UNIVERSITY^{OF} BIRMINGHAM University of Birmingham Research at Birmingham

Low carbon transition of global power sector enhances sustainable development goals

Peng, Kun; Li, Jiashuo; Feng, Kuishuang; Chen, Bin; Shan, Yuli; Zhang, Ning; Wang, Peng; Fang, Kai; Bai, Yanchao; Zou, Xiaowei

DOI: 10.21203/rs.3.rs-1120662/v1

License: Creative Commons: Attribution (CC BY)

Document Version Other version

Citation for published version (Harvard):

Peng, K, Li, J, Feng, K, Chen, B, Shan, Y, Zhang, N, Wang, P, Fang, K, Bai, Y & Zou, X 2021 'Low carbon transition of global power sector enhances sustainable development goals'. https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-1120662/v1

Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal

General rights

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

•Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.

•Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.

•User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?) •Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

Take down policy

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.



Low carbon transition of global power sector enhances sustainable development goals

Kun Peng

Institute of Blue and Green Development, Shandong University

Jiashuo Li

Institute of Blue and Green Development, Shandong University https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2915-4770

Kuishuang Feng (≥ kfeng@umd.edu)

University of Maryland, College Park https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5139-444X

Bin Chen

Fudan Tyndall Center, Department of Environmental Science and Engineering, Fudan University

Yuli Shan

University of Groningen https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5215-8657

Ning Zhang

Shandong University

Peng Wang

Institute of Urban Environment

Kai Fang

School of Public Affairs, Zhejiang University

Yanchao Bai

College of Environmental Science and Engineering, Yangzhou University

Xiaowei Zou

Institute of Blue and Green Development, Shandong University

Article

Keywords: low-carbon transition, Global power sector, SDGs, Climate scenarios

Posted Date: December 15th, 2021

DOI: https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-1120662/v1

License: (a) This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License. Read Full License

1	Low carbon transition of global power sector enhances sustainable
2	development goals
3	Kun Peng ¹ , Jiashuo Li ^{1, *} , Kuishuang Feng ^{2, *} , Bin Chen ³ , Yuli Shan ⁴ , Ning Zhang ¹ ,
4	Peng Wang ⁵ , Kai Fang ⁶ , Yanchao Bai ⁷ , Xiaowei Zou ¹
5	¹ Institute of Blue and Green Development, Shandong University, Weihai 264209,
6	China
7	² Department of Geographical Sciences, University of Maryland, College Park, MD
8	20742, United States
9	³ Fudan Tyndall Center, Department of Environmental Science and Engineering,
10	Fudan University, Shanghai 200438, China
11	⁴ Integrated Research on Energy, Environment and Society (IREES), Energy and
12	Sustainability Research Institute Groningen, University of Groningen, Groningen, the
13	Netherlands
14	⁵ Key Lab of Urban Environment and Health, Institute of Urban Environment,
15	Chinese Academy of Sciences, Xiamen 361021, China
16	⁶ School of Public Affairs, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou 310058, China
17	⁷ College of Environmental Science and Engineering, Yangzhou University, Yangzhou
18	225127 China
19	
20	
21	Abstract: Low-carbon power transition, key to combatting climate change, brings far-
22	reaching effects on achieving Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), in terms of
23	resources use, environmental emissions, employment, and many more. Here we
24	assessed the potential impacts of power transition on 49 regional multiple SDGs
25	progress under three different climate scenarios. We found that power transition could
26	increase global SDG index score from 72.36 in 2015 to 74.38 in 2040 under the 1.5°C

27 scenario, compared with 70.55 and 71.44 under 'Coal-dependent' and 'Middle of the 28 road' scenario, respectively. The power transition related global SDG progress would 29 mainly come from switching to renewables in developing economies. Power transition 30 also improves the overall SDG in most developed economies under all scenarios, while 31 undermining their employment-related SDG progress. The global SDG progress would 32 be jeopardized by power transition related international trade changes under 'Coaldependent' and 'Middle of the road' scenario, while improved under the 1.5°C scenario. 33 Keywords: low-carbon transition; Global power sector; SDGs; Climate scenarios 34

36 Introduction

The current fossil fuel-dominated power sector contributes for near 40% of global annual energy-related CO₂ emissions ^{1 2}. The low carbon transition of the power sector is crucial to tackling climate change and ensuring the future supply of energy ^{3,4}. According to the International Energy Agency (IEA), the climate target in the Paris Agreement that pursuing efforts to limit end-of-century warming to 1.5°C, cannot be achieved until the share of energy production from low-carbon energy technologies rising to 85% by 2040 ⁵.

44 However, power sector transition's impact is far beyond climate. It brings farreaching effects on achieving Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)⁶, in terms of 45 resources use^{7,8}, environmental emissions³, employment⁹, and many more^{10,11}. What's 46 47 more, power transition may reduce one problem while exacerbate others at times. For 48 instance, the closure of coal-fired power plants will reduce cooling water withdrawal (advancing SDG 6: Clean Water and Sanitation)^{12,13}, but cause massive job losses in 49 50 coal power industry and its various ancillary, upstream, and downstream industries (hindering SDG 8: Decent Work and Economic Growth)^{14,15}. Expansion of low-carbon 51 52 power such as wind power and solar energy as substitutes for fossil fuels can improve countries' ability to deal with climate change (advancing SDG 13: Climate Action)¹⁶, 53 54 while increases demand for critical materials (hindering SDG 12: Responsible Consumption and Production) ^{17,18}. 55

