Journal Pre-proof



Carbon footprint, municipality size and rurality in Spain: Inequality and carbon taxation

Manuel Tomás, Luis Antonio López, Fabio Monsalve

PII: S0959-6526(20)31845-X

DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.121798

Reference: JCLP 121798

To appear in: *Journal of Cleaner Production*

Received Date: 29 August 2019

Revised Date: 27 February 2020

Accepted Date: 18 April 2020

Please cite this article as: Tomás M, López LA, Monsalve F, Carbon footprint, municipality size and rurality in Spain: Inequality and carbon taxation, *Journal of Cleaner Production* (2020), doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.121798.

CREDIT AUTHOR STATEMENT

Manuel Tomás: Conceptualization, Methodology, Software, Validation, Formal analysis, Investigation, Resources, Data Curation, Writing - Original Draft, Writing - Review & Editing, Visualization, Project administration, Funding acquisition.

Luis Antonio López: Conceptualization, Methodology, Investigation, Resources, Writing - Original Draft, Writing - Review & Editing, Visualization, Supervision, Funding acquisition.

Fabio Monsalve: Conceptualization, Software, Validation, Formal analysis, Resources, Data Curation, Writing - Review & Editing, Funding acquisition.

9993 words (excluding this ones)

Carbon footprint, municipality size and rurality in Spain: Inequality and carbon taxation

Tomás, Manuel[a]*; López, Luis Antonio[b]; Monsalve, Fabio[b]

[a]*Basque Centre for Climate Change (BC3), Scientific Campus of the University of the Basque Country, Building 1, 1st floor, Sarriena s/n, 48940, Leioa, Spain*

[b]*Global Energy and Environmental Economics Analysis Research Group, Faculty of Economics and Business, University of Castilla-La Mancha, Pza. de la Universidad 1, 02071, Albacete, Spain*

Corresponding author information*

E-mail: manuel.tomas@bc3research.org; Tel. +34 944 014 690 Ext. 183

ABSTRACT

By using an environmentally extended multi-regional input-output model, this paper analyses the Spanish households' carbon footprint for the 2008-2017 period considering the municipality size as well as the urban or rural residential zone where families live. Results show that, on a per capita basis, inhabitants of medium-high municipalities emit fewer carbon emissions than those settled in small ones (between 0.34-0.54 tCO_2/cap depending on the year studied). This carbon unbalance is mainly explained by the higher direct carbon footprints of dwellers who reside in small municipalities and, in special, in rural zones. Furthermore, we apply inequality measures through a consumption-based carbon footprint Gini coefficient, discovering that inequality is lower in small municipality both in income and CO_2 emissions. In the light of the findings, in Spain, the application of a carbon pricing on direct and indirect carbon footprints will be regressive, being especially harmful to people of small municipalities and rural areas. Accordingly, carbon inequalities between these types of households must be contemplated to avoid a poor design of this kind of mitigation policies implemented for fighting against climate change.

KEYWORDS

Carbon footprint; Input-output analysis; Inequality; Carbon pricing; Climate change.

1. Introduction

The term “empty Spain” has been coined to reflect how part of the Spanish territory is being depopulated during the last years. This phenomenon mainly affects the small municipalities of the centre of the country, where industrial activity is very depleted, and the population is largely elderly (CES, 2018). The young and middle-aged population leaves these places hoping to find better job opportunities and to reach urban living standards in cities. Although urbanisation is especially incipient in developing countries, it also affects developed nations (UN, 2019b). In Spain, for instance, during the 2008-2017 period, 269 thousand people have moved from small municipalities to other places; while towns and cities have grown by 683 thousand inhabitants [dataset] (INE, 2020a). These demographic changes have an impact on climate change as a result of the differences between urban and rural consumption patterns. Nonetheless, in the literature, there is still an open debate about whether the urbanisation process boosts or saves carbon emissions on a per capita basis (Hubacek et al., 2017b; Schubert and Gill, 2015).

On the one hand, cities allow people to take advantage of agglomeration economies obtaining a higher labour division and labour productivity that gives rise to larger average wages (Krugman, 1991; Puga, 2010). As a consequence, these higher per capita earnings in cities could intensify the environmental scale effect which states that as the families’ income rises, so does their spending on consumption and, with it, their carbon emissions (Chancel and Piketty, 2015; Hubacek et al., 2017a; López et al., 2016), energy requirements (Lenzen et al., 2006; Moll et al., 2005; Reinders et al., 2003) and material uses (López et al., 2017). Apart from the larger purchasing power, in urban zones, there are also a wider variety of products for consumption, which usually leads to high-carbon lifestyles (Gill and Moeller, 2018; Heinonen et al., 2013). All these thoughts have encouraged previous literature to make many efforts on assessing the carbon footprints of big cities given its standing as a hot-spot for fighting against climate change (Chen et al., 2016; Harris et al., 2020; Huang et al., 2018; Moran et al., 2018).

On the other hand, some scholars have argued that urbanisation can contribute to reducing global warming (Glaeser, 2011). Behind this idea underlies the so-called "relief by density" hypothesis, according to which, in per capita terms, city dwellers emit fewer carbon emissions than those settle in rural zones (Dodman, 2009; Gill and

Moeller, 2018; Schubert and Gill, 2015). In this manner, people located in urban areas might save carbon emissions thanks to the scale economies linked with public transport and commute smaller distances (Rau and Vega, 2012); the larger number of gas distribution networks, which is more carbon-efficient than other fuels (Poumanyvong and Kaneko, 2010); and, the abundance of compact and small houses that save energy (Norman et al., 2006). Meanwhile, rural municipalities have a limited offer of employment, infrastructure, and goods and services that may forces their inhabitants to use private transport (e.g., cars) for travelling to cities to fully meet their needs (VandeWeghe and Kennedy, 2007) as well as to employ more carbon-intensive fuels for heating and cooking (Labandeira et al., 2011; Wang and Jiang, 2017).

A highly relevant decision to address the aforementioned academic discussion is how to identify which are urban and rural households. To date, there is not yet a globally agreed-upon that division due to national differences in the criterion used to separate urban from rural areas. Traditionally this categorisation has been based on differences in living standards (UN, 2019a). Nevertheless, it has become blurred in developed countries where well-being is pretty widespread, giving way to other criteria relying on municipality size or population density. It has influenced previous works that have estimated carbon footprints of urban and rural households: Gill and Moeller (2018) employed the municipality size as a criterion for calculating rural and urban individuals' carbon footprints in Germany. These authors found that the accumulation of people in cities save some greenhouse gas emissions and pointed out that inhabitants of small municipalities could be hit heavily by carbon taxes on direct energy use; Ottelin et al. (2019) followed the urbanisation degree (i.e., a population density approach) as the criterion for estimating EU households' carbon footprints showing that per capita carbon emissions are slightly lower in cities than in rural areas when income and other household features are controlled; lastly, for Spain, Arce et al. (2017) and Duarte et al. (2012) applied both approaches to defining urbanity and rurality concluding that larger population density or municipality size leads households to more carbon-intensive lifestyles.

In the context of this discussion, this article contributes to the existing body of knowledge in several ways. First, we test the "relief by density" hypothesis in Spain by employing the size of the municipality as the criterion for separating the households. This approach allows connecting the scientific findings with local administrative bodies, i.e., municipal councils, expediting the good design, applicability and effectiveness of mitigation policies. Second, we account for carbon footprints of households located in small and medium-high municipalities from a dynamic perspective (considering both crisis and post-crisis period, i.e., from 2008 to 2017). Due to the division between municipalities raised could not reflect rurality as such, we cross municipality size with a control variable that states the urban vs rural residential location of the household to capture those typical nuances of rural life in our analysis adequately. Third, we evaluate how the economic cycle has affected income and carbon inequality within municipalities through the Gini coefficient. And, finally, we go beyond just estimating carbon footprints by simulating carbon pricing scenarios. We view this analysis particularly relevant, given that, lately, the Spanish Government has firmly pledged to boost policy actions to address climate change, among which a green fiscal reform is called to have a prevalent role (Gobierno de España, 2020). However, this kind of measures may cause adverse distributional effects because of poor people spend a large share of income on inelastic and potentially carbon-taxable products (Böhringer et al., 2019). Furthermore, the households' location determinates their energy demand significantly (Jain and Kumar, 2018; Reinders et al., 2003; Zhang and Lahr, 2018). Thus, we look at the distributional effects of carbon pricing policies on Spanish households for different settlements' locations and types of products (Bureau, 2011; Callan et al., 2009; Pashardes et al., 2014) to propose some policy recommendations that could pave the way for the acceptance of eventual green tax reforms.

