

# ***MIT Joint Program on the Science and Policy of Global Change***



## **Directed Technical Change and Climate Policy**

*Vincent M. Otto, Andreas Löschel and John Reilly*

**Report No. 134**

*April 2006*

The MIT Joint Program on the Science and Policy of Global Change is an organization for research, independent policy analysis, and public education in global environmental change. It seeks to provide leadership in understanding scientific, economic, and ecological aspects of this difficult issue, and combining them into policy assessments that serve the needs of ongoing national and international discussions. To this end, the Program brings together an interdisciplinary group from two established research centers at MIT: the Center for Global Change Science (CGCS) and the Center for Energy and Environmental Policy Research (CEEPR). These two centers bridge many key areas of the needed intellectual work, and additional essential areas are covered by other MIT departments, by collaboration with the Ecosystems Center of the Marine Biology Laboratory (MBL) at Woods Hole, and by short- and long-term visitors to the Program. The Program involves sponsorship and active participation by industry, government, and non-profit organizations.

To inform processes of policy development and implementation, climate change research needs to focus on improving the prediction of those variables that are most relevant to economic, social, and environmental effects. In turn, the greenhouse gas and atmospheric aerosol assumptions underlying climate analysis need to be related to the economic, technological, and political forces that drive emissions, and to the results of international agreements and mitigation. Further, assessments of possible societal and ecosystem impacts, and analysis of mitigation strategies, need to be based on realistic evaluation of the uncertainties of climate science.

This report is one of a series intended to communicate research results and improve public understanding of climate issues, thereby contributing to informed debate about the climate issue, the uncertainties, and the economic and social implications of policy alternatives. Titles in the Report Series to date are listed on the inside back cover.

Henry D. Jacoby and Ronald G. Prinn,  
*Program Co-Directors*

For more information, please contact the Joint Program Office

Postal Address: Joint Program on the Science and Policy of Global Change  
77 Massachusetts Avenue  
MIT E40-428  
Cambridge MA 02139-4307 (USA)

Location: One Amherst Street, Cambridge  
Building E40, Room 428  
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Access: Phone: (617) 253-7492  
Fax: (617) 253-9845  
E-mail: [globalchange@mit.edu](mailto:globalchange@mit.edu)  
Web site: <http://MIT.EDU/globalchange/>

# Directed Technical Change and Climate Policy

Vincent M. Otto<sup>†</sup>, Andreas Löschel<sup>‡</sup> and John Reilly<sup>\*</sup>

## Abstract

*This paper studies the cost effectiveness of climate policy if there are technology externalities. For this purpose, we develop a forward-looking CGE model that captures empirical links between CO<sub>2</sub> emissions associated with energy use, directed technical change and the economy. We find the cost-effective climate policy to include a combination of R&D subsidies and CO<sub>2</sub> emission constraints, although R&D subsidies raise the shadow value of the CO<sub>2</sub> constraint (i.e. CO<sub>2</sub> price) because of a strong rebound effect from stimulating innovation. Furthermore, we find that CO<sub>2</sub> constraints differentiated toward CO<sub>2</sub>-intensive sectors are more cost effective than constraints that generate uniform CO<sub>2</sub> prices among sectors. Differentiated CO<sub>2</sub> prices, through technical change and concomitant technology externalities, encourage growth in the non-CO<sub>2</sub> intensive sectors and discourage growth in CO<sub>2</sub>-intensive sectors. Thus, it is cost effective to let the latter bear relatively more of the abatement burden. This result is robust to whether emission constraints, R&D subsidies or combinations of both are used to reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions.*

## Contents

1. Introduction .....	1
2. Basic features of the model.....	2
2.1 Model specifications .....	3
2.2 Equilibrium and growth .....	4
3. Calibration .....	4
3.1 Accounting for knowledge capital .....	4
3.2 Data and parameter values .....	5
4. Simulations .....	6
4.1 <i>Simulation 1</i> : Differentiated CO <sub>2</sub> -emission constraints.....	6
4.2 <i>Simulation 2</i> : Differentiated R&D subsidies .....	8
4.3 <i>Simulation 3</i> : Combinations of differentiated CO <sub>2</sub> -emission constraints and differentiated R&D subsidies.....	10
4.4 Macro-economic effects .....	11
4.5 Sensitivity analysis.....	12
5. Conclusions .....	14
6. References .....	16
Appendix A. Structure and parameter values of the model.....	18
Appendix B. Data.....	27

## 1. INTRODUCTION

There is an increasing consensus that growing emissions of greenhouse gases pose a serious threat to the world. One strategy for addressing this threat is to use environmental policy such as a cap and trade system to constrain emissions; the approach envisioned in the Kyoto Protocol of the Framework Convention on Climate Change that has entered into force and will be implemented in most industrial nations beginning in 2008. The use of a cap and trade system in

---

<sup>†</sup> Environmental Economics and Natural Resources Group, Wageningen University, The Netherlands; Joint Program on the Science and Policy of Global Change, MIT, Bldg. E40-410, 77 Massachusetts Ave, Cambridge, MA

<sup>‡</sup> Institute for Prospective Technological Studies, DG Joint Research Centre, European Commission, Edificio Expo, C/ Inca Garcilaso, s/n, E-41092 Sevilla, Spain

<sup>\*</sup> Joint Program on the Science and Policy of Global Change, MIT, Bldg. E40-433, 77 Mass. Ave, Cambridge, MA

this agreement was seen as a success of economic reasoning by many, because such systems are widely heralded as generating a given level of abatement in the most “cost-effective” manner. The Bush Administration has taken the United States out of the Kyoto Protocol and instead adopted a technology policy that includes support for R&D as an alternative strategy, with the idea that without technological options to reduce greenhouse gases an emission constraint will mostly punish the economy by slowing economic growth. While such a punishment seems mostly exaggerated for “small” reductions in emissions the ultimate goal of the Framework Convention, stabilization of greenhouse gas concentrations, requires that the world economy reduces emissions by 90 to 95% from best projections of where it otherwise would be. This is untested territory, and thus the need for new technology is real if these stabilization goals are to be met. However, even recognizing that new technology is needed, one might believe that appropriate environmental policy instruments—the right emissions constraint or tax—would induce new technologies.

We study the cost effectiveness of these different strategies. If emissions are priced will that induce technical change? Can R&D subsidies achieve emission reductions, and is this strategy cheaper than using emission constraints? Are the two strategies complementary? Can one improve on uniform emission-reduction policy by differentiating policy toward relatively dirty technologies? Previous investigations of the two strategies include Jaffe *et al.* (2005) and the general equilibrium analyses of Goulder and Schneider (1999) and Popp (2004), who show that carbon taxes are cost effective when they are complemented by a R&D subsidy. In a cost-minimization setting, Rosendahl (2004) and Bramoullé and Olson (2005) demonstrate theoretically that technology externalities call for differentiation of pollution taxes. We proceed by empirically studying these different strategies in which we pay specific attention to their differentiation.

For this purpose, we develop a forward-looking computable general equilibrium (CGE) model that captures empirical links between CO<sub>2</sub> emissions associated with energy use, directed technical change and the economy. We draw on endogenous growth models of Rivera-Batiz and Romer (1991) and Acemoglu (2002) and specify technologies as stocks of knowledge capital that are sector-specific investment goods, which have associated positive externalities. We calibrate the model to the Dutch economy, where availability of investment data for knowledge capital that is consistent with the national accounting framework allows us to pay special attention to its representation in the benchmark data. Simulations are constructed to reveal cost effective combinations of CO<sub>2</sub> constraints and R&D subsidies, including the desirability of differentiating these instruments among clean and dirty sectors.

## **2. BASIC FEATURES OF THE MODEL**

This section describes the key specifications of our model. We offer a full description of the model in Appendix A.

## 2.1 Model specifications

We specify a representative consumer and producers in the following sectors: agriculture (AGR), CO<sub>2</sub>-intensive industry (IND), non-CO<sub>2</sub> intensive industry and services (SER), trade and transport (TT), energy (NRG), CO<sub>2</sub>-intensive electricity (CIE) and non-CO<sub>2</sub> intensive electricity (NCIE), where the energy sector comprises the oil- and gas industries. Agents behave rationally and have perfect foresight. A representative consumer maximizes intertemporal utility subject to the intertemporal budget constraint. Intertemporal utility is a function of the discounted sum of consumption over the time horizon. Environmental quality does not enter the utility function, implying independence of the demand functions for goods with respect to environmental quality.

Producers maximize profits over time subject to their production-possibility frontier, which are determined by nested constant-elasticity-of-substitution (CES) functions of knowledge capital, physical capital, labor, and intermediate inputs. In addition, imported coal is used in the production of CO<sub>2</sub>-intensive goods and electricity. Intermediate usage of oil, gas, and coal entail CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, which might be subject to quantity constraints, *i.e.* cap and trade systems.

Technical change is characterized by innovation possibility frontiers, which describe investment in knowledge capital in the sectors. Knowledge capital is sector specific (*c.f.* Basu and Weil, 1998). Further, technical change is a deterministic process and aggregate innovation possibility frontiers are continuous, which allows us to avoid problems due to uncertainty or integer variables.<sup>1</sup> Investments in knowledge capital merely involve final goods as input. In addition, there is positive delayed feedback in technical change in that previous investments in knowledge capital have a positive external effect on the efficiency of current investments, *i.e.* learning-by-researching (henceforth referred to as positive feedback).<sup>2</sup> We specify this positive feedback operating within each sector only but relax this assumption in the sensitivity analysis. Finally, knowledge-capital investments accumulate into stocks, which gives rise to an additional technology externality on sector production. The rationale for this externality is that, while producers can prevent others from using their knowledge capital by means of patent protection, they cannot completely prevent knowledge embodied in patents from spilling over to other producers in their sector. These two types of technology externalities lead to the result that profit maximizing firms underinvest in R&D and thus there exists a rationale to subsidize investments in knowledge capital (henceforth referred to as R&D subsidies).

Regarding international trade, domestically produced goods and physical capital are allocated between domestic and export markets. Goods traded on domestic markets are combined with imported goods into an Armington (1969) aggregate, which satisfies demand for intermediate- and final goods. An exception is coal imports, which are directly used in certain CO<sub>2</sub>-intensive industries and the CO<sub>2</sub>-intensive electricity sector. Domestic investment in physical capital is combined with foreign investment into an Armington aggregate as well, satisfying investment

---

<sup>1</sup> Even though indivisibility of knowledge capital and uncertainty related to R&D processes are facts of life, averaging out makes these facts matter less at aggregate levels (Romer, 1990).

<sup>2</sup> Rivera-Batiz and Romer (1991) dub this specification ‘knowledge-based’ in contrast to the former specification, which they dub ‘lab-equipment’ for its emphasis on physical inputs.

demand for physical capital. We do not model international trade in knowledge capital. As a small open economy, it is potentially easy for the Netherlands to meet CO<sub>2</sub>-emission constraints by specializing in non-CO<sub>2</sub> intensive sectors so that the implied emissions occur outside the economy. While that might be a realistic response for a small economy independently pursuing a CO<sub>2</sub> reduction policy, if it succeeds only by increasing emissions elsewhere there is little or no real climate benefit. The Armington specification, as opposed to a Heckscher-Ohlin formulation, closes international trade in a way that limits this leakage effect.

## **2.2 Equilibrium and growth**

Each agent solves its optimization problem. When markets clear at all points in time, the output, price and income paths constitute an equilibrium. Markets for production factors and final goods are perfectly competitive but there initially is no market for CO<sub>2</sub> emissions associated with energy use. The technology externalities support nonconvexities in the possibility frontiers and cause private and social returns to knowledge capital to diverge.

Economic growth reflects the growth rates of the labor supply and stocks of physical and knowledge capital. Growth of the labor supply is exogenous and constant over time. Growth rates of both capital stocks stem from endogenous saving and investment behavior. The economy achieves balanced growth over time with the stocks of physical and knowledge capital growing at the same rate as the labor supply.

## **3. CALIBRATION**

In this section, we describe the calibration of our model in which we pay special attention to the accounting of knowledge capital. Accounting for knowledge capital in CGE models is relatively new and, when undertaken, is typically done in a rudimentary fashion because of absence of detailed information. Because of the availability of investment data for knowledge capital in The Netherlands that is consistent with the national accounting framework, we calibrate our model to the Dutch economy. We choose 1999 as the benchmark year.

### **3.1 Accounting for knowledge capital**

To account for knowledge capital, we identify and capitalize flows associated with knowledge and subsequently incorporate these in the national accounting matrix (Statistics Netherlands, 2000). We follow De Haan and Rooijen-Horsten (2004) and identify expenditures on R&D, expenditures on education (EDU) and investments in information- and communication infrastructure (ICT) as knowledge flows.<sup>3</sup> ICT is included because of its role in disseminating and storing knowledge and is therefore an important part of the infrastructure required for knowledge capital to be productive.

---

<sup>3</sup> We are aware that this identification entails to a certain degree unavoidable randomness. There are many types of knowledge and knowledge may be embedded not only in software and books but also in *e.g.*, people and traditions. It therefore is difficult to comprehensively measure and aggregate knowledge. Yet, it is not altogether different from aggregating physical capital goods. The main difference is, of course, that it is difficult to attach a value to knowledge capital (Griliches, 1979).

To capitalize these knowledge flows, we take the following two steps. First, we create an additional (column) account registering investments in the stock of knowledge capital and an additional (row) account registering services derived from the stock. Investment in ICT is reported as investment and expenditures on R&D and education are reported as derived services. We assume the Dutch economy to be on a balanced growth path in 1999, which implies a fixed relation between investments in and services derived from the sector-specific stocks of knowledge capital. This relation gives us the total column and row accounts for knowledge capital as a result of the three knowledge flows. Second, we debit the national accounting matrix to avoid double counting. Given that investments in ICT are originally reported as investments in physical capital, we debit the investment (column) account with the amounts of investment in ICT. Expenditures on R&D and education are originally reported as intermediate consumption requiring us to debit the intermediate goods matrix. We follow Terleckyj (1974) and assume that knowledge is embodied in tangible goods and services, which allows us to debit each sector's expenditures on education and R&D from the sector's consumption of intermediate goods proportionally to its sector of origin. We balance the national accounting matrix by adjusting the (row) account for labor.

### 3.2 Data and parameter values

Besides accounting for knowledge capital, we make further data adjustments to account for CO<sub>2</sub> emissions associated with energy use. We divide the electricity sector into CO<sub>2</sub>-intensive and non-CO<sub>2</sub>-intensive electricity generation using techno-economic data for the key technologies that are sufficient to give an appropriate representation for both types of electricity generation (Böhringer, 2003). Table B.1 (see Appendix B) presents cost structures and market shares of the electricity generation technologies in The Netherlands. Further, we obtain data on fossil-fuel inputs in The Netherlands from the GTAP-EG database (Palstev and Rutherford, 2000) and match this data with CO<sub>2</sub> emission data for The Netherlands (Koch *et al.*, 2002). We classify CO<sub>2</sub>-intensive industry, trade and transport, energy and CO<sub>2</sub>-intensive electricity as CO<sub>2</sub>-intensive sectors and agriculture, non-CO<sub>2</sub> intensive industry and services and non-CO<sub>2</sub> intensive electricity as non-CO<sub>2</sub> intensive sectors. Table B.2 presents the national accounting matrix and Table B.3 reports factor- and CO<sub>2</sub> intensities.

Turning to model parameters, we use general parameter values that are standard in the literature (see Tables A.5-6 in Appendix A). Regarding international trade, however, we assume unitary substitution elasticity between domestic and foreign commodities, which is lower than is often used. This limits the leakage effect discussed above. Many of the largest trading partners of The Netherlands are implementing similar environmental policies, such as the EU emissions trading scheme, which limits effects of international trade on relative factor shares. Regarding technology-related parameters, we use a 25% depreciation rate for knowledge capital.<sup>4</sup> Pakes and Schankerman (1979) study patent renewals in the United Kingdom, Germany, France, The

---

<sup>4</sup> Alternatively, one can take the view that knowledge doesn't depreciate at all. This assumption is likely to be valid if the sector or industry under study is narrowly defined and its stock of knowledge capital changes only slowly (Griliches, 1988). This assumption is less likely to be valid, however, if one defines sectors more broadly or for periods where one might suspect more rapid obsolescence of knowledge capital such as the decades following the ICT boom.

Netherlands and Switzerland and find a point estimate for the depreciation rate of 25% with a confidence interval between 18 and 35%. This estimate is consistent with data on lifespans of applied R&D expenditures, which suggests an average service life of four to five years. More recently, Jorgenson and Stiroh (2000) have estimated a geometric depreciation rate for computer equipment and software of 31.5%. Further, we assume a positive feedback effect in technical change of 20% being the difference between the private- and social returns to knowledge capital. The former is at least equal to the 25% depreciation rate whereas estimates of the latter lie in the range of 30-60% (see *e.g.* Baumol, 2002, or Otto et al., 2006), who find a positive feedback effect of 45% with delays up to eight years). We base the coefficient value for the knowledge spillovers on Coe and Helpman (1995) who estimate the elasticity of R&D stocks on total factor productivity at 9% for non-G7 OECD countries.

Finally, we consider a 27-year time horizon, defined over the years 1999 through 2025, and calibrate the model to a balanced growth path of two percent, which serves as reference case in the simulations below.

#### 4. SIMULATIONS

We analyze cost-effectiveness of both environmental- and technology policy to reduce cumulative CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in production over the time horizon of the model by 10% relative to the reference case, where we differentiate both policies between CO<sub>2</sub>-intensive and non-CO<sub>2</sub>-intensive sectors. Environmental policy takes the form of quantity constraints for CO<sub>2</sub> emissions (*i.e.* cap and trade systems) and technology policy takes the form of R&D subsidies. To avoid leakage of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions to consumption in all simulations, we also reduce these emissions by 10% relative to the reference case using a separate quantity constraint.


##### 4.1 Simulation 1: Differentiated CO<sub>2</sub>-emission constraints

**Figure 1** shows effects of the various possibilities to differentiate the CO<sub>2</sub> emission constraint between CO<sub>2</sub>-intensive and non-CO<sub>2</sub>-intensive sectors on shadow prices of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in the sectors (lower graph) and discounted utility (upper graph). We explain this figure in several steps, starting with the horizontal axes that list percentage changes in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions of the non-CO<sub>2</sub>-intensive sectors. As a first step, we set these percentage changes exogenously and calculate the CO<sub>2</sub>-emission constraint for the CO<sub>2</sub>-intensive sectors necessary for total emissions in production to be reduced by 10%. Second, we use the model to calculate the general equilibrium result associated with each differentiation of both CO<sub>2</sub> emission constraints. The lower graph maps the corresponding sets of shadow prices for CO<sub>2</sub> emissions required to meet the sectoral emission constraints. In general, technology externalities positively affect the shadow prices. In this simulation, however, we find the shadow prices with technology externalities to exhibit negligible differences from those without technology externalities.<sup>5</sup> For this reason, we present only one curve for each sector in this graph. Yet, the technology externalities have a noticeable

---

<sup>5</sup> The difference between shadow prices with and without technology externalities is difficult to graphically detect in this simulation. Technology externalities have a positive effect on the shadow price of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions because of their positive effect on welfare and hence overall demand for energy and concomitant CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. Yet, this effect is limited in this simulation because of the deadweight losses associated to the CO<sub>2</sub> emission constraints.





**Figure 1.** Effects of differentiated CO<sub>2</sub>-emission constraints on discounted utility. Notes: CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in the CO<sub>2</sub>-intensive sectors change to the extent that overall CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in production are reduced by 10%.

effect on welfare. As a last step, therefore, we map the changes to discounted utility that correspond with each differentiation of the CO<sub>2</sub> emission constraints in the upper graph. Utility indices smaller than one imply welfare losses relative to the reference case. The upper curve shows the welfare loss if there are technology externalities whereas the lower curve shows the welfare loss if there are none. The left dashed vertical line represents the set of uniform shadow prices, which is the cost-effective (highest welfare) set if there are no technology externalities. The right dashed vertical line represents the set of differentiated shadow prices, which is the cost-effective set if there are technology externalities.

We find that the conventional result of uniform shadow prices across sectors being cost effective holds if there are no technology externalities. The 10% emission reduction in production entails a welfare loss of 0.36% over the time period and results in a shadow price of €2.25 per ton CO<sub>2</sub> in all sectors. When there are technology externalities, however, we find that welfare is higher for all differentiations of the CO<sub>2</sub> emission constraints. If the constraints can be set at different levels, we find it cost effective to differentiate the constraints toward the CO<sub>2</sub>-intensive sectors. The 10% emission reduction in production now entails a welfare loss of 0.34% over the time period and results in shadow prices of €2.30 per ton CO<sub>2</sub> in the CO<sub>2</sub>-intensive sectors and €1.60 per ton CO<sub>2</sub> in the non-CO<sub>2</sub>-intensive sectors. CO<sub>2</sub> emission constraints direct technical change toward non-CO<sub>2</sub> intensive sectors yielding relatively more technology

externalities in these sectors and therefore raising their opportunity cost of abatement. The electricity sector, for example, redirects its R&D toward biomass and wind technologies resulting in relatively more knowledge spilling over from the development of these technologies than fossil-fuel electricity technologies. Thus, it is cheaper to shift some abatement toward CO<sub>2</sub>-intensive technologies and sectors.

The bias in technical change can be best understood with help of the general framework presented by Acemoglu (2002) or the framework applied to energy biased technical change of Otto *et al.* (2005). On the supply side of the economy, CO<sub>2</sub>-emission constraints give rise to a substitution effect in production in that knowledge capital substitutes for fossil fuels raising the profitability of investing in knowledge capital in the CO<sub>2</sub>-intensive sectors. On the demand side, however, CO<sub>2</sub>-emission constraints give rise to a substitution effect in consumption as consumers shift toward non-CO<sub>2</sub>-intensive goods raising the profitability of investing in knowledge capital in the non-CO<sub>2</sub>-intensive sectors. When introducing CO<sub>2</sub> emission constraints, we find the demand side to be relatively important as substitution in consumption is necessary for cost-effective emission reduction. Technology externalities reinforce the bias.


#### **4.2 Simulation 2: Differentiated R&D subsidies**

We now study R&D subsidies as our instrument to reduce overall CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in production by 10% relative to the reference case. **Figure 2** shows effects of the various possibilities to differentiate the CO<sub>2</sub> emission reduction between CO<sub>2</sub>-intensive and non-CO<sub>2</sub>-intensive sectors on required R&D subsidies (lower graph) and discounted utility (upper graph). We obtain Figure 2 in a similar fashion as Figure 1 except that we now compute R&D subsidy rates instead of shadow prices of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in general equilibrium. Finally, the left dashed vertical line represents the set of uniform R&D subsidies and the right dashed vertical line represents the set of differentiated R&D subsidies.

We find that R&D subsidies can also achieve the 10% emission reduction in production. In fact, differentiating R&D subsidies toward non-CO<sub>2</sub> intensive sectors not only can reduce emissions but also increases welfare compared to the reference case. **Table 1** shows that compared to the hypothetical reference case, however, using R&D subsidies to achieve the emission reduction always entails a welfare loss as R&D subsidies are a first-best instrument to internalize technology externalities but a second-best instrument to reduce emissions.

The cost-effective set of R&D subsidies yields a welfare gain of 11.6% over the time period and comprises an R&D subsidy of 48% in the non-CO<sub>2</sub>-intensive sectors and an R&D *tax* of 36% in the CO<sub>2</sub>-intensive sectors. Although the introduction of an R&D subsidy in the non-CO<sub>2</sub>-intensive sectors has a negative effect on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions because of substitution effects in production and consumption, the R&D subsidy also gives rise to a strong rebound effect that offsets the substitution effects. As the R&D subsidy lowers the marginal costs of non-CO<sub>2</sub>-intensive goods, it indirectly increases demand for these goods and the concomitant demand for energy and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. More importantly, by internalizing some of the technology externalities as well, the R&D subsidy increases welfare leading to an overall higher demand for

energy and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions that strengthens the rebound effect. If R&D subsidies are the sole instruments of choice, an R&D *tax* in CO<sub>2</sub>-intensive sectors is thus preferred in the cost-effective solution to keep overall emissions within bounds.<sup>6</sup> Essentially, the policy is one of supporting growth of non-CO<sub>2</sub> intensive sectors while slowing it in CO<sub>2</sub>-intensive sectors. Introducing R&D subsidies in all sectors is feasible albeit cost ineffective in achieving the emission reduction.



**Figure 2.** Effects of differentiated R&D subsidies on discounted utility. Notes: CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in the CO<sub>2</sub>-intensive sectors change to the extent that overall CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in production are reduced by 10%.


**Table 1.** Effects of policies on discounted utility (percent change from reference).

	% change from:	original reference	hypothetical reference
<b>reference cases</b>			
original		0.00	-28.20
hypothetical with correction for technology externalities		28.20	0.00
<b>simulations</b>			
differentiated CO <sub>2</sub> -emission constraints		-0.34	-28.54
differentiated R&D subsidies to reduce CO <sub>2</sub> emissions		11.60	-16.60
combinations of differentiated CO <sub>2</sub> -emission constraints and differentiated R&D subsidies		27.08	-1.12

<sup>6</sup> This finding is in line with other studies. Popp (2004), for example, finds that subsidizing energy R&D yields significant increases in energy technology but nevertheless has little effect on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions.

### 4.3 Simulation 3: Combinations of differentiated CO<sub>2</sub>-emission constraints and differentiated R&D subsidies

We next study combinations of CO<sub>2</sub> emission constraints and R&D subsidies as our instruments to abate CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in production by 10% relative to the reference case. For this purpose, we augment the first simulation by introducing combinations of differentiated R&D subsidies before computing the general equilibrium associated with each differentiation of the CO<sub>2</sub> emission constraints. This way we can identify both the cost-effective set of differentiated CO<sub>2</sub> emission constraints and the efficient set of differentiated R&D subsidies. Figure 3 shows effects of the various possibilities to differentiate the CO<sub>2</sub> emission constraint between CO<sub>2</sub>-intensive- and non-CO<sub>2</sub>-intensive sectors on shadow prices of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in the sectors (lower graph) and discounted utility (upper graph) when the efficient set of R&D subsidies is introduced next to the CO<sub>2</sub>-emission constraints.



**Figure 3.** Effects of cost-effective set of differentiated CO<sub>2</sub> emission constraints and differentiated R&D subsidies on discounted utility. Notes: CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in the CO<sub>2</sub>-intensive sectors change to the extent that overall CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in production are reduced by 10 percent.

Emission reduction is cost effective if R&D subsidies complement rather than substitute for CO<sub>2</sub> emission constraints. The cost-effective set of instruments yields a welfare gain of 27.1% over the time period and comprises R&D subsidies of 62% and 52% in the CO<sub>2</sub>-intensive and non-CO<sub>2</sub>-intensive sectors as well as shadow prices of €15.40 and €4.20 per ton CO<sub>2</sub> in the respective sectors. Of course, the emission reduction still comes at a cost when compared to the hypothetical reference case in which we would already correct for the technology externalities (see Table 1). Compared with this hypothetical case, welfare falls by 1.12% over the time period, which is significantly more than the 0.34% welfare loss in the case where we do not yet make such a correction (see the first simulation). The CO<sub>2</sub> emission constraints are more binding when the technology externalities are already corrected and hence they entail a bigger deadweight loss.

Regarding differentiation of the policy instruments, we find that continued differentiation remains a feature of the cost-effective policy in this simulation because of interacting policy effects. The CO<sub>2</sub> emission constraints are principally introduced to reduce emissions but also induce technical change and concomitant technology externalities. Similarly, R&D subsidies correct for the technology externalities but at the same time affect CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. The R&D subsidies are now differentiated toward CO<sub>2</sub>-intensive sectors, as they are in the hypothetical reference case in which we just correct technology externalities without regard for emission reduction, and subsequently direct technical change toward these sectors. CO<sub>2</sub> shadow prices remain differentiated in this simulation as technology externalities, and hence the opportunity costs of abatement, remain higher in non-CO<sub>2</sub> intensive sectors because of their initial size and knowledge intensity. Compared to the first simulation though, the difference in shadow prices narrows while shadow prices increase in magnitude because of the CO<sub>2</sub>-emission constraints being more binding.

#### **4.4 Macro-economic effects**

**Table 2** shows that the three simulations have different macro-economic effects besides having different welfare implications. Contracted growth characterizes the first simulation with CO<sub>2</sub> emission constraints. Except for non-CO<sub>2</sub>-intensive industry and services, all sectors lower their production relative to the reference case, where CO<sub>2</sub>-intensive sectors decrease their production relatively more as they are subject to the more stringent CO<sub>2</sub> emission constraints. With respect to inputs to production, the factor substitution effect in production increases marginal returns to factors other than energy, where the marginal return to physical capital increases to the extent that investments in physical capital actually increase slightly relative to the reference case. Foreign investment changes accordingly. International trade in goods falls proportionally to domestic trade as we assume trading partners of The Netherlands to introduce similar CO<sub>2</sub> emissions abatement policies. Biased growth characterizes the second simulation with R&D subsidies. By using R&D subsidies in non-CO<sub>2</sub> intensive sectors and R&D taxes in CO<sub>2</sub>-intensive sectors, one speeds up growth in the former while slowing it in the latter. The production structure, for example, shifts markedly from CO<sub>2</sub>-intensive to non-CO<sub>2</sub>-intensive goods. Although increased welfare and limited substitution possibilities in the economy lessen

**Table 2.** Effects of CO<sub>2</sub>-reduction policies on the Dutch economy (percentage changes).

<i>Simulation:</i>		<i>1</i>			<i>2</i>			<i>3</i>		
		2005	2015	2025	2005	2015	2025	2005	2015	2025
Production	Total	-0.4	-0.6	-0.9	30.9	44.8	45.2	47.6	77.3	96.0
CO <sub>2</sub> intensive	IND	-0.7	-1.3	-2.0	-7.7	-7.4	-26.5	88.6	137.0	167.5
	TT	-0.7	-1.3	-2.0	-9.0	-12.7	-37.1	36.4	61.1	75.0
	NRG	-4.6	-7.2	-10.9	-10.6	-7.0	-27.5	12.7	25.8	21.1
	CIE	-1.1	-1.8	-2.8	-6.5	-1.0	-9.4	46.2	73.9	81.3
Non-CO <sub>2</sub> intensive	AGR	-0.6	-1.2	-1.8	16.2	21.4	-8.6	20.1	58.9	83.3
	SER	0.1	0.2	0.3	48.3	73.8	89.0	50.7	78.6	97.6
	NCIE	-0.3	-0.6	-0.8	22.6	30.8	16.4	31.9	70.9	95.9
Investments in knowledge capital	Total	-0.2	-0.3	-0.5	243.6	279.1	310.1	337.0	491.8	600.8
CO <sub>2</sub> intensive	IND	-0.9	-1.6	-2.2	-36.7	-41.6	-52.6	650.6	959.4	1191.7
	TT	-1.0	-1.7	-2.4	-36.4	-46.6	-61.1	365.0	541.5	633.6
	NRG	-5.2	-8.1	-11.5	-41.4	-41.3	-53.8	235.2	370.5	363.5
	CIE	-1.2	-1.9	-2.7	-39.0	-34.6	-38.7	403.6	616.3	696.0
Non-CO <sub>2</sub> intensive	AGR	-0.9	-1.4	-2.1	169.2	177.1	77.6	167.0	362.4	472.2
	SER	0.0	0.2	0.2	320.3	367.9	415.5	303.3	435.1	533.2
	NCIE	-0.4	-0.6	-0.8	180.2	222.4	159.4	193.6	412.7	535.2
Investments in physical capital		1.0	1.6	2.0	37.9	86.0	122.5	37.3	40.9	49.3
Exports of goods		-0.9	-1.7	-2.6	0.8	-3.0	-38.2	30.2	57.3	73.6
Imports of goods		-0.6	-1.0	-1.5	3.8	11.1	3.9	31.4	56.1	69.7
Foreign investment		0.8	1.3	1.5	12.8	51.3	77.7	38.0	42.8	50.8
Shadow price of CO <sub>2</sub> emissions	CI	2.3	2.3	2.3				15.4	15.4	15.4
	NCI	1.6	1.6	1.6				4.2	4.2	4.2
Subsidy on investments in knowledge capital	CI				-0.36	-0.36	-0.36	0.62	0.62	0.62
	NCI				0.48	0.48	0.48	0.52	0.52	0.52

Notes: Shadow prices of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are in €/t CO<sub>2</sub>. AGR is agriculture, IND is CO<sub>2</sub>-intensive industry, TT is the trade and transport sector, SER is non-CO<sub>2</sub> intensive industry and services, NRG is the energy sector, CIE is CO<sub>2</sub>-intensive electricity and NCIE is non-CO<sub>2</sub> intensive electricity. CI refers to CO<sub>2</sub>-intensive sectors and NCI to non-CO<sub>2</sub> intensive sectors.

the negative impact for the CO<sub>2</sub>-intensive sectors for the first half of the model horizon, these sectors are hit hard afterwards when more substitution has been taking place and path dependency in technical change is strong. Further, more physical capital is required to expand the non-CO<sub>2</sub>-intensive sectors and as a result investments in physical capital increase. Foreign investments change accordingly. Finally, more goods are now imported and fewer goods exported. Enhanced growth characterizes the third simulation with both CO<sub>2</sub> emission constraints and R&D subsidies. Because of the introduction of R&D subsidies in all sectors, total factor productivity and hence production levels increase throughout the economy relative to the reference case. As a result, demand for production factors increases as is reflected in, among others, increased investment in physical capital. Foreign investments and international trade in goods change accordingly.

#### 4.5 Sensitivity analysis

**Table 3** reports the sensitivity of our results to key parameter values. We use central parameter values in all sensitivity simulations (see Tables A.5-6 in Appendix A) except for the

parameter subject to analysis. Given the importance of technical change for our findings, we focus on technology parameters, which simultaneously are a good proxy for the knowledge-capital accounting. Effects are reported as index values compared to the regular simulations.

The general result from Table 3 is that our findings are robust to the range of parameter values considered. The cost-effective set of instruments still includes R&D subsidies as complements to, rather than substitutes for, CO<sub>2</sub> emission constraints while the cost-effective differentiation remains unchanged (no index value changes sign).

Turning to the specific parameters subject to analysis, lowering the depreciation rate of knowledge capital ( $\delta^H$ ) by 25% has a negative effect on discounted utility in all simulations as fewer investments in knowledge capital are required yielding less positive feedback in technical change.<sup>7</sup> The overall decrease of technology externalities reduces the relative opportunity cost of CO<sub>2</sub> abatement in the non-CO<sub>2</sub>-intensive sectors and hence the cost-effective differentiation of the CO<sub>2</sub> emission constraints in the third simulation. As R&D subsidies fall relatively more in non-CO<sub>2</sub>-intensive sectors in the third simulation, the gap between R&D subsidies widens. In the second simulation, this gap widens as well albeit for a different reason. Bigger stocks of knowledge capital enhance total factor productivity and the rebound effect, *ceteris paribus*. It therefore is cost effective to further differentiate R&D subsidies to keep emissions within bounds. The opposite holds if we increase the depreciation rate of knowledge capital by 25%.

**Table 3.** Piecemeal sensitivity analysis.

Simulation:	Discounted utility			Cost-effective differentiation of instruments			
	1	2	3	1	2	3	
	$U$	$U$	$U$	$p_{CI}^{EM} - p_{NCI}^{EM}$	$s_{CI} - s_{NCI}$	$p_{CI}^{EM} - p_{NCI}^{EM}$	$s_{CI} - s_{NCI}$
Regular simulation	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
$\delta^H$ low	1.00	0.99	0.97	1.00	1.09	0.93	1.10
$\delta^H$ high	1.00	1.01	1.02	1.00	0.92	1.04	0.90
$\xi$ low	1.00	0.95	0.93	1.00	0.93	0.99	1.10
$\xi$ high	1.00	1.09	1.13	1.00	1.05	1.01	0.80
$\xi$ uniform	1.00	0.99	1.00	1.00	1.59	0.86	0.90
$\sigma^H$ low	1.00	0.96	0.94	1.00	0.91	1.00	1.20
$\sigma^H$ high	1.00	1.05	1.07	1.00	1.27	1.01	0.70

Notes: All numbers are indexed to the regular simulation. Results in Simulation 1 are robust at the 1% precision level.

Simulation 1 refers to differentiated CO<sub>2</sub>-emission constraints; Simulation 2 to differentiated R&D subsidies; Simulation 3 to combinations of differentiated CO<sub>2</sub>-emission constraints and differentiated R&D subsidies. Low and high refer to 25% lower and higher parameter values than in the regular simulation and uniform refers to positive feedback in technical change being specified to operate across sectors.  $U$  denotes discounted utility,  $p^{EM}$  denotes the shadow price of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and  $s$  denotes the R&D subsidies.

Lowering the positive-feedback effect in technical change ( $\xi$ ) by 25% has a negative effect on discounted utility in all simulations as fewer technology externalities are enjoyed. The

<sup>7</sup> At the same time, lower depreciation rates lead to bigger stocks of knowledge capital yielding more knowledge spillovers. This positive welfare effect, however, is outweighed by the negative welfare effect of less positive feedback in technical change.

decrease of technology externalities reduces the relative opportunity cost of CO<sub>2</sub> abatement in non-CO<sub>2</sub>-intensive sectors and hence the cost-effective differentiation of R&D subsidies in the second simulation and of CO<sub>2</sub> emission constraints in the third simulation. As R&D subsidies fall relatively more in non-CO<sub>2</sub> intensive sectors in the third simulation, the gap between R&D subsidies widens. The opposite holds if we increase the positive-feedback effect by 25%.

Specifying a positive feedback in technical change to operate across rather than within sectors has a small negative effect on discounted utility, especially in the second simulation, as technology externalities in the non-CO<sub>2</sub>-intensive sectors now also benefit CO<sub>2</sub>-intensive sectors requiring a higher R&D tax in the latter to keep emissions within bounds. Consequently, the cost-effective differentiation of R&D subsidies widens in the second simulation. In the third simulation, however, the cost-effective differentiation of both policy instruments narrows as positive feedback benefits all sectors while the policy instruments are used for their first-best purpose.

Finally, lowering the substitution elasticity between knowledge capital and other factors in production ( $\sigma^h$ ) by 25% has a negative effect on discounted utility in especially the second- and third simulations as substitution possibilities to adjust to the CO<sub>2</sub> abatement are limited. Moreover, the limited substitution possibilities translate into lower demands for knowledge capital and therefore fewer technology externalities. Consequently, changes in model results are similar to the analysis in which we changed the height of the positive-feedback effect.

## 5. CONCLUSIONS

Recent interest has arisen with respect to the role of induced innovation in environmental policy, particularly regarding climate change. The Kyoto Protocol that many industrial countries are pursuing relies on a conventional cap and trade system to constrain emissions. The US has withdrawn and has instead adopted technology policy as an alternative strategy with the intent of directing R&D to reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. The questions we addressed in this paper are: Which strategy is preferred from a welfare perspective or does a combination of both strategies work better? Can one improve on uniform emission-reduction policy by differentiating policy toward CO<sub>2</sub>-intensive sectors?

To answer these questions, we developed a forward-looking computable general equilibrium model that captures empirical links between CO<sub>2</sub> emissions associated with energy use, directed technical change and the economy. We specified technologies as knowledge capital, which are sector-specific investment goods and which empirical research has long found to cause positive technology externalities leading to underinvestment relative to what is socially optimal.

At this point, it is necessary to add some policy reality to the discussion. If policies can be designed to correct for technology externalities the economy can gain substantially. We show this to be the case, such that welfare in the Dutch economy under study can be improved by nearly 30% over our 27-year time span. We find that R&D subsidies that are optimally differentiated to achieve a 10% reduction in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions improve the economy by about 12% relative to the reference case where technology externalities are not yet internalized. This appears



to be a double-dividend world where CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are reduced while leaving the economy better off. The difficulty, however, is how to design such technology policy in reality. The unrealized 30% welfare gain from the technology externalities is evidence of the difficulty of correcting for them. Our best past efforts, patent protection and government funded R&D, leave us with significant underinvestment. To realize the emission reduction requires that we overcome the known limits of government funding and intellectual property rights protection and then direct technology policy toward non-CO<sub>2</sub>-intensive sectors. Our results suggest that the differential policy to achieve the emission reduction needs to be very strong. Essentially, it means creating disincentives for R&D in CO<sub>2</sub>-intensive sectors causing them to wither away, and creating large subsidies for non-CO<sub>2</sub>-intensive sectors, accelerating their growth. If it is possible to ideally correct for the technology externalities, we find that the preferred policy is to do so in combination with CO<sub>2</sub> emission constraints, *i.e.* cap and trade systems. These constraints are costly to the economy relative to the case where technology externalities are corrected for without reducing emissions, but a combination is much preferred to R&D subsidies alone or emission constraints alone.

Regardless of the particular instruments chosen, we find that technology externalities call for differentiation of instruments between non-CO<sub>2</sub>-intensive and CO<sub>2</sub>-intensive sectors, such that the latter bear relatively more of the abatement burden. Essentially such differentiation partly corrects for the CO<sub>2</sub> implications of the technology externalities. The welfare gain for differentiated emission constraints is relatively small compared with uniform constraints. The gain is large for the differentiation of R&D subsidies; in fact, uniform R&D subsidies are negative in all sectors, essentially slowing economic growth to achieve the emission reduction with highly negative welfare effects relative to the reference case or the cases involving emission constraints.

Thus, is a true double dividend possible? In principle differentiated R&D subsidies with or without CO<sub>2</sub> emission constraints lead to that result, relative to the reference case. However, if we can design such precise incentives for R&D we might as well compare our situation to a reference case where technology externalities are already corrected without regard to emission reduction. Compared to the “R&D corrected” reference case, emission constraints entail a larger welfare loss than does the “emission constraints only case” relative to the reference case where technology externalities are not yet corrected. So, the answer depends in part on perspective and in large part on the confidence one has that public policy can effectively direct R&D.

## **Acknowledgements**

We would like to thank Ekko van Ierland, Tinus Pulles, Toon van Harmelen, Ian Sue Wing, Gilbert Metcalf and several seminar participants at MIT, RFF and Dartmouth for helpful comments. The usual disclaimer applies.

## 6. REFERENCES

- Acemoglu, D. (2002), Directed Technical Change. *Review of Economic Studies*, **69**(4): 81-109.
- Armington, P.S. (1969), A Theory of Demand for Products Distinguished by Place of Production. IMF Staff Papers, 16, p.159-178.
- Basu, S., and D.N. Weil (1998), Appropriate Technology and Growth. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, **113**(4): 1025-1054.
- Baumol, W.J. (2002), *The Free-Market Innovative Machine: Analyzing the Growth Miracle of Capitalism*. Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- Beaudry, P., and E. van Wincoop (1996), The Intertemporal Elasticity of Substitution: An Exploration Using a U.S. Panel of State Data. *Economica*, **63**(251): 495-512.
- Böhringer, C., T. Hoffmann and A. Löschel (2003), Dismantling Nuclear Power in Europe: Macroeconomic and Environmental Impacts. Discussion Paper 03-15, Centre for European Economic Research, Mannheim.
- Bramoullé, Y., and L.J. Olson (2005), Allocation of Pollution Abatement under Learning by Doing. *Journal of Public Economics*, **89**: 1935-1960.
- Coe, D.T., and E. Helpman (1995), International R&D Spillovers. *European Economic Review*, **39**(5): 859-887.
- Ferris, M.C., and T.S. Munson (2000), Complementarity Problems in GAMS and the PATH Solver. *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control*, **24**(2): 165-188.
- Goulder, L.H. and S.H. Schneider (1999), Induced Technological Change and the Attractiveness of CO<sub>2</sub> Abatement Policies. *Resource and Energy Economics*, **21**: 211-253.
- Griliches, Z. (1979), Issues in Assessing the Contribution of Research and Development to Productivity Growth. *Bell Journal of Economics*, **10**(1): 92-116.
- Griliches, Z. (1988), Productivity Puzzles and R&D: Another Nonexplanation. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, **2**(4): 9-21.
- Haan, M. de, and M. van Rooijen-Horsten (2004), Knowledge Indicators Based on Satellite Accounts. Final report for NESIS - work package 5.1, CBS, The Hague.
- Hall, R.E. (1988), Intertemporal Substitution in Consumption. *Journal of Political Economy*, **96**(2): 339-357.
- Jaffe, A.B., R.G. Newell and R.N. Stavins (2005), A Tale of Two Market Failures: Technology and Environmental Policy. *Ecological Economics*, **54**: 164-174.
- Jorgenson, D.W., and K.J. Stiroh (2000), Raising the Speed Limit: U.S. Economic Growth in the Information Age. *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, **1**: 125-211.
- Koch, W.W.R., A.K. van Harmelen, P.W.H.G. Coenen and G. van Grootveld (2002), Emission Monitor for the Netherlands. Environmental Monitor Nr.5, Inspectorate for Environmental Protection, Den Haag.
- Otto, V.M., T. Kuosmanen and E.C. van Ierland (2006), Estimating Feedback in Technical Change: A Frontier Approach. FEEM Working Paper No. 27-2006, Milano.
- Ottos, V.M., A. Löschel and R.B. Dellink (2005), Energy Biased Technical Change: A CGE Analysis, FEEM Working Paper No. 90-2005, Milano.

- Pakes, A., and M. Schankerman (1979), The Rate of Obsolescence of Knowledge, Research Gestation Lags, and the Private Rate of Return to Research Resources. NBER Working Paper 346, Cambridge, MA.
- Paltsev, S., and T.F. Rutherford (2000), GTAP-Energy in GAMS: The Dataset and Static Model. Department of Economics Working Paper 00-02, University of Colorado, Boulder.
- Popp, D. (2004), R&D Subsidies and Climate Policy: Is There a “Free Lunch”? NBER Working Paper 10880, Cambridge, MA, forthcoming in *Climatic Change*.
- Rivera-Batiz, L.A., and P.M. Romer (1991), Economic Integration and Endogenous Growth. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, **106**(2): 531-555.
- Romer, P.M. (1990), Endogenous Technological Change. *Journal of Political Economy*, **98**(5): S71-S102.
- Rosendahl, K.E. (2004), Cost-Effective Environmental Policy: Implications of Induced Technological Change. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, **48**(3): 1099-1121.
- Rutherford, T.F. (1999), Applied General Equilibrium Modeling with MPSGE as a GAMS Subsystem: An Overview of the Modeling Framework and Syntax. *Computational Economics*, **14**: 1-46.
- Statistics Netherlands (1990), Tax Incidence in the Netherlands: Accounting and Simulations. Statistics Netherlands report M42, SDU Publishers, The Hague.
- Statistics Netherlands (2000), Nationale Rekeningen 1999. Voorburg/Heerlen.
- Terleckyj, N. (1974), Effects of R&D on Productivity Growth of Industries: An Exploratory Study. National Planning Association, Washington D.C.

## APPENDIX A. STRUCTURE AND PARAMETER VALUES OF THE MODEL

This appendix provides an algebraic summary of the model. We formulate the model as a mixed-complementarity problem using the Mathematical Programming System for General Equilibrium Analysis (Rutherford, 1999), which is a subsystem of the General Algebraic Modeling System (Ferris and Munson, 2000). In this approach, three classes of equilibrium conditions characterize an economic equilibrium: zero-profit conditions for production activities, market clearance conditions for each primary factor and good, and an income definition for the representative consumer. The fundamental unknowns of the system are activity levels, market prices, and the income level. The zero profit conditions exhibit complementary slackness with respect to associated activity levels, the market clearance conditions with respect to market prices, and the income definition equation with respect to the income of the representative consumer. The notation  $\Pi^z$  denotes the zero profit condition for activity  $z$  and the orthogonality symbol  $\perp$  associates variables with complementary slackness conditions. For the sake of transparency, we use the acronyms CES (constant elasticity of substitution), CD (Cobb Douglas), and LT (Leontief) to indicate functional form. Differentiating profit and expenditure functions with respect to input and output prices provides compensated demand and supply coefficients (Hotelling's lemma), which appear subsequently in the market clearance conditions. An equilibrium allocation determines production levels, relative prices, and incomes. We choose the price of intertemporal utility as numeraire and report all prices in present values. **Tables A.1** through **A.6** list the nomenclature.

### A.1 Zero profit conditions

Production of goods:

$$\Pi_{i,t}^Y \equiv \overline{H}_{i,t}^{-\gamma} CES\left(r_{i,t}^H, p_{i,t}^{KLEM}; \sigma^H\right) - p_{i,t} \geq 0 \quad \perp Y_{i,t} \quad i = 1, \dots, I; t = 1, \dots, T \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where

$$p_{i,t}^{KLEM} = CES\left(p_{i,t}^A, CES\left(p_{i,t}^{KE}, w_t; \sigma_i^{KLE}\right); \sigma_i^{KLEM}\right)$$

$$p_{i,t}^{KE} = CES\left(r_t^K, CES\left(p_t^{EL}, p_{i,t}^{FF}; \sigma_i^E\right); \sigma_i^{KE}\right)$$

$$p_{i,t}^{FF} = LT\left(p_{NRG,t}, p_{NCI}^{EM}\right) \quad i = AGR, SER$$

$$p_{i,t}^{FF} = LT\left(p_{NRG,t}, p_{CI}^{EM}\right) \quad i = TT, NRG$$

$$p_{i,t}^{FF} = CES\left(LT\left(p_{NRG,t}, p_{CI}^{EM}\right), LT\left(p_t^{COAL}, p_{CI}^{EM}\right); \sigma_i^{FF}\right) \quad i = CII, CIE$$

Aggregate production of electricity:

$$\Pi_t^{EL} \equiv CES(p_{i,t}; \sigma^{EL}) - p_t^{EL} \geq 0 \quad \perp EL_t \quad i \in EL; t = 1, \dots, T \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Investments in knowledge capital:

$$\Pi_{i,t}^R \equiv \bar{R}_{i,t-1}^{-\xi} p_{i,t} (1 - s^c) - p_{i,t+1}^H = 0 \quad \perp R_{i,t} \quad i \in c; t = 1, \dots, T-1 \quad (\text{A.3})$$

$$\Pi_{i,T}^R \equiv \bar{R}_{i,T-1}^{-\xi} p_{i,T} (1 - s^c) - p_i^{TH} = 0 \quad \perp R_{i,T} \quad i \in c$$

Stock of knowledge capital:

$$p_{i,t}^H = r_{i,t}^H + (1 - \delta^H) p_{i,t+1}^H \quad \perp H_{i,t} \quad \begin{matrix} i = 1, \dots, I; \\ t = 1, \dots, T-1 \end{matrix} \quad (\text{A.4})$$

$$p_{i,T}^H = r_{i,T}^H + p_i^{TH} \quad \perp H_{i,T} \quad i = 1, \dots, I$$

Investments in physical capital:

$$\Pi_t^I \equiv CD(p_{i,t}, CES(r_t^K, p_t^{FDI}; \sigma^A)) - p_{t+1}^K = 0 \quad \perp I_t \quad t = 1, \dots, T-1 \quad (\text{A.5})$$

$$\Pi_T^I \equiv CD(p_{i,T}, CES(r_T^K, p_T^{FDI}; \sigma^A)) - p^{TK} = 0 \quad \perp I_T$$

Stock of physical capital:

$$p_t^K = r_t^K + (1 - \delta^K) p_{t+1}^K \quad \perp K_t \quad t = 1, \dots, T-1 \quad (\text{A.6})$$

$$p_T^K = r_T^K + p^{TK} \quad \perp K_T$$

Armington aggregate:

$$\Pi_{i,t}^A \equiv CES(p_{i,t}^{IM}, CES(p_{j,t}; \sigma_i^M); \sigma^A) - p_{i,t}^A \geq 0 \quad \perp A_{i,t} \quad \begin{cases} i = 1, \dots, I; j \notin E; \\ t = 1, \dots, T \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.7})$$

Imports of goods:

$$\Pi_{i,t}^{IM^Y} \equiv p_t^{FX} - p_t^{IM} \geq 0 \quad \perp IM_{i,t}^Y \quad i = 1, \dots, I; t = 1, \dots, T \quad (\text{A.8})$$

Imports of coal:

$$\Pi_t^{IM^{COAL}} \equiv p_t^{FX} - p_t^{COAL} \geq 0 \quad \perp IM_t^{COAL} \quad t = 1, \dots, T \quad (\text{A.9})$$

Foreign direct investment:

$$\Pi_t^{FDI} \equiv p_t^{FX} - p_t^{FDI} \geq 0 \quad \perp FDI_t \quad t = 1, \dots, T \quad (\text{A.10})$$

Exports of goods:

$$\Pi_t^{EX^Y} \equiv CD(p_t^{EL}, p_{i,t}) - p_t^{EX} \geq 0 \quad \perp EX_t^Y \quad i \notin EL; t = 1, \dots, T \quad (\text{A.11})$$

Exports of physical capital:

$$\Pi_t^{EX^K} \equiv r_t^K - p_t^{FX} \geq 0 \quad \perp EX_t^K \quad t = 1, \dots, T \quad (\text{A.12})$$

Intratemporal utility:

$$\Pi_t^W \equiv CES\left(p_t^{FX}, CES\left(p_{j,t}, p_t^E; \sigma_w^{YE}\right); \sigma^A\right) - p_t^W \geq 0 \quad \perp W_t \quad j \notin E; t = 1, \dots, T \quad (\text{A.13})$$

where

$$p_t^E = CES\left(p_t^{EL}, LT\left(p_{NRG,t}, p_W^{EM}\right); \sigma_w^E\right)$$

Intertemporal utility:

$$\Pi^U \equiv CES\left(p_t^W; \rho\right) - p^U = 0 \quad \perp U \quad (\text{A.14})$$

## A.2 Market clearing conditions

Goods:

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{j,t} &= \frac{\partial \Pi_{i,t}^R}{\partial p_{j,t}} R_{j,t} + \frac{\partial \Pi_t^I}{\partial p_{j,t}} I_t + \sum_i \frac{\partial \Pi_{i,t}^A}{\partial p_{j,t}} A_{i,t} \\ &\quad + \frac{\partial \Pi_t^W}{\partial p_{j,t}} W_t + \frac{\partial \Pi_t^{EX^Y}}{\partial p_{j,t}} EX_t^Y \end{aligned} \quad \perp p_{j,t} \quad j \notin E; t = 1, \dots, T \quad (\text{A.15})$$

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{j,t} &= \frac{\partial \Pi_{i,t}^R}{\partial p_{j,t}} R_{j,t} + \frac{\partial \Pi_t^I}{\partial p_{j,t}} I_t + \sum_i \frac{\partial \Pi_{i,t}^Y}{\partial p_{j,t}} Y_{i,t} \\ &\quad + \frac{\partial \Pi_t^W}{\partial p_{j,t}} W_t + \frac{\partial \Pi_t^{EX^Y}}{\partial p_{j,t}} EX_t^Y \end{aligned} \quad \perp p_{j,t} \quad j = NRG; t = 1, \dots, T$$

$$Y_{j,t} = \frac{\partial \Pi_{i,t}^R}{\partial p_{j,t}} R_{j,t} + \frac{\partial \Pi_t^I}{\partial p_{j,t}} I_t + \frac{\partial \Pi_t^{EL}}{\partial p_{j,t}} EL_t \quad \perp p_{j,t} \quad j \in EL; t = 1, \dots, T$$

Electricity:

$$EL_t = \sum_i \frac{\partial \Pi_{i,t}^Y}{\partial p_t^{EL}} Y_{i,t} + \frac{\partial \Pi_t^{EX^Y}}{\partial p_t^{EL}} EX_t^Y + \frac{\partial \Pi_t^W}{\partial p_t^{EL}} W_t \quad \perp p_t^{EL} \quad t = 1, \dots, T \quad (\text{A.16})$$

Knowledge capital (in market):

$$\frac{r_{i,t}^H H_{i,t}}{r + \delta^H} = \frac{\partial \Pi_{i,t}^Y}{\partial r_{i,t}^H} Y_{i,t} \quad \perp r_{i,t}^H \quad i = 1, \dots, I; t = 1, \dots, T \quad (\text{A.17})$$

Knowledge capital (in stock):

$$\begin{aligned}
H_{i,t=1} &= H_{0i} && \perp p_{i,t=1}^H && i = 1, \dots, I && \text{(A.18)} \\
H_{i,t} &= (1 - \delta^H) H_{i,t-1} + R_{i,t-1} && \perp p_{i,t}^H && i = 1, \dots, I; t = 2, \dots, T \\
TH_i &= (1 - \delta^H) H_{i,T} + R_{i,T} && \perp p_i^{TH} && i = 1, \dots, I
\end{aligned}$$

Physical capital (in market):

$$\frac{r_t^K K_t}{r + \delta^K} = \frac{\partial \Pi_t^I}{\partial r_t^K} I_t + \sum_i \frac{\partial \Pi_{i,t}^Y}{\partial r_t^K} Y_{i,t} + \frac{\partial \Pi_t^{EX^K}}{\partial r_t^K} EX_t^K \quad \perp r_t^K \quad t = 1, \dots, T \quad \text{(A.19)}$$

Physical capital (in stock):

$$\begin{aligned}
K_{t=1} &= K_0 && \perp p_{t=1}^K && \text{(A.20)} \\
K_t &= (1 - \delta^K) K_{t-1} + I_{t-1} && \perp p_t^K && t = 2, \dots, T \\
TK &= (1 - \delta^K) K_T + I_T && \perp p^{TK}
\end{aligned}$$

Labor:

$$L_t = \sum_i \frac{\partial \Pi_{i,t}^Y}{\partial w_t} Y_{i,t} \quad \perp w_t \quad t = 1, \dots, T \quad \text{(A.21)}$$

Coal (imports):

$$IM_t^{COAL} = \sum_i \frac{\partial \Pi_{i,t}^Y}{\partial p_t^{COAL}} Y_{i,t} \quad \perp p_t^{COAL} \quad t = 1, \dots, T \quad \text{(A.22)}$$

Import aggregate:

$$IM_{i,t}^Y = \frac{\partial \Pi_{i,t}^A}{\partial p_{i,t}^{IM}} A_{i,t} \quad \perp p_{i,t}^{IM} \quad i = 1, \dots, I; t = 1, \dots, T \quad \text{(A.23)}$$

Armington aggregate:

$$A_{i,t} = \frac{\partial \Pi_{i,t}^Y}{\partial p_{i,t}^A} Y_{i,t} \quad \perp p_{i,t}^A \quad i = 1, \dots, I; t = 1, \dots, T \quad \text{(A.24)}$$

Foreign investments:

$$FDI_t = \sum_i \frac{\partial \Pi_t^I}{\partial p_t^{FDI}} I_t \quad \perp p_t^{FDI} \quad t = 1, \dots, T \quad \text{(A.25)}$$

Foreign exchange:

$$BOP_t = \frac{\partial \Pi_t^{EX^Y}}{\partial p_t^{FX}} EX_t^Y + \frac{\partial \Pi_t^{EX^K}}{\partial p_t^{FX}} EX_t^K - \sum_i \frac{\partial \Pi_{i,t}^{IM^Y}}{\partial p_t^{FX}} IM_{i,t}^Y - \frac{\partial \Pi_t^{IM^{COAL}}}{\partial p_t^{FX}} IM_t^{COAL} - \frac{\partial \Pi_t^{FDI}}{\partial p_t^{FX}} FDI_t - \frac{\partial \Pi_t^W}{\partial p_t^{FX}} W_t \quad \perp p_t^{FX} \quad t = 1, \dots, T \quad (\text{A.26})$$

CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in consumption:

$$EM_W = \sum_t \frac{\partial \Pi_t^W}{\partial p_W^{EM}} W_t \quad \perp p_W^{EM} \quad (\text{A.27})$$

CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in production:

$$EM_c = \sum_i \sum_t \frac{\partial \Pi_{i,t}^Y}{\partial p_c^{EM}} Y_{i,t} \quad \perp p_c^{EM} \quad c = CI, NCI \quad (\text{A.28})$$

Intratemporal utility:

$$W_t = \frac{\partial \Pi_t^U}{\partial p_t^W} U \quad \perp p_t^W \quad t = 1, \dots, T \quad (\text{A.29})$$

Intertemporal utility:

$$U = \frac{B}{p^U} \quad \perp p^U \quad (\text{A.30})$$

### A.3 Income balance

$$B = \sum_i (H_{i,0} - p_i^{TH} TH_i) + K_0 - p^{TK} TK + \sum_t w_t L_t + \sum_c p_c^{EM} EM_c - \sum_c \sum_t s^c \frac{\partial \Pi_{i,t}^R}{\partial p_{i,t}^R} R_{i,t} + \sum_t p_t^{FX} BOP_t \quad (\text{A.31})$$

### A.4 Endowments

Supply of labor:

$$L_t = (1 + g)^{t-1} L_0 \quad t = 1, \dots, T \quad (\text{A.32})$$

Balance of Payments:

$$BOP_t = (1 + g)^{t-1} BOP_0 \quad t = 1, \dots, T \quad (\text{A.33})$$



## A.5 Constraints

CO<sub>2</sub> emission constraint of environmental policy in consumption:

$$EM_w = (1-a) \sum_t (1+g)^{t-1} EM_{0w} \quad (\text{A.34})$$

CO<sub>2</sub> emission constraint of environmental policy in production in Simulations 1 and 3:

$$EM_c = (1-a^c) \sum_t (1+g)^{t-1} EM_{0c} \quad c = CI, NCI \quad (\text{A.35})$$

where:

$$a EM = \sum_c EM_c$$

and in Simulation 2:

$$EM_c = \sum_t (1+g)^{t-1} EM_{0c} \quad c = CI, NCI$$

CO<sub>2</sub>-emission constraint of technology policy in simulation 2:

$$\sum_i \sum_t \frac{\partial \Pi_{i,t}^Y}{\partial p_c^{EM}} Y_{i,t} \leq (1-a^c) EM_c \quad \perp s^c \quad c = CI, NCI \quad (\text{A.36})$$

where:

$$a EM = \sum_c (1-a^c) EM_c$$

and in Simulation 3:

$$\sum_i \sum_t \frac{\partial \Pi_{i,t}^Y}{\partial p_c^{EM}} Y_{i,t} \leq EM_c \quad \perp s^c \quad c = CI, NCI$$

Terminal condition for physical capital:

$$\frac{I_T}{I_{T-1}} = \frac{W_T}{W_{T-1}} \quad \perp TK \quad (\text{A.37})$$

Terminal condition for physical capital:

$$\frac{R_{i,T}}{R_{i,T-1}} = \frac{W_T}{W_{T-1}} \quad \perp TH_i \quad (\text{A.38})$$

## A.6 Nomenclature

**Table A.1** Sets and indices.

$i$	$AGR, IND, TT, SER, NRG, CIE, NCIE$	Sectors and goods (aliased with $j$ )
$E$	$NRG, CIE, NCIE$	Energy (sectors)
$EL$	$CIE, NCIE$	Electricity (sectors)
$FF$	$COAL, NRG$	Fossil fuel (sectors)
$c$	$CI : IND, TT, NRG, CIE$ $NCI : AGR, SER, NCIE$	Sectors according to CO <sub>2</sub> intensity
$t$	$1, \dots, T$	Time periods

**Table A.2** Activity variables.

$Y_{it}$	Production of goods in sector $i$ at time $t$
$EL_t$	Aggregate production of electricity at time $t$
$H_{it}$	Stock of knowledge capital in sector $i$ at time $t$
$\overline{H}_{i,t}$	Knowledge spillover applied to sector $i$ at time $t$
$TH_i$	Terminal stock of knowledge capital in sector $i$
$R_{i,t}$	Investments in knowledge capital in sector $i$ at time $t$
$\overline{R}_{i,t}$	Feedback in technical change applied to sector $i$ at time $t$
$K_t$	Stock of physical capital at time $t$
$TK$	Terminal stock of physical capital
$I_t$	Investments in physical capital at time $t$
$A_{i,t}$	Armington aggregate of domestic- and foreign intermediate goods in sector $i$ at time $t$
$IM_{i,t}^Y$	Aggregate imports of goods in sector $i$ at time $t$
$IM_t^{COAL}$	Aggregate imports of coal at time $t$
$FDI_t$	Foreign direct investment at time $t$
$EX_t^Y$	Aggregate exports of goods at time $t$
$EX_t^K$	Aggregate exports of physical capital at time $t$
$W_t$	Intratemporal utility at time $t$
$U$	Intertemporal utility

**Table A.3** Income and endowment variables.

$B$	Budget of the representative agent
$BOP_0$	Initial Balance of Payments of the domestic representative agent
$BOP_t$	Balance of Payments of the domestic representative agent at time $t$
$H_{0i}$	Initial stock of knowledge capital in sector $i$
$K_0$	Initial stock of physical capital
$L_0$	Initial endowment of labor
$L_t$	Endowment of labor at time $t$
$EM_0$	Initial allowances of CO <sub>2</sub> emissions
$EM$	Overall allowances of CO <sub>2</sub> emissions

**Table A.4** Price variables (in present values).

$p$	Prices
$p_t^{FX}$	Price of foreign exchange at time $t$
$p^{EM}$	Shadow prices of CO <sub>2</sub> emissions
$s^c$	Subsidy on investments in knowledge capital in sectors $c$
$r_t$	Rental rate of capital at time $t$
$w_t$	Wage rate at time $t$

**Table A.5** Parameters.

Description	Value	
$a$	Abatement of CO <sub>2</sub> emissions	0.10
$\gamma$	Knowledge spillover coefficient	0.09
$\xi$	Coefficient of positive feedback in technical change	0.20
$g$	Growth rate	0.02
$r$	Interest rate	0.05
$\delta^K$	Depreciation rate of physical capital	0.05
$\delta^H$	Depreciation rate of knowledge capital	0.25

**Table A.6.** Elasticities

Description		Value						
<b>Elasticity of substitution in intertemporal utility</b>								
$\rho$	Between time periods	0.5						
<b>Elasticities of substitution in intratemporal utility</b>								
$\sigma_W^{YE}$	Between energy and other goods	0.5						
$\sigma_W^E$	Between electricity and fossil fuels	0.7						
<b>Elasticities of substitution in international trade</b>								
$\sigma^A$	Between domestic and foreign commodities	1.0						
<b>Elasticities of substitution in aggregate electricity production</b>								
$\sigma^{EL}$	Between CO <sub>2</sub> -intensive and non-CO <sub>2</sub> intensive electricity	1.0						
<b>Elasticities of substitution in production sector</b>		<b>AGR</b>	<b>IND</b>	<b>TT</b>	<b>SER</b>	<b>NRG</b>	<b>CIE</b>	<b>NCIE</b>
$\sigma^H$	Between knowledge capital and remaining inputs	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
$\sigma_i^{KLEM}$	Between intermediate inputs and remaining inputs	0.4	0.5	0.7	0.7	0.9	0.1	0.1
$\sigma_i^M$	Between intermediate inputs	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.5	0.1	0.1
$\sigma_i^{KLE}$	Between labor and remaining inputs	0.3	0.2	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.1	0.1
$\sigma_i^{KE}$	Between physical capital and energy	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7
$\sigma_i^E$	Between electricity and fossil fuels	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	
$\sigma_i^{FF}$	Between fossil fuels	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.5	

Notes: The substitution elasticities in utility are assumed. The substitution elasticity in intertemporal utility lies between smaller values typically found in time-series studies (*e.g.*, Hall, 1998) and larger values typically found in studies that also exploit cross-sectional data (*e.g.*, BwUDRY AND WINCOOP, 1996). The substitution elasticity in international trade is lower than usual to reflect introduction of similar CO<sub>2</sub> emission reduction policies by most of the trading partners of The Netherlands. We obtain the substitution elasticities in production from the TaxInc model (STATISTICS NETHERLANDS, 1990), except for the substitution elasticity between knowledge capital and remaining inputs, which we obtain from Goulder and Schneider (1999), and except the substitution elasticity in aggregate electricity production, which is assumed.

## APPENDIX B. DATA

**Table B.1** Cost and market shares of electricity technologies (%).

	<i>Cost shares</i>					<i>Market share</i>
	<i>Physical Capital</i>	<i>Labor</i>	<i>Energy</i>	<i>Intermediate inputs</i>	<i>Total</i>	
<b>CO<sub>2</sub> intensive</b>						
Natural-gas fired	24.9	5.6	62.2	7.3	100.0	56.9
Hard-coal fired	38.6	5.6	23.7	9.0	76.9	25.5
Oil-fired	46.9	2.2	40.3	10.6	100.0	7.6
<b>Non-CO<sub>2</sub> intensive</b>						
Biomass	18.8	6.6		58.5	83.9	4.6
Nuclear	59.0	5.1		17.4	81.5	4.4
Wind	86.4	19.8			106.2	1.0

Source: Böhringer *et al.* (2003)

**Table B.2** National accounting matrix for The Netherlands in 1999 (million euro).

	<i>Agriculture</i>	<i>CO<sub>2</sub>-intensive industry</i>	<i>Trade and transport</i>	<i>Non-CO<sub>2</sub> intensive industry &amp; services</i>	<i>Energy</i>	<i>CO<sub>2</sub>-intensive electricity</i>	<i>Non-CO<sub>2</sub> intensive electricity</i>	<i>Exports</i>	<i>Consumption</i>	<i>Investments in physical capital</i>	<i>Investments in knowledge capital</i>	<i>Supply changes</i>	<i>Total</i>
Agriculture	16.69	0.10	0.13	2.66	0.02		0.02	32.73	10.52	0.76	2.28	0.07	65.96
CO <sub>2</sub> -intensive industry	1.22	4.92	1.43	8.29	0.13	0.05	0.07	34.66	3.96	0.28	7.31	0.01	62.31
Trade and transport	0.62	0.65	3.14	4.03	0.23	0.01	0.02	77.38	7.06	0.51	6.87	-0.01	100.50
Non-CO <sub>2</sub> intensive industry & services	4.94	4.84	14.60	65.57	1.03	0.64	0.08	30.78	157.80	89.33	59.92	0.15	429.67
Energy	1.01	0.94	1.49	1.08	4.17	0.83		10.85	5.37	0.07	1.05	0.08	26.93
Electricity	0.55	0.63	0.57	0.73	0.05	3.32	0.39	2.07	2.20	0.01	0.60	0.00	11.13
Imports	16.58	21.01	13.75	58.18	6.06	1.26			62.90	23.59		0.25	203.56
Taxes minus subsidies	1.08	0.12	-0.98	2.40	4.60	0.38	0.06						7.66
Labor	6.91	10.90	33.23	132.72	1.23	0.76	0.09						185.84
Physical capital	13.84	10.09	25.52	87.43	8.26	2.16	0.31	0.56	16.96	3.50			168.63
Knowledge capital	2.53	8.12	7.63	66.58	1.17	0.60	0.07						86.71
<b>Total</b>	<b>65.96</b>	<b>62.31</b>	<b>100.50</b>	<b>429.67</b>	<b>26.93</b>	<b>10.01</b>	<b>1.12</b>	<b>189.02</b>	<b>266.76</b>	<b>118.04</b>	<b>78.03</b>	<b>0.54</b>	<b>1348.90</b>

Sources: Statistics Netherlands (2002), Böhringer *et al.* (2003), De Haan and Rooijen-Horsten (2004) and own calculations.

**Table B.3** Selected factor-intensities of the Dutch economy in 1999 (% of gross sectoral product)

Sector	Knowledge capital				Physical capital	Labor	CO <sub>2</sub>
	R&D	EDU	ICT	Total			
<b>Production</b>							
CO <sub>2</sub> intensive	3.2	4.8	0.7	8.7	23.0	23.1	0.08
CO <sub>2</sub> -intensive industry	8.3	4.4	0.4	13.1	16.2	17.5	0.03
Trade and transport	0.8	6.3	0.6	7.7	25.4	33.0	0.03
Energy	1.8	1.3	1.3	4.4	30.7	4.6	0.33
CO <sub>2</sub> -intensive electricity	1.3	2.4	2.3	6.0	21.6	7.6	0.19
Non-CO <sub>2</sub> intensive	3.7	8.7	1.5	13.9	20.5	28.1	<0.01
Agriculture	1.8	1.6	0.4	3.8	21.0	10.5	0.01
Non-CO <sub>2</sub> intensive industry & services	4.0	9.8	1.7	15.5	20.4	30.9	<0.01
Non-CO <sub>2</sub> intensive electricity	1.3	2.4	2.3	6.0	28.3	7.8	0.00
<b>Consumption</b>							0.01

Note: Capital intensities are respectively services derived from knowledge- and physical capital expressed as percentages of gross sectoral product. CO<sub>2</sub> intensities are CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in Mt. expressed as percentage of gross sectoral product in million euros. We obtain data on knowledge capital from De Haan and Rooijen-Horsten (2004) and data on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from the GTAP-EG database (Paltsev and Rutherford, 2000) and the Emission Monitor for The Netherlands (Koch *et al.*, 2002).

## REPORT SERIES of the MIT Joint Program on the Science and Policy of Global Change

1. **Uncertainty in Climate Change Policy Analysis**  
*Jacoby & Prinn* December 1994
2. **Description and Validation of the MIT Version of the GISS 2D Model** *Sokolov & Stone* June 1995
3. **Responses of Primary Production and Carbon Storage to Changes in Climate and Atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> Concentration** *Xiao et al.* October 1995
4. **Application of the Probabilistic Collocation Method for an Uncertainty Analysis** *Webster et al.* January 1996
5. **World Energy Consumption and CO<sub>2</sub> Emissions: 1950-2050** *Schmalensee et al.* April 1996
6. **The MIT Emission Prediction and Policy Analysis (EPPA) Model** *Yang et al.* May 1996 (*superseded* by No. 125)
7. **Integrated Global System Model for Climate Policy Analysis** *Prinn et al.* June 1996 (*superseded* by No. 124)
8. **Relative Roles of Changes in CO<sub>2</sub> and Climate to Equilibrium Responses of Net Primary Production and Carbon Storage** *Xiao et al.* June 1996
9. **CO<sub>2</sub> Emissions Limits: Economic Adjustments and the Distribution of Burdens** *Jacoby et al.* July 1997
10. **Modeling the Emissions of N<sub>2</sub>O and CH<sub>4</sub> from the Terrestrial Biosphere to the Atmosphere**  
*Liu* August 1996
11. **Global Warming Projections: Sensitivity to Deep Ocean Mixing** *Sokolov & Stone* September 1996
12. **Net Primary Production of Ecosystems in China and its Equilibrium Responses to Climate Changes**  
*Xiao et al.* November 1996
13. **Greenhouse Policy Architectures and Institutions**  
*Schmalensee* November 1996
14. **What Does Stabilizing Greenhouse Gas Concentrations Mean?** *Jacoby et al.* November 1996
15. **Economic Assessment of CO<sub>2</sub> Capture and Disposal**  
*Eckaus et al.* December 1996
16. **What Drives Deforestation in the Brazilian Amazon?**  
*Pfaff* December 1996
17. **A Flexible Climate Model For Use In Integrated Assessments** *Sokolov & Stone* March 1997
18. **Transient Climate Change and Potential Croplands of the World in the 21st Century** *Xiao et al.* May 1997
19. **Joint Implementation: Lessons from Title IV's Voluntary Compliance Programs** *Atkeson* June 1997
20. **Parameterization of Urban Sub-grid Scale Processes in Global Atmospheric Chemistry Models**  
*Calbo et al.* July 1997
21. **Needed: A Realistic Strategy for Global Warming**  
*Jacoby, Prinn & Schmalensee* August 1997
22. **Same Science, Differing Policies; The Saga of Global Climate Change** *Skolnikoff* August 1997
23. **Uncertainty in the Oceanic Heat and Carbon Uptake and their Impact on Climate Projections**  
*Sokolov et al.* September 1997
24. **A Global Interactive Chemistry and Climate Model**  
*Wang, Prinn & Sokolov* September 1997
25. **Interactions Among Emissions, Atmospheric Chemistry and Climate Change** *Wang & Prinn*  
September 1997
26. **Necessary Conditions for Stabilization Agreements**  
*Yang & Jacoby* October 1997
27. **Annex I Differentiation Proposals: Implications for Welfare, Equity and Policy** *Reiner & Jacoby* Oct. 1997
28. **Transient Climate Change and Net Ecosystem Production of the Terrestrial Biosphere**  
*Xiao et al.* November 1997
29. **Analysis of CO<sub>2</sub> Emissions from Fossil Fuel in Korea: 1961-1994** *Choi* November 1997
30. **Uncertainty in Future Carbon Emissions: A Preliminary Exploration** *Webster* November 1997
31. **Beyond Emissions Paths: Rethinking the Climate Impacts of Emissions Protocols** *Webster & Reiner* November 1997
32. **Kyoto's Unfinished Business** *Jacoby et al.* June 1998
33. **Economic Development and the Structure of the Demand for Commercial Energy** *Judson et al.* April 1998
34. **Combined Effects of Anthropogenic Emissions and Resultant Climatic Changes on Atmospheric OH**  
*Wang & Prinn* April 1998
35. **Impact of Emissions, Chemistry, and Climate on Atmospheric Carbon Monoxide** *Wang & Prinn* April 1998
36. **Integrated Global System Model for Climate Policy Assessment: Feedbacks and Sensitivity Studies**  
*Prinn et al.* June 1998
37. **Quantifying the Uncertainty in Climate Predictions**  
*Webster & Sokolov* July 1998
38. **Sequential Climate Decisions Under Uncertainty: An Integrated Framework** *Valverde et al.* September 1998
39. **Uncertainty in Atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> (Ocean Carbon Cycle Model Analysis)** *Holian* Oct. 1998 (*superseded* by No. 80)
40. **Analysis of Post-Kyoto CO<sub>2</sub> Emissions Trading Using Marginal Abatement Curves** *Ellerman & Decaux* Oct. 1998
41. **The Effects on Developing Countries of the Kyoto Protocol and CO<sub>2</sub> Emissions Trading**  
*Ellerman et al.* November 1998
42. **Obstacles to Global CO<sub>2</sub> Trading: A Familiar Problem**  
*Ellerman* November 1998
43. **The Uses and Misuses of Technology Development as a Component of Climate Policy** *Jacoby* November 1998
44. **Primary Aluminum Production: Climate Policy, Emissions and Costs** *Harnisch et al.* December 1998
45. **Multi-Gas Assessment of the Kyoto Protocol**  
*Reilly et al.* January 1999
46. **From Science to Policy: The Science-Related Politics of Climate Change Policy in the U.S.** *Skolnikoff* January 1999

Contact the Joint Program Office to request a copy. The Report Series is distributed at no charge.

## REPORT SERIES of the MIT Joint Program on the Science and Policy of Global Change

47. **Constraining Uncertainties in Climate Models Using Climate Change Detection Techniques**  
*Forest et al.* April 1999
48. **Adjusting to Policy Expectations in Climate Change Modeling** *Shackley et al.* May 1999
49. **Toward a Useful Architecture for Climate Change Negotiations** *Jacoby et al.* May 1999
50. **A Study of the Effects of Natural Fertility, Weather and Productive Inputs in Chinese Agriculture**  
*Eckaus & Tso* July 1999
51. **Japanese Nuclear Power and the Kyoto Agreement**  
*Babiker, Reilly & Ellerman* August 1999
52. **Interactive Chemistry and Climate Models in Global Change Studies** *Wang & Prinn* September 1999
53. **Developing Country Effects of Kyoto-Type Emissions Restrictions** *Babiker & Jacoby* October 1999
54. **Model Estimates of the Mass Balance of the Greenland and Antarctic Ice Sheets** *Bugnion* Oct 1999
55. **Changes in Sea-Level Associated with Modifications of Ice Sheets over 21st Century** *Bugnion* October 1999
56. **The Kyoto Protocol and Developing Countries**  
*Babiker et al.* October 1999
57. **Can EPA Regulate Greenhouse Gases Before the Senate Ratifies the Kyoto Protocol?**  
*Bugnion & Reiner* November 1999
58. **Multiple Gas Control Under the Kyoto Agreement**  
*Reilly, Mayer & Harnisch* March 2000
59. **Supplementarity: An Invitation for Monopsony?**  
*Ellerman & Sue Wing* April 2000
60. **A Coupled Atmosphere-Ocean Model of Intermediate Complexity** *Kamenkovich et al.* May 2000
61. **Effects of Differentiating Climate Policy by Sector: A U.S. Example** *Babiker et al.* May 2000
62. **Constraining Climate Model Properties Using Optimal Fingerprint Detection Methods** *Forest et al.* May 2000
63. **Linking Local Air Pollution to Global Chemistry and Climate** *Mayer et al.* June 2000
64. **The Effects of Changing Consumption Patterns on the Costs of Emission Restrictions** *Lahiri et al.* Aug 2000
65. **Rethinking the Kyoto Emissions Targets**  
*Babiker & Eckaus* August 2000
66. **Fair Trade and Harmonization of Climate Change Policies in Europe** *Viguié* September 2000
67. **The Curious Role of "Learning" in Climate Policy: Should We Wait for More Data?** *Webster* October 2000
68. **How to Think About Human Influence on Climate**  
*Forest, Stone & Jacoby* October 2000
69. **Tradable Permits for Greenhouse Gas Emissions: A primer with reference to Europe** *Ellerman* Nov 2000
70. **Carbon Emissions and The Kyoto Commitment in the European Union** *Viguié et al.* February 2001
71. **The MIT Emissions Prediction and Policy Analysis Model: Revisions, Sensitivities and Results**  
*Babiker et al.* February 2001 (*superseded* by No. 125)
72. **Cap and Trade Policies in the Presence of Monopoly and Distortionary Taxation** *Fullerton & Metcalf* Mar 2001
73. **Uncertainty Analysis of Global Climate Change Projections** *Webster et al.* March 2001  
(*superseded* by No. 95)
74. **The Welfare Costs of Hybrid Carbon Policies in the European Union** *Babiker et al.* June 2001
75. **Feedbacks Affecting the Response of the Thermohaline Circulation to Increasing CO<sub>2</sub>**  
*Kamenkovich et al.* July 2001
76. **CO<sub>2</sub> Abatement by Multi-fueled Electric Utilities: An Analysis Based on Japanese Data**  
*Ellerman & Tsukada* July 2001
77. **Comparing Greenhouse Gases** *Reilly et al.* July 2001
78. **Quantifying Uncertainties in Climate System Properties using Recent Climate Observations**  
*Forest et al.* July 2001
79. **Uncertainty in Emissions Projections for Climate Models** *Webster et al.* August 2001
80. **Uncertainty in Atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> Predictions from a Global Ocean Carbon Cycle Model**  
*Holian et al.* September 2001
81. **A Comparison of the Behavior of AO GCMs in Transient Climate Change Experiments**  
*Sokolov et al.* December 2001
82. **The Evolution of a Climate Regime: Kyoto to Marrakech** *Babiker, Jacoby & Reiner* February 2002
83. **The "Safety Valve" and Climate Policy**  
*Jacoby & Ellerman* February 2002
84. **A Modeling Study on the Climate Impacts of Black Carbon Aerosols** *Wang* March 2002
85. **Tax Distortions and Global Climate Policy**  
*Babiker et al.* May 2002
86. **Incentive-based Approaches for Mitigating Greenhouse Gas Emissions: Issues and Prospects for India** *Gupta* June 2002
87. **Deep-Ocean Heat Uptake in an Ocean GCM with Idealized Geometry** *Huang, Stone & Hill* September 2002
88. **The Deep-Ocean Heat Uptake in Transient Climate Change** *Huang et al.* September 2002
89. **Representing Energy Technologies in Top-down Economic Models using Bottom-up Information**  
*McFarland et al.* October 2002
90. **Ozone Effects on Net Primary Production and Carbon Sequestration in the U.S. Using a Biogeochemistry Model** *Felzer et al.* November 2002
91. **Exclusionary Manipulation of Carbon Permit Markets: A Laboratory Test** *Carlén* November 2002

Contact the Joint Program Office to request a copy. The Report Series is distributed at no charge.



## REPORT SERIES of the MIT *Joint Program on the Science and Policy of Global Change*

92. **An Issue of Permanence: Assessing the Effectiveness of Temporary Carbon Storage** *Herzog et al.* December 2002
93. **Is International Emissions Trading Always Beneficial?** *Babiker et al.* December 2002
94. **Modeling Non-CO<sub>2</sub> Greenhouse Gas Abatement** *Hyman et al.* December 2002
95. **Uncertainty Analysis of Climate Change and Policy Response** *Webster et al.* December 2002
96. **Market Power in International Carbon Emissions Trading: A Laboratory Test** *Carlén* January 2003
97. **Emissions Trading to Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions in the United States: The McCain-Lieberman Proposal** *Paltsev et al.* June 2003
98. **Russia's Role in the Kyoto Protocol** *Bernard et al.* June 2003
99. **Thermohaline Circulation Stability: A Box Model Study** *Lucarini & Stone* June 2003
100. **Absolute vs. Intensity-Based Emissions Caps** *Ellerman & Sue Wing* July 2003
101. **Technology Detail in a Multi-Sector CGE Model: Transport Under Climate Policy** *Schafer & Jacoby* July 2003
102. **Induced Technical Change and the Cost of Climate Policy** *Sue Wing* September 2003
103. **Past and Future Effects of Ozone on Net Primary Production and Carbon Sequestration Using a Global Biogeochemical Model** *Felzer et al.* (revised) January 2004
104. **A Modeling Analysis of Methane Exchanges Between Alaskan Ecosystems and the Atmosphere** *Zhuang et al.* November 2003
105. **Analysis of Strategies of Companies under Carbon Constraint** *Hashimoto* January 2004
106. **Climate Prediction: The Limits of Ocean Models** *Stone* February 2004
107. **Informing Climate Policy Given Incommensurable Benefits Estimates** *Jacoby* February 2004
108. **Methane Fluxes Between Terrestrial Ecosystems and the Atmosphere at High Latitudes During the Past Century** *Zhuang et al.* March 2004
109. **Sensitivity of Climate to Diapycnal Diffusivity in the Ocean** *Dalan et al.* May 2004
110. **Stabilization and Global Climate Policy** *Sarofim et al.* July 2004
111. **Technology and Technical Change in the MIT EPPA Model** *Jacoby et al.* July 2004
112. **The Cost of Kyoto Protocol Targets: The Case of Japan** *Paltsev et al.* July 2004
113. **Economic Benefits of Air Pollution Regulation in the USA: An Integrated Approach** *Yang et al.* (revised) January 2005
114. **The Role of Non-CO<sub>2</sub> Greenhouse Gases in Climate Policy: Analysis Using the MIT IGSM** *Reilly et al.* August 2004
115. **Future United States Energy Security Concerns** *Deutch* September 2004
116. **Explaining Long-Run Changes in the Energy Intensity of the U.S. Economy** *Sue Wing* Sept. 2004
117. **Modeling the Transport Sector: The Role of Existing Fuel Taxes in Climate Policy** *Paltsev et al.* November 2004
118. **Effects of Air Pollution Control on Climate** *Prinn et al.* January 2005
119. **Does Model Sensitivity to Changes in CO<sub>2</sub> Provide a Measure of Sensitivity to the Forcing of Different Nature?** *Sokolov* March 2005
120. **What Should the Government Do To Encourage Technical Change in the Energy Sector?** *Deutch* May 2005
121. **Climate Change Taxes and Energy Efficiency in Japan** *Kasahara et al.* May 2005
122. **A 3D Ocean-Seaice-Carbon Cycle Model and its Coupling to a 2D Atmospheric Model: Uses in Climate Change Studies** *Dutkiewicz et al.* (revised) November 2005
123. **Simulating the Spatial Distribution of Population and Emissions to 2100** *Asadoorian* May 2005
124. **MIT Integrated Global System Model (IGSM) Version 2: Model Description and Baseline Evaluation** *Sokolov et al.* July 2005
125. **The MIT Emissions Prediction and Policy Analysis (EPPA) Model: Version 4** *Paltsev et al.* August 2005
126. **Estimated PDFs of Climate System Properties Including Natural and Anthropogenic Forcings** *Forest et al.* September 2005
127. **An Analysis of the European Emission Trading Scheme** *Reilly & Paltsev* October 2005
128. **Evaluating the Use of Ocean Models of Different Complexity in Climate Change Studies** *Sokolov et al.* November 2005
129. **Future Carbon Regulations and Current Investments in Alternative Coal-Fired Power Plant Designs** *Sekar et al.* December 2005
130. **Absolute vs. Intensity Limits for CO<sub>2</sub> Emission Control: Performance Under Uncertainty** *Sue Wing et al.* January 2006
131. **The Economic Impacts of Climate Change: Evidence from Agricultural Profits and Random Fluctuations in Weather** *Deschenes & Greenstone* January 2006
132. **The Value of Emissions Trading** *Webster et al.* February 2006
133. **Estimating Probability Distributions from Complex Models with Bifurcations: The Case of Ocean Circulation Collapse** *Webster et al.* March 2006
134. **Directed Technical Change and Climate Policy** *Otto et al.* April 2006

Contact the Joint Program Office to request a copy. The Report Series is distributed at no charge.