

Regional Outlook 2021 - Country notes

Sweden

Progress in the net zero transition



Disclaimer (for the referring document)

This document, as well as any data and map included herein, are without prejudice to the status of or sovereignty over any territory, to the delimitation of international frontiers and boundaries and to the name of any territory, city or area. Extracts from publications may be subject to additional disclaimers, which are set out in the complete version of the publication, available at the link provided.

EMISSIONS


2018 OECD average:
11.5 tCO₂e/capita

2018 Swedish average:
5.2 tCO₂e/capita

Swedish target:
net zero GHG emissions by 2045

Large regions (TL2)

Figure 1. Estimated regional greenhouse gas emissions per capita
Tons CO₂ equivalent (tCO₂e), 2018, large regions (TL2)



Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions per capita generated in most Swedish large regions are below 10 tCO₂e per capita. Only Upper Norrland has slightly higher emissions per capita than the OECD average of 11.5 tCO₂e per capita.

Estimated emissions per capita in Upper Norrland are almost four times higher than in Stockholm.

Small regions (TL3)

Figure 2. Contribution to estimated GHG emissions
By type of small region, 2018





Figure 3. Estimated GHG emissions per capita
By type of small region, 2018




Across the OECD, metropolitan regions emit more greenhouse gases than remote regions. In Sweden, non-metropolitan regions emit most greenhouse gases. As elsewhere in the OECD, emissions per capita in Swedish remote rural regions are higher than in metropolitan regions.

Target notes: Emissions targets included in the Net Zero Tracker database from ECIU before January 25, 2021 are considered.
Figure notes: Figures 1, 2, 3 and the OECD average show OECD calculations based on estimated greenhouse gas emissions data from the European Commission's Joint Research Centre (ECJRC). The Emissions Database for Global Atmospheric Research of the ECJRC allocates national greenhouse gas emissions to locations according to about 300 proxies. See Box 3.7 in the 2021 *OECD Regional Outlook* for more details.

ENERGY

Swedish electricity mix

Figure 4. National electricity generation by energy source in 2019



Share of coal-fired electricity generation

2019 OECD average: 23%


2019 Swedish average: 1%

2030 well below 2°C benchmark for the EU: <2%

2030 1.5°C benchmark for OECD countries: 0%

Figure 5. Regional coal-fired electricity generation estimates

Per cent of total electricity generation, large regions (TL2), 2017



Almost all Swedish regions do not use coal in electricity generation. Only East Middle Sweden used some coal (less than 5%) for its electricity generation. No new capacity is planned or being build.

Wind power


2019 OECD average: 8%

2019 Swedish average: 12%

2030 well below 2°C benchmark for the EU: >29%

Figure 6. Wind power potential

Mean wind power density (W/m²)



Source: Map produced by The Global Wind Atlas

Solar power


2019 OECD average: 3%

2019 Swedish average: 0%

2030 well below 2°C benchmark for the EU: >14%

Figure 7. Solar power potential in Southern Sweden

Global horizontal irradiation (kWh/m²)



Source: Map produced by The Global Solar Atlas


Although national wind and solar shares are below the 2030 benchmarks, Sweden has one of the largest shares of zero-emission electricity generation due to nuclear power and hydropower. Currently, onshore wind power contributes 10TWh to electricity generation while offshore wind power contributes 0.6TWh. Wind strength is highest offshore.

Benchmark notes: The well-below 2 degrees benchmarks show IEA Sustainable Development Scenario (SDS) numbers. The SDS models how the global energy system can evolve in alignment with the Paris Agreement's objective to keep the global average temperature increase well below 2°C above pre-industrial levels. According to the Powering Past Coal Alliance (PPCA), a phase-out of unabated coal by 2030 for OECD countries is cost-effective to limit global warming to 1.5°C. Figure notes: Figure 4 shows data from the IEA (2020). Figure 5 shows OECD calculations based on the Power Plants Database from the WRI. The database captures electricity generation from the power plants connected to the national power grid. As a result, small electricity generation facilities disconnected from the national power grid might not be captured. See [here](#) for more details. Figures 6 and 7 show the power potential of solar and wind. Mean wind power density (WPD) is a measure of wind power available, expressed in Watt per square meter (W/m²). Global horizontal irradiation (GHI) is the sum of direct and diffuse irradiation received by a horizontal surface, measured in kilowatt hours per square metre (kWh/m²).

SECTORAL EMPLOYMENT RISKS

Figure 8. Employment in selected sectors which may be subject to employment loss by 2040 if emissions are reduced in line with the Paris climate agreement

Per cent of total regional employment, large regions (TL2), 2017



There will be both employment gains and losses due to the transition to net zero greenhouse gas emissions. They may not be distributed in the same way across regions. Employment in sectors that may be subject to some job loss by 2040 as a result of policies to reduce emissions in line with the climate objectives in the Paris Agreement amounts to less than 2.5% in all Swedish regions. Almost all Swedish regions have less employment in these sectors than the OECD average. West Sweden, Småland with Islands and Central Norrland have a larger share, largely driven by chemicals. The selection of sectors is broad and based on employment effects simulated across OECD countries (See Box 3.9 of the 2021 *OECD Regional Outlook*). It does not take specific local characteristics into account.

Figure notes: Figure 8 is based on data from OECD Statistics. Sectors are selected based on macroeconomic simulations of a scenario limiting global warming to well below 2 degrees. See Box 3.9 in the 2021 *OECD Regional Outlook* for more details.


TRANSPORT

Electrification of passenger cars

<p>2018 Swedish average share of full-electric new passenger car sales: 4%</p>	<p>Benchmarks for new zero-emission passenger car sales:</p> <p>IEA well-below 2°C benchmark: 100% by 2040.</p> <p>Aligned with net zero emissions by 2050: 100% by 2035 at the latest. 2030 cost-effective.</p>	<p>Swedish target sales of zero emission new passenger cars: 100% by 2030</p>
---	---	--

Figure 9. Full-electric road motor vehicles stock

For 1000 vehicles, large regions (TL2), 2018




Stockholm is the only province for which over 5 per 1000 registered passenger cars were fully electric in 2018.

Countries with a net zero target by 2050 will need to phase out sales of new conventional cars by 2035 at the latest (considering cars have an average useful life of 15 years). A phase-out by 2030 as in Sweden is more cost-effective.

Modal shift

Stockholm has higher GDP per capita and better public transport performance than both Göteborg and Malmö. For comparison, London (UK) has among the highest public transport performance scores. Inhabitants of the metropolitan area of London can on average reach 95% of the population living within 8 km in 30 minutes by public transport.

Figure 10. Public transport performance in 2018



Benchmark notes: In the IEA's Sustainable Development Scenario, OECD countries (such as the European Union, Japan and the United States) as well as China fully phase out conventional car sales by 2040. This scenario is aligned with the Paris Agreement's objective to keep the global average temperature increase well below 2°C above pre-industrial levels. The UK Committee on Climate Change finds that all new cars and vans should be electric (or use a low carbon alternative such as hydrogen) by 2035 at the latest to reach net zero GHG emission targets by 2050. A more cost-effective date from the point of view of users is 2030.

Figure notes: Figure 9 is based on data from OECD Statistics. Figure 10 is based on data from ITF and OECD Statistics. See Box 3.10 in the 2021 *OECD Regional Outlook* for more details. GDP per capita is expressed in USD per head, PPP, constant prices from 2015.

AIR POLLUTION

Large regions (TL2)


2019 OECD share of population exposed above the WHO-recommended threshold: 62%

2019 Swedish share of population exposed above the WHO-recommended threshold: 2%

WHO-recommended air quality threshold: PM2.5 annual mean concentration < 10 µg/m³

Figure 11. Share of population exposed to levels of air pollution above the WHO-recommended threshold

Percentage of population exposed to above 10 µg/m³ PM2.5, large regions (TL2), 2019



Policies towards net-zero greenhouse gas emissions can bring many benefits beyond halting climate change. They include reduced air and noise pollution, reduced traffic congestion, healthier diets, enhanced health due to increased active mobility, health benefits through thermal insulation, and improved water, soil and biodiversity protection. Some are hard to quantify.

Small particulate matter (PM2.5) is the biggest cause of human mortality induced by air pollution. Major disease effects include stroke, cardiovascular and respiratory disease. Air pollution amplifies respiratory infectious disease such as Covid-19. It affects children the most. It reduces their educational outcomes as well as worker productivity.

Figure notes: Figure 11 is based on data from OECD Statistics.