

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

**IMPACT OF ENERGY POLICY INSTRUMENTS ON THE ESTIMATED
LEVEL OF UNDERLYING ENERGY EFFICIENCY IN THE EU
RESIDENTIAL SECTOR**

Massimo FILIPPINI

Centre for Energy Policy and Economics (CEPE), ETH Zurich, Zürichbergstrasse
18, CH-8032, Zürich, Switzerland, and Department of Economics, University of
Lugano, Tel: +41 44 632 0649, Fax: +41 44 632 16 22, massimo.filippini@usi.ch

Lester C. HUNT

Surrey Energy Economics Centre (SEEC), School of Economics, University of
Surrey, Guildford, GU2 7XH, UK, Tel: +44(0)1483 686956, Fax:
+ 44(0)1483 689548, E-mail: L.Hunt@surrey.ac.uk

Jelena ZORIĆ

Faculty of Economics, University of Ljubljana, Kardeljeva pl. 17, 1000 Ljubljana,
Slovenia, Tel: +386 1 5892 785, Fax: +386 1 5892 698, E-mail:
jelena.zoric@ef.uni-lj.si (corresponding author)

Abstract

The promotion of energy efficiency is seen as one of the top priorities of EU energy policy (EC, 2010). In order to design and implement effective energy policy instruments, it is necessary to have information on energy demand price and income elasticities in addition to sound indicators of energy efficiency. This research

1 combines the approaches taken in energy demand modelling and frontier analysis in
2 order to econometrically estimate the level of energy efficiency for the residential
3 sector in the EU-27 member states for the period 1996 to 2009. The estimates for the
4 energy efficiency confirm that the EU residential sector indeed holds a relatively
5 high potential for energy savings from reduced inefficiency. Therefore, despite the
6 common objective to decrease ‘wasteful’ energy consumption, considerable
7 variation in energy efficiency between the EU member states is established.
8
9 Furthermore, an attempt is made to evaluate the impact of energy-efficiency
10 measures undertaken in the EU residential sector by introducing an additional set of
11 variables into the model and the results suggest that financial incentives and energy
12 performance standards play an important role in promoting energy efficiency
13 improvements, whereas informative measures do not have a significant impact.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 **Key words:** energy efficiency, residential energy demand, stochastic frontier
32 analysis
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 **1. Introduction**

40
41
42
43 In 2010, the EU adopted a new energy strategy Energy 2020 – a strategy for
44 competitive, sustainable and secure energy, where the increase in the level of energy
45 efficiency is listed among five priorities (EC, 2010). Improving energy efficiency is
46 viewed to be one of the most cost-effective ways of reducing greenhouse gas
47 emissions, increasing security of energy supply, leading to more sustainable energy
48 policy and enhancing industry competitiveness. Member states are, in comparison
49 with projected trends, expected to achieve 20% savings of its primary energy
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 consumption by 2020. However, the latest report by the European Commission (EC,
2 2011a) suggests that with the present policies the EU will achieve only half of the 20
3 % target in 2020. This is claimed not to be because of the lack of economic potential
4 but because of market failures, regulatory failures and also the rebound effect. In
5 order to close this gap, a new directive on energy efficiency was adopted in 2012
6 (Directive 2012/27/EU).
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16

17 Defining and measuring energy efficiency is yet another challenge. Energy
18 efficiency is typically approximated by energy intensity, despite several
19 shortcomings related to this measure. For example, EC (2000, p. 3) recognises that
20 “Changes in energy intensity for final energy consumption are a first and rough
21 estimate indicator for changes in energy efficiency. This is due to the fact that energy
22 intensity can also include temperature effects and the weighting effects of economic
23 restructuring.” In the same manner IEA (2009, p. 19) notes that “Energy intensity is
24 the amount of energy used per unit of activity. It is commonly calculated as the ratio
25 of energy use to GDP. Energy intensity is often taken as a proxy for energy
26 efficiency, although this is not entirely accurate since changes in energy intensity are
27 a function of several factors including the structure of the economy and energy
28 efficiency.”
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 Therefore, following an approach based on microeconomic production theory
50 proposed by Filippini and Hunt (2011, 2012) and Evans et al. (2013), this paper uses
51 an econometric approach to estimate the level of energy efficiency for each member
52 state. Based on this measure it is then possible to identify the saving potential that
53 can be reached with improvement in the level of energy efficiency. In this context,
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 the EU member states may decide to improve or introduce new energy policy
2 instruments. From the policy makers' point of view it is important to have
3
4 information on the effectiveness of energy policy instruments designed to increase
5
6 the level of energy efficiency. For instance, one of the interesting questions is to
7
8 know if performance standards are more effective than monetary incentives. In fact,
9
10 during the last two decades most of the EU member states have introduced
11
12 performance standards in buildings, heating systems and electrical appliances in an
13
14 attempt to improve the level of energy efficiency in the residential sector, whereas
15
16 others have also introduced monetary incentives such as subsidies and tax credits.
17
18 From the research point of view it is therefore interesting to analyse the impact of
19
20 different policy instruments on the level of energy efficiency. In order to do so, two
21
22 issues should be addressed. First, how to define and measure the level of energy
23
24 efficiency and, second, how to empirically identify the impact of introduced policy
25
26 measures.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 As stated above, this paper uses the approach introduced by Filippini and Hunt
37
38 (2011, 2012) to define and measure energy efficiency based on the theory of
39
40 productive efficiency.¹ Therefore, a stochastic frontier framework for the empirical
41
42 analysis of energy efficiency is used, as opposed to the more conventional indicator
43
44 of energy intensity. This econometric measure of energy efficiency controls for a
45
46 range of economic and other factors and is therefore viewed as a more suitable
47
48 approach to measure energy efficiency.² Therefore, a stochastic frontier analysis
49
50 (SFA) is employed to estimate a 'frontier' residential energy demand function using
51
52 unbalanced panel data for EU member states over the period 1996 to 2009.
53
54
55
56

57 Additionally, a set of policy variables is considered in the model to evaluate the
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 impact of energy efficient measures on promoting energy efficiency in the EU
2 member states.
3
4
5
6

