

Manuscript Details

Manuscript number	GEC_2018_60_R2
Title	Advancing the use of scenarios to understand society's capacity to achieve the 1.5 degree target
Article type	Research Paper

Abstract

With a range of potential pathways to a sustainable future compatible with the Paris Agreement 1.5°C target, scenario analysis has emerged as a key tool in studies of climate change mitigation and adaptation. A wide range of alternative scenarios have been created, and core amongst these are five socio-economic scenarios (Shared Socio-economic Pathways or SSPs) and four emission scenarios (Representative Concentration Pathways or RCPs). Whilst mitigation scenarios (the Shared Policy Assumptions, or SPAs) have been developed for each SSP-RCP combination, describing the actions necessary to match the climate pathway of the RCP, there has not yet been a systematic approach to address whether and how these actions can be enabled in practice. We present a novel and transferable framework to understand society's capacity to achieve the 1.5°C target, based on four participatory case studies using the SSP-RCP scenarios. The methodology builds on a framework for categorising different types of societal capitals and capacities and assessing their impact on the potential to implement different types of mitigation actions. All four case studies show that SSP1 has the highest potential to reach the target. Although environmental awareness is high in both SSP1 and SSP4, continued social inequalities in SSP4 restrict society's capacity to transform, despite economic growth. In the two least environmentally-aware SSPs, SSP3 and SSP5, the transformation potential is low, but the view on capitals and capacities nonetheless helps identify opportunities for actors to develop and implement mitigation actions. The study highlights that techno-economic assessments of climate strategies need to be complemented by consideration of the critical role played by social and human capital, and by societal capacity to mobilise and create these capitals despite different socio-economic trends. These capitals and capacities are essential to enable the rapid innovation, behavioural change and international co-ordination needed to achieve the 1.5°C target

Keywords	SSP-RCP scenarios; capitals; capacities; mitigation; transformation; 1.5 degree target
Corresponding Author	Simona Pedde
Corresponding Author's Institution	Wageningen University
Order of Authors	Simona Pedde, Kasper Kok, Katharina Hölscher, Niki Frantzeskaki, Ian Holman, Robert Dunford, Alison Smith, Jill Jaeger
Suggested reviewers	Karoliina Pilli-Sihvola, Calum Brown, Karen O'Brien, Kristie Ebi

Submission Files Included in this PDF

File Name [File Type]

Cover_letter.docx [Cover Letter]

Revision_15022019_final.docx [Response to Reviewers (without Author Details)]

Highlights.docx [Highlights]

Title_page_15022019_final.docx [Title Page (with Author Details)]

Manuscript_15022019_final.docx [Manuscript (without Author Details)]

Supplementary_material.docx [Supplementary Material]

To view all the submission files, including those not included in the PDF, click on the manuscript title on your EVISE Homepage, then click 'Download zip file'.

Research Data Related to this Submission

There are no linked research data sets for this submission. The following reason is given:
Data will be made available on request

Cover letter

We would like to submit our revised manuscript “Advancing the use of scenarios to understand society’s capacity to achieve the 1.5 degree target” to Global Environmental Change.

Our research advances the use of scenarios, the widely used applied Shared Socio-economic Pathways (SSPs) and Representative Concentration Pathways (RCPs), by developing regional and local versions to analyse the potential of society to transform conformly to a 1.5 degree world. We integrate the social science component in the SSPxRCP scenarios by developing and applying a methodology that systematically assess both societal capacities and capitals in the scenarios. Our results demonstrate that local and regional assessments may complement drivers of global environmental change, by identifying the enabling conditions of mitigation and transformation at multiple scales.

This research that was performed within the “IMPRESSIONS” project (<http://www.impressions-project.eu/>, Grant Agreement Number 603416). The full author team is part of this project and its strength consists in the strong interdisciplinarity and innovative collaboration within the project. This is also reflected in the manuscript development process, to which all co-authors fully contributed. We have no conflict of interests to declare.

We would like to thank the editor for allowing the extension of our review, largely due to the finalisation of the first author’s PhD thesis and new temporary employment and transfer abroad. Such an extension has resulted to be also contentwise timely, due to the recent publication of the 1.5°C IPCC Special Report. Because the report cannot be cited yet, we have incorporated reference to the recently approved Summary for Policymakers.

Last but not least, we thank the anonymous reviewers for their rich and constructive reviews. They have guided restructuring and rewriting of large parts of our manuscript. We hope that our revised manuscript will be considered for publication in Global Environmental Change.

Sincerely, on behalf of all authors,

Simona Pedde

-Reviewer 1

Comment 1). Thank you for the revisions, which considerably strengthened the manuscript. A few minor suggestions:

Response: Thank you for your comments. We agree that the manuscript has considerably improved.

Comment 2). Introduction. The IPCC SR1.5 did not present four alternative pathways; it presented four illustrative pathways. Overall, the introduction reads as if someone else wrote it. It is not as clear and is much more difficult to read. It would be very helpful to have a different member of the author team to go through the introduction to identify where language could be made clearer and more consistent. There are SSP / RCP combinations, which are then referred to as scenarios, without telling the reader that combinations = scenarios in this context. Further, it was acknowledged from the beginning that the SSPs were a tool for researchers. Citing a paper published at the same time as O'Neill et al. described the narratives is inappropriate. And is that information even important for this manuscript? It would be helpful to just focus on what is necessary for the rest of the manuscript.

Response: Many thanks for these comments. We corrected the terminology for the IPCC SR1.5 pathways as suggested. We also clarified what the SSP - RCP combinations are and called them consistently “combined SSP - RCP scenarios”. The author team have reviewed and revised the Introduction to increase its clarity, consistency and narrative flow. We agree that citing the O'Neill paper with another paper from 2015 is not appropriate. It is still a problem though that SSPs and RCPs are de facto still utilised to inform policy, also with policies developed at global scale as demonstrated by their emphasis in the IPCC SR1.5. Therefore, we maintained this point and substituted the reference to the SSP – RCP framework to a similar stance for the SSPs and RCPs which is reported in Moss et al. 2010.

Comment 3). I finally figured out figure 5, but it was a more of challenge than necessary. Two suggestions to increase its usefulness. The colors are darker than the text, so one's eye is drawn to the colors and not to the capacities. Making the capacities bold would be very helpful. Also, only one row in each mega row has information, so the results would be a lot more obvious if you only showed one row for Europe, Scotland, etc. You could keep the spacing (but making it not so tall), showing (for example), rows 1, 3, 3, 1 for Europe. That would keep this from looking so busy and empty, with the information you want to convey lost. Slightly increasing the size of the legend would make sure people understand that matrix.

Response: Many thanks for this advice. We changed the figure as suggested and fully agree that it is now much less busy and concise.

Comment 4). It would be appropriate to include in the discussion that a potential downside of the approach taken is it is intensive and therefore expensive, so can't be easily replicated without external human and financial resources.

Response: We included this point in the discussion, where the approach is highlighted as systematic but expensive.

-Reviewer 2

Comment 5). The authors have addressed my previous comments thoroughly, and I found the paper much clearer and more engaging this time. I just have a couple of small suggestions to make:

Response: We thank the reviewer for helping with his/her comments.

Comment 6). Section 3.2 seems a bit of a mix of results and discussion. I suspect it could be trimmed, and put into the discussion as a separate section there.

Response: We have re-framed the Results section and sub-sections to focus more clearly on the results. In particular, elements of the original Section 3.2 have been removed from the results and integrated into the discussion regarding global IAM studies

Comment 7). The Discussion is a little light on citations to relevant work, and I wonder whether there's more in the social science literature that could be brought out here? You mention the link to social science in the conclusion, but don't really illustrate it in any detail at the moment. I suspect there are a number of discussions or even specific criticisms of model-based research you could refer to, to illustrate the way in which your approach can link the two fields. I'd appreciate a little more of this general reflection on how more robust methods can be developed, using qualitative and quantitative approaches, and think you could lose some of the more results-focused discussion to make room for it.

Response: We have included additional references in the Discussion to demonstrate the need for including qualitative approaches and scale up knowledge to inform global assessments.

References

Moss, R.H., Edmonds, J.A., Hibbard, K.A., Manning, M.R., Rose, S.K., van Vuuren, D.P., Carter, T.R., Emori, S., Kainuma, M., Kram, T., Meehl, G.A., Mitchell, J.F.B., Nakicenovic, N., Riahi, K., Smith, S.J., Stouffer, R.J., Thomson, A.M., Weyant, J.P., Wilbanks, T.J. (2010) The next generation of scenarios for climate change research and assessment. 463, 747-756.

Highlights

- We present a framework combining capitals and capacities within SSPxRCP scenarios
- Capitals and capacities are needed for society to move towards the 1.5°C target
- Locally derived capitals and capacities complement global mitigation scenarios
- Social equality is more important than technological development to achieve the 1.5°C target
- “Business-as-usual” SSP5 has potential only if capitals and capacities are high

Advancing the use of scenarios to understand society's capacity to achieve the 1.5 degree target

Simona Pedde^{1†}, Kasper Kok¹, Katharina Hölscher², Niki Frantzeskaki², Ian Holman³, Rob Dunford⁴, Alison Smith⁴ and Jill Jäger⁶

¹ Soil Geography and Landscape Group, Wageningen University, Droevendaalsesteeg 3, 6708 PB Wageningen, The Netherlands; email: kasper.kok@wur.nl; phone: +31317482422

² Dutch Research Institute For Transitions (DRIFT), Faculty of Social Sciences, Erasmus University Rotterdam, Burgemeester Oudlaan 50, 4000 DR, Rotterdam, The Netherlands; emails: holscher@drift.eur.nl and frantzeskaki@drift.eur.nl; phone: +31104081457 and +31104088674

³ Cranfield Water Science Institute, Cranfield University, Cranfield MK43 0AL, UK; email: i.holman@cranfield.ac.uk; phone: +441234758277

⁴ Environmental Change Institute, University of Oxford, Dyson Perrins Building, South Parks Road, Oxford, OX1 3QY, UK; emails: robert.dunford@ouce.ox.ac.uk and alison.smith@ouce.ox.ac.uk; phone: +441865285183 and +441865285534

⁵ Independent scholar, Vienna, Austria; email: jill.jaeger@speed.at; phone: +436763015095

† Author for correspondence: S. Pedde; email: simona.pedde@wur.nl; phone: +31317483029

Acknowledgement

The research was financially supported by the IMPRESSIONS project, funded by the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme for research, technological development and demonstration under Grant Agreement Number 603416. We also thank the two anonymous reviewers for their valuable comments

Advancing the use of scenarios to understand society's capacity to achieve the 1.5 degree target

Abstract

With a range of potential pathways to a sustainable future compatible with the Paris Agreement 1.5°C target, scenario analysis has emerged as a key tool in studies of climate change mitigation and adaptation. A wide range of alternative scenarios have been created, and core amongst these are five socio-economic scenarios (Shared Socio-economic Pathways or SSPs) and four emission scenarios (Representative Concentration Pathways or RCPs). Whilst mitigation scenarios (the Shared Policy Assumptions, or SPAs) have been developed for each SSP-RCP combination, describing the actions necessary to match the climate pathway of the RCP, there has not yet been a systematic approach to address whether and how these actions can be enabled in practice.

We present a novel and transferable framework to understand society's capacity to achieve the 1.5°C target, based on four participatory case studies using the SSP-RCP scenarios. The methodology builds on a framework for categorising different types of societal capitals and capacities and assessing their impact on the potential to implement different types of mitigation actions. All four case studies show that SSP1 has the highest potential to reach the target. Although environmental awareness is high in both SSP1 and SSP4, continued social inequalities in SSP4 restrict society's capacity to transform, despite economic growth. In the two least environmentally-aware SSPs, SSP3 and SSP5, the transformation potential is low, but the view on capitals and capacities nonetheless helps identify opportunities for actors to develop and implement mitigation actions.

The study highlights that techno-economic assessments of climate strategies need to be complemented by consideration of the critical role played by social and human capital, and by societal capacity to mobilise and create these capitals despite different socio-economic trends. These capitals and capacities are essential to enable the rapid innovation, behavioural change and international co-ordination needed to achieve the 1.5°C target.

Keywords: SSP-RCP scenarios; capitals; capacities; mitigation; transformation; 1.5 degree target

1. Introduction

The ambition of the Paris climate agreement to limit global temperature increase to 1.5°C by 2100 creates a pressing demand to find ways to achieve this goal (Hulme, 2016; Rogelj et al., 2016). The IPCC special report on the 1.5°C target presents four illustrative pathways, which all involve major transformation of the energy system together with large-scale changes to human behaviour and land-use (IPCC, 2018). These changes pose major political challenges, and some authors argue that the 1.5°C target will be unattainable without resorting to high-risk, large-scale geo-engineering (Akimoto et al., 2017). Others, however, claim that limiting global temperature increases to 1.5°C is possible through action-led, societal transformation (Hermwille, 2016; O'Brien, 2015; Rockström et al., 2017; Tàbara et al., 2013; Tàbara et al., 2018a, Westley et al., 2011).