56	Previous studies have primarily demonstrated the impacts of specific national or
57	regional power sector transition on a single aspect of sustainable development, such as
58	regional employment ¹⁹ , economic growth ²⁰ , natural resources use ^{21,22} , greenhouse gas
59	and pollutant emissions ²³ . However, few have evaluated the environmental-social-
60	economic interrelationships (trade-offs or synergies) of the power sector transition and
61	its impacts on each region toward achieving the multiple SDGs simultaneously. The
62	lack of comprehensive assessment may lead to unintended consequences, or even
63	hinder some SDGs progress, when designing power transition pathways. For instance,
64	Wang et al. found that Developing Asia's long-term power plan featuring coal power
65	generation has not yet included the impact on regional sustainable use of water
66	resources, which may exacerbate its water shortage (hindering SDG 6: Clean Water and
67	Sanitation), if without any strategies to reduce cooling water use ²⁴ . Additionally, power
68	transition in one region affects not only the local SDGs, but also SDGs progress in other
69	regions via inter-regional trade. The expansion of renewable power or the reduction of
70	fossil fuels in electricity mix in one country might lead to the changes of environmental
71	emissions, resources consumption, employment and value-added embodied in products
72	and services from global supply chains, thus potentially influencing other regions'
73	SDGs ²⁵ . Some researchers have conducted initial investigations and found out that
74	European renewable energy directive will harm forests of tropical countries, such as
75	Indonesia and Brazil, through wood trade (hindering SDG 12: Responsible
76	Consumption and Production) ²⁶ . Thus, we further highlight the role of international

trade in regional SDG progress for preventing the power transition at the expense ofSDG in other regions.

79 By applying Environmentally Extended Multiregional Input-Output Analysis 80 (MRIO) and SDG assessment approach, here, we examine the direct and supply-chain effects of power transitions throughout the world on regional and global SDGs, 81 82 including the net environmental, social, and economic changes under three climate mitigation scenarios ('Coal-dependent', 'Middle of the road' and 1.5°C scenario) (see 83 84 detailed explanations in Methods). Our findings demonstrate that low carbon 85 transition of global power sector could enhance the overall SDG performance, but there are huge differences across individual SDGs in different economies. 86

87 **Results**



88 The environmental and socio-economic impacts of global power sector transition

90 Figure 1. Comparison of the net changes in environmental and socio-economic impacts of

global power sector in 2025-2040 under three different climate scenarios to that in 2015. (a-b)
environmental emissions, (c-d) water resources use, (e-h) material use, and (i-j) socio-economic
impacts. The three transition scenarios are Current Policies Scenario (CPS), Stated Policies Scenario

94 (SPS), and Sustainable Development Scenario (SDS), namely 'high coal' scenario, 'medium-sized
95 coal' scenario, and 1.5°C scenario, respectively.

Figure 1 shows the net changes of environmental emissions, water resources use,
material use, and socioeconomic impacts (the basic indicators to evaluate SDG progress)
associated with global power transition under three different climate scenarios-Current
Policies Scenario (CPS), Stated Policies Scenario (SPS), and Sustainable Development
Scenario (SDS), namely 'Coal-dependent', 'Middle of the road' and 1.5°C scenario,
respectively.

From the figure we can see that_global CO₂ emissions (**Figure 1a**) will increase by 10% and 18% under CPS and SPS scenarios between 2015 and 2040, but decrease by 15% under the SDS scenario. PM emissions (**Figure 1b**) show a similar trend with relatively small absolute changes. The discrepancy of emissions under different scenarios mainly results from the difference in energy mix of electricity production (**Table S1-S3**).

For water use, scenario results showed a similar trend as the changes in environmental emissions. Only SDS scenario results showed a significant annual decrease of 3.93 Gm³ (-0.33%) blue water consumption and 234.61 Gm³ (-17.2%) blue water withdrawal associated with power transition by 2040, compared with the increase of water use under the CPS and SPS scenarios (**Figure 1c and 1d**).

Given the higher demand for electricity in the future, all scenarios results showedan increasing use of materials, such as metal, non-metal minerals and biomass for power

transition, except a decrease of fossil fuels under the SDS scenario (Figure 1e-h).
However, compared with the CPS and SPS scenarios results, power sector would
consume much less materials under the SDS scenario.

118 In terms of socio-economic impacts of the power production and transition, we 119 can see a significant increase in both employment (Figure 1i) and value added (Figure 120 1g) under all scenarios, due to the high future demand of electricity. As coal power per unit of installed capacity can generate more jobs than that of renewables, but drive less 121 122 economic output, our results showed that power generation and transition under the 123 SDS scenario (the most ambitious scenario with renewables generation) may bring less job opportunities but create higher value added, compared with the results under CPS 124 and SPS. 125

127 Power transition's impacts on global SDGs



129	Figure 2. Global SDG index score and individual SDG score under three different climate
130	scenarios. (a) global SDG index score and (b-h) scores of SDG 6.4 (Ensure sustainable withdrawals
131	and supply of freshwater), SDG 8.4 (Improve resource efficiency in consumption and production),
132	SDG 8.5 (Achieve full and productive employment), SDG 9.4 (Promote clean and Sustainable
133	industrialization), SDG 11.6 (Reduce the adverse per capita environmental impact of cities), SDG
134	12.2 (Achieve the sustainable management and efficient use of natural resources) and SDG 13.2
135	(Integrate climate change measures into national policies, strategies and planning). Note: To ensure
136	comparability across different SDGs and different country/region, the SDG scores are normalized
137	to a standard scale ranging from 0 (worst-performing in achieving SDGs) to 100 (best-performing
138	in achieving SDGs).
139	Here, we translated the changes in environmental and social-economic indicators
140	into global SDGs progress using the United Nations SDG assessment approach (see
141	method section). Our results showed that the global SDG index score, defined as the
142	overall performance in achieving all individual SDG evaluated, will increase from
143	72.36 in 2015 to 74.38 in 2040 under SDS, while decrease to 70.55 and 71.44 in 2040,
144	under CPS and SPS, respectively (Figure 2a). The fossil fuel for electricity generation
145	plays a decisive role in global SDG performance of the power sector. As described in
146	our three scenarios, global SDG index score only rises when fossil power generation
147	drops (SDS), even though low-carbon power share will increase under each scenario.