2. Methodology and data

2.1 Estimating household carbon footprints on a per capita basis

The indicator chosen to measure the direct and indirect Spanish families' CO_2 emissions is the household carbon footprint per capita (CF), which is defined in expression [1]:

$$CF = \overbrace{iCF}^{1.1} + \underbrace{dCF}_{1.2} \qquad [1]$$

where expression [1.1] represents the indirect household carbon footprint per capita (iCF), i.e., the CO_2 emitted, directly and indirectly, along the global value chains until the households' final demand is satisfied; and expression [1.2] shows the direct household carbon footprint per capita (dCF), i.e., the direct CO_2 emissions associated with the demand for energy goods consumed both within and out of the home.

2.1.1 The indirect household carbon footprint per capita (iCF)

In order to estimate the iCF of different families, we employ an environmentally extended multi-regional input-output (EEMRIO) model adapted to the households in its consumption based-approach, which has been previously applied in the literature (Arce et al., 2017; Brizga et al., 2017; Gill and Moeller, 2018; Huang et al., 2018; López et al., 2016). The main virtue of this environmental accounting method is its capacity to interconnect local consumption decisions with the total CO_2 emissions embedded along fragmented global production chains and international trade (Hubacek et al., 2014). Regarding the standard EEMRIO model framework presented in Miller and Blair (2009), we undertake the necessary adaptations until achieving the accurate model to estimate the iCF for different types of Spanish households. Let us define the following variables: r is the region under study, in this case, Spain; s is a conglomerate of regions formed by the rest of the countries called "Rest of the World"; $\hat{f}$ is a vector of CO_2 emissions coefficients diagonalized, which collects the CO_2 per monetary unit of production for all regions and all industries; A is a matrix of domestic and import technical coefficients; $L = (I - A)^{-1}$ is the Leontief inverse matrix, which shows the direct and indirect inputs necessary for an additional monetary unit of output to satisfy the final demand; $\hat{c}_i^r$ is a consumption vector diagonalized of a type of household with i characteristics of the r region, which can be decomposed into the diagonalized vector of domestic household consumption ($\hat{c}_i^{rr}$) and the diagonalized vector of imported goods from region s ($\hat{c}_i^{sr}$); and, P_i^r is the total population that belongs to a determined kind of household i in r region. In accordance with all these definitions, the iCF for a determinate kind of households i of the region r is calculated as follows:

$$iCF_i^r = \frac{\hat{f}\ L\ \hat{c}_i^r}{\mathrm{P}_i^r} = \begin{pmatrix} \overbrace{\dfrac{\hat{f}^r\ L^{rr}\ \hat{c}_i^{rr} + \hat{f}^r\ L^{rs}\ \hat{c}_i^{rr}}{\mathrm{P}_i^r}}^{1.1.1} \\ \cdots \\ \underbrace{\dfrac{\hat{f}^s\ L^{sr}\ \hat{c}_i^{sr} + \hat{f}^s\ L^{ss}\ \hat{c}_i^{sr}}{\mathrm{P}_i^r}}_{1.1.2} \end{pmatrix} \qquad [1.1]$$

In expression [1.1] two emission sources can be discerned: **a)** the direct and indirect CO_2 emissions associated with the production of the region r that is intended to meet the demand of households in the region r (expression [1.1.1]); and, **b)** the direct and indirect CO_2 emissions linked to the output of region s that ends up supplying the demand of households in region r (expression [1.1.2]).

The consumption patterns (c_i^r) that represents alternative spending behaviours existing in the Spanish society are derived from a household survey microdata, while the EEMRIO model is based on the principles of the national accounts (NA). Thus, this datasets combination hides many uncertainties, mainly due to the different information sources foundations. The first inexactness comes from compiling the household consumption survey, given that each survey suffers common errors such as defective sampling, recall bias, changes in measurement, inadequate supervision and lack of responses (Amores, 2018; Deaton, 2005). Moreover, the household survey microdata has severe difficulties in accurately measuring the income and expenses of the wealthiest families, whose economic and environmental impacts are high (McCully, 2014; Milanovic, 2013; Piketty and Saez, 2014; Pinkovskiy and Sala-i-Martin, 2016). The second uncertainty emerges from the multi-regional input-output (MRIO) methodology and databases, e.g., homogeneous sectors, same price for all the sector supply, linear model, inability to detect structural changes in the economy and accounting and adaptation of MRIO tables and satellite accounts (Peters et al., 2016; Wiedmann, 2009). The remaining challenge is to bridge the household survey microdata (each vector of consumption c_i^r) with the MRIO tables used by the model. This step has been carried out in a sufficient non-transparent way by a large part of the literature that, previously, has calculated household footprints by using data survey on consumption (Min and Rao, 2018). Therefore, we have followed the procedure and materials developed by Cazcarro et al. (2020) to harmonize the information for the case of Spain.

2.1.2 The direct household carbon footprint per capita (dCF)

In order to fully estimate the total CF of a specific type of family i of Spain, it is necessary to add to the iCF all additional CO_2 emitted directly by families when burning energy goods. With this purpose, we have followed the method contemplated by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC, 2006) for estimating direct CO_2 emissions in national emission inventories, which is specified below:

$$dCF_i^{re} = \frac{\hat{j}^e \; c_i^{re}}{P_i^r} \qquad [1.2]$$

where $\hat{J}^{re}$ is a diagonalized vector of direct emissions factors that shows the CO_2 emissions per unit of quantity consumed for e energy goods in r region; and, c_i^{re} is another vector that collects the basket of the e energy goods consumed by Spanish households with i characteristics expressed in their respective physical units.

2.2 Measuring income and carbon inequality

The Gini coefficient is the most commonly-used indicator when researchers study personal inequality and its evolution over time (Chancel and Piketty, 2015; López et al., 2016; Milanovic, 2013; Palma, 2011; Wiedenhofer et al., 2016). The estimation of the Gini index is based on the Lorenz curve, in which we plot the accumulated percent of the population on the horizontal axis and the accumulated percent of the income or carbon emissions on the vertical axis. In Fig. A1 of the Appendix we illustrate schematically how the indicator can be estimated geometrically by dividing A (the area located above the Lorenz curve and below the line of equality) between A+B (the triangular area below the line of perfect equality). The indicator ranges from 0 to 1, in such a way that when there is maximum equity among individuals the Gini coefficient will be equal to 0, but if the income or carbon distribution is fully unbalanced its value will be 1.