7 Literature that attempts to analyse the impact of energy efficiency measures on the
8 level of energy efficiency is relatively scarce. Bigano et al. (2011) investigate the
9 influence of adopted energy efficiency policies and measures on energy intensity,
10 energy security and carbon intensity index using an econometric approach; but not
11 based on the estimation of a frontier function. Instead, Bigano et al. (2011) use
12 energy intensity as a proxy for energy efficiency and regress it on several factors
13 such as price, income and dummy variables representing the presence of energy
14 policy measures promoting the level of energy efficiency. Further, following
15 Filippini and Hunt (2011, 2012), Saussay et al. (2012) make use of the SFA
16 approach to analyse the impact of introduced building codes on the energy
17 efficiency of residential space heating in selected European countries. However, the
18 correction for unobserved heterogeneity in estimating energy efficiency is not
19 considered in their model. Hence, the analysis undertaken here builds on previous
20 works and explicitly takes into account unobserved heterogeneity and furthermore
21 considers a broad set of energy efficiency measures to estimate the effect of
22 implemented energy efficiency measures on energy efficiency of the EU residential
23 energy demand.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 The rest of the paper is organised as follows. Section 2 provides an overview of the
52 EU energy policy objectives and measures implemented in the area of energy
53 efficiency. Section 3 elaborates on the methodology and specification of the energy
54 demand frontier function, which is followed by Section 4 where the data employed
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 to estimate the model are presented. Section 5 provides the estimation results and
2 discusses the main findings, while Section 6 sets out relevant policy implications and
3 concludes the paper.
4
5
6
7
8
9

10 **2. Energy-efficiency policy measures in the EU**

11
12
13
14 Promotion of the efficient use of energy³ has received a lot of attention and has been
15 an important policy objective of the EU member states ever since the oil shocks in
16 the 1970s, where in the context of high oil prices energy savings became important
17 for reducing energy import dependence. As a result of implemented policy measures
18 and structural changes of the economies, member states have been able to decouple
19 economic growth from energy consumption (IEA, 2009). Nevertheless, as reported
20 in EC (1998) and IEA (2007), the rate of decline in energy intensity in the EU-15
21 and G8 countries was found to be higher before the 1990s than afterwards. Hence,
22 despite the EU commitment to promote energy savings and various initiatives,
23 programmes and instruments introduced at the Community level, the results turned
24 out to be dissatisfactory. According to EC (2000) this could be attributed to
25 decreasing energy prices and relatively low priorities given to energy saving
26 measures and demand-side management by member states. Also, several market
27 failures and barriers to investments in energy-efficiency have been identified by EC
28 (2000) such as the lack of information, technical, institutional, legal, and financial
29 barriers.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

56 The action in the field of energy efficiency policy was revived as a response to rising
57 energy security issues and commitment to achieve environmental targets set up by
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 the Kyoto protocol. Council of the EU (1998) set a target to improve energy intensity
2 of final consumption by a further one percentage point per year, on average, over
3 that which would have otherwise been attained in order for the EU to realise its full
4 potential for energy savings by 2010. Policies and measures for removal of the
5 market barriers and realisation of the energy saving potential were further laid down
6 in Action Plan to Improve Energy Efficiency in the European Community (EC,
7 2000). In line with the findings reported in the Green Paper on Energy Efficiency or
8 Doing More with Less (EC, 2005) these efforts again proved to be insufficient and in
9 the light of increasing energy prices and environmental concerns a new round of
10 energy efficiency debates was launched. The Green Paper estimated that the EU
11 holds a potential to achieve a reduction of energy consumption by 20 % compared to
12 the projections for 2020 in a cost-effective way. The Action Plan for Energy
13 Efficiency: Realising the Potential that followed proposed a range of cost-effective
14 measures to realise the 20% saving potential (EC, 2006).

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36 In 2006, Directive 2006/32/EC on energy end-use efficiency and energy services was
37 adopted according to which the EU member states are to achieve a 9% saving in
38 final energy consumption in the period from 2008 to 2016. In line with this, member
39 states were required to prepare National Energy Efficiency Action Plans (NEEAPs)
40 laying down various sector-specific, cross-sectoral and horizontal measures which
41 would allow achieving indicated savings in the nine-year period. It is worth noting
42 that the target set by the directive is not mandatory but only indicative. Also, it is
43 claimed not to aim at realizing the full estimated potential for energy savings, but is
44 rather seen as an important first step towards reaching the 20% target. Therefore, the
45 recently issued Energy Efficiency Plan 2011 envisages new measures that are
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 expected to close this gap (EC, 2011b). It was furthermore accompanied by a
2 proposal of new energy-efficiency directive (Directive 2012/27/EU) which became
3 effective in 2012.
4
5
6

7
8
9 According to EC (2006) the residential sector is estimated to represents roughly 17
10 % of total primary energy consumption and 25 % of the final energy consumption in
11 the EU. It has been identified to have the most potential for cost-effective savings
12 which are estimated to be 27 %, where huge energy saving opportunities lie in
13 retrofitted roof and wall insulation of buildings as well as improved appliances and
14 other energy-using equipment. Despite this, arguably the progress in achieving
15 energy savings so far has been relatively slow. While according to ADEME (2009)
16 improvement in the EU's final energy consumption between 1996 and 2007 was
17 found to be 13%, the residential sector improved only by 8% on average.
18
19
20

21 Considerable variation in achieved progress between countries can also be
22 established where more than half of the member states realised less than the 1 %
23 annually requested in the Energy Efficiency and Energy Service Directive
24 (2006/32/EC).
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 Despite the huge potential for cost-effective energy-saving measures in the
32 residential sector established by several EU official documents, it is found that their
33 implementation is hindered by various hurdles such as a lack of investment funds,
34 information gap, transaction cost, adverse incentives for owners and tenants and
35 other institutional barriers. Therefore, several energy policy instruments have been
36 introduced by the EU member states to promote energy efficiency. An overview of
37 adopted measures in Table 1 reveals the predominant use of legislative measures
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 (i.e., energy performance standards) and financial incentives (e.g., subsidies and tax
2 deductions), while informative measures such as labelling and informational and
3 educational campaigns seem to be used to a somewhat lower extent. The number of
4 implemented energy-efficiency measures and policy mix are, of course, found to
5 vary by member states.
6
7
8
9
10

