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Is the global ecosystem approaching a tipping point?
A glance at the Swiss consumption’s impact on global resources

If every person on Earth consumed like the average person in Switzerland, we would need 3.1 Earths.

Switzerland used up its territorial biocapacity for the year on April 10th. The Earth’s population will use up the Earth’s biocapacity on August 13th.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Switzerland National Deficit Day</th>
<th>April 10, 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earth Overshoot Day</td>
<td>August 13, 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Swiss consumption impact
Assessing performance against limit

CH Ecological Footprint of consumption as if the world biocapacity were the limit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Confidence in score</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clearly Unsafe</td>
<td>Large overrun</td>
<td>High by media &amp; politicians</td>
<td>Slow evolution so far</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CH per capita EF &gt;&gt; World</td>
<td>Medium to low by experts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>per capita Biocapacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After “Environmental Limits and Swiss Footprints Based on Planetary Boundaries”, FOEN, 2015
De-carbonize, baby, de-carbonize! vs. drill, baby, drill!
Die Vision

Decoupling of resource use from economic growth
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A Mandate for the CH Sustainable Development Strategy (1)

After discussing out the four usual fixers invoked by mainstream economists to cope with resource global issues:

• Scarce resource $\rightarrow$ increased **price** $\rightarrow$ substitution $\rightarrow$ Resilience
• Int. **Trade** $\rightarrow$ Resilience
• **Technology** $\rightarrow$ Resilience
• High **Income** $\rightarrow$ Resilience

We argued that “Tragedy of the Commons” and the collective action dilemma do not exhaust the subject

And that, therefore, there is still room for unilateral action at country level
In spite of international stalemate on Climate Change

Even long-sighted unilateral action without immediate co-benefits (like frontrunner standard-setting to control the country’s Ecological Footprint) would do a good job for CH competitiveness.
A Mandate for the CH Sustainable Development Strategy (2)

Due to budget limitation, we could not run an econometric model of CH and panel countries in order to simulate the shocks to competitiveness resulting from increasing global overshoot.

Instead, we empirically described the evolution over time for a number of ratios mixing macro-economic data and NFA data, looking at how CH compared with the panel.

We showed that CH is not always best in class as one would believe.
A Mandate for the CH Sustainable Development Strategy (3)

1. Retreat from the World (safe by quitting cut-throat competition)

2. Embrace Hyper-Growth (safe by outperforming others for ever)

3. Hedge your Bets! (safe by relying on emergency savings)

4. Less Butter, More Guns-Post-Oil Infrastructure (safe by investing now and ahead of others)

5. Forge Privileged Resource Relationships (safe by courting the resource-rich)
A Mandate for the CH Sustainable Development Strategy (4)

OUR CONCLUSION TO THE SWISS GOVERNMENT

Neither option is an obvious fix, which BTW doesn’t make ‘all of the above’ a better fix either!
Subnational and Sector Footprinting 1

Sector EF by Landtype: Genoa 2010

- Food
- Housing
- Personal Transportation
- Goods
- Services
- Government
- Gross Fixed Capital...

GHa per capita:
- Carbon
- Built up Land
- Fishing Grounds
- Forest Land
- Grazing Land
- Cropland
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EF Italy and Cities in 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>gha per capita</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palermo</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genoa</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- Gross Fixed Capital Formation
- Government
- Services
- Goods
- Personal Transportation
- Housing
- Food
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Deviation from Country EF

Naples  Palermo  Tel Aviv  Thessaloniki  Valencia  Marseille  Antalya  Rome  Tirana  Genoa  Izmir  Athens  Barcelona  Istanbul  Valletta  Tunis
Interpretation of the Results

Observation:
• Difference between the cities and the national average
• Difference between cities within the same country

Potential drivers of the differences:
• Income
• Geographic Conditions
• Culture
• Policies: e.g. Existing Infrastructure
Can PBs offer an additional framework for action? (beyond those already existing)

If **taking action against global warming** is really the mother of all battles, then:

“Klima-Wende” → “Energie-Wende” → “Ressourcen-Wende” (SWISSCLEANTECH Ressourcen-Strategie)

**Not the other way round!** In other words, the other PBs risk turning out ancillary or second priority.
Our Research Agenda

• Robustness of existing measure
• Assess Fragility/ Vulnerability of Biocapacity
• Link Biocapacity to Specific Resource Constraints/ PB
• Enhance understanding of international relationships
Eine Wagenladung an Themen ...

und nur wenige einfache Antworten!

Vielen Dank!