Different power sector transition paths would undermine (green and blue lines in
Figure 2) or underpin (red lines in Figure 2) individual SDG progress (Figures 2b-

150 2g). In 2040, SDG 6.4, SDG 8.4, SDG 9.4, SDG 11.6, SDG 12.2 and SDG 13.2 present 151 higher scores under SDS scenario than the other two scenarios. The environmental and 152 socio-economic benefits from the low carbon transition (SDS scenario) are intrinsically 153 related to the reduction in blue water use, fossil fuels use, CO₂ and PM from the shutdown of a large number of thermal power plants (see Table S1-S4). However, CPS 154 155 and SPS presents higher scores in SDG 8.5 (Achieve full and productive employment) (Figure 2d). For example, in 2040, SDG 8.5 score under SDS (57.88) is less than 1.03% 156 157 of that under CPS (58.92). This is main because the shutdown of coal power under SDS 158 would lead to a large number of unemployment in both coal power generation and 159 upstream supply chains (e.g. coal mining sector).

160

161 The impacts of power transition on regional SDGs

SDG index score changes vary significantly across economies (Figure. 3). In 162 163 general, the higher the GDP per capita is, the more inclined an economy is to improve the SDG index score and vice versa (Table S4). During the period of 2015-2040, the 164 165 average SDG index scores of developed economies will increase by 2 percentage points and almost every developed economy improves their SDG scores to some extent under 166 the SDS scenario. However, close to 30% of the developed economies may face a 167 168 decline in their SDG scores under the CPS scenario. In contrast, more than half of the developing economies, mainly from Asia and Africa, will have a decline in their SDG 169



scores under the CPS scenario, while this number decreased to about 20% under the

171 SDS scenario.

174 (a) changes under CPS, (b) changes under SPS, (c) changes under SDS and (d) score ranges and175 mean score.

176

177 Estonia, one of the countries that most dependent on fossil power, is top economy 178 in SDG index score increase by 2040 under all scenarios, with a range of 8.29 to 11.33, 179 as it expects to significantly replace coal power through the development of renewable energy such as wind power and biomass affected by European Climate Law. This 180 181 verifies that strict climate legislation can effectively improve the sustainable 182 development level of regions highly dependent on fossil power. In contrast, Middle East is the economy with the biggest drops in SDG index score from 2.40 to 12.39, because 183 it will still develop gas power substantially. 184

185 SDS shows that regional power transition can also lead to synergies and trade-offs between different individual SDGs (Figure 4c). As for synergies, more than 80%, 60%, 186 187 60%, 85%, 60%, and 80% of countries or regions will have an increase in SDG 6.4 scores, SDG 8.4/12.2 scores, SDG 8.5 scores, SDG 9.4 scores, SDG 11.6 scores, SDG 188 189 13.2 scores. However, there is a trade-off between SDG 8.5 and SDG index. For 190 example, under SDS, Bulgaria's SDG index score will increase by 11.55 in 2040, but 191 due to the loss of employment during the transition, its SDG 8.5 score fall by 0.05. In 192 addition, the power transition of some will increase all individual SDGs score, such as 193 United State, India, South Africa.

194



under three scenarios. (a) CPS, (b) SPS, and (c) SDS.





201 The effects of power transition related international trade changes on SDGs

203 Figure 5. The impacts of power transition related international trade on global and regional

204 SDG performance between 2015 and 2040 under three different scenarios.

The power transition will change the scale and category of international trade for renewable equipment and traditional power fuels between different economies and lead to the changes in environmental emissions, resources consumption, employment and value-added embodied in exports and imports, thus influencing SDG performance in different regions. Under SDS scenario, the international trade will improve the overall SDG performance (0.37%) globally between 2015 and 2040, while the results are opposite (about -0.04%) under the CPS and SPS scenarios (**Figure 5a**). However, the

212 overall impacts of changes in international trade on the global SDG performance are 213 quite limited, as the traded commodities and services related to power sector only 214 account for less than 2% of the international trade, in terms of economic value. Climate-215 related SDG (SDG 13.2) performance will have highest degree of improvement 216 (2.95%), mainly due to the reduction of CO₂ emissions embodied in thermal power-217 related trade, under SDS (Figure 5h). Under CPS and SPS, the employment-related 218 SDG (SDG 8.5) performance will be improved (0.07-0.28%), mainly because of the 219 expansion of labor intensive renewable power sectors (Figure 5d). However, all 220 scenarios showed a decline (0.03-0.13%) in the average scores of resource-related SDGs (SDGs 6.4, 8.4 and 12.2), due to the increase in power production related 221 222 resource use met by international trade (Figure 5b, c and g). The increasing resource 223 use for power transition may also lead to a decrease in the average scores of SDG 11.6 224 (Reduce the adverse per capita environmental impact of cities) by 0.04-0.1% under all 225 scenarios (Figure 5f).