11
12 While performance standards (e.g., relating to insulation standards of new and
13 existing buildings, efficiency of boilers, heating systems and electrical appliances)
14 generally have a long lifetime and get stricter over time, this may not hold for
15 financial incentives and informative campaigns, especially since they are not
16 necessarily provided on a continuous basis (ADEME, 2009). Nevertheless, the
17 impact of individual measures should not be evaluated in isolation, since several
18 different measures are usually required for an effective policy mix. A package of
19 financial incentives typically supports various programmes related to energy-
20 efficient renovation of buildings and sustainable building construction, installation of
21 energy-efficient heating systems, efficient electricity use and schemes for efficient
22 energy use for low-income households. To facilitate behavioural changes this is
23 furthermore accompanied by educational and awareness-raising campaigns,
24 provision of information, promotional and training programmes and demonstration
25 projects. According to ADEME (2009) many implemented energy efficiency
26 measures in the member states are the result of the EU policy, such as the directives
27 on energy efficiency and energy services, energy performance of buildings, labelling
28 of electrical appliances and eco-design for energy using products. In the residential
29 sector EU energy efficiency policies seem to have particularly strong impact as they
30 already represent about one third of all implemented measures at the national level.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Table 1: Adopted energy-efficiency policy measures in the EU countries from 1974
to 2016 ^a

Member state	MS	Number of policy measures by measure type					Total
		Legislative/ Performance standards	Legislative/ Informative - Labelling	Information/ Education	Financial/ Fiscal	Other	
Austria	AT	7	2	6	7	1	23
Belgium	BE	9	6	6	16	0	37
Bulgaria	BG	13	6	0	8	0	27
Cyprus	CY	6	3	1	1	0	11
Czech Republic	CZ	10	3	4	7	0	24
Denmark	DK	9	8	8	6	1	32
Estonia	EE	8	5	5	10	0	28
Finland	FI	8	6	10	7	1	32
France	FR	15	8	5	24	1	53
Germany	DE	18	12	4	7	4	45
Greece	GR	11	6	3	13	2	35
Hungary	HU	10	7	8	25	0	50
Ireland	IE	13	2	6	8	0	29
Italy	IT	17	10	2	5	0	34
Latvia	LV	12	2	2	7	0	23
Lithuania	LT	3	0	0	3	0	6
Luxembourg	LU	12	0	3	17	0	32
Malta	MT	2	1	4	6	0	13
Netherlands	NL	4	2	4	8	8	26
Poland	PL	4	2	0	4	0	10
Portugal	PT	8	3	2	0	0	13
Romania	RO	11	4	1	4	0	20
Slovakia	SK	11	4	0	3	0	18
Slovenia	SI	10	2	2	11	0	25
Spain	ES	42	9	6	25	3	85
Sweden	SE	4	7	4	6	2	23
United Kingdom	UK	25	3	10	15	2	55
Total		302	123	106	253	25	809

Note: ^a – The period refers to the start date of adopted policy measures. Only in the case of few reported measures the implementation is yet to take place during the following years.

Source: MURE II database (2012).

1
2 As discussed later in the paper, the information included in Table 1 will be used to
3
4 construct the variables considered in the econometric analysis that should reflect the
5
6 choice and intensity of the energy policy instruments adopted in each EU member
7
8 state.
9
10

11 12 13 **3. Methodology** 14 15 16

17
18 As previously mentioned, in this paper a stochastic frontier approach is used to
19
20 estimate a residential frontier energy demand function. This allows for estimation of
21
22 state specific levels of energy efficiency for the residential sector. Moreover,
23
24 econometric specifications that give the possibility to analyse the impact of the
25
26 energy policy instruments on the level of energy efficiency are utilised.
27
28
29
30
31

32
33 Within the framework of household production theory detailed in Deaton and
34
35 Muellbauer (1980), residential demand for energy is a derived demand (i.e. derived
36
37 from the demand for energy services such as a warm home, cooked food, hot water
38
39 etc.).⁴ Households purchase energy together with other inputs such as labour and
40
41 capital (in form of electrical appliances, heating system and insulation materials) to
42
43 produce a composite energy service entering their utility function. Therefore, the
44
45 production of energy services can be represented with a production function and a
46
47 set of input demand functions. Nevertheless, because data on all inputs and input
48
49 prices are generally not available, it is common in the energy economics literature to
50
51 estimate only one input demand function, i.e. energy demand. Accordingly, in this
52
53 paper the focus is on estimating an input demand function frontier which gives the
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 minimum level of energy input used by a household for any given level of output.
 2 Also, it is worth noting that, as discussed in Schmidt and Lovell (1979) and in
 3 Kumbhakar and Lovell (2000), the difference between the observed input and the
 4 cost-minimizing input demand derived from a Cobb-Douglas production function,
 5 represents both technical as well as allocative inefficiency. Furthermore, the Cobb-
 6 Douglas production function implies that the level of technical and allocative
 7 efficiency is the same for all inputs. Moreover, in the context of production theory
 8 the term energy efficiency is imprecise. In fact, the level of productive efficiency is
 9 measured, i.e. an improvement of the productive efficiency determines a reduction of
 10 all inputs, not only a reduction of energy.⁵ However, in what follows the term energy
 11 efficiency will continue to be used in order to be in line with the energy economics
 12 literature.

13
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28
 29
 30
 31
 32
 33
 34
 35
 36
 37
 38
 39
 40
 41
 42
 43
 44
 45
 46
 47
 48
 49
 50
 51
 52
 53
 54
 55
 56
 57
 58
 59
 60
 61
 62
 63
 64
 65

Following the approach introduced by Filippini and Hunt (2011 and 2012) and based on the availability of the data, the following aggregate residential input energy demand function for EU-27 member states is specified:

$$ED_{it} = f(PE_{it}, Y_{it}, POP_{it}, DSIZE_{it}, HDD_{it}, HOT_i, UEDT_t, EF_{it}), \quad (1)$$

where ED_{it} represents final residential energy consumption, PE_{it} the real energy price, Y_{it} real income, POP_{it} population, $DSIZE_{it}$ the average size of a dwelling, HDD_{it} the number of heating degree days, HOT_i a hot climate dummy variable, and $UEDT_t$ the underlying energy demand trend to capture the effect of technical progress (and other exogenous factors); all for a member state i in year t . Furthermore, EF_{it} is introduced to capture the level of ‘underlying energy efficiency’

1 of the EU residential sector. A low level of ‘underlying energy efficiency’ implies an
2 inefficient use of energy (i.e. ‘waste energy’). This underlying energy efficiency
3 indicator is not observed directly, but has to be estimated.
4
5
6
7
8
9

10 It is worth noting that, as discussed in Filippini and Hunt (2012), from the empirical
11 point of view the impact of technological innovation and behavioural change on the
12 energy consumption could be captured in different ways, which is either through the
13 price effect, the income effect, the $UEDT_t$ or EF_{it} terms. Therefore, the measure of
14 ‘underlying energy efficiency’ could also capture the waste of energy determined by
15 the fact that a household is not using the most modern technology. In this context,
16 we can identify two cases where households are producing an energy service without
17 minimizing the use of inputs. In the first case, a household employing a modern
18 technology is utilizing the inputs in an inefficient way, i.e. households are not
19 minimizing the use of energy, labor and capital in the production of an energy
20 service. In the second case, households are using a relatively old technology that
21 does not allow the household to minimize the use of energy, labor and capital. In
22 both cases, the level of energy used to produce a predefined level of energy services
23 could be reduced, i.e. we have a situation characterized by “waste” energy. In
24 general, this discussion suggests that a reduction of the energy consumption for the
25 production of energy services could be determined by an improvement of the level of
26 the productive efficiency and/or by the adoption of a modern energy-saving
27 technology due to technical change.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 One of the important issues in applying this approach is to measure the level of
56 energy services produced within the residential sector. In fact, it is difficult to find
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 indicators on these services such as the size of the heated rooms, lighting hours,
2 number of cooked meals, hours of watching television etc. In order to solve this
3 problem, at least partially, some variables are introduced in the model that indirectly
4 reflect the level of energy services produced by the households such as dwelling size
5 and the climate.
6
7
8
9
10

11
12
13
14 Following Filippini and Hunt (2011 and 2012) the stochastic frontier approach
15 (SFA) is employed to estimate the ‘frontier’ energy demand function and
16 ‘underlying energy efficiency’.⁶ The frontier gives the minimum level of energy
17 consumption necessary for households to produce any given level of energy services.
18
19 If the residential sector of a member state is found to be on the frontier, it is
20 considered to be energy efficient, while the deviation from the frontier is assumed to
21 represent the inefficient use of energy. The level of energy inefficiency may differ
22 over member states. These differences may occur as a result of various factors such
23 as differences in capital equipment and technical appliances in use, differences in
24 energy policy instruments and differences in behaviour as a reflection of different
25 lifestyle, social norms and values.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 The approach used in this study is based on the assumption usually considered in the
44 stochastic frontier literature that the level of the energy inefficiency of the residential
45 sector can be approximated by a one-sided non-negative term. Therefore, using a
46 log-log functional form and adopting the SFA approach, it is possible to specify the
47 ‘frontier’ residential energy demand in Equation (1) in the following way:
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

$$\ln ED_{it} = a_{(i)} + b_{PE} \ln PE_{it} + b_Y \ln Y_{it} + b_{POP} \ln POP_{it} + b_{DSIZE} \ln DSIZE_i + b_{HDD} \ln HDD_i + b_{HOT} HOT_{it} + b_t t + v_{it} + u_{it}, \quad (2)$$

where the $UEDT_t$ is proxied by t .⁷ The error term in (2) is assumed to be composed of two independent parts: a stochastic error (v_{it}), capturing the effect of noise, and a one-sided non-negative disturbance capturing the effect of inefficiency ($u_{it} \geq 0$). In line with Filippini and Hunt (2011, 2012) the second part, u_{it} , is interpreted as an indicator of the inefficient use of energy.

In the literature on the estimation of a Stochastic Frontier Model (SFM) using panel data, it is possible to identify several models that could be used for the estimation of Equation (2). In this study, the focus is on the effects of energy policy measures on the level of energy efficiency. Therefore, the stochastic frontier models for panel data that allow the level of energy efficiency to vary over time and to depend on a set of covariates such as the presence of subsidies for energy efficient appliances or the presence of energy efficiency standards are selected. For this purpose, three suitable panel data models are identified: i) panel data model proposed by Battese and Coelli (1995) (BC95 hereafter); ii) the True Random Effects model (TRE hereafter); and iii) the True Fixed Effects model (TFE hereafter).⁸ These two last models have been proposed more recently by Greene (2005a and 2005b). All these approaches allow for the estimation of a stochastic frontier model in which the level of efficiency can be expressed as a specific function of explanatory variables.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Following Battese and Coelli (1995) the inefficiency term u_{it} in Equation (2) is modified so as to have a systematic component associated with a vector of policy measures (\mathbf{z}_{it}) and a random component (e_{it}):⁹

$$u_{it} = \eta' \mathbf{z}_{it} + e_{it} . \quad (3)$$

Energy-efficiency policy measures considered under \mathbf{z}_{it} consist of several groups of policy measures, namely performance standards of buildings and heating systems (BH_{it}), performance standards of electrical appliances (APP_{it}), financial incentives (FIN_{it}) and informative measures ($INFO_{it}$). This model can be estimated in a single stage by the maximum likelihood ML procedure where stochastic term is assumed to follow a normal distribution $v_{it} \sim \text{iid } N(0, \sigma_v^2)$ and inefficiency is assumed to follow a truncated normal distribution $u_{it} \sim N^+(\eta' \mathbf{z}_{it}, \sigma_u^2)$.

Furthermore, the characteristic of the TRE and the TFE models is the inclusion of an individual random or fixed effect in the equation to be estimated. In these models individual effects should take into account all unobserved socioeconomic and environmental characteristics that are time-invariant. The TRE and the TFE models are therefore able to distinguish time invariant unobserved heterogeneity from the time varying level of efficiency component. The problem of these two models is that the level of inefficiency does not include the persistent inefficiencies that might remain more or less constant over time. To the extent that in the residential sector there are certain sources of energy efficiency that result in time-invariant excess energy consumption, the estimates of these models provide relatively high levels of energy efficiency.

1
2 Further, the TRE and the BC95 models can suffer from the ‘unobserved variables
3 bias’, because the unobserved characteristics may not be distributed independently of
4 the explanatory variables. In order to address the unobserved heterogeneity bias, a
5 Mundlak version of the BC95 model originally proposed by Battese and Coelli
6 (1995) is estimated.¹⁰ The Mundlak version of the BC95 (BC95M hereafter) is based
7 upon Mundlak’s (1978) modification of the BC95 for the general specification;
8 whereby the correlation of the individual specific effects (a_i) and the explanatory
9 variables are considered in an auxiliary equation given by:
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

$$25 \quad a_i = AX_i \pi + \gamma_i , \quad AX_i = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T X_{it} , \quad \gamma_i \sim iid(0, \sigma_\delta^2) , \quad (4)$$

26
27
28
29
30 where X_{it} is the vector of all explanatory variables, AX_i is the vector of the averages
31 of all the explanatory variables, and π is the corresponding vector of coefficients.¹¹
32
33 By replacing constant with a_i , Equation (4) is readily incorporated in the main
34 frontier Equation (2) and estimated using the BC95 model. Nevertheless, in a frontier
35 model the error term is a composite asymmetric term and consequently the estimated
36 coefficients are not the within estimators as in Mundlak’s classical formulation.
37
38 However, since the correlation between the individual effects and the explanatory
39 variables is at least partially captured in the model, the heterogeneity bias is expected
40 to be relatively low. Moreover, the application of Mundlak’s adjustment to the BC95
41 frontier framework should decrease the bias in inefficiency estimates by separating
42 inefficiency from unobserved heterogeneity.¹² In fact, the term γ_i of the Mundlak
43 adjustment in Equation (4) should represent the time persistent inefficiency and
44 should be absorbed in the inefficiency term. Of course, the possibility that this term
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 is absorbed by the error term cannot be excluded. In this case, the inefficiency term
2 would include only partially the time persistent inefficiency.
3
4
5
6

7 Given the discussion above, the BC95M is the preferred model, but for comparison
8 purposes the BC95 and the TFE models are also estimated.¹³ The TFE model is
9 estimated by ML method by simply creating dummy variables (a_i) for each member
10 state. Here a_i is a country-specific time-invariant fixed effect meant to capture cross-
11 country unobserved heterogeneity.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 The estimated energy-efficiency level is usually expressed in terms of efficiency
23 score:
24
25
26
27
28

$$29 \quad EF_{it} = \frac{ED_{it}}{ED_{it}^F} = \exp(-\hat{u}_{it}), \quad (5)$$

30
31
32
33
34
35

36 where ED_{it} is the observed final energy demand and ED_{it}^F is the respective frontier
37 demand of the i -th member state in time t . An efficiency score of one indicates an
38 energy efficient member state in year t . Alternatively, an energy inefficiency score
39 can be calculated as the reciprocal of efficiency score (EF_{it}) in Equation (5).
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 **4. Data**

50
51
52
53

54 The study is based on an unbalanced panel data set for a sample of 27 EU member
55 states ($i = 1, \dots, 27$) over the period 1996 to 2009 ($t = 1, \dots, 14$). Due to the missing
56 data on average dwelling size one member state, namely Malta, had to be excluded
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 from the analysis. ED_{it} for a given member state i in year t is the final residential
2 energy consumption measured in tonnes of oil equivalent (toe). PE_{it} represents the
3 real energy price, calculated based on the harmonised index of consumer energy
4 prices where 2005=100. Real income, Y_{it} , is approximated by GDP in purchasing
5 power parity and constant US\$ prices. $DSIZE_{it}$ denotes average dwelling size of a
6 household, measured in square meters. To control for differences in climate
7 conditions, the data on heating degree days (HDD_{it}) is utilised. As the data on
8 cooling degree days is not available, a dummy variable corresponding to the hot
9 climate HOT_i is considered in the model. Descriptive statistics of the variables
10 included in the model are presented in Table 2. It can be seen that the variables
11 show considerable variation between member states in the observed period. The data
12 is obtained from various sources which include Eurostat, IEA and Odyssee
13 databases.

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34 Further, the construction of the variables on energy policy instruments is based on
35 information taken from MURE II database and presented in Table 1.¹⁴ This database
36 includes applied national measures defined in National Energy Efficiency Action
37 Plans and EU-related measures implemented in line with the EU directives. These
38 measures were furthermore classified in three different groups which correspond to
39 the most frequently used measure types, namely (i) energy performance standards,
40 (ii) financial and fiscal incentives, and (iii) informative measures. Energy
41 performance standards were furthermore broken into categories corresponding to
42 standards related to buildings and heating systems, standards related to electrical
43 appliances and other measures. Since different measures are often not comparable in
44 terms of scope, impact and required funding, several dummy variables were created,
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 which should reflect both the presence of some measures as well as the number of
2 measures. This is arguably a relatively simplistic approach because, as already
3 mentioned, the measures are heterogeneous; hence, counting the number of measures
4 introduced in each group could be imprecise. However, it is believed that this
5 approximation should capture the most important developments in the introduction
6 of energy policy measures in each country. Moreover, given the analysis is for EU
7 member countries, for consistency, the general structure in the definition of the
8 energy policy measures are followed, which also supports this decision. A similar
9 approach is adopted in Bigano et al. (2011), where the data on energy efficiency
10 policies and measures used in this study is also obtained from MURE database.
11 Dummy variables are created for subcategory of policies where value of one denotes
12 that any kind of policy is implemented in a given country during the period
13 investigated. Alternatively, in Saussay et al. (2012) the respective policy variable
14 introduced in the model represents the number of years elapsed since building energy
15 codes were implemented.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 $BH1_{it}$ is equal to 1 if one or two energy performance standards related to buildings
40 or heating systems were in place in a given member state and a given year, or 0
41 otherwise. Similarly, $BH2_{it}$ is equal to 1 if three or more such performance standards
42 were in place. APP_{it} denotes whether at least one measure related to performance
43 standards of electrical appliances was introduced by a member state in a given year.
44 Furthermore, $FIN1_{it}$ indicates whether a member state in a given year implemented
45 one or two financial incentives to promote energy efficient investments (e.g., grants,
46 subsidies, loans with reduced interest rate, tax reductions), while $FIN2_{it}$ indicates
47 whether three or more financial measures were implemented. Taking two measures
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