With such different potential pathways to a sustainable future, scenario analysis has emerged as a key tool in studies of climate change mitigation and adaptation, and a wide range of alternative socio-economic and climate scenarios have been created (Akimoto et al., 2017; Friedlingstein et al., 2014; Rogelj et al., 2016; Rogelj et al., 2009; Rogelj et al., 2015). Core amongst these are the five socio-economic scenarios (Shared Socio-economic Pathways or SSPs) and four emission scenarios (Representative Concentration Pathways or RCPs), which have been developed in parallel (Moss et al., 2010) and are intended to be independent yet complementary (O'Neill et al., 2016; van Vuuren et al., 2014). The RCPs describe the evolution of future greenhouse gas concentrations and associated climate impacts without any assumptions on mitigation actions. The SSPs explore different socio-economic futures and the challenges they present for climate mitigation and adaptation (O'Neill et al., 2015) as socio-economic factors enable or constrain the actions needed to meet climate and sustainability targets (O'Neill et al., 2016). For example, scenarios including high investment in green technology and low energy demand reduce the additional effort required for climate mitigation, whereas scenarios assuming high levels of human well-being and flexible institutions may enable easier adaptation to climate change (O'Neill et al., 2017). For each SSP, a baseline scenario describes a future socio-economic trajectory assuming no climate change and no additional climate policy actions (Riahi et al., 2017). For each SSP-RCP combination, a set of internally-consistent Shared Policy Assumptions (SPAs) has been developed that describes the additional mitigation actions that would need to be taken (beyond the SSP baseline) to match the climate pathway of the RCP (Riahi et al., 2017).

Whilst the SSP-RCP scenario matrix has been designed to be relevant to end-users (such as decision-makers, policymakers and practitioners) and consistent with climate policy assumptions (Carlsen et al., 2013; Kriegler et al., 2014; Kriegler et al., 2012), there are limits to its utility in decision-making contexts for several reasons. Firstly, the new scenarios were not designed as a direct tool for policy-makers, but rather for researchers to produce climate assessments that will then be shared with policy-makers (Moss et al. 2010). As a result, policy-makers report “poor understandability of scenario data” (Pilli-Sihvola et al., 2015). Secondly, the global SSPs may not be suitable for use in all applications (e.g. a different spatial scale or context)” (Nilsson et al., 2017). Thirdly, such externally-created scenarios may not be well connected to the users’ worldviews, impacting their understanding of and buy-in to the scenarios (Lempert, 2013). There is therefore a need to better connect the knowledge of climate researchers and policy-makers (Klein and Juhola, 2014; Pilli-Sihvola et al., 2015) in order for the new scenarios to inform better adaptation and mitigation planning.

In this study, we advance the use of combined SSP-RCP scenarios to explore systematically future society’s ability to achieve the 1.5°C target, by identifying the *potential* to transform as a function of capitals and capacities in the SSP-RCP combinations. Our methodology identifies the elements that ‘enable’ climate action in each SSP through an assessment of i) five capital stocks available for society to draw upon (human, social, natural, financial and manufactured capital), and ii) four types of agency capacities (stewarding, unlocking, transforming and orchestrating) through which actors are able to leverage these capitals and enact change. To this end, we developed and applied a novel, cross-scale and transferable approach combining capitals (as indicators of the material and non-material resources available) with actors’ collective capacities for change, consistent with each combined SSP-RCP scenario for a series of nested case studies from global to European sub-national scales. We discuss how

this framework of capitals and capacities provides relevant information to decision-makers on the possible future challenges and opportunities associated with the 1.5°C target.

2. Methodology

This study builds on the SSP-RCP framework to identify how different scenarios enable or constrain the achievement of the 1.5°C target, for each of four case studies. We start with the recognition that the 1.5°C target requires strong action, involving not just technological and social development but also institutional change, behavioural change and land-use change, consistent with the level of mitigation action reported in integrated assessments globally (Riahi et al., 2017) and regionally (van der Zwaan et al., 2016). The IPCC Special Report on 1.5°C highlights the importance of this framework, by stating that “strengthened multi-level governance, institutional capacity, policy instruments, technological innovation and transfer and mobilization of finance, and changes in human behaviour and lifestyles are enabling conditions that enhance the feasibility of achieving the 1.5°C target” (IPCC, 2018). This recognition requires moving beyond the original distinction between “challenges to adaptation and challenges to mitigation” that defines the uncertainty space of the SSPs, and adopting a more holistic approach geared towards understanding what the SSPs mean for achieving fundamental societal transformation (Westley et al., 2011; Feola, 2015; Hermwille, 2016; Gillard et al., 2016; IPCC 2018).

Societal transformations are ultimately driven by different actors – both individuals or organisations representing different societal spheres (governments, communities, market and third sector) – who consciously or unconsciously act to change the state of human and natural systems (O'Brien, 2015; 2016; Avelino and Wittmayer, 2016). As these actors are embedded within societal structures (e.g. formal and informal institutions, social networks, resource distribution), their capacities are manifest in the extent to which they are able to mobilise, create and change these structures (Giddens, 1979) – in terms of institutions, resources, networks etc. We therefore base our methodology on assessing two key sets of indicators:

1. Stocks of five types of capital: human, social, natural, manufactured and financial, with a focus on human and social capital because they underpin the potential for transformational societal change;
2. Four types of capacity that give actors the agency to mobilise, create and change the stocks of these five capitals: stewarding, unlocking, transforming, orchestrating.

The main goal of our methodology is to identify which stocks of capital can be mobilised by which types of actors in each scenario combination. Whether and how actors are able to mobilise capitals is analysed by drawing on a systematic framework of their capacities for transformation (Hölscher et al., 2018a). The actors are identified inductively in the scenario narratives, and are integrated into the capacity analysis.

The first step of our methodology was to link the capitals and capacities to potential mitigation actions in a theoretical framework (Section 2.1). We then applied this framework within four case-studies (Section 2.2). In the results (Section 3) we interpret the joint impact of the capacities and capitals on the potential for society to meet

the 1.5°C target under each scenario, and show how these findings relate to Integrated Assessment Modelling approaches.

2.1. Capital stocks and societal capacities that constrain and enable actions towards the 1.5°C target

“Capitals” are defined as stocks yielding a benefit valued by humans (Porritt, 2007). The concept of capitals is useful for providing information on the enabling conditions in scenarios. They are straightforward (Tinch et al., 2015) and provide a more systemic understanding than economic- or population-based indicators. In this study, we consider five capitals: human (education, knowledge, health), social (individual relationships, societal trust, institutions and networks), manufactured (technology and infrastructure), natural (ecosystems) and financial (markets) (Jäger et al., 2015; Porritt, 2007; Tinch et al., 2015).

Whether and how the capital stocks can be mobilised, created and changed to achieve the 1.5°C target essentially depends on questions of agency (Westley et al. 2011, Gillard et al., 2016). In other words, *who* in the scenario narrative has *abilities* to mobilise, create and change societal structures (e.g. formal and informal institutions, social networks), knowledge, beliefs and resources for developing and implementing strategies and actions (Garud et al. 2007; Boyd et al. 2014; Westley et al., 2013). We employ the concept of capacities for understanding the abilities of actors in the scenarios to effectively mobilise, create and change capital stocks. At the same time, capital stocks can constrain or enable actors in using their capacities.

Different types of capacities can be identified that fulfil distinct functions for developing and implementing transformative strategies and responding to different types of transformation dynamics: stewarding, unlocking, transforming and orchestrating (Table 1) (Hölscher et al. 2018a; Hölscher et al. 2018b). These capacities build on a literature review of sustainability transitions and resilience approaches that are concerned with transformative change and agency (Grin et al., 2010; Loorbach et al., 2017; Folke 2016; Olsson et al., 2014; Westley et al., 2013). The three *levels* of capacity defined in Table 1 are based on the authors’ interpretation and synthesis of the literature review and are subsequently used during the scenario analysis (see Section 2.2).

Table 1: Interpretation of capacities to measure enabling and disabling conditions in combined SSP-RCP scenarios. The literature reviewed to assess the level of capacity is indicated in column 1, below the definition of each capacity

Capacities	Low	Medium	High
Stewarding (Ability to anticipate, protect and recover from disturbances while exploiting opportunities beneficial for sustainability) (Chapin et al., 2010;	-Low social cohesion. -Risk-numb: No desire for long-term planning and reactive risk management. -Coping, no reflexivity.	-Communities of interest without collective identity. -Risk-averse: Mid-term planning to control risk. -Fragmented know-how (without knowledge integration).	-Strong social networks and supportive social contexts. -Proactive long-term integrated planning. Risk taking and uncertainty embracing. -Collective memory and learning (reflexivity, integration of knowledge).

Folke et al., 2005; Garmestani and Benson, 2013)			
Unlocking (Ability to recognise and dismantle drivers of unsustainability and path-dependencies) (Geels, 2014; Kivimaa and Kern, 2016)	-Acceptance and support of existing institutions, values and practices. -Powerful interest networks to maintain status quo.	-Uncoordinated counter-movements. -Competing interest networks along with weaker counter-networks.	-No support for status-quo. -Effective opposition networks.
Transforming (Ability to create novelties and embed them in practices) (Frantzeskaki et al., 2012; Raven et al. 2010; Westley et al., 2013)	-Low investments in and no leadership for innovation.	-Innovation and competition for specific interests.	-Leadership for innovation. -Learning from tested solutions (e.g upscaling and replicating).
Orchestrating (Ability to coordinate multi-actor processes to maximise synergies) (Chan et al., 2015; Frantzeskaki et al., 2014; Hodson and Marvin, 2010)	-No shared development goals and frameworks. -Low collaboration across scales and sectors. -No transparency in decision-making.	-Shared and long-term development goals between small groups. -Collaboration limited by competition across scales and sectors. -Good governance but no political culture.	-Shared and long-term development goals -Collaboration across scales and sectors. -Good governance, with engaged political culture.

The theoretical framework facilitates the integration of human and societal dimensions of agency (via the capacities) into the analysis of adaptation, mitigation and transformation. To do this, we divide actions into four broad categories: technological, institutional, lifestyle and land-based, based on expert judgement of our interdisciplinary authorship team. In our framework, these categories each depend on a different mix of capital stocks, and require the relevant actors and capacities to mobilise these stocks (Figure 1). Using mitigation action as an example, technological mitigation involves developing and investing in new and improved technologies such as energy supply and energy efficiency, carbon capture and storage and (in some scenarios) ‘geo-engineering’, requiring high stocks of financial and manufactured capital as well as social and human capital for technical expertise. This therefore links with the transformative capacity for innovation and learning (capacity “T” in Figure 1). Institutional action includes governance-related actions such as taxation, regulation and market reform (e.g. carbon trading). Lifestyle change includes individual and collective actions that reduce demand for energy and resources, including dietary change and waste avoidance. Both institutional and lifestyle change require high levels of social and human capital. To mobilise these capitals towards institutional change, all four capacities are required. For individual lifestyle change, the focus is on the capacity to build flexible networks of individuals (stewarding), social innovation (transforming) and effective counter-movements (unlocking). Land-based mitigation (including

reduced emissions from agriculture, increased carbon storage and sequestration in soils and vegetation, and bioenergy with or without carbon capture and storage) requires integrated, co-ordinated and long term planning as well as know-how (stewarding, transformative and orchestrating capacities).

The crucial point in the framework is that the level of societal transformation required to meet the 1.5°C target cannot be achieved through only one type of action, e.g. technological action alone, due to spillovers and trade-offs (IPCC, 2018). According to this reasoning, mobilising capital stocks to enable the full spectrum of actions requires all four types of capacity. However, the societal context (in this study, the combined SSP-RCP scenarios) determines which capacities and which types of action will be feasible.

Action Types	Capitals					Actors				Capacities			
Technological	S	H	N	F	M	G	C	M	T	S	U	T	O
Institutional	S	H	N	F	M	G	C	M	T	S	U	T	O
Life-style	S	H	N	F	M	G	C	M	T	S	U	T	O
Land-based	S	H	N	F	M	G	C	M	T	S	U	T	O

Figure 1: Elements of the theoretical framework to analyse the potential to reach the 1.5°C target. Capitals are social (S), human (H), natural (N), financial (F), manufactured (M). Actors are governments (G), communities (C), markets (M), third sectors such as NGOs and research (T). Capacities are: stewarding (S), unlocking (U), transformative (T), orchestrating (O). The darker shaded cells with bold lettering are capitals, actors and capacities which are most influential in determining the effectiveness of a given mitigation type

2.2 Case studies: participatory development of SSPs for the European region, Iberia, Hungary and Scotland

This theoretical framework has been applied in four case studies: Europe as a whole (the 2013 EU 27 plus Switzerland and Norway); Scotland, the Iberian Peninsula (Spain and Portugal) and two municipalities in Hungary. SSPs were co-produced with stakeholders for each case study: the ‘Eur-SSPs’ for Europe and the three ‘local SSPs’: Scottish, Iberian and Hungarian.

The European and Scottish case studies focus on the cross-sectoral impacts of land-use and climate change, linking urbanisation, agriculture, water resources, forestry and biodiversity sectors (Kok et al. 2017a; Harrison et al. 2018). Both European and Scottish case studies build from previous scenario work in the CLIMSAVE project (Harrison et al. 2015; Holman et al. 2016) and have been further developed to include the socio-economic and climate drivers of the SSPs and RCPs (Kok et al. 2017a). The Iberian and Hungarian case studies focus on the sectors and impacts that are more relevant to local societal interests. For Iberia the focus is on impacts on agro-forest systems and governance of transboundary river basins (Tàbara et al. 2018b) while for Hungary the focus is on impacts of population dynamics on urban land-use and health (Li et al. 2018).