From a regional perspective, more than 80% of economies would improve their SDG performance under SDS (**Figure 5**). The countries/regions with rich fossil energy resources, such as the Middle East, Czech Republic, Slovakia, ranked at the top in term of SDG index score increase. This is mainly because other economies' low-carbon power transition inevitably leads to the decrease of fossil fuel imported from these regions, potentially reducing their resource extraction and related environmental impacts. For example, under the SDS scenario, oil exports from the Middle East for

233	other economies' power production would be reduced by 65%, which result in a 0.28%
234	increase in its SDGs 8.4 (Improve resource efficiency in consumption and production)
235	score. In contrast, jobs will be wiped out in these fossil fuel export-dependent regions
236	such as Australia, as a result of the coal export deceases, therefore, leading to a 0.07%
237	of decrease in its employment-related SDG score (SDG 8.5). However, under CPS and
238	SPS, most of the individual economy's SDG progress (about 60%) would be impeded
239	by international trade, as the expansion of fossil fuel based power production leads to
240	the increase of power sector related resource consumption and environmental emissions
241	embodied in international trade. For instance, Russia, as a resource-rich economy, will
242	export more fossil resources to support power expansion of other economies, resulting
243	in an increase (about 7%) of carbon emissions embodied in its exports, and a decrease
244	(about 3%) of its climate-related SDG performance (Table S5 and S6).

245

246

247 **Discussion**

For the first time, we performed a quantitative analysis of power sector transition's impacts on global and regional multiple SDGs performances. We found the evolution of global SDG index score (the average score of seven selected SDGs) during 2015-2040, is opposite under different climate scenarios. Power transition brings an increase of 2.8% (72.36 in 2015 to 74.38 in 2040) in global SDG index score under the 1.5°C scenario (i.e. SDS), while leads to a reduction of 1.3-1.5% (72.36 in 2015 to 70.5571.44 in 2040) under the 'high coal' and 'medium-sized coal' scenario (i.e. CPS andSPS).

256	We also found that there are significant differences across regional SDG index
257	score changes. From 2015 to 2040, the regional SDG index score change is estimated
258	to be in the range of -12.39 (Row Middle East) to 8.29 (Estonia), -11.28 (Row Middle
259	East) to 11.97 (Estonia) and -2.4 (Row Middle East) to 12.33 (Estonia), under CPS,
260	SPS and SDS, namely 'Coal-dependent', 'Middle of the road' and 1.5°C scenario
261	respectively. In addition, the change of regional individual SDG score isn't always
262	consistent with that of SDG index score. For instance, resource-related SDGs (SDGs
263	8.4 and 12.2) on 17 of the 49 economies, on the contrary, will become worse if the
264	currently fossil-dominated power structure transited to a renewable-dominated one (1.5 $^\circ$ C
265	scenario).

According to Sustainable Development Report 2020, the progress of achieving the SDGs by 2030 lags far behind the schedule predesigned by the UN ²⁷. One of the main reasons is that there is a lack of understanding of the interactions between SDGs ²⁸, which is essential to trade-offs between SDGs and advance the overall SDGs with minimal efforts¹¹. As our research reveals the SDGs synergies and trade-offs in global and regional power transition, which provide an insight into advancing the power transformation and improving the current SDG "dilemma".

273

274 Developing economies' lower carbon power transition is crucial

275 Our results demonstrate that whether the global SDG performance can be 276 improved will be determined by developing economies' power transition. The main reason is that fossil power contributed more than 70% of the electricity demand in 277 278 developing economies. As a result of gradual expansion in population and economy, 279 the electricity demand of developing economies will increase by 81.6-112.3% between 280 2015 and 2040, which is much higher than that of the developed economies (23.2-28.4%)⁵. If power generation in developing economies is still dominated by fossil fuels, 281 282 there will be a large amount of greenhouse gas and pollutant emissions, as well as a 283 large amount of water resources and fossil fuels and minerals depletion, thus posing 284 great threats to global SDG progress.

To promote the clean and low carbon power transition in developing economies is crucial to global SDG progress. Meanwhile, due to the different levels of economic development and power structure, different developing economies need to take varying measures.

For Africa, the continent with the lowest average income, the biggest challenge facing transition is the lack of sufficient financial support ²⁹. For example, African lowcarbon electricity transition cannot be achieved until investments in power growing by two-and-a-half times through to 2040, according to IEA. Given the limited financial capacity and financial constraints of utilities of governments, private sources of finance will be critical to bridge investment gaps. However, more than 1/3 of sub-Saharan African countries such as Nigeria, Sudan do not allow for private sector participation in electricity generation or networks, which greatly jeopardizes the decarbonization of
 electricity in these areas ⁵. For the smooth transition of the region, private investment
 can be appropriately introduced.

299 For China and India, the two biggest coal-fired power producers in the world, a 300 rapid transition away from unabated coal use is essential. Recent regional trends reflect 301 a shift in coal power prioritization from the US and EU to many fast-developing countries in Asia, especial in China and India³⁰. Thus, specific policy efforts that target 302 303 coal-power production reduction are critical, for example, reductions in multilateral 304 development banks' financing of coal projects, national limits on coal consumption. 305 More importantly, the state needs to improve its commitment. China has come up with 306 clear carbon neutral targets and India needs to catch up.

