



CHALMERS
UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY

Potential climate benefits of digital consumer innovations

Downloaded from: <https://research.chalmers.se>, 2026-04-05 00:06 UTC

Citation for the original published paper (version of record):

Wilson, C., Kerr, L., Sprei, F. et al (2020). Potential climate benefits of digital consumer innovations. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, 45: 113-144.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev-environ-012320-082424>

N.B. When citing this work, cite the original published paper.

Annual Review of Environment and Resources
**Potential Climate Benefits of
 Digital Consumer Innovations**

Charlie Wilson,^{1,2} Laurie Kerr,¹ Frances Sprei,³
 Emilie Vrain,¹ and Mark Wilson¹

¹Tyndall Centre for Climate Change Research, University of East Anglia, Norwich NR4 7TJ, United Kingdom; email: charlie.wilson@uea.ac.uk

²International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis, Laxenburg A-2361, Austria

³Department of Space, Earth and Environment, Physical Resource Theory, Chalmers University of Technology, Gothenburg 412 96, Sweden

Annu. Rev. Environ. Resour. 2020. 45:113–44

First published as a Review in Advance on
 July 29, 2020

The *Annual Review of Environment and Resources* is
 online at environ.annualreviews.org

<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-environ-012320-082424>

Copyright © 2020 by Annual Reviews.
 This work is licensed under a Creative Commons
 Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits
 unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in
 any medium, provided the original author and
 source are credited. See credit lines of images or
 other third-party material in this article for license
 information

Keywords

consumers, digital innovations, climate change, mobility, food, homes, energy

Abstract

Digitalization has opened up a wealth of new goods and services with strong consumer appeal alongside potential emission-reduction benefits. Examples range from shared, on-demand electric mobility and peer-to-peer trading of electricity, food, and cars to grid-responsive smart appliances and heating systems. In this review, we identify an illustrative sample of 33 digital consumer innovations that challenge emission-intensive mainstream consumption practices in mobility, food, homes, and energy domains. Across these domains, digital innovations offer consumers a range of potentially appealing attributes from control, choice, and convenience to independence, interconnectedness, and integration with systems. We then compile quantitative estimates of change in activity, energy, or emissions as a result of consumers adopting digital innovations. This novel synthesis of the evidence base shows clear but variable potential emission-reduction benefits of digital consumer innovations. However, a small number of studies show emission increases from specific innovations as a result of induced demand or substitution effects that need careful management by public policy. We also consider how concurrent adoption of digital consumer innovations across mobility, food, homes, and energy domains can cause broader disruptive impacts on regulatory frameworks, norms, and infrastructures. We conclude by arguing for the importance of public policy in steering the digitalization of consumer goods and services toward low-carbon outcomes.

**ANNUAL
REVIEWS CONNECT**

www.annualreviews.org

- Download figures
- Navigate cited references
- Keyword search
- Explore related articles
- Share via email or social media



Contents

1. DIGITAL CONSUMER INNOVATIONS	114
1.1. Consumer Activity and Climate Change	114
1.2. Digitalization of Consumer Goods and Services	115
1.3. Aim and Scope of this Review	116
2. IDENTIFYING DIGITAL CONSUMER INNOVATIONS WITH POTENTIAL EMISSION-REDUCTION BENEFITS	117
2.1. Directed Literature Review	117
2.2. Why We Didn't Include Uber and Amazon	118
3. NOVEL VALUE PROPOSITIONS OF DIGITAL CONSUMER INNOVATIONS WITH POTENTIAL EMISSION-REDUCTION BENEFITS	120
3.1. Mobility	123
3.2. Food	124
3.3. Homes and Energy	125
3.4. Variation in Consumer Appeal Between Innovations and Domains	125
3.5. Common Themes in Consumer Appeal Across Innovations and Domains	126
4. DIRECT AND INDIRECT IMPACTS ON EMISSIONS OF DIGITAL CONSUMER INNOVATIONS	127
4.1. Synthesis of Quantitative Estimates of Change	127
4.2. The Evidence for Potential Emission Reductions from Digital Consumer Innovations	128
5. SECOND-ORDER EFFECTS OF DIGITAL CONSUMER INNOVATIONS ON MARKETS, REGULATORY FRAMEWORKS, AND INFRASTRUCTURES	133
5.1. Interactions Between Innovations Giving Rise to Second-Order Disruption ..	133
5.2. Data, Digital Competences, and Consumer Protection	135
5.3. Regulatory Balancing and Policy Steering	135
6. CONCLUSIONS	136

Mainstream (also referred to as incumbent):

consumption practices, firms, service providers, regulatory frameworks and infrastructures with well-established positions that dominate how a particular good or service is provided or consumed

1. DIGITAL CONSUMER INNOVATIONS

1.1. Consumer Activity and Climate Change

Consumers account for the substantial majority of greenhouse gas emissions. If emissions from manufacturing, distribution, and production systems “upstream” are attributed to the consumer goods and services that they supply “downstream,” more than three-quarters of all emissions can be attributed to consumption (1–3). Consumption activity related to mobility, food, homes, and energy makes up the principal domains of daily life as well as the principal opportunities for emission reductions (1, 4). We use the term domain to describe types of consumption activity (e.g., mobility, food) as distinct from the economic sector that provides for that activity (e.g., transportation, agriculture) (5). The energy domain describes activity at the interface between energy-supply infrastructure and energy use in homes, recognizing the emerging opportunities for households to generate, store, trade, and supply energy as well as consume it (6, 7).

Mainstream consumption practices are often wasteful, emission intensive, and shaped by consumers’ private interests without regard to the carbon intensity or effective functioning of production systems. Mainstream consumption practices include owning and driving

single-occupancy vehicles (mobility), provisioning for meat-based diets at large out-of-town retailers (food), and passively using or manually controlling domestic appliances and devices whenever needed (homes, energy).

A large body of research dating back to the 1970s has identified, analyzed, and quantified opportunities to reduce energy demand with associated emission-reduction benefits (8–11). Changing behavior and routines, maintaining equipment and appliances, and investing in energy-efficiency improvements and technologies can all yield large savings under current policy, market, and infrastructural conditions (12). Demand-side options for reducing emissions are increasingly recognized in syntheses and assessments (5, 13, 14). A recent European Union study estimated 25–30% emission reductions from a portfolio of 90 actions termed green demand-side initiatives, which included both behavioral changes and efficiency investments (4). However, the type of action contributing the most emission reductions was changing consumption patterns through the purchase of alternative goods and services.

There are numerous opportunities for consumers to buy, subscribe, adopt, access, install or otherwise use lower-carbon goods and services as alternatives to mainstream consumption practices. This review emphasizes these opportunities.

1.2. Digitalization of Consumer Goods and Services

Digitalization has opened up a wealth of new possibilities across all domains of consumption (15). The most dramatic changes to date have been in the consumption of media and how information spreads through social networks. Information about available resources (supply) and people's needs as part of daily life (demand) flow through digital networks in real time at low or zero marginal cost (16). Real-time information flows also allow for surplus resources to be identified, shared, transacted, or exchanged through digital platforms (17, 18). Sharing-economy business models now cover cars, rides, taxis, food, meals, tools, consumer goods, and even electricity (19). Across different domains of consumption, digitalization is inextricably linked to smartphones and other information and communication technologies (ICTs) that act as interfaces to cloud-based services (20). To paraphrase the futurist, Kevin Kelly, we may no longer need to own stuff if we can access it online whenever we need it (21). In this and other ways, digital innovations are having far-reaching consequences on the way we live (16, 22).


In the mobility domain, mobility-as-a-service apps synthesize data from a wide range of transport providers so that users can combine different modes to meet specific trip needs (23). Identifying users' mobility needs in real time enables car-, ride-, and taxi-sharing services to make use of surplus capacity otherwise sitting idle (24). In the food domain, online food hubs as well as food-sharing and redistribution apps match users' food preferences with available food grown locally or surplus from supermarkets or restaurants (25). Other services and apps deliver, gamify, or suggest recipes to encourage dietary change or reduced waste (26). In the homes domain, Internet-enabled smart technologies provide new control functionality with possibilities for algorithms to manage heating, lighting, or appliances to reduce bills or support the electricity and gas networks during times of peak demand (27–29). The number of digitally networked devices is growing exponentially (30). In the energy domain where supply networks meet final demand, algorithms and control software enable distributed generation through rooftop solar systems or electric vehicles to be extended into electricity storage, trading, and provision of services back to the grid (6, 31).

These are but some of the new goods and services available to consumers as a result of digitalization. As we show in this review, all could have potential emission-reduction benefits if adopted at scale. But few are primarily and purposefully designed to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Information and communication technologies (ICTs): technologies for creating, sharing, exchanging, storing, and transmitting information, with a particular emphasis in this review on digital and Internet-connected ICTs such as smartphones, tablets, computers, and related applications

Table 1 Scope of this review

What we do in this review	What we do not do in this review
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on potentially low-carbon digital innovations available to consumers as an alternative to mainstream consumption practices • Conduct a directed and selective literature review of 215 studies (summarized in the Supplemental Materials, and with full annotated bibliographies available from the authors on request) • Identify 33 illustrative examples of digital consumer innovations with evidenced emission-reduction benefits in mobility, food, homes, and energy domains • Comparatively analyze the value propositions of these innovations across domains to draw out common elements in the consumer appeal of potentially low-carbon digital innovations • Estimate the potential emission-reduction benefits of these innovations within and across consumption domains to explore reasons for variation • Assess the wider challenge to mainstream consumption practices, markets, regulatory frameworks, and infrastructures from digital consumer innovations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider behavioral change and efficiency investment options available to individuals and households for reducing emissions • Conduct a systematic literature review of all digital innovations or all low-carbon innovations • Identify an exhaustive set of digital innovations available to consumers, including those with evidenced adverse impacts on emissions • Analyze the business models or services offered by specific firms such as Uber or Amazon • Focus in depth on consumer appeal or emission-reduction benefits within a specific consumption domain



Digital consumer innovations: digital or digitally enabled goods and services offering novel value propositions to consumers in mobility, food, homes, and energy domains

Value proposition: attributes, features, or functionalities that provide clear and demonstrable benefits for consumers as a result of buying, using, or otherwise experiencing a good or service

Indeed their mass market uptake depends on their consumer appeal on core attributes such as affordability and reliability as well as a range of novel attributes such as control, flexibility, and connectedness (32).

1.3. Aim and Scope of this Review

In this review, we survey digital consumer innovations in mobility, food, homes, and energy domains and analyze their consumer appeal and potential emission-reduction benefits. Our emphasis is on generalizable insights across different domains, not on providing a systematic review of innovations within any given domain (Table 1).

Our motivating question is the following: Are there new and appealing value propositions for consumers, enabled by digitalization, which could potentially help reduce emissions? By value proposition, we mean the attributes of a good or service that provide clear and demonstrable benefits to consumers. Novel value propositions that are alternatives to mainstream consumption practices may provide a “radical functionality” that enables users to do or accomplish something that they could not do before (33).