The scenarios have been developed by engaging stakeholders to develop the scenario narratives and review the analyses (Tàbara et al. 2018b), therefore ensuring that scenarios are diverse enough to be relevant for and driven by stakeholders but still comparable in terms of structure and process.

In line with van Ruijven et al. (2014), the local SSPs are consistent with the global SSPs, while allowing for specific characteristics, depending on the stakeholders' choice of key drivers of change and their interpretation of the global and Eur-SSPs. The local and Eur-SSPs describe a range of challenges to adaptation and mitigation, which have been interpreted as varying levels of inequality and carbon intensity (Figure 2). Eur-SSP1 and Eur-SSP5 develop into relatively inclusive societies, whereas Eur-SSP3 and Eur-SSP4 are highly unequal. Eur-SSP1 and Eur-SSP4 are less carbon-intensive than Eur-SSP3 and Eur-SSP5. A European SSP2 was not developed as it was interpreted to converge to the average of the other scenarios, and therefore was less suitable than the other SSPs for identifying alternative capacities and challenges. We refer to Kok and Pedde (2016) for the Eur-SSPs and local SSPs and to the Supplementary Material for the sketch of all the SSP narratives for all case studies.




Figure 2: Interpretation of challenges to adaptation (inequality) and mitigation (carbon intensity) of the European SSPs

The Eur-SSPs and local European SSPs combined with the respective RCP can be used to structure “what could happen” and map the trend onto a theoretical space in time (until 2100) and to show the distance from “what do we want”, i.e. the 1.5°C target (Figure 3). The combining of each SSP with an RCP was based on the challenges to mitigation. SSP1 and SSP4 have lower challenges to mitigation so they were combined with RCP4.5, while SSP3 and SSP5 were combined with RCP8.5.




Figure 3: Conceptualisation of scenarios as context to develop mitigation and adaptation pathways to reach a desired vision in 2100.
The actions to develop sustainable pathways towards the vision build from the scenario and are scenario-contextualised in time.

This conceptualisation is consistent with the original separation between SSPs and SPAs. Actions (SPAs) are not included in our combined SSP-RCP scenarios but are enabled or constrained by the differing capacities of the actors and capitals in each SSP-RCP combination. In this reasoning, SSP-RCP represents the societal potential to transform, and the SPAs represent societal action towards transformation. The SSP-RCP context thus needs to contain information on what conditions exist to enable (or constrain) the additional actions needed to reach the 1.5°C target.

The participatory process to develop the Eur-SSPs and local SSPs consisted of workshops in which stakeholders addressed the exploratory question: “what could happen?” (Börjeson et al. 2006). The workshops were professionally facilitated (Gramberger et al. 2015) and used an analytical method for analysing qualitative and semi-quantitative variables in order to bridge qualitative and quantitative scenarios (Pedde et al. 2018). As part of this, the level (low-medium-high) of each type of capital was defined for each scenario in each of three time-slices (2010-2040, 2041-2070 and 2071-2100). The trends in capitals are reported in Supplementary Material and categorised in Figure 4.

Subsequently, the scenario narratives were interpreted to qualitatively assess the capacities against the categories and levels of capacities of Table 1. The capacities interpreted for each scenario narrative were then combined with the stakeholder-derived capital trends to assess the potential of society to transform to achieve the 1.5°C target. The potential was then interpreted against the categories of mitigation actions to define what mitigation is feasible and this was compared with potential identified with the global SSP-RCP mitigation pathways (Riahi et al., 2017).

3. Results: Capacities and capitals in SSPs

3.1 Availability of capitals and capacities across SSPs

The results show the levels of capacities and capitals available in the SSPs to transform society to function consistently with the requirements to achieve the 1.5°C target. The availability of capitals and capacities in each case study is summarised in Figure 4.

	Region	Capitals					Storyline	Capacities			
		H	S	M	F	N		S	T	O	U
SSP1	Europe						High commitment to achieve sustainable development goals through effective governments and global cooperation, ultimately resulting in less inequality and less resource intensive lifestyles				
	Scotland						Effective regulation ("communitarianism"), stable but slower economic growth and social participation lead to a sustainable Scotland				
	Iberia						Triggered by continuing and growing social participation in environmental, social, and economic issues and fuelled by a European social-oriented political framework, Iberia embraces a path towards a new development model				
	Hungary						A transparent and multi-level governance leads to a prosperous and greener Hungary characterised by local circular economies and integration in Europe				
SSP3	Region	H	S	M	F	N	Storyline	S	T	O	U
	Europe						Sparked by economic woes in major economies and regional conflict, antagonism between and within regional blocs increases, resulting in the disintegration of social fabric and many countries struggling to maintain living standards				
	Scotland						Driven by resource pressure and migration, rivalry between social groups explodes, resulting in feudal-like systems where the have-nots work to provide the haves. Everyone learns to live with less				
	Iberia						Short-lived governments lead to a fragmentation of the social and economic fabric in Iberia				
	Hungary						Hungary finds itself in a 'war zone' between competing regional powers. A day-to-day mentality establishes. This leads to social fragmentation, stratification and sectarianism.				
SSP4	Region	H	S	M	F	N	Storyline	S	T	O	U
	Europe						Globally, power and economic opportunities concentrate in a relatively small political and business elite, leading to substantial proportions of populations having a low level of development. Europe, as a whole, becomes an important player in a world full of tensions				
	Scotland						The private sector gains political power and the country is ruled by few multinationals. Wealthy live in eco-communities, while social unrest slowly takes over, resulting in the revolutionary "tartan spring"				
	Iberia						Higher inequalities lead to substantial proportions of the population having a low level of development and a "subtle" enforcement of inequality, while an increase in renewable energies business is very lucrative for the political elite				
	Hungary						With social inequalities and power centralisation on the rise, Hungary becomes a socio-economically stratified country. Resources are scarce for the have nots. Local communities self-organise at the periphery of an elitist regime				
SSP5	Region	H	S	M	F	N	Storyline	S	T	O	U
	Europe						Competitive markets, innovation and participatory societies produce rapid technological progress and development of human capital as the path to sustainable development. A lack of environmental concern leads to the exploitation of abundant fossil fuel resources				
	Scotland						Establishment of for-profit publically owned energy companies, such as Statoil and the Scotland Energy Corporation (SEC), leads to high revenues, redistributed with egalitarian social policies. High employment and population growth, but higher pressure on the environment				
	Iberia						Iberia becomes dependent on technology, fossil fuels, subsidies from the EU and gas from northern Africa, and investments of large corporations. Eventually this development model collapses				
	Hungary						Economic growth and rigid governance schemes hook Hungary to fossil fuel development model. Eventually, this leads to environmental degradation and atomizing society: Hungary ends in turmoil				

Figure 4: Overview of the SSP analysis for four case studies ("regions") with levels of capitals and capacities indicated by the colour: green=high; orange=medium; red=low; white=not quantified. Capitals are social (S), human (H), natural (N), financial (F), manufactured (M). Capacities are: stewarding (S), unlocking (U), transformative (T), orchestrating (O).

In all case studies, SSP1 achieves the highest capitals and capacities because of the active participation of all types of actors (market, research, government and third sector) towards sustainability. In the Eur-SSP1, strong international cooperation and institutions, most importantly the political integration of European countries in view of shared sustainability priorities, enable the establishment of multi-level governance and an early shift towards a sustainability focus. European institutions also play a positive role in enabling a strong early push towards sustainability in the Hungarian and Iberian SSP1 (a “European social framework” in Iberia and the European Union in Hungary), in combination with bottom-up participation and municipality-level sustainability-oriented investments and governance. Only in the Scottish SSP1 the trigger towards sustainability is not directly enabled by the European Union but rather by the Scottish government.

The rapid transition towards sustainability in SSP1 leads to the maintenance and further steady creation of capacities until 2100. Societal and environmental awareness is generated early in the scenario, resulting in high levels of human and social capital and thus in high orchestrating, transformative and stewarding capacity. The unlocking capacity that has supported the establishment of effective counter-movements and social innovation decreases towards 2100, as the new sustainability paradigm is established and the importance of opposition networks decreases.

In SSP3, capacities and capitals decline in all case studies. The cause of the overall decrease of capacities is the focus on short-term governance, weak leadership and low investment for innovation. The lack of reflexivity and learning from tested solutions results in generally low stewarding, transformative and orchestrating capacities, apart from in the Scottish case study, where governance and innovation are managed by large companies. However, unlocking capacity brings the potential for novel networks, unconstrained by top-down enforcement given the lack of leadership. The potential for a reversal of the status-quo is limited by the general lack of coordination and competing interests of counter-movements.



In SSP4, capacities tend to average at medium level for two main reasons: societal fragmentation and a combination of low capacity for local actors with higher capacity of actors at national or European level. In Europe, Iberia and Scotland, powerful multinationals exert a stabilising influence which enables cooperation (orchestrating capacity) and innovation (transformative capacity). These capacities are however exercised in a very top-down manner due to the concentration of power, and learning is limited due to competition, political and economic power-grabbing and large-scale social exclusion. In Hungary, social networks and reflexive learning together with the existence of counter-movements until 2070 generate high stewarding and unlocking capacity, enabling communities to push for sustainability and resilience. At national level, however, the focus is on day to day survival and coping, low investments, and rigid top-down maintenance of status throughout the whole scenario, de facto decreasing the potential of local actors.

SSP5 shows the greatest variation of capitals and capacities between case studies. Natural capital is low in all SSP5 case studies, while human and social capitals are high in Europe and Iberia but low in Scotland and Hungary. Although all SSP5 case studies share the common traits of economic development and social equality, the effect of individualism, economic growth (linked to high resource exploitation and consumption) and environmental

damage were perceived differently in different case studies. Scotland and Iberia end up with medium unlocking capacity, consistent with lack of support for the status-quo and effective opposition. Because other capacities and/or capitals are limited, overall potential remains close to “medium”, except for Europe (and Scotland, to an extent) where potential is “high” due to the availability of knowledge, capitals, technology and preparedness to shift to “re-emergence of investments in renewables” when needed.

3.2 Potential to transform

In Figure 5, we show the overall potential of Eur-SSPs to transform societies towards a 1.5°C -consistent world as a function of capitals and capacities. Letters representing each of the four capacities (S, U, T, O) are plotted on a scale of high-medium-low (according to the definitions in Table 1) on the x-axis, and their position on the y-axis is determined by the combined level of human and social capital (the capitals that underpin social transformation). The colour of the boxes indicates how these levels of capitals and capacities combine to determine society’s overall potential to achieve the 1.5°C target in each scenario, from “very low” to “very high”. For example, in the Eur-SSP1 the potential for achieving the 1.5°C target is “very high” as a result of “high” social and human capitals, “high” stewarding, orchestrating and transformative capacity and “medium” unlocking capacity; whereas Eur-SSP3 results in “low” potential because of overall “low” capitals, “low” stewarding and orchestrating capacity, “medium”



Legend: the potential of societies to transform consistently with a 1.5°C world

Figure 5: Analysis of the potential to transform society to function consistently with the requirements to achieve a 1.5°C world for each Shared Socio-economic Pathway (SSP) as a result of the combination of different levels of capitals and capacities in each case study in 2100. The capacities assessed are stewarding (S), unlocking (U), transformative (T) and orchestrating (O). Their position on the y axis depends on the combined level of human and social capital.

Because of the high levels of both capacities and capitals, SSP1 has generally “very high” potential to transform. However, because people are generally more satisfied with this world and there is less impetus for transformative change, this manifests in medium unlocking and “high” (rather than “very high”) transformative capacities. In contrast, SSP3 has “very low” or “low” potential in all case studies, as the capitals and capacities are low due to the power of “elites” coupled with conflicts and disparities. However stewarding, unlocking and orchestrating capacity can grow –as people organise themselves into communities of interest to counter the status quo, and to share resources such as food (as in the Hungarian and Scottish case studies). This provides some stability and decreases conflict, albeit with larger inequalities than at present. In the Eur-SSP3, the European Union collapses but “richer (ex) Member States” can still afford clean technology, clean water, energy and health services.

SSP4 tends to have “low” or “medium” potential across all case studies. This is because cohesion, collaboration and networks exist within social classes (unlike the more conflictual SSP3 scenarios). Capacities and capitals are high for the elite, who adopt green technology, but low for the majority. This stratification and social exclusion limit the capitals and capacities, and thus the overall potential to transform. Despite generally having higher capitals than SSP3, due to more stability and economic growth, the overall potential of SSP4 is similar to or only slightly higher than SSP3 because the capacities tend to change little over time.

The SSP5 potential, in contrast, ranges from “very low” to “very high”. In Europe and Scotland high stewarding and transformative capacity are available, as risk-taking and uncertainty are embraced and innovation is embedded. However, the lack of engaged political culture tends to reduce the potential in all case studies. A U-turn towards sustainability emerges in all SSP5 case studies by 2100, but this happens smoothly in Europe and Scotland whereas in Hungary and Iberia, with lower transformative potential, the transition is much more chaotic.

In summary, these results show important differences in the way in which capacities are manifested both between case studies and between SSPs. For example, in SSP5 (and to some extent in SSP4) transformative capacities enable large-scale deployment of high-tech solutions, whereas in SSP3 unlocking and orchestrating capacities can grow and enable low-technology community-based action and social innovation.

