The labour and resource use requirements of a good life for all

Chris McElroy^{1,2}, Daniel W. O'Neill^{2,3}

 ¹ Community Development and Applied Economics, University of Vermont, Burlington, Vermont, United States of America
 ² Sustainability Research Institute, School of Earth and Environment, University of Leeds, Leeds, LS2
 9JT, United Kingdom
 ³ School of Economics, Universitat de Barcelona, C/ de John Maynard Keynes 1-11, 08034 Barcelona, Spain

Abstract

We use multi-regional input-output analysis to calculate the paid labour, energy, emissions, and material use required to provide basic needs for all people. We calculate two different low-consumption scenarios, using the UK as a case study: (1) a "decent living" scenario, which includes only the bare necessities, and (2) a "good life" scenario, which is based on the minimum living standards demanded by UK residents. We compare the resulting footprints to the current footprint of the UK, and to the footprints of the US, China, India, and a global average. Labour footprints are disaggregated by sector, skill level, and region of origin.

We find that both low-consumption scenarios would still require an unsustainable amount of labour and resources at the global scale. The decent living scenario would require a 26-hour working week, and on a per capita basis, 89 GJ of energy use, 5.9 tonnes of emissions, and 5.7 tonnes of used materials per year. The more socially sustainable good life scenario would require a 53-hour working week, 165 GJ of energy use, 9.9 tonnes of emissions, and 11.5 tonnes of used materials per capita. Both scenarios represent substantial reductions from the UK's current labour footprint of 68 hours per week, which the UK is only able to sustain by importing a substantial portion of its labour from other countries. We conclude that reducing consumption to the level of basic needs is not enough to achieve either social or environmental sustainability. Dramatic improvements in provisioning systems are also required.

Key words: Labour footprint; resource use; basic needs; decent living standards; good life; inputoutput analysis; scenarios

© 2024. This manuscript version is made available under the CC BY-NC-ND 4.0 license https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/

1. Introduction

1.1 Providing for human needs within planetary boundaries

Current global provisioning systems are both unsustainable and ineffective, leaving billions without basic necessities while contributing to a worsening environmental crisis (Kikstra et al., 2021). Moreover, no country currently meets the basic needs of its residents at a level of resource use that is globally sustainable (O'Neill et al., 2018). Researchers have repeatedly shown that necessary reductions in resource use are not compatible with an ever-increasing gross domestic product (GDP) (Haberl et al., 2020; Parrique et al., 2019). Yet reductions in resource use must be made compatible with meeting basic needs.

Gough (2015) proposes using basic and universal requirements for human beings to provide a foundation for achieving justice within environmental limits. To that end, Doyal and Gough (1991) list universal characteristics of need satisfiers that they suggest are common to all cultures, including adequate food and water, health care, physical security, and basic education. Rao and Min (2018) define a set of decent living standards based on this list and several other well-being theories. These decent living standards provide a basis for calculating the minimum resource use and emissions associated with meeting basic needs. Millward-Hopkins et al. (2020), for example, use Rao and Min's (2018) standard and find that decent living standards could be met globally with 60–75% less energy consumption than at present. Druckman and Jackson (2010) apply a UK-specific minimum income standard established by Bradshaw et al. (2008), and show that this standard could be met with 37% lower emissions than the UK had at the time of their study.

Such analyses offer a way to understand both the potential and limits of low-consumption approaches to sustainability. However, there is as yet no similar evaluation of the minimum labour requirements in the literature. This article aims to fill this gap in knowledge, both building on — and further developing — the living standards used by Millward-Hopkins et al. (2020) and Druckman and Jackson (2010) to evaluate the paid labour requirements of achieving a good life for all people.

1.2 Research aims and approach

This article seeks to answer three primary research questions:

- 1. What are the paid labour requirements of providing a good life for all?
- 2. What are the energy, emissions, and material footprints associated with providing a good life for all?
- 3. How do these requirements compare to the existing footprints of different countries?

A good life for all is modelled through two scenarios: a "decent living" scenario based strictly on the decent living standards proposed by Rao and Min (2018), and a "good life" scenario based on a more

-2-

generous minimum income standard published by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation (Davis et al., 2012), which is based on the deliberations of UK focus groups. These scenarios only model reduced consumption, and assume that the existing makeup of the global economy remains the same. The analysis centres on the UK, as it is the basis for the minimum income standard used by Druckman and Jackson (2010), and it provides a good case study of the scope to reduce labour footprints. The labour requirements are specifically compared to the existing footprints of the UK, US, China, India, and the global average. Energy, emissions, and material footprints are included to both contextualise the results and demonstrate the environmental impact of each scenario. While the calculations are based on UK consumption and its existing supply chains, the results are scaled to represent general, per capita footprints for each scenario.

The remainder of this article proceeds as follows. Section 2 provides more background on the existing minimum requirement literature. Section 3 provides a detailed account of each scenario and the methods used to calculate the footprints. Section 4 presents the results for both low-consumption scenarios and all footprint variables. Section 5 discusses the implications of the results, their limitations, the potential for future research, and the novel contributions of this article. Section 6 concludes.

2. Background

2.1 Minimum production requirements

Several researchers have estimated the minimum production requirements for providing human wellbeing, including the required energy, emissions, and materials. Estimates of the minimum energy required to meet basic needs extend as far back as 1985, when Goldemberg et al. (1985) argued that the basic needs of far more people could be met without increasing energy consumption in developing countries. Goldemberg et al. (1985) concluded that 33 gigajoules per capita per year (GJ/cap/year) would be sufficient. Rao and Baer (2012) develop an early version of the decent living standards for minimum emissions and energy calculations, which Lamb and Rao (2015) improve upon and use. Lamb and Rao (2015) predict that countries in Africa and Asia could meet basic needs with between 28–40 GJ/cap/year. More recent bottom–up estimates based on Rao and Min's (2018) decent living standards have found much lower values. Rao et al. (2019) estimate that 11–24 GJ/cap/year would be sufficient for decent living in Brazil, India, and South Africa. This result is also in line with an estimate by Millward-Hopkins et al. (2020), who estimate a requirement of 15.3 GJ/cap/year globally, ranging from 13–18.4 GJ/cap/year for individual countries.

While some estimates of the energy required to meet basic needs are as high as 100 GJ/cap/year (Rao et al., 2019), these tend to either assume that social and economic systems will change relatively little (Arto et al., 2016), or they provide higher standards of living for countries that are already better off

– 3 –

(Grubler et al., 2018; IEA, 2019, p. 90). Millward-Hopkins et al. (2020), by contrast, only include regional variations based on differences in demographics and geography, not existing differences in wealth or living standards, and calculate the energy required to meet specific needs instead of extrapolating from correlations between quality of life and energy demand.

Studies based on Rao and Min's (2018) decent living standards yield far lower estimates of the minimum energy necessary to meet basic needs in part because the basic needs they consider are quite restricted. Rao and Min's (2018) standards feature minimal housing space, only 9 years of education, one phone and one television per household, and vehicles and washing machines that are shared between households. Overall, these requirements represent a far lower standard of living compared to what is included in the minimum income standard for the UK published by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation (Davis et al., 2012), which provides larger apartments for couples and families, basic furniture and cooking utensils, and small amounts of income for occasionally dining out or traveling within the UK. Millward-Hopkins et al. (2020) do not include the energy required for community services and government functions in their analysis. The low results reported by Millward-Hopkins et al. (2020) are to some degree a reflection of these exclusions.

In addition to energy, emissions and material requirements have been studied as well. Druckman and Jackson (2010) find that the minimum income standards proposed by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation (Bradshaw et al., 2008) would have per capita yearly emissions of 17 tonnes of CO_2 equivalent. Lamb and Rao (2015) find that only 4.1–6.7 tonnes of CO_2 equivalent per person are likely to be required to meet basic needs and provide a high life expectancy. Akenji et al. (2019) calculate the carbon footprints associated with different countries' lifestyles, and find that they range from 10.4 tonnes CO_2 equivalent per person per year in Finland, to 2.0 tonnes in India. Vélez-Henao and Pauliuk (2023) find that the total material requirement of the decent living standards proposed by Rao and Min (2018) would be between 3 and 14 tonnes per person per year (depending on the exact implementation), with 6 tonnes for their reference scenario.

2.2 Minimum labour requirements

Several researchers have suggested that reductions in working time have the potential to improve well-being and reduce carbon emissions (Coote et al., 2010; Kallis et al., 2013; Stronge and Harper, 2019). However, despite this, there are few examples in the literature of minimum labour requirements that mirror the energy research discussed in Section 2.1. Many authors have predicted the potential for working-time reductions over the past 150 years, often arguing that working weeks could be reduced to between 15 and 25 hours (e.g. Lafargue, 1883; Keynes, 1930; Gorz, 1994; Bregman, 2017). However, this argument is largely based on extrapolations of historical improvements in average productivity, alongside the potential benefits of shorter working weeks, rather than a consumption-based analysis of the labour that is required to meet people's needs. These

-4-

predictions have also largely failed to materialise due to the economic incentive to maintain employment, as explained by Jackson (2017): in our current economic system, productivity gains tend to lead to increased production — a larger GDP — rather than greater leisure. This tendency represents a version of Jevons' paradox based on labour efficiency (Polimeni et al., 2008).