We are specifically interested in digital or digitally enabled innovations that offer a distinctive set of features, performance metrics, and attributes of potential appeal to consumers (34, 35). Novelty stimulates early adoption, and broad consumer appeal is necessary for subsequent widespread diffusion (32, 36). Within this wide scope, we are interested in only those innovations

with evidenced benefits for emission reductions. By definition, therefore, all the digital consumer innovations we consider are potentially low-carbon innovations even though this is not central to their value proposition. A premise of our review is that being low carbon is insufficient to drive widespread uptake beyond motivated and resourced niche consumer segments.

Table 1 sets out more clearly the scope and aim of our review to help manage readers' expectations about what we do and what we do not do given the breadth and range of the topic. From the outset, we recognize that our review is partial in examining from only one angle the complex relationship between consumers and climate change. Our narrow aim is to explore the potential for consumers and consumption practices in an ever-more digital age to contribute to climate change mitigation.

We use a directed review of peer-reviewed and gray literature to identify digital consumer innovations with potential emission-reduction benefits in mobility, food, homes, and energy domains (Section 2). We characterize the novel value propositions or consumer appeal of these innovations and draw out thematic similarities across domains (Section 3). We also synthesize quantitative estimates of changes to consumption activity, energy, or emissions associated with these innovations and explore reasons for variation (Section 4). We then broaden our analysis to consider the wider impacts of alternative consumption practices on mainstream markets and incumbent regulatory frameworks, emphasizing again the thematic similarities across consumption domains (Section 5). Finally, we reflect on some of the limitations of our review and conclude with implications for climate change policy and practice (Section 6).

2. IDENTIFYING DIGITAL CONSUMER INNOVATIONS WITH POTENTIAL EMISSION-REDUCTION BENEFITS

2.1. Directed Literature Review

We review literature on consumer innovations with potential emission-reduction benefits in mobility, food, homes, and energy domains. Our review is extensive and wide ranging, but it is neither systematic nor exhaustive. We seek to identify a set of goods and services illustrative of the changing possibilities available to consumers as a result of digitalization from among a much larger set of low-carbon innovations (see section 1 of the **Supplemental Materials**; follow the **Supplemental Material link** from the Annual Reviews home page at <http://www.annualreviews.org>). **Table 2** summarizes our search criteria.

Supplemental Material >

Table 2 Our literature search criteria

What our literature search identified	What our search criteria implied
(i) Novel goods and services available to consumers. . .	<~10 years since market introduction and/or <~15% market share corresponding to Rogers' (36) early adopters
(ii) which are digital or digitally enabled, and. . .	Internet-enabled services accessed or controlled by consumers through smartphones or other information and communication technologies (e.g., carsharing, meal kits), as well as innovations using digitalization to support system integration (e.g., electric vehicle-to-grid), match demand with surplus resources (e.g., food-sharing apps), or otherwise enhance functionality and performance (e.g., electric vehicles, heat pumps)
(iii) which offer an alternative to mainstream consumption practices in mobility, food, homes, and energy domains. . .	Exclusion of a wide range of goods and services offering more efficient variants of existing practices (e.g., energy-efficient appliances, fuel-efficient vehicles, loft insulation)
(iv) with clear evidence of potential emission-reduction benefits	Exclusion of goods, services, and business models with ambiguous or adverse impacts on emissions (e.g., on-demand ridehailing, e-commerce, and rapid home delivery)

Avoid-shift-improve: a typology for distinguishing consumption-based options for reducing emissions according to whether they avoid consumption, shift to less emission-intensive forms of consumption, or improve the emission intensity of consumption

Supplemental Material >

We follow precedent in using literature-based discovery methods to survey scientific articles, industry reports, and media as a common means for identifying innovations that challenge mainstream practices (20, 37). Patent databases provide an alternative resource for tracking technology development including for climate change mitigation (38, 39). However, patents tend to be better measures of inventive activity than of consumer adoption (e.g., if patented innovations are not commercialized) (40). Some business model innovations creating novel value propositions may also not be patentable. Publications, patents, and other indicators such as sales figures and firm valuations have also been used in combination to identify consumer innovations with clear potentials such as mobile phones, GPS, and digital photography, but insights tend to be conclusive only *ex post* (41). As a result, we confine our search to publications.

Using the search criteria shown in **Table 2**, we identify a set of 33 digital consumer innovations such as bikesharing (mobility), 11th hour apps (food), smart heating (homes), and electric vehicle-to-grid (energy). **Figure 1** represents all the innovations except for those in the food domain, which are shown separately for space reasons (see section 2 of the **Supplemental Materials**). The app symbolism used for each innovation points to digitalization as a general enabler. **Figure 1** shows how energy, materials, and other resources (far-right side of **Figure 1**) are converted into useful goods and services for consumers (far-left side of **Figure 1**) through complex provisioning systems and supply chains. All the innovations are shown on the left side of **Figure 1**, as they are at or near the point of consumption.


For each innovation identified, we use convenience sampling of peer-reviewed and gray literature to identify three to six relevant studies of the innovation's consumer appeal, its potential emission-reduction benefits, or both. Where possible, we prioritize studies with quantitative estimates of emission impacts using robust study designs. We use the full set of studies to analyze value propositions (Section 3) and a subset of studies with quantitative impact estimates to analyze potential emission-reduction benefits (Section 4). We record relevant information on both topics in annotated bibliographies (available from the authors on request) to enable comparative analysis across innovations and domains. **Table 3** summarizes the sample sizes of innovations and studies in our review.

Table 4 defines and gives commercially available examples of the 33 innovations in our sample, along with an illustrative source reference (see section 3 of the **Supplemental Materials** for full bibliographies per innovation). For each innovation, we use the avoid-shift-improve typology to characterize how the innovation may potentially reduce emissions. Avoid-shift-improve originates in transport studies but is becoming more widely used to distinguish demand-side or consumption-based options for reducing emissions (70). Avoid means consuming less of a good or service (e.g., fewer passenger-kilometers traveled). Shift means consuming more resource-efficient forms of a good or service (e.g., traveling more by train and less by car). Improve means upgrading the resource efficiency of an existing good or service (e.g., buying a more fuel-efficient vehicle) (70).

2.2. Why We Didn't Include Uber and Amazon

Uber and Amazon are poster children of disruptive innovators shaking up incumbent practices in mobility and retail domains, respectively (71, 72). Yet we include neither on-demand ridehailing nor e-commerce with rapid home delivery in our review of digital consumer innovations—why?

There are three reasons. First, we aim to provide examples of novel goods and services not an exhaustive account. Second, despite the evident disruptive impacts of ridehailing and e-commerce on established businesses and markets, from a consumer perspective they improve on already valued attributes (affordability, convenience) as much as they provide novel value propositions as an



(Caption appears on following page)

Figure 1 (Figure appears on preceding page)

Digital consumer innovations influence how energy and resources are converted into useful services. Energy, biomass, and material resources (*right*) are converted through a series of stages into final energy and resources available to consumers (*middle*) and then into useful services in the home and on the move (*left*). The outline of the home demarcates resource consumption in a private context from shared and public contexts, particularly for transport. Mobility innovations (*blue*, T1–T12; T10—bikesharing—not shown), homes innovations (*red*, H1–H8), and energy innovations (*yellow*, E1–E7) are described in the main text. Abbreviation: GHG, greenhouse gas. Figure design by chrisvincze.info ©2019 SILCI.org.

alternative to mainstream consumption practices. Third, and most importantly for our review, neither innovation offers clear potential emission-reduction benefits.

A recent US study found that on-demand ridehailing services lead to a small decrease in vehicle ownership but nonsignificant impacts on vehicle miles traveled and fuel consumption (73). However, ridehailing can also (*a*) substitute for trips made by active or public transport modes (74); (*b*) induce trips that otherwise would not have been taken (75); and (*c*) increase congestion resulting from, for example, vehicle relocation between trips (76). All these effects directly or indirectly increase, not reduce, emissions. In contrast, studies of shared ridehailing services clearly show how increasing occupancy rates of vehicles can have dramatic benefits for congestion and emissions, so we do include these in our review (24).

The increase in speed, flexibility, and product range of e-commerce is changing consumers' purchasing behavior and expectations (77). Consequently, the impact on emissions of Amazon's business model combining vast product ranges with rapid home delivery is likely dominated by hard-to-estimate induced demand effects. As we note in our review of meal kits (home delivery of recipe boxes), home delivery can save emissions from avoided trips by individual consumers driving to retail outlets. However, Amazon's same-day and one-day delivery premium services for small packages potentially increase delivery trips and reduce capacity factors of delivery vans (77). Current testing of drone-based delivery as a substitute for road freight offers potential emission-reduction benefits under certain conditions, principally that delivery distances are kept short, which implies a network of small urban and suburban distribution centers (78, 79). However, this is not yet a commercial reality.

3. NOVEL VALUE PROPOSITIONS OF DIGITAL CONSUMER INNOVATIONS WITH POTENTIAL EMISSION-REDUCTION BENEFITS

All the digital consumer innovations identified in **Table 4** offer potential emission-reduction benefits (see next section). But this is rarely their main design criterion or the basis of their consumer appeal. In this section, we consider the value propositions of digital consumer innovations within each domain, and then focus on drawing out common themes across domains.

Table 3 Number of innovations identified and number of studies reviewed

Consumption domain	Number of digital consumer innovations	Number of studies reviewed and annotated	Subset number of studies with quantitative impact estimates
Mobility	12	74	49
Food	6	30	15
Homes	8	83	30
Energy	7	28	Not applicable

Table 4 Examples of digital consumer innovations with potential emission-reduction benefits in mobility, food, homes, and energy domains

	Innovation	Definition	Example ^a	-Δ Emissions ^b	Reference ^c
Mobility					
T1	Carsharing (car clubs in the United Kingdom)	A membership-based service offering short-term rental of vehicles	Zipcar	Shift	42
T2	Peer-to-peer (P2P) carsharing	Networks of car owners making their vehicles available to others for short-term rental	Turo	Shift	43
T3	Ridesharing (liftsharing in the United Kingdom)	Networks connecting passengers and drivers for shared car journeys or commutes (can be payment based or for free)	Liftshare	Shift (improve)	44
T4	Shared ridehailing or taxis	Cars or minivans with multiple passengers on similar routes, booked on short notice via apps	UberPool	Shift (improve)	24
T5	Mobility-as-a-service	App-based scheduling, booking, and payment platform for multiple transport modes	Whim	Shift	23
T6	Electric vehicles	Vehicles with electric motor propulsion and a battery that is recharged from external sources of electricity	Nissan Leaf	Improve	45
T7	E-bikes	Bicycles with an electric motor and battery for assisting with pedaling up to limited speeds	Gocycle G3	Shift	46
T8	Fully autonomous vehicles	Vehicles that can be driven autonomously without active engagement from the driver	Waymo	Improve (shift)	47
T9	Neighborhood electric vehicles	Light-weight, low-speed, battery-driven vehicles allowed on roads	Hongdi	Shift	48
T10	Bikesharing	Fleets of bicycles available for short-term rental from fixed points (docked) or free-floating (dockless)	Ofo	Shift	49
T11	Telecommuting	Remote working enabled by information and communication technology (ICT)	Slack	Avoid	50
T12	Video-conferencing and virtual meetings	Virtual interactions between people in different physical locations, enabled by ICTs	Cisco TelePresence	Avoid	51