4. Discussion

4.1 Lessons learned: understanding potential in scenarios

In the theoretical framework we have assumed that the capacities of actors to mobilise capitals can explain the potential to achieve the 1.5°C target. The results have shown that using the combined capitals-capacities framework allowed us to systematically identify the enabling and constraining conditions in the scenarios. This results in further enriching the understanding of the scenarios, with the capitals-capacities framework acting as the bridging framework between scenarios and policy.

The analysis of capitals and capacities within the locally derived European scenarios reinforces the ability of SSP1 to deliver mitigation to meet RCP2.6, and confirms the finding that SSP3 is unlikely to be able to meet RCP2.6

(Riahi et al. 2017), unless the turbulence in the scenario leads to major institutional and lifestyle changes (Marquart-Pyatt et al. 2014, Longhurst et al. 2016, Schanes et al. 2018). For SSP4 and SSP5, which rely mainly on technological and land-based mitigation, the analysis raises doubts over the ability of society to deliver the level of mitigation required to achieve RCP2.6, given the relatively weak and uneven levels of human and social capital and governance capacity. To meet the 1.5°C target, even higher levels of mitigation would be required, which emphasises that only SSP1 might have a good chance of meeting this target.

It is worth noting that the IAM modelling of the global SSP-RCP scenarios reported in Riahi et al. (2017) is intended as a reference case on which further analysis of climate impacts and adaptation can be built, and therefore does not consider the feedback effects of climate change on socio-economic systems (e.g. via impacts on ecosystems, energy systems, infrastructure or health). Given that some level of warming is implicit in all scenarios, even those which eventually achieve a RCP2.6 or 1.5°C target (possibly after overshoot), these potential negative feedbacks are significant. Consideration of the capitals and capacities framework helps to illustrate that climate change could negatively affect all five types of capital, which could further reduce the chances of reaching climate targets. The SSP1 scenario, which acts early and strongly to limit climate change and does not rely on overshoot followed by negative emissions, is likely to minimise these negative climate feedback effects and maximise the chances of successful mitigation. The choice of mitigation action could also create positive or negative feedbacks on capacity, as with the example of high food prices for SSP4 reported in Popp et al. (2017). Again, SSP1 with its focus on reduced demand for resources minimises this type of impact. Similarly, high levels of capital and capacity will foster more effective adaptation to climate impacts, which in turn will reduce the damage from climate change.

The four “mitigation types” used in our framework are derived from macro-scale mitigation studies, such as van Vuuren et al. (2008), Riahi et al. (2017) and Fujimori et al. (2018). In local SSPs, the boundaries between those types become more blurred. In future assessments, the categories need to be explicitly assessed to capture the full potential of SSPs. For example, the results of SSP5 show that, in spite of lower potential for institutional and lifestyle change, there could be potential for actors to move towards the goal in ways that are (1) not covered by the categories or (2) fall between the categories. It is therefore necessary to inform global assessments with results from continental and local case studies (Kok et al. 2017b, Rosa et al. 2017, Obermeister et al. 2018) and increase the relevance of mitigation at multiple levels.

However, there was some conceptual mismatch between the results in Figures 4 and 5 and our framework of capacities (Figure 1). The main mismatch was for the stewarding capacity in SSP1 and SSP5. With low challenges to adaptation and mitigation, SSP1 implies some level of transformation towards the 1.5°C target. However the stewarding capacity inferred from analysis of the stakeholder-derived scenario did not fit perfectly in either the “medium” or “high” category in our framework (Table 1). This mismatch results from the normative conceptualisation of the capacities as ideal-type conditions and actor abilities, while the SSPs outline very divergent socio-economic scenarios. We nevertheless show that the application of the framework enriches the for understanding potential in scenarios, by providing overarching analytical categories.

The mismatches between capacity categories and challenges to mitigation and adaptation assumptions behind the European SSPs can be explained by the uncertainty due to (1) the interpretative nature of the capacity categories and (2) the diverging worldviews and opinions on the social challenges to sustainability and the 1.5°C target. Although studies such as Rockström et al. (2017) suggest clear decadal steps to be undertaken at global level for the road to 1.5°C target, the sub-global level shows diverging opinions because different beliefs and stakes are accounted for in order to enable the (global) action. This study adds the capitals and capacities dimensions to the SSP-RCP framework to complement actor-based, participatory approaches (Klein and Juhola, 2014), narratives-only approaches (Nilsson et al., 2017) and fully empirical studies that cannot be directly applicable in other geographical areas or sectors (Chaudhury et al., 2013; Vervoort et al., 2014). Because the approach is systematic, it can be applied and tested in other geographical areas and sectors to increase comparability, in spite of the inevitable interpretative nature of narratives. However, future application could be hampered by the approach being intensive and therefore needing expensive external human and financial resources. Nevertheless, because of its conceptual simplicity and inclusion of actor-based capacity analysis, the approach could appeal to decision-makers and practitioners (Klein and Juhola, 2014) and enhance the use of scenarios to explore how agency affects the future (Falardeau et al. 2019). The categories of capacities in Table 1 enable impact modellers to include qualitative and quantitative information about the SSP context, beyond GDP and population-based indicators (Barrington-Leigh and Galbraith, 2019).

4.2 Potential application of the SSP capital and capacity framework to Integrated Assessment Modelling

The assessment of capitals and capacities for each scenario can complement the use of Integrated Assessment Models (IAMs). Our framework can provide a ‘reality check’ to indicate whether the societal conditions consistent with each SSP would actually allow the relevant actors to build and mobilise the capitals that are required to implement the mitigation options to meet a given RCP. In this section we link the level of capitals and capacities within each case study SSP (from Figures 4 and 5) to the mitigation and transformation options required to achieve the 1.5°C target (Figure 1), and consider the implications for IAM modelling.

For SSP1, all four case studies envisage that the level of social and human capital and the stewarding, transformative and orchestrating capacities increase to high levels by 2100, with the unlocking capacity starting high but falling to medium by 2100 as most citizens become satisfied with the status quo. The potential to implement all four types of mitigation (technological, institutional, lifestyle and land-use) is therefore generally high, if we assume that the high social and human capital will enable the high levels of manufactured and financial capital that are required for technological mitigation. Natural capital also increases in SSP1 (e.g. a large increase for Iberia and moderate increase for Hungary by 2100), indicating that land-based mitigation would also be viable, especially as there is a high level of stewarding and transformative capacity.

This can be compared with the mitigation actions required to reach RCP2.6 from the SSP1 baseline for the OECD region of Europe according to IAM modelling (Bauer et al., 2017; Bauer et al., 2016; Popp et al., 2017; van Vuuren et al., 2017), bearing in mind that even stronger mitigation (beyond RCP2.6) will be required to reach the 1.5°C

target. Mitigation in the SSP1xRCP2.6 IAM starts with a strong focus on reducing energy demand, through both technological and lifestyle measures. After 2040 there is a major shift from fossil fuel towards biomass and renewable energy, as well as extensive afforestation, which is made possible by the low demand for meat which frees up land for biomass and forests. This scenario thus involves rapid implementation of all four types of mitigation (technological, institutional, lifestyle and land-based), which in turn requires high levels of all four capacities. Our study complements the IAM modelling by giving confidence that the locally derived versions of SSP1 for Europe are broadly consistent with high levels of these capitals and capacities.

For SSP3, in contrast, levels of social and human capital and orchestrating capacity decrease to low levels in all case studies as governance breaks down and anarchy prevails. Levels of the other capacities vary from low to medium across the case studies, with unlocking potential reaching a high level in the Eur-SSP by 2100 because of general dissatisfaction with the prevailing situation. This means that it is not possible to achieve a significant level of climate change mitigation either through technological innovation (e.g. due to low transformative capacity) or land-use change (low stewarding capacity) consistent with the finding in the IAM literature that RCP 2.6 is not achievable with the global SSP3 (Riahi et al., 2017). However, this study shows that SSP3's turbulence may also enable dramatic (and, sometimes, enforced) behavioural and institutional changes with potential for local reconstruction when networks of people reorganise and effectively oppose the status-quo (when unlocking capacity is high). Similar potential has been identified in the POLFREE project, where low internationalisation and economic growth (as assumed in SSP3) have been linked to reduced GHGs emissions, increased circular economies and overall employment (Schanes et al. 2018 and POLFREE, 2016).

For the unequal and divided society portrayed in SSP4, levels of social and human capital are low in the Eur-SSP and Hungary and medium in Scotland and Iberia. Transformative capacity is medium in Scotland and Iberia, indicating some potential for technological development including wind and solar power in Iberia. The other capacities are medium to low, indicating that it will be difficult to implement a comprehensive mitigation strategy that includes lifestyle change and land-based change. For comparison, the IAM modelling of SSP4 (Bauer et al., 2017; Calvin et al., 2017; Popp et al., 2017) requires very high investment in low-carbon energy technologies (nuclear, renewables and bioenergy with CCS) to reach RCP2.6, because the potential for land-based measures is limited by high population growth and high demand for food. This reliance on low-carbon energy supply results in a very expensive mitigation strategy, with carbon prices reaching over US\$2000/t CO₂ (compared to just US\$140/t CO₂ in SSP1 which focuses on demand reduction and land use). However, the low level of capitals and capacities in the locally derived SSPs raises doubts that this high level of technical investment and innovation could be achieved in practice. In addition, IAM modelling of SSP4 indicates that food prices would increase by a factor of six (Popp et al., 2017) due to pressure on land for bio-energy and afforestation. This would have implications for human and social capital that could further limit the mitigation potential.

The locally derived fossil-fuel based SSP5 scenarios vary markedly between case studies. There could be a high potential for technological and land-based solutions in the Eur-SSP and Scotland to some extent, though in the other case studies and for other mitigation options the mitigation potential is limited by low capacities or capitals. The IAM modelling for SSP5 indicates that very drastic mitigation is needed to reach RCP2.6, to counter the

strong growth in energy demand and lock-in to fossil fuel technologies up to 2040 (Bauer et al., 2017; Kriegler et al., 2017; Popp et al., 2017). By 2100, 65% of global final energy demand must be delivered as electricity and 7% as hydrogen, and fossil fuels are almost completely replaced by renewables, biomass with CCS (to provide negative emissions), and nuclear. Biomass demand in 2100 is the highest of all the scenarios, though a high biomass production efficiency is assumed, limiting the global cropland area to slightly less than in SSP4. As for SSP3, the uneven spread of capitals and capacities highlights potential difficulties with reaching this level of mitigation in practice. The Eur-SSP does provide the required high levels of capital and capacity for technological and land-based mitigation, but the local SSPs reveal limitations in capitals (Scotland), capacities (Iberia) or both (Hungary).

5. Conclusion

Our study has developed a transferable method for assessing the ability of society to achieve the societal transformation necessary to meet climate targets, which has been tested across a range of spatial scales in European case studies. The assessment of capitals and capacities in the SSPs has the potential to inform a more realistic assessment of the potential uptake and effectiveness of a range of mitigation options needed to achieve 1.5°C by taking account of the diverse scenario-specific constraints and enablers. By integrating social science and participatory approaches with climate and socio-economic scenario modelling outputs, this transdisciplinary method can explore important feedbacks on the capacity for transformation that cannot be included in techno-economic models.

The results at sub-global level have highlighted different potentials to achieve the 1.5°C target for the same SSP across different case study areas, not only due to scale effects, but also to the normativity of the SSPs and the different beliefs and stakes of local actors that must be taken into account in order to enable change at global scale. Even in the most archetypical SSP1 and SSP3 scenarios, the capacities to enable change result in multiple possibilities to act which may lead to trade-offs or give unexpected opportunities for transformation and mitigation, such as in SSP3. The case studies consistently show that the SSPs with least challenges to mitigation, SSP1 and SSP4, have very different potentials for transformation, with SSP1 having a high or very high potential whereas SSP4 is restricted to low or medium potential due to high levels of inequality. Likewise the two SSPs with highest challenges to mitigation, SSP3 and SSP5, have different potentials, with SSP5 having the highest potential in those case study versions with higher capitals and lower social inequality.

This study highlights the critical role played by social and human capital, and also by societal capacity to mobilise and create these capitals despite different socio-economic trends, for example by stewarding and human natural resources, orchestrating collaboration in alignment with long-term goals for positive change, unlocking existing unsustainable path-dependencies in behaviours, values, market patterns, institutions etc., and developing social, technological and governance innovations. These capitals and capacities are essential to enable the rapid innovation, behavioural change and international co-ordination needed to achieve the 1.5°C goal. Consideration of future changes in capitals and capacities alongside IAM projections could help to inform policy-making and determine the actions and strategies needed to achieve ambitious climate targets.