Given that this article analyses economic and environmental inequality we use an income Gini coefficient (Income-Gini) and consumption-based carbon footprint Gini coefficient (CF-Gini) applied for households of small and medium-high municipalities in order to evaluate inequality within each type of settlement (Wiedenhofer et al., 2016). Let us define C as the total income or CO_2 emission of the household income group j and P as the population size of the household income group j. Regarding the expression $\mathrm{c}_j = \sum_0^j \mathrm{C}_j/\mathrm{C} \quad {}_{j\,=\,0\ldots n}$ that shows the proportion of income or CO_2 emitted for each household income group j and the expression $\mathrm{p}_j = \sum_0^j \mathrm{P}_j/\mathrm{P} \quad {}_{j\,=\,0\ldots n}$ that reflects the population share of each household income group j, we built the Gini index that will be applicable for measuring both income and carbon inequality as follows:

$$\mathrm{Gini} = 1 - \sum_{j=1}^{n} (\mathrm{p}_j - \mathrm{p}_{j-1})(\mathrm{c}_j + \mathrm{c}_{j-1}) \qquad [2]$$

2.3 Data sources

In this analysis, the MRIO tables used to feed the EEMRIO model are provided by the World Input-Output Database (WIOD) in its 2016 Release [dataset] (Timmer et al., 2015; Timmer et al., 2016). This source includes 44 regions and 56 homogeneous industries and covers the entire study period except for the last three years, i.e., 2015, 2016, and 2017. This data limitation is overcome by using the MRIO table of 2014 for the years without available data under the assumptions of constant technology and fixed commercial structure. WIOD information has been transformed from millions of dollars at current and basic prices to euros, applying annual average exchange rates euro/dollar [dataset] (EUROSTAT, 2020). Environmental information has been obtained from [dataset] Corsatea et al. (2019) who provides CO_2 emissions satellite accounts consistent with the WIOD Release 2016 (44 regions and 56 industries) covering the needed period (i.e., 2008-2014) to implement the model according to the assumptions mentioned above. The consumption vectors c_i^r have been created from the Spanish Household Budget Survey (HBS) microdata, that covers the entire period of study [dataset] (INE, 2020b). In order to maximize the impact of the analysis, many types of consumption patterns have been generated, representing alternative spending behaviours in Spanish society. The main criterion used for grouping households is the municipality size, but also we cross it with other control variables such as rural/urban residential area and income level of the household[1]. On the one hand, for calculating iCF consumption patterns are obtained from the HBS in euros at current and purchase prices and are distributed into 47 groups of the Classification of Individual Consumption by Purpose (COICOP)[2]. In order to feed a macroeconomic model as EEMRIO, this information must be adapted. In this case, we use the procedure proposed by Cazcarro et al. (2020) through the following main steps: **(1)** Align consumption and population data of the

[1] The INE provides all the household segmentation variables used in this work. Firstly, the size of the municipality offered splits into five groups: (a) municipality of 100,000 inhabitants or more; (b) municipality with 50,000 or more and less 100,000 inhabitants; (c) municipality with 20,000 or more and less than 50,000 inhabitants; (d) municipality with 10,000 or more and less than 20,000 inhabitants; and, (e) municipality with less than 10,000 inhabitants. We regroup the variable into two categories so that municipalities with 10,000 inhabitants or more are called medium-high municipalities and municipalities with less than 10,000 inhabitants are called small municipalities. Secondly, the area of residence of the family which allow us to identify rural and urban households. And, thirdly, the income level of the household is estimated by deciles (based on the households' per capita income).

[2] Since 2016, the INE is using the European Classification of Individual Consumption by Purpose (ECOICOP). The affected data has been transformed to COICOP following (INE, 2020b) methodology.

Spanish HBS to NA accounting principles[3]. **(2)** Convert consumption data of the Spanish HBS in NA principles to production-based classifications, concretely in Classification of Products by Activity (CPA) 2008 version[4]. **(3)** Revaluate Spanish HBS data based on NA principles and production-based classification to basic prices[5]. **(4)** Adapt data based on production-based classifications to the WIOD MRIO tables that rely on the industry-based classification[6]. On the one other hand, for estimating the dCF, consumption patterns of energy goods are obtained from the HBS, which provides data on the number of energy goods consumed in cubic meters (m^3), kilograms (kg) or liters (l), depending on the characteristics of the energy good considered. This information has been aligned with the NA principles taken into account the differences between HBS and HFCE population. The population size contemplated for each type of household by the HBS has been adjusted to the NA ones. Furthermore, direct emissions factors are provided by (MITECO, 2019) and have been adapted to be combined with energy consumption patterns expressed in physical units. The final results of dCF for all the types of families analysed are calibrated regarding the difference between the total direct household CO_2 emissions calculated via HBS and those provided by the environmental satellite accounts for the whole Spanish household sector (Corsatea et al., 2019).

[3] This step requires the use of data on Household Final Consumption Expenditure (HFCE) consistent with the Spanish NA and comparable with the HBS [dataset] (INE, 2020c).

[4] This step requires a bridge matrix that links the COICOP classification with the CPC classification. This kind of bridge matrix shows the share of each COICOP category that is reassigned to each CPC category. The accessibility to this bridge matrices is quite reduced (Amores, 2018). Luckily, Cazcarro et al. (2020) have managed to standardize this type of matrices for the whole of the EU-28 countries. These authors build bridge matrices that link information from COICOP (with 47 categories, from CP011 to CP127) with the Classification of Products by Activity (CPA) (CPA 2008 version, with 64 categories, from CPA_A01 to CPA_U) for 2010. Therefore, the Spanish bridge matrix of 2010 has been used to reclassify all consumption patterns based on COICOP, taking them to CPA 2008 for all years analysed.

[5] This step implies using the IO tables where the information for each CPA category appears in the total supply to purchase prices, net taxes on products, transport margins, commercial margins, and total supply at basic prices. Given that this information it is not public in Spain, we have used that one estimated by Cazcarro et al. (2020) for this country. In this manner, it is possible to calculate implicit ratios of the net taxes, commercial margins, and transport margins, for each CPA 2008 category. This technique implies starting from the data at purchasers' prices; deducting/adding the net taxes; extracting the trade and transport margins and reassigning them in their respective CPA 2008 categories (following the structure of the Spanish IO tables); finally, the consumption patterns become to be at basic prices (Amores, 2018).

[6] Even though consumption patterns data are in NA principles, CPA 2008 classification and basic prices, they are not yet ready to be integrated into the WIOD Realise 2016 MRIO tables. For this, it is necessary to move the data from the product-by-product approach (i.e., CPA 2008) to the industry-by-industry approach, which is the form as WIOD has been built (i.e., ISIC Rev.3 (Timmer et al., 2015; Timmer et al., 2016)). With this purpose, we have applied Model D (fixed product sales structure assumption) (Mahajan et al., 2018) in order to transform the consumption profiles in the same manner as the WIOD Realise 2016 MRIO tables has been build (Amores, 2018).

3. Results and discussions

3.1 Overview of the individuals' carbon footprint during the period 2008-2017

Throughout the 2008-2017 period, the households sector emitted between 60% and 78% of the total carbon footprint of Spain. This weight trended upwards over time, mainly as a result of the slowdown in investment made in the construction sector during the economic recession (Zafrilla and López, 2018). Despite this increase in relative terms, the Spanish households' have reduced their absolute carbon footprints in this period from 265 to 236 $MtCO_2$, largely due to the lower consumption during the crisis (López et al., 2016). International trade has also been a relevant driver of this trend. Imports from the Spanish economy are very carbon-intensive, especially those from developing countries where there are many poorly paid workers and lax environmental regulations (López et al., 2014). As a result, the sharp decline in imports demand since the beginning of the crisis helped to relieve the carbon footprints in Spain.

On a per capita basis, the effects of the economic cycle are visible too. Fig 1 illustrates the evolution of the average per capita consumption and CF in small and medium-high municipalities and splits the CF into the dCF and iCF (the latter, in its turn, is divided into domestic and imported iCF). Results show that the per capita consumption was higher in households located in medium-high municipalities than in the small ones, whereas for the CF the contrary occurs. Indeed, depending on the year studied, an average dweller of a small settlement emits between 0.34-0.54 tCO_2/cap more than his/her counterparts living in towns or cities. That means that the "relief by density" hypothesis found in others countries is also fulfilled for the case of Spain (Dodman, 2009; Gill and Moeller, 2018; Schubert and Gill, 2015), and, at the same time, it breaks with previous studies applied to the case of Spain that, unlike us, found a positive relationship between CF and municipality size (Arce et al., 2017; Duarte et al., 2012).

Direct emissions from households, not indirect emissions, explains why the households settled in villages have larger CFs (Fig. 1). As is usual in developed countries, dCF represented only between 25% and 38% of the total households' CFs, but it was decisive for the CFs unbalance between municipalities (Schubert and Gill, 2015). Indeed, people of small municipalities could not reduce its dCF between 2008-2017 period, on the contrary, they increased it by 1%. It becomes evident that the limitations in the small settlements of supply of infrastructure, employment, and goods and services, truly affects the direct energy demand of their dwellers and, as a consequence, their carbon emissions (Gill and Moeller, 2018; Jain and Kumar, 2018; Zhang and Lahr, 2018). Looking at the iCF, we find that the larger income and consumption levels in medium-high municipalities lead to slightly higher iCF, both domestic and imported (Arce et al., 2017; Gill and Moeller, 2018).