(Continued)

Table 4 (Continued)

	Innovation	Definition	Example ^a	-Δ Emissions ^b	Reference ^c
Food					
F1	Digital hubs for local food	Buy food for delivery directly from multiple local producers	Open Food Network	Shift	25
F2	Meal kits (or meal boxes)	Home deliveries of fresh produce pre-portioned for cooking specific recipes	Hello Fresh	Avoid (shift) ^d	52
F3	11th hour apps	Food outlets advertise surplus fresh food at reduced prices	Too Good to Go	Shift (avoid)	53
F4	Foodpairing apps	Design vegetarian recipes using surplus ingredients	Plant Jammer	Avoid (shift)	http://plantjammer.com
F5	Food sharing	Enable retailers or individuals to share surplus food with local charities and residents	Olio	Avoid	26
F6	Food gamification apps (for dietary change or waste reduction)	Elements of gameplay used to support efforts to reduce food waste or meat consumption	Quit Meat	Shift (avoid)	54
Homes					
H1	Smart heating systems	Monitoring, automation, adaptive learning, and control (via app) of heating	Nest	Improve (shift) ^e	55
H2	Smart lighting	Customization and control (via app) of lighting	Philips Hue	Improve (shift) ^e	56
H3	Smart home appliances	Automation and control (via app or by utilities) of white goods and other large appliances	Samsung Smart Fridge	Improve (shift) ^e	57
H4	Home energy management systems	Monitoring, control, and management system for multiple home functions including heating, cooling, lighting, appliances, and solar photovoltaics (PV)	GreenWave Reality (Energy Management)	Improve (shift) ^e	58
H5	Heat pumps	Heating (or cooling) technologies that extract available heat from the air or ground to thermally condition homes	Mitsubishi Ecodan	Improve	59
H6	Prefabricated whole-home retrofits	Custom-fitted high-performance building shells combined with solar PV and heat pump units fabricated off-site and retrofitted externally	Energiesprong	Improve	60

(Continued)

Table 4 (Continued)

	Innovation	Definition	Example ^a	–Δ Emissions ^b	Reference ^c
H7	P2P exchange of goods	Networks of individuals for exchanging products, tools, and other material goods	Streetbank	Shift	61
H8	Disaggregated real-time energy feedback	Activity- or appliance-level electricity or gas consumption data available to households	Neurio	Improve (shift) ^e	62
Energy					
E1	Domestic electricity generation with storage	Electricity generated domestically stored in a battery system to maximize own-consumption	Tesla Powerwall	Shift	63
E2	P2P electricity trading	Networks of households for trading surplus electricity generated domestically	Brooklyn Microgrid	Shift	64
E3	Electric vehicle-to-grid	Allowing bidirectional flows between the grid and batteries of electric vehicles when plugged in to recharge	DriveElectric V2G	Shift	65
E4	Time-of-use pricing	Electricity or gas tariff reflecting marginal cost of supply with high prices during peak periods	Agile Octopus	Improve (shift) ^e	66
E5	Demand response	Remote control of domestic appliances by utilities to help reduce peak demand	Geo Hybrid Home	Shift (avoid)	67
E6	Energy service companies	Third-party service providers who manage domestic energy use subject to performance contracts	Sealed HomeAdvance	Improve (shift) ^e	68
E7	Third-party financing	Third-party finance providers who install efficiency or renewables in homes on a pay-as-you-save basis	SunPower Corp	Improve (shift) ^e	69

^aThe Example column draws mainly on current US and UK markets.

^bThe –Δ Emissions column uses the avoid-shift-improve framework to identify the mechanism by which innovation adoption leads to potential emission reductions, with –Δ emissions signifying negative change in emissions (i.e., emission reductions).

^cThe Reference column gives one example citation (see the full bibliographies provided in section 3 of the **Supplemental Materials**).

^dAvoid food waste from pre-portioned ingredients.

^eThese innovations offer novel service characteristics (i.e., shift) but are mainly designed to provide a similar service for less energy input (i.e., improve).

3.1. Mobility

Most of the 12 mobility innovations labeled T1–T12 in **Table 4** are either shared [T1–T5, T10], electric [T6–T7, T9], or autonomous [T8] forms of mobility (80). Potential emission reductions come from disrupting mainstream consumption practices of owning and driving internal combustion engine vehicles with low occupancy rates. Two innovations, telecommuting

Supplemental Material >

and virtual meetings [T11–T12], are distinct in providing a virtual substitute that avoids the need for physical mobility related to work, social, health, educational, or other activities.

The value propositions that make the mobility innovations in **Table 4** attractive to consumers are varied. Shared mobility offers usership instead of ownership [T1–T5, T10]. Having access to, rather than owning, a vehicle incurs lower fixed costs including those associated with vehicle depreciation, insurance, parking permits, and taxes (81). Paying per use or per trip increases the transparency and distribution of costs (82, 83). However, the overall cost advantage of shared mobility over private vehicle use depends on usage patterns. Service-based and shared mobility options provide flexibility and choice over a wider range of vehicle models (84), and thus customizable or fit-for-purpose solutions for particular travel needs (85). Users of services also value different attributes from buyers and owners of goods: Car markets may become more homogeneous as shared modes mean model obsolescence and in-car features become less important for consumers (86).

Despite air pollution and CO₂ benefits, electric vehicles [T6] are the closest like-for-like substitute for current mainstream consumption practices based on car use. Private mobility reinforces core attributes of autonomy and independence (87). Neighborhood electric vehicles [T9] similar to golf carts are more novel than electric vehicles [T6] in terms of their value propositions, as they enfranchise the young and old who are otherwise unable to drive or afford regular cars (48). This is evident in China where there are more than two million low-speed electric vehicles used by older generations who never got their driver's licenses when young (88).

Virtual mobility [T11–T12] offers clear financial as well as time benefits. Reducing work-related time and geographic constraints positively impacts quality of life by improving flexibility and reducing commuting-related stress (89). Vehicle automation [T8] can also reduce driving stress and free up travel time for other activities including productive work (90). Active modes [T7, T10] have appealing health and well-being attributes (91). All the alternatives to car ownership are more socially inclusive, widening accessibility to mobility services (90).

3.2. Food

The six food innovations labeled F1–F6 in **Table 4** help share or use surplus food [F3–F6], and shift consumers to less emission-intensive diets [F4, F6] or food retail [F1–F2]. Potential emission reductions come from disrupting mainstream consumption practices that are meat-based and wasteful. In the United Kingdom, more than half of people eat meat every day and more than 7 million tonnes of the total 12 million annual tonnes of food waste occurs in homes rather than in the supply chain (92, 93).

The appealing attributes for consumers of food innovations vary. Value propositions offer novel combinations of choice [F1, F3], convenience [F2–F3], better-quality food [F1], and healthier diets [F4, F6] (52, 94, 95). Several of the food innovations help build social connections as an integral part of their appeal to consumers [F1, F5–F6] (26, 54). Alternative food networks [F1, F5] have appeal because of the alternative they offer to lengthy, anonymized supply chains from conventional farming through food processing and distribution to supermarkets (96–98). Some innovations combine traditional attributes such as saving money with opportunities for new culinary experiences [F3–F5] (53). As new ways of buying, sourcing, cooking, or eating food, these innovations sit alongside long-established behavioral change strategies to avoid food waste, change dietary preferences, and reduce food miles to improve public health and environmental outcomes (95, 99).

3.3. Homes and Energy

The eight homes innovations labeled H1–H8 in **Table 4** and the seven energy innovations labeled E1–E7 are closely related but with different emphases: Homes innovations change how useful services such as heating are consumed in domestic settings; energy innovations change how energy is supplied to, generated by, or managed by households. This distinction is captured in **Figure 1**, which shows the homes innovations (red) closer to useful services, whereas energy innovations (yellow) sit at the interface between homes and energy-supply networks.

Five homes innovations [H1–H4, H8] fall under the smart technology rubric for controlling and managing thermal comfort, lighting, and appliances. These closely relate to two energy innovations: time-of-use pricing [E4] as a variable tariff structure offered to consumers, which enables home energy management systems [H4] to better manage costs, and demand response [E5], which allows utilities or network operators to remotely curtail smart appliances to reduce consumption during critical periods of peak demand [H3]. Three other energy innovations [E1–E3] broaden the role of domestic energy consumers to include generation, trading, and the provision of services back to the grid (7). Two homes innovations are examples of alternatives to fossil-based heating and cooling [heat pumps, H5] and alternatives to owning products with low utilization rates [peer-to-peer exchange of goods, H7]. The final homes innovation is an alternative to piecemeal energy-efficiency improvements [prefabricated whole-home retrofits, H6] (100). This links to two energy innovations for outsourcing and professionalizing energy management [E6] and renovation finance [E7]. Although these outsourcing business models are established in the commercial sector (101), digitally enabled streams of real-time, granular information on energy performance reduce transaction costs of application in the residential sector (102). Potential emission reductions from this diverse set of homes and energy innovations come from challenging inefficient or carbon-intensive forms of consumption associated with manual controls and on-demand immediate use of energy whenever needed and without regard to optimal energy system performance.

Consumer value propositions for the cluster of smart energy management technologies [H1–H4] are based on controllability and accessibility (including by remote) (27–29), and opportunities for adaptive automation of tasks or routines to reduce energy costs by shifting consumption out of peak periods or reducing standby consumption (103). Connectivity through networks of data [H1–H4] or people [H7] raises expectations among consumers for a greater breadth of services that a device, appliance, or system should provide (104). Homes and energy innovations open up new possibilities for consumers to generate, store, and trade their own electricity [E1–E2] as well as helping grid operators to balance supply and demand during peak periods [H3–H4, E4–E5] (31, 105).

Some of the other homes innovations have highly distinctive value propositions. Prefabricated retrofits [H6] combine high specifications from offsite fabrication in controlled conditions with hassle-free installations, as the work is largely external (60). Peer-to-peer exchange of goods [H7] has novel social attributes relating to building community relationships and interconnectedness, in addition to affordability (106).

3.4. Variation in Consumer Appeal Between Innovations and Domains

All the digital consumer innovations identified in **Table 4** challenge emission-intensive mainstream consumption practices, but there is wide variation in their value propositions. Some innovations are costless [food sharing, F5], others are still prohibitively costly [prefabricated retrofits, H6]. Some innovations are personal [smart heating, H1], others are interpersonal or collective [shared ridehailing, T4]. Some are primarily hardware [heat pumps, H5], others are mainly

software [foodpairing apps, F4]. Some are based on new possibilities [vehicle-to-grid, E3], others are new versions of old practices [ridesharing, T3].

There are also clear differences between the four domains of consumption activity. Mobility plays out in a public and visible sphere, whereas homes are private, and energy innovations intermediating between supply networks and consumption in the home are largely invisible. Food consumption choices are largely unregulated; energy retail is highly regulated. Mobility innovations are strongly dependent on network density, particularly in cities; homes innovations are not.

