

INVESTING IN RENEWABLES DOES NOT AUTOMATICALLY REPLACE FOSSIL FUELS

Joyeeta Gupta, Augusto Heras, Nina Herzog-Hawelka, Moataz Talaat, Frank de Morrée, Clara McDonnell, Opal Morales Asencio

KEY MESSAGES

1. Data shows that renewable energy increases in the energy mix but does not replace fossil fuels (FF)
2. For Low-/Middle Income Countries, the energy addition is inevitable, but does not need to come from FF
3. Big banks continue to heavily invest in FF compared to Renewable Energy Sources (RES)
4. Investments in RES by FF companies compared to their FF investments are a drop in the ocean
5. A focused policy on phasing out fossil fuel is needed

INTRODUCTION


Since the industrial revolution, fossil fuels (FF) play a major role in contributing significantly to cheap energy access, facilitating social and physical mobility, and powering the economy. However, this has come at the cost of exacerbating the climate change problem. Since the use of FF is a key cause of climate change, its use needs to be phased out and replaced by alternative clean energy sources. However, while there is growing investment in renewable energy sources (RES) and this is reflected in the energy mix, it does not appear to replace FF. Many countries have invested in RES policy development but did not include an actual FF phase-out. A focused policy on phasing out FF is needed.

DATA SHOWS THAT RES INCREASE IN THE ENERGY MIX BUT SUCH INCREASE DOES NOT REPLACE FOSSIL FUELS

Although global renewable primary energy rose by about 5.1 EJ in 2021, FF contributed to 82% of primary energy use, down from 85% five years ago and 83% in 2019 (BP, 2022). RES appears to increasingly contribute to the energy mix, but they are just boosting (or keeping constant) the overall quantity of energy generated without replacing FF (see Fig. 1). Some see addition as the necessary initial phase of transition, followed by substitution (BP, 2025). Thus, investment in RES is not enough to ensure the energy transition (King, 2012; Lazaro et al., 2022), in fact it may be misleading and even counterproductive to refer to RES investments as a "transition," since it may impede a true FF phase-out (York and Bell, 2019).

Moreover, Norway uses more RES but exports around 70% of its FF output. So, a FF phaseout is not just about decreasing FF consumption, but also decreasing FF production and export.

Figure 1. Energy consumption by source and shares



Source: own figures, data from BP (2022)

FOR LOW AND MIDDLE INCOME COUNTRIES, THE ENERGY ADDITION IS INEVITABLE BUT DOES NOT NEED TO COME FROM FOSSIL FUEL

First, the global South faces a chronic energy shortage problem. This means that increasing energy provision is critical for enhancing the wellbeing of these countries. Second, since the global South has more than 80% of the remaining FF reserves within its territory, it is likely to use such FF. Third, this is especially so since financing RES is regarded as riskier than investing in FF. Hence, Low-/Middle Income Countries (LMICs) are investing heavily in FF infrastructure and production to address development issues such as energy poverty, access and security, and fulfilling electricity demand (Nalule, 2019; La Rovere, 2020; SEI et al., 2021). However, while such investments augment energy supplies and enhance expectations of increasing GDP, they also lock in countries into a FF-based economy and may leave them with stranded assets (e.g., FF infrastructure, labour, or debt). Since LMICs have less FF infrastructure than the Global North, they may avoid such carbon

lock-in by leapfrogging to RES. Dependence on FF is not inevitable (Schaffartzik and Fischer-Kowalski, 2018).

BIG BANKS CONTINUE TO HEAVILY INVEST IN FF COMPARED TO RES


In 2024 alone, the largest 65 private banks financed FF with 869 Bn USD. JPMorgan Chase contributed alone with 53.5 Bn USD (Banking on Climate Chaos, 2025). In comparison, in 2025 the global RES debt market attracted 436 Bn USD from commercial banks (Climate Policy Initiative, 2025). This sheer difference in “leaders” shows the difference in banks’ appetite for financing FF vs RES.

INVESTMENTS IN RES BY FF COMPANIES ARE MERELY A DROP IN THE OCEAN COMPARED TO THEIR CORE BUSINESS SPENDINGS

Clean energy investment from FF companies is seen to be the core driver of transition in the FF industry (Li et al., 2022; Hartmann et al., 2021). However, compared to their investments in core business activities, investments in clean energy alternatives are trivial. On average FF companies spend less than 1% of their CAPEX outside their core business with transition leaders spending around 5%. This includes not only investments in RES but also carbon capture and storage as well as other diversification activities (e.g., electricity distribution or electric vehicle charging) (IEA, 2020).

Although sustainability reporting is becoming ever more important, particularly for publicly traded companies as they need to satisfy shareholder and investor demands, not all FF companies disclose information on their RES spendings. And more often than not, pledges do not meet their actual spendings and transition claims with FF companies justifying their FF activities using the arguments of necessitarianism and techno-optimism (Li et al., 2022; Green et al., 2021; Megura and Gunderson, 2022; InfluenceMap, 2022). Likewise, investments in RES by major FF companies have not reduced their total hydrocarbon production (see Fig. 2).

Figure 2. Average daily FF production of key companies



Source: own figure, data from annual reports

A FOCUSED POLICY ON PHASING OUT FF IS NEEDED

Instead of just focusing on RES development, a strong policy framework guiding a managed phase-out is needed. Rather than merely focusing on demand-side measures and emissions, supply-side regulations are needed. Phasing out fossil fuel requires a focused policy mix combining the removal of FF subsidies, implementation of financial instruments supporting RES, stopping investments in new FF projects, and the application of justice principles between rich and poor countries based on the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities (CBDR) and respective capabilities.

REFERENCES

- Banerjee, N.; Cushman, J. H.; Hasemyer, D.; Song, L. (2015): Exxon. The road not taken. [Brooklyn, New York?]: InsideClimate News.
- Banking on Climate Chaos (2022): Fossil Fuel Finance Report 2022.
- Boon, M. (2019): A climate of change? The oil industry and decarbonization in historical perspective. In *Business History Review* 93 (1), pp. 101–125.
- BP (2022): ‘Statistical Review of World Energy | Energy Economics’. BP Global. 2022. <https://www.bp.com/en/global/corporate/energy-economics/statistical-review-of-world-energy.html>.
- BP. (2025). Energy Outlook 2025. BP.
- Clean Energy Pipeline (2021): Banking on renewables. Top clean energy lead arrangers 2021.
- Green, J.; Hadden, J.; Hale, T.; Mahdavi, P. (2021): Transition, hedge, or resist? Understanding political and economic behavior toward decarbonization in the oil and gas industry. In *Review of International Political Economy*.
- Hartmann, J.; Inkpen, A. C.; Ramaswamy, K. (2021): Different shades of green: Global oil and gas companies and renewable energy. In *J Int Bus Stud* 52 (5), pp. 879–903.
- IEA - International Energy Agency (2020): The Oil and Gas Industry in Energy Transitions. Insights from IEA analysis.
- InfluenceMap (2022): Big Oil’s Real Agenda on Climate Change 2022. <https://influencemap.org/report/Big-Oil-s-Agenda-on-Climate-Change-2022-19585>
- King, R. (2012): Cap the grid. Post Carbon Institute. Retrieved from <https://www.postcarbon.org/publications/cap-the-grid/>
- La Rovere, E.L. (2020): The Potential Contribution of Emerging Economies to Stop Dangerous Climate Change. The Case of Brazil. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change* 11 (1).
- Lazaro, L. L. B., Soares, R. S.; Bermann, C.; Collaço, F. M. A.; Giatti, L. L. & Abram, S. (2022): Energy transition in Brazil: Is there a role for multilevel governance in a centralized energy regime? *Energy Research & Social Science*, 85, 102404.
- Li, M.; Trencher, G.; Asuka, J. (2022): The clean energy claims of BP, Chevron, ExxonMobil and Shell: A mismatch between discourse, actions and investments. In *PloS one* 17 (2), e0263596.
- Megura, M.; Gunderson, R. (2022): Better poison is the cure? Critically examining fossil fuel companies, climate change framing, and corporate sustainability reports. *Energy Research & Social Science*, 85.
- Nalule, V.R. (2019): Transitioning to a Low Carbon Economy: Is Africa Ready to Bid Farewell to Fossil Fuels? In *The Palgrave Handb. of Managing Fossil Fuels and Energy Transitions*, pp. 261–86.
- Schaffartzik, A.; Fischer-Kowalski, M. (2018): Latecomers to the Fossil Energy Transition, Frontrunners for Change? The Relevance of the Energy “underdogs” for Sustainability Transformations. *Sustainability (Switzerland)* 10 (8).
- SEI, IISD, ODI, E3G, and UNEP. (2021). The Production Gap Report 2021. <http://productiongap.org/2021report>
- York, R.; Bell, S.E. (2019): Energy Transitions or Additions? Why a Transition from Fossil Fuels Requires More than the Growth of Renewable Energy. *Energy Research & Social Science* 51, 40–43.