References

- Abbott, K.W., Genschel, P., Snidal, D., Zangl, B. (2015) International organizations as orchestrators. Cambridge University Press.
- Akimoto, K., Sano, F., Tomoda, T. (2017) GHG emission pathways until 2300 for the 1.5 °C temperature rise target and the mitigation costs achieving the pathways. *Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies for Global Change*, doi: 10.1007/s11027-017-9762-z.
- Avelino, F., Wittmayer, J.M. (2016) Shifting Power Relations in Sustainability Transitions: A Multi-actor Perspective. *Journal of Environmental Policy & Planning* 18, 628-649, doi: 10.1080/1523908X.2015.1112259.
- Barrington-Leigh C, Galbraith E (2019) Feasible future global scenarios for human life evaluations *Nature Communications* 10:161, doi:10.1038/s41467-018-08002-2
- Bauer, N., Calvin, K., Emmerling, J., Fricko, O., Fujimori, S., Hilaire, J., Eom, J., Krey, V., Kriegler, E., Mouratiadou, I., Sytze de Boer, H., van den Berg, M., Carrara, S., Daioglou, V., Drouet, L., Edmonds, J.E., Gernaat, D., Havlik, P., Johnson, N., Klein, D., Kyle, P., Marangoni, G., Masui, T., Pietzcker, R.C., Strubegger, M., Wise, M., Riahi, K., van Vuuren, D.P. (2017) Shared Socio-Economic Pathways of the Energy Sector – Quantifying the Narratives. *Global Environmental Change* 42, 316-330, doi: 10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2016.07.006.
- Bauer, N., Hilaire, J., Brecha, R.J., Edmonds, J., Jiang, K., Kriegler, E., Rogner, H.-H., Sferra, F. (2016) Assessing global fossil fuel availability in a scenario framework. *Energy* 111, 580-592, doi: 10.1016/j.energy.2016.05.088.
- Börjeson, L., Höjer, M., Dreborg, K.-H., Ekvall, T., Finnveden, G. (2006) Scenario types and techniques: Towards a user's guide. *Futures* 38, 723-739, doi: 10.1016/j.futures.2005.12.002.
- Calvin, K., Bond-Lamberty, B., Clarke, L., Edmonds, J., Eom, J., Hartin, C., Kim, S., Kyle, P., Link, R., Moss, R., McJeon, H., Patel, P., Smith, S., Waldhoff, S., Wise, M. (2017) The SSP4: A world of deepening inequality. *Global Environmental Change* 42, 284-296, doi: 10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2016.06.010.
- Carlsen, H., Dreborg, K.H., Wikman-Svahn, P. (2013) Tailor-made scenario planning for local adaptation to climate change. *Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies for Global Change* 18, 1239-1255, doi: 10.1007/s11027-012-9419-x.
- Chan, S., Falkner, R., Van Asselt, H., Goldberg, M. (2015) Strengthening non-state climate action: a progress assessment of commitments launched at the 2014 UN Climate Summit.
- Chapin, F.S., Carpenter, S.R., Kofinas, G.P., Folke, C., Abel, N., Clark, W.C., Olsson, P., Smith, D.M.S., Walker, B., Young, O.R. (2010) Ecosystem stewardship: sustainability strategies for a rapidly changing planet. *Trends in ecology & evolution* 25, 241-249, doi: 10.1016/j.tree.2009.10.008.
- Chaudhury, M., Vervoort, J., Kristjanson, P., Ericksen, P., Ainslie, A. (2013) Participatory scenarios as a tool to link science and policy on food security under climate change in East Africa. *Regional Environmental Change* 13, 389-398, doi: 10.1007/s10113-012-0350-1.
- Chelleri, L., Waters, J.J., Olazabal, M., Minucci, G. (2015) Resilience trade-offs: addressing multiple scales and temporal aspects of urban resilience. *Environment and Urbanization* 27, 181-198, doi: 10.1177/0956247814550780.
- Dunford, R., Harrison, P.A., Jäger, J., Rounsevell, M.D.A., Tinch, R. (2015) Exploring climate change vulnerability across sectors and scenarios using indicators of impacts and coping capacity. *Climatic Change* 128, 339-354, doi: 10.1007/s10584-014-1162-8.
- Falardeau M, Raudsepp-Hearne C, Bennett EM (2019) A novel approach for co-producing positive scenarios that explore agency: case study from the Canadian Arctic *Sustainability Science* 14:205-220, doi:10.1007/s11625-018-0620-z.
- Feola, G. (2015) Societal transformation in response to global environmental change: A review of emerging concepts. *Ambio* 44, 376-390, doi: 10.1007/s13280-014-0582-z.
- Folke, C., Hahn, T., Olsson, P., Norberg, J. (2005) Adaptive Governance of Social-Ecological Systems. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources* 30(1): 441-473, doi: 10.1146/annurev.energy.30.050504.144511.
- Folke, C., Carpenter, S., Walker, B., Scheffer, M., Chapin, T., Rockström, J. (2010) Resilience thinking: integrating resilience, adaptability and transformability. *Ecology and Society* 15.

504 Folke, C. (2016) Resilience (Republished). *Ecology and Society* 21(4):44, doi: 10.5751/ES-09088-210444

505 Frantzeskaki, N., Loorbach, D., Meadowcroft, J. (2012) Governing societal transitions to sustainability.
506 *International Journal of Sustainable Development* 15, 19-36.

507 Frantzeskaki, N., Wittmayer, J., Loorbach, D. (2014) The role of partnerships in 'realising' urban sustainability in
508 Rotterdam's City Ports Area, The Netherlands. *Journal of Cleaner Production* 65, 406-417, doi:
509 10.1016/j.jclepro.2013.09.023.

510 Friedlingstein, P., Andrew, R.M., Rogelj, J., Peters, G.P., Canadell, J.G., Knutti, R., Luderer, G., Raupach, M.R.,
511 Schaeffer, M., van Vuuren, D.P., Le Quere, C. (2014) Persistent growth of CO₂ emissions and implications for
512 reaching climate targets. *7*, 709-715, doi: 10.1038/ngeo2248.

513 Fujimori, S., Hasegawa, T., Ito, A., Takahashi, K., Masui, T. (2018) Gridded emissions and land-use data for
514 2005–2100 under diverse socioeconomic and climate mitigation scenarios. *Scientific Data* 5, 180210, doi:
515 10.18959/20180403.001.

516 Garmestani, A.S., Benson M.H. (2013) A framework for resilience-based governance of social-ecological systems.
517 *Ecology and Society* 18(1): 9, doi: 10.5751/ES-05180-180109.

518 Geels, F.W. (2014) Regime resistance against low-carbon transitions: Introducing politics and power into the
519 multi-level perspective. *Theory, Culture & Society* 31, 21-40, doi: 10.1177/0263276414531627.

520 Giddens, A. (1979) *Central problems in social theory: Action, structure, and contradiction in social analysis*. Univ
521 of California Press.

522 Giddens, A. (1986) *The constitution of society: Outline of the theory of structuration*. Univ of California Press.

523 Gillard, R., Gouldson, A., Paavola, J., Van Alstine, J. (2016) Transformational responses to climate change:
524 beyond a systems perspective of social change in mitigation and adaptation. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews:*
525 *Climate Change* 7, 251-265, doi: 10.1002/wcc.384.

526 Gramberger, M., Zellmer, K., Kok, K., Metzger, M. (2015) Stakeholder integrated research (STIR): a new
527 approach tested in climate change adaptation research. *Climatic Change* 128, 201-214, doi: 10.1007/s10584-014-
528 1225-x.

529 Grin, J., Rotmans, J., Schot, J. (2010) *Transitions to sustainable development: new directions in the study of long*
530 *term transformative change*. Routledge, ISBN: 0-203-85659-7.

531 Harrison, P.A., Holman, I.P., Berry, P.M. (2015) Assessing cross-sectoral climate change impacts, vulnerability
532 and adaptation: an introduction to the CLIMSAVE project. *Climatic Change* 128, 153-167, doi: 10.1007/s10584-
533 015-1324-3.

534 Harrison, P.A., Dunford, R.W., Holman, I.P., Cojocar, G., Madsen, M.S., Chen, P.-Y., Pedde, S., Sandars, D.,
535 (2018) Differences between low-end and high-end climate change impacts in Europe across multiple sectors.
536 *Regional Environmental Change*, 1-15, doi: 10.1007/s10113-018-1352-4.

537 Hermwille, L. (2016) Climate Change as a Transformation Challenge. A New Climate Policy Paradigm? *GAIA-*
538 *Ecological Perspectives for Science and Society* 25, 19-22, doi: 10.14512/gaia.25.1.6.

539 Hodson, M., Marvin, S. (2010) Can cities shape socio-technical transitions and how would we know if they were?
540 *Research policy* 39, 477-485, doi: 10.1016/j.respol.2010.01.020.

541 Holman IP, Harrison PA, Metzger MJ (2016). Cross-sectoral impacts of climate and socio-economic change in
542 Scotland - implications for adaptation policy. *Regional Environmental Change* 16(1), 97-109, doi:
543 10.1007/s10113-014-0679-8

544 Hölscher, K., Frantzeskaki, N., Loorbach, D., (2018a) Steering transformation under climate change: capacities
545 for transformative climate governance and the case of Rotterdam, the Netherlands. *Regional Environmental*
546 *Change*, doi: 10.1007/s10113-018-1329-3.

547 Hölscher, K., Frantzeskaki, N., Loorbach, D., (2018b) Transformative and orchestrating capacities in moving
548 beyond experimentation in climate governance in Rotterdam, the Netherlands, in: Turnheim, B., Kivimaa, P.,
549 Berkhout, F. (Ed.), *Beyond experiments: Understanding how climate governance innovations become embedded*.
550 Cambridge University Press.

551 Hulme, M. (2016) 1.5°C and climate research after the Paris Agreement. *Nature Climate Change* 6, 222-224, doi:
552 10.1038/nclimate2939.

553 IPCC (2018) Global warming of 1.5°C: Summary for Policymakers. Approved at the First Joint Session of
554 Working Groups I, II and III of the IPCC and accepted by the 48th Session of the IPCC, Incheon, Republic of
555 Korea, 6 October 2018.

556 Jäger, J., Rounsevell, M.D.A., Harrison, P.A., Omann, I., Dunford, R., Kammerlander, M., Pataki, G. (2015)
557 Assessing policy robustness of climate change adaptation measures across sectors and scenarios. *Climatic Change*
558 128, 395-407, doi: 10.1007/s10584-014-1240-y.

559 Kivimaa, P., Hildén, M., Huitema, D., Jordan, A., Newig, J. (2017) Experiments in climate governance—a
560 systematic review of research on energy and built environment transitions. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, doi:
561 10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.01.027.

562 Kivimaa, P., Kern, F. (2016) Creative destruction or mere niche support? Innovation policy mixes for sustainability
563 transitions. *Research policy* 45, 205-217, doi: 10.1016/j.respol.2015.09.008.

564 Klein, R.J.T., Juhola, S. (2014) A framework for Nordic actor-oriented climate adaptation research. *Environmental*
565 *Science & Policy* 40, 101-115, doi: 10.1016/j.envsci.2014.01.011.

566 Kok, K., Pedde, S. (2016) IMPRESSIONS socio-economic scenarios. IMPRESSIONS project

567 Kok, K., Pedde, S., Gramberger, M., Harrison, P.A., Holman, I.P. (2017a) New European socio-economic
568 scenarios for climate change research: operationalising concepts to extend the shared socio-economic pathways.
569 *Regional Environmental Change*, 1-12, doi: 10.1007/s10113-018-1400-0.

570 Kok, M.T., Kok, K., Peterson, G.D., Hill, R., Agard, J., Carpenter, S.R. (2017b) Biodiversity and ecosystem
571 services require IPBES to take novel approach to scenarios. *Sustainability Science* 12, 177-181, doi:
572 10.1007/s11625-016-0354-8.

573 Kriegler, E., Bauer, N., Popp, A., Humpenöder, F., Leimbach, M., Strefler, J., Baumstark, L., Bodirsky, B.L.,
574 Hilaire, J., Klein, D., Mouratiadou, I., Weindl, I., Bertram, C., Dietrich, J.-P., Luderer, G., Pehl, M., Pietzcker, R.,
575 Piontek, F., Lotze-Campen, H., Biewald, A., Bonsch, M., Giannousakis, A., Kreidenweis, U., Müller, C., Rolinski,
576 S., Schultes, A., Schwanitz, J., Stevanovic, M., Calvin, K., Emmerling, J., Fujimori, S., Edenhofer, O. (2017)
577 Fossil-fueled development (SSP5): An energy and resource intensive scenario for the 21st century. *Global*
578 *Environmental Change* 42, 297-315, doi: 10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2016.05.015.

579 Kriegler, E., Edmonds, J., Hallegatte, S., Ebi, K., Kram, T., Riahi, K., Winkler, H., van Vuuren, D. (2014) A new
580 scenario framework for climate change research: the concept of shared climate policy assumptions. *Climatic*
581 *Change* 122, 401-414, doi: 10.1007/s10584-013-0971-5.

582 Kriegler, E., O'Neill, B.C., Hallegatte, S., Kram, T., Lempert, R.J., Moss, R.H., Wilbanks, T. (2012) The need for
583 and use of socio-economic scenarios for climate change analysis: A new approach based on shared socio-economic
584 pathways. *Global Environmental Change* 22, 807-822, doi: 10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2012.05.005.

585 Lempert, R. (2013) Scenarios that illuminate vulnerabilities and robust responses. *Climatic Change* 117, 627-646,
586 doi: 10.1007/s10584-012-0574-6.

587 Longhurst N et al. (2016) Experimenting with alternative economies: four emergent counter-narratives of urban
588 economic development. *Current opinion in environmental sustainability* 22:69-74, doi:
589 10.1016/j.cosust.2017.04.006.

590 Loorbach, D. (2014) To transition! Governance panarchy in the new transformation. Inaugural Address; Erasmus
591 University Rotterdam: Rotterdam, The Netherlands.