Although being low-carbon is not a core attribute supporting consumer uptake, our search criteria mean that all the innovations in **Table 4** potentially contribute emission reductions. Drawing on the avoid-shift-improve framework, there are further differences in emphasis in how the innovations potentially contribute to reducing emissions. The food domain sees the greatest proportion of avoid strategies given the problem of overconsumption and waste in mainstream food practices (107). Innovations in the homes domain are almost all improve strategies to manage or reduce energy demand without changing the basic form of useful services such as heating and lighting. Mobility innovations are dominated by shift strategies for switching from private cars to public and shared modes with very different service attributes but much lower emission intensity.

The avoid-shift-improve framework also usefully highlights different emission-reduction strategies within a domain. For example, mobility innovations can avoid consumption of passenger-kilometers [telecommuting, T11], can shift to lower emission forms of mobility [mobility-as-a-service, T5], or can improve the emission intensity of mainstream forms of mobility [T6, electric vehicles].

3.5. Common Themes in Consumer Appeal Across Innovations and Domains

Despite these differences, there are also some common themes in the novel value propositions across consumption domains, each of which is clearly associated with digitalization as an enabling meta-innovation (20, 22, 37). These common themes are making use of surplus, integrating into systems, controlling service provision, customizing choice, using not owning, blurring boundaries of consumption, and contributing collective benefits.

First, real-time information flows afford consumers opportunities to connect, share, and exchange available or surplus resources with other consumers on digital platforms, which range from transactional big business to community-based networks (17, 108). Peer-to-peer innovations using sharing-economy business models enable the exchanging or sharing of cars [T2], rides [T3], taxis [T4], food [F5], goods [H7], and electricity [E2].

Second, digitalization brings connectedness, with consumers playing more integrated roles within transport, food, and energy provisioning systems. Consumption becomes less atomized, autonomous, and independent. Through their consumption practices, consumers can help balance supply and demand, reduce waste including through redistributing surplus food [F3, F5], make idle assets available to other users or system operators [T2, H3, E3], and alleviate pressures on supply infrastructure [E4–E5].

Third, ubiquitous Internet connectivity affords consumers greater control over how services are provided. This can be control by active users (e.g., through apps or websites) or control for users through algorithms, automation, and adaptive learning (109). The appeal of active and passive roles varies by innovation. As examples, consumers may prefer not to fully cede control to home energy management systems [H4] or smart appliances [H3] providing demand response services to the grid [E5], whereas consumers may prefer to allow algorithms to manage the storage and trade of own-generated electricity [E1–E3].

Fourth, innovations based on real-time information about consumers' needs enable services to be customized or enriched in terms of functionality (20). Mass customization affords consumers versatility and flexibility of choice in how services are matched to specific demands. Mobility-as-a-service [T5] offers different combinations of modes for different trips. Digital food hubs [F1] combine the locality and personality of a farmers market with the breadth of choice of a supermarket or online shop.

Fifth, a shift in consumption practices from ownership to usership affords convenience and ready accessibility (82, 110). Shifting to a consumer culture based on accessing services rather than owning goods is one of the essential characteristics of innovations that challenge mainstream consumption practices (33). Business models enabling this shift are increasingly evident across consumption domains, particularly mobility, but also in homes. Service-based mobility innovations [T1–T5] free drivers from owning, insuring, maintaining, and parking privately owned vehicles, which typically sit idle more than 95% of the time. Energy service companies [E6] or finance providers [E7] can take on responsibility for mundane efficiency improvements and investments on behalf of households (111).

Sixth, increasing connectedness alongside the shift from owning to using is blurring the boundaries between private, shared, public, and collective forms of consumption. Peer-to-peer platforms [F5, H7] connect private users into relational networks, placing private goods in shared or public domains. The virtual mobility innovations [T11–T12] redefine the geography of work while many of the homes and energy innovations redefine consumers as producers, traders, and service providers (7).

Seventh, although low-carbon is not strongly emphasized in the consumer appeal of innovations shown in **Table 1**, collective benefits around health, community, and society as well as environment clearly align with diverse public policy goals. Food innovations provide the clearest example. Digital food hubs introduce notions of accountability for environmental standards, animal welfare, and farmer livelihoods into consumers' shopping preferences (96, 98). Apps and platforms for redistributing food surpluses pressure large retailers to address social exclusion (26, 112). Changing dietary norms through an emphasis on the health and environmental benefits of reducing meat consumption can alleviate pressure on health care systems (54). Whether in food or other domains, business models that can capture social business cases help challenge emission-intensive consumption cultures (113, 114).

Taken together, these seven common elements in the consumer appeal of digitally enabled goods and services across different domains of consumption form a compelling value proposition to stimulate adoption of multiple innovations within specific consumer groups.

4. DIRECT AND INDIRECT IMPACTS ON EMISSIONS OF DIGITAL CONSUMER INNOVATIONS

4.1. Synthesis of Quantitative Estimates of Change

If digital consumer innovations prove sufficiently appealing in challenging mainstream consumption practices, what would be the impact on emissions? We extract quantitative estimates of change in an outcome variable relevant to emissions from all the studies in our directed review that reported useable data (**Table 3**). We leave each variable with its original metric but expressed as a percent change relative to a baseline or reference point typically defined by the absence of the innovation. This percent change measure (or % Δ in shorthand) was either reported directly or could be estimated from other data in the studies reviewed.

We use variable quantities or metrics of three main types:

- % Δ activity: percent change in the amount of activity or useful service consumed (e.g., passenger-kilometers traveled);
- % Δ energy: percent change in the amount of energy or resources needed to provide a useful service (e.g., natural gas consumption for heating);
- % Δ carbon: percent change in the amount of greenhouse gas emissions either in absolute terms (e.g., tCO₂e from energy consumption in homes) or in relative terms (e.g., gCO₂ per kilometer traveled by car). Some metrics use CO₂ and others use CO₂-equivalent greenhouse gases; see section 4 of the **Supplemental Materials** for details).

Supplemental Material >

The activity and energy metrics are one or more steps removed from emissions (**Figure 1**). However, reductions in any of the metrics are directionally consistent with reductions in emissions. For example, fewer passenger-kilometers traveled in a single-occupancy vehicle (% Δ activity) reduces fuel use for mobility (% Δ energy), which directly reduces tailpipe CO₂ emissions (% Δ carbon).

Having measures of different types isolates the effect of innovation adoption on changing consumption practices. In contrast, converting all measures into emission reductions would require context-dependent assumptions about the emission intensity of energy, materials, and food production systems. However, a disadvantage of having measures of different types is that the estimates are neither directly comparable nor can they be used to quantify overall emission-reduction potentials. We discuss this further below.

Figure 2 summarizes the results for the 12 mobility innovations, 6 food innovations, and 8 homes innovations in our sample (see section 4 of the **Supplemental Materials** for full details). We do not show results for the energy innovations, as impacts tended to be indirect (upstream) through changes in system functioning and are thus difficult to isolate and attribute to the adoption and use of an innovation. As an example, time-of-use pricing [E4] may shift demand from peak to off-peak periods, but the impact on emissions is dependent on the carbon intensity of electricity generation at different times of the day.

Each row in **Figure 2** shows percent change (% Δ) in a consumption-related measure, grouped by innovation, and ordered within each innovation from % Δ activity to % Δ energy then % Δ carbon. Some studies provided more than one measure if an innovation was trialed or implemented in more than one way, or if the impact was measured in more than one way. These are denoted in the row labels by suffixes A, B, C or i, ii, iii (see section 4 of the **Supplemental Materials** for details).

4.2. The Evidence for Potential Emission Reductions from Digital Consumer Innovations

The synthesis of % Δ estimates shown in **Figure 2** draws on a wide range of studies with varying assumptions, methodologies, sample sizes, time horizons, and study locations. Studies reported point estimates, low and high values, ranges with or without means, and data syntheses. Methodologies included field trials, natural experiments, simulation models, accounting or simple estimation models, demonstration projects, and testing in labs and other controlled conditions. Some studies estimated technical potentials under what-if scenarios; other studies observed actual changes. Sample sizes varied from a single home or individual to hundreds of thousands participating tacitly in natural experiments. Data collection or observational timescales varied from a week to more than a decade. Study locations spanned all the inhabited continents but with the majority in Europe and North America. As a result of this variation in study designs and estimation methodologies,

a Mobility innovations:

% change in outcome measure related directly or indirectly to emissions





Figure 2

(Continued)

a Mobility innovations:

% change in outcome measure related directly or indirectly to emissions (continued)



b Food innovations:

% change in outcome measure related directly or indirectly to emissions




Figure 2

(Continued)

C Homes innovations:

% change in outcome measure related directly or indirectly to emissions





Figure 2

Percent change (%Δ) in consumption-related measures from the adoption and use of digital consumer innovations in mobility (*a*), food (*b*), and homes (*c*) domains. Measures are grouped by innovation and ordered within each innovation as %Δ activity, %Δ energy, and %Δ carbon emissions. Measures include point estimates, low-high estimates, ranges, and syntheses. Labels for each measure identify the study's first author only and the year (see section 4 of the **Supplemental Materials** for the full citation including all authors). Suffixes A, B, C or i, ii, iii indicate where studies provided more than one measure if an innovation was trialed or implemented in more than one way, or if the impact was measured in more than one way. Abbreviations: HEMS, home energy management systems; NEVs, neighborhood electric vehicles; P2P, peer-to-peer; WRAP, Waste & Resources Action Programme.

both the internal validity (robustness) and external validity (generalizability) of the quantitative estimates in **Figure 2** vary widely.

The $\% \Delta$ estimates in **Figure 2** also vary in the type of quantities or measures, their specificity, and how directly they relate to emissions. Some studies measured change in a defined activity at a specific time and place, whereas other studies generalized changes over longer time periods and more varied contexts. As noted above, studies reporting changes in activity were several steps removed from measuring impacts on emissions. Impacts on emissions from reported changes in activity are therefore subject to many assumptions and intervening conditions.

These variations in both study designs and types of measure synthesized in **Figure 2** mean that descriptive statistics across the full sample are not meaningful. We therefore limit our interpretation to some general observations.

First, and notwithstanding the many caveats with the sampling and studies reviewed, **Figure 2** clearly shows that changes in consumption practices from adopting and using digital consumer innovations can directly or indirectly help reduce emissions. That almost all studies show outcomes consistent with emission reductions is not surprising, as this was a search criterion for the innovations (**Table 2**). Nevertheless, the consistency of potential reductions in activity, energy consumption, or greenhouse emissions is quite striking.

Second, a handful of studies report positive $\% \Delta$ estimates for certain innovations, with four innovations potentially exceeding +20% changes: autonomous vehicles [T8], bikesharing [T10], digital hubs for local food [F1], and meal kits [F2]. These adverse impacts are due to substitution effects or induced demand effects. Substitution effects describe the reference point or baseline form of the good or service for which the innovation is a substitute. If docked or free-floating bikesharing schemes substitute for private bicycles, then the additional energy used by the digital booking, payment, and unlocking infrastructure means adverse indirect impacts on emissions [see **Figure 2a**, row “T10: $\% \Delta$ carbon (Bonilla-Alicea 2020) A”] (115). Induced demand effects describe changes in consumer behavior as a result of adopting an innovation. For example, consumption of a good or service can increase if the good or service becomes more appealing or affordable (103). If autonomous vehicles decrease the effective cost of car use while freeing up productive time for users, this may lead to an increase in passenger-kilometers traveled by cars with adverse indirect impacts on emissions (see **Figure 2a**, row “T8: $\% \Delta$ energy (Wadud 2016) i” (90). These two counterexamples to the general trend of negative $\% \Delta$ estimates shown in **Figure 2** point to the importance of real-world contexts and careful empirical study designs.