In a sense, the UK has already found a way to reduce its labour requirement significantly — by offshoring the production of goods and services. According to Coote et al. (2010), working-age people in the UK average 19.6 hours of paid work per week (including students and others who are not working)¹. These same people enjoy the products of more than double their own labour, given that the majority of UK labour is imported. Sakai et al. (2017) calculate the UK's labour footprint based on the products and services purchased by UK residents. They find that only 40% of the labour embodied in the UK's consumption is domestic (Sakai et al., 2017). The UK's increased leisure, then, reflects its ability to extract labour from other countries more than it represents a realisation of Keynes' vision of a 15-hour working week for his generation's grandchildren (Keynes, 1930).

At present, few examples exist of consumption-based analyses of minimum labour requirements. Hardt et al. (2020) provide a description of the structural changes required for a "post-growth" economy, but leave the determination of the necessary labour levels in such an economy to future research (Hardt et al., 2020). Kallis (2017) points out that at least some industrial labour seems necessary, but he does not provide a more detailed analysis. Popper-Lynkeus argued in 1912 that basic needs could be met with a 12-year, 35-hour-per-week labour service (Martinez Alier, 1992). However, the economy has changed dramatically in the past 112 years, and understandings of the material requirements of a good life have changed with it (Davis et al., 2022; Grubler et al., 2018). In summary, there is a clear need for a consumption-based, sector-specific analysis of the minimum labour required to provide a good life for all people in a modern economy.

3. Methods

3.1 Scenarios

Within our analysis, we explore two low-consumption scenarios that approximate meeting basic needs: (1) a "decent living" scenario based on the decent living standards of Rao and Min (2018), and (2) a "good life" scenario based on the minimum income standard published by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation (Davis et al., 2012). The per-category spending in each scenario, along with the recorded UK spending in 2012 (i.e. the baseline spending), is shown in Table 1. This section provides an overview of the two scenarios, while more detailed descriptions are provided in the Appendix.

¹ This is about 27.4 hours per week equivalent, using the units we use for our own results, which account for time off work (see Section 3.2).

Categories	Baseline spending	Decent living spending	Good life spending
Groceries (food and drinks)	€ 78,294	€ 112,297	€ 127,189
Clothing	€ 28,153	€ 36,594	€ 36,594
Housing	€ 292,119	€ 119,245	€ 132,517
Utilities and insurance	€ 92,013	€ 41,047	€ 44,493
Healthcare	€ 213,436	€ 38,091	€ 149,405
Appliances, furnishing, and maintenance	€ 45,199	€ 7,742	€ 39,410
Education	€ 204,705	€ 103,102	€ 204,705
Devices (TVs, phones, computers)	€ 57,348	€ 17,662	€ 20,017
Transport	€ 197,959	€ 67,606	€ 67,606
Public administration and defence	€ 178,590	€ 31,700	€ 129,328
Recreation (vacations, toys, dining out)	€ 362,950	€ 0	€ 108,949
Care work (babysitters, senior care)	€ 44,844	€ 0	€ 22,650
Gross fixed capital formation	€ 311,709	€ 0	€ 287,695
Total	€ 2,107,318	€ 575,085	€ 1,370,558

Table 1. Consumption in the UK in each scenario, by spending category. Values are in millions of 2012 euros (to match EXIOBASE 3 data).

3.1.1 The decent living scenario

The decent living scenario was constructed to include, as closely as possible, the household and collective requirements specified by Rao and Min (2018) in their "decent living standards". This scenario therefore permits direct comparison with other studies that draw on these standards, such as the energy studies of Rao et al. (2019) and Millward-Hopkins et al. (2020). Rao and Min (2018) include 12 household requirements and 10 collective requirements in their decent living standards. These are included within the 13 spending categories used in our analysis (Table 1). Clothing and transport budgets were kept at the same levels as the minimum income standards defined by Davis et al. (2012). Spending in the remaining 11 categories was reduced below these levels to reflect Rao and Min's (2018) requirements.

Many of these reductions are based on explicit exclusions by Rao and Min (2018). For example, although the scenario includes groceries, clothing, heating and cooling equipment, basic household appliances, and a mobile phone for each adult, it does not include alcohol, dining out, or a computer. Moreover education is limited to 9 years, and annual healthcare spending to PPP \$700 per person. These values leave education spending at 50% of the baseline scenario and healthcare spending at 18% of the baseline scenario. The decent living standard includes a minimum floor space of 30 m² for each family, with 10 m² of additional space for each person after the third (Rao and Min, 2018). Given the size of UK apartments (Roberts-Hughes, 2011), this means that essentially all families would be living in single-bedroom-sized apartments, and this is reflected in the housing budget. Many other categories are not discussed by Rao and Min (2018), such as furniture (e.g. mattresses,

eating/cooking utensils, chairs), legislative and judicial bodies, police or fire departments, care work, depreciation costs, and insurance. As such, spending on these is also set to zero. For a full description of the decent living scenario, please see the Appendix.

3.1.2 The good life scenario

Within the UK, the Joseph Rowntree Foundation have used group discussions to determine a set of minimum living requirements for UK residents, and converted these into a minimum income standard (Bradshaw et al., 2008). This research has been carried out for 16 years, notably by Davis et al. (2012; 2018; 2022), to continually establish what UK residents consider "the basic or default minimum standard, below which it is unacceptable for anyone to have to live" (Bradshaw et al., 2008, p. 16). This minimum income standard forms the basis of our good life scenario.

The good life scenario has similar goals to the decent living scenario, but aims to include many important things that are excluded from the decent living scenario, such as the government, university education, fixed capital investment, recreation, and greater healthcare spending. The budgets allocated by Davis et al. (2012) were used for every category except for care work and healthcare, and three categories that we added (education, public administration and defence, and gross fixed capital formation). The care work budget was set to 20% of the Davis et al. (2012) spending numbers because Davis et al. (2012) assume that all of a child's parents work full time, but in practice this is only true of about 20% of children (Bradshaw et al., 2008). The healthcare budget provided by Davis et al. (2012) does not include public spending on healthcare, so we instead used the UK's baseline healthcare spending, with a 30% reduction based on the repeated finding that about 20–40% of healthcare spending is wasted (WHO, 2014; Berwick and Hackbarth, 2012).

Importantly, the Davis et al. (2012) budgets do not include education, public administration and defence, or gross fixed capital formation (GFCF). Education spending was kept at the baseline level, as a considerable amount of both new research and skill development seems necessary to support this scenario. All baseline public administration costs were included except for those relating to defence. GFCF spending was scaled to include only what is required to cover the costs of depreciation. For a full description of the good life scenario, please see the Appendix.

3.2 Multi-regional input–output analysis

We used multi-regional input–output (MRIO) analysis to determine the paid labour footprints associated with the consumption profiles for the two low-consumption scenarios. MRIO analysis requires input–output tables that total the sales of each sector, in each region, to every other sector. We used EXIOBASE 3, a set of input–output tables designed for environmentally-extended MRIO analysis (Statdler et al., 2018). This method involves inverting the tables to reveal the resulting production in all sectors from a single unit of consumption in any particular sector (Kitzes, 2013). The

resulting production values are then scaled by the impact of one unit of production in each sector, to determine the total impact of any unit of consumption (Kitzes, 2013). This approach allows for the evaluation of any consumption scenario across a wide range of impacts, including the consumption of particular resources, the emission of different substances, or the labour required for production (Stadler et al., 2018).

To present more understandable and extensible results, we present labour footprints as the hours of labour per week equivalent, by dividing the total hours of required labour by the number of working weeks per year, the working age (15–64 year-old) population of the country, and the percent of working years we expect one person to work. UK law requires 5.6 weeks per year for holiday (GOV.UK, 2023), so our calculations assume about 46.6 working weeks per year worked. We assume that 80% of a person's potential working years are spent working (40 out of 50 years), which is both in line with global employment figures and allows time for essential activities such as attending school and raising children. The working age population is based on data from the OECD (2024). Since the conversions are all linear, alternate results can be derived through multiplication with preferred factors.

Footprints for our two low-consumption scenarios were compared against footprints based on the real consumption of the UK, US, China, India, and the global average. The year 2012 was chosen as the year for our analysis since it is the last year with real employment data in EXIOBASE 3 (Stadler et al., 2015, p. 260). We disaggregated the resulting labour footprint in each scenario by consumption category, sector, origin, and skill-level. Sectors were aggregated into seven categories based on the concordance tables provided by Wood (2022). Energy, emissions, and material footprints were calculated for each scenario and each country. Since changes in direct use are beyond the scope of MRIO analysis, the footprints assume that energy and emissions associated with direct use scale proportionally with changes to embedded energy and emissions footprints. Material use was calculated both with and without unused domestic extraction, for comparison with both total material requirement (i.e. total material consumption) and material footprint (i.e. raw material consumption) results in the literature. Each of these scenarios, including the baselines used for comparison, focuses on total consumption, so changes in inventories, which do not involve consumption, are omitted. We used the *Pymrio* library (Stadler, 2021) to conduct our analysis.

3.3 Scenario alignment

The underlying data for the two low-consumption scenarios feature categories that are distinct from each other, and from the product sectors in EXIOBASE 3. To allow for alignment between these sources, final demand was separated into a custom set of 13 categories (Table 1). Data from Davis et al. (2012) were central to this alignment process, and therefore our 13 categories most closely match the 17 categories used by Davis et al. (2012). Of these, six categories were merged with others, one

- 8 -

was excluded (Council tax), and three were added (education, public administration and defence, and gross fixed capital formation). Categories were merged for overall simplicity and for more tractable calculations. For example, the "social participation" category used by Davis et al. (2012) includes funds for a TV, laptop, gifts, stationary, domestic travel, a passport, and donations (Loughborough University, 2023b). These funds were split into two separate categories (i.e. recreation and devices), based on detailed accounts from Loughborough University (2023b). Council tax was excluded as it does not count as final demand. The three new categories were added to better account for non-household spending.

Calculating alternate spending totals required a comprehensive account of household types and costs. Household costs in the UK in 2012 were based on the estimates from Davis et al. (2012), using the detailed breakdowns provided by Loughborough University (2023a). These per-household costs were then multiplied by the number of households of each type, based on values from the UK Office of National Statistics (ONS, 2023). Because these accounts have different sets of household types, the Davis et al. (2012) household budgets were adjusted to fit the types used by the ONS (2023) before multiplying them to produce a full weekly UK budget for each category. These adjustments were based on demographic data from the ONS (2012; 2023).

To align changes in these budgets with the MRIO accounts, the 200 sectors used by EXIOBASE 3 were sorted into our 13 categories (shown in Table 1). This concordance process was largely based on the sector definitions provided in the concordance tables from Wood (2022), with further clarification based on classification definitions from the UN (2018) and category definitions from Bradshaw et al. (2008), Davis et al. (2012), and Davis et al. (2022). Note that many sectors with zero final demand in the UK in 2012 were not sorted. Changes in demand for each category were modelled as a proportional increase or decrease in spending for all sectors within that category. Good fits for spending types were prioritised over matching total spending per category, to preserve the makeup of each category when scaled. Because of this decision, two categories in the low-consumption scenarios (groceries and clothing) have higher-than-baseline spending totals (see Table 1). This result reflects a difference in where spending is allocated, and not a true increase in consumption.

Since non-profit and government spending are concentrated into just a few sectors in EXIOBASE, both types of spending were consolidated with household spending into a single spending vector. Gross fixed capital formation was kept as a separate vector, denoted by its total under the category with the same name. Changes to total GFCF were used to scale GFCF spending for each sector proportionally. As noted above, changes in inventories were omitted in all scenarios.

To scale government spending, public spending data were sourced from HM Treasury (2012). The EXIOBASE total for UK spending on public administration and defence in 2012 is within 2.1% of public spending reported by HM Treasury (2012), when excluding components that are accounted for

-9-

elsewhere or that are not final spending (i.e. education, healthcare, waste management, recreation, public debt transactions, social protection, and EU transactions). This pruned-down version of public spending was then used as a basis for scaling the EXIOBASE spending account, proportional to the resulting change any cuts would have in reported spending. Definitions for each category were drawn from Eurostat (2019).

4. Results

4.1 Overall labour requirements

The UK labour footprint in 2012 was 67.9 hours per week equivalent, while the decent living scenario footprint is 26.4 hours per week equivalent, and the good life scenario footprint is 52.8 hours per week equivalent (Fig. 1). These footprints represent the total amount of global labour embodied in the direct and indirect production of the goods and services purchased in the final spending amounts provided in Table 1. The totals do not include any labour or spending on exports, except as necessary for final domestic consumption. As discussed in Section 3.2, these equivalent units distribute the work over a population the size of the working age (i.e. 15–64 year-old) population of the UK in 2012, and assume that people work 80% of their working age years, with 5.6 weeks per year spent on holiday.




Fig 1. Labour footprint for each scenario, split by spending category. Results are reported in hours of work per working week, divided by 80% of the working age population (ages 15–64) of each region in 2012. Results are split by the categories of spending that drive each hour of labour (not types of labour).

The good life scenario represents a reduction in labour footprint of 15.1 hours per week compared to the baseline, while the decent living scenario represents a further reduction of 26.4 hours per week. About 54% of this latter reduction is due to the three categories that are entirely absent from the

decent living scenario: recreation, care work, and spending on depreciation (GFCF). The rest is primarily the result of increased spending on public goods, with public administration, healthcare, and education alone accounting for 74% of the remaining difference. Labour for groceries and clothing is higher in both the low-consumption scenarios versus the baseline scenario, as a result of the higher spending in these sectors discussed in Section 3.3. These apparent increases are offset by decreases in food and drinks purchased at stores and restaurants, which mostly fall under recreation in baseline spending. In the good life scenario, for example, groceries and clothing generate 6.6 hours more work per week than the baseline scenario, but this is offset by 7.4 fewer hours per week from decreased spending on recreation. The main categories separating the good life scenario from the baseline scenario are transport (4.2 hours per week) and healthcare and care work (4.9 hours per week). The 10 other categories combined represent a difference of 6.0 hours per week.

4.2 Labour compositions and comparative analysis

The UK's average labour footprint is far higher than the labour footprints of the US, China, India, and the global average (Fig. 2). The US has a labour footprint of 57.6 hours per week equivalent, while China, India, and the global average have footprints below 40 hours per week equivalent. India's labour footprint is 24.9 hours per week, China's is 36.3 hours per week, and the global average is 37.3 hours per week.

The country comparisons also help contextualise the labour footprint for the two low-consumption scenarios. The labour footprint for the decent living scenario is substantially below the global average, exceeding only the labour footprint of India. The good life scenario, on the other hand, has a labour footprint that is 15.5 hours per week above the global average, and only 4.8 hours per week below the US footprint.




Fig 2. Labour footprint for different countries in comparison to the two low-consumption scenarios, split by source of embodied labour. Results are reported in hours of work per working week, divided by 80% of the working age population (ages 15–64) of each region in 2012. Totals are split into domestic and imported labour.

A key part of the story of global labour is the labour embodied in imports, which is extracted from other countries (Fig. 2). While the UK imports 59% of its labour, India imports only 6.5% of the labour in its consumption footprint. Notably, there is much less variation between each country's domestic labour footprint (that is, the labour in each country that goes towards producing products that are consumed in that country). India has the lowest embodied domestic labour footprint (23.3 hours per week) while China has the largest (31.8 hours per week). India also has the lowest overall domestic labour hours per week equivalent (29.6 hours) and China the largest (38.5 hours). India nevertheless has the largest fraction of its domestic labour embodied in goods purchased in other countries (21%), while the US has the lowest (10%). With so little variation in domestic production, most of the difference between these footprints is in the embodied labour that countries are able to import from other countries. UK residents, for example, import labour equivalent to 160% of the total (domestic and imported) per capita labour footprint of Indian residents.

The fraction of labour imported in the two low-consumption scenarios is quite similar to the fraction observed in the baseline UK footprint, although the decent living scenario includes a higher proportion of imports. The decent living scenario has a higher proportion of imports because it features less spending in sectors with a high proportion of domestic labour, such as healthcare and care work. More generally, though, the relatively similar fraction of domestic versus imported labour across the UK scenarios is a product of the method used in our analysis, which assumes that the UK's relative spending between regions for a given consumption category remains unchanged. For example, no allowance was made for the possible prioritisation of domestic production over foreign production, to avoid making the unrealistic assumption that sectors in different countries produce identical goods. As a result, however, the composition of each low-consumption scenario is primarily a reflection of existing UK supply chains.

By contrast, the sectoral composition of each scenario is dramatically different from the baseline footprint, and the international comparisons provide quite helpful context (Fig. 3). Interestingly, the sectoral makeup of the labour footprint for the decent living scenario is very similar to that of India; both include about 45% agriculture and 29% services. By contrast, the good life scenario's sectoral composition is quite similar to the global average, with about 29% agriculture, 20% manufacturing, and 40% services.




Fig 3. Sectoral composition of each labour footprint. Compositions are reported as a percentage of the overall footprints shown in Fig. 2. Note that changes in inventory are not included as part of demand. Proportions are by hours of work, not by number of workers.

Both of the low-consumption scenarios feature far more agricultural work, in relative terms, than the UK at present, which has a similar sectoral makeup to the US. The labour footprints of both the UK and the US feature over 50% services, and less than 20% agriculture. The large differences in relative agricultural work may be misleading, however, since the absolute differences are quite small. All seven of the labour footprints presented in Fig. 3 include between 8.3 and 15.0 hours per week equivalent of agricultural work.

The US and UK, however, are able to import an immense amount of embodied services. The UK's footprint includes 34.6 hours per week of services labour, 151% higher than the global average and 380% higher than India's footprint. Both low-consumption scenarios require far less service work (7.4 hours per week for the decent living scenario and 21.8 hours per week for the good life scenario), and interestingly, both include increases in agricultural work. In particular, the good life scenario includes 18% more agricultural labour than the baseline scenario, suggesting that its spending on food and drinks may be higher than necessary.

The differences in skill level composition are less noticeable, but the international comparisons again serve as helpful context (Fig. 4). The decent living scenario includes a very high proportion of low-skill labour hours, greater than in any country included in our analysis. The proportion of low-skill labour in the good life scenario is smaller, but still greater than in any country analysed. These results are in line with the overall goal of these low-consumption scenarios, which is to focus on delivering basic needs rather than high-tech luxury goods. The high-skill labour component of the good life scenario is 22%, slightly less than the baseline scenarios (23%). The high-skill component of the decent living scenario footprint is lower at 17%, near the global average of 16%. The decrease in high-skill labour within the decent living scenario is consistent with the fact that it only includes 9 years of education, so high-skill labour would be difficult to provide in this scenario.




Fig 4. Skill level composition of each labour footprint. Compositions are reported as a percentage of the overall footprints shown in Fig. 2. Note that changes in inventory are not included as part of demand. Proportions are by hours of work, not by number of workers.

4.3 Energy, emissions, and material impact

The low-consumption scenarios reduce the energy, emissions, and material footprints of the UK (Fig. 5). The energy footprint of the UK in 2012 was 255 GJ per person per year. The decent living scenario uses only 35% of this footprint, while the good life scenario requires 64% (Fig. 5a). The ratio of imported to domestic energy use in both low-consumption scenarios is slightly higher than in the baseline ratio (both are over 1.4:1, compared to 1.3:1 in the baseline scenario). The energy required for the decent living scenario (89 GJ/cap/year) is below that of the UK, US, China, and the global average, although still well above India's 33 GJ/cap/year footprint. The energy footprint of the good life scenario (165 GJ/cap/year) exceeds all but the footprints of the UK and US. Notably, while the US has a lower labour footprint than the UK, its energy footprint is 91% higher. This difference is due to the much higher domestic energy varies roughly proportionally with each country's overall energy use, validating the proportional estimate used in our analysis.




Fig 5. Resource footprints for (a) energy, (b) emissions, and (c) materials, split by source. All values are per capita per year, based on 2012 population data. Results are split into domestic, imported, and direct use. Direct use in the low-consumption scenarios is scaled to match reductions in embodied amounts. For material use, both total material consumption (TMC) and material footprint (MF) are presented.

The emissions footprints (Fig. 5b) are quite similar to the energy footprints, although the emissions in the low-consumption scenarios are slightly higher relative to the baseline scenario. The decent living scenario has 5.9 tonnes of CO₂-equivalent emissions per person per year, compared to the baseline of 13.8 tonnes per person per year, while the good life scenario has emissions of 9.9 tonnes per person per year. The US, again, far exceeds all other countries' footprints at 22.8 tonnes, while India is responsible for less than 10% of the US's per capita emissions, at 2.2 tonnes. The decent living scenario emissions are 6% lower than the global average, while the good life scenario would represent a 59% increase. As with energy, the direct emissions caused by residential heating, transportation, and other non-industrial sources scale roughly proportionally with each country's overall emissions.

Material use (Fig. 5c) is calculated in two ways, both as total material consumption (TMC), which includes both used and unused material extraction, and raw material consumption (RMC), which only includes used material extraction. The term "material footprint" (MF) is commonly used to refer to RMC (e.g. Wiedmann et al., 2015), and it is in this sense that we use the term. The total material consumption values for the baseline, decent living, and good life scenarios are 25.8 tonnes, 10.8 tonnes, and 21.0 tonnes respectively. Notably, the good life scenario footprint is only 18% lower than the baseline. The material footprints are even closer, with the baseline at 12.6 tonnes per capita and the good life scenario at 11.5 tonnes per capita. The material footprint of the decent living scenario is far smaller, at 5.7 tonnes per capita. The ratio of imported to domestic total material consumption is even more extreme for the UK than energy and emissions, at 3.2:1 for the baseline scenario, 3.8:1 for the decent living scenario, and 2.9:1 for the good life scenario. These numbers are still high for material footprint, at 2.1:1, 2.8:1, and 1.9:1 for the baseline, decent living, and good life scenarios respectively. In contrast, China, India, and the US all have ratios well under 1:1. Clearly, UK spending on sectors with high levels of (especially foreign) material use is mirrored in both low-consumption scenarios.

5. Discussion

5.1 Scenario feasibility

Overall, our results suggest that it is not feasible to achieve a good life for all people with a socially sustainable labour footprint within the scenarios that we have considered. Providing a good life for all would require workers to work roughly 52.8 hours a week. Matching the UK's consumption in 2012 would require an even higher 67.9 hours per week of labour. Generalising these lifestyles to other countries would require increasing global working hours by 15.5 and 30.6 hours per week, respectively. Both results far exceed the 48-hour limit on weekly working time in the UK (The Working Time Regulations 1998). The decent living scenario would involve a more plausible 26.4

hours per week of work, but the lower hours in this scenario are only made possible by excluding many important societal needs.

For example, the decent living scenario does not include funds for the executive or legislative bodies of government, public safety, universities, childcare, insurance, or capital investment. We argue that for a scenario to be realistic, it should include the government, safety, skilled workers, children, risk, and depreciation. Together these categories make up 51% of the gap between the baseline scenario and the decent living scenario; including them would increase the working hours in the decent living scenario to 47.6 hours per week.

Some of the consumption reductions within the decent living scenario seem harsh to the point of infeasibility. Healthcare spending in the UK would be reduced to only 18% of its baseline amount. The UK healthcare system is already struggling with a lack of funding (Montgomery et al., 2017); this change would serve as a drastic impediment to care. At home, people would have to survive without beds, furniture, eating utensils, or other basic goods. Each household, no matter its number of inhabitants, would live in a one-bedroom-sized apartment. There would be no alcohol consumption, and no toys, personal computers, or other leisure goods would be provided. While individuals might be living, their life does not seem very decent, and they would continue to work 26.4 hours per week to make this life possible. Rao and Min (2018), who proposed the decent living standards framework, themselves note that these standards are "instrumental (but not sufficient) to achieve… wellbeing" (p. 231).

In addition to the labour footprints, our findings also suggest that the environmental footprints of our two scenarios are unsustainable. For a 67% chance of limiting global warming to 2 °C, the global carbon budget between 2020 and 2100 is 1150 Gt CO₂, or about 1.75 tonnes per person per year if distributed evenly over a population of 8.2 billion people (IPCC, 2023). Existing commitments would leave the global average at about 4.3 tonnes per person per year by 2030 (Alcaraz et al., 2018). The values associated with the decent living and good life scenarios are much higher, at 5.9 and 9.9 tonnes per person, respectively. Although a sustainability threshold for material footprint is harder to quantify than CO₂, previous authors have estimated a value of around 7 tonnes per person per year (Bringezu et al., 2015; O'Neill et al., 2018; Fanning et al., 2022). While the material footprint of the decent living scenario is below this threshold, at 5.7 tonnes per person, the good life scenario clearly exceeds it, with 11.5 tonnes per person per year.

If a good life is to be provided for all, then our results suggest that provisioning systems must be dramatically improved. Basic needs must be met with a fraction of the labour, material, energy, and emissions footprints that they require today. Merely reducing current consumption, while maintaining anything approximating today's supply chains, is clearly not enough to be able to provide a good life for all within planetary boundaries.

– 17 –

Although a scenario that explores the dynamic improvements that could be made to provisioning systems is beyond the static nature of our MRIO analysis, glimpses of the possibilities are still apparent in our results. India has less than one tenth of the per-capita emissions of the US, but it does not have one tenth of its life expectancy or happiness. Some countries have clearly found ways to provide what is necessary for their residents with dramatically smaller footprints. Rao and Min (2018) adopted a low level of healthcare funding based on their observation that funding above PPP \$700 per capita showed little impact on life expectancy. Others have shown that there is no statistically significant relationship between changes in GDP and life expectancy (Fanning and O'Neill, 2019). While cutting the UK's national health service to 18% of its current funding would likely be a disaster, there may be ways to obtain similar outcomes with a lower budget, such as a greater focus on preventive medicine or healthy lifestyles (Campbell, 2015; Heron et al., 2019). Viable alternatives would likely involve dramatic changes in the structure of existing provisioning systems, not just reductions in consumption.

5.2 Implicit imperialism

In some ways, the good life scenario demonstrates the extent to which imperialist appropriation is baked into the social norms and laws of the UK. The budgets provided by Davis et al. (2012) represent the minimum acceptable standard for residents of the UK. Yet the footprints implied by this standard are very high, including a 52.8-hour working week, and emissions, energy, and material footprints that are much higher than the global average. Given that humanity is already transgressing six planetary boundaries (Richardson et al., 2023), a scenario that involves increasing emissions, material extraction, and working hours is clearly not sustainable. The UK enjoys a high standard of living because it is able to appropriate many goods and services from the rest of the world, while allowing its residents to live a life of relative leisure. The UK thus represents a clear example of the appropriating systems defined by Fanning et al. (2020). Notably, the 48-hour limit on weekly working time in the UK would prevent it from onshoring all of the labour required to meet the minimum acceptable living standard of its citizens.

If a good life is to be achieved for all people, then the living standards demanded by a given country should match the labour supplied by that country. At present there is a large mismatch, with countries in the global North demanding a higher standard of living than they are willing to provide through their own labour. This imbalance adds another dimension to the drain from the global South calculated by Hickel et al. (2022). While global trade is not inherently unsustainable, a society that relies on asymmetrical appropriation of goods from other countries cannot serve as a model for sustainability.

5.3 Comparison with previous literature

Several authors have predicted that working weeks could be reduced to 15–25 hours in the future (e.g. Lafargue, 1883; Keynes, 1930; Gorz, 1994; Bregman, 2017). The predictions of these previous studies are all substantially lower than the 52.8-hour working week of our good life scenario, although the 26.4-hour working week of the decent living scenario is quite near their upper end.

The difference between these predictions and our scenarios emerges because the predictions in the literature do not account for the change in social standards that has occurred over time (and that may continue to occur). Productivity gains tend to lead to increased production instead of decreased working hours (Jackson, 2017). The resulting increases in living standards are often seen as essential, as acknowledged by both Davis et al. (2012) and Rao and Min (2018).

As an illustration, we can look to Popper-Lynkeus's 1912 prediction of a 12-year, 35-hour-per-week labour service (Martinez Alier, 1992). To make this prediction directly comparable to our results, we need to stretch the labour service over 40 years, and include 5.6 weeks of vacation per year. The result is a 12-hour working week, which is much lower than in either of our scenarios. However, Popper-Lynkeus's prediction does not include the labour needed for modern healthcare, computers, transport, or appliances — all of which are seen as necessities today.

Druckman and Jackson (2010) report that their minimum income scenario would lead to 37% lower emissions for the UK (compared to their baseline year of 2004). The good life scenario, based on similar household budgets, but extended to include other important societal needs, yields 28% lower emissions than the baseline value. The decent living scenario yields a far larger (57%) reduction in emissions, although it represents much steeper cuts in living standards than those modelled by Druckman and Jackson (2010). The decent living scenario is within the 4.1–6.7 tonnes per capita range predicted by Lamb and Rao (2015), while the good life scenario is well outside of this range.

The energy footprint of the decent living scenario is far closer to the UK's baseline energy footprint than the results of Millward-Hopkins et al. (2020), Rao et al. (2019), or Grubler et al. (2018) would predict. These previous studies estimate minimum energy footprints of between 10 and 30 GJ per capita per year. However, the decent living and good life scenarios have energy footprints of 89 and 165 GJ per capita per year, respectively, about 10 times higher than the lowest previous results. The decent living scenario requires over twice the maximum energy (40 GJ per capita per year) predicted by Lamb and Rao (2015), despite being within their range of emissions. Our calculation of the total material consumption required for the decent living scenario (10.8 tonnes per person) is almost twice the reference value for total material requirement estimated by Vélez-Henao and Pauliuk (2023) for decent living (6 tonnes per person). However, it is within their range of possible values (3–14 tonnes per person), and what is included is similar to their 14-tonne value (which includes standard buildings, meat and grain-based diets, and automobiles). The good life scenario is much higher than this range,

at 21.0 tonnes per person. Overall, our results align with those of Vogel et al. (2021); both suggest the need for radical changes to provisioning systems to prioritise meeting basic needs within sustainable limits.

Our higher results for energy stem from two major factors — our use of the UK's supply chains as the basis of our scenarios, and the top–down approach of MRIO analysis. Millward-Hopkins et al. (2020), Rao et al. (2019), and Grubler et al. (2018) all use a bottom–up methodology. While a bottom–up approach allows for modelling more radical changes to provisioning systems, it can fail to include many of the indirect or implicit resource requirements that MRIO accounts for, such as infrastructure, capital investment, and governance. Vélez-Henao and Pauliuk (2023), by contrast, reference top–down data (though they eschew MRIO analysis) and arrive at similar results for total material consumption to us. Notably, the gaps in Rao and Min's (2018) decent living standards outlined in Section 5.1 suggest that these previous estimates are likely missing many essential components that are captured in the good life scenario. Our analysis, however, is unable to model the radical changes to the UK economy that Rao and Min (2018) imagine. In any case, there remains a considerable gap between top–down and bottom–up approaches to estimating the resource and labour requirements of meeting basic needs, which future research should aim to narrow.

5.4 Novel contributions

This article makes a number of important contributions to the literature. It presents the first comprehensive calculation of the labour and resources required to provide a good life for all, based on the minimums demanded by the population of a developed country. Moreover, it also provides the first MRIO-based account of the labour and resources associated with Rao and Min's (2018) decent living standards. The specific results are both novel and challenge previous findings in the literature.

Beyond its results, the article also makes important methodological contributions. It contributes a new set of basic needs categories (Table 1), which go beyond the household-focussed decent living standards of Rao and Min (2018) to include additional forms of consumption that are required to maintain society (e.g. government, recreation, care work, and maintenance of the capital stock). In practical terms, it provides concordance tables linking these categories to the minimum income budgets of Davis et al. (2012), the decent living standards of Rao and Min (2018), and the 200 sectors in EXIOBASE 3.

Lastly, it provides a new unit of account for labour footprints (hours per week equivalent), which maintains the scalability and tangibility of per-capita accounts, while accounting for the number of years people are likely to work during their life and the number of working weeks per year. This unit allows for easy comparison between results for different populations or different years, as well as a more intuitive understanding of what the results mean in practice.

5.5 Limitations and future research

The approach we have adopted in this study has a number of limitations. Although MRIO analysis is a powerful method for estimating the paid labour and resource requirements associated with different consumption profiles, it is a static methodology, and does not account for changes over time. Potential changes in prices, living standards, technology, or labour efficiency post-2012 are therefore not accounted for in our analysis. Nor is the important contribution of unpaid labour.

The method is also limited by the underlying data. We rely heavily on the spending profiles provided by Davis et al. (2012). These spending profiles are based on UK residents' opinions about minimum standards. Rao and Min (2018) specifically mention the UK minimum income standard used as the basis for our analysis as a standard that reflects cultural embeddedness more than universal needs. As discussed in Section 5.2, both the social standard of the UK and its existing supply chains are clearly reflected in our results. Davis et al. (2012) and Bradshaw et al. (2008) both recognise many limitations of their budgets, including unrealistically high budgets in some cases, and a lack of accounting for people with disabilities, particular health or diet needs, or little access to urban resources.

Future research could help overcome these limitations. More comprehensive bottom–up analyses of labour requirements could help establish a lower bound for the labour required to provide a good life for all. Time use surveys could be used to estimate the contribution of unpaid labour. Further MRIO analysis could use other countries' supply chains and minimum social standards, drawing on work such as Ng et al. (2023), Aban Tamayo et al. (2021), or other studies referenced by Loughborough University (2024). Such an analysis could also attempt to account for future changes in economic structure, technological improvements (e.g. artificial intelligence), and demographic changes, going beyond static MRIO analysis to develop a dynamic model.

Lastly, Graeber (2018) argues that modern economies contain a substantial number of "bullshit jobs". These are jobs that are not needed to meet people's needs, but which serve the role of keeping people plugged into the economic system. Our analysis, which explores the labour impact of reducing consumption on a sector-by-sector basis, is not able to capture this effect, or to quantify the efficiency improvements that could be made within each of these sectors. Future research should also aim to explore the improvements that could be made to provisioning systems — to meet basic needs with less labour and resources.

6. Conclusion

This article has explored the labour, energy, emissions, and material footprints of providing a good life for all people. Our results suggest that reducing consumption to a level associated with meeting basic needs would still require an unsustainable amount of labour and resources at the global scale.

-21-

A bare bones decent living scenario, based on the decent living standards of Rao and Min (2018), would require a 26.4-hour working week, and on a per capita basis, 89 GJ of energy use, 5.9 tonnes of emissions, and 5.7 tonnes of used material. A more socially sustainable good life scenario, based on minimum social standards demanded by UK residents, would require a 52.8-hour working week, 165 GJ of energy use, 9.9 tonnes of emissions, and 11.5 tonnes of used material per capita.

Our results suggest that reducing consumption to the level of basic needs may be a necessary, but certainly not sufficient, condition for social and environmental sustainability. The 52.8-hour working week required to sustain the good life scenario is a far cry from Keynes' vision of a 15-hour working week for his generation's grandchildren (Keynes, 1930), or the more-recent literature that advocates a shorter working week as way to simultaneously improve human well-being and reduce environmental pressure (e.g. Coote et al., 2010; Kallis et al., 2013; Stronge and Harper, 2019).

Our results also reveal the imperialist appropriation embodied in the social customs, laws, and economy of the UK. They illustrate how the opulence of developed countries requires continued extraction of labour and resources from some of the poorest regions in the world. The decent living scenario requires unconscionable cuts to UK society, while the good life scenario requires infeasible amounts of labour — at least without a periphery to extract it from. Both scenarios require energy and emissions footprints that are far too high in the context of planetary boundaries that are already transgressed. Neither of these low-consumption scenarios represent a workable path to providing a good life for all.

If reducing consumption is not enough on its own to achieve a good life for all people, then radical changes to provisioning systems are also required. Our analysis suggests that the provisioning systems and supply chains of the UK are less labour and resource efficient than in many other countries, and could likely be improved, although cultural norms would have to shift as well. Crucially, such improvements in efficiency would need to be made without also increasing production.

Acknowledgements

C.M. acknowledges funding by Leadership for the Ecozoic. D.W.O. acknowledges funding by the European Union in the framework of the Horizon Europe Research and Innovation Programme under grant agreement number 101137914 (*MAPS: Models, Assessment, and Policies for Sustainability*). The authors wish to thank Anne Owen and John Barrett for their valuable insights and comments on this research.

References

- Aban Tamayo, J.D., Becerra Pérez, M., Delajara, M., León Robles, L., and Valadez-Martínez, L. 2021. The Minimum Income Standard for Four of Mexico's Largest Cities. Mexico, Espinosa Yglesias Research Centre. Available at: <u>https://ceey.org.mx/minimum-income-standard-for-four-of-mexicos-largest-cities/</u>.
- Akenji, L., Lettenmeier, M., Koide, R., Toiviq, V., Amellina, A. 2019. 15-degree Lifestyles: Targets and Options for Reducing Lifestyle Carbon Footprints. [Online]. Institute for Global Environmental Strategies. [Accessed 24 August 2024]. Available from: <u>https://www.iges.or.jp/en/pub/15-degrees-lifestyles-2019/en</u>.
- Alcaraz, O., Buenestado, P., Escribano, B., Sureda, B., Turon, A., and Xercavins, J. 2018. The global carbon budget and the Paris agreement. *Climate Change Strategies and Management*. 11(3), pp.310-325. Available from: <u>https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCCSM-06-2017-0127</u>.
- Arto, I., Capellán-Pérez, I., Lago, R., Bueno, G., and Bermejo, R. 2016. The energy requirements of a developed world. *Energy for Sustainable Development*. 33, pp.1-13.
- Berwick, D.M., and Hackbarth, A.D. 2012. Eliminating Waste in US Health Care. *Journal of the American Healthcare Association.* **307**(14), pp.1513-1516.
- Bradshaw, J., Middleton, S., Davis, A., Oldfield, N., Smith, N., Cusworth, L., and Williams, J. 2008. *A minimum income standard for Britain*. [Online]. Joseph Rowntree Foundation. [Accessed 5 September 2023]. Available from: <u>https://www.jrf.org.uk/report/minimum-income-standard-britain-what-people-think</u>.
- Bregman, R. 2017. Utopia for Realists. [ePub]. New York: Hatchette.
- Bringezu, S. 2015. Possible Target Corridor for Sustainable Use of Global Material Resources. *Resources.* **4**, pp.25–54.
- Campbell, D. 2015. Aboriginal involvement in caring-for-country: an economic case study in primary preventative health. *Australasian Psychiatry*. **23**(6), pp.623-625.
- Coote, A., Franklin, J., and Simms, A. 2010. 21 hours: Why a shorter working week can help us all to flourish in the 21st century. [Online]. new economics foundation. [Accessed 5 September 2023]. Available from: https://neweconomics.org/uploads/files/f49406d81b9ed9c977 p1m6ibgje.pdf.
- Davis, A., Hirsch, D., Padley, M., and Sheperd, C. 2018. A Minimum Income Standard for the UK 2008-2018: continuity and change. [Online]. Joseph Rowntree Foundation. [Accessed 7 September 2023]. Available from: <u>https://www.jrf.org.uk/report/minimum-income-standarduk-2018</u>.

- Davis, A., Hirsch, D., Smith, N., Beckhelling, J., and Padley, M. 2012. A minimum income standard for the UK in 2012. [Online]. Joseph Rowntree Foundation. [Accessed 5 September 2023]. Available from: https://www.jrf.org.uk/report/minimum-income-standard-uk-2012.
- Davis, A., Stone, J., Blackwell, C., Padley, M., Shepherd, C., and Hirsch, D. 2022. A Minimum Income Standard for the United Kingdom in 2022. [Online]. Joseph Rowntree Foundation. [Accessed 23 June 2023]. Available from: <u>https://www.jrf.org.uk/report/minimum-incomestandard-uk-2022</u>.
- Doyal, L., and Gough, I. 1991. A Theory of Human Need. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Druckman, A., and Jackson, T. 2010. The bare necessities: How much household carbon do we really need? *Ecological Economics*. **69**, pp.1794-1804.
- Elaine, D. Farquharson, C., Ogden, K., Sibieta, L., Tahir, I., and Waltmann, B. 2023. Annual report on education spending in England: 2023. [Online]. Economic and Social Research Council. [Accessed 3 June 2024]. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1920/re.ifs.2023.0290.
- Eurostat. 2019. *Manual on sources and methods for the compilation of COFOG statistics*. [Online]. [Accessed 3 June 2024]. Available from: <u>https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/products-manuals-and-guidelines/-/ks-gq-19-010</u>.
- Fanning, A.L., and O'Neill, D.W., 2019. The Wellbeing–Consumption paradox: Happiness, health, income, and carbon emissions in growing versus non-growing economies. *Journal of Cleaner Production.* 212, pp.810-821.
- Fanning, A.L., O'Neill, D.W., and Büchs, M. 2020. Provisioning systems for a good life within planetary boundaries. *Global Environmental Change*. **64**, article no: 102135 [no pagination]
- Fanning, A.L., O'Neill, D.W., Hickel, J., and Roux, N. 2022. The social shortfall and ecological overshoot of nations. *Nature Sustainability*. 5, pp.26-36.
- FRED. 2024a. Gross Domestic Product. [Online]. [Accessed July 1 2024]. Available from: https://fred.stlouisfed.org/series/GDPA.
- FRED. 2024b. Net domestic investment: Private: Domestic business. [Online]. [Accessed July 1 2024]. Available from: <u>https://fred.stlouisfed.org/series/W790RC1A027NBEA</u>.
- FRED. 2024c. Gross Private Domestic Investment. [Online]. [Accessed July 1 2024]. Available from: https://fred.stlouisfed.org/series/GPDIA.
- Goldemberg, J., Johansson, T.B., Reddy, A.K.N., and Williams, R.H. 1985. Basic Needs and Much More with One Kilowatt per Capita. *Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences*. 14(4/5), pp.190-2000.
- Gorz, A. 1994. Capitalism, Socialism, Ecology. 1st edition. Translated by C. Turner. Verso.

- Gough, I. 2015. Climate change and sustainable welfare: the centrality of human needs, *Cambridge Journal of Economics*. **39**(5), pp.1191–1214.
- GOV.UK. 2023. *Holiday entitlement*. [Online]. [Accessed 6 September 2023]. Available from: <u>https://www.gov.uk/holiday-entitlement-rights</u>.
- Graeber, D. 2018. Bullshit Jobs: A New Theory. Simon & Shuster, New York.
- Grubler, A., Wilson, C., Bento, N., Boza-Kiss, B., Krey, V., McCollum, D.L., Rao, N.D., Riahi, K., Rogeli, J., De Stercke, S., Cullen, J., Frank, S., Fricko, O., Guo, F., Gidden, M., Havlík, P., Huppman, D., Kiesewetter, G., Rafaj, P., Schoepp, W., and Valin, H. 2018. A low energy demand scenario for meeting the 1.5 °C target and sustainable development goals without negative emission technologies. *Nature Energy*. **3**, pp.515-527.
- Haberl, H., Wiedenhofer, D., Virág, D., Kalt, G., Plank, B., Brockway, P., Fishman, T., Hausknost, D., Krausmann, F.P., Leon-Gruchalski, B., Mayer, A., Pichler, M., Schaffartzik, A., Sousa, T., Streeck, J., Creutzig, F., 2020. A systematic review of the evidence on decoupling of GDP, resource use and GHG emissions, part II: synthesizing the insights. *Environmental Research Letters*. 15, article no: 065003 [no pagination] <u>https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/ab842a</u>.
- Hardt, L., Barrett, J., Taylor, P.G., and Foxon, T.J. 2020. What structural change is needed for a postgrowth economy: A framework of analysis and empirical evidence. *Ecological Economics*. 179, pp.1-13.
- Heron, L., O'Neill, C., McAneney, H., Kee, F., and Tully, M.A. 2019. Direct healthcare costs of sedentary behaviour in the UK. *J Epidemiol Community Health.* 73, pp.625-629.
- Hickel, J., Dorniger, C., Wieland, H., and Suwandi, I. 2022. Imperialist appropriation in the world economy: Drain from the global South through unequal exchange, 1990–2015. *Global Environmental Change*. **73**, article no: 102467 [no pagination].
- HM Treasury. 2012. Public Expenditure Statistical Analyses 2012. [Online]. The Stationery Office Limited. [Accessed 5 September 2023]. Available from: <u>https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/</u> <u>file/220623/pesa_complete_2012.pdf</u>.
- IEA. 2019. *World Energy Outlook 2019*. [Online]. France: Corlet. [Accessed 23 June 2023]. Available from: https://www.iea.org/reports/world-energy-outlook-2019
- IPCC. 2023. Summary for Policymakers. In: *Climate Change 2023: Synthesis Report*. IPCC, Geneva, Switzerland, pp.1-34, doi: 10.59327/IPCC/AR6-9789291691647.001

- Jackson, T. 2017. *Prosperity without Growth*. [Online]. 2nd ed. Abingdon: Routledge. [Accessed 27 June 2023]. Available from: https://www.routledge.com/9781138935419.
- Kallis, G. 2017. Radical dematerialization and degrowth. *Philosophical Transactions Royal Society A*.**375**, article no: 20160383 [no pagination]
- Kallis, G., Kalush, M., O'Flynn, H., Rossiter, J., and Ashford, N. 2013. "Friday off": Reducing working hours in Europe. *Sustainability*. 5, pp.1545-1567.
- Keynes, J.M. 1930. Economic Possibilities for our Grandchildren (1930). [Online] Yale University. [Accessed 5 September 2023]. Available from: <u>http://www.econ.yale.edu/smith/econ116a/keynes1.pdf</u>.
- Kikstra, J.S., Mastrucci, A., Min, J., Riahi, K., and Rao, N.D. 2021. Decent living gaps and energy needs around the world. *Environmental Research Letters*. 16, article no: 095006 [no pagination]
- Kitzes, J. 2013. An Introduction to Environmentally-Extended Input-Output Analysis. *Resources.* 2, pp.489–503.
- Lafargue, 1883. *The Right to Be Lazy and Other Studies*. [Online]. Lafargue Internet Archive. [Accessed 5 September 2023]. Available from: <u>https://rowlandpasaribu.files.wordpress.com/2013/09/paul-lafargue-the-right-to-be-lazy.pdf</u>.
- Lamb, W.F., and Rao, N.D. 2015. Human development in a climate-constrained world: What the past says about the future. *Global Environmental Change*. **33**, pp.14-22.
- Loughborough University. 2023a. *Using Minimum Income Standard Data*. [Online]. [Accessed 6 September 2023]. Available from: <u>https://www.lboro.ac.uk/research/crsp/usingmisdata/</u>.
- Loughborough University. 2023b. *Household budgets*. [Online]. [Accessed 6 September 2023]. Available from: <u>https://www.lboro.ac.uk/research/crsp/minimum-income-standard/household-budgets/</u>.
- Loughborough University. 2024. *Minimum Income Standard in other countries*. [Online]. [Accessed 23 August 2024]. Available from: <u>https://www.lboro.ac.uk/research/crsp/minimum-income-standard/other-countries/</u>.
- Martinez Alier, J. 1992. Ecological Economics and Concrete Utopias. *Utopian Studies*. **3**(1), pp.39-52.
- Millward-Hopkins, J., Steinberger, J.K., Rao, N.D., and Oswald, Y. 2020. Providing decent living with minimum energy: A global scenario. *Global Environmental Change*. 65, article no: 102168 [no pagination]

- Montgomery, H.E., Haines, A., Marlow, N., Pearson, G., Mythen, M.G., Grocott, M.P.W., and Swanton, C. 2017. The future of UK healthcare: problems and potential solutions to a system in crisis. *Annals of Oncology*. 28(8), pp.1751-1755. Available from: <u>https://doi.org/10.1093/annonc/mdx136</u>.
- Ng, K. H., Wong, Y. L., Teo, Y. Y., Neo, Y. W., Maulod, A., and Chok, S. 2023. Minimum Income Standard 2023: Household budgets in a time of rising costs. Available at: <u>https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=4587341</u>.
- O'Neill, D.W., Fanning, A.L., Lamb, W.F., and Steinberger, J. 2018. A good life for all within planetary boundaries. *Nature Sustainability*. **1**, pp.88–95.
- OECD, 2024. *Working age population*. [Online]. [Accessed 3 June 2024]. Available from: https://data.oecd.org/pop/working-age-population.htm.
- ONS. 2012. 2011 Census: Population Estimates for the United Kingdom, March 2011. [Online]. [Accessed 6 September 2023]. Available from: <u>https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/populatione</u> <u>stimates/bulletins/2011censuspopulationestimatesfortheunitedkingdom/2012-12-17</u>.
- ONS. 2023. Families and Households 2022. [Online]. [Accessed 6 September 2023]. Available from: https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/birthsdeathsandmarriages/families/d atasets/familiesandhouseholdsfamiliesandhouseholds.
- Parrique, T., Barth, J., Briens, F., Kerschner, C., Kraus-Polk, A., Kuokkanen, A., and Spangenberg, J.H. 2019. Decoupling Debunked: Evidence and Arguments Against Green Growth as a Sole Strategy for Sustainability. *European Environment Bureau*. Brussels. Available from: <u>https://eeb.org/library/decoupling-debunked/</u>.
- Rao, N.D., and Baer, P. 2012. "Decent Living" Emissions: A Conceptual Framework. *Sustainability*.4, pp.656-681.
- Rao, N.D., and Min, J. 2018. Decent Living Standards: Material Prerequisites for Human Wellbeing. Social Indicators Research. 138, pp.225-244.
- Rao, N.D., Min, J., and Mastrucci, A. 2019. Energy requirements for decent living in India, Brazil and South Africa. *Nature Energy*. 4, pp.1025-1032.
- Richardson, K., Steffen, W., Lucht, W., Bendtsen, J., Cornell, S.E., Donges, J.F., Drüke, M., Fetzer,
 I., Bala, G., von Bloh, W., Feulner, G., Fiedler, S., Gerten, D., Gleeson, T., Hofmann, M.,
 Huiskamp, W., Kummu, M., Mohan, C., Nogués-Bravo, D., Petri, S., Porkka, M., Rahmstorf,
 S., Schaphoff, S., Thonicke, K., Tobian, A., Virkki, V., Wang-Erlandsson, L., Weber, L., and

Rockström, J. 2023. Earth beyond six of nine planetary boundaries. *Science Advances*. **9**(37), eadh2458.

- Roberts-Hughes, R. 2011. *The Case for Space*. [Online]. RIBA. [Accessed 6 September 2023]. Available from: <u>https://issuu.com/ribacomms/docs/case_for_space_email</u>.
- Sakai, M., Owen, A., and Barrett, J. 2017. The UK's Emissions and Employment Footprints: Exploring the Trade-Offs. *Sustainability*. **9**(7), article no: 1242 [no pagination]
- Stadler, K., Wood, R., Simas, M., Bulavskaya, T., Kuenen, J., Fernández, J.A., Usubiaga, A., Merciai, S., Schmidt, J., Theurl, M.C., Kastner, T., Eisenmenger, N., Giljum, S., Lutter, S., Lieber, M., Wieland, H., and Tukker, A. 2015. *Integrated report on EE IO related macro resource indicator time series*. [Online]. DESIRE. [Accessed 6 September 2023]. Available from: <u>https://lca-net.com/publications/show/d5-3-integrated-report-ee-io-related-macro-resourceindicator-time-series/</u>.
- Stadler, K., Wood, R., Bulavskaya, T. et al. 2018. EXIOBASE 3. *Journal of Industrial Ecology*. **22**(3), pp.502-515.
- Stadler, K. 2021. Pymrio: Multi-Regional Input-Output Analysis in Python. [Online]. [Accessed 6 September 2023]. Available from: <u>https://pymrio.readthedocs.io/en/latest/intro.html</u>.
- Stronge, W., and Harper, A. 2019. The Shorter Working Week. [Online]. Autonomy. [Accessed 6 September 2023]. Available from: <u>https://autonomy.work/portfolio/the-shorter-working-week-a-report-from-autonomy-in-collaboration-with-members-of-the-4-day-week-campaign/</u>.

The working time regulations 1998. (c.4) London: The National Archives.

- UN. 2018. Classification of Individual Consumption According to Purpose (COICOP) 2018. [Online]. [Accessed 3 June 2024]. Available from: https://unstats.un.org/unsd/classifications/unsdclassifications/COICOP_2018_-_preedited_white_cover_version_-_2018-12-26.pdf.
- Vélez-Henao, J.A. and Pauliuk, S. 2023. Material Requirements of Decent Living Standards. *Environmental Science & Technology*, **57**(38), pp.14206–14217. Available from: <u>https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.3c03957</u>.
- Vogel, J., Steinberger, J.K., O'Neill, D.W., and Lamb, W.F. 2021. Socio-economic conditions for satisfying human needs at low energy use: An international analysis of social provisioning. *Global Environmental Change*. 69, article no: 102287 [no pagination]
- WHO. 2014. WHO Global Health expenditure atlas. [Online]. [Accessed 1 July 2024]. Available from: <u>https://cdn.who.int/media/docs/default-source/health-financing/atlas2014.pdf</u>.

- Wiedmann, T.O., Schandl, H., Lenzen, M., Moran, D., Suh, S., West, J., and Kanemoto, K. 2015. The material footprint of nations. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. **112**(20), pp.6271-6276. Available from: <u>https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1220362110</u>.
- Wood, R. 2022. *Concordances*. [Online]. [Accessed 6 September 2023]. Available from: <u>https://ntnu.app.box.com/v/EXIOBASEconcordances</u>.

Appendix Detailed Scenario Descriptions

Our analysis focuses on two low-consumption scenarios: a decent living scenario and a good life scenario. Each scenario is defined through 13 spending categories. In each category, a number of data sources are integrated to generate a total budget, which we then used as an input for multi-regional input–output analysis. This appendix includes detailed descriptions of the method used to calculate budgets for all spending categories in both scenarios.

A1. The decent living scenario

The decent living scenario matches the household and collective requirements of the decent living standard proposed by Rao and Min (2018). Rao and Min (2018) include 12 household requirements and 10 collective requirements. These material requirements were converted into spending budgets largely based on the minimum budgets provided by Davis et al. (2012), which are explained in detail by Bradshaw et al. (2008) and several other sources. While these minimum budgets were used as a starting point, they were reduced in almost every category to match the decent living standards proposed by Rao and Min (2018). The process to generate the personal budget for each category is explained in detail below.

A1.1 Groceries (food and drinks)

The first household requirement is a minimum daily intake of calories, protein, vitamins, and minerals, which was paired with the food and beverage categories of EXIOBASE and the food category of the Davis et al. (2012) budgets. Since Rao and Min (2018) explicitly exclude alcohol from their requirements, it is not included in the decent living scenario. Davis et al. (2012) include the cost of dining out in the food budget despite discussing it in the social participation budget. Based on the detailed budgets provided by Loughborough University (2023b), dining out represented between 10.1% and 13.8% of the provided food budget in 2018, averaging around 11.6%. To account for this, 11.6% of the Davis et al. (2012) food budget was therefore removed for the decent living scenario.

A1.2 Clothing

Rao and Min's (2018) clothing requirement is aimed at achieving basic comfort, while the Davis et al. (2012) budgets seem more focused on social acceptability (Bradshaw et al., 2008). However the standards were deemed similar enough, and the Davis et al. (2012) clothing budget was left untouched.

A1.3 Housing

Rent was reduced from the Davis et al. (2012) budget to the amount given for those living alone, enough for a 1-bed, mid-terrace, ground-floor flat (Bradshaw et al., 2008). Roberts-Hughes (2011) reports that 1-bed, 1-bath homes have a recommended area of 37 m² in the London Housing Design Guide, with the smallest 2-bedroom home having an area of 61 m². Since Rao and Min (2018) recommend 30 m² per household, with only 10 m² more area for each person after the third, and every housing type except for multi-family averages less than four people per household, 37 m² was deemed a good approximation for average housing costs under the Rao and Min scenario, and the minimum (single bedroom) rental costs were used for all household types.

A1.4 Utilities and insurance

To ensure acceptable living conditions, including a safe space, basic comfort, and hygiene, Rao and Min (2018) include heating and cooling equipment, electricity, toilets, waste management, and water supply as requirements. These requirements are well-matched by the water rates and fuel budget from Davis et al. (2012), which includes electricity and gas for residences, not fuel for transit. Insurance is not discussed by Rao and Min (2018) and therefore is not included.

A1.5 Healthcare

Healthcare spending was reduced to meet the PPP \$700 per capita threshold specified by Rao and Min (2018). This threshold represents a large (82%) decrease from real healthcare spending in the UK in 2012, but represents the upper end of Rao and Min's (2018) PPP \$450–700 per capita range.

A1.6 Appliances, furnishing, and maintenance

Rao and Min (2018) include provisions for a refrigerator, heating/cooling equipment, shared washing machines, adequate lighting, toilets, and cook stoves. Davis et al. (2012) either assume that these requirements are provided as part of rent (such as toilets and running water), or include them between their "Other housing costs" and "Household goods" categories. However, these categories also include provisions for much more than these minimum requirements, including items like mattresses, eating/cooking utensils, chairs, lampshades, and cleaning equipment, which are not mentioned by Rao and Min (2018), and therefore are not include here. Spending on household goods was therefore reduced to a quarter of its original value, enough to cover washing machines and refrigerators (Davis et al., 2018).

A1.7 Education

Rao and Min (2018) only require 9 years of education in their decent living standards. This value would include primary education and roughly half of secondary education in the UK. All public spending for primary education and half of the spending on secondary education represents 50.4% of UK public spending on education (HM Treasury, 2012). Since private funding data for education in

- 32 -

the UK are largely unavailable (Elaine et al., 2023), public funding was deemed an acceptable proxy for overall spending, and UK spending on education was reduced by this ratio for the decent living scenario.

A1.8 Devices (TVs, phones, computers)

Rao and Min (2018) include one TV for each household, one phone either per household or per adult (there are inconsistencies), and communication infrastructure. Davis et al. (2012) include a TV, TV license, laptop, landline and mobile phones, cell and internet service, and in some instances a radio and DVD player. The Davis et al. (2012) budget was therefore reduced to only include a TV, TV license, internet connection, and phone service (which includes a landline and a mobile phone for each adult). No computer is included.

A1.9 Transport

The allotments for transport are quite similar between Rao and Min (2018), who require public transport in urban areas and some private vehicles for rural areas, and Davis et al. (2012), who include funding for public transport, bikes, and occasional taxis for most households, and private cars for families with multiple children. As such, the Davis et al. (2012) budgets were left untouched.

A1.10 Public administration and defence

Public administration and defence spending is included as a single sector in EXIOBASE, and was scaled by overall spending as described in Section 3.3 of the main manuscript. The scaling was based on the ratio between total public spending in the UK in 2012 and the hypothetical total had spending been limited to the categories described in Rao and Min's (2018) decent living standards (HM Treasury 2012, pp. 74–76). We did not include spending for general public services, defence, public order and safety, and environment protection, as none of these are included as collective requirements by Rao and Min (2018). Economic affairs spending was limited to the proportion used for fuel and energy; mining, manufacturing, and construction; transport infrastructure; and ICT infrastructure. Housing and community amenities spending was restricted to only include community development, water supply, and street lighting. Education, healthcare, recreation, and waste management are covered by other spending categories and therefore not included in this category.

A1.11 Recreation (vacations, toys, dining out)

Spending on recreation was set to zero, as Rao and Min (2018) make no mention of vacations, toys, or dining out. They mention leisure several times, including traveling for leisure, but no specific allowances for these activities are made, such as hotels, long distance travel, or leisure goods.

A1.12 Care work (babysitters, senior care)

Spending on care work was also set to zero, as Rao and Min's (2018) discussion only includes it as an aspect of healthcare. Senior care and childcare are explicitly mentioned as aspects of healthcare, and are assumed to be covered under the total PPP \$700 per capita healthcare budget.

A1.13 Gross fixed capital formation

Finally, spending on gross fixed capital formation (GFCF) was also set to zero. Rao and Min (2018) make no allowances for depreciation or the investment necessary to maintain industrial equipment. For consistency with other results based on their decent living standards, spending on GFCF was not included in this scenario.

A2. The good life scenario

This scenario is based largely on the minimum income standards published by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation (Bradshaw et al., 2008; Davis et al., 2012). The budgets determined by Davis et al. (2012) were used for every category except for care work and healthcare, and the three added categories (education, public administration, and gross fixed capital formation). Per-category spending is explained in detail below.

A2.1 Groceries (food and drinks)

This category includes food and drinks (including alcohol) bought from grocery stores. Food was selected for nutritional adequacy and affordability (Bradshaw et al., 2008). Restaurants and bars are not included. However, as mentioned in Section 1.1, Davis et al. (2012) include the cost of dining out in the food budget despite discussing it in the social participation budget. Therefore the same 11.6% reduction was applied here, and added to the recreation budget.

A2.2 Clothing

Clothing was selected for a range of wearers and the budget was based on product lifetimes estimated by groups of UK residents (Bradshaw et al., 2008).

A2.3 Housing

Expected costs are based on average social rents in the East Midlands (Davis et al., 2012). Note that single couples are provided with a two-bedroom flat, where the second bedroom is for visitors or illness (Bradshaw et al., 2008).

A2.4 Utilities and insurance

This category includes water rates, household insurances, and costs for residential power and natural gas use (the last two of which Davis et al. 2012 refer to as "fuel"). Note that EXIOBASE 3.8.2

includes almost no record of UK natural gas purchases, which we confirmed to be an error. This error has a negligible effect on the overall results, however.

A2.5 Healthcare

Davis et al. (2012) include a small allotment for personal healthcare needs, under the title "personal goods and services". This allotment was replaced with a more comprehensive account of healthcare based on total domestic spending on healthcare in the UK in 2012 by households, the government, and non-profits (provided in the EXIOBASE data). A 30% reduction from this total spending amount was introduced based on the repeated finding that about 20–40% of healthcare spending is wasted (WHO, 2014; Berwick and Hackbarth, 2012).

A2.6 Appliances, furnishing, and maintenance

This category includes two categories from Davis et al. (2012): "other housing costs" and "household goods". The former includes a budget for decorations and maintenance, and the latter includes a large variety of items, such as "lampshades and light bulbs, carpets and curtains, kitchen appliances, and all furniture, cooking utensils, crockery, electrical devices, textiles, etc" (Bradshaw et al., 2008, p. 20). The household goods category is cut to 25% for the decent living scenario to include only the costs of a fridge and washing machine, but it is included in full here.

A2.7 Education

As a considerable amount of both new research and skill development seems necessary to support this scenario, all existing education (elementary, secondary, and tertiary) was included in the good life scenario. To model this, the education budget for the good life scenario was set equal to the baseline education spending in the UK in 2012.

A2.8 Devices (TVs, phones, computers)

This category was assembled from pieces of two categories from the Davis et al. (2012) budgets. The first category was the "household services" category, which includes funding for a landline and mobile phone, as well as home internet. It also includes a fairly small cost for stamps for paper mail (Loughborough University, 2023b). The remaining devices were pulled from the "social participation" category, using 2018 costs from Loughborough University (2023b).

A2.9 Transport

Transport is combined from two Davis et al. (2012) categories: "motoring", which includes the costs of owning and operating a car, and "other travel costs", which covers taxi, bus, and rail fares (not costs of long-distance transit for leisure) (Davis et al., 2012). Notably, 2012 was the first year that families with children were deemed to need a private car to get by in urban areas; cost and availability of public transport were deemed insufficient (Davis et al., 2012).

A2.10 Public administration and defense

The good life scenario includes over four times the public administration budget of the decent living scenario. This budget still does not include interest payments on public debt, spending on social protection, or EU transactions, as these don't show up as final government spending in EXIOBASE. Education, healthcare, waste management, and recreation are also not included, because they are represented in other, more specific sectors in EXIOBASE. This leaves 9 broad categories: executive and legislative functions, defense, public order and safety, economic affairs (which includes industry regulations and participation in particular industries), transportation, utilities, environmental protection, public spaces, and housing. All of these categories were included in the good life budget except for defense, which seemed counter to an economy focused on achieving a good life for all people globally. Defense was about 28% of baseline spending in this category. UK residents crafting the minimum income standards for Davis et al. (2012) clearly assumed that each of the remaining 8 categories of public spending would still be present, further justifying their inclusion in the budget.

A2.11 Recreation (vacations, toys, dining out)

This category is the remainder of social participation, once spending on electronic devices is removed. It includes presents, toys, pocket money for children of secondary school age, dining out (about three times a year for families and once a month at cheaper places for pensioners), and holiday travel (Davis et al., 2012). The 11.6% of the food budget that represents dining out was moved here, as explained in Section 2.1. Holiday travel includes a one-week per year holiday within the UK (Davis et al., 2012).

A2.12 Care work (babysitters, senior care)

The care work budget was set to 20% of the Davis et al. scenario because the Davis et al. spending numbers assume that all of a child's parents work full time (Bradshaw et al., 2008). In practice only 16% of children in couple-parent families, and 22% of children in lone-parent families, are in this situation (Bradshaw et al., 2008). Senior care is still assumed to be covered under healthcare.

A2.13 Gross fixed capital formation

Gross fixed capital formation (GFCF) is included as a separate spending vector in EXIOBASE. It includes both capital investment for increases in production and spending to cover depreciation. The latter category is considered a necessary cost of production, and included in the good life scenario. The amount of GFCF spending necessary to cover depreciation of assets is estimated to be roughly 13.5% of GDP, based on US figures for investment and GDP (FRED, 2024a; 2024b; 2024c).