592 Loorbach, D., Frantzeskaki, N., Huffenreuter, R.L. (2015) Transition management: taking stock from governance
593 experimentation. *The Journal of Corporate Citizenship*, 48-67, doi: 10.9774/GLEAF.4700.2015.ju.00008.

594 Loorbach D., Frantzeskaki N., Avelino F. (2017) Sustainability Transitions Research: Transforming Science and
595 Practice for Societal Change. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources* 42:599-626, doi: 10.1146/annurev-
596 environ-102014-021340.

597 Marquart-Pyatt ST, McCright AM, Dietz T, Dunlap RE (2014) Politics eclipses climate extremes for climate
598 change perceptions. *Global Environmental Change* 29:246-257, doi: 10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2014.10.004.

599 Moss, R.H., Edmonds, J.A., Hibbard, K.A., Manning, M.R., Rose, S.K., van Vuuren, D.P., Carter, T.R., Emori,
600 S., Kainuma, M., Kram, T., Meehl, G.A., Mitchell, J.F.B., Nakicenovic, N., Riahi, K., Smith, S.J., Stouffer, R.J.,
601 Thomson, A.M., Weyant, J.P., Wilbanks, T.J. (2010) The next generation of scenarios for climate change research
602 and assessment. 463, 747-756, doi: 10.1038/nature08823.

603 Nilsson, A.E., Bay-Larsen, I., Carlsen, H., van Oort, B., Bjørkan, M., Jylhä, K., Klyuchnikova, E., Masloboev, V.,
604 van der Watt, L.-M. (2017) Towards extended shared socio-economic pathways: A combined participatory
605 bottom-up and top-down methodology with results from the Barents region. *Global Environmental Change* 45,
606 124-132, doi: 10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2017.06.001.

607 O'Brien, K. (2015) Political agency: The key to tackling climate change. *Science* 350, 1170-1171, doi:
608 10.1126/science.aad0267.

609 O'Brien, K.L. (2016) Climate change and social transformations: is it time for a quantum leap? *Wiley*
610 *Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change* 7, 618-626, doi: 10.1002/wcc.413.

611 O'Neill, B.C., Tebaldi, C., Van Vuuren, D.P., Eyring, V., Friedlingstein, P., Hurtt, G., Knutti, R., Kriegler, E.,
612 Lamarque, J.-F., Lowe, J. (2016) The scenario model intercomparison project (ScenarioMIP) for CMIP6.
613 *Geoscientific Model Development* 9, 3461, doi: 10.5194/gmd-9-3461-2016.

614 O'Neill, B., Kriegler, E., Riahi, K., Ebi, K., Hallegatte, S., Carter, T., Mathur, R., van Vuuren, D. (2015) A new
615 scenario framework for climate change research: the concept of shared socio-economic pathways. *Climatic Change*
616 122, 387-400, doi: 10.1007/s10584-013-0905-2.

617 O'Neill, B.C., Kriegler, E., Ebi, K.L., Kemp-Benedict, E., Riahi, K., Rothman, D.S., van Ruijven, B.J., van Vuuren,
618 D.P., Birkmann, J., Kok, K., Levy, M., Solecki, W. (2017) The roads ahead: Narratives for shared socio-economic
619 pathways describing world futures in the 21st century. *Global Environmental Change* 42, 169-180, doi:
620 10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2015.01.004.

621 Obermeister, N. (2018) Local knowledge, global ambitions: IPBES and the advent of multi-scale models and
622 scenarios. *Sustainability Science*, doi: 10.1007/s11625-018-0616-8.

623 Olsson, P., Galaz, V., Boonstra, W. (2014) Sustainability transformations: a resilience perspective. *Ecology and*
624 *Society* 19, doi: 10.5751/ES-06799-190401.

625 Pedde, S., Kok, K., Onigkei, J., Brown, C., Holman, I., Harrison, P.A. (2018) Bridging uncertainty concepts across
626 narratives and simulations in environmental scenarios. *Regional Environmental Change*, doi: 10.1007/s10113-
627 018-1338-2.

628 Pilli-Sihvola, K., van Oort, B., Hanssen-Bauer, I., Ollikainen, M., Rummukainen, M., Tuomenvirta, H. (2015)
629 Communication and use of climate scenarios for climate change adaptation in Finland, Sweden and Norway. *Local*
630 *Environment* 20, 510-524, doi: 10.1080/13549839.2014.967757.

631 Jäger (2016). Civil Society Leads – In Short. POLFREE project website [http://polfree.seri.at/civil-society-leads-](http://polfree.seri.at/civil-society-leads-in-short/)
632 [in-short/](http://polfree.seri.at/civil-society-leads-in-short/) (last accessed 14 October 2018).

633 Popp, A., Calvin, K., Fujimori, S., Havlik, P., Humpenöder, F., Stehfest, E., Bodirsky, B.L., Dietrich, J.P.,
634 Doelmann, J.C., Gusti, M., Hasegawa, T., Kyle, P., Obersteiner, M., Tabeau, A., Takahashi, K., Valin, H.,
635 Waldhoff, S., Weindl, I., Wise, M., Kriegler, E., Lotze-Campen, H., Fricko, O., Riahi, K., Vuuren, D.P.v. (2017)
636 Land-use futures in the shared socio-economic pathways. *Global Environmental Change* 42, 331-345, doi:
637 10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2016.10.002.

638 Porritt, J., (2007) *The Five Capitals Framework, Capitalism as if the World Matters*. Earthscan, London, UK, pp.
639 137-142, ISBN: 978-1-84407-193-7.

640 Rauschmayer, F., Bauler, T., Schäpke, N. (2015) Towards a thick understanding of sustainability transitions—
641 Linking transition management, capabilities and social practices. *Ecological economics* 109, 211-221, doi:
642 10.1016/j.ecolecon.2014.11.018.

643 Raven, R., van den Bosch, S., Weterings, R. (2010) Transitions and strategic niche management: towards a
644 competence kit for practitioners. *Int. J. Technology Management* 51(1):57-74, doi: 10.1504/IJTM.2010.033128.

645 Riahi, K., van Vuuren, D.P., Kriegler, E., Edmonds, J., O'Neill, B.C., Fujimori, S., Bauer, N., Calvin, K., Dellink,
646 R., Fricko, O., Lutz, W., Popp, A., Cuaserna, J.C., Kc, S., Leimbach, M., Jiang, L., Kram, T., Rao, S., Emmerling,
647 J., Ebi, K., Hasegawa, T., Havlik, P., Humpenöder, F., Da Silva, L.A., Smith, S., Stehfest, E., Bosetti, V., Eom, J.,
648 Gernaat, D., Masui, T., Rogelj, J., Streffer, J., Drouet, L., Krey, V., Luderer, G., Harmsen, M., Takahashi, K.,
649 Baumstark, L., Doelman, J.C., Kainuma, M., Klimont, Z., Marangoni, G., Lotze-Campen, H., Obersteiner, M.,
650 Tabeau, A., Tavoni, M. (2017) The Shared Socio-economic Pathways and their energy, land use, and greenhouse
651 gas emissions implications: An overview. *Global Environmental Change* 42, 153-168, doi:
652 10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2016.05.009.

653 Rockström, J., Gaffney, O., Rogelj, J., Meinshausen, M., Nakicenovic, N., Schellnhuber, H.J. (2017) A roadmap
654 for rapid decarbonization. *Science* 355, 1269-1271, doi: 10.1126/science.aah3443.

655 Rogelj, J., den Elzen, M., Höhne, N., Fransen, T., Fekete, H., Winkler, H., Schaeffer, R., Sha, F., Riahi, K.,
656 Meinshausen, M. (2016) Paris Agreement climate proposals need a boost to keep warming well below 2 °C. 534,
657 631-639, doi: 10.1038/nature18307.

658 Rogelj, J., Hare, B., Nabel, J., Macey, K., Schaeffer, M., Markmann, K., Meinshausen, M. (2009) Halfway to
659 Copenhagen, no way to 2 °C. *Nature Reports Climate Change*, 81-83.

660 Rogelj, J., Luderer, G., Pietzcker, R.C., Kriegler, E., Schaeffer, M., Krey, V., Riahi, K. (2015) Energy system
661 transformations for limiting end-of-century warming to below 1.5 [deg]C. *Nature Climate Change* 5, 519-527, doi:
662 10.1038/nclimate2572.

663 Rosa, I.M.D., Pereira, H.M., Ferrier, S., Alkemade, R., Acosta, L.A., Akcakaya, H.R., den Belder, E., Fazel, A.M.,
664 Fujimori, S., Harfoot, M., Harhash, K.A., Harrison, P.A., Hauck, J., Hendriks, R.J.J., Hernández, G., Jetz, W.,
665 Karlsson-Vinkhuyzen, S.I., Kim, H., King, N., Kok, M.T.J., Kolomytsev, G.O., Lazarova, T., Leadley, P.,
666 Lundquist, C.J., García Márquez, J., Meyer, C., Navarro, L.M., Nesshöver, C., Ngo, H.T., Ninan, K.N., Palomo,
667 M.G., Pereira, L.M., Peterson, G.D., Pichs, R., Popp, A., Purvis, A., Ravera, F., Rondinini, C., Sathiyapalan, J.,
668 Schipper, A.M., Seppelt, R., Settele, J., Sitas, N., van Vuuren, D. (2017) Multiscale scenarios for nature futures.
669 *Nature Ecology & Evolution* 1, 1416-1419, doi: 10.1038/s41559-017-0273-9.

670 Schanes, K., J. Jäger, and P. Drummond (2018) Three Scenario Narratives for a Resource-Efficient and Low-
671 Carbon Europe in 2050. *Ecological Economics*, 70-79, doi: 10.1016/j.ecolecon.2018.02.009.

672 Tàbara, J.D., Mangalagu, D., Kupers, R., Jaeger, C.C., Mandel, A., Paroussos, L. (2013) Transformative targets
673 in sustainability policy making: the case of the 30% EU mitigation goal. *Journal of Environmental Planning and*
674 *Management* 56, 1180-1191, doi: 10.1080/09640568.2012.716365.

675 Tàbara, J.D., Frantzeskaki, N., Hölscher, K., Pedde, S., Kok, K., Lamperti, F., Christensen, J.H., Jäger, J., Berry,
676 P. (2018a) Positive tipping points in a rapidly warming world. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*
677 31, 120-129, doi: 10.1016/j.cosust.2018.01.012.

678 Tàbara, J.D., Cots, F., Pedde, S., Hölscher, K., Kok, K., Lovanova, A., Capela Lourenço, T., Frantzeskaki, N.,
679 Etherington, J. (2018b) Exploring Institutional Transformations to Address High-End Climate Change in Iberia.
680 *Sustainability* 10, 161, doi: 10.3390/su10010161.

681 Tinch, R., Jäger, J., Omann, I., Harrison, P.A., Wesely, J., Dunford, R. (2015) Applying a capitals framework to
682 measuring coping and adaptive capacity in integrated assessment models. *Climatic Change* 128, 323-337, doi:
683 10.1007/s10584-014-1299-5.

684 van der Zwaan, B., Calvin, K.V., Clarke, L.E. (2016) Climate Mitigation in Latin America: Implications for Energy
685 and Land Use: Preface to the Special Section on the findings of the CLIMACAP-LAMP Project. *Energy*
686 *Economics*, Medium: ED; Size: p. 495-498, doi: 10.1016/j.eneco.2016.05.005.

687 van Ruijven, B., Levy, M., Agrawal, A., Biermann, F., Birkmann, J., Carter, T., Ebi, K., Garschagen, M., Jones,
688 B., Jones, R., Kemp-Benedict, E., Kok, M., Kok, K., Lemos, M., Lucas, P., Orlove, B., Pachauri, S., Parris, T.,
689 Patwardhan, A., Petersen, A., Preston, B., Ribot, J., Rothman, D., Schweizer, V. (2014) Enhancing the relevance
690 of Shared Socio-economic Pathways for climate change impacts, adaptation and vulnerability research. *Climatic*
691 *Change* 122, 481-494, doi: 10.1007/s10584-013-0931-0 .

692 Van Vuuren, D.P., Meinshausen, M., Plattner, G.-K., Joos, F., Strassmann, K.M., Smith, S.J., Wigley, T.M.L.,
693 Raper, S.C.B., Riahi, K., de la Chesnaye, F., den Elzen, M.G.J., Fujino, J., Jiang, K., Nakicenovic, N., Paltsev, S.,
694 Reilly, J.M. (2008) Temperature increase of 21st century mitigation scenarios. *Proceedings of the National*
695 *Academy of Sciences*, doi: 10.1073/pnas.0711129105.

696 van Vuuren, D. P., Kriegler, E., O'Neill, B., Ebi, K., Riahi, K., Carter, T., Edmonds, J., Hallegatte, S., Kram, T.,
697 Mathur, R., Winkler, H. (2014) A new scenario framework for Climate Change Research: scenario matrix
698 architecture. *Climatic Change* 122, 373-386, doi: 10.1007/s10584-013-0906-1.

699 van Vuuren, D.P., Stehfest, E., Gernaat, D.E.H.J., Doelman, J.C., van den Berg, M., Harmsen, M., de Boer, H.S.,
700 Bouwman, L.F., Daioglou, V., Edelenbosch, O.Y., Girod, B., Kram, T., Lassaletta, L., Lucas, P.L., van Meijl, H.,
701 Müller, C., van Ruijven, B.J., van der Sluis, S., Tabeau, A. (2017) Energy, land-use and greenhouse gas emissions
702 trajectories under a green growth paradigm. *Global Environmental Change* 42, 237-250, doi:
703 10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2016.05.008.

704 Vervoort, J.M., Thornton, P.K., Kristjanson, P., Förch, W., Ericksen, P.J., Kok, K., Ingram, J.S.I., Herrero, M.,
705 Palazzo, A., Helfgott, A.E.S., Wilkinson, A., Havlík, P., Mason-D'Croz, D., Jost, C. (2014) Challenges to scenario-
706 guided adaptive action on food security under climate change. *Global Environmental Change* 28, 383-394, doi:
707 10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2014.03.001.

708 Westley, F., Olsson, P., Folke, C., Homer-Dixon, T., Vredenburg, H., Loorbach, D., Thompson, J., Nilsson, M.,
709 Lambin, E., Sendzimir, J. (2011) Tipping toward sustainability: emerging pathways of transformation. *AMBIO:
710 A Journal of the Human Environment* 40, 762-780, doi: 10.1007/s13280-011-0186-9.

711 Westley, F., Tjornbo, O., Schultz, L., Olsson, P., Folke, C., Crona, B., Bodin, Ö. (2013) A theory of transformative
712 agency in linked social-ecological systems. *Ecology and Society* 18, doi: 10.5751/ES-05072-180327.

Electronic supplementary material

Advancing the use of scenarios to understand society's capacity to achieve the 1.5°C target

European SSPs (Eur-SSPs) and local European SSPs: narratives and capitals

In this document, we report the sketches of the European SSPs (Eur-SSPs) and local European SSPs. For the full text, we refer to the deliverable 2.2 of the IMPRESSIONS project (Kok and Pedde 2016). The SSP reported below are in the form of narratives and key trends, and developed participatorily in professionally facilitated workshops (Gramberger, Zellmer et al. 2015).

The SSP narratives and key trends are reported for the following case studies: Europe, Hungary, Iberia and Scotland. For each case study, we omit the SSP2 scenario as it was not developed in the participatory process.

Amongst the key trends for each SSP in each case study, we report the levels of capitals (human, social, manufactured, financial and natural), as indicators of material and immaterial wealth (Porritt 2007).

Eur-SSP1 Sustainability

There is a high commitment to achieve sustainable development goals through effective governments and global cooperation, ultimately resulting in less inequality and less resource intensive lifestyles.

The interplay of financial, environmental, and economic crises fuel the feeling that behaviour has to change away from an unregulated market-driven economy to a sustainable development path. This puts governments under pressure to take ambitious measures, including stimulating an energy transition towards renewables and facilitating innovative research, accompanied by investments in health, education, and social support. A decrease in conflicts in Europe's Southern and Eastern border regions leads to higher political stability and moderate but steady economic growth in an increasingly equitable Europe. The European Union expands further and participates in new global governance initiatives. Advances in green technologies are further stimulated by international competition leading to a CO₂ neutral society by 2050. By 2100, Europe is characterised by a high level of sustainability-oriented political and societal awareness, focusing on renewable energy and low material growth in a strongly regulated but effective multi-level governance structure.

Key elements	Sustainability
Decision-making level	International/EU leader
International cooperation	Strong, EU important player
Net migration- low in-migration	Low immigration
Economic development	Gradual (with hiccups at the beginning)
Mobility	No barriers, but movements are limited
Social cohesion	High
Technology development	High, but not pervasive
Quality of Governance	High – focus on sustainability
Human health investments	High
Education investments	High
Environmental respect	High
Human capital	Strong increase (0, +, ++)
Social capital	Strong increase (0, +, ++)
Manufactured capital	Steady increase (0, ½+, +)
Financial capital	Steady increase (0, ½+, +)

Eur-SSP3 Regional Rivalry

Sparked by economic woes in major economies and regional conflict, antagonism between and within regional blocs increases, resulting in the disintegration of social fabric and many countries struggling to maintain living standards.

With the economy gradually picking up, the demand for resources increases, which turns out to be a tipping point for the state of the environment with severe ecosystem failures. The persistence of conflicts and decline in trade also substantially increases energy and food prices, while initiating a massive build-up of the defense sector, which is resource hungry but not resource efficient. Long-term policy planning becomes rare with hardly any money for education, research or innovation. Eventually the EU breaks down, with new regional blocs forming in the north and in the south of Europe, while new alliances with other countries are forged to ensure sufficient energy supply. Social counter-movements temporarily appear but do not take root in a fragmented and divided Europe with strong regional rivalry and conflict. Ultimately, a high-carbon intensive Europe emerges that is not worse off than the rest of the world, but struggles not to become the world's backwater with high inequalities predominantly between but also within countries.

Key elements	Regional Rivalry
Decision-making level	National/Local+ fragmentation
International cooperation	Weak
Net migration- low in-migration	Outmigration
Economic development	Low
Mobility	Low
Social cohesion	Low EU\higher within countries
Technology development	Low
Quality of Governance	Low and ineffective
Human health investments	Low
Education investments	Low
Environmental respect	Low
Human capital	Decrease (0,-,-)
Social capital	Increase, then decrease (0, +, 0). Increase because group of people cluster against others
Manufactured capital	Decrease (0,-,-)
Financial capital	Strong decrease (-,-,--)

Eur-SSP4 Inequality

Globally, power becomes more concentrated in a relatively small political and business elite, accompanied by increasing disparities in economic opportunity, leading to substantial proportions of populations having a low level of development, although Europe becomes an important player in a world full of tensions.

Sparked by the economic crisis and extreme weather events, the EU increases commitment to find innovative solutions to the depletion of natural resources and climate change. In combination with current relatively high levels of social cohesion, energy efficiency and environmental policy-making this initiates a shift towards a high-tech green Europe. This transformation is strongly supported by large businesses that successfully seek collaboration with the increasingly powerful European government. At the same time, however, inequalities are rising because of a number of simultaneously acting factors, including highly unequal investments in education. This leads to a large and widening gap between an internationally-connected society and a more fragmented collection of lower-income societies that work in a labour intensive, low-tech economy. Technological development has not resulted in reduced energy prices, but has instead established an oligarchy of green business developers that control energy supply. By 2100, Europe is an important player in a world full of tensions, but with growing inequalities across and within European countries.

Key elements	Inequality
Decision-making level	International / Europe leader on the global scale
International cooperation	Strong , EU important player
Net migration- low in-migration	Selected immigration
Economic development	High
Mobility	High
Social cohesion	Low
Technology development	High in some areas; low in labour intensive areas
Quality of Governance	High and effective
Human health investments	High for elites
Education investments	High for elites
Environmental respect	High in pockets
Human capital	Decrease and then increase (0, -, 0). Middle class re-emerges
Social capital	Decrease and then increase (0, -, 0).
Manufactured capital	Increase (0, +, +). Depends on sector
Financial capital	Strong increase (0, ++, ++) with saturation after 2050.

Eur-SSP5 Fossil-fuelled Development

People in this world place increasing faith in competitive markets, innovation and participatory societies to produce rapid technological progress and development of human capital as the path to sustainable development. A lack of environmental concern leads to the exploitation of abundant fossil fuel resources.

Global markets are increasingly integrated, with interventions focused on removing institutional barriers. There are also strong investments in health, education, and institutions to enhance human and social capital. The push for economic and social development is coupled with the exploitation of abundant fossil fuel resources, including large-scale extraction of shale gas. This further stimulates economic wealth, part of which is used to stimulate the development of (green) technologies. Europe regains its leading position in the global economy. Faith is strong in the ability to effectively manage social and ecological systems, including by geo-engineering. Population across all societal classes adopts a very energy intensive lifestyle. The environment degrades, but the majority of the population is unaware because of successful technological innovation. Towards 2100, the environment is locally seriously degraded as non-renewables are further exploited, which eventually results in a slow re-emergence of investments in renewables.

Key elements	Fossil-fuelled Development
Decision-making level	International/EU not a leader on the global scale
International cooperation	Strong (trade)
Net migration- low in-migration	High to cities and from poorer countries
Economic development	High
Mobility	High
Social cohesion	High
Technology development	Strong and crucial
Quality of Governance	High – focus on businesses
Human health investments	High
Education investments	High
Environmental respect	Low, but high NIMBY
Human capital	Strong increase (1, 1 ½ +, ++)
Social capital	Strong increase (1, 1 ½ +, ++)
Manufactured capital	Strong increase (1, 1 ½ +, ++)
Financial capital	Strong increase (½ +, +,++)

Hungarian SSP1 - Rózsaszín álom

Triggered by changing public opinion on current economic and demographic problems, local governments take the initiative to invest in services. This results in the local increase of skills and good practices: Veszprém becomes a knowledge centre and Szekszárd turns to sustainable agricultural practices. New generation of policy-makers come from local communes and represent the will of people. Because of more transparency and accountability of politicians, corruption decreases. This leads also to an economic shift in many sectors, whereby technology development and high-value exports become the new backbone of the Hungarian economy. International cooperation is strong also thanks to stable neighbouring countries and decrease in migration. Emigration and birth rates also stabilise. Hungary in 2100 is a fully sustainable, financially healthy and safe country.

Key elements	Hungarian SSP1 - Rózsaszín álom
Decision-making level	Multilevel – development model upscaled from local to national
International cooperation	Strong, EU important player
Net migration- low in-migration	Moderate immigration – reverted brain drain
Economic development	Gradual
Mobility	No barriers, but movements are limited
Social cohesion	High
Technology development	High – focus on renewable and re-use
Quality of Governance	High – focus on sustainability
Human health investments	High
Education investments	High
Environmental respect	High
Human capital	Increase and levelling (++, ++, ++) (gets high soon)
Social capital	Increase and levelling (++, ++, ++) (gets high soon)
Manufactured capital	0, -, -
Natural capital	0, +, +

Hungarian SSP3 – Regional Rivalry

In the context of increased geopolitical instability and higher energy prices, the Hungarian government shifts its budget away from environmental and social services towards industrial development and defence. However, stalling wages, low resources and unemployment trigger social tensions and brain drain. The government responds with authoritarian measures, further decreasing social services and implementing fossil-fuel subsidy schemes to keep prices artificially low. Poverty increases and people move out of cities: urban and rural ghettos develop. People try to become self-sufficient by re-learning old practices. By 2100, Hungary is affected by energy shortages: large-scale agricultural and urbanisation are halted. Because of increased migration, a new multicultural society emerges.

Key elements	Hungarian SSP3 - Regional Rivalry
Decision-making level	National
International cooperation	Weak - conflict
Net migration- low in-migration	Brain drain – increased immigration
Economic development	Low
Mobility	Low – people move to ghettos
Social cohesion	Low
Technology development	Low
Quality of Governance	Low and ineffective
Human health investments	Low
Education investments	Low
Environmental respect	Low
Human capital	Decrease but flattening due to self-reliance (0,-,-)
Social capital	(+,-,-) increases due to crises, decreases due to institutions
Manufactured capital	(+,-,-)
Natural capital	Decrease – some flattening due to reduced input use and pressure (-,-,-)

Hungarian SSP4 – Inequality

The direction of tender systems strengthens a power system leading to concentration of power and landownership in the hands of few. With corruption and tensions on the rise, new elections promise change but fail: new leadership brings stability but strengthens the power of elites. The EU is complacent. A centralised Hungary stabilises borders and supplied cheap (but low educated) labour force. Health and education services are minimal and the state prefer to manage crises rather than prevent. Besides an industrialised food production system, haven-nots self-organise even if life of the majority is still a struggle, with a controlled media and education system. With growing hunger riots, the elites show flexibility to avoid revolts (thawing of dictatorship) with a new charismatic leader. People live in a very unequal world but they are happy with what they have.

Key elements	Hungarian SSP4 - Inequality
Decision-making level	State - Europe
International cooperation	Strong for elites
Net migration- low in-migration	First high immigration, then controlled
Economic development	Medium-high
Mobility	High for elite
Social cohesion	Low – high for have-nots
Technology development	High in some areas; low in labour intensive areas
Quality of Governance	Effective (stability)
Human health investments	Low
Education investments	Low
Environmental respect	High in pockets
Human capital	(---,--, -)
Social capital	(0,--, -)
Manufactured capital	(-,--, -)
Natural capital	(--, -, 0)

Hungarian SSP5 - Pató Pál Úr

Lifestyle in Hungary is increasingly coupled with increased consumption, less social interactions and pervasive technology. Higher energy demand is met with readily available fossil fuels and little investments on new energy or infrastructure. An exclusive development model sets up, with rising corruption. However, popularity is high because of effective crises management and welfare spending. Even if education is stratified, with high mobility for the rich, all layers of society have a decent energy-hungry lifestyle. Technology can fix temporarily the wide spreading environmental and health degradation until the system collapse. Population decimates. The increasing awareness for change leads to a rebirth of communities. Hungary returns on the bumpy path towards a post fossil fuel era that was abandoned decades before.