Third, the magnitude of $\% \Delta$ in consumption-related measures varies widely, both within and between innovations. No single innovation dominates others in terms of change potential. Only two innovations show broad convergence between multiple data points: telecommuting [T11] in the range 0 to -10% and disaggregated energy feedback [H8] in the range -5 to -25% . Otherwise within-innovation variation is quite large. This emphasizes the many differences and contingencies in both study design and outcome measures. Several innovations almost span the full range of possibility from positive to -100% change: home energy management systems [H4], digital food hubs [F1], and e-bikes [T7]. These wide ranges are linked to differences in assumptions about what is being avoided, substituted for, or improved by the innovation.

Fourth, the evidence base is clearly weaker for some innovations, particularly those characterized by either novelty and thus very low market share (e.g., mobility-as-a-service [T5]), or value propositions that are not associated with emission reductions (e.g., peer-to-peer exchange of goods [H7]). For some innovations we were unable to find any robust quantifications (e.g., smart home appliances [H3]) despite arguments and evidence in the literature for potential emission-reduction benefits (103). Outcome measures of avoid strategies tend to be the hardest to quantify, as the reference point needed to estimate $\% \Delta$ is counterfactual. These include the

virtual mobility innovations [T11, T12] and the food waste innovations [F4, F5, F6] for which the evidence base is either weak or particularly dependent on assumed system boundaries of what consumption practices are being avoided.

Fifth, those studies reporting changes in emissions generally made static assumptions about the emission intensity of production systems, particularly for electricity. This improves the transparency and interpretability of the $\% \Delta$ estimates, but fails to capture the strong interactions between demand-led change (left side of **Figure 1**) and upstream production systems (right side of **Figure 1**). Scenario analysis of consumer preferences, innovation adoption rates, and wider market conditions and supply chains using system modeling tools is one approach for testing the full scope of change potential (116).

Overall, the synthesis presented in **Figure 2** establishes a clear evidence base for potential emission reductions from innovation adoption, while also calling for more empirical research to strengthen the evidence, reduce variability, and identify perverse substitution or induced demand effects to be managed through business model design and public policy.

5. SECOND-ORDER EFFECTS OF DIGITAL CONSUMER INNOVATIONS ON MARKETS, REGULATORY FRAMEWORKS, AND INFRASTRUCTURES

In Section 3, we have drawn out common elements in the value propositions of digital consumer innovations across mobility, food, homes, and energy domains. In Section 4, we have characterized the potential impact of innovation adoption on emissions whether directly or indirectly. Here, we explore the broader consequences of digital consumer innovations. In particular we focus on digital competences and data protection, the balancing act for regulators to maintain stability while enabling low-carbon transformation, and the critical importance of public policy for steering change dynamics to deliver societal benefits.

5.1. Interactions Between Innovations Giving Rise to Second-Order Disruption

Interdependencies between consumer innovations diffusing concurrently can lead to more widespread or disruptive impacts (41). Interdependencies take many different forms: between novel value propositions offering similarly distinctive attributes of appeal (32); between risk-taking opinion leaders adopting innovations in different market segments (117); or between firms, markets, and consumption norms being challenged by innovation adoption.

In this way, challenges to consumption practices from innovations clustering and interacting at the consumer level can lead to second-order disruptions defined as “substantially changing societal norms and institutions” (20, p. 262). Mobility innovations provide the clearest example. Shared, electric, and autonomous mobility innovations each offer distinct types of appeal to consumers, but have a much stronger disruptive effect in combination (71). Shared and usage-based mobility challenge deeply embedded norms of private car ownership (118). Automation further confronts norms and perceptions of driving and control (90). Shared and autonomous vehicles can provide for current urban mobility needs with dramatically fewer vehicles at higher occupancy rates (119). This improves overall transport system efficiency, reduces congestion to close to zero, and allows for a massive repurposing of urban road infrastructure for public benefit (24, 120). If vehicles are also electrified, urban air pollution and the adverse health impacts of private transport in cities are dramatically reduced. Virtual mobility innovations that erode workplace norms including the temporal coordination of daily travel needs offer health, safety, and emission benefits (121).

Whether in mobility or other domains, second-order disruptions can destabilize regulatory frameworks, challenge embedded consumption cultures, and drive change in physical

	First-order disruption		Second-order disruption	
<p>Novel value propositions</p> <p>Mainstream goods & services</p>				

5.2. Data, Digital Competences, and Consumer Protection

Digital innovations connect consumers to information, energy, and social networks, offering not only new roles, sources of value, and opportunities for control but also risks and constraints. The collection and use of real-time mobility, food purchasing, electricity, and gas data raises questions about privacy, trust, and security as the data used by providers to deliver services is linkable to intimate details of daily life (128). Shared and usage-based innovations change the relationship between consumer and service provider from one-off transaction to repeated interaction. This further emphasizes the importance of sustaining trust.

Consumer protection concerns have already been felt in several markets with mandated smart meter programs and are frequently cited as a barrier to more pervasive uptake of Internet-enabled devices, platforms, and applications (129). Standards, codes of conduct, or regulatory oversight are needed both to establish appropriate legal and ethical principles in these new markets (130) and to make clear where liability and responsibilities lie (57).

Pervasive digitalization also means firms need strong digital competences as well as expertise in managing complex, secure IT systems (131). As an example, smart heating, lighting, and appliances are not discrete products but a multi-layered technology and data infrastructure through which consumer and provider continually exchange data (130, 132). Tesla's "iPad on wheels" electric vehicles and Google's investment in self-driving cars provide other examples of how digital, data, and software expertise are transforming incumbent markets (133). Data-driven companies are entering the traditionally quite stable car manufacturing industry on multiple fronts, from service providers (Uber, Zipcar) to technology companies (Apple, Google) to manufacturers (Tesla, BYD) (85). Cars' operating systems are moving toward the continual cycles of patching, updating, and improvement familiar to smartphone users, ushering in a whole new range of data and security risks.

5.3. Regulatory Balancing and Policy Steering

Regulatory frameworks are designed in part to maintain reliable, affordable, and safe service provision for consumers. In a climate change context, alignment between regulatory frameworks and the firms providing for emission-intensive consumption practices represents a form of institutional lock-in slowing or resisting change (122). Second-order disruptions initiated by novel consumer value propositions can help escape this lock-in by demonstrating the value in rewriting or renewing rules governing access to transport infrastructure, energy retail markets, and consumer data. Indeed, pressure on regulators to allow for new opportunities while guarding against new threats is a good indication of second-order disruption underway (41, 134).

Decentralized energy supply, storage, and demand-response innovations create new opportunities for households to provide balancing or flexibility services "from the edge of the grid" (6, 135). But this challenges the alignment between market access regulations and the business models of incumbent energy companies (31). Food sharing through community fridges or from surplus food stocks creates private benefit but also a range of social benefits, from social capital in community relationships to waste reduction. But this challenges incumbent regulations for ensuring food safety and traceability, and clear liability in the case of risks to health (136, 137). Shared ride-hailing creates versatile, scalable, and hybridized modes of private-shared transport for efficient intraurban mobility (24). But this challenges incumbent provision of fixed-route, fixed-schedule public transit.

How regulators respond in enabling and managing the market access of digital consumer innovations is therefore critical. Energy regulators in several countries have created "sandboxes"

for trialing new value propositions on a time-limited basis without impacts spilling out into national markets (138). These test beds allow certain rules to be suspended or relaxed so regulators can learn about potentially disruptive impacts. Municipal authorities have been using regulatory oversight and market access (e.g., operating licenses, use of parking infrastructure, road charging) to extract sustainability commitments from new mobility service providers (139). This is a period of experimentation and learning as to what works. In different cities around the world, shared vehicle fleet operators have been variously (*a*) banned from competing with high-volume transit routes; (*b*) allowed to serve as feeders from suburban residential areas into public transit hubs to address the “last mile” problem; (*c*) formally integrated into public transport networks; and (*d*) required to provide data on users to help optimize use of urban infrastructure and build the social case for their businesses (140, 141).

Comparing and learning from these different approaches builds the necessary regulatory and policy capacity to steer digital consumer innovations toward societal goals (16, 142). There are many examples in our four consumption domains of innovative policy approaches to test, learn about, stimulate, and steer digital innovations. In the food domain, for example, rules in France prohibit retailers from disposing of food surplus (143). This encourages greater use of 11th hour apps, business-to-business food-sharing platforms and, indirectly, peer-to-peer food sharing (26). In the homes and energy domains, public policy sets efficiency standards and adoption incentives to stimulate consumer demand for innovations that benefit energy-system management. In the mobility domain, limiting or increasing the cost of vehicle use in urban areas encourages active, shared, or public modes with strong health and pollution benefits. Infrastructure provision at a local scale is particularly important, including high-occupancy vehicle lanes or parking zones for shared vehicles (144), electric vehicle charging points (145), appropriate docking stations for bike-sharing (146), and an integrated, colocated multi-modal transport system for mobility-as-a-service (147). More generally, policymakers need to build substantive expertise to anticipate and respond to digital innovations, to signal intentions clearly to innovators and investors, and to consistently enforce rules (148).

6. CONCLUSIONS

There are large potential benefits for climate change mitigation from changing consumption practices (4, 5, 13). But consumers tend to be framed as part of the problem, resistant to change, and neither active pursuers of low-carbon novelty nor willing participants in emission-reduction efforts (148). In this review we have identified many different examples of novel consumer goods and services enabled by digitalization that challenge mainstream consumption practices in mobility, food, homes, and energy domains. Many of the innovations in our sample offer new approaches to longstanding mitigation challenges such as how to stimulate modal shift out of single-occupancy vehicles or how to reduce wastage of food and energy. Digital consumer innovations sit alongside the numerous other opportunities for individuals and households to reduce their emissions including through behavioral changes and efficiency improvements to homes, devices, and vehicles (11). More broadly, our emphasis on consumers meant we did not include the large number of low-carbon innovations applicable upstream in supply chains and production systems (**Figure 1**).

Important limitations also caution against a naive optimism for the role of digital consumer innovations in tackling climate change and invite further empirical research. Consumers' choices are constrained by innovation availability, socioeconomic conditions, and access to supporting infrastructure. Innovations may fail to gain market footholds or appeal only to niche consumer segments. Conversely, more appealing, accessible, and affordable digital innovations may induce greater consumption, such that increases in activity offset decreases in emissions per unit of

activity. Incumbents may successfully resist, slow, or adapt to novel threats. Policymakers and regulators may prioritize stability and continuity by dampening digital innovations' access to consumers, particularly in mobility and energy domains that are more regulated.