Fig. 1. Spanish households' CF and consumption by municipality size and years

Although the household's location has a relevant impact on its CF, maybe the cut raised between municipalities smaller and larger than 10.000 dwellers does not allow to isolate the phenomenon of rurality completely. In order to undertake more in-depth research in this direction, we try to answer the question: how does rurality affect CFs in each type of municipality? With this regard, in Table 1, we cross both variables, municipality size and rural-urban residential zone, and calculate the R/U ratio for both environments. This indicator is equal to 1 when the figures of the urban and rural households are balanced; is higher than 1 for larger results of the rural households; and, is below 1 for the opposite situation.

Focusing the attention on population distribution, we find that the rural dwellers are mostly concentrated in villages, while they are residual in settlements of 10,000 or more inhabitants. For the CFs, regardless of whether the household is rural or urban, we always observe that as smaller is the municipality size higher are the CFs, which consolidate the idea showed previously in Fig. 1. Even though the differences between the total CFs of the rural and urban households are minimal, rurality affects the household carbon pattern heavily. In terms of dCF, rural households are much more dependent on liquid and solid fuels (e.g., gasoline or coal) for heating and cooking (R/U > 1), whereas gas has penetrated more into urban residential zones (R/U < 1). For dCF associated with the burning of fossil fuels for private transport, we find the municipality size as the relevant driver in front of rurality for this matter due to the carbon emissions are always larger for households of small municipalities regardless the rurality effect. Finally, looking at the iCF, both domestic and imported, it is observed that urbanity leads to higher carbon responsibility, mainly because urban households, on average, earn larger revenues given rise to lifestyles more inclined towards mass consumption (R/U < 1). Therefore, having a rural or urban lifestyle strongly affects the carbon structure of the household, but not the quantity which largely depends on the municipality size: whereas rural households are more dependent on direct energy sources of high carbon-intensive, urban households tend to have greater purchasing power which leads to more CO_2 emissions associated with the production and distribution of goods and services.

	Medium-high municipalities				**Small municipalities**			
	Residential zone		**Total**	**R/U**	**Residential zone**		**Total**	**R/U**
	Urban	Rural			Urban	Rural		
Population	35,30	1,77	37,07	0.05	4,37	5,08	9,45	1.16
Share of population	95%	5%	100%	0.05	46%	54%	100%	1.16
dCF	1.25	1.91	1.28	1.54	1.86	2.28	2.09	1.22
Gas	0.24	0.13	0.23	0.54	0.23	0.17	0.20	0.75
Liquid and solid fuels	0.08	0.65	0.11	7.90	0.43	0.96	0.71	2.22
Private transport	0.93	1.14	0.94	1.23	1.21	1.15	1.18	0.95
iCF	3.72	3.07	3.69	0.82	3.57	3.31	3.43	0.93
Domestic	1.93	1.55	1.91	0.80	1.82	1.68	1.75	0.93
Imported	1.80	1.52	1.78	0.84	1.75	1.62	1.68	0.93
CF	4.97	4.98	4.97	1.00	5.43	5.58	5.51	1.03

Table 1. Population (millions of people) and CF (tCO_2) by type of household in Spain for 2017

3.2 Measuring income and carbon inequality within municipalities

Given that there is an important carbon unbalances between households by type of municipality (medium-high vs small) and regarding that municipalities, as centres of decision-making, are critical for the application of climate policies, we now focus on to measure income and carbon inequality at this administrative level. For that, we use the Gini coefficient described methodologically above (section 2.2). The Gini index results showed in Fig. 2 reveals how inequality in terms of income and carbon footprint has grown continuously from 2008 to 2013 both in small and medium-high municipalities of Spain, mainly by the harmful effects on employment due to the Great Recession (Anghel et al., 2018; López et al., 2016). The economic recovery has helped to reduce income inequality, but without returning the Income-Gini indicator to pre-recession levels. At the same time, it must be noted that income inequality is always larger in the medium-high municipalities than in small ones, something normal considering the concentration of higher salaries in cities as a result of the agglomeration economies generated in these places (Krugman, 1991; Puga, 2010).



Fig. 2. Quantifying inequality by type of municipality in Spain for the period 2008-2017

Taking into account that income is the main driver of household consumption, and the latter, in turn, determines the CO_2 emitted, the trends of the Income-Gini index end up marking the evolution of carbon inequality among individuals (Fig. 2). However, all the inequality indicators evaluated for carbon emissions are lower than those applied to income. Behind these results, there are differences in carbon-intensities: poor households allocate a considerable proportion of their income to the consumption of very carbon-intensive goods (e.g., clothing, food or energy) and high-income households direct their marginal consumption to sectors with low CO_2-intensity (e.g., personal services, education, and leisure) (López et al., 2016). Then, for instance, it could be expected that if carbon inequality measures are calculated by the type of product consumed, the CF-Gini coefficient will be lower for food than services as has been pointed out for other countries (Wiedenhofer et al., 2016).

In addition, we found that from 2008 to 2017 inequality in the CF (Fig. 2b), iCF (Fig. 2c) and dCF (Fig. 2d) has risen in medium-high settlements but tends to remain more stable in villages. Regarding the evolution of inequality in CF, it is important to see that since 2012 there has been an increase of the gap in inequality between both types of municipalities, which is also observed for the iCF-Gini and dCF-Gini indexes. Also, while the direct CO_2 emissions inequality between individuals located in medium-high and small municipalities is little, especially between 2008 and 2012, in the case of iCF, the inequality gap between some settlements and others is quite large. The inequality of carbon footprint impacts in direct terms rely on to the basket of the energy goods consumed. In this sense, we observe than the inequality in dCF is significantly lower than in iCF. This makes us think that the expenditure on transport, heating, refrigeration, and expenses for preparing meals made by poorer households is not much distinct to the consumption made by wealthier households in both types of municipality. However, the imbalance in the iCF is much greater, given that consumption patterns among different income groups, by the contrary, vary significantly.

3.3 Inequality of the carbon pricing in urban and rural households

Carbon pricing serves to capture the external cost of carbon emissions into market prices, giving an economic signal to polluters for reducing the environmental harms (Wang et al., 2016; World Bank Group, 2019). We take into account two of the most important instruments currently available to put a price on carbon: emissions trading systems (ETS) and carbon taxes (CT). In terms of regressivity, both generally end having similar effects because they are quickly transmitted to the final prices of the economic system and share certain similarities (Burtraw et al., 2009; Shammin and Bullard, 2009). Thus, adopting similar approaches used by Feng et al. (2018) and Wang et al. (2019), we develop a hypothetical tax reform scenario based on a carbon pricing of 50 €/tCO_2 applied on the direct and indirect carbon footprint of each consumption category and household type. To this end, we assume: **a)** a carbon price that can be fully passed on to the price paid by consumers, which are low for energy goods, especially in rural areas (Labandeira et al., 2017); **b)** the disregard of the demand elasticities and substitution possibilities; **c)** there is no recycling back of the carbon prices revenues collected by the government. Therefore, in this section, we evaluate how heavy the carbon pricing burden is in different environments by employing: **a)** absolute value of per capita carbon payment (i.e., the average cost per person paid for his/her own carbon emissions); and, **b)** the per capita carbon payment burden rate (i.e., the per capita carbon payment as share of the per capita expenditure, which is the sum of the pre-tax per capita expenditure and the per capita total carbon payment).

Fig. 3 proves that carbon pricing has regressive effects, i.e., the lower-income groups of households have to face a higher burden of carbon pricing than the richest ones. In other words, the per capita carbon payment captures a more significant proportion of their per capita expenditure (Böhringer et al., 2019). Nonetheless, regressivity is not equal across municipalities. Indeed, the carbon pricing scenario simulated reveals the families settled in small municipalities will be hit much more at each and every level of income. For example, the carbon payment burden rate on poorest households of small municipalities is 2.15% (€155), whereas in households of the highest income level it only represents 1.89% (€464). But if we look at the households of the median-high settlements the burden rates are always lower, varying between 1.73% (€112) and 1.53% (€452). These results are similar in amount to those found by Wang et al. (2019) in an study applied for China, in which they estimated a carbon burdens rates that ranges from 0,5% in some regions to 1,5% in other regions.



Fig. 3. Per capita carbon payment burden rate and expenditure by median-high municipalities and small municipalities (Spain, 2017)

A detailed analysis of the carbon pricing scenario, weighting both municipality size and rural-urban residential zone, for the year 2017 is showed in Table 2. It allows us to evaluate to what extent the regressivity generated by the hypothetical green tax reform could affect households. In dCF terms, the carbon payment would be born to a larger extend by rural households, regardless the municipality size where are located (i.e., the R/U is always higher than 1). At the same time, on a per capita basis, the families of small municipalities would face a carbon tax payment of 104 euros (0.42% of burden rate), sharply larger than the 64 euros paid by people of medium-high municipalities (0.76% of burden rate). Thus, the poor population of small municipalities and rural zones is the most vulnerable to the application of carbon pricing, as other previous studies have found, e.g., for Germany (Gill and Moeller, 2018), Ireland (Callan et al., 2009) or China (Wang et al., 2019). It would be especially regressive on carbon emissions from burning petroleum (i.e., gasoline or diesel) and liquid and solid fuels, which usually are fundamental in the energy pattern of rural households. As a result, a green reform based on carbon pricing could generate, *ceteris paribus*, expected regressive effects on this population which may encourage the depopulation process that is hitting many rural municipalities of the "empty Spain".

		Medium-high municipalities				**Small municipalities**			
		Residential zone		**Total**	**R/U**	**Residential zone**		**Total**	**R/U**
		Urban	Rural			Urban	Rural		
Direct CF	CP	62.31	95.68	63.91	1.54	93.16	113.94	104.34	1.22
	CBR	0.40%	0.78%	0.42%	1.92	0.65%	0.86%	0.76%	1.32
Indirect CF	CP	186.22	153.30	184.65	0.82	178.42	165.28	171.35	0.93
	CBR	1.21%	1.25%	1.21%	1.03	1.24%	1.25%	1.25%	1.00
Domestic	CP	96.32	77.45	95.42	0.80	90.98	84.23	87.35	0.93
	CBR	0.62%	0.63%	0.62%	1.01	0.63%	0.64%	0.64%	1.00
Imported	CP	89.90	75.85	89.23	0.84	87.44	81.05	84.00	0.93
	CBR	0.58%	0.62%	0.58%	1.06	0.61%	0.61%	0.61%	1.01
CF	CP	248.53	248.98	248.56	1.00	271.58	279.22	275.69	1.03
	CBR	1.61%	2.02%	1.63%	1.26	1.89%	2.11%	2.01%	1.11

Table 2. Carbon payment (CP) and carbon burden rate (CBR) by municipality size and residential zone in euros and percentages (Spain, 2017)

Looking at the iCF, we observe that the carbon burden rates are very similar for both rural and urban household (i.e., R/U is very close to 1). This is due to the fact that the emissions associated with the purchase of goods and services grow driven by the level of consumption, making that the carbon payment burden rate ends up balanced for iCFs in any environment. Also, it should be noted the enormous problems in truth applying taxes on imports, since it involves skipping trade agreements already established between countries and, therefore, requires multilateral negotiations that generally do not end in agreement given the impacts on the competitiveness of the most coal-intensive sectors, frequently relocated in countries with weak labour and environmental regulations (López et al., 2014). Therefore, we find that regressivity of carbon pricing applied on total CFs will heavily affect rural households, and such regressivity will tend to be slightly higher in small municipalities. In addition, the regressivity found for these households will be greatly influenced by their direct emission patterns.

Finally, we go further by analysing regressivity by type of consumption product (i.e., the 47 COICOP categories) in Tables A1 and A2 of the Appendix. It allows us to highlight which are the goods and services more carbon-intensive, and, by extension, to point out in which items the carbon burden is more concentrated. We find that 5 of 47 products concentrate the mayor part of the carbon burden (between 66% and 75% depending on the type of household considered) in the following order: operation transport equipment, electricity gas and other fuels, food, transport services and catering services. This is because of they are very carbon-intensive goods (either directly or indirectly) and also have a significant weight in the families' consumption basket. Focusing the attention in these carbon-intensive top five items, we observe several differences in regressivity among households. For instance, rural households may be more affected by carbon pricing on electricity, gas and other fuels, operation transport equipment (i.e., private transport) and food (R/U > 1), while families settled in urban zones could be more sensitive to carbon taxes on transport and catering services (R/U < 1). Besides, municipality size also is important looking at product carbon burdens, especially for energy goods and private and public transport.

4. Conclusions and policy implications

By employing an EEMRIO model adapted to the households in its consumption based-approach we have verified that the Spanish households' have reduced their CFs during the crisis (López et al., 2016); however, since 2013, the return of economic growth has boosted carbon emissions changing this trend. It has been pointed out that the "relief by density" hypothesis is fulfilled in Spain, given that, on a per capita basis, city and town dwellers emit fewer carbon emissions than those settled in small municipalities (between 0.34-0.54 tCO_2/cap depending on the year analysed). Such results are mainly due to the sharply unbalance in direct emissions between both types of households, making evident that people living in small settlements are more dependent on private transport as well as cannot take advantage of some infrastructures as natural gas and public transport networks. On the contrary, we have found that the iCF rises as the municipality size, mainly owing to the existing higher purchasing power in cities. Besides, we have observed that significant inequalities also arise within municipalities. Indeed, all the Gini indexes calculated (i.e., Income-Gini, CF-Gini, iCF-Gini and dCF-Gini) reveal that inequality is always larger in the medium-high municipalities. However, since 2012, there has been a considerable increase in the gap of inequality between both types of municipalities, which has remained without falling even in spite of the economic growth during the post-crisis years. Finally, because of the division between municipalities raised could not reflect rurality as such, we have added rural vs urban residential zone as a control variable, showing that the rural or urban character of the household heavily affects its carbon structure, but not especially the figures of carbon emissions which largely depends on the municipality size.

At first glance, the statements above could suggest that policy in favour of population migrations towards the urban zones would be beneficial for climate change mitigation. Indeed, it could reduce CO_2 emissions through the lower need for transportation to the city as well as to take advantage of environmental economies of scale linked to urban infrastructures. Nonetheless, this urbanisation process would require a vast increase in CO_2 emissions, above all if new infrastructure and homes are needed. On top of that, it could generate other critical problems such as air pollution, waste concentration, or overexploitation of natural resources. In this manner, the urbanisation process and the fulfilment of the “relief by density” hypothesis should not be seen as an acceptable solution to climate change issues linked to the unsustainable consumption pathway of Spanish households. For balancing CFs asymmetries is necessary to create and upgrade infrastructure and boost the local economy of the small settlements, making possible fewer polluting lifestyles for their inhabitants. In this way, at least, they have the choice to meet their basic necessities with goods and services that are closer to their homes, as well as use more “cleaner” technologies and energy goods.

The CFs results above-shown determine adverse distributional effects among individuals in front of a possible carbon pricing policy. However, regressivity is not equal across municipalities, been always higher for families located in small municipalities at every level of income. Rurality also is important for regressivity, given that it determinate the households' emissions patterns. Accordingly, mitigation policies based on carbon taxation should have in mind the carbon inequalities between households depending on its location (i.e., the municipality size) as well as its residential nuances (i.e., rural vs urban zone) in order to avoid the lack of social acceptance of green tax reform and the greatest damage to disadvantaged households, especially in municipalities little ones. It may be especially useful to recycle the carbon pricing revenues for implementing monetary compensation on the vulnerable population as well as fighting against energy poverty. This should be complemented by the development of energy and transports infrastructures in rural environments along with the establishment of subsidies for low carbon household appliances and investments electric photovoltaic self-consumption.

Appendix



Fig. A1. A schematic diagram of the income or carbon Lorenz curve

	Medium-high municipalities				Small municipalities			
	Residential zone		Total	R/U	Residential zone		Total	R/U
	Urban	Rural			Urban	Rural		
Food	24.35	22.99	24.28	0.94	24.03	25.21	24.67	1.05
Non-alcoholic beverages	2.00	1.89	1.99	0.95	1.85	1.67	1.76	0.91
Alcoholic beverages	1.57	1.37	1.56	0.87	1.51	1.41	1.46	0.94
Tobacco	3.60	3.63	3.60	1.01	4.08	4.12	4.10	1.01
Narcotics	1.48	1.48	1.48	1.00	1.48	1.48	1.48	1.00
Clothing	9.00	6.99	8.90	0.78	8.33	7.63	7.95	0.92
Footwear	2.78	2.17	2.75	0.78	2.50	2.52	2.51	1.01
Actual rentals for housing	1.54	0.49	1.49	0.32	0.96	0.43	0.67	0.44
Imputed rentals for housing	6.39	5.60	6.35	0.88	6.18	6.24	6.21	1.01
Maintenance and repair of the dwelling	1.46	1.78	1.48	1.22	1.72	1.98	1.86	1.15
Water supply and miscellaneous services relating to the dwelling	2.44	1.14	2.37	0.47	1.51	0.93	1.20	0.61
Electricity, gas and other fuels	44.40	65.59	45.41	1.48	66.18	88.68	78.28	1.34
Furniture and furnishings, carpets and other floor coverings	2.22	1.46	2.19	0.66	1.97	2.01	1.99	1.02
Household textiles	0.88	0.94	0.88	1.07	1.00	0.93	0.96	0.93
Household appliances	1.96	1.45	1.93	0.74	2.00	1.88	1.94	0.94
Glassware, tableware and household utensils	1.22	0.90	1.20	0.74	1.28	0.87	1.06	0.68
Tools and equipment for house and garden	0.47	0.54	0.47	1.16	0.45	0.62	0.54	1.39
Goods and services for routine household maintenance	4.13	3.32	4.09	0.80	3.35	3.45	3.40	1.03
Medical products, appliances and equipment	3.65	2.70	3.60	0.74	3.21	2.81	2.99	0.88
Out-patient services	1.82	1.45	1.80	0.80	1.70	1.63	1.66	0.96
Hospital services	0.36	0.48	0.36	1.34	0.28	0.29	0.29	1.06
Purchase of vehicles	8.43	7.26	8.37	0.86	8.86	7.04	7.88	0.79
Operation of personal transport equipment	62.54	74.96	63.14	1.20	80.31	76.12	78.06	0.95
Transport services	17.30	8.04	16.86	0.46	9.33	6.46	7.79	0.69
Postal services	0.07	0.05	0.07	0.73	0.03	0.04	0.03	1.26
Telephone and telefax equipment	0.53	0.38	0.52	0.73	0.42	0.35	0.38	0.83
Telephone and telefax services	2.07	1.71	2.05	0.83	2.05	1.80	1.91	0.88
Audio-visual, photographic and information processing equipment	1.25	0.82	1.23	0.65	1.09	0.74	0.91	0.68
Other major durables for recreation and culture	0.16	0.10	0.16	0.65	0.30	0.12	0.20	0.40
Other recreational items and equipment, gardens and pets	2.51	2.61	2.52	1.04	2.84	2.36	2.58	0.83
Recreational and cultural services	3.75	2.90	3.71	0.77	3.68	3.13	3.38	0.85
Newspapers, books and stationery	1.14	0.58	1.12	0.50	0.90	0.62	0.75	0.69
Package holidays	1.71	0.89	1.67	0.52	1.30	0.97	1.12	0.75
Pre-primary and primary education	0.14	0.04	0.14	0.27	0.11	0.04	0.07	0.36
Secondary education	0.10	0.03	0.09	0.35	0.06	0.03	0.05	0.58
Post-secondary non-tertiary education	0.10	0.03	0.09	0.35	0.06	0.03	0.05	0.58
Tertiary education	0.26	0.07	0.25	0.28	0.27	0.12	0.19	0.45
Education not definable by level	0.35	0.26	0.35	0.75	0.22	0.21	0.21	0.96
Catering services	15.52	10.61	15.29	0.68	14.12	12.67	13.34	0.90
Accommodation services	1.72	0.67	1.67	0.39	1.29	1.01	1.14	0.78
Personal care	5.75	4.27	5.68	0.74	4.86	4.14	4.47	0.85
Prostitution	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00
Personal effects n.e.c.	1.38	1.03	1.36	0.75	0.89	1.12	1.01	1.26
Social protection	1.06	0.87	1.05	0.83	0.56	0.67	0.62	1.19
Insurance	0.60	0.51	0.59	0.86	0.59	0.49	0.53	0.82
Financial services n.e.c.	1.42	1.35	1.42	0.95	1.09	1.08	1.08	0.99
Other services n.e.c.	1.07	0.59	1.05	0.55	0.89	1.11	1.01	1.24

Table A1. Carbon payment (CP) by type of product, municipality size and residential zone in euros (Spain, 2017)

	Medium-high municipalities				Small municipalities			
	Residential zone		Total	R/U	Residential zone		Total	R/U
	Urban	Rural			Urban	Rural		
Food	0.16%	0.19%	0.16%	1.19	0.17%	0.19%	0.18%	1.14
Non-alcoholic beverages	0.01%	0.02%	0.01%	1.19	0.01%	0.01%	0.01%	0.98
Alcoholic beverages	0.01%	0.01%	0.01%	1.10	0.01%	0.01%	0.01%	1.02
Tobacco	0.02%	0.03%	0.02%	1.27	0.03%	0.03%	0.03%	1.09
Narcotics	0.01%	0.01%	0.01%	1.26	0.01%	0.01%	0.01%	1.08
Clothing	0.06%	0.06%	0.06%	0.98	0.06%	0.06%	0.06%	0.99
Footwear	0.02%	0.02%	0.02%	0.98	0.02%	0.02%	0.02%	1.09
Actual rentals for housing	0.01%	0.00%	0.01%	0.40	0.01%	0.00%	0.00%	0.48
Imputed rentals for housing	0.04%	0.05%	0.04%	1.10	0.04%	0.05%	0.05%	1.10
Maintenance and repair of the dwelling	0.01%	0.01%	0.01%	1.53	0.01%	0.02%	0.01%	1.25
Water supply and miscellaneous services relating to the dwelling	0.02%	0.01%	0.02%	0.59	0.01%	0.01%	0.01%	0.67
Electricity, gas and other fuels	0.29%	0.53%	0.30%	1.85	0.46%	0.67%	0.57%	1.45
Furniture and furnishings, carpets and other floor coverings	0.01%	0.01%	0.01%	0.83	0.01%	0.02%	0.01%	1.11
Household textiles	0.01%	0.01%	0.01%	1.34	0.01%	0.01%	0.01%	1.01
Household appliances	0.01%	0.01%	0.01%	0.93	0.01%	0.01%	0.01%	1.02
Glassware, tableware and household utensils	0.01%	0.01%	0.01%	0.93	0.01%	0.01%	0.01%	0.74
Tools and equipment for house and garden	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.45	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.50
Goods and services for routine household maintenance	0.03%	0.03%	0.03%	1.01	0.02%	0.03%	0.02%	1.12
Medical products, appliances and equipment	0.02%	0.02%	0.02%	0.93	0.02%	0.02%	0.02%	0.95
Out-patient services	0.01%	0.01%	0.01%	1.00	0.01%	0.01%	0.01%	1.04
Hospital services	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.69	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.15
Purchase of vehicles	0.05%	0.06%	0.06%	1.08	0.06%	0.05%	0.06%	0.86
Operation of personal transport equipment	0.41%	0.61%	0.41%	1.50	0.56%	0.58%	0.57%	1.03
Transport services	0.11%	0.07%	0.11%	0.58	0.07%	0.05%	0.06%	0.75
Postal services	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.92	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.37
Telephone and telefax equipment	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.91	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.90
Telephone and telefax services	0.01%	0.01%	0.01%	1.04	0.01%	0.01%	0.01%	0.95
Audio-visual, photographic and information processing equipment	0.01%	0.01%	0.01%	0.82	0.01%	0.01%	0.01%	0.74
Other major durables for recreation and culture	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.82	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.43
Other recreational items and equipment, gardens and pets	0.02%	0.02%	0.02%	1.31	0.02%	0.02%	0.02%	0.90
Recreational and cultural services	0.02%	0.02%	0.02%	0.97	0.03%	0.02%	0.02%	0.92
Newspapers, books and stationery	0.01%	0.00%	0.01%	0.63	0.01%	0.00%	0.01%	0.74
Package holidays	0.01%	0.01%	0.01%	0.66	0.01%	0.01%	0.01%	0.81
Pre-primary and primary education	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.34	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.39
Secondary education	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.44	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.63
Post-secondary non-tertiary education	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.44	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.63
Tertiary education	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.36	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.49
Education not definable by level	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.94	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.04
Catering services	0.10%	0.09%	0.10%	0.86	0.10%	0.10%	0.10%	0.97
Accommodation services	0.01%	0.01%	0.01%	0.49	0.01%	0.01%	0.01%	0.85
Personal care	0.04%	0.03%	0.04%	0.93	0.03%	0.03%	0.03%	0.92
Prostitution	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.26	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.08
Personal effects n.e.c.	0.01%	0.01%	0.01%	0.94	0.01%	0.01%	0.01%	1.37
Social protection	0.01%	0.01%	0.01%	1.04	0.00%	0.01%	0.00%	1.29
Insurance	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.08	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.89
Financial services n.e.c.	0.01%	0.01%	0.01%	1.20	0.01%	0.01%	0.01%	1.08
Other services n.e.c.	0.01%	0.00%	0.01%	0.69	0.01%	0.01%	0.01%	1.35

