O. Y., Rovelli, D., Levesque, A., Marangoni, G., & Tavoni, M. (2021). Long term, cross-country effects of buildings insulation policies. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 170, 120887. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2021.120887>
- Edelenbosch, O. Y., van Vuuren, D. P., Blok, K., Calvin, K., & Fujimori, S. (2020). Mitigating energy demand sector emissions: The integrated modelling perspective. *Applied Energy*, 261, 114347. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2019.114347>
- Emmerling, J., Drouet, L., Reis, L. A., Bevione, M., Berger, L., Bosetti, V., . . . Havlik, P. (2016). *The WITCH 2016 model documentation and implementation of the shared socioeconomic pathways*. In *Mitigation, Innovation and Transformation Pathways 2016*, 42 Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei.
- Faber, J., Nelissen, D., Hon, G., Wang, H., & Tsimplis, M. (2012). *Regulated Slow Steaming in Maritime Transport: An Assessment of Options, Costs and Benefits*. C. Delft.

- Fishman, T., Heeren, N., Pauliuk, S., Berrill, P., Tu, Q., Wolfram, P., & Hertwich, E. G. (2021). A comprehensive set of global scenarios of housing, mobility, and material efficiency for material cycles and energy systems modeling. *Journal of Industrial Ecology*, 25(2), 305-320. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jiec.13122>
- Fragkos, P., & Kouvaritakis, N. (2018). Model-based analysis of Intended Nationally Determined Contributions and 2 °C pathways for major economies. *Energy*, 160, 965-978. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2018.07.030>
- Garaffa, R., Cunha, B. S. L., Cruz, T., Bezerra, P., Lucena, A. F. P., & Gurgel, A. C. (2021). Distributional effects of carbon pricing in Brazil under the Paris Agreement. *Energy Economics*, 101, 105396. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eneco.2021.105396>
- Gillingham, K. T., & Huang, P. (2020). Long-Run Environmental and Economic Impacts of Electrifying Waterborne Shipping in the United States. *Environmental Science & Technology*, 54(16), 9824-9833. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.0c03298>
- Girod, B., van Vuuren, D. P., & Deetman, S. (2012). Global travel within the 2°C climate target. *Energy Policy*, 45, 152-166. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2012.02.008>
- Gray, N., McDonagh, S., O'Shea, R., Smyth, B., & Murphy, J. D. (2021). Decarbonising ships, planes and trucks: An analysis of suitable low-carbon fuels for the maritime, aviation and haulage sectors. *Advances in Applied Energy*, 1, 100008. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adapen.2021.100008>
- Grubler, A., Wilson, C., Bento, N., Boza-Kiss, B., Krey, V., McCollum, D. L., . . . Valin, H. (2018). A low energy demand scenario for meeting the 1.5 °C target and sustainable development goals without negative emission technologies. *Nature Energy*, 3(6), 515-527. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41560-018-0172-6>
- IEA. (2017). *Energy Technology Perspectives 2017*. <https://www.iea.org/reports/energy-technology-perspectives-2017>
- IEA. (2020). *Energy Technology Perspectives 2020*. <https://www.iea.org/reports/energy-technology-perspectives-2020>
- IEA. (2021). *World Energy Model Documentation*. https://iea.blob.core.windows.net/assets/932ea201-0972-4231-8d81-356300e9fc43/WEM_Documentation_WEO2021.pdf
- IPCC. (2022). *Climate Change 2022: Mitigation of Climate Change. Contribution of Working Group III to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. In. Cambridge, UK and New York, NY, USA: Cambridge University Press.
- Jaramillo, P. K. R. S. a. N. P. a. D. S. a. D. O. E. a. K. T. a. L. D. S. a. N. S. B. (2022). *Cross-Chapter Paper 10: Transport*, booktitle = *Climate Change 2022: Mitigation of Climate Change. Contribution of Working Group III to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*.
- Kikstra, J. S., Vinca, A., Lovat, F., Boza-Kiss, B., van Ruijven, B., Wilson, C., . . . Riahi, K. (2021). Climate mitigation scenarios with persistent COVID-19-related energy demand changes. *Nature Energy*, 6(12), 1114-1123. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41560-021-00904-8>
- Leblanc, F., Bibas, R., Mima, S., Muratori, M., Sakamoto, S., Sano, F., . . . Wise, M. (2022). The contribution of bioenergy to the decarbonization of transport: a multi-model assessment. *Climatic Change*, 170(3), 21. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-021-03245-3>
- Levesque, A., Pietzcker, R. C., Baumstark, L., De Stercke, S., Grübler, A., & Luderer, G. (2018). How much energy will buildings consume in 2100? A global perspective within a scenario framework. *Energy*, 148, 514-527. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2018.01.139>
- Levesque, A., Pietzcker, R. C., & Luderer, G. (2019). Halving energy demand from buildings: The impact of low consumption practices. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 146, 253-266. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2019.04.025>

- Luderer, G., Madeddu, S., Merfort, L., Ueckerdt, F., Pehl, M., Pietzcker, R., . . . Kriegler, E. (2022). Impact of declining renewable energy costs on electrification in low-emission scenarios. *Nature Energy*, 7(1), 32-42. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41560-021-00937-z>
- Mastrucci, A., van Ruijven, B., Byers, E., Pobleto-Cazenave, M., & Pachauri, S. (2021). Global scenarios of residential heating and cooling energy demand and CO2 emissions. *Climatic Change*, 168(3), 14. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-021-03229-3>
- Mulholland, E., Teter, J., Cazzola, P., McDonald, Z., & Ó Gallachóir, B. P. (2018). The long haul towards decarbonising road freight – A global assessment to 2050. *Applied Energy*, 216, 678-693. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2018.01.058>
- Mundaca, L., Ürge-Vorsatz, D., & Wilson, C. (2019). Demand-side approaches for limiting global warming to 1.5 °C. *Energy Efficiency*, 12(2), 343-362. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12053-018-9722-9>
- Müller-Casseres, E., Edelenbosch, O. Y., Szklo, A., Schaeffer, R., & van Vuuren, D. P. (2021). Global futures of trade impacting the challenge to decarbonize the international shipping sector. *Energy*, 237, 121547. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2021.121547>
- Pettifor, H., Wilson, C., & Agnew, M. (forthcoming). A universal framework for measuring and modelling low-carbon lifestyles.
- Replogle, M. A., & Fulton, L. M. (2014). A global high shift scenario: impacts and potential for more public transport, walking, and cycling with lower car use.
- Rochedo, P. (2016). *Development of a global integrated energy model to evaluate the Brazilian role in climate change mitigation scenarios* Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro]. Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.
- Rottoli, M., Dirnaichner, A., Kyle, P., Baumstark, L., Pietzcker, R., & Luderer, G. (2021). Coupling a Detailed Transport Model to the Integrated Assessment Model REMIND. *Environmental Modeling & Assessment*, 26(6), 891-909. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10666-021-09760-y>
- Schäfer, A., Heywood, J. B., Jacoby, H. D., & Waitz, I. A. (2009). Transportation in a Climate-Constrained World. In. The MIT Press. <https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/7985.001.0001>
- UNEP. (2019). *Emissions Gap Report 2019*. United Nations Environment Programme.
- van Vuuren, D. P., Stehfest, E., Gernaat, D. E. H. J., van den Berg, M., Bijl, D. L., de Boer, H. S., . . . van Sluisveld, M. A. E. (2018). Alternative pathways to the 1.5 °C target reduce the need for negative emission technologies. *Nature Climate Change*, 8(5), 391-397. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-018-0119-8>
- Waisman, H., Guivarch, C., Grazi, F., & Hourcade, J. C. (2012). The Imaclim-R model: infrastructures, technical inertia and the costs of low carbon futures under imperfect foresight. *Climatic Change*, 114(1), 101-120. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-011-0387-z>
- Walsh, C., Mander, S., & Larkin, A. (2017). Charting a low carbon future for shipping: A UK perspective. *Marine Policy*, 82, 32-40. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2017.04.019>