In conclusion, through our narrow and partial lens on climate mitigation solutions, we found that digitally enabled challenges to mainstream consumption practices across different domains are characterized in general terms by more exchange, control, choice, services, and system integration. In our quantitative synthesis of the evidence base, we demonstrated the clear emission-reduction benefits should these elements prove appealing to consumers in stimulating adoption (**Figure 2**). We also sketched wider second-order impacts of shifting consumption on norms, infrastructures, and in particular, regulatory frameworks. Public policy has a critical role to play in ensuring that these second-order disruption dynamics contribute to greenhouse gas emission reductions.

SUMMARY POINTS

1. A wide range of consumer innovations enabled by digitalization offer novel value propositions that challenge mainstream consumption practices and can potentially reduce greenhouse emissions if widely adopted.
2. Common themes in the consumer appeal and impact of digital innovations across mobility, food, homes, and energy domains include making use of surplus, using not owning, controlling service provision, customising choice, and integrating into systems.
3. There are clear and consistent potential emission-reduction benefits from the adoption and use of digital consumer innovations, although the evidence is stronger for innovations studied at scale in real-world contexts.
4. Challenges to consumption practices from innovations clustering and interacting at the consumer level can lead to disruption at larger scales. As an example, mobility innovations such as shared, electric, autonomous vehicles offer novel attributes to consumers but can also impact urban form, social exclusion, and working practices as well as the automotive industry.
5. Digital consumer innovations have important consequences for rules and structures including data rights and consumer protection, and the balancing act faced by regulators in maintaining stability while enabling low-carbon transformation.
6. Public policy has a critical role to play in managing induced demand effects, enabling market access, learning from urban-scale experiments, and developing digital capabilities to anticipate and steer change dynamics toward societal goals.

FUTURE ISSUES

1. Identify interdependencies between alternatives to mainstream consumption practices in mobility, food, homes, and energy domains.
2. Carry out more empirical research in real-world settings to estimate the direct, indirect, and induced impacts on emissions from consumer adoption of digital innovations.

3. Map out potential second-order impacts of digital consumer innovations on firms, infrastructures, and regulatory frameworks.
4. Build the competences and capacities for policymakers and regulators to steer digital consumer innovations to deliver on societal goals.

DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

The authors are not aware of any affiliations, memberships, funding, or financial holdings that might be perceived as affecting the objectivity of this review.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Charlie Wilson, Laurie Kerr, Emilie Vrain, and Mark Wilson were supported by the European Research Council (Starting Grant 678799). Frances Sprei was supported by Mistra Carbon Exit. Hannah Wynton, Maureen Agnew, Trudie Dockerty, and Tim Minshall provided invaluable assistance compiling the annotated bibliographies used in this review.

LITERATURE CITED

1. Int. Gov. Panel Clim. Change (IPCC). 2014. Summary for policymakers. In *Climate Change 2014: Mitigation of Climate Change. Contribution of Working Group III to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, ed. O Edenhofer, R Pichs-Madruga, Y Sokona, E Farahani, S Kadner, et al., pp. 1–30. Cambridge, UK/New York: Cambridge Univ. Press
2. Ivanova D, Stadler K, Steen-Olsen K, Wood R, Vita G, et al. 2016. Environmental impact assessment of household consumption. *J. Ind. Ecol.* 20:526–36
3. Allwood JM, Dunant CF, Luptoin RC, Cleaver CJ, Serrenho ACH, et al. 2019. *Absolute Zero: Delivering the UK's Climate Change Commitment with Incremental Changes to Today's Technologies*. Cambridge, UK: Univ. Cambridge
4. Moran D, Wood R, Hertwich E, Mattson K, Rodriguez JFD, et al. 2020. Quantifying the potential for consumer-oriented policy to reduce European and foreign carbon emissions. *Climate Policy* 20:S28–38
5. van de Ven D-J, González-Eguino M, Arto I. 2017. The potential of behavioural change for climate change mitigation: a case study for the European Union. *Mitig. Adapt. Strateg. Glob. Change* 23:853–86
6. Brown D, Hall S, Davis ME. 2019. Prosumers in the post subsidy era: an exploration of new prosumer business models in the UK. *Energy Policy* 135:110984
7. Schot J, Kanger L, Verbong G. 2016. The roles of users in shaping transitions to new energy systems. *Nat. Energy* 1:16054
8. Socolow RH. 1978. *Saving Energy in the Home: Princeton's Experiments at Twin Rivers*. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger
9. Gardner GT, Stern P. 1995. *Environmental Problems and Human Behavior*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon
10. Stern PC. 2002. Changing behavior in households and communities: What have we learned? In *New Tools for Environmental Protection: Education, Information, and Voluntary Measures*, ed. T Dietz, PC Stern, pp. 201–11. Washington, DC: Nat. Acad. Press
11. Stern PC, Janda KB, Brown MA, Steg L, Vine EL, Lutzenhiser L. 2016. Opportunities and insights for reducing fossil fuel consumption by households and organizations. *Nat. Energy* 1:16043
12. Dietz T, Gardner GT, Gilligan J, Stern PC, Vandenberg MP. 2009. Household actions can provide a behavioral wedge to rapidly reduce US carbon emissions. *PNAS* 106:18452–56
13. Creutzig F, Fernandez B, Haberl H, Khosla R, Mulugetta Y, Seto KC. 2016. Beyond technology: demand-side solutions for climate change mitigation. *Annu. Rev. Environ. Resour.* 41:173–98

14. Grubler A, Wilson C, Bento N, Boza-Kiss B, Krey V, et al. 2018. A low energy demand scenario for meeting the 1.5°C target and sustainable development goals without negative emission technologies. *Nat. Energy* 3:515–27
15. Ger. Advis. Coun. Glob. Change (WBGU). 2019. *Towards our common digital future*. Rep., WBGU, Berlin, Ger.
16. The World in 2050 (TWI2050). 2019. *The Digital Revolution and sustainable development: opportunities and challenges*. Rep., Int. Inst. Appl. Syst. Anal. (IIASA), Laxenburg, Austria
17. Frenken K. 2017. Political economies and environmental futures for the sharing economy. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. A* 375:20160367
18. Benkler Y. 2004. Sharing nicely: on shareable goods and the emergence of sharing as a modality of economic production. *Yale Law J.* 114:273–358
19. Acquier A, Daudigeos T, Pinkse J. 2017. Promises and paradoxes of the sharing economy: an organizing framework. *Technol. Forecast. Soc. Change* 125:1–10
20. Schuelke-Leech B-A. 2018. A model for understanding the orders of magnitude of disruptive technologies. *Technol. Forecast. Soc. Change* 129:261–74
21. Kelly K. 2017. *The Inevitable: Understanding the 12 Technological Forces that will Shape our Future*. New York: Viking
22. McKinsey & Co. 2013. *Disruptive technologies: advances that will transform life, business, and the global economy*. Rep., McKinsey Glob. Inst., San Francisco. https://www.mckinsey.com/~media/McKinsey/Business%20Functions/McKinsey%20Digital/Our%20Insights/Disruptive%20technologies/MGI_Disruptive_technologies_Full_report_May2013.pdf
23. Kamargianni M, Li W, Matyas M, Schäfer A. 2016. A critical review of new mobility services for urban transport. *Transp. Res. Procedia* 14:3294–303
24. Int. Transp. Forum (ITF). 2016. *Shared Mobility: Innovation for Liveable Cities*. Paris: ITF
25. Richards TJ, Hamilton SF. 2018. Food waste in the sharing economy. *Food Policy* 75:109–23
26. Harvey J, Smith A, Goulding J, Branco Illodo I. 2020. Food sharing, redistribution, and waste reduction via mobile applications: a social network analysis. *Ind. Mark. Manag.* 88:437–48
27. Hargreaves T, Wilson C. 2017. *Smart Homes and Their Users*. London: Springer
28. Park E, Kim S, Kim Y, Kwon SJ. 2018. Smart home services as the next mainstream of the ICT industry: determinants of the adoption of smart home services. *Univers. Access Inf. Soc.* 17:175–90
29. Yang H, Lee W, Lee H. 2018. IoT smart home adoption: the importance of proper level automation. *J. Sens.* 2018:6464036
30. Int. Energy Agency (IEA). 2017. *Digitalization and Energy*. Paris: IEA
31. Burger SP, Luke M. 2017. Business models for distributed energy resources: a review and empirical analysis. *Energy Policy* 109:230–48
32. Pettifor H, Wilson C, Bogelein S, Cassar E, Kerr L, Wilson M. 2020. Are low-carbon innovations appealing? A typology of functional, symbolic, private and public attributes. *Energy Res. Soc. Sci.* 64:101422
33. Nagy D, Schuessler J, Dubinsky A. 2016. Defining and identifying disruptive innovations. *Ind. Mark. Manag.* 57:119–26
34. Tellis GJ. 2006. Disruptive technology or visionary leadership? *J. Prod. Innov. Manag.* 23:34–38
35. Govindarajan V, Kopalle PK. 2006. Disruptiveness of innovations: measurement and an assessment of reliability and validity. *Strateg. Manag. J.* 27:189–99
36. Rogers EM. 2003. *Diffusion of Innovations*. New York: Free Press
37. Dotsika F, Watkins A. 2017. Identifying potentially disruptive trends by means of keyword network analysis. *Technol. Forecast. Soc. Change* 119:114–27
38. Yan Z, Du K, Yang Z, Deng M. 2017. Convergence or divergence? Understanding the global development trend of low-carbon technologies. *Energy Policy* 109:499–509
39. Momeni A, Rost K. 2016. Identification and monitoring of possible disruptive technologies by patent-development paths and topic modeling. *Technol. Forecast. Soc. Change* 104:16–29
40. Popp D. 2005. Lessons from patents: using patents to measure technological change in environmental models. *Ecol. Econ.* 54:209–26
41. Killki K, Mäntylä M, Karhu K, Hämmäinen H, Ailisto H. 2018. A disruption framework. *Technol. Forecast. Soc. Change* 129:275–84

42. Martin E, Shaheen S. 2016. *Impacts of car2go on vehicle ownership, modal shift, vehicle miles traveled, and greenhouse gas emissions: an analysis of five North American cities*. Work. Pap., Transp. Sustain. Res. Cent., Berkeley, CA. <https://tsrc.berkeley.edu/publications/impacts-car2go-vehicle-ownership-modal-shift-vehicle-miles-traveled-and-greenhouse-gas>
43. Nijland H, van Meerkerk J. 2017. Mobility and environmental impacts of car sharing in the Netherlands. *Environ. Innov. Soc. Transit.* 23:84–91
44. Jacobson SH, King DM. 2009. Fuel saving and ridesharing in the US: motivations, limitations, and opportunities. *Transp. Res. Part D* 14:14–21
45. Canals Casals L, Martinez-Laserna E, Amante García B, Nieto N. 2016. Sustainability analysis of the electric vehicle use in Europe for CO₂ emissions reduction. *J. Cleaner Prod.* 127:425–37
46. Hiselius LW, Svensson Å. 2017. E-bike use in Sweden—CO₂ effects due to modal change and municipal promotion strategies. *J. Cleaner Prod.* 141:818–24
47. Bauer GS, Greenblatt JB, Gerke BF. 2018. Cost, energy, and environmental impact of automated electric taxi fleets in Manhattan. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 52:4920–28
48. Harvard Business Review. 2015. Tesla's not as disruptive as you might think. *Harvard Bus. Rev.* May 2015:22–23
49. Zhang Y, Mi Z. 2018. Environmental benefits of bike sharing: a big data-based analysis. *Appl. Energy* 220:296–301
50. Kim S-N. 2017. Is telecommuting sustainable? An alternative approach to estimating the impact of home-based telecommuting on household travel. *Int. J. Sustain. Transp.* 11:72–85
51. Guerin TF. 2017. A demonstration of how virtual meetings can enhance sustainability in a corporate context. *Environ. Q. Manag.* 27:75–81
52. Heard BR, Bandekar M, Vassar B, Miller SA. 2019. Comparison of life cycle environmental impacts from meal kits and grocery store meals. *Resour. Conserv. Recycl.* 147:189–200
53. Davies AR, Legg R. 2018. Fare sharing: interrogating the nexus of ICT, urban food sharing, and sustainability. *Food, Cult. Soc.* 21:233–54
54. Sullivan RK, Marsh S, Halvarsson J, Holdsworth M, Waterlander W, et al. 2016. Smartphone apps for measuring human health and climate change co-benefits: a comparison and quality rating of available apps. *JMIR mHealth uHealth* 4:e135
55. Behav. Insights Team (BIT). 2017. *Evaluating the Nest Learning Thermostat*. Rep., BIT, London
56. Laidi R, Djenouri D, Ringel M. 2019. Commercial technologies for advanced light control in smart building energy management systems: a comparative study. *Energy Power Eng.* 11:283–302
57. Hsu CL, Lin JCC. 2016. An empirical examination of consumer adoption of Internet of Things services: network externalities and concern for information privacy perspectives. *Comput. Hum. Behav.* 62:516–27
58. Beaudin M, Zareipour H. 2015. Home energy management systems: a review of modelling and complexity. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.* 45:318–35
59. Sivasakthivel T, Murugesan K, Sahoo PK. 2014. A study on energy and CO₂ saving potential of ground source heat pump system in India. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.* 32:278–93
60. Jacobs P, Leidelmeijer K, Borsboom W, van Vliet M, de Jong P. 2015. *Energiesprong: Transition Zero*. Rep., Energiesprong, The Hague, Neth.
61. Fremstad A. 2017. Does Craigslist reduce waste? Evidence from California and Florida. *Ecol. Econ.* 132:135–43
62. Kelly J, Knottenbelt W. 2016. *Does disaggregated electricity feedback reduce domestic electricity consumption? A systematic review of the literature*. Paper presented at the 3rd International NILM Workshop, Vancouver, BC, Canada, May 14–15
63. Fares RL, Webber ME. 2017. The impacts of storing solar energy in the home to reduce reliance on the utility. *Nat. Energy* 2:17001
64. Morstyn T, Farrell N, Darby SJ, McCulloch MD. 2018. Using peer-to-peer energy-trading platforms to incentivize prosumers to form federated power plants. *Nat. Energy* 3:94–101
65. Mwasilu F, Justo JJ, Kim EK, Do TD, Jung JW. 2014. Electric vehicles and smart grid interaction: a review on vehicle to grid and renewable energy sources integration. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.* 34:501–16

66. Andersen LM, Hansen LG, Lynge Jensen C, Wolak FA. 2017. *Using real-time pricing and information provision to shift intra-day electricity consumption: evidence from Denmark*. Work. Pap., Dep. Econ., Stanf. Univ., Stanf., CA. https://web.stanford.edu/group/fwolak/cgi-bin/sites/default/files/into_versus_away_paper.pdf
67. Srivastava A, Van Passel S, Laes E. 2018. Assessing the success of electricity demand response programs: a meta-analysis. *Energy Res. Soc. Sci.* 40:110–17
68. Winther T, Gurigard K. 2017. Energy performance contracting (EPC): a suitable mechanism for achieving energy savings in housing cooperatives? Results from a Norwegian pilot project. *Energy Effic.* 10:577–96
69. Overholm H. 2015. Spreading the rooftop revolution: What policies enable solar-as-a-service? *Energy Policy* 84:69–79
70. Creutzig F, Roy J, Lamb WF, Azevedo IML, Bruine de Bruin W, et al. 2018. Towards demand-side solutions for mitigating climate change. *Nat. Clim. Change* 8:268–71
71. Cramer J, Krueger AB. 2016. Disruptive change in the taxi business: the case of Uber. *Am. Econ. Rev.* 106:177–82
72. King AA, Baartogtokh B. 2015. How useful is the theory of disruptive innovation? *MIT Sloan Manag. Rev.* 57:77
73. Ward JW, Michalek JJ, Azevedo IL, Samaras C, Ferreira P. 2019. Effects of on-demand ridesourcing on vehicle ownership, fuel consumption, vehicle miles traveled, and emissions per capita in U.S. states. *Transp. Res. Part C* 108:289–301
74. Clewlow RR, Mishra GS. 2017. *Disruptive transportation: the adoption, utilization, and impacts of ride-hailing in the United States*. Rep. UCD-ITS-RR-17-07, Inst. Transp. Stud., Univ. Calif., Davis
75. Rayle L, Dai D, Chan N, Cervero R, Shaheen S. 2016. Just a better taxi? A survey-based comparison of taxis, transit, and ridesourcing services in San Francisco. *Transp. Policy* 45:168–78
76. Erhardt GD, Roy S, Cooper D, Sana B, Chen M, Castiglione J. 2019. Do transportation network companies decrease or increase congestion? *Sci. Adv.* 5:eaau2670
77. Cheris A, Taylor C, Hayes J, Davis-Peccoud J. 2017. *Retailers' Challenge: How to Cut Carbon Emissions as E-Commerce Soars*. San Francisco: Bain & Co.
78. Goodchild A, Toy J. 2018. Delivery by drone: an evaluation of unmanned aerial vehicle technology in reducing CO₂ emissions in the delivery service industry. *Transp. Res. D* 61:58–67
79. Stolaroff JK, Samaras C, O'Neill ER, Lubers A, Mitchell AS, Ceperley D. 2018. Energy use and life cycle greenhouse gas emissions of drones for commercial package delivery. *Nat. Commun.* 9:409
80. Fulton L, Mason J, Meroux D. 2017. *Three revolutions in urban transportation: how to achieve the full potential of vehicle electrification, automation, and shared mobility in urban transportation systems around the world by 2050*. Rep., Inst. Transp. Stud., Univ. Calif., Davis
81. Baptista P, Melo S, Rolim C. 2014. Energy, environmental and mobility impacts of car-sharing systems. Empirical results from Lisbon, Portugal. *Procedia Soc. Behav. Sci.* 111:28–37
82. Bardhi F, Eckhardt GM. 2012. Access-based consumption: the case of car sharing. *J. Consum. Res.* 39:881–98
83. Lane C. 2005. PhillyCarShare: first-year social and mobility impacts of carsharing in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. *Transp. Res. Rec.* 1927:158–66
84. Sprei F, Ginnebaugh D. 2015. *Can car sharing facilitate a more sustainable car purchase?* Paper presented at the Summer Study of the European Council for an Energy Efficient Economy (ECEEE), Toulon/Hyeres, France, Jun. 1–6
85. McKinsey & Co. 2016. *Automotive revolution—perspective towards 2030: how the convergence of disruptive technology-driven trends could transform the auto industry*. Rep., McKinsey & Co., San Francisco. <https://www.mckinsey.com/industries/automotive-and-assembly/our-insights/disruptive-trends-that-will-transform-the-auto-industry/de-de>
86. Hughes T. 2017. The effect of ride-sharing on the auto industry. *Moody's Anal. Risk Perspect.* 9:16–21
87. Yu A, Wei Y, Chen W, Peng N, Peng L. 2018. Life cycle environmental impacts and carbon emissions: a case study of electric and gasoline vehicles in China. *Transp. Res. Part D* 65:409–20
88. Ling Z, Cherry CR, Yang H. 2019. Emerging mini electric cars in China: user experience and policy implications. *Transp. Res. Part D* 69:293–304

89. O'Keefe P, Caulfield B, Brazil W, White P. 2016. The impacts of telecommuting in Dublin. *Res. Transp. Econ.* 57:13–20
90. Wadud Z, MacKenzie D, Leiby P. 2016. Help or hindrance? The travel, energy and carbon impacts of highly automated vehicles. *Transp. Res. A: Policy Pract.* 86:1–18
91. Bullock C, Brereton F, Bailey S. 2017. The economic contribution of public bike-share to the sustainability and efficient functioning of cities. *Sustain. Cities Soc.* 28:76–87
92. Bajzelj B, McManus W, Parry A. 2019. *Food Waste in Primary Production in the UK*. Banbury, UK: Waste Resour. Action Progr.
93. Ipsos Mori. 2016. *Poll conducted for The Vegan Society—incidence of vegans research*. Rep., Ipsos Mori, London
94. Ferguson D. 2019. Food waste: how to get cheap grub and help save the planet. *The Guardian*, July 6. <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2019/jul/06/food-waste-how-to-get-cheap-grub-and-help-save-the-planet>
95. Jungbluth N, Keller R, König A. 2016. ONE TWO WE—life cycle management in canteens together with suppliers, customers and guests. *Int. J. Life Cycle Assess.* 21:646–53
96. Kurnia S, Hill S, Rahim MM, Larsen K, Braun P, Samson D. 2015. Open Food Network: the role of ICT to support regional food supply chains in Australia. arXiv:1606.01456 [cs.CY]
97. Kurnia S, Rahim MM, Hill S, Larsen K, Braun P, et al. 2017. Supporting regional food supply chains with an e-commerce application. In *Social Inclusion and Usability of ICT-Enabled Services*, ed. J Choudri, P Tsatsou, S Kurnia, pp. 1–19. New York: Routledge
98. McFarland K, Wittmayer JM. 2017. Hitting a policy wall: the transformative potential and limitations of community pick-up point schemes. In *Social Innovation and Sustainable Consumption*, ed. J Backhaus, A Genus, S Lorek, E Vadovics, JM Wittmayer, pp. 72–85. London: Routledge
99. Pérez-Neira D, Grollmus-Venegas A. 2018. Life-cycle energy assessment and carbon footprint of peri-urban horticulture. A comparative case study of local food systems in Spain. *Landsc. Urban Plann.* 172:60–68
100. Fawcett T. 2014. Exploring the time dimension of low carbon retrofit: owner-occupied housing. *Build. Res. Inf.* 42:477–88
101. Stuart E, Carvallo JP, Larsen PH, Goldman CA, Gilligan D. 2018. Understanding recent market trends of the US ESCO industry. *Energy Effic.* 11:1303–24
102. Int. Energy Agency (IEA). 2018. *Energy Efficiency Market Report*. Paris: IEA
103. Hittinger E, Jaramillo P. 2019. Internet of things: Energy boon or bane? *Science* 364:326–28
104. Coskun A, Kaner G, Bostan İ. 2018. Is smart home a necessity or a fantasy for the mainstream user? A study on users' expectations of smart household appliances. *Int. J. Des.* 12:7–20
105. Moore S. 2016. *The Disrupted Decade: 4 Disruptions that Will Shake Things Up for Energy Consumers*. London: Citiz. Advice
106. Böcker L, Meelen T. 2017. Sharing for people, planet or profit? Analysing motivations for intended sharing economy participation. *Environ. Innov. Soc. Transit.* 23:28–39
107. Spang ES, Moreno LC, Pace SA, Achmon Y, Donis-Gonzalez I, et al. 2019. Food loss and waste: measurement, drivers, and solutions. *Annu. Rev. Environ. Resour.* 44:117–56
108. Geissinger A, Laurell C, Sandström C. 2020. Digital disruption beyond Uber and Airbnb—tracking the long tail of the sharing economy. *Technol. Forecast. Soc. Change* 155:119323
109. Hargreaves T, Wilson C. 2017. Control of smart home technologies. See Ref. 27, pp. 91–105
110. Lamberton CP, Rose RL. 2012. When is ours better than mine? A framework for understanding and altering participation in commercial sharing systems. *J. Mark.* 76:109–25
111. Wilson C, Crane L, Chrysochoidis G. 2015. Why do homeowners renovate energy efficiently? Contrasting perspectives and implications for policy. *Energy Res. Soc. Sci.* 7:12–22
112. Schanes K, Stagl S. 2019. Food waste fighters: What motivates people to engage in food sharing? *J. Cleaner Prod.* 211:1491–501
113. Wainstein ME, Bumpus AG. 2016. Business models as drivers of the low carbon power system transition: a multi-level perspective. *J. Cleaner Prod.* 126:572–85
114. Bocken NMP, Short SW, Rana P, Evans S. 2014. A literature and practice review to develop sustainable business model archetypes. *J. Cleaner Prod.* 65:42–56

