

WHICH SUSTAINABILITY?

MOBILITY

	Policy	Model	Why this classification?
1	Build more highways to reduce congestion	VERY WEAK	The logic is purely growth-oriented: solve congestion by building more, not by reducing car dependency. No ecological limit is recognised. Nature is treated as empty space to be paved. This is classic Very Weak: the environment must adapt to the economy.
2	Subsidise the purchase of private electric cars	WEAK	It addresses emissions through technological substitution — replacing dirty cars with cleaner ones — without questioning car culture itself. Individual ownership, suburban sprawl, and resource extraction (lithium, cobalt) remain unchallenged. Classic Weak: green the product, keep the system.
3	Set strict emission standards for new vehicles (e.g. Euro 7)	WEAK	Regulation makes each car cleaner, but the total number of cars can still grow. Efficiency gains are real but do not cap total emissions. The approach trusts technology and market turnover to solve the problem within the existing system.
4	Make public transport free for all residents	STRONG	This redistributes access to mobility as a public good. It prioritises collective transport over private vehicles, reduces inequality (the poor benefit most), and treats mobility as a right, not a market commodity. The commons logic is Strong.
5	Invest massively in protected cycling infrastructure	STRONG	Public infrastructure that makes low-carbon mobility safe and accessible for all. It redistributes road space away from cars toward a collective, ecological alternative. The investment is in commons, not in private technology.
6	Ban private cars from the city centre	STRONG	Restricts private use of shared space for collective benefit. It challenges the assumption that car access is a right and reclaims the city centre as a commons. Some students may argue VS (it limits consumption of space), but the primary logic is Strong: collective good over individual convenience.
7	Implement a 15-minute city plan ⚡	STRONG	This redesigns the built environment to reduce the need for motorised transport. It could be read as Weak (smart urban planning, efficiency) or Strong (restructuring society around proximity and public space). The classification depends on governance: if it is a top-down technocratic plan, it leans W; if it involves community participation and challenges car-dependent capitalism, it is S.
8	Allow Uber and ride-hailing with no regulation ⚡	VERY WEAK	Pure deregulation in the name of innovation and consumer choice. It undermines public transport, creates precarious gig labour, and concentrates profits in platform corporations. The 'sharing economy' label is misleading — this is platform capitalism. Very Weak: the market decides, nature and workers bear the cost.

9	Tax frequent flyers progressively	STRONG	Progressive taxation targets the heaviest polluters (frequent flyers are disproportionately wealthy). It redistributes the cost of pollution and discourages luxury emissions. The logic is equity and ecological justice — Strong.
10	Set a personal annual carbon budget for travel	VERY STRONG	This imposes an absolute cap on individual consumption — not just making travel greener, but limiting how much anyone can travel. It challenges the assumption that mobility is unlimited. Very Strong: total throughput is capped, sufficiency replaces efficiency.
11	Subsidise the expansion of low-cost airlines ⚡	VERY WEAK	It looks democratic ('everyone can fly!') and might be mistaken for Weak (market intervention). But it actively subsidises one of the most polluting industries. Cheap flights increase total emissions. The market is prioritised over ecology. Very Weak: growth is sacred, nature pays.

ENERGY

	Policy	Model	Why this classification?
12	Subsidise fossil fuel extraction (oil, gas, coal)	VERY WEAK	Directly funds the extraction of resources that cause climate change. The state actively supports the fossil economy. No ecological limit is recognised. Very Weak: nature is a resource to be exploited for profit.
13	Deregulate the energy market to increase competition	VERY WEAK	Assumes the market will produce the best outcomes. In practice, deregulation leads to price volatility, underinvestment in infrastructure, and corporate concentration. Energy is treated as a commodity, not a public good. Very Weak: the market rules.
14	Create a feed-in tariff for renewable energy producers	WEAK	A market mechanism that steers investment toward renewables. Effective for energy transition, but does not change ownership or question total consumption. Corporations can profit just as easily as cooperatives. Weak: green the supply, keep the market logic.
15	Implement a carbon tax on all fossil fuel use	WEAK	Uses price signals to discourage fossil fuel use. Economically efficient, but regressive (hits the poor harder) unless revenue is redistributed. The system is corrected through the market, not restructured. Weak: internalise externalities within the existing framework.
16	Launch a national green hydrogen strategy ⚡	WEAK	Sounds cutting-edge and green. But green hydrogen is extremely capital-intensive, requires rare materials, and its production chain is controlled by large corporations. The question is: who owns the infrastructure? If the answer is corporations, this is Weak in green packaging — technological substitution without democratising energy. Some argue it can mask continued fossil fuel dependency (blue hydrogen is often sold as green).
17	Give legal priority to community energy	STRONG	Restructures ownership: energy production is democratised. The community controls its own

	cooperatives over corporations		resource. This challenges corporate power and builds the commons. Strong: who owns the energy system matters as much as what fuel it uses.
18	Declare energy a public good and ban privatisation	STRONG	Removes energy from the market entirely. It is treated as a right and a commons, not a commodity. The logic is collective provision and democratic control. Strong: the commons over the market.
19	Create an energy poverty programme (free energy for low-income)	STRONG	Addresses the social dimension of energy: access is a matter of justice, not purchasing power. It redistributes resources and treats energy as a right. Strong: equity and ecological justice together.
20	Set a national cap on total energy consumption ⚡	VERY STRONG	This is the critical distinction. Weak caps emissions (make energy cleaner). Very Strong caps throughput — how much energy society uses, period. Even if all energy were renewable, VS asks: is infinite consumption sustainable? This challenges the growth paradigm at its root.
21	Build new nuclear power plants ⚡	WEAK	Low-carbon, so it addresses climate emissions (Weak logic). But nuclear is centralised, capital-intensive, corporate-controlled, and produces waste that lasts millennia. Strong asks: who bears the risk? Communities near plants, future generations, or the corporations that profit? The governance question makes this Weak, not Strong.
22	Ban all advertising for fossil fuel companies	STRONG	Targets the cultural infrastructure of fossil capitalism: the ability of polluting industries to shape public opinion and normalise extraction. It challenges corporate power and protects public discourse. Strong: the commons of public debate is defended against private interests.

FOOD

	Policy	Model	Why this classification?
23	Subsidise industrial agriculture and large monocultures	VERY WEAK	Supports the industrial food system that destroys biodiversity, depletes soil, and concentrates land ownership. Nature is treated as a factory floor. Small farmers are pushed out. Very Weak: profit over ecology and community.
24	Allow corporations to patent seeds (GMO patents) ⚡	VERY WEAK	The privatisation of life itself. Seeds — the basis of food sovereignty — become corporate property. Farmers become dependent on annual purchases. Some argue GMOs reduce pesticide use (Weak logic), but the ownership question is decisive: who controls the seed controls the food system. Very Weak: nature as private property.
25	Deregulate pesticide approval to speed up innovation ⚡	VERY WEAK	Framed as 'cutting red tape' and 'enabling innovation.' But deregulation means ignoring health and ecological evidence. The precautionary principle is abandoned. Corporate interests override public health. Very Weak: the market decides what is safe.

26	Fund the EU Farm-to-Fork strategy	WEAK	A comprehensive reform within the existing system: targets for reduction, incentives for organic production, supply chain improvements. But it operates through market mechanisms and voluntary targets, without challenging ownership or setting absolute limits. Weak: reform, not transformation.
27	Certify and label organic products (EU Bio) ⚡	WEAK	Reduces chemical use — a real improvement. But the logic is consumer choice in the marketplace: buy green, vote with your wallet. Certification does not change the food system; it creates a premium market segment. Large corporations can obtain Bio labels too. Weak: market-driven reform, not structural change.
28	Subsidise agrivoltaics (solar panels over fields) ⚡	WEAK	Efficient dual use of land — a clever technical solution. But the key question is governance: if corporations own the panels and farmers rent them, value is extracted from agriculture. If cooperatives own them, it could be Strong. In the default corporate scenario, this is Weak: green technology that may deepen farmer dependency.
29	Protect farmers' right to save and exchange seeds	STRONG	Defends the commons against privatisation. Seeds are a shared heritage, not corporate property. This protects small farmers, biodiversity, and food sovereignty. Strong: the commons over the market.
30	Support community-supported agriculture with public funds	STRONG	Builds direct relationships between producers and consumers, bypassing corporate supply chains. It strengthens local food systems and redistributes risk. Strong: community-based, commons-oriented.
31	Implement land reform: redistribute large landholdings	STRONG	Directly challenges concentrated ownership — the structural root of food inequality. Land is treated as a commons to be shared, not a commodity to be accumulated. Strong: redistribution and justice.
32	Pass a Food Sovereignty law	STRONG	Asserts democratic control over the food system against global corporate supply chains. Communities decide what they grow and eat. Strong: self-determination, commons, and ecological justice.
33	Ban industrial animal farming entirely ⚡	VERY STRONG	Recognises that industrial animal farming causes immense ecological damage (emissions, deforestation, water pollution) and animal suffering. Banning it entirely is a limit on total throughput, not just an efficiency improvement. The productive question is: what replaces it? Very Strong: absolute limits on a destructive system.
34	Mandate that all schools serve only local, seasonal food	STRONG	Uses public institutions to build local food systems. Schools become anchors for sustainable agriculture. It redistributes public spending toward small local producers and educates children about seasonality. Strong: public institutions serving the commons.
35	Fund research into lab-grown meat ⚡	WEAK	A technological substitute that avoids questioning consumption itself. It replaces the animal with the

			lab, but the desire for meat (and the corporate control of its production) remains unchallenged. Who will own the patents? Weak: tech substitution within the existing system.
--	--	--	--

WATER

	Policy	Model	Why this classification?
36	Privatise the city water supply	VERY WEAK	Water — the most basic necessity of life — becomes a commodity for profit. Access depends on ability to pay. Private companies extract value from a natural monopoly. Very Weak: the market owns nature.
37	Allow companies to buy water extraction rights ⚡	VERY WEAK	Even if regulated (which would make it look Weak), the underlying logic is that water is property that can be bought. Nature is a commodity. The question is not how efficiently the market allocates water, but whether water should be in the market at all. Very Weak: the commodification of nature.
38	Set water efficiency standards for appliances	WEAK	Reduces water use per unit through better technology. Effective but incremental — it does not question total consumption or ownership. Weak: efficiency within the existing system.
39	Install smart water meters in all homes ⚡	WEAK	An efficiency tool — it makes waste visible and enables pricing signals. But the question is: who collects and owns the data? If a private water company uses the data for profit maximisation, this is surveillance capitalism applied to a basic need. If a public utility uses it for commons management, it leans Strong. Default classification is Weak: efficiency through technology and data.
40	Build public drinking fountains in every neighbourhood	STRONG	Treats water as a public good and provides universal access regardless of income. It also reduces plastic bottle consumption. The city invests in commons infrastructure. Strong: public provision for all.
41	Write into the constitution that water is a human right	STRONG	Elevates water above the market: it cannot legally be denied to anyone. A rights-based framework protects the commons against privatisation. Strong: constitutional protection of a shared resource.
42	Hold a referendum to ban water privatisation (Italy 2011)	STRONG	Direct democracy defending the commons. Citizens collectively decide that water must not be a commodity. The 2011 Italian referendum was a landmark victory for the commons movement. Strong: democratic control of a shared resource.
43	Give legal personhood to a river (New Zealand) ⚡	VERY STRONG	The river has rights in itself — not because it is useful to humans, but because it is a living entity. This is a radical ontological shift: nature is not a resource to be managed, but a subject with legal standing. Very Strong: nature has intrinsic value. The productive question is whether a human legal system can truly protect an ecosystem.
44	Ban water-intensive crops in drought-prone regions	VERY STRONG	Imposes an absolute ecological limit on economic activity. It says: the ecosystem's capacity sets the

boundary, not the market's demand. Farmers cannot grow whatever is most profitable if it destroys the water table. Very Strong: ecological limits override economic logic.

HOUSING

	Policy	Model	Why this classification?
45	Deregulate construction permits to speed up development	VERY WEAK	Treats regulation as an obstacle to growth. Environmental and social protections are sacrificed for speed and profit. Developers decide what gets built, not communities. Very Weak: the market builds, nature and communities adapt.
46	Offer tax breaks for real estate developers	VERY WEAK	Public money flows to private profit. Developers build what is most profitable (luxury housing), not what is most needed (affordable housing). The housing crisis is treated as a supply problem, not a distribution problem. Very Weak: state serves capital.
47	Require green energy efficiency standards for new buildings	WEAK	Makes buildings greener through technical standards. Effective for reducing emissions per building, but does not question who builds, who owns, or how much is built. Weak: green the product, keep the system.
48	Subsidise home insulation and heat pump installation ⚡	WEAK	A green retrofit — undeniably useful. But the trap is distributional: if only homeowners benefit, renters and the poor are excluded. The subsidy can deepen inequality. If made universal and targeted at social housing, it moves toward Strong. In its default form, it is Weak: green technology for those who can afford it.
49	Build social housing with ecological materials	STRONG	Public investment that addresses both housing inequality and environmental impact. Housing is treated as a right, not a market product. The state builds for need, not profit. Strong: public provision, ecological justice, commons.
50	Implement strict rent control in cities	STRONG	Restricts the market to protect a basic need. Housing is treated as a right, not an investment vehicle. Tenants — often the most vulnerable — are protected from speculation. Strong: regulation for social justice.
51	Create community land trusts (collectively owned land)	STRONG	Removes land from speculation permanently. The commons is institutionalised: land belongs to the community, not to investors. Strong: collective ownership against the market.
52	Regulate Airbnb to protect housing for residents ⚡	STRONG	Regulates the platform economy to protect a basic need. Without regulation, Airbnb extracts housing from the local market, raises rents, and displaces residents. Very Weak says: let the market decide. Strong says: housing for residents is a commons that must be protected. The trap is that students may see regulation as merely Weak — but the purpose (protecting the commons) makes it Strong.

53	Set maximum square metres per person in new construction ⚡	VERY STRONG	Limits consumption of space — one of the most material-intensive forms of consumption. It challenges the assumption that bigger is better and that wealth should translate into unlimited space. Very Strong: sufficiency as a principle, absolute limits on material throughput.
54	Ban real estate speculation (buying to resell, not to live in)	STRONG	Housing is a home, not an investment. This removes the speculative logic that drives housing crises. The market is subordinated to the social function of housing. Strong: use value over exchange value.

WASTE

	Policy	Model	Why this classification?
55	Allow exporting waste to developing countries	VERY WEAK	Environmental colonialism: wealthy countries export their pollution to poorer ones. The ecological cost is externalised onto those with the least power. Very Weak: nature and people in the Global South pay the price of Northern consumption.
56	Set mandatory recycling targets for municipalities	WEAK	Manages waste more efficiently but does not question why so much waste is produced. Recycling is necessary but insufficient — it treats symptoms, not causes. Weak: improve waste management within the existing production system.
57	Pass an Extended Producer Responsibility law	WEAK	Shifts the cost of waste from the public to the producer — a real improvement. But it operates within the market: companies internalise the cost and adjust prices. It does not cap production or question consumption. Weak: smarter market regulation.
58	Implement a deposit-return system for bottles	WEAK	An effective market mechanism for recovering materials. It creates an economic incentive to return, not discard. But it manages one waste stream within the existing consumption model. Weak: a well-designed market tool.
59	Pass a Right to Repair law ⚡	WEAK	Extends product life and challenges planned obsolescence — but through market regulation, not system change. It gives consumers the right to repair within the existing ownership model. Strong would ban planned obsolescence outright. Very Strong would reduce total production. Weak: reform the market, empower the consumer.
60	Ban single-use plastics completely	STRONG	An absolute ban, not a tax or incentive. It removes an entire category of harmful products from the economy. The logic is not 'make plastic cheaper to recycle' but 'stop producing it.' Strong: collective prohibition for ecological protection.
61	Create municipal zero-waste programmes ⚡	STRONG	Public infrastructure for waste elimination — a collective, commons-based approach. The trap question is: does zero-waste at the municipal level address overproduction at the corporate level? It is Strong (public programme, collective goal), but it may

			not reach Very Strong unless it caps total material throughput.
62	Set a national cap on total material consumption ⚡	VERY STRONG	The most radical policy in this section. It caps total throughput — not waste, not emissions, but how much stuff society uses. This directly challenges economic growth as a goal. If you can only use X tonnes of material per year, the economy must operate within that limit. Very Strong: absolute ecological limits override economic logic.
63	Ban planned obsolescence (products designed to break)	STRONG	Removes a core mechanism of consumer capitalism: the artificial creation of replacement demand. Products must last, which reduces total production and waste. Strong: collective regulation against corporate manipulation.
64	Tax all advertising for non-essential consumer goods ⚡	VERY STRONG	Targets the engine of consumer capitalism: demand creation through advertising. If you tax the mechanism that makes people want more stuff, you challenge the growth paradigm at its root. This is not about making products greener (W) or redistributing access (S) — it is about reducing total demand. Very Strong: sufficiency over growth.