STRATHCLYDE

DISCUSSION PAPERS IN ECONOMICS

THE SYSTEM-WIDE IMPACT OF HEALTHY EATING: ASSESSING
EMISSIONS AND ECONOMIC IMPACTS AT THE REGIONAL LEVEL

BY

GRANT ALLAN, DAVID COMERFORD AND PETER MCGREGOR

NO 18-07

DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS
UNIVERSITY OF STRATHCLYDE
GLASGOW

The system-wide impact of healthy eating: assessing emissions and economic impacts at the regional level

Grant Allan, David Comerford and Peter McGregor

Fraser of Allander Institute and Department of Economics, University of Strathclyde

March 2018

Abstract

Encouraging consumers to shift their diets towards to a lower meat/lower calorie alternative has been the focus of food and health policies across the world. The economic impact on regions has been less widely examined, but is likely to be significant, where agricultural and food activities are important for the host region. In this study we use a multi-sectoral modelling framework to examine the environmental and economic impacts of a dietary change, and illustrate this using a detailed model for Scotland. We find that if household food and drink consumption follows healthy eating guidelines, it would reduce both Scotland's "footprint" and "territorial" emissions, and yet may be associated with positive economic impacts, generating a "double dividend" for both the environment and the economy. Furthermore, the likely benefits to health suggest the potential for a "triple dividend". The economic impact however depends critically upon how households use the income previously spent on higher calorie diets.

Keywords: Diet; Emissions; Economic impact; Scotland.

JEL codes: Q11; Q18; R11.

1.   Introduction

There is an increasing focus on encouraging individuals to undertake actions that would improve their health. Rates of obesity across the western world have risen sharply in recent decades (Ng et al, 2014), while in 2016, 29% of Scottish adults were classified as obese[1], with a further 36% overweight (Scottish Government, 2017a). Obesity rates for Scottish Men and Women have increased since 2003 from 22% to 29% and 24% to 29% respectively. Almost one in three Scottish children has a BMI outwith the healthy range, with one in seven at risk of obesity (a BMI above the 95th percentile).

In response, the Scottish diet has been examined (Food Standards Scotland, 2018) and a number of proposals made to improve food and diet choices, including reducing consumption of certain goods. The Scottish Government's "Revised Dietary Goals" (Scottish Government, 2016) set out that individuals should seek to reduce daily calorie intake by 120 kcals, eat more than 400g of fruit and vegetables per day while limiting their intake of red and processed meat to no more than 90g/day (p.3). Increased rates of obesity lead to a number of negative outcomes for individuals, such as increasing the chance of developing cancers, diabetes and cardiovascular disease (see for instance, Wang et al, 2011).

The private benefits of moving towards a healthy diet are therefore clear, and the kinds of interventions which could encourage this shift are widely understood (including education, pricing and regulation)[2].

---

[1] Obesity is typically defined using Body Mass Index (BMI) measures, which is calculated as an individual's weight (kg) divided by the square of their height (metres). A BMI of more than 30 indicates "Obese", while between 25.0 and 29.9 is classified as "Overweight" and a "normal weight" defined as a BMI between 18.5 and 24.9. (Baker, 2018).

[2] The "Supporting Healthy Choices" programme seeks to "rebalance" the Scottish diet through education as well as voluntary action to support healthy living, the promotion of healthier products and encouraging food producers to formulate healthier products.

Red meat consumption also matters for climate change. It is acknowledged that red meat is a particularly inefficient and carbon intensive way of generating calories for human consumption (see, for example, Scarborough et al (2014)). For each calorie of meat produced, many calories of grain and other vegetable crops have to be grown to feed livestock. To the extent that arable farming has a certain emissions consequence per human calorie supplied, livestock production clearly multiplies these emissions per calorie produced. And this is before we take into consideration the methane produced by livestock, which further adds to climate change emissions. Springmann et al (2016) found that "transitioning toward more plant-based diets that are in line with standard dietary guidelines could reduce global mortality by 6–10% and food-related greenhouse gas emissions by 29–70% compared with a reference scenario in 2050" (p. 4146).

This suggests the prospect of a policy win-win: if diets improve in accordance with healthy eating guidelines (i.e. reducing calorie intake generally, but especially from red meat consumption) then not only will it help meet health policy outcomes, it could also lead to reduced emissions, with consequential environmental benefit.

Currently omitted from this discussion however – and the focus of this paper - is an assessment of the possible *economic* impacts of such a change in individuals' diets. For instance, a healthy diet will mean lower food consumption – in line with lower calories - and in particular, lower expenditures on food and drink types higher in saturated fats, sugars, salts and other indicators of less healthy eating choices, such as red meat. If expenditure on food, and especially red meat, falls - and in the absence of any increases in demand for other goods – economic activity is likely to reduce. It might be expected that reductions in activity would be felt in red meat producing and sales sectors, as well as ripple effects on the downstream activities in food production.

However, the *net* economic impact of reducing spending on "bad" diets depends on the extent to which the spending which was previously made on these diet choices is then spent

on other products. The overall impact might be either positive or negative depending on the extent to which the gross effect of the reduced spending on poor diets was offset by the positive effect of increased expenditure on alternative uses. Understanding the factors affecting the *net* economic – as well as environmental - impacts of changes in diet is the major focus of this paper, which we analyse here through focusing on the expenditure effects of the diet change[3].

Economic activity attributable to food consumption is especially important in Scotland where food production and related activity are important sectors in the economy. Food and Drink is one of the Scottish Government's "Growth Sectors" (Scottish Government, 2015) and the focus of policy actions[4]. The recent strategy for the Food and Drink sector set the ambition to double turnover in "farming, fishing, and food and drink" to £30 billion by 2030 (Scottish Food and Drink Partnership, 2017)[5]. There is of course potential for a conflict between ambitions for these sectors growing through increasing exports (Scottish Food and Drink Partnership, 2014) at a time of heightened global concern about healthy eating[6].

It is to this debate that the current paper contributes. We seek to explore three issues. First, what are the economic impacts on Scotland of a shift in consumer demands consistent with healthier eating in Scotland? Specifically, we identify the extent to which economically

---

[3] It has been argued that better diets could also have positive fiscal benefits through both reduced medical costs and fewer absences from work related to obesity. A report for the Scottish Parliament noted prior estimates that healthcare cost of treating overweight and obesity was £363 million in 2007/8 while lost earnings from obesity-relate sickness in Scotland were estimated at XXX (Castle, 2015). To be clear, an improved diet would be expected to lead to a further supply-side disturbance; a healthier and more productive labour force, with reduced expenditures on public health actions; however the additional economic impacts through this health mechanism, are not examined in this paper.

[4] The Scottish Government's "Food & Drink" growth sector is defined using Standard Industrial Classifications (SIC), and includes: Agriculture; Fishing; Aquaculture; Meat Processing; Fish & fruit Processing; Dairy Products, Oils & Fats Processing; Grain Milling & Starch; Bakery & Farinaceous; Other Food; Animal Feeds; Spirits & Wines; Beer & Malt; and, Soft Drinks.

[5] On the most recent data, this broadly defined sector generates £5.2 billion of Gross Value Added (GVA), and direct employs 111,000 people, approximately 4% of total employment in Scotland (Scottish Government, 2018).

[6] Scottish Food and Drink Partnership (2014) envisages that the future global consumer "will be seeking out" Scottish produce, including dairy and red meat.

important sectors of the Scottish economy are affected by a reduction in meat consumption consistent with this healthier diet.

Second, we identify the impact on emissions associated with both Scottish production ("territorial") and Scottish consumption ("footprint") following the change in diet and expenditure patterns. This permits us to quantify both the economic and environmental consequences of healthier eating for the region. As part of the motivation for a move towards a lower meat diet is the environmental benefits, being able to systematically evaluate whether policies designed to improve in this domain, also might have economic consequences is likely to be highly valuable to policymakers. Our proposed framework adds environmental detail within an economic model due to the interdependence between economic outcomes and (in this case) emissions.

Third, our methodological contribution is to identify the *net* impacts of a positive shift in consumer demands in line with improved dietary choices. That is to say, reductions in household expenditure consistent with reduced calories and meat consumption, will not necessarily reduce the total amount household spending. The profile of household spending across products will change however, with increases in discretionary (and non-food) items acting to maintain total household consumption. Neither the aggregate nor sectoral results on economic and environmental measures of this change in consumption patterns cannot be known in advance.

The net economic impact will primarily depend upon the scale of food production systems in the host region and their linkages to the rest of the regional economy. The analysis captures the countervailing system-wide effects of the fall in economic activity associated with the reduction in spending on meat products and the rise in activity generated by the positive "multiplier" impacts of the reallocated consumption. There will be thus (which might be positive or negative) consequences for both economic and environmental variables at sectoral and aggregate levels.

The paper proceeds as follows. Section 2 discusses previous literature on the consequences –
including economic and environmental - of a shift to a healthy diet and the modelling
frameworks which have been employed to analyse the consequences. Section 3 presents our
proposed regional multisectoral modelling framework, the data requirements, and the
simulation strategy employed in alternative scenarios around consumption "re-spending".
Section 4 presents the results of our analysis, including the sectoral and aggregate economic
and emissions impacts of each scenario. Section 5 provides some brief conclusions and
directions for future research.

2.   *Literature review*

There is a large literature on the environmental consequences of improvements in
households' diet, with some using multi-sectoral modelling approaches to comprehend these
impacts. At the global level, Stehfest et al (2009) examined the climate consequences of diet
changes, finding that moving towards diets involving less meat consumption could have major
implications for global emissions. Their findings include that a switch towards a lower meat
diet could reduce the costs of mitigation by 50% in 2050 compared to the reference case, with
significant changes in land use away from crops for feed, and animal production. They
intriguingly suggest that as well as positive health benefits, dietary changes have an
"important role in future climate change mitigation policies" (p. 83). No system-wide
economic impacts are provided in this analysis, however, unlike studies for the EU and UK[7].

In a major study for the EU, Tukker et al (2011) focus on changes in demand for food, with a
specific focus on the emissions impacts. In their approach, the E3IOT input-output model
captures the environmental impacts of different food products, so that when there are

---

[7] Stehfest et al (2013) undertake a comparison of two global models, both of which are "coupled" to the IMAGE
integrated assessment model to explore the importance of model choice in driving results. As with the 2009
paper described in the text, discussion of economic results are limited to the impacts of specific agricultural
commodities and their prices.

dietary changes, the impact are captured upon a range of environmental indicators. The partial equilibrium "CAPRI" model - solely focusing on the agricultural sector - is additionally used in this paper to capture the adjustments within the demand for agricultural products which produce price effects that are not captured in the E3IOT model[8].

For the UK, Audsley et al (2000) examined the consequences of a switch towards plant-based products and away from livestock products, and found that this can have beneficial impacts not only on greenhouse gas emissions but also for the availability and use of land for other uses. In all cases, reductions in consumption of meat reduce the UK grassland areas previously used for animals and crops for animal feed. Their report considers the possible consequences of reductions in land use for animals, opening up opportunities for expansion of tillable land, including production of livestock for export, or "biofuel crops, planted woodland and re-wilding". Discussing the economic impacts of the consequences, Audsley et al (2000) note that these would likely be unevenly distributed across the UK, with output contraction for "almost all" farmers in Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales, and "output growth in the south and east of England"[9].

In addition to emissions, other environmental indicators can be linked to food production and consumption, including water. For example, Hess et al (2016) examine the impact on (global) emissions and blue water scarcity of different carbohydrate products consumed in the UK, while Hess et al (2015) examine the level and distribution of blue water scarcity changes resulting from changes in UK diet. Both papers show the critical nature of extra-national water impacts and the potential unintended consequences of reducing meat consumption domestically in the UK[10].

---

[8] Specifically, the change in diet is translated in the E3IOT model into a demand change across specific categories. These were entered into the CAPRI model as relative demand changes, which produces a new set of equilibrium demands for each product taking into account adjustments in prices. This adjusted set of demands for imported and domestically produced products is subsequently entered to the E3IOT model.

[9] It is noted that "the farm-level economic impact of a [50% reduction in livestock product consumption] will depend crucially on what replacement output is found for the land released and on market effects that are beyond the scope of this study" (p. 6).

[10] As Hess et al (2015, p. X) note, "From this perspective, the impact of policies designed to promote healthier eating on global blue water scarcity may appear benign. However, the alternative dietary scenarios considered

Further, some have examined the health consequences of dietary change, including Milner et al (2015). To date however, there is limited examination of the economic consequences of improvements in household diet. It is in this gap that the current paper contributes.

3. Data and methods

To undertake the empirical evaluation of the economic and emissions consequences of changes in Scottish diet, we use Input-Output accounts for Scotland, extended with detail on the meat production sector using a novel disaggregation of the agriculture sector, and a set of emissions coefficients relating economic activity and consumption to emissions. In principle therefore, the modelling approach set out in this paper could be employed for any region or nation for which these data were available.

This section sets out the data used, beginning with the economic data and the approach to disaggregation of the agriculture sector (Section 3.1) before detailing the emissions data, including the starting point for Scotland's territorial and footprint-based emissions (Section 3.2) and the modelled dietary change scenarios (Section 3.3).

3.1 Economic data, including disaggregation of Red Meat production sector

The Scottish Government produces economic accounts, known as Input-Output (IO) tables, on an annual basis. These show the structure of production and consumption in the economy at a highly disaggregated level of industrial detail (see, for example, Miller and Blair, 2009). The full IO tables show, in columns, what each industry purchases from all other sectors in

---

show differing regional impacts – with all but the most extreme dietary scenario producing increases in the potential contribution to domestic blue water scarcity (due largely to increased consumption of dairy products) and potentially large impacts on blue water scarcity in other countries associated with increased imports of irrigated fruit and vegetables from countries with an already high level of water stress (e.g. Spain, South Africa, Israel).".

Scotland and imports for use in production, plus the wages, profits and taxes that these firms pay. Across the rows, IO tables show the destination for output of each firm, either to other industries for use in production (i.e. as intermediate inputs to the production of other sectors outputs), and sales by each industry to consumers, either domestic – e.g. households, governments – or to external markets (i.e. Scottish exports).

As well as showing the destination of sales and source of inputs, IO tables therefore reveal the industrial interconnectedness between sectors of the economy. This feature means that IO tables can be widely used in economic "impact" analysis – such as the impact on the Scottish economy of specific disturbances, or to identify the contribution of different sectors of the economy, for example Higher Education Institutions (Hermannsson et al, 2013) or forestry sector (McGregor and McNicoll, 1992).

The key strength of the IO accounts is that they are multisectoral in nature, and so permit a detailed analysis of industries across the Scottish economy. In the published accounts the Scottish economy is disaggregated into 98 industrial sectors, and the characteristics of sectors in the economy, and links between industries can be observed directly from these tables.

The Scottish IO tables show that there are strong links between the industries which make up the Scottish Food & Drink sector. For example, "Meat Processing" purchases inputs from the "Agriculture" sector, which in turn purchases inputs from "Animal Feeds", which in turn purchases inputs from Agriculture (plant foods). But there are also links between the industries that constitute the Food & Drink sector and the wider economy. For example, Restaurants purchase meat products from the meat processing sector, which – in turn – sources inputs from meat production activities within the Agriculture sector.

Hence, this means that any reduction in consumer expenditure on the output of one industry – such as Meat Processing - will have spillover effects on the levels of activity in other industries from which the sector sources inputs, especially (but not limited to) the other

industries of the Food & Drink sector (e.g. in transport). In addition, those sectors providing inputs to the directly stimulated sectors will reduce their demand for intermediate inputs, and so on.

Given the differential carbon intensity of red meat consumption as compared to the carbon intensity of other foods, it is useful to disaggregate the agriculture sector in the IO table into "red meat" and "other agriculture" sub-sectors. Fortunately, Moxey (2016) has done much of the required work in a report for Quality Meat Scotland. Our research expands this disaggregation of the Agriculture sector to help distribute total "food and drink" carbon emissions between red meat consumption and other food and drink consumption[11].

Using the (now 99 sector) IO table, we calculate a range of "multipliers" which demonstrate the interconnectedness between different sectors and the rest of the economy. These are reported in Table 1, where we focus on key economic and environmental multipliers for the Primary sectors. GVA-output multipliers show the impact on Gross Value Added (GVA) across the whole economy of unit changes in the final demand for the output of each sector, while employment-output and CO2e-output multipliers show the impact of a unit change in final demand on employment and CO2e emissions respectively.

We note a number of interesting points from Table 1. First, Meat production has a high carbon impact; indeed of all 99 sectors, it has the highest CO2e-output multiplier (of 4.781)[12]. Thus, an additional £1 million of final demand for the output of the Meat production sector increases total emissions across all sectors of the Scottish economy by 4.781 kTCO2e. Second, we see that changes in demand for the output of all sectors in the table have relatively larger impacts on GVA than on employment (i.e. the ranking of these sectors' GVA-output multipliers are higher than their employment-output multipliers). Thus, reallocation of

---

[11] Full details are given in Appendix A.
[12] In all analysis, we use Type 1 multipliers (Miller and Blair, 2009)

demand away from these sectors to others has the potential to create positive impacts on employment. We return to this point in Section 4.

Table 1: Some sectoral Type 1 multipliers in the disaggregated IO tables, Scotland

Sector	GVA-Output multiplier	Rank, n = 99	Employment-output multiplier	Rank, n = 99	CO2e-output multiplier	Rank, n = 99
Meat production	0.626	58	22.366	15	4.781	1
Other agriculture	0.530	83	13.063	37	2.111	6
Forestry planting	0.730	34	20.425	18	0.244	39
Fishing	0.653	54	15.153	30	0.285	34
Meat processing	0.464	92	12.928	39	1.438	8
Fish and fruit processing	0.466	91	10.279	60	0.374	27
Dairy products, oil and fats processing	0.469	89	10.452	58	1.179	10
Food and beverage services	0.695	42	24.670	10	0.212	43

Source: Authors' calculations.

3.2   Emissions data

The scale of carbon emissions at a regional level can be measured using two alternative perspectives: production-oriented territorial emissions and the consumption-oriented carbon footprint. Territorial emissions are those actually produced within a territory and therefore include the emissions generated from the production of goods which are exported and consumed outside a territory.

The carbon footprint conversely seeks to measure the emissions associated with all goods consumed by the residents of a territory, irrespective of where these goods are produced. Accordingly, emissions associated with goods and services imported into Scotland for consumption by Scottish residents are included in the footprint measure, while emissions associated with the production of Scottish exports are omitted[13].

Scotland's estimated carbon footprint, at 76.8MtCO$_2$e, is much higher than its territorial emissions of 49.5MtCO$_2$e (Scottish Government, 2017b). This reflects the facts that Scotland imports more than it exports (where exports and imports are both to/from the rest of the UK and international destinations), and that its imports are much more carbon intensive than its exports, as is normally the case for an advanced, service-sector dominated economy, like Scotland.

Table 2 shows how we can reconcile Scotland's territorial emissions with its carbon footprint. In this calculation, we assume that Scotland's exports are as carbon intensive as its consumption from domestic production, and that economic activity in the rest of the UK has the same carbon intensity as Scotland.

Table 2: Scotland's Territorial Carbon Emissions and Carbon Footprint

	Values (£m)	Emissions (MtCO$_2$e)	
Gross Output	233,147	49.5	Territorial Emissions
rUK Intermediate Imports	29,297	11.9	
International Intermediate Imports	15,725	17.0	
Less Total Intermediates	(102,591)		
Total Final Goods	175,577	78.5	
Exports	(70,926)	(17.1)	

---

[13] Scottish Government (2017) provides an assessment of the carbon footprint of Government spending in Scotland, including emissions outside of Scotland in the production of goods and services imported to Scotland.

rUK Final Good Imports	24,184	7.1	
International Final Good Imports	12,041	8.4	
National Income	140,876	76.8	Carbon Footprint

Productive economic activity in Scotland (in combination with international aviation and shipping emissions and emissions from land use changes) is associated with Scottish territorial emissions of 49.5MtCO$_2$e. However, from a consumption-oriented perspective, this activity relies on imported intermediate goods which also cause emissions in their production outwith Scotland, and these emissions must be added as being associated with Scottish consumption. Furthermore, not all Scottish production is consumed in Scotland, and so we can subtract the emissions associated with Scotland's exports. Conversely, we must add the emissions associated with final goods imports into Scotland in order to reach the Carbon Footprint total of 76.8MtCO$_2$e.

The territorial emissions, and the emissions associated with imported intermediate goods and services, can then be allocated to economic activity in specific sectors, while emissions associated with final goods imports can be associated with consumer demand for specific goods.

3.3   Method, including scenarios

In this paper we are interested in the economic and emissions impact of a change in consumer expenditures on Food & Drink, in line with healthy eating guidelines. We model this using the Input-Output framework extended with sectoral emissions data. Here, we describe two scenarios that represent the extremes of what households can do with the income that they now do not spend on food and drink: that is they either save all of this income ("Scenario 1") or they spend all of it on other goods and services ("Scenario 2"). Both scenarios, however,

feature the same reduced expenditure on the output of the sectors providing food and drink to Scottish households.

We use the healthy eating guidelines described in Springmann et al (2016) which approximate to a 38.8% reduction in calories from red meat, and a 2.7% reduction in calories from other foods and drinks[14]. Assuming that there is a one to one correspondence between expenditure and calories, the healthy eating scenario is assumed to involve a 38.8% reduction in household expenditure on the output from the "Red Meat" and "Meat Processing" industries (SIC2007 10.1), a 2.7% reduction in Scottish household expenditure upon the output of all the other Food & Drink sector industries[15] and a 1.4% reduction on spending on the "Food and beverages services"[16]. Lower calories therefore translates to lower spending, with demand for domestic products falling by £277 million, and a reduction in food and drink imports of £430 million. Thus, total spending is reduced by £706 million with roughly one-third of this falling on domestic Scottish production.

The two scenarios differ in terms of what these consumers are assumed do with the money they have saved from their reduction in food and drink expenditures. In Scenario 1 household expenditure on food and drink is reduced as described above and nothing else changes (i.e. the unspent income is saved). Accordingly, this scenario is associated with a reduction in total households' expenditure.

Scenario 2 assumes that household expenditure in total is unaltered, with the reduction in food and drink expenditure being accompanied by an increase in expenditure across all other discretionary goods (in proportion to current households' expenditure on these items) (including imports to Scotland). Discretionary goods are identified as all those goods in the

---

[14] Overall, the healthy eating scenario considered here implies that calories should fall by 5.1% and that meat consumption should fall by 38.8%. Given an estimate of how much calories come from meat, this implies a non-meat calorie reduction of 2.7%.

[15] These are the nine sectors comprising SICs 10 and 11, specifically "Fish and Fruit processing", "Dairy products", "Grain milling", "Bakery", "Other food", "Animal feeds", "Spirits and Wines", "Beer and Malt", and "Soft Drinks".

[16] This is calculated from the 5.1% reduction in calories and information that around 27% of inputs to the Food and Beverages sector is from food and drink ingredients.

economy other than public services, accommodation costs and legal and financial services (i.e. the assumption is that, just because food expenditure has gone down, this does not mean that, for example, rent or insurance costs have gone up, or that the government starts taxing households more in order to fund and spend more on public services).

As described earlier, we can use the IO modelling framework to identify the economic consequences of these implied changes in demand for the outputs of Scottish sectors, and our environmental extension permits the analysis of changes in Scotland's territorial emissions and carbon footprints.

4. Results

4.1 Headline

Our headline economic and environmental results are set out in Table 3. Recall that in Scenario 1 the reduced expenditure associated with lower consumption of calories is not offset by any reallocation of expenditure to discretionary goods; rather savings increase. We thus expect the reduction in economic activity in this Scenario observed in the first main row of Table 3. In the second scenario there is a reallocation of spending away from food and drink consumption and towards a mixed basket of "discretionary" expenditures. The net effect of both the (reduced) demand for food and drink and (increased) discretionary expenditure is shown in the second row of Table 3.

Table 3: Changes in headline economic and emissions indicators (absolute values and % changes from base year).

	GVA		Employment		Incomes		Emissions: Territorial		Emissions: Footprint	
	(£m)	%	(no. e'ees)	%	(£m)	%	(ktCO$_2$e)	%	(ktCO$_2$e)	%
Scenario 1	-156	-0.1%	-4,896	-0.2%	-86	-0.1%	-635	-1.1%	-2,714	-3.5%
Scenario 2	+185	+0.1%	+2,148	+0.1%	+113	+0.2%	-452	-0.8%	-2,365	-3.1%

Source: Authors calculations

Scenario 1

In Scenario 1, households reduce their spending on food and drink, and this leads to a reduction in GVA and employment associated with the food production and distribution sectors, and in the sectors which supply inputs to the food sectors through the "multiplier" process.

Looking at the whole economy, GVA falls by 0.1% (£156 million), employment falls by 0.1% (around 4,900 FTE jobs), and carbon emissions generated within the Scottish economy fall by 1.1% (slightly more than 0.6MtCO$_2$e). Exports are assumed to be unchanged, but various sectors of the Scottish economy now have reduced import demand (because of the reduced economic activity) and consumers have reduced their expenditure on food imports.

The combination of these two effects improves Scotland's trade balance by £557 million, and reduces the emissions generated outwith Scotland, but on behalf of Scottish residents, by 2.1MtCO$_2$e. The combination of reduced emissions within and outwith Scotland is to reduce Scotland's carbon footprint by 3.5%.

Scenario 2

In Scenario 2, total household expenditure is unchanged, with the reduction in spending on food and drink offset exactly by an equivalent increase in discretionary household expenditures, defined above. At the aggregate level we can see the net economic and environmental impacts of this change in the sectoral distribution of spending: GVA rises by £185 million (+0.1%) with employment also increasing, up by just over 2,100 FTE jobs. The trade balance increases with lower imports (down £193 million) and (assumed) unchanged exports. Of course, the net aggregate outcome of the reallocation of expenditures reflects the different characteristics of the impacted sectors: on average discretionary household expenditures are more value-added and employment-intensive than e.g. expenditure on Red meat production.

Carbon emissions generated within the Scottish economy fall by 0.8% (around 0.5MtCO2e), and emissions generated outwith Scotland but on behalf of Scottish consumers are reduced by 1.9MtCO2e. Scotland's carbon footprint falls by slightly less than in Scenario 1, down by 3.1%.

This smaller reduction in both territorial and consumption-oriented emissions is partly explained by the stimulus to the economy under this Scenario and a commensurate increase in emissions from Scottish production. However, total carbon emissions still fall in this case, because spending (and therefore activity) has been reallocated from high emission sectors (including "Red meat production" etc.) to lower emission sectors.

4.2   Sectoral results

We now turn to the sectoral results. Recall that the level and composition of household spending will be different in each of our two scenarios. In Scenario 1, household spending – both domestically and on imported goods - is reduced in line with the reduced consumption of calories. In Scenario 2, total spending is unaltered; only the composition of spending changes.

We highlight the sectoral results from both Scenario 1 and Scenario 2 by showing the sectors with the largest (in absolute terms) changes in GVA and employment in Figure 1 and 2 respectively. We can clearly see the "winners" and "losers" across the economy of this reallocation of household spending. The largest absolute reductions in economic activity are seen in "Red meat production", which experiences reductions of approximately 2,150 jobs and £50million in GVA. This is similar in both Scenarios, as there is an assumed reduction in demand for the output of this sector in Scenario 1 and in Scenario 2 no discretionary spending is allocated to this sector. Other reductions were noted in directly affected sectors of "Food and beverage services", "Meat processing" and "Other agriculture" and small reductions in

those sectors with backward linkages to these sectors, including "Land transport" and "Veterinary services". Positive changes were however seen in sectors benefitting from the increased demand for their outputs, in particular those where a high portion of households' discretionary spending is concentrated, in particular the "Retail" sector - where employment and GVA increase by 2,500 FTE jobs and £97 million respectively – as well as in "Other personal services" and "Wholesale" sectors.

Figure 1: Scenario 1 - Changes in GVA and employment from base year, absolute change, £m and FTE jobs

Figure 2: Scenario 2 - Changes in GVA and employment from base year, absolute change, £m and FTE jobs

Source: Authors' calculations.

5.   Conclusions

Our objective in this paper is to identify the system-wide economic and emissions consequences of a switch away from red meat, in particular, to a healthier diet. We explore the issues using a purpose- built environmental input-output (IO) model of the Scottish economy that separately identifies the "red meat" sector.

We have used Input-Output modelling, including a novel disaggregation of the Agriculture sector, to explore the economic and environmental consequences of reduction in expenditure on calories by Scottish households in line with a healthier diet. Importantly, we capture the net impact in Scenario 2 by considering the role of "reallocation" of expenditure away from

food and drink consumption and towards "discretionary" spending. Thus, a lower calorie diet does not necessarily mean reduced household spending, and our results confirm that – under one possible scenario – the reallocation of household spending can have a positive impact on economic activity while preserving the environmental benefits associated with a healthier diet.

The results of the analysis depend on the precise nature of the shift towards a healthier diet. Such a change, of course, always results in a reduction in households spending on "unhealthy" goods and services. However, if households simply save that part of their income which was previously spent on red meat, total consumption expenditure falls. In this case our IO model identifies a contraction in aggregate economic activity, with falls in value-added and employment. The impact is concentrated in the red meat and related sectors. However, there is also a significant drop in CO_2 emissions.

From a policy perspective, the results of this first scenario are mixed. First, emissions fall contributing to the achievement of a key environmental goal of policy; emissions targets. Furthermore, not only do territorial emissions fall, but so too does the Scottish carbon footprint, so that territorial emissions are not being improved by effectively redistributing emissions to trading partners. Second, however, economic activity actually contracts due to the reduction in consumption expenditure. It seems the shift to a healthy diet, while unambiguously benefiting the environment and population health, may be bad news for another key policy goal, economic growth.

However, this result is not general, and is, at least in part, a feature of the assumptions underlying the first scenario. In particular, it seems more likely that households who decide to shift to a healthier diet would choose simply to reallocate their spending, rather than reduce it overall. In this case the income not spent on red meat would instead be spent on other discretionary goods and services. In this case there are clearly countervailing effects on the economy: the contractionary impact of reduced spending on red meat and the

expansionary effects of reallocating this spending to other goods and services. The net economic and environmental effects are not known ex ante.

However, in this alternative scenario we find that, for the Scottish case, the reallocation of spending actually stimulates aggregate economic activity slightly (indicating that the expanding sectors are more value-added and employment-intensive than the contracting sectors, including "Meat Production"). Emissions still fall – according to both production and consumption-oriented measures, but by less than in the first scenario because of the stimulus to economic activity that occurs in this case.

Third, although we do not seek to model the effects here, we know that a shift to a more healthy diet can have substantial health benefits for the individual. So there is again a positive contribution to a significant goal of policy, namely improved health outcomes.

So a shift to a healthier diet can simultaneously: stimulate economic activity, improve health outcomes and reduce emissions. This represents a potential "triple dividend" from a policy perspective in that three key objectives of policy are favourably impacted. Furthermore, our IO framework can only identify the expenditure effects of switching to a healthier diet: many of the health benefits would be expected to stimulate the supply side of the economy e.g. increase in labour supply (through greater longevity) and productivity (through reduced absenteeism and presenteeism). Future research should systematically explore the impact of these potential supply side impacts.

What are the implications for policy? First, and most importantly, our analysis suggests that policies that successfully induce a shift in consumption away from unhealthy diets are likely to improve health, emissions and, probably, the economy (though the latter depends, in general on the structure of the target economy since this impact is the net effect of countervailing forces). This suggests the desirability of pursuing such policies. However, our analysis simply analyses the impact of an exogenous shift towards a healthier diet.

How might government induce such a change in behaviour? Government-sponsored information campaigns and moral suasion are one such policy instrument that may induce a shift in tastes towards healthy eating. Health-oriented taxation policies are another, but proper analysis of this would necessitate a framework that can handle impacts on relative prices. Future research should examine such policies explicitly. Futhermore, these policies should be explored in a framework where the supply side impacts of improved health on the economy and health-motivated taxation impacts, including the use of recycled tax revenues, can be explicitly addressed.

References

Audsley, E., Angus, A., Chatterton, J., Graves, A., Morris, J., Murphy-Bokern, D., Pearn, K., Sandars, D. and Williams, A. (2011), "Food, land and greenhouse gases. The effect of changes in UK food consumption on land requirements and greenhouse gas emissions", report for The Committee on Climate Change, April 2011, online at https://dspace.lib.cranfield.ac.uk/bitstream/handle/1826/6496/CCC_Food_land_and_GHG_Sep%202011.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

Food Standards Scotland (2018), "The Scottish Diet: It needs to change, 2018 update", accessed 22nd march 2018, available online at http://www.foodstandards.gov.scot/downloads/Situation_report_-_the_Scottish_diet_-_it_needs_to_change_-_2018_update.pdf

Hermannsson, K., Lisenkova, K., McGregor, P.G. and Swales, J.K. (2013), "The expenditure impacts of individual higher education institutions and their students on the Scottish economy under a regional government budget constraint: homogeneity or heterogeneity?", *Environment and Planning A*, Vol. 45, p. 710-727

McGregor, P. and McNicoll, I. (1992), "The impact of forestry on Output in the UK and its Member Countries", Regional Studies, Vol. 26(1), p. 69-79

Miller, R.E. and Blair, P.D. (2009), *Input-output analysis: foundations and extensions*, Cambridge University Press

Milner, J., Green, R., Dangour, AD, Haines, A., Chalabi, Z., Spadaro, J., Markandya, A. and Wilkonson, P. (2015), "Health effects of adopting low greenhouse emission diets in the UK", BMJ Open, 5, doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2014-007364

Moxey, A. (2016) "An Assessment of the Economic Contribution of Scotland's Red Meat Supply Chain", available online at http://www.qmscotland.co.uk/sites/default/files/economic-contribution-of-scotlands-red-meat-supply-chain.pdf

National Atmospheric Emissions Inventory (2016) "Greenhouse Gas Inventories for England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland: 1990 – 2014", available online at https://uk-air.defra.gov.uk/assets/documents/reports/cat07/1606140853_DA_GHGI_1990-2014_Report_v1.pdf

Ng, M. et al (2014), "Global, regional, and national prevalence of overweight and obesity in children and adults during 1980–2013: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2013", *The Lancet*, 384, p. 766-781

Scarborough, P., Appleby, P.N., Mizdrak, A., Briggs, A.D.M., Travis, R.C., Bradbury, K.E. and Key, T.J. (2014), "Dietary greenhouse has emissions of meat-eaters, fish eaters, vegetarians and vegans in the UK", *Climatic Change*, Vol. 125(2), p. 179-192.

Scottish Food and Drink Partnership (2017), "Scotland: A land of food and drink", published March 2017, available online at http://www.foodanddrink.scot/about-us/our-publications.aspx#

Scottish Food and Drink Partnership (2014), "Tomorrow, the world…: An export plan for Scotland's food and drink industry", published March 2014, available online at http://www.foodanddrink.scot/media/71112/Export-Strategy-0314.pdf

Scottish Government (2015), Government Economic Strategy, March 2015, accessed 22nd March 2018, available online at https://beta.gov.scot/publications/scotlands-economic-strategy/

Scottish Government (2016), "Revised dietary goals for Scotland – March 2016", accessed 22nd March 2018, available online at http://www.gov.scot/Resource/0049/00497558.pdf

Scottish Government (2017a), "Scottish Health Survey 2017: Main report", Octber 2017, available online at http://www.gov.scot/Publications/2017/10/2970

Scottish Government (2017b), "Carbon Assessment of the 2018-19 Draft Budget", published 14th December 2017, accessed 22nd March 2018, available online at http://www.gov.scot/Publications/2017/12/3692

Scottish Government, (2017c), "Scotland's Carbon footprint 1998 to 2013", April 2017, available online at http://www.gov.scot/Topics/Statistics/Browse/Environment/Publications/carbonfootprint9813

Scottish Government (2018a), "The Scottish Health Survey", 2016 edition, Volume 1, main report, accessed 22nd March 2018, available online at http://www.gov.scot/Resource/0052/00525472.pdf

Scottish Government (2018b), "Growth Sector Statistics Database", accessed 22nd March 2018, available online at http://www.gov.scot/Topics/Statistics/Browse/Business/Publications/GrowthSectors/Database

Springmann, M., Godfray, H.C.J., Rayner, M. and Scarborough, P. (2016), "Analysis and valuation of the health and climate change co- benefits of dietary change", *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, Vol. 113, 4146-4151.

Stehfest, E., Bouwman, L., van Vuuren, D.P., den Elzen, M.G.J., Eickhout, B. and Kabat, P. (2009), "Climate benefits of changing diet", *Climatic Change*, Vol. 95, p. 83-102.

Stehfest, E., van den Ber, M., Woltjer, G., Msangi, S. and Westhoek, H. (2013), "Options to reduce the environmental impact of livestock production – comparison of two economic models", *Agricultural Systems*, Vol. 114, p. 38-53.

Tukker, A., Goldbohm, R.A., de Koning, A., Verheijden, M., Kleijn, R., Wolf, O., Pérez-Dominguez and Rudea-Cantuche, J.M. (2011), "Environmental impacts of changes to healthier diets in Europe", *Ecological Economics*, Vol. 70 (10, p. 1776-1788.

Wang, Y.C., McPherson, K., Marsh, T., Gortmaker, S.L. and Brown, M. (2011), "Health and economic burden of the projected obesity epidemic in the USA and UK", *The Lancet*, Vol. 378, No. 9793, p. 815-825.

Appendix A: Disaggregation

The Agriculture sector comprises many heterogeneous activities: types of farming, quality of land, etc; the detail of which is lost when considering agriculture as a single sector. Further, in terms of climate change policy, both the emissions intensity and the putative policy instruments vary by farm type. In particular, red meat production has a higher emissions contribution per calorie produced than the production of other food, and as a result, we disaggregate the Agriculture sector in the IO accounts to separately identify the red meat and non-red meat sub-sectors. A more complete disaggregation may be desirable for other applications, but is in no way precluded by starting with a simple 'Red Meat–Non-red Meat' disaggregation.

Moxey (2016) "An assessment of the economic contribution of Scotland's red meat supply chain" provides a starting point for disaggregating the Agriculture sector into Red Meat and Non-red Meat. This work draws upon the June 2016 Agricultural Census, the Farm Accounts Survey, and Input-Output tables, as well as data from the Quality Meat Scotland (QMS) trade association who commissioned that report.

Red Meat purchase shares from other sectors (as a share of the (IO table) Agriculture sector purchases from other sectors) is based on figures from Table C5 of Moxey (2016). This table reports the estimated GVA "beyond farmgate arising from suppliers" to the Agriculture sector as a whole, and to Red Meat farms. Allocating Agriculture purchases (i.e. the Agriculture column in the IO table) to Red meat/Non-red Meat, based on these GVA figures is therefore akin to assuming that each sector supplies a homogenous good to both Red Meat and Non-red Meat sectors. The level of purchases from each sector by each of these two sub-sectors would therefore be linearly related to the GVA arising.

Then we need to make an assumption about how to divide Agriculture's spending on Agriculture output into Red Meat and Other Agriculture. The assumption used is to assume that the red meat sector sells its output to red meat and to other agriculture in same proportions as Meat Processing does. Other agriculture then sells the balance to red meat and other agriculture in the same proportions as agriculture sells to meat processing and agriculture.

Table B3 & B5 of Moxey (2016) allows us to split the total intermediate input purchases, subsidies (assuming that subsidies can be divided into "on products" or "on production" using the Agriculture sector proportions for both red meat and for other agriculture), GVA, and gross output of the Agriculture sector into Red Meat/Non-red Meat. This allows us to infer the split of imports by these sectors. Further, we assume a common wage rate across Agriculture, using Table D3 of QMS to divide employment numbers, and so split wages. The profit split is then a balancing item.

The Red Meat sector is assumed to sell the same proportion of its gross output to domestic final consumers and to other sectors as Meat Processing does, with the exception of what we label as "high red meat input sectors": Meat Processing, Dairy Products Oils & Fats, and Food & Beveridge Services. For these, we assume 80% of Agriculture's sales to Meat Processing were actually from Red Meat, and for the other two sectors we split Agriculture's sales by the Red Meat-Other Agriculture gross output shares.

Table B3 & B5 of Moxey (2016) gives us to the capital consumption for Agriculture and for Red Meat. We use this to split Agriculture sales to Gross Fixed Capital Formation, Valuables, and Change in inventories, into sales from Red Meat and from Other Agriculture. Export sales are then the balancing item of final demand (we use the Agriculture split between Non-resident households, Rest of UK exports, and Rest of world exports).