115. Bonilla-Alicea RJ, Watson BC, Shen Z, Tamayo L, Telenko C. 2020. Life cycle assessment to quantify the impact of technology improvements in bike-sharing systems. *J. Ind. Ecol.* 24:138–48
116. Adner R. 2002. When are technologies disruptive? A demand-based view of the emergence of competition. *Strateg. Manag. J.* 23:667–88
117. Roy R. 2018. Role of relevant lead users of mainstream product in the emergence of disruptive innovation. *Technol. Forecast. Soc. Change* 129:314–22
118. Urry J. 2014. The problem of energy. *Theory Cult. Soc.* 31:3–20
119. Greenblatt JB, Saxena S. 2015. Autonomous taxis could greatly reduce greenhouse-gas emissions of US light-duty vehicles. *Nat. Clim. Change* 5:860–63
120. Int. Transp. Forum (ITF). 2015. *Urban Mobility System Upgrade: How Shared Self-Driving Cars Could Change City Traffic*. Paris: ITF
121. Lister K, Harnish T. 2011. *The Shifting Nature of Work in the UK: Bottom Line Benefits of Telework*. San Diego, CA: Telework Res. Netw.
122. Seto KC, Davis SJ, Mitchell RB, Stokes EC, Unruh G, Ürge-Vorsatz D. 2016. Carbon lock-in: types, causes, and policy implications. *Annu. Rev. Environ. Resour.* 41:425–52
123. Geels FW, Sovacool BK, Schwanen T, Sorrell S. 2017. Sociotechnical transitions for deep decarbonization. *Science* 357:1242–44
124. Geels FW. 2018. Disruption and low-carbon system transformation: progress and new challenges in socio-technical transitions research and the Multi-Level Perspective. *Energy Res. Soc. Sci.* 37:224–31
125. Urry J. 2008. Governance, flows, and the end of the car system? *Global Environ. Change* 18:343–49
126. Lund H, Kempton W. 2008. Integration of renewable energy into the transport and electricity sectors through V2G. *Energy Policy* 36:3578–87
127. Sprei F. 2018. Disrupting mobility. *Energy Res. Soc. Sci.* 37:238–42
128. Marikyan D, Papagiannidis S, Alamanos E. 2019. A systematic review of the smart home literature: a user perspective. *Technol. Forecast. Soc. Change* 138:139–54
129. Wilson C, Hargreaves T, Hauxwell-Baldwin R. 2017. Benefits and risks of smart home technologies. *Energy Policy* 103:72–83
130. Crowley J, Coutaz J. 2015. An ecological view of smart home technologies. In *Ambient Intelligence: 12th European Conference, AmI 2015, Athens, Greece, November 11–13, 2015, Proceedings*, ed. B de Ruyter, A Kameas, P Chatzimisios, I Mavrommati, pp. 372–72. Cham, Switz: Springer
131. Porter ME, Heppelmann JE. 2014. How smart, connected products are transforming competition. *Harvard Bus. Rev.* 92:64–88
132. Ford R, Pritoni M, Sanguinetti A, Karlin B. 2017. Categories and functionality of smart home technology for energy management. *Build. Environ.* 123:543–54
133. Seba T. 2014. *Clean Disruption of Energy and Transportation*. Silicon Valley, CA: Clean Planet Ventur.
134. van den Broek T, van Veenstra AF. 2018. Governance of big data collaborations: how to balance regulatory compliance and disruptive innovation. *Technol. Forecast. Soc. Change* 129:330–38
135. Graffy E, Kihm S. 2014. Does disruptive competition mean a death spiral for electric utilities? *Energy Law J.* 35:1–44
136. Morrow O. 2019. Sharing food and risk in Berlin’s urban food commons. *Geoforum* 99:202–12
137. Chies BM. 2017. Turning food “waste” into a commons. The case of Foodsharing (Germany) and Solidarity Fridge (Sweden). In *Proceedings of the XVI Biennial IASC-Conference (Practicing the Commons: Self-Governance, Cooperation and Institutional Change)*, Utrecht, The Netherlands, July 10–14. <https://www.iasc2017.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/chies.pdf>
138. Int. Smart Grid Action Netw. (ISGAN). 2019. *Smart grid case studies: innovative regulatory approaches with focus on experimental sandboxes*. Rep., Int. Energy Agency, Paris
139. Creutzig F, Franzen M, Moeckel R, Heinrichs D, Nagel K, et al. 2019. Leveraging digitalization for sustainability in urban transport. *Glob. Sustain.* 2:e14
140. Cooper R, Timmer V. 2015. *Local Governments and the Sharing Economy: A Roadmap Helping Local Governments Across North America Strategically Engage with the Sharing Economy to Foster More Sustainable Cities*. Vancouver, BC: One Earth
141. Int. Transp. Forum (ITF). 2017. *Shared Mobility: Simulations for Auckland*. Paris: ITF

142. Kramer GJ. 2018. Energy scenarios—exploring disruption and innovation. *Energy Res. Soc. Sci.* 37:247–50
143. Chrisafis A. 2016. French law forbids food waste by supermarkets. *The Guardian*, Febr. 4. <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2016/feb/04/french-law-forbids-food-waste-by-supermarkets>
144. Sprei F, Ginnebaugh D. 2018. Unbundling cars to daily use and infrequent use vehicles—the potential role of car sharing. *Energy Effic.* 11:1433–47
145. Leibowicz BD. 2018. Policy recommendations for a transition to sustainable mobility based on historical diffusion dynamics of transport systems. *Energy Policy* 119:357–66
146. Millar C, Lockett M, Ladd T. 2018. Disruption: technology, innovation and society. *Technol. Forecast. Soc. Change* 129:254–60
147. Sochor J, Strömberg H, Karlsson ICM. 2015. Implementing mobility as a service: challenges in integrating user, commercial, and societal perspectives. *Transp. Res. Rec.* 2536:1–9
148. Wilson C. 2018. Disruptive low-carbon innovations. *Energy Res. Soc. Sci.* 37:216–23



Contents

I. Integrative Themes and Emerging Concerns

- Climate Change and Small Island Developing States
*Adelle Thomas, April Baptiste, Rosanne Martyr-Koller, Patrick Pringle,
and Kevon Rhiney* 1

II. Earth's Life Support Systems

- Soil Microbiomes Under Climate Change and Implications for Carbon
Cycling
*Dan Naylor, Natalie Sadler, Arunima Bhattacharjee, Emily B. Graham,
Christopher R. Anderton, Ryan McClure, Mary Lipton,
Kirsten S. Hofmocker, and Janet K. Jansson*29
- The State of the World's Insects
Paul Eggleton61
- The Impacts of Ocean Acidification on Marine Ecosystems and Reliant
Human Communities
Scott C. Doney, D. Shallin Busch, Sarah R. Cooley, and Kristy J. Kroeker83

III. Human Use of the Environment and Resources

- Potential Climate Benefits of Digital Consumer Innovations
Charlie Wilson, Laurie Kerr, Frances Sprei, Emilie Vrain, and Mark Wilson 113
- The Harvest of Tropical Wildlife for Bushmeat and Traditional
Medicine
Tien Ming Lee, Amanda Sigouin, Miguel Pinedo-Vasquez, and Robert Nasi 145
- A Snapshot of the World's Groundwater Challenges
Upmanu Lall, Laureline Josset, and Tess Russo 171
- Chemical Contamination of Drinking Water in Resource-Constrained
Settings: Global Prevalence and Piloted Mitigation Strategies
Susan E. Amrose, Katya Cherukumilli, and Natasha C. Wright 195
- Advances Toward a Net-Zero Global Building Sector
*Diana Ürge-Vorsatz, Radhika Khosla, Rob Bernhardt, Yi Chieh Chan,
David Vérez, Shan Hu, and Luisa F. Cabeza* 227

IV. Management and Governance of Resources and Environment

Climate Decision-Making <i>Ben Orlove, Rachael Shwom, Ezra Markowitz, and So-Min Cheong</i>	271
Corruption and Anti-Corruption in Environmental and Resource Management <i>Luca Tacconi and David Aled Williams</i>	305
Sustainability Science: Toward a Synthesis <i>William C. Clark and Alicia G. Harley</i>	331
The Tropes of Celebrity Environmentalism <i>Crystal Abidin, Dan Brockington, Michael K. Goodman, Mary Mostafanezhad, and Lisa Ann Richey</i>	387
Urban Climates and Climate Change <i>Valéry Masson, Aude Lemonsu, Julia Hidalgo, and James Voogt</i>	411

V. Methods and Indicators

Modeling Costs and Benefits of Energy Storage Systems <i>Eric Hittinger and Rebecca E. Ciez</i>	445
Reconciling Conflict and Cooperation in Environmental Governance: A Social Network Perspective <i>Örjan Bodin, María Mancilla García, and Garry Robins</i>	471
The Boundaries of the Planetary Boundary Framework: A Critical Appraisal of Approaches to Define a “Safe Operating Space” for Humanity <i>Frank Biermann and Rakhyun E. Kim</i>	497

Indexes

Cumulative Index of Contributing Authors, Volumes 36–45	523
Cumulative Index of Article Titles, Volumes 36–45	530

Errata

An online log of corrections to *Annual Review of Environment and Resources* articles may be found at <http://www.annualreviews.org/errata/environ>