Key elements	Hungarian SSP5 – Pató Pál Úr
Decision-making level	International/national
International cooperation	Strong (trade)
Net migration- low in-migration	High
Economic development	High, until collapse
Mobility	High
Social cohesion	Low, then higher
Technology development	Strong and crucial
Quality of Governance	High – focus on national level and industries
Human health investments	High – welfare system
Education investments	High – welfare system
Environmental respect	Low
Human capital	(-, -, -)
Social capital	(-, -, -)
Manufactured capital	(+, ++, ++)
Natural capital	(-, --, --)

Iberia SSP1 - Sustainability

Triggered by continuing and growing social participation in environmental, social, and economic issues and fuelled by a European social-oriented political framework, Iberia embraces a path towards a new development model. Initially at slow pace, but increasing rapidly and supported by socially and environmentally sustainable policy making, a fundamental change is achieved towards boosting education, innovation, job opportunities in the green sectors (renewables and reuse of materials), and eventually green technologies. Because of the strengthening of the democratic governance structures, globalisation is no longer opposed to local sustainability, but on the contrary, positive sustainable development synergies are being created. This leads also to an economic shift in many sectors, whereby technology development and high-value exports become the new backbone of the Iberian economy. By 2100, the new decision-making culture and practice culminates in the new development model for the Iberian countries. This model encourages broad public participation, institutional collaboration and includes a harmonic integration of health, social, economic, political and environmental sectors.

Key elements	Iberia SSP1 - Sustainability
Decision-making level	International – both bottom-up and top-down
International cooperation	Strong, EU important player
Net migration- low in-migration	Moderate immigration
Economic development	Gradual
Mobility	No barriers, but movements are limited
Social cohesion	High
Technology development	High – focus on renewable and re-use
Quality of Governance	High – focus on sustainability
Human health investments	High
Education investments	High
Environmental respect	High
Human capital	+, +++, +++
Social capital	++, +++, +++
Manufactured capital	-, +, ++
Natural capital	-, ++, +++

Iberia SSP3 - Regional Rivalry

Short-lived governments lead to a fragmentation of the social and economic fabric in Iberia. In 2030 Catalonia gains independence, which is later followed by other regions both in Iberia and in other Mediterranean countries. To counteract economic crises, the Southern countries unite in a separate Union, the 'Club Med'. Continued environmental and economic problems increase social tensions and social inequalities, which in turn negatively affect tourism. By the 2060s four countries have come to exist in Iberia: Portugal, Spain, Catalonia and the Basque Country, with strong borders between them. Over time, conflicts escalate although war over water and other scarce resources is prevented. By 2100, a deserted and desertified inland rural Iberia remains and this produces a large divide even further than with the rest of Europe. Continuous conflicts across multiple countries which experiment such similar disintegration processes occur elsewhere and this limit cooperation within Club Med and with other international power blocs.

Key elements	Iberia SSP3 - Regional Rivalry
Decision-making level	National/Local+ fragmentation
International cooperation	Weak
Net migration- low in-migration	Outmigration
Economic development	Low
Mobility	Low
Social cohesion	Low within and across Iberia
Technology development	Low
Quality of Governance	Low and ineffective
Human health investments	Low
Education investments	Low
Environmental respect	Low
Human capital	-,---,---
Social capital	-,---,--- and ½
Manufactured capital	--,---,---
Natural capital	-,---,---

Iberia SSP4 - Inequality

Economic challenges and environmental accidents are exacerbated by new European and global crises, which leads to an increased migration from Northern Africa and the Middle East. In Iberia, unemployment rises to record levels, this eventually results in social unrest and massive protests. Social stratification intensifies with strong high-income elites and a divided large lower class, bringing about strong tensions within and between social classes. This unstable social situation escalates in the 2040s, and lead to a shift in the political system. New governments establish an oligarchical system with power and money gradually centralised and controlled by an elite of a few companies and central governments. The political and industrial elite successfully implements a strategy of “subtle” enforcement of inequality through education and keeping people busy on low skilled tasks, with low future expectations. To their benefit, the elite invests in solar and wind energy, eventually becoming a market leader.

Key elements	Iberia SSP4 - Inequality
Decision-making level	International / Europe
International cooperation	Strong , Iberia strong player in EU
Net migration- low in-migration	First high immigration, then controlled
Economic development	High
Mobility	High
Social cohesion	Low
Technology development	High in some areas; low in labour intensive areas
Quality of Governance	High and effective
Human health investments	High for elites
Education investments	High for elites
Environmental respect	High in pockets
Human capital	+, -, 1 and ½
Social capital	+, 0, -
Manufactured capital	½+, +, ++
Natural capital	+, ++, ++

Iberia SSP5 - Fossil-fuelled Development

The burst of the financial bubble increases the need for social aid and subsidies for Iberia, which is facilitated by an increasing economic surplus in the north of Europe. Crucial is the establishment of a connection of electricity networks that increase access to external (fossil) resources. Iberia is part of this network and located strategically in the energy nexus. Iberia also starts exploiting its own resources, while intensifying agriculture and forestry. In the 2040s, environmental problems occur that are combatted with successful technological solutions. The accompanying environmental destruction goes by unnoticed as most people live in the cities, where water, food, and energy supply are secured. By 2060, Iberia totally depends on technology, fossil fuels, and investments of large companies. Ultimately, a number of environmental disasters lead to an increased awareness across Iberia that technology can no longer sustain agricultural production. The outlook is uncertain as the fossil-fuel based development model collapses and business opportunities decrease.

Key elements	Iberia SSP5 - Fossil-fuelled Development
Decision-making level	International/EU not a leader on the global scale
International cooperation	Strong (trade)
Net migration- low in-migration	High to cities and from poorer countries
Economic development	High, until collapse
Mobility	High
Social cohesion	Medium
Technology development	Strong and crucial
Quality of Governance	Focus on businesses
Human health investments	High (private), then low
Education investments	High (private), then low
Environmental respect	Low
Human capital	++,+++,++
Social capital	+,+,-
Manufactured capital	+++,+++,++
Natural capital	-,--,-

Scottish SSP1 – Mactopia

Through increased societal involvement policy and effective governance, Scotland achieves the transition towards a sustainable and equitable society by 2040. This transition comes within the context of positive economic development and a further devolution from the UK. Scotland has stronger ties with other like-minded countries both within and outside the EU. More income is also generated from the export of surplus water and is invested in social and environmental policies. The shift towards a green (but highly taxed) economy increases tax evasion and resource smuggling. In addition, some social unrest develops as a result of the increase in both unskilled and highly skilled migrants, especially from the rest of the UK. These problems are, however, limited due to high government presence (e.g. with social assimilation programs). By 2070-2100, Scotland has become more aware of national security issues, but the core values of social and environmental sustainability and equity are dominant. Thus the country remains open to trade by consolidating healthy trade relationships with rich countries, as well as helping with the (economic) development of poor countries. The country has grown a bit less than business-as-usual, but unemployment and homeless people are now something of the past.

Key elements	SSP1 – Mactopia
Decision-making level	Multilevel and communitarianism
International cooperation	Strong with like-minded countries and BRICS
Net migration- low in-migration	High immigration
Economic development	Steady but somewhat slow
Mobility	No barriers,
Social cohesion	High
Technology development	High
Quality of Governance	High – focus on trade-offs and social inclusiveness
Human health investments	High
Education investments	High
Environmental respect	High
Human capital	Strong increase (+, ++, ++)
Social capital	Strong increase (+, ++, ++)
Manufactured capital	Increase (+, +, +)
Financial capital	Steady increase (+, +, ++)

Scottish SSP3 – Mad Max

On-going conflicts, political instability and demographic issues in other countries are drivers for increased resource issues and migration to Scotland. Because of increased pressure on resource exploitation, investors buy up land and access to water leading to volatile markets. More and more people have problems buying land but also food and water. This leads to a society with less solidarity. Energy becomes increasingly valuable and the government sells energy to the highest bidders. These are multinationals who also own large portions of land, control the scarce water and food supplies and determine the consistently high pricing of essential goods and commodities. Fragmentation of society leads to more sectarianism. Conflicts between Catholics and Protestants are rampant, especially in the small mining communities in the Highlands. By 2040 the EU breaks down and suffers from social unrest and an economic and energy crisis. In Scotland, a survival from day-to-day, “getting the sandbags out” type of mentality prevails over a long-term structural approach, especially for the Have-nots. The Haves on the other hand are preoccupied with securing their fortunes and the few remaining resources. By 2070-2100, we reach a balance, where both the Haves and Have-nots realise they have to organise themselves: the Haves to protect themselves and their property, the Have-nots to survive. These unions originate out of necessity. However, conflict within these groups is also common. There is no, or very limited contact between the different strata. The poorer Scots work for the richer Scots, but that is the only interaction between them. The whole society has learned to live with less.

Key elements	SSP3 - Mad Max
Decision-making level	Corporate and clan level
International cooperation	Weak
Net migration- low in-migration	High immigration at the beginning
Economic development	Low
Mobility	Very low
Social cohesion	Low between strata, higher within strata
Technology development	Low
Quality of Governance	Low and ineffective at national level (short-term)
Human health investments	Low
Education investments	Low
Environmental respect	Low
Human capital	Decrease (-, -, -)
Social capital	Decrease (-, ½ -, ½ -)
Manufactured capital	Decrease (1/2 - ,--,--)
Financial capital	Strong decrease (-,1 and ½ -, -)

Scottish SSP4 – Tartan Spring

The strong middle class and present prosperity pave the way for technological innovation which leads to more efficient use of resources. A whole new generation of highly educated young people takes the lead. To capture the full potential of all these technological developments, the Scottish government decides to open resource access to the private sector and to establish liberal market structures. As a result, by 2040 the influence of the private sector in Scotland has become very strong. Economic growth becomes the fundament of Scottish nationalism and of political independence is achieved in 2040. The middle class favours further deregulation and cuts in public spending, spearheaded by the economic growth. An unwanted consequence is the disappearance of welfare measures and more public GDP spent on overseas conflicts to secure ownership of access to resources. With more income from resources going to multinationals and little welfare, disparity between the poor and the wealthy in Scotland is more pronounced. This disparity further increases because technological innovation makes it possible to eliminate jobs and manpower. Those that have a job still benefit from privately organised health care schemes, but a large part of the workforce services the super-rich and has only limited social security, barely enough for a decent life. By 2070 people realise that is not enough to live in a rich country which lacks sustainability and accountability of governance. Strikes and uprising become more frequent and violent. Scotland enters turbulent times.

Key elements	SSP4 – Tartan Spring
Decision-making level	National/Multinationals
International cooperation	Strong , EU important player
Net migration- low in-migration	High migration
Economic development	High
Mobility	Low
Social cohesion	Low
Technology development	High
Quality of Governance	Ineffective
Human health investments	High and then private (exclusive)
Education investments	High and then private (exclusive)
Environmental respect	Low
Human capital	Decrease and then increase (+, 0, -).
Social capital	Many small up and downs between 2050 and 2100 (½+, 0, 0)
Manufactured capital	Increase (+, +, +)
Financial capital	Increase then decrease (½+, +, 0)

Scottish SSP5 – Fossil-fueled Development

A stabilisation of the fossil fuel price has allowed for an increased tax on fossil fuels. Because of a concomitant increase of immigrants from outside the EU, the Scottish government invests extra income in health services, social housing and education. The government also invests in the establishment of for-profit publically owned energy companies, such as Statoil and the Scotland Energy Corporation (SEC). At the central level, SEC investment fund has a large stake in fossil fuels and can invest in public services. This means profits stay in Scotland, with SEC paying dividends to each Scottish resident. By 2040, Scottish policy is increasingly driven by technology in many sectors: finance, education (technology university), labour force. Strong devolution has also resulted in ‘clantons’. These become more and more powerful alongside public participation, e.g. with innovative internet referenda. The lack of focus in environmental problems, however, starts to have its toll. Some discontent starts to rise among pockets of the population, driven by issues such as ‘the last bumblebee in Scotland’. This is initially partly overshadowed by steady economic growth. By 2070 energy and food demands are met and surpassed. On the other hand, environmental degradation reaches a tipping point. Larger shares of the population realise the high costs of geo-engineering, and the increasing economic inefficiency of fossil fuels. As a result, unhappiness about environmental degradation spreads. After a major clean-up undertaken by SEC, a shift towards renewables triggers a change towards a whole new energy system. SEC investments in renewables slowly increase, matching those in fossil fuels by the end of the century.

Key elements	SSP5 – Fossil-fueled Development
Decision-making level	International/national and “clantons”
International cooperation	Strong (trade)
Net migration- low in-migration	High to cities and from non-EU countries
Economic development	High
Mobility	High
Social cohesion	High
Technology development	Strong and crucial
Quality of Governance	High – focus on profitable investments
Human health investments	High
Education investments	High (focus on sciences, engineering and technology)
Environmental respect	Low, but high NIMBY
Human capital	Increase (0, +, +)
Social capital	Decrease (0, -, -). High human but low social capital
Manufactured capital	Strong increase (+, ++, ++)
Financial capital	Strong increase (+, ++, +++). Faster growth rate than present

References

Gramberger, M., et al. (2015). "Stakeholder integrated research (STIR): a new approach tested in climate change adaptation research." *Climatic Change* 128(3-4): 201-214.

Kok, K. and S. Pedde (2016). "IMPRESSIONS socio-economic scenarios." IMPRESSIONS project

Porritt, J. (2007). *The Five Capitals Framework. Capitalism as if the World Matters*. London, UK, Earthscan: 137-142.