Table A2. Carbon burden rate (CBR) by type of product, municipality size and residential zone in percentages (Spain, 2017)

Acknowledgments

Funding: Manuel Tomás was supported by the H2020 project number 821105 LOCOMOTION (Low-carbon society: an enhanced modelling tool for the transition to sustainability), and the Spanish Government through María de Maeztu excellence accreditation [MDM-2017-0714] and the grant [RTI2018-099858-A-100]. Luis A. López and Fabio Monsalve were supported by the *Ministerio de Economía y Competividad* (MINECO) of Spain [ECO2016-78939-R].

Bibliography

Amores, A.F., 2018. The challenge of using consumption surveys to feed macroeconomic models, 6th SHAIO Workshop, Madrid, Spain.

Anghel, B., Basso, H., Bover, O., Casado, J.M., Hospido, L., Izquierdo, M., Kataryniuk, I.A., Lacuesta, A., Montero, J.M., Vozmediano, E., 2018. Income, consumption and wealth inequality in Spain. SERIEs 9, 351-387.

Arce, G., Zafrilla, J.E., López, L.A., Tobarra, M.Á., 2017. Carbon Footprint of Human Settlements in Spain, in: Fernández, R.Á., Zubelzu, S., Martínez, R. (Eds.), Carbon Footprint and the Industrial Life Cycle. Springer.

Böhringer, C., Garcia-Muros, X., González-Eguino, M., 2019. Greener and fairer: A progressive environmental tax reform for Spain. Oldenburg Discussion Papers in Economics.

Brizga, J., Feng, K., Hubacek, K., 2017. Household carbon footprints in the Baltic States: A global multi-regional input–output analysis from 1995 to 2011. Applied Energy 189, 780-788.

Bureau, B., 2011. Distributional effects of a carbon tax on car fuels in France. Energy Economics 33, 121-130.

Burtraw, D., Sweeney, R., Walls, M., 2009. The Incidence of U.S. Climate Policy: Alternative Uses of Revenues from a Cap-and-Trade Auction. National Tax Journal 62, 497-518.

Callan, T., Lyons, S., Scott, S., Tol, R.S.J., Verde, S., 2009. The distributional implications of a carbon tax in Ireland. Energy Policy 37, 407-412.

Cazcarro, I., Amores, A.F., Arto, I., Kratena, K., 2020. Bridge matrices for linking multisectoral economic models and consumption surveys for the EU-28 countries, Working Paper.

CES, 2018. El medio rural y su vertebración social y territorial. Consejo Económico y Social (España), Madrid.

Corsatea, T.D., Lindner, S., Arto, I., Roman, M.V., Rueda-Cantuche, J.M., Afonso, A.V., Amores, A.F., Neuwahl, F., 2019. World Input-Output Database Environmental Accounts. Joint Research Centre (Seville site).

Chancel, L., Piketty, T., 2015. Carbon and inequality: from Kyoto to Paris. Trends in the global inequality of carbon emissions (1998-2013) & prospects for an equitable adaptation fund. Paris School of Economics., Paris

Chen, G., Wiedmann, T., Wang, Y., Hadjikakou, M., 2016. Transnational city carbon footprint networks – Exploring carbon links between Australian and Chinese cities. Applied Energy 184, 1082-1092.

Deaton, A., 2005. Measuring poverty in a growing world (or measuring growth in a poor world). Review of Economics and Statistics 87, 1-19.

Dodman, D., 2009. Blaming cities for climate change? An analysis of urban greenhouse gas emissions inventories. Environment and urbanization 21, 185-201.

Duarte, R., Mainar, A., Sánchez-Chóliz, J., 2012. Social groups and CO 2 emissions in Spanish households. Energy Policy 44, 441-450.

EUROSTAT, 2020. Bilateral exchange rates. European Commission.

Feng, K., Hubacek, K., Liu, Y., Marchán, E., Vogt-Schilb, A., 2018. Managing the distributional effects of energy taxes and subsidy removal in Latin America and the Caribbean. Applied Energy 225, 424-436.
Gill, B., Moeller, S., 2018. GHG Emissions and the Rural-Urban Divide. A Carbon Footprint Analysis Based on the German Official Income and Expenditure Survey. Ecological Economics 145, 160-169.
Glaeser, E.L., 2011. Triumph of the city : how our greatest invention makes us richer, smarter, greener, healthier, and happier. Penguin Press, New York.
Gobierno de España, 2020. Acuerdo de consejo de ministros por el que se aprueba la declaración del gobierno ante la emergencia climática y ambiental, retrieved from: https://www.miteco.gob.es/es/prensa/declaracionemergenciaclimatica_tcm30-506551.pdf.
Harris, S., Weinzettel, J., Bigano, A., Källmén, A., 2020. Low carbon cities in 2050? GHG emissions of European cities using production-based and consumption-based emission accounting methods. Journal of Cleaner Production 248, 119206.
Heinonen, J., Jalas, M., Juntunen, J.K., Ala-Mantila, S., Junnila, S., 2013. Situated lifestyles: I. How lifestyles change along with the level of urbanization and what the greenhouse gas implications are—a study of Finland. Environmental Research Letters 8, 025003.
Huang, R., Zhang, S., Liu, C., 2018. Comparing Urban and Rural Household CO2 Emissions—Case from China’s Four Megacities: Beijing, Tianjin, Shanghai, and Chongqing. Energies 11, 1257.
Hubacek, K., Baiocchi, G., Feng, K., Muñoz Castillo, R., Sun, L., Xue, J., 2017a. Global carbon inequality. Energy, Ecology and Environment 2, 361-369.
Hubacek, K., Baiocchi, G., Feng, K., Patwardhan, A., 2017b. Poverty eradication in a carbon constrained world. Nature Communications 8, 912.
Hubacek, K., Feng, K., Minx, J., Pfister, S., Zhou, N., 2014. Teleconnecting Consumption to Environmental Impacts at Multiple Spatial Scales. Journal of Industrial Ecology 18, 7-9.
INE, 2020a. Demography and population. Population figures and demographic censuses. Population figures. Spanish National Institute of Statistics
INE, 2020b. Spanish Household Budget Survey [Encuesta de presupuestos familiares de España]. Spanish National Institute of Statistics
INE, 2020c. Spanish National Accounts: Household Final Consumption Expenditure (COICOP). Spanish National Institute of Statistics
IPCC, 2006. General Guidance and Reporting. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.
Jain, S., Kumar, A., 2018. Energy Comsumption Pattern for Indian Households, International Conference on Recent Innovations in Engineering and Technology, India.
Krugman, P., 1991. Increasing returns and economic geography. Journal of political economy 99, 483-499.
Labandeira, X., Labeaga, J.M., López-Otero, X., 2011. Energy demand for heating in Spain: An empirical analysis with policy purposes. WP 6, 2011.
Labandeira, X., Labeaga, J.M., López-Otero, X., 2017. A meta-analysis on the price elasticity of energy demand. Energy Policy 102, 549-568.
Lenzen, M., Wier, M., Cohen, C., Hayami, H., Pachauri, S., Schaeffer, R., 2006. A comparative multivariate analysis of household energy requirements in Australia, Brazil, Denmark, India and Japan. Energy 31, 181-207.
López, L.A., Arce, G., Morenate, M., Monsalve, F., 2016. Assessing the Inequality of Spanish Households through the Carbon Footprint: The 21st Century Great Recession Effect. Journal of Industrial Ecology 20, 571-581.
López, L.A., Arce, G., Morenate, M., Zafrilla, J.E., 2017. How does income redistribution affect households’ material footprint? Journal of Cleaner Production 153, 515-527.
López, L.A., Arce, G., Zafrilla, J.E., 2014. Financial crisis, virtual carbon in global value chains, and the importance of linkage effects. The Spain-china case. Environ Sci Technol 48, 36-44.

Mahajan, S., Beutel, J., Guerrero, S., Inomata, S., Larsen, S., Moyer, B., Remond-Tiedrez, I., Rueda-Cantuche, J.M., Simpson, L.H., Thage, B., 2018. Handbook on Supply, Use and Input-Output Tables with Extensions and Applications.
McCully, C.P., 2014. Integration of Micro-and Macrodata on Consumer Income and Expenditures, Measuring Economic Sustainability and Progress. University of Chicago Press, pp. 137-179.
Milanovic, B., 2013. Global Income Inequality in Numbers: In History and Now. Global Policy 4, 198-208.
Miller, R.E., Blair, P.D., 2009. Input-output analysis : foundations and extensions, 2nd ed. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
Min, J., Rao, N.D., 2018. Estimating Uncertainty in Household Energy Footprints. Journal of Industrial Ecology 22, 1307-1317.
MITECO, 2019. Informe de inventario nacional de gases de efecto invernadero. Ministerio para la Transición Ecológica.
Moll, H.C., Noorman, K.J., Kok, R., Engström, R., Throne-Holst, H., Clark, C., 2005. Pursuing more sustainable consumption by analyzing household metabolism in European countries and cities. Journal of Industrial Ecology 9, 259-275.
Moran, D., Kanemoto, K., Jiborn, M., Wood, R., Többen, J., Seto, K.C., 2018. Carbon footprints of 13 000 cities. Environmental Research Letters 13, 064041.
Norman, J., MacLean, H.L., Kennedy, C.A., 2006. Comparing high and low residential density: life-cycle analysis of energy use and greenhouse gas emissions. Journal of urban planning and development 132, 10-21.
Ottelin, J., Heinonen, J., Nässén, J., Junnila, S., 2019. Household carbon footprint patterns by the degree of urbanisation in Europe. Environmental Research Letters 14, 114016.
Palma, J.G., 2011. Homogeneous Middles vs. Heterogeneous Tails, and the End of the ‘Inverted-U’: It's All About the Share of the Rich. Development and Change 42, 87-153.
Pashardes, P., Pashourtidou, N., Zachariadis, T., 2014. Estimating welfare aspects of changes in energy prices from preference heterogeneity. Energy Economics 42, 58-66.
Peters, G.P., Andrew, R.M., Karstensen, J., 2016. Global environmental footprints: A guide to estimating, interpreting and using consumption-based accounts of resource use and environmental impacts. Nordic Council of Ministers.
Piketty, T., Saez, E., 2014. Inequality in the long run. Science 344, 838-843.
Pinkovskiy, M., Sala-i-Martin, X., 2016. Lights, Camera … Income! Illuminating the National Accounts-Household Surveys Debate *. The Quarterly Journal of Economics 131, 579-631.
Poumanyvong, P., Kaneko, S., 2010. Does urbanization lead to less energy use and lower CO2 emissions? A cross-country analysis. Ecological Economics 70, 434-444.
Puga, D., 2010. The magnitude and causes of agglomeration economies. Journal of Regional Science 50, 203-219.
Rau, H., Vega, A., 2012. Spatial (Im) mobility and Accessibility in I reland: Implications for Transport Policy. Growth and Change 43, 667-696.
Reinders, A.H.M.E., Vringer, K., Blok, K., 2003. The direct and indirect energy requirement of households in the European Union. Energy Policy 31, 139-153.
Schubert, J., Gill, B., 2015. Are cities really smart? The environmental impact of urban and rural municipalities according to different methodological perspectives, Handbook of Research methods and Applications in Environmental Studies. Edward Elgar Publishing.
Shammin, M.R., Bullard, C.W., 2009. Impact of cap-and-trade policies for reducing greenhouse gas emissions on U.S. households. Ecological Economics 68, 2432-2438.
Timmer, M.P., Dietzenbacher, E., Los, B., Stehrer, R., de Vries, G.J., 2015. An Illustrated User Guide to the World Input–Output Database: the Case of Global Automotive Production. Review of International Economics 23, 575-605.

Timmer, M.P., Los, B., Stehrer, R., de Vries, G.J., 2016. An anatomy of the global trade slowdown based on the WIOD 2016 release. Groningen Growth and Development Centre (GGDC) Research Memorandum.
UN, 2019a. Demographic Yearbook 2018, New York.
UN, 2019b. World Urbanization Prospects: The 2018 Revision [key facts]. United Nations.
VandeWeghe, J.R., Kennedy, C., 2007. A spatial analysis of residential greenhouse gas emissions in the Toronto census metropolitan area. Journal of industrial ecology 11, 133-144.
Wang, Q., Hubacek, K., Feng, K., Guo, L., Zhang, K., Xue, J., Liang, Q.-M., 2019. Distributional impact of carbon pricing in Chinese provinces. Energy Economics 81, 327-340.
Wang, Q., Hubacek, K., Feng, K., Wei, Y.-M., Liang, Q.-M., 2016. Distributional effects of carbon taxation. Applied Energy 184, 1123-1131.
Wang, R., Jiang, Z., 2017. Energy consumption in China's rural areas: A study based on the village energy survey. Journal of Cleaner Production 143, 452-461.
Wiedenhofer, D., Guan, D., Liu, Z., Meng, J., Zhang, N., Wei, Y.-M., 2016. Unequal household carbon footprints in China. Nature Climate Change 7, 75.
Wiedmann, T., 2009. A review of recent multi-region input–output models used for consumption-based emission and resource accounting. Ecological Economics 69, 211-222.
World Bank Group, 2019. State and Trends of Carbon Pricing 2019, State and Trends of Carbon Pricing World Banck, Washington.
Zafrilla, J.E., López, L.A., 2018. Chapter 2 - Booming and Stagnation of Spanish Construction Sector Through the Extended Carbon Footprint Concept, in: Muthu, S.S. (Ed.), Environmental Carbon Footprints. Butterworth-Heinemann, pp. 19-43.
Zhang, H., Lahr, M.L., 2018. Households' Energy Consumption Change in China: A Multi-Regional Perspective. Sustainability 10, 2486.

Declaration of interests

☒ The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

☐The authors declare the following financial interests/personal relationships which may be considered as potential competing interests: