

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT • OPEN ACCESS

Food and land system transformations under different societal perspectives on sustainable development

To cite this article before publication: Isabelle Weindl *et al* 2024 *Environ. Res. Lett.* in press <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/ad8f46>

Manuscript version: Accepted Manuscript

Accepted Manuscript is “the version of the article accepted for publication including all changes made as a result of the peer review process, and which may also include the addition to the article by IOP Publishing of a header, an article ID, a cover sheet and/or an ‘Accepted Manuscript’ watermark, but excluding any other editing, typesetting or other changes made by IOP Publishing and/or its licensors”

This Accepted Manuscript is © 2024 The Author(s). Published by IOP Publishing Ltd.



As the Version of Record of this article is going to be / has been published on a gold open access basis under a CC BY 4.0 licence, this Accepted Manuscript is available for reuse under a CC BY 4.0 licence immediately.

Everyone is permitted to use all or part of the original content in this article, provided that they adhere to all the terms of the licence <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>

Although reasonable endeavours have been taken to obtain all necessary permissions from third parties to include their copyrighted content within this article, their full citation and copyright line may not be present in this Accepted Manuscript version. Before using any content from this article, please refer to the Version of Record on IOPscience once published for full citation and copyright details, as permissions may be required. All third party content is fully copyright protected and is not published on a gold open access basis under a CC BY licence, unless that is specifically stated in the figure caption in the Version of Record.

View the [article online](#) for updates and enhancements.

Food and land system transformations under different societal perspectives on sustainable development

Isabelle Weindl^{1,*}, Bjoern Soergel¹, Geanderson Ambrósio², Vassilis Daioglou^{2,3}, Jonathan Doelman^{2,3}, Felicitas Beier^{1,4}, Arthur Beusen^{3,5}, Benjamin Leon Bodirsky¹, Astrid Bos³, Jan Philipp Dietrich¹, Florian Humpeönder¹, Patrick von Jeetze^{1,4}, Kristine Karstens^{1,4}, Sebastian Rauner¹, Elke Stehfest³, Miodrag Stevanović¹, Willem-Jan van Zeist⁶, Hermann Lotze-Campen^{1,4}, Detlef van Vuuren^{2,3}, Elmar Kriegler^{1,7}, and Alexander Popp^{1,8}

¹ Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research (PIK), Member of the Leibniz Association, PO Box 601203, 14412 Potsdam, Germany

² Copernicus Institute of Sustainable Development, Utrecht University, Princetonlaan 8a, 3584, CS, Utrecht, the Netherlands

³ PBL Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency, PO Box 30314, 2500, GH, The Hague, the Netherlands

⁴ Albrecht Daniel Thaer-Institute of Agricultural and Horticultural Sciences, Humboldt University of Berlin, Germany

⁵ Department of Earth Sciences-Geochemistry, Faculty of Geosciences, Utrecht University, PO Box Princetonlaan 8a, 3584 CB, Utrecht, The Netherlands

⁶ Wageningen Economic Research, The Hague, the Netherlands

⁷ Faculty of Economics and Social Sciences, University of Potsdam, Potsdam, Germany

⁸ Faculty of Organic Agricultural Sciences, University of Kassel, Witzenhausen, Germany

* Corresponding author: weindl@pik-potsdam.de

Abstract

The future of food and land systems is crucial for achieving multiple UN Sustainable Development Goals, given their essential role in providing adequate nutrition and their significant impact on Earth system processes. Despite widespread consensus on the need for transformation, discussed strategies vary widely, from technology-driven to sufficiency-focused approaches, emphasizing different agents of change and policy mixes. This study assesses the implications of a new generation of target-seeking scenarios incorporating such diverse sustainability perspectives. We apply two integrated assessment models to explore food and land futures under three whole-economy Sustainable Development Pathways (SDPs): Economy-driven Innovation, Resilient Communities, and Managing the Global Commons. Our assessment shows that all SDPs align sufficient food supply with progress towards planetary integrity, halting biodiversity loss, mitigating adverse impacts from irrigation, and significantly reducing nitrogen pollution. While all pathways comply with the Paris climate target, they diverge in the timing of climate mitigation efforts and focus on different greenhouse gases and emission sources. The Economy-driven Innovation pathway rapidly achieves net-negative CO₂ emissions from the land system, whereas Resilient Communities and Managing the Global Commons significantly decrease agricultural non-CO₂ emissions. Moreover, sustainability interventions attenuate trade-offs associated with narrowly focused mitigation pathways and reduce reliance on carbon dioxide removal strategies like re/afforestation and bioenergy with carbon capture and storage.

Keywords:

sustainable development pathways, food systems, land systems, dietary patterns, climate change mitigation, Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), integrated assessment

Introduction

The future of food and land systems plays a critical role in achieving the Paris climate target and the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), particularly in efforts to 'end hunger' and 'ensure healthy lives' while safeguarding planetary integrity (Rockström *et al.*, 2020; Soergel, Kriegler, Weindl, *et al.*, 2021). Human use of land has left a lasting imprint on the Earth system, altering global biogeochemical cycles, reshaping landscapes, and causing biodiversity loss (Vitousek *et al.*, 1997; Foley *et al.*, 2005; Jaureguiberry *et al.*, 2022). Agriculture, the dominant global land use, also drives nitrogen pollution (Liu *et al.*, 2010; Schulte-Uebbing *et al.*, 2022) and violates the environmental flows required to sustain freshwater ecosystems in many regions (Jägermeyr *et al.*, 2017). Across the supply chain, food systems account for one-third of anthropogenic greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions (Crippa *et al.*, 2021).

Food is intrinsically linked to human health through both nutrition-related channels and indirect effects, such as agricultural pollution of air and water (Pozzer *et al.*, 2017; Ward *et al.*, 2018; Wang *et al.*, 2024). Dietary and metabolic risks constitute the largest contributors to the total burden of disease (GBD 2017 DALYs and HALE Collaborators, 2018). The nutrition transition towards affluent diets is altering the risk landscape, increasing those associated with overnutrition (Popkin, Adair and Ng, 2012; Bodirsky *et al.*, 2020). Meanwhile, efforts to combat undernutrition are insufficient, with approximately 9% of the world population suffering from hunger - more than before the COVID-19 pandemic (FAO *et al.*, 2023).

The importance of delineating the role of food and land systems in sustainable development pathways is increasingly emphasized (von Braun *et al.*, 2023). These pathways can be translated by modelling approaches into target-seeking scenarios (IPBES, 2016), building quantitatively consistent bridges from the current to a desirable future state (van Vuuren *et al.*, 2022). Modelling capacities in this field have advanced significantly. First, improved indicator coverage has enabled the assessment of pathways across domains highly relevant to the SDGs, such as biodiversity (Hof *et al.*, 2018; Leclère *et al.*, 2020; Ambrósio *et al.*, 2024), food security (Hasegawa *et al.*, 2018; Fujimori *et al.*, 2022), and planetary boundaries (Springmann *et al.*, 2018; Willett *et al.*, 2019; Gerten *et al.*, 2020). Second, greater granularity in process representation has expanded the portfolio of modelled interventions targeting areas such as consumption, nature conservation, and efficiency improvements (van Vuuren *et al.*, 2015; FOLU, 2019; Searchinger *et al.*, 2019; Bodirsky *et al.*, 2022; Doelman *et al.*, 2022; Humpenöder, Popp, *et al.*, 2022; Kok *et al.*, 2023), aligning with priorities for sustainable food and land systems (Schmidt-Traub, Obersteiner and Mosnier, 2019). Finally, exploring sustainable food and land futures as integral parts of whole-economy transformations has underscored that they are both a prerequisite for, and dependent on, transformations in other sectors (Soergel, Kriegler, Weindl, *et al.*, 2021; Humpenöder *et al.*, 2024; Ruggeri Laderchi *et al.*, 2024).

Despite these advancements, many studies have focused on a single sustainable pathway, such as the most optimistic of the Shared Socioeconomic Pathways (van Vuuren *et al.*, 2017; Moallemi *et al.*, 2022; Pereira *et al.*, 2024) or a more comprehensive transformation scenario aimed at boosting progress towards several targets (FOLU, 2019; Soergel, Kriegler, Weindl, *et al.*, 2021). However, while the Paris Agreement and the SDGs offer a politically negotiated target space for designing target-seeking scenarios, additional value-specific factors are involved in identifying desirable futures within that space and preferred ways to achieve them (Leach *et al.*, 2018). Thus, there is a need for alternative target-seeking scenarios to provide a more balanced representation of different societal perspectives (Aguiar *et al.*, 2020) and make assessments less policy-prescriptive (Edenhofer and Kowarsch, 2015). Yet, no study

1
2
3 has investigated multiple internally coherent food and land system transformations, limiting
4 the exploration of the plurality of debated interventions and their underlying paradigms for
5 steering these systems towards sustainability.
6

7 We address this gap by providing a multi-model assessment of three alternative food- and
8 land-system futures embedded in distinct cross-sectoral visions for sustainable development,
9 using a new generation of target-seeking scenarios (Kriegler *et al.*, in prep.; Soergel *et al.*, in
10 press). The narratives of these novel Sustainable Development Pathways (SDPs) differ
11 regarding their preferences for different forms of societal organization and global governance,
12 the role of markets, societal or technological innovations, and the balance of interventions
13 targeting primarily demand or supply. While Soergel *et al.* (in press) provide an overview of
14 the whole-economy outcomes of three quantified SDPs (Economy-driven Innovation, Resilient
15 Communities, and Managing the Global Commons), this multi-model study offers a detailed
16 assessment of how these SDPs affect food and land systems. We evaluate the characteristics,
17 strengths, and challenges of the SDPs using a comprehensive set of indicators, ranging from
18 nutrition and agricultural demand drivers to environmental impacts in the domains of resource
19 use, biodiversity loss, nitrogen pollution and GHG emissions.
20
21
22
23
24

25 **Methods**

26 **Narratives for sustainable food and land systems**

27 The SDPs are a new set of scenarios describing transformation pathways aimed at achieving
28 the UN Agenda 2030 and the Paris Agreement. The underlying narratives were co-created
29 through a trans-disciplinary stakeholder process (Kriegler *et al.*, in prep.), involving the
30 identification of 12 dimensions in which sectoral and societal organization is shaped. Within
31 each dimension, alternative sustainable development (SD) strategies were elaborated,
32 reflecting different paradigms and societal debates. These strategies were then combined
33 across all dimensions to construct the SDPs, which are holistic in their ambition, covering a
34 broad range of interacting societal and biophysical systems. This adaptable methodology
35 facilitates the creation of several SDPs, of which three archetypal variants were selected for
36 scenario quantification. In the following summary, we focus on the 'Land and Food' dimension,
37 while other dimensions are detailed in Kriegler *et al.* (in prep.) and Soergel *et al.* (in press). An
38 overview of the overarching features of the three selected SDP narratives is provided in Suppl.
39 Table S1.
40
41
42
43
44

45 **Economy-driven Innovation (SDP-EI):**

46 *Technological progress and global cooperation are endorsed to promote sustainable*
47 *development. Competitive markets are perceived as catalysts for innovation and prosperity,*
48 *while governments act as regulators to align market outcomes with societal goals.* Food and
49 land systems are characterized by the principle of sparing land, achieved by constraining
50 spatial expansion while intensifying production and improving the efficiency of the agricultural
51 and land use sectors, applying increasingly automated and partially landless biomass
52 production, artificial intelligence and sensor technologies. Market dynamics are harnessed to
53 boost innovation, including novel foods and food storage, decrease resource use, waste and
54 environmental pollution, increase material provision for the bioeconomy, and improve other
55 ecosystem services like carbon sequestration.
56
57
58
59
60

Resilient Communities (SDP-RC):

Community- and sufficiency-oriented world views value solidarity and well-being, prioritizing local organization, environmentally conscious lifestyles, and equitable access to resources for sustainability. State and non-state actors collaborate as partners in a wider societal partnership. The transition towards sustainable food and land systems is facilitated by behavioral change towards healthy and sustainable diets with a high share of plant-based foods, alongside societal support for agroecological practices and diversified farming, rooted in the principle of caring for people, animals and nature. Food supply chains are short and the value of food is high, which is reflected in strong skills for food preparation and storage, resulting in low food waste. Social acceptance of large-scale re-/afforestation projects and bioenergy plantations is low.

Managing the Global Commons (SDP-MC):

State actors cooperate to advance the transition towards sustainability in a functioning multilateral system, where policy mixes target levers both on the demand- and supply-side to manage resources and safeguard ecosystem services. Food and land systems also combine several approaches to reduce resource use and pollution, including dietary changes and lower food waste. The dichotomy between managed and natural systems is becoming less pronounced, following the principle of sharing resources for reconciling human well-being and ecosystem health. Innovation feeds from many sources, combining technological with traditional approaches, further developing multipurpose systems like agroforestry and focusing on synergies and whole-system efficiency, e.g., improved nutrient cycling at landscape scale or biodiversity-friendly land-based mitigation.

Pathway quantification

We apply the two integrated assessment models (IAMs) REMIND-MAgPIE (Kriegler *et al.*, 2017; Dietrich *et al.*, 2019; Soergel, Kriegler, Weindl, *et al.*, 2021) and IMAGE (Stehfest *et al.*, 2014; van Vuuren *et al.*, 2017) to derive scenario quantifications for the above-described SDPs. The two models include detailed representations of food and land systems, including socio-economic components and spatially explicit biophysical data (see Supplementary Material (SM) for model descriptions), and have been compared in previous assessments (e.g., Doelman *et al.*, 2022). The qualitative characteristics of the SDP narratives are translated into quantitative model parameterization using a structured modelling protocol. An excerpt of the protocol covering the model-specific settings related to food and land systems is available as part of our SM (see SM of Soergel *et al.* (in press) for the complete modelling protocol). Table 1 summarizes the relevant characteristics of the SDP narratives for modelling food and land systems as semi-quantitative specifications, such as low, medium, and high. Important input data like population, economic growth and within-country inequality are harmonized between models (Soergel *et al.*, in press; Min *et al.*, 2024).

We compare the quantified SDPs with two other scenarios: SSP2-Ref, based on the Shared Socioeconomic Pathway 2 (Riahi *et al.*, 2017), reflects a continuation of current trends and existing climate policies, while SSP2-1.5C focuses on ambitious climate change mitigation aligned with the Paris Agreement – also including the Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) - without additional efforts towards achieving Agenda 2030. The quantification of scenarios does not consider the impacts of climate change beyond the current level of warming.

Characteristics	Economy-driven Innovation SDP-EI	Resilient Communities SDP-RC	Managing the Global Commons SDP-MC
General			
Population	Low population growth	Low population growth	Low population growth
Urbanization	High in all regions, medium to strong convergence	Low-medium urbanization	High urbanization
GDP growth rate	High in all regions, medium to strong convergence	Post-growth (= gradual convergence to zero growth) in developed countries, medium to high in other countries, strong convergence	Moderate in developed countries, high in other countries, strong convergence
Trade	Globalized	Regionalized	Globalized
Food demand			
Dietary patterns	Partial substitution of livestock products with animal-free alternatives, adoption of novel foods, overcoming hunger	Fast transition to sustainable and healthy diets (e.g., according to EAT-Lancet Commission), overcoming hunger and overnutrition	Medium-paced transition to sustainable and healthy diets (e.g., according to EAT-Lancet Commission), overcoming hunger and overnutrition
Food waste	Minor food waste reduction	Strong food waste reduction	Medium food waste reduction
Ecosystem protection			
Land protection	Strong, focus on carbon sequestration and price-based policy instruments, peatland protection and restoration	Medium, focus on biodiversity and regulatory policy instruments, peatland protection and restoration	Co-existence, focus on biodiversity in managed landscapes and in vulnerable habitats, mix of policy instruments, peatland protection and restoration
Environmental flow protection (EFP)	Very high	High	Very high
Agricultural management			
Crop yields and livestock productivity	High increase	Convergence: increase in low productive systems, stable yields in efficient systems	Medium increase
Nitrogen use efficiency (NUE)	High	Medium	High
Irrigation efficiency	High	Medium	High
Land-based mitigation			
Re/afforestation	High carbon sequestration potential through managed plantations, but notable limits on land availability according to the land-sparing principle	Low carbon sequestration through deliberate re/afforestation, preference for natural regrowth on abandoned land	Medium carbon sequestration potential through re/afforestation, with low human intervention and certain limits to land availability for sustainability reasons
Bioenergy (energy crops)	High (irrigation possible)	Low (rainfed only)	Medium (rainfed only)

Table 1: Characteristics of SDP narratives relevant to food and land systems. Details on the modeling protocol, including the translation into model assumptions and parameterizations specific to food and land systems, are available as part of the Supplementary Material.

Results

We analyze the implications of the different pathways for food and land systems using a comprehensive set of indicators. Fig. 1 provides quantitative insights into demand- and supply-side characteristics of the food system, including nutrition-related health risks, agricultural demand, and productivity. We then explore the impacts of agricultural production and land use on planetary integrity, covering land resources (Fig. 2), terrestrial biodiversity and freshwater ecosystems (Fig. 3), the nitrogen cycle (Fig. 4), and GHG emissions (Fig. 5). While most indicators capture endogenous model dynamics, some indicators in Fig. 1 reflect scenario assumptions or quantified scenario drivers. Suppl. Table S2 provides an overview of indicator definition and classification.


Dietary trends, biomass provision and agricultural supply dynamics

The three quantified SDPs set different priorities regarding food consumption, reflected in food intake, dietary patterns and nutrition-related health risks (Fig. 1; Suppl. Fig. S2). SDP-EI emphasizes overcoming hunger and promotes innovative alternatives to resource-intensive animal-source foods. SDP-RC and SDP-MC assume comprehensive dietary shifts towards healthy, sustainable diets as recommended by the EAT-Lancet commission (Willett *et al.*, 2019) until 2050 (SDP-RC) and 2070 (SDP-MC), including eradication of both under- and overnutrition and reduced consumption of animal-source foods.


All SDPs align with the goal of zero hunger (SDG 2), albeit after 2030 and at different speeds. In contrast, prevalence of underweight only declines from 730 to 640 million between 2020 and 2050 in the reference scenario (SSP2-Ref). SDP-RC also eradicates overnutrition by mid-century due to the assumed rapid transition to healthy diets, while the slower pace in SDP-MC makes it more difficult to offset the rising obesity in the baseline. In SDP-EI, prevalence of obesity surpasses that of all other scenarios until 2050, driven by economic growth and income convergence between Global North and Global South (Suppl. Fig. S1), accelerating the transition towards affluent diets in the Global South (Suppl. Fig. S3; see Suppl. Table S3 for regional mapping). However, prevalence of obesity improves in the second half of the century, falling below SSP2-Ref.

The timing and focus of measures targeting nutrition-related health risks (SDG 3) affect total calorie intake, which increases in the short term across all SDPs compared to SSP2-Ref. Only in SDP-RC, intake falls slightly below current levels by 2050. SDP-EI projects the highest intake, but reductions in food waste (SDG 12) in the Global North lead to global per-capita food calorie demand only moderately exceeding SSP2-Ref during a catch-up phase in low-income regions, reaching lower levels in the long term (REMIND-MAGPIE quantification; Suppl. Figs. S2 and S3). SDP-RC substantially reduces food waste by 2050 (-170 kcal/cap/day compared to 2020), lowering per-capita food calorie demand below current levels. SDP-MC also reduces food waste and food calorie demand compared to SSP2-Ref, albeit at a slower pace than SDP-RC.


a: Food consumption, waste and public health risks




b: Demand for agricultural commodities



c: Agricultural expenditures relative to GDP



d: Material throughput and productivity



— SDP-EI — SDP-MC — SDP-RC — SSP2-1.5C — SSP2-Ref

Figure 1: Food consumption, related health risks, and demand- and supply-side characteristics of the food system. **a** Food intake, prevalence of underweight and obesity, and food waste. **b** Total crop demand for food, non-food and feed (excluding energy use), livestock demand, crop demand for feed (also included in the panel *Crop demand*), and demand for second-generation bioenergy crops. **c** GDP per capita and the share of expenditures for agricultural commodities relative to GDP. **d** Agricultural material footprint, calculated as the total crop demand for all purposes (including bioenergy) per capita, and cereal crop yields. Indicators are presented for the three SDP scenarios in comparison to a trends-continued reference scenario (SSP2-Ref) and a climate-policy-only scenario (SSP2-1.5C) for the period between 2020 and 2050. Note that some indicators represent scenario assumptions or quantified scenario drivers (see Suppl. Table S2 for the classification of indicators) that are not affected by climate policies and, therefore, do not differ between SSP2-Ref and SSP2-1.5C. For indicators quantified by both models, vertical bars show the model range and thin lines the individual models (see also Suppl. Figs. S4 and S5 for results from each model separately).

Differences in diets and food waste are reflected in demand projections. Livestock product demand is ranked according to the ambition of demand-side interventions, with both models estimating demand for 2050 below current levels only for SDP-RC. A shift from animal- to plant-based foods increases crop demand for direct consumption or processing, though this increase is smaller than the reduction in feed crop demand, which drives dynamics in SDP-RC and SDP-MC. For SDP-EI, models diverge on the direction of change compared to SSP2-Ref. In REMIND-MAgPIE, partially substituting ruminant meat with animal-free alternatives helps balance the rapid nutrition transition to affluent diets globally. However, in low- and middle-income regions, consumption of animal-source foods still strongly increases until mid-

1
2
3 century due to economic growth. However, long-term crop demand for feed is considerably
4 lower than in SSP2-Ref. In IMAGE, the share of animal-source foods in diets declines across
5 all world regions in SDP-EI.

6
7 SDP demand projections for second-generation lignocellulosic bioenergy crops are lower than
8 in SSP2-1.5C, particularly in SDP-RC and SDP-MC. Although the agricultural material
9 footprint increases in most scenarios, the SDP-RC quantification from REMIND-MAGPIE - a
10 sufficiency-oriented post-growth scenario - remains close to today's level. Projections for
11 cereal yields indicate that while SSP2-based scenarios and SDP-EI counteract high per-capita
12 material throughput with increased productivity, less material-intensive lifestyles in other SDPs
13 reduce the need for intensification. Lower demand pressure in SDP-RC and SDP-MC is also
14 reflected in expenditures for agricultural commodities, where expenditure shares even fall
15 below SSP2-Ref. In SDP-EI, detrimental impacts of climate policy on commodity prices are
16 substantially reduced compared to SSP2-1.5C (Soergel *et al.*, in press), with fast economic
17 development lowering expenditure shares to levels comparable to SSP2-Ref. Thus, the
18 diverse SD strategies effectively mitigate trade-offs between climate protection and food
19 affordability, addressing food security risks associated with ambitious global climate action
20 (Hasegawa *et al.*, 2018; Fujimori *et al.*, 2022).


24 25 **Natural resource use and implications for biosphere integrity**

26 The different SD strategies regarding demand-side interventions, efficient agricultural
27 management, and land productivity have repercussions on life on land (SDG 15). Land-use
28 dynamics (Fig. 2) are also shaped by land conservation policies, land-based climate mitigation
29 measures, approaches to landscape structure - whether separating managed and natural
30 spheres or spatially integrating them - and the balance between land and water use (SDG 6,
31 target 6.4 "sustainable withdrawals of freshwater").

32
33 In SSP2-1.5C, climate mitigation efforts discernibly affect cropland and pasture dynamics, with
34 cropland decreasing by 277-322 million ha and pasture by 603-665 million ha by 2100
35 compared to SSP2-Ref, primarily driven by changes in the Global South (Suppl. Fig. S7).
36 Agricultural land use is curbed by pricing emissions from land-use change and allocating land
37 for non-agricultural purposes, such as carbon sequestration through re-/afforestation and
38 bioenergy production. Cropland dedicated to bioenergy crops increases to 190-206 million ha
39 by 2050 and 145-353 million ha by 2100 in the climate-policy-only scenario. However, this
40 increase is mitigated by SD interventions both in the medium and long term. Although demand
41 for bioenergy and other crops varies across scenarios, cropland projections show little
42 deviation by 2050 with climate policies in place, suggesting that high demand pressures are
43 largely counterbalanced by intensification. In the long term, however, a clear ranking of the
44 SDPs emerges, with SDP-RC having the lowest and SDP-EI the highest cropland levels.

45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

a: Agricultural land



b: Forest and other natural land





Figure 2: Global land-use dynamics in the 21st century. **a** Projections for agricultural land and **b** forest and other natural land for the three SDP scenarios in comparison to a trends-continued reference scenario (SSP2-Ref) and a climate-policy-only scenario (SSP2-1.5C). The *Cropland* panel shows total arable land, including land used for second-generation bioenergy crops and irrigated cropland, which are also displayed separately. *Forest* cover includes the net effect of deforestation, timber plantations, intended re/afforestation, and natural regrowth of forest vegetation following land abandonment. *Other natural land* includes natural land not classified as forest incl. natural succession. *Re/afforestation* shows the gross area increase due to intended re/afforestation compared to 2020. *Change in natural forest* shows the net change in natural forest (excluding re/afforestation and timber plantations) compared to 2020. Vertical bars depict the model range and symbols indicate results from individual models. The shaded grey bands denote the ranges of modelled values for 2020. The vertical magenta lines display the 10-90% ranges of 1.5°C scenarios from the IPCC AR6 scenario DB with no/low overshoot (C1), with the label C1 label representing the median of the ranges and the labels *IMP-SP*, *IMP-Ren* and *IMP-LD* the three illustrative mitigation pathways.

Only one SDP quantification (SDP-EI from REMIND-MAgPIE) notably expands irrigated areas to alleviate land pressure, thereby increasing pressure on water resources in the Global South (Suppl. Fig. S6), though less so than SSP2-1.5C. This is reflected in water withdrawals for irrigation (Fig. 3b) in SDP-EI, which are similar to SSP2-Ref around mid-century, but substantially lower than in SSP2-1.5C for the same model. Although timing differs, all SDPs implement measures to protect water resources, ensuring that, despite continued irrigation demand, transgressions of environmental flow requirements are gradually reduced - key to sustaining freshwater ecosystems in fair condition. In contrast, water withdrawals in SSP2-Ref and SSP2-1.5C are projected to increasingly violate environmental flow requirements without these measures in place.


SD interventions also affect pasture dynamics. In SDP-RC, rapid shifts towards healthy diets significantly drive pasture reduction, complemented in IMAGE by ambitious conservation efforts to protect half of Earth's land (Doelman *et al.*, 2022). In MAgPIE, pastures react less

1
2
3 sensitive to declining livestock demand than in IMAGE, due to possible extensification. A
4 combination of high agricultural productivity and partial substitution of ruminant-based
5 products in SDP-EI results in substantial pasture decline in both models until the end of the
6 century. In the REMIND-MAgPIE quantification of SDP-MC, carbon prices are applied to the
7 conversion of both natural and managed land, which disincentivizes the conversion of
8 pastures rich in soil carbon, aligning with the scenario's less dichotomic view on land systems.
9 The priorities set by the SDPs for sustainable land use also influence the dynamics of non-
10 agricultural land. In the long term, forest cover increases similarly across SDPs but remains
11 below SSP2-1.5C levels (4289-4587 million ha). However, the contributions of re/afforestation
12 versus natural forest regrowth, as well as their timing, vary significantly. SDP-EI emphasizes
13 the climate benefits of expanding forests, favoring rapid onset and fast carbon sequestration,
14 which results in highest re/afforestation (281-319 million ha) of all SDPs by 2050. Although
15 natural forest cover decreases slightly over the same period, SDP-EI achieves the largest
16 negative CO₂ emissions from the land system (Fig. 5b). SDP-RC sees the smallest increase
17 in re/afforestation by 2100 (in REMIND-MAgPIE only within the scope of the NDCs), while
18 natural regrowth leads to long-term annual negative CO₂ emissions from land-use change at
19 levels similar to SDP-MC. The applied models offer different perspectives on SDP-MC: In
20 REMIND-MAgPIE, re/afforestation is the main driver of forest increase, following growth
21 curves of natural vegetation, suggesting the use of native species. In IMAGE, forest expansion
22 is driven by both natural succession on abandoned land and re/afforestation.
23 Future land use will affect spatial configuration, cropland diversity, and terrestrial biodiversity
24 (Fig. 3). Cropland diversity primarily benefits from demand-side SD interventions, which
25 broaden cropping patterns as food consumption shifts towards healthy and sustainable diets.
26 If current trends continue, biodiversity as measured by the Biodiversity Intactness Index (BII)
27 and Mean Species Abundance (MSA) of plant species will decline beyond today's levels.
28 Land-based mitigation, such as avoided deforestation, is a key lever for tackling both the
29 climate and biodiversity crises. While all climate mitigation scenarios improve on SSP2-Ref,
30 even without accounting for the likely negative impacts of unabated climate change in the
31 baseline, biodiversity impacts of different climate mitigation and SD strategies need to be
32 considered more explicitly to better understand synergies.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

a: Terrestrial biodiversity



b: Aquatic ecosystems



c: Croparea diversity

— SDP-EI — SDP-MC — SDP-RC — SSP2-1.5C — SSP2-Ref

Figure 3: Food- and land-system impacts on terrestrial and aquatic freshwater ecosystems. **a** shows biodiversity indicators related to terrestrial ecosystems, measured using Mean Species Abundance (MSA) and the Biodiversity Intactness Index (BII), where the middle panel only considers land within biodiversity hotspots and the right panel depicts changes since 2020. **b** displays indicators related to freshwater ecosystems, where environmental flow violations are reported as the volume of withdrawals that exceed environmental flow requirements. **c** presents croparea diversity measured by the Shannon index, which accounts for crop richness and abundance. Indicators are presented for the three SDP scenarios in comparison to a trends-continued reference scenario (SSP2-Ref) and a climate-policy-only scenario (SSP2-1.5C) for the period between 2020 and 2050. For indicators quantified by both models, vertical bars show the model range and thin lines the individual models (see also Suppl. Fig. S6 for results from each model separately). All indicators are described in Suppl. Table S2.


The narrower focus of SDP-EI on carbon sequestration, favouring fast vegetation growth over natural succession in newly forested areas, entails the least favorable biodiversity outcomes among the SDPs around mid-century, with BII in biodiversity hotspots falling below SSP2-1.5C levels. The sufficiency-oriented approach of SDP-RC, combined with the ambitious Half Earth protection scheme (IMAGE quantification), clearly bends the curve of biodiversity loss, increasing MSA of plant species more than other scenarios. While SDP-MC shows less pronounced improvements in the aggregated BII across all land types than SDP-RC, the BII in biodiversity hotspots is at the upper end of estimates for 2050 due to land protection measures targeting vulnerable and species-rich areas.

Nitrogen inputs and agricultural nitrogen pollution

Agricultural Nitrogen (N) use affects several SDGs, influencing biodiversity and human health through air and water pollution while enhancing food security (Schulte-Uebbing *et al.*, 2022). To assess agricultural N pollution, we use indicators for N surplus from croplands, pastures, and animal waste management, defined as N inputs minus N outputs in these subsystems (Fig. 4). Despite ambitious SD interventions to mitigate N pollution, even the most optimistic scenario (81 Tg N/yr; SDP-RC from REMIND-MAGPIE) fails to reduce *N surplus in agricultural soils* by 2050 below the proposed planetary boundary of 57 Mt Nr/yr (Schulte-Uebbing *et al.*, 2022). In SSP2-Ref, N surplus is projected to worsen significantly, while SSP2-1.5C manages to stabilize N pollution at high levels. Overall, both models show a consistent ranking of the SDPs for all surplus indicators, with SDP-EI accomplishing the lowest, but still substantial, reductions compared to current levels and the SSP2-based scenarios. The performance of SDP-RC and SDP-MC varies by subsystem and over time, with SDP-MC benefiting from synergies between demand-side shifts and efficiency gains in the long term, achieving the lowest losses from cropland.

N surplus from cropland soils is a key driver in transgressing the N boundary, with all SDP projections (60-83 Tg N/yr) for this subsystem surpassing the overall surplus threshold by 2050. In SSP2-Ref, N surplus from cropland soils alone exceeds twice the N boundary for agricultural soils by mid-century. While N inputs on cropland follow similar trends to N surplus indicators, with strong increases in SSP2-Ref and considerable improvements in SDPs, there are notable differences. N inputs continue to increase significantly in SSP2-1.5C. Moreover, in some SDPs, reducing all types of N inputs below current levels remains challenging. This underscores the importance of improving nitrogen use efficiency (NUE) and animal waste management in the SDPs to achieve substantial reductions in N surplus indicators. Consequently, N surplus from agricultural soils is curbed more effectively than new N fixation, especially in the Global South (Suppl. Fig. S8), where new N fixation is defined as the sum of inorganic fertilizer and intentional biological N fixation by leguminous crops.

a: Nitrogen inputs on cropland



b: Nitrogen surplus




Figure 4: Global nitrogen inputs and surpluses. **a** Nitrogen (N) inputs on cropland, including inorganic fertilizer, manure, and total N inputs. Total inputs also account for biological fixation and atmospheric deposition. New N fixation denotes the sum of inorganic fertilizer and biological fixation by cultivating leguminous crops. **b** N surplus in croplands, pastures, and manure management as well as N surplus in agricultural soils, derived as the sum of surplus from croplands and pastures. Indicators are presented for the three SDP scenarios in comparison to a trends-continued reference scenario (SSP2-Ref) and a climate-policy-only scenario (SSP2-1.5C) for the years 2030, 2050 and 2100. Vertical bars depict the model range and symbols indicate results from individual models. The shaded grey bands denote the ranges of modelled values for 2020. The cyan lines display the global boundaries for the respective N indicators (Schulte-Uebbing *et al.*, 2022). All indicators are described in Suppl. Table S2.

GHG emissions and removals under different sustainability priorities

All SDPs and the climate-policy-only scenario align with the Paris Agreement's long-term target, reaching warming levels well below 1.5°C by the end of the century, after temperatures have peaked at 1.56-1.64°C (Soergel *et al.*, in press). However, differences exist in the contribution of food and land systems to mitigation efforts, the composition of emission sources and gases from agriculture, forestry and other land use (AFOLU), and their temporal development (Fig. 5).

In the REMIND-MAGPIE quantification of SSP2-1.5C, the AFOLU sector continues to generate positive annual GHG emissions around 2100, despite net-negative CO₂ emissions from land-use change (-569 Mt CO₂/yr) that cannot counterbalance residual non-CO₂ emissions (6273 Mt CO₂-equiv/yr). Conversely, in the IMAGE quantification of the same scenario, large-scale re/afforestation (852 million ha) contributes to significant net-negative CO₂ emissions from land-use change (-4918 Mt CO₂/yr), with most of these negative emissions occurring in the Global South (Suppl. Fig. S9), which almost offset agricultural non-CO₂ emissions (5121 Mt CO₂-equiv/yr). Across all SDPs, both models agree that the AFOLU sector approaches emission neutrality by the end of the century (83-1161 Mt CO₂-equiv/yr), with less reliance on

1
2
3 re/afforestation and lower residual non-CO₂ emissions. Notably, none of the scenarios
4 achieves net-negative GHG emissions from the AFOLU sector.

5 In SDP-RC and SDP-MC, the main levers to reach these marked emission reductions are the
6 profound demand-side transformations, i.e. the shift towards healthy, sustainable diets and
7 low levels of food waste, in combination with technical mitigation measures like better livestock
8 and animal waste management and higher NUE, which substantially reduce CH₄ (mainly from
9 enteric fermentation and animal waste systems) and N₂O emissions (mainly from agricultural
10 soils and animal waste management). These scenarios have their strengths in mitigating
11 agricultural non-CO₂ emissions, going beyond typical C1 scenarios from the IPCC AR6
12 ensemble (Byers *et al.*, 2022; Riahi *et al.*, 2022), which contributes to the low overshoot in
13 SDP-RC due to the early onset of mitigating non-CO₂ emissions (Soergel *et al.*, in press). Both
14 scenarios also achieve net-negative CO₂ emissions from the AFOLU sector, mainly via natural
15 vegetation regrowth following land abandonment in the wake of dietary changes and land
16 protection, but in SDP-MC also via carbon removal in re/afforestation projects (Fig. 5c).

17 In SDP-EI, net CO₂ emissions from land-use change rapidly become negative, falling below
18 the levels observed in other scenarios (except the IMAGE quantification of *SSP2-1.5C* with
19 overall high mitigation pressure), mainly due to carbon dioxide removal (CDR) from fast
20 regrowth in re/afforestation projects (-2565 to -4131 Mt CO₂/yr in 2050). Managed peatlands
21 remain a source of CO₂ emissions in all mitigation scenarios (240-721 Mt CO₂/yr), though
22 considerably reduced compared to *SSP2-Ref* through peatland protection and restoration. In
23 addition to CDR in the AFOLU sector, the land system also supplies biomass for the energy
24 system. Bioenergy with carbon capture and storage (BECCS) contributes to overall CDR, with
25 a clear ranking across the SDP scenarios, albeit at lower levels compared to *SSP2-1.5C*.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 5: Climate change mitigation strategies impacting Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use (AFOLU). **a** Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions in the AFOLU sector. **b** Net CO₂ emissions in the AFOLU sector: Net CO₂ emissions from Land Use, Land-Use Change and Forestry (LULUCF) including emissions from managed peatlands. Net CO₂ emissions from managed peatlands (drained and rewetted) are also presented separately. **c** Negative CO₂ emissions in the AFOLU sector: The left panel illustrates negative CO₂ emissions resulting from regrowth of natural vegetation, including re/afforestation and land abandonment (covering forested and non-forested land). The right panel displays negative CO₂ emissions specifically from re/afforestation. **d** Carbon capture and storage (CCS) using bioenergy (BECCS) in the energy system. **e** Non-CO₂ emissions from the AFOLU sector: Non-CO₂ emissions are depicted both as total, using IPCC AR6 Global Warming Potential (GWP100) factors of 273 and 27 to convert N₂O and CH₄ emissions into CO₂ equivalents, and individually. Indicators are presented for the three SDP scenarios in comparison to a trends-continued reference scenario (SSP2-Ref) and a climate-policy-only scenario (SSP2-1.5C) for the years 2030, 2050 and 2100. A detailed explanation of the visual elements can be found in the caption to Fig. 2.

Discussion and conclusion

This study contributes a multi-model assessment of the food and land system implications of a new generation of target-seeking scenarios aimed at meeting the Paris Agreement and accelerating progress towards the UN Agenda 2030. While this “target space” (van Vuuren *et al.*, 2022) constrains the set of possible scenarios, the SDPs populate the remaining option space for sustainable food and land systems with diverse pathways consistent with economy-wide transformations.

Despite differences in focus and timing, all SDPs substantially improve planetary integrity while overcoming hunger. Less area than today is used to supply food and other agricultural commodities, without raising the share of income spent on them. Although re/afforestation is more constrained, the AFOLU sector achieves near-emission neutrality by the end of the century, aided by significant reductions in residual non-CO₂ emissions. Biodiversity loss in terrestrial ecosystems is halted, environmental flow requirements of freshwater ecosystems are increasingly protected, and nitrogen pollution is greatly alleviated. These outcomes resonate with insights from a growing body of literature exemplifying transformations that improve indicators across multiple dimensions (van Vuuren *et al.*, 2015; Springmann *et al.*, 2018; Willett *et al.*, 2019; Soergel, Kriegler, Weindl, *et al.*, 2021; Bodirsky *et al.*, 2022; Doelman *et al.*, 2022; Humpenöder, Popp, *et al.*, 2022).

The SDPs, each offering distinct visions for climate-friendly food and land systems, enrich the set of 1.5°C scenarios (Byers *et al.*, 2022; Riahi *et al.*, 2022) with less typical but much-needed representatives. They rely less on CDR, involving reduced re/afforestation and limited BECCS deployment, which lowers feasibility risks linked to biogeophysical and technological considerations associated with biomass-sourced primary energy and CCS scale-up (Soergel *et al.*, in press; Brutschin *et al.*, 2021). SD interventions also lessen other trade-offs inherent in narrowly tailored mitigation pathways, such as impacts on food affordability (Hasegawa *et al.*, 2018; Fujimori *et al.*, 2022) and pressures on land and water resources (Hof *et al.*, 2018; Humpenöder *et al.*, 2018), corroborating findings from a single-SDP study that integrated policymaking is key to advancing multiple SDGs (Soergel, Kriegler, Weindl, *et al.*, 2021). Demand-side changes in the SDPs help to reduce these trade-offs but diverge from historical trends, challenging socio-cultural feasibility depending on ambition levels (Soergel *et al.*, in press).

Each SD paradigm offers a unique mix of benefits, downsides, and risks. SDP-EI relies least on demand-side transformations and meets consumer preferences for protein intake and taste (Fehér *et al.*, 2020) by substituting livestock products with animal-free alternatives. This strategy, already yielding environmental benefits as an individual measure (Humpenöder, Bodirsky, *et al.*, 2022), synergistically improves mitigation outcomes, achieving highest carbon sequestration and bioenergy provision among SDPs without increasing food expenditures above baseline trends. N pollution improves substantially, albeit less than in other SDPs. However, the limited ambition in addressing the nutrition transition conflicts with the World Health Organization’s target to halt the rise in adult obesity, likely increasing diet-related risks (Global Nutrition Report, 2021). Technological solutions drive intensification, which risks perpetuating simplification and biotic homogenization of landscapes (Gámez-Virués *et al.*, 2015; Ellis *et al.*, 2021), historically linked to strong species decline (Beckmann *et al.*, 2019; Seibold *et al.*, 2019). Such biodiversity implications are not quantified in our study, representing an important limitation.

Contrastingly, SDP-MC addresses landscape characteristics both qualitatively, by reducing the dichotomy between managed and natural systems, and quantitatively, by integrating at

1
2
3 least 20% (semi-)natural habitat into farmed landscapes to enhance pest control, hydrology,
4 and biodiversity (Garibaldi *et al.*, 2021; Tschardt *et al.*, 2021). While fine-scale implications
5 were beyond our study's scope, recent modelling efforts suggest that this intervention
6 improves configurational landscape heterogeneity and pollination sufficiency (von Jeetze *et*
7 *al.*, 2023). Intensification is moderate, facilitated by the transition towards healthy and
8 sustainable diets, pursued more gradually than in SDP-RC, thereby reducing socio-cultural
9 feasibility risks (Soergel *et al.*, in press). Although SDP-MC mostly ranks between the other
10 SDPs (e.g., biomass demand and carbon removal), its combination of demand- and supply-
11 side levers most effectively reduces new N fixation and N surplus from soils.

12
13 Finally, SDP-RC features the most ambitious demand-side transformation, emphasizing rapid
14 adoption of healthy, sustainable diets and effective food waste reduction. Combined with low
15 BECCS deployment, these strategies stabilize agricultural material throughput per capita and
16 reduce food expenditures. Since healthy diets are more expensive than current diets in low-
17 income countries (Springmann *et al.*, 2021), trends in income and inequality are critical for
18 their adoption. Although SDP-RC features income growth in the Global South and a rapid
19 reduction in the Gini coefficient (Min *et al.*, 2024), food affordability may still pose a barrier to
20 dietary transformation, which is not captured by our modelling. However, if successful, it would
21 address malnutrition and align consumption with human needs, fostering a balance between
22 high quality of life and low environmental degradation (Bodirsky *et al.*, 2022). Additionally,
23 transitioning to healthy diets significantly curtails non-CO₂ emissions, contributing to the low
24 overshoot of 1.5°C (Soergel *et al.*, in press; Humpenöder *et al.*, 2024). Despite modest
25 agricultural productivity gains, SDP-RC uses less land than other SDPs, increasing forest
26 cover and other natural vegetation mainly through natural regrowth following land
27 abandonment—benefiting terrestrial biodiversity.

28
29 All SDPs increase policy integration by combining various interventions, reflecting preferences
30 for specific policy instruments (Dombrowsky *et al.*, in review). However, the granularity of
31 modelled interventions remains limited. Unlike some explicitly modelled economic
32 instruments, such as carbon pricing, regulatory instruments are typically represented through
33 exogenous variations in model parameters and constraints (e.g., land protection schemes).
34 The representation of demand-side interventions does not allow for the identification of specific
35 instruments to foster behavioural change, which may partly occur intrinsically, as in SDP-RC,
36 although policy options can be inferred from the SDP narratives (Dombrowsky *et al.*, in
37 review). SDP-EI might use taxes and subsidies to influence consumption, while SDP-RC could
38 address the personal food environment (e.g., food knowledge), and SDP-MC may target
39 external factors like advertising. As dietary transitions in low-income contexts are contingent
40 on food affordability, these policy options may need to be complemented by measures such
41 as reforms to food distribution systems and poverty alleviation efforts, e.g. through the
42 redistribution of carbon pricing revenues (Soergel, Kriegler, Bodirsky, *et al.*, 2021). How
43 demand-side changes are realized affects the costs, benefits and risks of pathways – such as
44 the regressive impacts of taxes on food availability –, which is not captured quantitatively in
45 our study or other modelling efforts (Willett *et al.*, 2019; Doelman *et al.*, 2022; Humpenöder
46 *et al.*, 2024; Ruggeri Laderchi *et al.*, 2024).

47
48 Moreover, policy implementation may face constraints due to political economy considerations
49 and institutional capacity (Béné *et al.*, 2020; Gaupp *et al.*, 2021). As positive visions of
50 potential futures, the SDPs rely on assumptions of high institutional quality and peace
51 (Dombrowsky *et al.*, in review). Our methods cannot assess the feasibility of these
52 preconditions, nor can they capture potential repercussions of SD interventions on
53 governance and stability. Further gaps include limited coverage of socio-economic
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 implications, such as changes in agricultural employment and the distributional effects of
4 policies, and limitations in the environmental impact assessment, notably the omission of land
5 degradation and ecosystem services that sustain land productivity (Dainese *et al.*, 2019; Duflot
6 *et al.*, 2022). Climate impacts are not considered, which could pose a risk to the permanence
7 of carbon stored in natural or regrown forests (Anderegg *et al.*, 2020), in addition to their
8 vulnerability to other anthropogenic drivers (Lapola *et al.*, 2023). However, some climate
9 impact channels are addressed in a complementary analysis exploring the effects of SD
10 interventions on the climate-land-energy-water nexus by Daioglou *et al.* (in prep.).

11
12 Despite the need for further research to address these limitations, the presented work
13 advances the debate on food and land system transformations. By quantifying multiple
14 scenarios and applying more than one model, it increases the robustness of results while
15 highlighting areas of uncertainty. Moving towards a more sustainable future requires a target
16 space, a shared perspective on where to go, and a roadmap leading the way from the current
17 to an aspired state. This study offers coherent sets of alternative qualitative visions and
18 quantitative pathways for future food and land systems, illustrating the multitude of options,
19 their impacts on several sustainability goals, and the levels of ambition required to realize such
20 transformations. In doing so, these pathways can serve as valuable reference points for
21 broader societal deliberation on desirable futures.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 **Acknowledgements**

32 This work has been partially funded through the project SHAPE. SHAPE is part of AXIS, an
33 ERA-NET initiated by JPI Climate, and funded by FORMAS (SE), FFG/BMWF (AT),
34 DLR/BMBF (DE, Grant No. 01LS1907A), NWO (NL) and RCN (NO) with co-funding by the
35 European Union (Grant No. 776608). This work was also supported by the European Union's
36 Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement numbers 821124
37 (NAVIGATE), 821471 (ENGAGE), and 101056848 (WET HORIZONS). Further support is
38 provided by the European Research Council (ERC) under the H2020-EU.1.1. Excellent
39 Science Programme under Grant No. 819566 (PICASSO). The funders had no role in study
40 design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript. The
41 SDG icons used in the figures and tables were created by the United Nations.
42
43
44
45

46 **Author contributions**

47 IW conceived the model analysis and led the writing of the manuscript, with inputs from BS,
48 GA, JD and VD. BS, SR, VD, IW, GA and AB performed the scenario model runs with the two
49 participating models. BS and IW designed the figures. JPD provided software engineering
50 solutions and technical support. All authors contributed to scenario design, the development
51 and scenario implementation of individual models, or the writing of the manuscript.
52
53

54 **Data availability statement**

55 The scenario data from the SHAPE project underlying this paper and other publications in this
56 focus issue are available for interactive exploration at <https://shape.apps.ece.iiasa.ac.at> and
57 can also be downloaded at <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13752116>. The authors encourage
58 re-use of the scenario data in future research, as well as implementation of the SDP scenarios
59 in other models.
60

Code availability

The MAgPIE code is available under the GNU Affero General Public License, version 3 (AGPLv3) via GitHub at <https://github.com/maggiemodel/magpie>. The release used in this study (version 4.6.5) can be found via Zenodo (<https://zenodo.org/records/7782037>). The technical documentation of model version 4.6.5 is available at <https://rse.pik-potsdam.de/doc/magpie/4.6.5/>. Instructions for software installation and running the model are available at <https://github.com/maggiemodel/magpie>.

The food demand model used in this study is available as part of the MAgPIE source code (model version 4.6.5) and documented as part of the full MAgPIE model documentation.

The REMIND code is available under the GNU Affero General Public License, version 3 (AGPLv3) via GitHub at <https://github.com/remindmodel/remind>. The REMIND source code and configuration of the exact model version used in this study is available at https://github.com/bs538/remind/tree/SHAPE_coupledFinal. The REMIND version 3.2.0 can also be found via Zenodo (<https://zenodo.org/records/7852740>). The technical documentation of model version 3.2.0 is available at <https://rse.pik-potsdam.de/doc/remind/3.2.0/>. Instructions for software installation, running the model and coupling to MAgPIE (tutorials subfolder) are available at <https://github.com/remindmodel/remind>.

References

Aguiar, A.P.D. *et al.* (2020) 'Co-designing global target-seeking scenarios: A cross-scale participatory process for capturing multiple perspectives on pathways to sustainability', *Global Environmental Change*, 65, p. 102198. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2020.102198>.

Ambrósio, G. *et al.* (2024) 'Global sustainability scenarios lead to regionally different outcomes for terrestrial biodiversity', *Environmental Research Letters*, 19(10), p. 104055. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/ad73eb>.

Anderegg, W.R.L. *et al.* (2020) 'Climate-driven risks to the climate mitigation potential of forests', *Science*, 368(6497), p. eaaz7005. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aaz7005>.

Beckmann, M. *et al.* (2019) 'Conventional land-use intensification reduces species richness and increases production: A global meta-analysis', *Global Change Biology*, 25(6), pp. 1941–1956. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.14606>.

Béné, C. *et al.* (2020) 'Five priorities to operationalize the EAT–Lancet Commission report', *Nature Food*, 1(8), pp. 457–459. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1038/s43016-020-0136-4>.

Bodirsky, B.L. *et al.* (2020) 'The ongoing nutrition transition thwarts long-term targets for food security, public health and environmental protection', *Scientific Reports*, 10(1), p. 19778. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-75213-3>.

1
2
3 Bodirsky, B.L. *et al.* (2022) 'Integrating degrowth and efficiency perspectives enables an
4 emission-neutral food system by 2100', *Nature Food*, 3(5), pp. 341–348. Available at:
5 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s43016-022-00500-3>.

6
7 von Braun, J. *et al.* (2023) 'Science for Transformation of Food Systems: Opportunities for
8 the UN Food Systems Summit', in J. von Braun *et al.* (eds) *Science and Innovations for*
9 *Food Systems Transformation*. Cham: Springer International Publishing, pp. 921–948.
10 Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-15703-5_50.

11
12 Brutschin, E. *et al.* (2021) 'A multidimensional feasibility evaluation of low-carbon scenarios',
13 *Environmental Research Letters*, 16(6), p. 064069. Available at:
14 <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/abf0ce>.

15
16 Byers, E. *et al.* (2022) *AR6 scenarios database*. International Institute for Applied Systems
17 Analysis. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Available at:
18 <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7197970> (Accessed: 20 April 2024).

19
20 Crippa, M. *et al.* (2021) 'Food systems are responsible for a third of global anthropogenic
21 GHG emissions', *Nature Food*, 2(3), pp. 198–209. Available at:
22 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s43016-021-00225-9>.

23
24 Dainese, M. *et al.* (2019) 'A global synthesis reveals biodiversity-mediated benefits for crop
25 production', *Science Advances*, 5(10), p. eaax0121. Available at:
26 <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.aax0121>.

27
28 Daioglou, V. *et al.* (in prep.) 'Implications of the Sustainable Development Pathways on the
29 Climate-Land-Energy-Water Nexus'.

30
31 Dietrich, J.P. *et al.* (2019) 'MAGPIE 4 – a modular open-source framework for modeling
32 global land systems', *Geoscientific Model Development*, 12(4), pp. 1299–1317. Available at:
33 <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-12-1299-2019>.

34
35 Doelman, J.C. *et al.* (2022) 'Quantifying synergies and trade-offs in the global water-land-
36 food-climate nexus using a multi-model scenario approach', *Environmental Research*
37 *Letters*, 17(4), p. 045004. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/ac5766>.

38
39 Dombrowsky, I. *et al.* (in review) 'Policy mixes for the implementation of sustainable
40 development pathways: representation in integrated assessment models'.

41
42 Dufлот, R. *et al.* (2022) 'Farming intensity indirectly reduces crop yield through negative
43 effects on agrobiodiversity and key ecological functions', *Agriculture, Ecosystems &*
44 *Environment*, 326, p. 107810. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2021.107810>.

45
46 Edenhofer, O. and Kowarsch, M. (2015) 'Cartography of pathways: A new model for
47 environmental policy assessments', *Environmental Science & Policy*, 51, pp. 56–64.
48 Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2015.03.017>.

49
50 Ellis, E.C. *et al.* (2021) 'People have shaped most of terrestrial nature for at least 12,000
51 years', *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 118(17), p. e2023483118.
52 Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2023483118>.

53
54 FAO *et al.* (2023) *The State of Food Security and Nutrition in the World 2023: Urbanization,*
55 *agrifood systems transformation and healthy diets across the rural–urban continuum*. Rome,
56 Italy: FAO, IFAD, UNICEF, WFP, WHO (The State of Food Security and Nutrition in the
57 World (SOFI), 2023). Available at: <https://doi.org/10.4060/cc3017en>.

58
59
60

1
2
3 Fehér, A. *et al.* (2020) 'A Comprehensive Review of the Benefits of and the Barriers to the
4 Switch to a Plant-Based Diet', *Sustainability*, 12(10), p. 4136. Available at:
5 <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12104136>.

6
7 Foley, J.A. *et al.* (2005) 'Global Consequences of Land Use', *Science*, 309(5734), pp. 570–
8 574. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1111772>.

9
10 FOLU (2019) *Growing Better: Ten Critical Transitions to Transform Food and Land Use*. The
11 Global Consultation Report of the Food and Land Use (FOLU) Coalition. London. Available
12 at: <https://www.foodandlandusecoalition.org/global-report/>.

13
14 Fujimori, S. *et al.* (2022) 'Land-based climate change mitigation measures can affect
15 agricultural markets and food security', *Nature Food*, 3(2), pp. 110–121. Available at:
16 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s43016-022-00464-4>.

17
18 Gámez-Virués, S. *et al.* (2015) 'Landscape simplification filters species traits and drives
19 biotic homogenization', *Nature Communications*, 6(1), p. 8568. Available at:
20 <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms9568>.

21
22 Garibaldi, L.A. *et al.* (2021) 'Working landscapes need at least 20% native habitat',
23 *Conservation Letters*, 14(2), p. e12773. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1111/conl.12773>.

24
25 Gaupp, F. *et al.* (2021) 'Food system development pathways for healthy, nature-positive and
26 inclusive food systems', *Nature Food*, 2(12), pp. 928–934. Available at:
27 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s43016-021-00421-7>.

28
29 GBD 2017 DALYs and HALE Collaborators (2018) 'Global, regional, and national disability-
30 adjusted life-years (DALYs) for 359 diseases and injuries and healthy life expectancy
31 (HALE) for 195 countries and territories, 1990–2017: a systematic analysis for the Global
32 Burden of Disease Study 2017', *The Lancet*, 392(10159), pp. 1859–1922. Available at:
33 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(18\)32335-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(18)32335-3).

34
35 Gerten, D. *et al.* (2020) 'Feeding ten billion people is possible within four terrestrial planetary
36 boundaries', *Nature Sustainability*, 3(3), pp. 200–208. Available at:
37 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-019-0465-1>.

38
39 Global Nutrition Report (2021) *The state of global nutrition*. Bristol, UK: Development
40 Initiatives.

41
42 Hasegawa, T. *et al.* (2018) 'Risk of increased food insecurity under stringent global climate
43 change mitigation policy', *Nature Climate Change*, 8(8), pp. 699–703. Available at:
44 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-018-0230-x>.

45
46 Hof, C. *et al.* (2018) 'Bioenergy cropland expansion may offset positive effects of climate
47 change mitigation for global vertebrate diversity', *Proceedings of the National Academy of
48 Sciences*, 115(52), pp. 13294–13299. Available at:
49 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1807745115>.

50
51 Humpenöder, F. *et al.* (2018) 'Large-scale bioenergy production: how to resolve
52 sustainability trade-offs?', *Environmental Research Letters*, 13(2), p. 024011. Available at:
53 <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/aa9e3b>.

54
55 Humpenöder, F., Popp, A., *et al.* (2022) 'Overcoming global inequality is critical for land-
56 based mitigation in line with the Paris Agreement', *Nature Communications*, 13(1), p. 7453.
57 Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-022-35114-7>.

58
59
60

1
2
3 Humpenöder, F., Bodirsky, B.L., *et al.* (2022) 'Projected environmental benefits of replacing
4 beef with microbial protein', *Nature*, 605(7908), pp. 90–96. Available at:
5 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-022-04629-w>.
6

7 Humpenöder, F. *et al.* (2024) 'Food matters: Dietary shifts increase the feasibility of 1.5°C
8 pathways in line with the Paris Agreement', *Science Advances*, 10(13), p. eadj3832.
9 Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.adj3832>.
10

11 IPBES (2016) *Summary for policymakers of the methodological assessment of scenarios*
12 *and models of biodiversity and ecosystem services of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy*
13 *Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services*. Edited by S. Ferrier *et al.* Bonn, Germany:
14 Secretariat of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem
15 Services. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3235275>.
16

17 Jägermeyr, J. *et al.* (2017) 'Reconciling irrigated food production with environmental flows for
18 Sustainable Development Goals implementation', *Nature Communications*, 8, p.
19 ncomms15900. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms15900>.
20

21 Jaureguiberry, P. *et al.* (2022) 'The direct drivers of recent global anthropogenic biodiversity
22 loss', *Science Advances*, 8(45), p. eabm9982. Available at:
23 <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.abm9982>.
24

25 von Jeetze, P.J. *et al.* (2023) 'Projected landscape-scale repercussions of global action for
26 climate and biodiversity protection', *Nature Communications*, 14(1), p. 2515. Available at:
27 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-023-38043-1>.
28

29 Kok, M.T.J. *et al.* (2023) 'Assessing ambitious nature conservation strategies in a below 2-
30 degree and food-secure world', *Biological Conservation*, 284, p. 110068. Available at:
31 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2023.110068>.
32

33 Kriegler, E. *et al.* (in prep.) 'New narratives for sustainable development pathways'.
34

35 Kriegler, E. *et al.* (2017) 'Fossil-fueled development (SSP5): An energy and resource
36 intensive scenario for the 21st century', *Global Environmental Change*, 42, pp. 297–315.
37 Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2016.05.015>.
38

39 Lapola, D.M. *et al.* (2023) 'The drivers and impacts of Amazon forest degradation', *Science*,
40 379(6630), p. eabp8622. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abp8622>.
41

42 Leach, M. *et al.* (2018) 'Equity and sustainability in the Anthropocene: a social–ecological
43 systems perspective on their intertwined futures', *Global Sustainability*, 1, p. e13. Available
44 at: <https://doi.org/10.1017/sus.2018.12>.
45

46 Leclère, D. *et al.* (2020) 'Bending the curve of terrestrial biodiversity needs an integrated
47 strategy', *Nature*, 585(7826), pp. 551–556. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2705-y>.
48

49 Liu, J. *et al.* (2010) 'A high-resolution assessment on global nitrogen flows in cropland',
50 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 107(17), pp. 8035–8040.
51

52 Masters, W.A. *et al.* (2016) 'The nutrition transition and agricultural transformation: a Preston
53 curve approach', *Agricultural Economics*, 47(S1), pp. 97–114. Available at:
54 <https://doi.org/10.1111/agec.12303>.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Min, J. *et al.* (2024) 'Income and inequality pathways consistent with eradicating poverty',
4 *Environmental Research Letters*, 19(11), p. 114041. Available at:
5 <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/ad7b5d>.
6

7 Moallemi, E.A. *et al.* (2022) 'Early systems change necessary for catalyzing long-term
8 sustainability in a post-2030 agenda', *One Earth*, 5(7), pp. 792–811. Available at:
9 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.oneear.2022.06.003>.
10

11 Pereira, H.M. *et al.* (2024) 'Global trends and scenarios for terrestrial biodiversity and
12 ecosystem services from 1900 to 2050', *Science*, 384(6694), pp. 458–465. Available at:
13 <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.adn3441>.
14

15 Popkin, B.M., Adair, L.S. and Ng, S.W. (2012) 'Global nutrition transition and the pandemic
16 of obesity in developing countries', *Nutrition Reviews*, 70(1), pp. 3–21. Available at:
17 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1753-4887.2011.00456.x>.
18

19 Pozzer, A. *et al.* (2017) 'Impact of agricultural emission reductions on fine-particulate matter
20 and public health', *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 17(20), pp. 12813–12826. Available
21 at: <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-17-12813-2017>.
22

23 Riahi, K. *et al.* (2017) 'The Shared Socioeconomic Pathways and their energy, land use, and
24 greenhouse gas emissions implications: An overview', *Global Environmental Change*, 42,
25 pp. 153–168. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2016.05.009>.
26

27 Riahi, K. *et al.* (2022) 'Mitigation pathways compatible with long-term goals', in *Climate
28 Change 2022: Mitigation of Climate Change. Contribution of Working Group III to the Sixth
29 Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. Cambridge, UK and
30 New York, NY, USA: Cambridge University Press, pp. 295–408. Available at:
31 <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009157926.005>.
32

33 Rockström, J. *et al.* (2020) 'Planet-proofing the global food system', *Nature Food*, 1(1), pp.
34 3–5. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1038/s43016-019-0010-4>.
35

36 Ruggeri Laderchi, C. *et al.* (2024) *The Economics of the Food System Transformation*.
37 Global Policy Report. Food System Economics Commission (FSEC). Available at:
38 <https://foodsystemeconomics.org>.
39

40 Schmidt-Traub, G., Obersteiner, M. and Mosnier, A. (2019) 'Fix the broken food system in
41 three steps', *Nature*, 569(7755), pp. 181–183. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-019-01420-2>.
42

43 Schulte-Uebbing, L.F. *et al.* (2022) 'From planetary to regional boundaries for agricultural
44 nitrogen pollution', *Nature*, 610(7932), pp. 507–512. Available at:
45 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-022-05158-2>.
46

47 Searchinger, T. *et al.* (2019) *Creating a sustainable food future: A menu of solutions to feed
48 nearly 10 billion people by 2050*. World Resources Report. World Resources Institute (WRI).
49 Available at: <https://research.wri.org/wrr-food> (Accessed: 12 September 2024).
50

51 Seibold, S. *et al.* (2019) 'Arthropod decline in grasslands and forests is associated with
52 landscape-level drivers', *Nature*, 574(7780), pp. 671–674. Available at:
53 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-019-1684-3>.
54

55 Soergel, B. *et al.* (in press) 'Multiple pathways towards sustainable development goals and
56 climate targets'. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/ad80af>.
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Soergel, B., Kriegler, E., Weindl, I., *et al.* (2021) 'A sustainable development pathway for
4 climate action within the UN 2030 Agenda', *Nature Climate Change*, 11(8), pp. 656–664.
5 Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-021-01098-3>.

6
7 Soergel, B., Kriegler, E., Bodirsky, B.L., *et al.* (2021) 'Combining ambitious climate policies
8 with efforts to eradicate poverty', *Nature Communications*, 12(1), p. 2342. Available at:
9 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-021-22315-9>.

10
11 Springmann, M. *et al.* (2018) 'Options for keeping the food system within environmental
12 limits', *Nature*, 562(7728), p. 519. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-018-0594-0>.

13
14 Springmann, M. *et al.* (2021) 'The global and regional costs of healthy and sustainable
15 dietary patterns: a modelling study', *The Lancet Planetary Health*, 5(11), pp. e797–e807.
16 Available at: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2542-5196\(21\)00251-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2542-5196(21)00251-5).

17
18 Stehfest, E. *et al.* (2014) *Integrated assessment of global environmental change with IMAGE*
19 *3.0: Model description and policy applications*. The Hague: Netherlands Environmental
20 Assessment Agency (PBL).

21
22 Tschardtke, T. *et al.* (2021) 'Beyond organic farming – harnessing biodiversity-friendly
23 landscapes', *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 36(10), pp. 919–930. Available at:
24 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2021.06.010>.

25
26 Vitousek, P.M. *et al.* (1997) 'Human Domination of Earth's Ecosystems', *Science*, 277(5325),
27 pp. 494–499. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.277.5325.494>.

28
29 van Vuuren, D.P. *et al.* (2015) 'Pathways to achieve a set of ambitious global sustainability
30 objectives by 2050: Explorations using the IMAGE integrated assessment model',
31 *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 98, pp. 303–323. Available at:
32 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2015.03.005>.

33
34 van Vuuren, D.P. *et al.* (2017) 'Energy, land-use and greenhouse gas emissions trajectories
35 under a green growth paradigm', *Global Environmental Change*, 42, pp. 237–250. Available
36 at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2016.05.008>.

37
38 van Vuuren, D.P. *et al.* (2022) 'Defining a sustainable development target space for 2030
39 and 2050', *One Earth*, 5(2), pp. 142–156. Available at:
40 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.oneear.2022.01.003>.

41
42 Wang, M. *et al.* (2024) 'A triple increase in global river basins with water scarcity due to
43 future pollution', *Nature Communications*, 15(1), p. 880. Available at:
44 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-024-44947-3>.

45
46 Ward, M.H. *et al.* (2018) 'Drinking Water Nitrate and Human Health: An Updated Review',
47 *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 15(7), p. 1557. Available
48 at: <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph15071557>.

49
50 Willett, W. *et al.* (2019) 'Food in the Anthropocene: the EAT–Lancet Commission on healthy
51 diets from sustainable food systems', *The Lancet*, 393(10170), pp. 447–492. Available at:
52 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(18\)31788-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(18)31788-4).

53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT