

# Balancing distributional equity and public budget constraints in the fossil fuel phase-out

### <u>Stefan Nabernegg<sup>1</sup></u>, Teresa Lackner<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Wegener Center for Climate and Global Change, University of Graz, Austria
<sup>2</sup> Graz Schumpeter Centre, University of Graz, Austria

24.Klimatag, April 4, 2024



# **Motivation**

- Large fossil fuel dependency of European countries (60% of EU final energy consumption) (EuroStat,  $\bigcirc$ 2022) including imports from geopolitically unstable regions
  - Heating as one driver of fossil fuel use and greenhouse gas emissions (17% of total energy ٠ related GHG emissions in EU)(UNFCCC, 2023)
- Green investment needs and public budget constraints
  - Strong increase in public deficits in the EU in recent years [4,9% p.a. 2020-2022 vs. 1,0% p.a. • 2014-2019] (Eurostat, 2023)
  - (Underestimated) investment needs for carbon-neutral transition (Kapeller et al., 2023; EC, 2020) •
- Policy ambition
  - Current political debate in Germany (Wärmewende) and Austria (Erneuerbare Wärme Gesätz, • EWG)



## Overview

### O In this study, we

- estimate total investment related to the fossil fuel phase-out in the residential housing sector for Austria based on micro-level household data
- estimate necessary public funds of the current subsidy program, and analyse it with respect do distributional equity
- derive net investment need across income groups (vertical equity)
- and identify **determinants of horizontal equity**, i.e. drivers beyond income for adversely affects household groups



## Method **Overview Microsimulation**

Starting point: every household will switch to a renewable heating system at some  $\bigcirc$ point during the transition phase (no endogenous investment decision)

Investment costs depend on  $\bigcirc$ 

- Living area ۲
- Assumed heating system (transition matrix for building type and location)  $\bullet$
- Required thermal renovation  $\bullet$



## Method **Overview Microsimulation**

Subsidy scheme (based on communication of the ministry (BMK, 2023))

- Heating system •
  - technology-specific flat-rate subsidies (Raus aus Ol und Gas)
  - full compensation for SFH home owner in lowest third of income distribution, up to a technology-specific threshold (Sauber Heizen für Alle, SHFA)
- Thermal renovation: flat-rate subsidies (Sanierungsbonus)  $\bullet$
- Database
  - Household budget survey (Konsumerhebung 2019/20 (Statistik Austria, 2022))
    - 7,139 Household observations
    - Use of economic data, dwelling data, housing tenure, urban-rural typology
  - Assumption: investment costs for tenant-occupied dwellings are covered by  $\bullet$ landlords (based on distribution of residence real estate ECB HFCS (Humer et al. 2015))



## Results Investment: Total

Bottom-up estimate of total investment costs for heating fossil fuel phase-out (incl. necessary renovation)

- € 67 bn over the transition period
- Comparable range to top-down estimate ullet
  - — € 47-71 bn for total investment (public and private, renovation and heating systems, 2022 2030) (Umweltbundesamt 2022)
- 28% of investment in tenant-occupied dwellings (importance of landlord-tenant relationships)

	Owner-occupied homes	
Heating system change	€ 14.5 bn	
Required thermal renovation	€ 33.2 bn	



### **Tenant-occupied homes** € 3.6 bn € 15.4 bn

# Results Subsidy program: total

- Support from the current subsidy program corresponds to estimated € 45.5 bn over the phase-out  $\bigcirc$ period.
- Strongly increased estimate, compared to Austrian WEM scenario (subsidies for renovation and heating systems 2020-2050): € 13.1 bn (Umweltbundesamt 2022)

	Owner-occupied homes	Tenant-occupied homes	Total
Investment	€ 47.6 bn	€ 18.9 bn	€ 66.5 bn
Subsidies	€ 31.4 bn	€ 14.1 bn	€ 45.5 bn
Net investment	€ 16.2 bn	€ 4.8 bn	€ 21.0 bn



### Results Investment: distribution

- If landlords have to finance the phase-out in rented dwellings, 53% of the total investment need is attributed to highincome households [V16-20] (33% to V19-20 alone).
- Investment need for tenantoccupied dwellings is much stronger distributed towards high-income households than investment need for home owners





investment as landlord

## **Results** Subsidy program: distribution

 Assuming that home owners and landlords finance investment and followingly receive subsidies, the subsidy scheme is progressive across income groups but highincome households [V16-20] receive 53% of government support.



investment as home owner

subsidy for home owner



### investment as landlord

subsidy for landlord

## **Results** Net investment: distribution

progressive (vertical)  $\bigcirc$ distribution of net investment for home owners and especially landlords



subsidy for landlord

investment as landlord



Income vigintiles

subsidy for home owner investment as home owner 

## Results

### Net investment: Home owners

- The specific subsidy program for low-income households (SHFA) makes the subsidy scheme progressive.
- However, SHFA does not address home owners in MFHs and thermal renovation investment.
- The largest financial burden in terms of net investment remains on lowest-income home owners.

### Home owners Avg subsidy and net investment relative to monthly disposable income







- $\bigcirc$  Investment need of € 67 bn over the transition period, corresponding to ~2,5% annual national investment (until 2040)
- $\bigcirc$  More than two thirds financed by public subsidies of  $\in$  46 bn, corresponding to 40% of pre-COVID total annual public subsidies (until 2040)
- O More than halve of these subsidies go to the high-income households.



# **Policy conclusions**

- The subsidy scheme is compensating for higher relative investment needs of (most) low-income households (i.e. progressive)
- O However it is not compensating the high relatively investment need of low-income home owners in MFHs and cooperative housing and for renovation investments in general
- O A mandated phase-out with an income-based cap on subsidies for the highest income deciles could address public budget constraints without compromising equity considerations.





# Thanks!

### <u>Stefan Nabernegg<sup>1</sup></u>, Teresa Lackner<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Wegener Center for Climate and Global Change, University of Graz, Austria
<sup>2</sup> Graz Schumpeter Centre, University of Graz, Austria

stefan.nabernegg@uni-graz.at

24.Klimatag, April 4, 2024