307 Measures to coordinate power transition and SDGs

308 Transforming the power sector to low-carbon energy under the 1.5°C pathway (or 309 rapid low-carbon power transition) was verified that it can bring co-benefits to global 310 SDGs performance on the whole. However, the situation in each region differs from 311 one another. All individual SDGs in these nine economies, Australia, Ireland, United States, Chinese Taiwan, RoW America, South Africa, RoW Europe, RoW Asia and 312 313 Pacific, India, can be advanced by rapid low-carbon power transition. This indicates 314 that the current and stated transition strategies of these countries are relatively 315 sustainable. However, it is worth noting that the power transition may lead to local SDG conflicts in these economies. For example, the Indian government's clean energy 316

317 transition strategies (solar capacity addition targets are accompanied by the retirement of thermal capacity) will create job opportunities primarily (60% of total) located in 318 319 western and southern parts of India (advancing SDG 8.5:Achieve full and productive 320 employment), while leading to job losses being concentrated in the coal-mining states located in eastern India (hindering SDG 8.5) ³¹. Thus, it is recommended a 321 322 comprehensive review of the cross-regional impact of the power transition in large economies, such as the United States and India, to reduce regional imbalances from 323 324 transition. Meanwhile, specific development plans for sub-regional low-carbon power 325 transition are needed.

326 For most countries, the rapid low-carbon transition will cause conflicts between 327 individual SDGs progress (where progress in one goal hinders progress in another), so 328 thus hinder SDGs progress. For example, the expansions of wind power in Germany 329 will increase demand for metals and nonmetals, and undermine its SDG 8.4. In response 330 to the material requirement or bottleneck for the future deployment of low-carbon 331 power, it is critical to increasing secondary supply of materials (recycle) other than 332 exploiting mines. Given the low rate of recycling of materials and high recycling costs in power sector, more efforts need to be exerted into the centralized recovery of retired 333 334 electrical equipment and the development of technologies that have lower costs and 335 higher recovery rates. The social justice issues come from laid-off workers caused by the decommissioning of coal power plants. For example, 4.9 million coal power-related 336 workers will be unemployed in China in 2040 under SDS. Coal electricians and 337

upstream coal miners are difficult to get reemployed due to their limited skills. Coaltransition support is, therefore, a necessary measure for coal workers and should be
considered by policymakers in coal-dependent countries.

341 Our results also indicate that international trade associated with the power sector 342 has a limited effect on the global overall SDG performance, but it will profoundly affect 343 the SDG process of individual countries. This means cross-national inequities in 344 achieving SDGs progress may be exacerbated as the expansion of renewable power or the reduction of fossil fuels in the electricity mix. For example, under SDS, in 2040, 345 346 55.9% of metal use increases (hindering SDG 8.4 and 12.2) in the Row Europe are 347 caused by power transition in the country itself, and the remaining 44.1% are driven by 348 the other countries (advancing SDG 9.4 and 13.2) low-carbon transition's ripple effects 349 throughout global supply chains. This emphasizes power transition as a global systemic 350 phenomenon, instead of looking at the area of power installation in isolation, which 351 calls for taking consumption-based accounting principle into considering when 352 formulating power transition strategies to facilitate best practice in minimizing impacts 353 on SDG.

354 Limitations and future works

This study employed the labor data in EXIOBASE 3 to analyze the impact of power transition on regional employment. Although this data is more detailed on sector classification than other authority's data, such as International Labor Organization, it divides the broad renewable sector's employment into detailed industries (such as wind 359 power, PV) according to their shares in total compensation of employees, and does not 360 distinguish the employment coefficients difference between different renewable power 361 sectors. This may leave uncertainty in our employment accounting in renewable sectors. 362 In future research, more detailed employment survey data in renewable sectors is 363 needed to reduce the uncertainty of analyzing power transitions' impact on employment. Moreover, the power transition is part of the energy transition, which also includes 364 industry and residential sectors' transition etc. Combining with the foundation lied by 365 this study, future studies can focus on much bigger picture, try to reveal the entire 366 367 energy system transition's influence on SDGs performance.

369 Methods

370 Three climate scenarios

371 The three climate scenarios (Current Policies Scenario, Stated Policies Scenario, and 372 Sustainable Development Scenario, namely 'Coal-dependent', 'Middle of the road' and 373 1.5°C scenario, respectively) were derived from the latest IEA's Word Energy Outlook 374 report. Current Policies Scenario is the most fossil-dependent scenario, in which coal-375 fired electricity generation, with an amount of 12923 TWh, accounts for 30% of 376 electricity supply and gas-fired generation for about 25% by 2040. Under Stated 377 Policies Scenario, coal-fired electricity generation's share of overall generation will decline from 38% to 25% and the share of generation from renewables increases from 378 26% today to 44% in 2040, with solar PV and wind together rising from 7% to 24%. 379 380 Sustainable Development Scenario has the most ambitious scenario with renewables 381 generation to keep global temperature rise below 1.5°C above the pre-industrial level. 382 The growth of renewables generation raising their share of generation to two-thirds by 383 2040. Wind and solar PV together provide 40% of generation in 2040. More details 384 about the three scenarios can be found in the IEA's Word Energy Outlook.

385

Indicator selection and data sources for SDG

The indicators selected for SDG in this study were from *the Global Indicator Framework for Sustainable Development Goals* developed by the United Nations' Inter-Agency and Expert Group on SDG Indicators ³², two reports titled "*Indicators and a Monitoring Framework for the Sustainable Development Goals*" and 390 "Sustainable Development Report 2020" published by the United Nations' Sustainable 391 Development Solutions Network ^{27,33}, and a study entitled "Assessing progress towards 392 sustainable development over space and time" published in Nature ³⁴. We chose SDG 393 indicators based on the following three criteria: (1) the indicators are likely to be affected by electricity transition, (2) the indicators can be quantified across 394 395 organizational levels and temporal scales, and (3) the data for quantifying the indicators are available from EXIOBASE³⁵ (see more detail about EXIOBASE in the next 396 397 paragraph).

398 Calculating the scores of selected SDG indicators

399 Using 2015 as baseline year, we calculated the score of selected SDG indicators for all 49 countries/regions in EXIOBASE 3. The procedure comprised following steps: 400 401 To ensure data comparability across different SDG indicators, each indicator data was 402 rescaled from 0 to 100, with 0 indicating worst performance and 100 denoting the 403 optimum. Given rescaling is very sensitive to extreme (outliers) values on both tails of 404 the data distribution, we followed the methods proposed by Sustainable Development 405 Report 2020 to determine the upper bound and low bound of each SDG indicator. We defined the data at the bottom 2.5th percentile of all economies' SDG indicator 406 performances for a given SDG indicator as the minimum value (0) and the data at the 407 408 upper 2.5th percentile as the maximum value (100) for the normalization, for removing the effect of extreme values. In addition, we used net CO₂ emissions to set a 100% 409 upper bound for SDG 9.4 and 13.2, as it must be achieved. After determining the upper 410

and lower bounds, we rescaled the selected SDG indicator values across economies toa scale of 0 to 100 with equation (1):

413
$$Z' = \frac{Z - min(Z)}{max(Z) - min(Z)} \times 100$$
 (1)

414 where Z represents the raw data value for a given SDG indicator. Min and max is the 415 bounds for the worse and best performance, respectively. Z' denote the normalized 416 value for a given SDG indicator.

417 MRIO analysis for estimating the impacts of electricity transition on SDG 418 progress

First, we applied Input-Output analysis (IOA) to quantifying the environmentalsocial-economic impact of power sector in 2015. This model captured both direct and indirect effects of eleven electricity production sub-sectors (including coal power, gas power, nuclear power, hydroelectricity, wind power, petroleum and other oil derivatives power, biomass and waste power, solar photovoltaic, solar thermal, tide, wave, ocean power, and geothermal power) on environmental emissions, water resources use, material use, employment and value-add. The basic framework of IOA is as follow:

$$426 X = (I - A)^{-I} Y (2)$$

427 where $X = \begin{bmatrix} X_i^r \end{bmatrix}_{n \times 1}^{r}$, X_i^r is the total output of *i*th sector in region *r*. *I* is the identity 428 matrix. $A = \begin{bmatrix} A_{ij}^{rs} \end{bmatrix}_{n \times n}^{r}$ is the technical coefficient matrix, A_{ij}^{rs} is given by 429 $A_{ij}^{rs} = Z_{ij}^{rs} / X_j^s$, in which Z_{ij}^{rs} represents the monetary value flows from *i*th sector in 430 region *r* to *j*th sector in region *s* and X_j^s is the total output of *j*th sector in region *s*. 431 $Y = \begin{bmatrix} Y_i^{rs} \end{bmatrix}_{n \times m}^{rs}$ is the final demand matrix, Y_i^{rs} represents the final demand of region 432 *s* for the goods and services of *i*th sector from region *r*.

433 Total (including direct and indirect) environmental-social-economic impact of one

434 of electricity production sub-sectors can be mathematically expressed as:

435
$$R = f(I - A)^{-I} X'$$
(3)

where *f* is a matrix of the environmental emissions, water resources use, material use, employment and value-add intensity (the direct environmental emissions, water resources use, material use, employment and value-add per unit total output from each sector) for all economic sectors in all regions. χ' is the total output matrix with zeros for all sectors' total output other than the electricity production sub-sectors.

In addition, we define the difference between the total impact and the direct impact
(*E*, the direct environmental emissions, water resources use, material use, employment
and value-add) as the impact of trade (*T*).

444

$$T = R - E \tag{4}$$

445 **Declaration of Interests**

- 446 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.
- 447
- 448
- 449
- 450

451 Table 1 Indicators selected for quantifying the impacts of power transition on SDG

No.	SDG Indicators	SDG indicators illustration			
1	SDG 6.4 Ensure sustainable	6.4.1 Water-use efficiency: blue water			
	withdrawals and supply of	consumption per GDP			
	freshwater	6.4.2 Level of water stress: blue water			
		withdrawal as a proportion of available			
		freshwater resources			
2	SDG 8.4 Improve resource	8.4.1 (1) Domestic material use per capita: metal			
	efficiency in consumption and	use per capita			
	production	8.4.1 (2) Domestic material use per capita: non-			
		metallic minerals use per capita			
		8.4.1 (3) Domestic material use per capita: fossil			
		fuels use per capita			

		8.4.1 (4) Domestic material use per capita:
		biomass use per capita
		8.4.2 (1) Domestic material use per capita: metal
		use per GDP
		8.4.2 (2) Domestic material use per capita: non-
		metallic minerals use per GDP
		8.4.2 (3) Domestic material use per capita: fossil
		fuels use per GDP
		8.4.2 (4) Domestic material use per capita:
		biomass use per GDP
3	SDG 8.5 Achieve full and	8.5 Unemployment rate (% total labor force)
	productive employment	
4	SDG 9.4 Promote clean and	9.4 CO ₂ emissions per unit of value added
	Sustainable industrialization	
5	SDG 11.6 Reduce the adverse per	11.6 Annual mean levels of fine particulate
	capita environmental impact of	matter (e.g. PM2.5 and PM10) in cities
	cities	(population weighted)
6	SDG 12.2 Achieve the sustainable	12.2.1 (1) Domestic material use per capita:
	management and efficient use of	metal use per capita
	natural resources (same indicators	12.2.1 (2) Domestic material use per capita: non-
	in the official indicator book:	metallic minerals use per capita
	8.4.1/12.2.1, 8.4.2/12.2.2)	12.2.1 (3) Domestic material use per capita:
		fossil fuels use per capita
		12.2.1 (4) Domestic material use per capita:
		biomass use per capita
		12.2.2 (1) Domestic material use per capita:
		metal use per GDP
		12.2.2 (2) Domestic material use per capita: non-
		metallic minerals use per GDP
		12.2.2 (3) Domestic material use per capita:
		fossil fuels use per GDP
		12.2.2 (4) Domestic material use per capita:
		biomass use per GDP
7	SDG 13.2 Integrate climate	13.2.1 CO ₂ emissions intensity of forest areas
	change measures into national	13.2.2 CO ₂ emissions intensity per capita
	policies, strategies and planning	13.2.3 CO ₂ emissions intensity per GDP

References

454	1	IEA.	(2019).	Global	Energy	&	CO2	Status	Report	2019.
455		https://	/www.iea.c	org/reports	/global-ene	ergy-c	o2-statu	s-report-2	<u>2019</u> .	

456	2	UNEP.	(2020).	Emissions	Gap	Report	2020.
457		https://www.ur	ep.org/intera	ctive/emissions-g	gap-report/20	<u>020/</u> .	
458	3	Pehl, M., Arve	sen, A., Hump	penöder, F., Popp	, A., Hertwi	ch, E. G. and	Luderer,
459		G. (2017). Und	lerstanding fu	ture emissions fi	rom low-car	bon power sy	stems by
460		integration of	life-cycle as	sessment and in	ntegrated en	ergy modell	ing. Nat.
461		Energy. 2, 939-	-945.				
462	4	Creutzig, F., A	Agoston, P., O	Goldschmidt, J.	C., Luderen	r, G., Nemet	, G. and
463		Pietzcker, R. C	. (2017). The	underestimated p	otential of s	olar energy to	mitigate
464		climate change	. Nat. Energy	. 2, 17140.			
465	5	IEA. (2019). V	World Energy	Outlook 2019.	https://www	v.iea.org/even	ts/world-
466		energy-outlook	<u>-2019</u> .				
467	6	Sasse, J. P. and	d Trutnevyte,	E. (2020). Regi	onal impacts	s of electricit	y system
468		transition in Ce	entral Europe	until 2035. Nat.	Commun. 1	1, 4972.	
469	7	Sharifzadeh, M	I., Hien, R. K	. T. and Shah, N	. (2019). Ch	ina's roadma	p to low-
470		carbon electric	ity and water	: Disentangling	greenhouse	gas (GHG) e	emissions
471		from electricity	y-water nexus	s via renewable	wind and so	olar power ge	eneration,
472		and carbon cap	ture and stora	age. Appl. Energ	y. 235, 31-42	2.	
473	8	Watari, T., McI	Lellan, B. C.,	Giurco, D., Dom	inish, E., Ya	masue, E. an	d Nansai,
474		K. (2019). Tota	al material rec	quirement for the	e global ener	rgy transition	to 2050:
475		A focus on tran	sport and ele	ctricity. Resour.	Conserv. Re	cycl. 148, 91	-103.
476	9	Cameron, L. an	nd van der Zv	waan, B. (2015).	Employmen	t factors for	wind and
477		solar energy te	echnologies: A	A literature revie	ew. Renew.	Sust. Energ.	Rev. 45,
478		160-172.					
479	10	Fuso Nerini, F.	, Tomei, J., T	o, L. S., Bisaga,	I., Parikh, I	P., Black, M.,	Borrion,
480		A., Spataru, C	C., Castán Br	oto, V., Ananda	rajah, G. <i>et</i>	al. (2017).	Mapping
481		synergies and	trade-offs be	etween energy a	nd the Sust	ainable Dev	elopment
482		Goals. Nat. En	ergy. 3, 10-15	5.			
483	11	Sachs, J. D., So	chmidt-Traub	, G., Mazzucato,	M., Messne	r, D., Nakice	novic, N.
484		and Rockströn	n, J. (2019).	Six Transforma	tions to acl	hieve the Su	stainable
485		Development (Goals. Nat. Su	ustain. 2, 805-814	4.		
486	12	Zhang, C., Zho	ong, L. and W	Vang, J. (2018). I	Decoupling b	etween wate	r use and
487		thermoelectric	power genera	ation growth in C	China. Nat. E	nergy. 3, 792	-799.
488	13	Liu, L., Hejazi	, M., Iyer, G.	. and Forman, B	. A. (2019).	Implications	of water
489		constraints on	electricity cap	pacity expansion	in the Unite	d States. Nat	. Sustain.
490		<i>2</i> , 206-213.					
491	14	He, G., Lin, J.,	Zhang, Y., Zł	hang, W., Larang	eira, G., Zha	ang, C., Peng	, W., Liu,
492		M. and Yang, I	F. (2020). Ena	abling a Rapid ar	nd Just Trans	sition away fi	rom Coal
493		in China. One.	Earth. 3, 187	-194.			
494	15	Burke, P. J., Be	est, R. and Jot	zo, F. (2019). Cl	osures of coa	al-fired powe	r stations
495		in Australia: lo	cal unemploy	ment effects. Au	st. J. Agr. Re	esour. Ec. 63,	142-165.
496	16	Carley, S. and I	Konisky, D. N	1. (2020). The jus	stice and equ	ity implication	ons of the
497		clean energy tr	ansition. Nat.	Energy. 5, 569-5	577.		

498 Li, J., Peng, K., Wang, P., Zhang, N., Feng, K., Guan, D., Meng, J., Wei, W. and 17 499 Yang, Q. (2020). Critical Rare-Earth Elements Mismatch Global Wind-Power 500 Ambitions. One. Earth. 3, 116-125. Kavlak, G., McNerney, J., Jaffe, R. L. and Trancik, J. E. (2015). Metal 501 18 502 production requirements for rapid photovoltaics deployment. Energ. Environ. 503 Sci. 8, 1651-1659. 504 19 Bohlmann, H. R., Horridge, J. M., Inglesi-Lotz, R., Roos, E. L. and Stander, L. 505 (2019). Regional employment and economic growth effects of South Africa's 506 transition to low-carbon energy supply mix. Energ. Pol. 128, 830-837. 507 Keček, D., Mikulić, D. and Lovrinčević, Ž. (2019). Deployment of renewable 20 508 energy: Economic effects on the Croatian economy. Energ. Pol. 126, 402-410. 509 21 Fishman, T. and Graedel, T. E. (2019). Impact of the establishment of US 510 offshore wind power on neodymium flows. Nat. Sustain. 2, 332-338. 511 22 Wang, P., Chen, L.-Y., Ge, J.-P., Cai, W. and Chen, W.-Q. (2019). Incorporating 512 critical material cycles into metal-energy nexus of China's 2050 renewable 513 transition. Appl. Energy. 253, 113612. 514 23 Bergesen, J. D., Heath, G. A., Gibon, T. and Suh, S. (2014). Thin-film photovoltaic power generation offers decreasing greenhouse gas emissions and 515 516 increasing environmental co-benefits in the long term. Environ. Sci. Technol. 517 48, 9834-9843. 518 24 Wang, Y., Byers, E., Parkinson, S., Wanders, N., Wada, Y., Mao, J. and Bielicki, 519 J. M. (2019). Vulnerability of existing and planned coal-fired power plants in 520 Developing Asia to changes in climate and water resources. Energ. Environ. Sci 521 12, 3164-3181. Xu, Z., Li, Y., Chau, S. N., Dietz, T., Li, C., Wan, L., Zhang, J., Zhang, L., Li, 522 25 523 Y., Chung, M. G. et al. (2020). Impacts of international trade on global 524 sustainable development. Nat. Sustain. 3, 964-971. 525 26 Searchinger, T. D., Beringer, T., Holtsmark, B., Kammen, D. M., Lambin, E. F., 526 Lucht, W., Raven, P. and van Ypersele, J. P. (2018). Europe's renewable energy 527 directive poised to harm global forests. Nat. Commun. 9, 3741. 528 27 Network, S. D. S. (2020). Sustainable Development Report 2020. 529 https://www.sdgindex.org/reports/sustainable-development-report-2020/. 530 Måns Nilsson, D. G. a. M. V. (2016). Map the interactions between Sustainable 28 531 Developme.pdf>. Nature. 532 29 Menyeh, B. O. (2021). Financing electricity access in Africa: A choice 533 experiment study of household investor preferences for renewable energy 534 investments in Ghana. Renew. Sust. Energ. Rev. 146, 111132. 535 30 Cui, R. Y., Hultman, N., Edwards, M. R., He, L., Sen, A., Surana, K., McJeon, 536 H., Iyer, G., Patel, P., Yu, S. et al. (2019). Quantifying operational lifetimes for 537 coal power plants under the Paris goals. Nat. Commun. 10, 4759.

- 538 31 Sharma, A. and Banerjee, R. (2021). Framework to analyze the spatial
 539 distribution of the labor impacts of clean energy transitions. Energ. Pol. 150,
 540 112158.
- 541 32 Indicators, I.-A. a. E. G. o. S. (2021). Global indicator framework for the
 542 Sustainable Development Goals and targets of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable
 543 Development. https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/indicators/indicators-list.
- Network, S. D. S. (2015). Indicators and a Monitoring Framework for
 Sustainable Development Goals: Launching a data revolution for the SDGs.
 <u>https://resources.unsdsn.org/indicators-and-a-monitoring-framework-for-</u>
 <u>sustainable-development-goals-launching-a-data-revolution-for-the-sdgs</u>.
- Xu, Z., Chau, S. N., Chen, X., Zhang, J., Li, Y., Dietz, T., Wang, J., Winkler, J.
 A., Fan, F., Huang, B. *et al.* (2020). Assessing progress towards sustainable
 development over space and time. Nature 577, 74-78.
- 551 35 Stadler, K., Wood, R., Bulavskaya, T., Södersten, C.-J., Simas, M., Schmidt, S.,
 552 Usubiaga, A., Acosta-Fernández, J., Kuenen, J., Bruckner, M. *et al.* (2018).
- 553 EXIOBASE 3: Developing a Time Series of Detailed Environmentally 554 Extended Multi-Regional Input-Output Tables. J. Ind. Ecol. 22, 502-515.

Supplementary Files

This is a list of supplementary files associated with this preprint. Click to download.

• SupplementaryInformation.docx