as a threshold to define two separate dummy variables in the case of both financial incentives and building and heating performance standards corresponds to the median value of the number of measures in place in a member state in a given year. $INFO_{it}$ denotes whether at least one informative measure was introduced such as mandatory labelling of appliances, advice network for citizens or information campaigns by specialised agencies. Likewise, in the case of informative measures two separate dummies could be considered. The decision to keep only one informative dummy in the model is based on preliminary model estimations which showed that these two dummies did not prove to be significant or have the expected signs.

Table 2: Descriptive statistics

Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max	N
<i>ED</i> (in thousands toe)	11,601.6	16,181.0	145.0	72,281.0	349
<i>PE</i> (2005=100)	92.1	25.1	21.3	196.0	349
<i>Y</i> (in billion 2005 US\$ in PPP)	494.9	684.4	12.1	2,777.7	349
<i>POP</i> (in million)	18.9	23.0	0.4	82.5	349
<i>DSIZE</i> (in m ²)	85.1	18.5	52.5	140.0	349
<i>HDD</i> (in degree days)	2,995.6	1,120.2	581.7	5,994.3	349
<i>HOT</i> (1 – hot climate, 0 – otherwise)	0.2006	0.4010	0.0	1.0	349
<i>BH1</i> (1 – 1 or 2 EPS for buildings & heating systems; 0 – otherwise)	0.3868	0.4877	0.0	1.0	349
<i>BH2</i> (1 – 3 or more EPS for buildings & heating systems; 0 – otherwise)	0.3926	0.4890	0.0	1.0	349
<i>APP</i> (1 – EPS for electrical appliances or lightning; 0 – otherwise)	0.2579	0.4381	0.0	1.0	349
<i>INFO</i> (1 – informative measures; 0 – otherwise)	0.7450	0.4365	0.0	1.0	349
<i>FIN1</i> (1 – 1 or 2 financial & fiscal measures; 0 – otherwise)	0.4012	0.4908	0.0	1.0	349
<i>FIN2</i> (1 – 3 or more financial & fiscal measures; 0 – otherwise)	0.3238	0.4686	0.0	1.0	349

5. Results

5.1 Estimated energy demand model

The estimation results of the residential energy demand model using different SFA approaches are given in Table 3. Since energy consumption and the regressors relating to the continuous variables are in logarithms the estimated coefficients are directly interpretable as demand elasticities. The estimated coefficients prove to have the expected signs and are generally statistically significant in all models. The exception can be found in the estimated price coefficient in the BC95 model, which is in contrast with theoretical expectations found to be positive but insignificant. However, by using Mundlak's correction in estimation of the BC95M model, the negative and highly significant price effect can be established. Significant coefficients related to the Mundlak's correction indicate the need to control for heterogeneity that is correlated with explanatory variables in order to avoid biased estimates. The TFE model which controls for time-invariant country-specific unobserved heterogeneity also results in negative and significant price effect on residential energy demand. The estimated own price elasticity of the BC95M and TFE models is estimated to be -0.26 and -0.19, respectively.

The estimated income elasticity is positive and significant in all three models. The results suggest that the EU residential energy demand is price and income inelastic, which is similar to the obtained results for the US residential consumption in

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Filippini and Hunt (2012). As expected, population size also has a positive and highly significant influence on residential energy demand in all models. Moreover, the coefficient for dwelling size is found to be negative and significant in the BC95 and TFE model, while BC95M model does not result in significant coefficient estimate. Negative dwelling size effect on residential energy demand may be explained by the fact that dwelling size is positively correlated with household size. The two climate variables appear to have a consistent and significant influence on residential energy demand. Higher heating degree days are positively and significantly associated with higher residential energy demand, while in the case of the hot climate negative relationship is established. The hot climate dummy is not included in the TFE model as its influence is already captured by the time-invariant country specific effects.

Furthermore, the time trend is only shown to significantly reduce energy demand in the BC95 model, but is not found to be significant in the BC95M and TFE models. According to Filippini and Hunt (2012) a possible explanation for these established differences may be found in the fact that different models capture the impact of technological innovation and behavioural change on the energy consumption in different ways, that is either through price effects, time trend or inefficiency terms.

5.2 Energy efficiency estimates

The results of the econometric analysis reported in Table 3 can be used to estimate the level of energy efficiency. Significant estimates of parameter lambda obtained, which indicates the relative contribution of the variance in inefficiency term compared to

1 the variance in random noise, denotes that considerable inefficiency is in fact present in
2 the model. Descriptive statistics of the level of energy efficiency are reported in
3
4 Table 4. Overall, a fair degree of variation among the EU member states is
5
6 established in energy efficiency estimates, indicating that there is still considerable
7
8 room for improvement. The estimated average energy efficiency resulting from the
9
10 BC95 model is 83.4 %. By controlling for heterogeneity associated with explanatory
11
12 variables in the BC95M model or alternatively, by controlling for time-invariant
13
14 country-specific unobserved heterogeneity in the TFE model, the estimated average
15
16 energy efficiency is increased and amounts to 89.6% and 94.0% respectively.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 As already noted, the BC95 model does not control for heterogeneity and may
25
26 therefore estimate inefficiencies in an imprecise way. On the other hand,
27
28 inefficiencies of the TFE model may be underestimated as they do not include the
29
30 persistent inefficiencies that might remain constant over time and are captured by the
31
32 individual effects. TFE model commonly results in very high average efficiency
33
34 scores and small differences in efficiency scores between different countries, so there
35
36 may be virtually nothing left to be explained by different policy measures in place.
37
38
39
40

41 The BC95M model which uses Mundlak's correction in order to control for
42
43 unobserved heterogeneity is, therefore, viewed to be the most appropriate model for
44
45 analysing the level of energy efficiency of the EU residential sector.¹⁵
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Table 3: Estimated residential energy demand function

Parameter	BC95 model	BC95M model	TFE model ^a
Parameters of the demand function			
<i>Constant</i>	5.4989*** (0.8231)	0.3779 (0.9425)	-8.3131*** (3.1866)
<i>LPE</i>	0.0449 (0.0810)	-0.2561*** (0.0594)	-0.1857*** (0.0371)
<i>LY</i>	0.6962*** (0.0287)	0.3318*** (0.1005)	0.4199*** (0.0568)
<i>LPOP</i>	0.3014*** (0.0262)	0.7252*** (0.1957)	1.2598*** (0.1608)
<i>LDS</i>	-0.3193*** (0.0739)	0.3428 (0.3056)	-0.4327** (0.2023)
<i>LHDD</i>	0.3348*** (0.0372)	0.3473*** (0.1256)	0.3708*** (0.0594)
<i>t</i>	-0.0146*** (0.0028)	0.0006 (0.0046)	-0.0028 (0.0024)
<i>HOT</i>	-0.4225*** (0.0409)	-0.5839*** (0.0342)	/
<i>MLPE</i>	/	1.1016*** (0.1333)	/
<i>MLY</i>	/	0.3165*** (0.1021)	/
<i>MLPOP</i>	/	-0.3746** (0.1882)	/
<i>MLDS</i>	/	-0.0189 (0.1337)	/
<i>MLHDD</i>	/	-0.4596 (0.3101)	/
Parameters in the one-sided error			
<i>Constant</i>	0.3378*** (0.0639)	0.3570*** (0.1370)	/
<i>BH1</i>	-0.1636** (0.0642)	-0.1798* (0.1025)	0.0063 (0.0980)
<i>BH2</i>	-0.1315* (0.0687)	-0.1170 (0.0936)	-0.2273 (0.1710)
<i>APP</i>	-0.1782 (0.1093)	-0.1714* (0.1031)	0.1131 (0.0947)
<i>INFO</i>	0.1384** (0.0568)	0.1749* (0.0964)	-0.0154 (0.0874)
<i>FIN1</i>	-0.2926*** (0.0819)	-0.4873** (0.2107)	-0.3305*** (0.1213)
<i>FIN2</i>	-0.2170*** (0.0633)	-0.4698*** (0.1042)	-0.8559*** (0.2827)
Variance parameters for the compound error			
<i>Sigma</i>	0.1872*** (0.0184)	0.2369*** (0.0282)	0.1966*** (0.0279)
<i>Lambda</i>	1.8263*** (0.5482)	9.2408*** (3.5860)	7.7338*** (1.7583)

Notes: ^a – country specific dummies (ranging from -0.31 to 3.37) are not reported in the table.

***, **, * – significant at 1%, 5% and 10% level, respectively.

Table 4: Estimated energy efficiency scores

Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max	Cases
<i>EFBC95</i>	0.8340	0.0989	0.6230	0.9708	349
<i>EFBCM95</i>	0.8961	0.0453	0.8590	0.9882	349
<i>EFTFE</i>	0.9398	0.0437	0.8607	0.9926	349

Energy efficiency scores are expected to be negatively correlated with energy intensity, since a level of energy intensity is supposed to decrease with an increase in energy efficiency. Nevertheless, the efficiency estimates from BC95M are found to be very poorly correlated with energy intensity (*EI*), which is approximated by the average residential energy demand and with the average consumption per dwelling.¹⁶ This arguably supports the view that energy intensity can only be viewed as a rough proxy for energy efficiency. While for some countries energy intensity indicator may be viewed as a good proxy of energy efficiency, this does not hold in general.

Using the average values of the estimated energy efficiency scores for each EU member state obtained with the BC95M, three groups of countries are identified, namely relatively efficient states (state specific average value of the level of efficiency higher than the third quartile), relatively inefficient states (state specific average value of the level of efficiency lower than the median efficiency level) and relatively speaking moderately efficient states (state specific average value of the level of efficiency between the median and the third quartile). From the results reported in Table 5 it is interesting to observe that there is no clear division between

1 old and new EU member states, since in both groups good and bad practice countries
2 can be identified.
3
4
5
6

7 *Table 5: Classification of member states based on the estimated average energy*
8 *efficiency*
9

Energy efficiency score (<i>EFBCM</i>)	Group	Member states
Below 86%	Inefficient states	BE, CY, DE, DK, EE, FI, GR, HU, IT, LV, PT
From 86% to 93%	Moderately efficient states	AT, FR, LU, PL, RO, SE, SI, SK
Above 93%	Efficient states	BG, CZ, ES, IE, LT, NL, UK

25 5.3 Impact of energy efficiency measures on estimated energy efficiency levels

26
27
28
29
30 The results on the impact of the energy policy instruments adopted in the EU
31 member states show that several instruments influence the level of energy efficiency
32 of the residential sector. In particular financial incentives seem to have an important
33 influence on reducing energy inefficiency of the residential sector in the EU member
34 states. Both financial dummies introduced in the model to capture the effect of
35 adopted financial measures, namely *FIN1* and *FIN2*, prove to be negative and highly
36 significant in all models.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46
47
48
49 There is also some evidence that performance standards of buildings, heating
50 systems and appliances contribute to improved efficiency, while informative
51 measures (*INFO*) do not seem to have an influence on the inefficiency level (TFE
52 model) or are even found to increase the level of inefficiency in the other two
53 models. This is, of course, a counterintuitive result and due to the wrong sign
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 obtained it is not found significant under the two-sided hypothesis in the BC95M
2 model. Since informative measures, among others, also consist of labelling, a
3 possible explanation of the obtained sign could be found in the rebound effect, where
4 people buy energy-saving appliances, but at the same time change behaviour in the
5 direction of increased consumption of energy services (Sorrell, 2009).
6
7
8
9
10

11
12
13
14 The relationship between inefficiency and one or two introduced performance
15 standards of buildings and heating systems (*BH1*) is found to be significant and
16 negative in both BC95 and BC95M model. Furthermore, three or more introduced
17 performance standards of buildings and heating systems (*BH2*) prove to be
18 significant in the BC95 model, while performance standards of electrical appliances
19 (*APP*) prove to be significant in the BC95M model. To perform a robustness check,
20 the three models were re-estimated with the number of energy efficiency measures
21 replacing the respective dummies. Similar results are obtained, although somewhat
22 lower significance levels are found. In addition, to test whether several types of
23 measures have a larger impact compared to only one type of measures in place,
24 interactions between energy efficiency dummies were also considered. However,
25 none of the interaction terms proved to be significant.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 The relatively low impact of standards on the level of energy efficiency of buildings
47 and heating systems may be due to the fact that these standards have generally an
48 impact on energy efficiency in the longer term as they mostly refer to new buildings.
49 This result could be due to the fact that the construction rate of new buildings and the
50 renovation rate of old buildings are relatively small and the standards apply generally
51 to new buildings. In summary, it can be concluded that the established results
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 provide some evidence on the effectiveness of the EU policy measures related to
2 promotion of energy-efficiency in the observed period.
3
4
5

6 **6. Conclusions**

7
8
9
10
11 Following the approach proposed by Filippini and Hunt (2011, 2012) this paper
12 employs a frontier demand energy model to estimate the ‘underlying energy
13 efficiency’ of residential sector for each EU member state over the period 1996 to
14 2009. Compared to the widely used energy intensity indicator this is argued to be a
15 more appropriate measure of energy efficiency since it is able to control for
16 differences in socio-economic and environmental factors among the member states.
17
18 In addition, the study also considers two alternative approaches to control for
19 unobserved heterogeneity and separate it from inefficiency estimates. The results
20 suggest that the rankings of member states based on energy intensity and energy
21 efficiency levels may substantially differ. Therefore, energy intensity indicator
22 cannot be considered as a good proxy for energy efficiency and should be combined
23 with other indicators in order to derive relevant policy conclusions.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 The estimated average energy efficiency level based on the preferred Battese and
44 Coelli (1995) model with Mundlak correction (1978) implies that there is a
45 significant potential for a decrease in energy consumption of households.
46
47
48
49

50 Considerable variation in energy efficiency between the EU member states is
51 established, implying that countries have not been equally successful in promoting
52 energy savings. In terms of energy efficiency performance no clear distinction
53 between old and new EU member states can be established. Additionally, in the
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 period under investigation no notable technical change is found in the EU residential
2 sector. As noted by Kumbhakar and Lovell (2000, p. 107), this may also reflect the
3 fact that sometimes it is difficult to disentangle the effect of movement to the frontier
4 and frontier shift.
5
6
7
8
9

10
11 In attempt to provide some evidence on the effectiveness of energy efficiency
12 measures implemented in the EU residential sector, several relevant policy measures
13 are considered in the model. The results imply that improved energy efficiency can
14 be linked to the introduced financial incentives and energy performance standards,
15 while informative measures such as labelling and educational campaigns do not
16 show to have significant effect in fostering energy efficiency improvements. The
17 results are also found to be in line with results from previous studies. In Saussay et
18 al. (2012) building energy codes are established to have a significant effect on the
19 improvement of residential space heating energy efficiency in the selected EU
20 countries. Bigano et al. (2011) also find the positive impact of the EU energy
21 efficiency policies on energy intensity and what seems to work is policy mix rather
22 than a single policy in isolation. Therefore, findings from our analysis provide useful
23 policy implications for further enhancing energy efficiency in the EU.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 **References**

- 46
47
48
49
50
51 ADEME, 2009. Energy Efficiency Trends and Policies in the EU 27, Results of the ODYSSEE-
52 MURE project. Paris, October 2009.
53
54
55 Aigner, D. J., Lovell, C. A. K., Schmidt, P., 1977. Formulation and Estimation of Stochastic Frontier
56 Production Function Models. *Journal of Econometrics*, 6(1), 21-37.
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Ang, B.W., 2006. Monitoring changes in economy-wide energy efficiency: From energy – GDP ratio to composite efficiency index. *Energy Policy*, 32(9), 1131-1139.

Banfi, S., Filippini, M., Hunt, L., 2005. Fuel tourism in border regions: The case of Switzerland. *Energy Economics*, 27, 689-818.

Battese, G.E., Coelli, T.J., 1995. A Model for Technical Inefficiency Effects in a Stochastic Frontier Production Function for Panel Data. *Empirical Economics*, 20, 325-332.

Bigano, A., Arigoni Ortiz, R., Markandya, A., Menichetti, E., Pierfederici, R., 2011. The linkages between energy efficiency and security of energy supply in Europe, in Galarraga, I., González-Eguino, M., Markandya, A. (Eds.), *Handbook of sustainable energy*. Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd., Northampton, pp. 60-83.

Council of the EU, 1998. Council Resolution of 7 December 1998 on energy efficiency in the European Community. OJ C 391/1.

Deaton, A. and Muellbauer, J., 1980. *Economics and Consumer behaviour*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Directive 2006/32/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 5 April 2006 on energy end-use efficiency and energy services and repealing Council Directive 93/76/EEC. OJ L 114, 27 April 2006.

Directive 2012/27/EU on energy efficiency, amending Directives 2009/125/EC and 2010/30/EU and repealing Directives 2004/8/EC and 2006/32/EC. OJ L315, 14 November 2012.

European Commission (EC), 1998. Communication from the Commission. Energy Efficiency in the European Community – Towards a Strategy for the Rational use of Energy. COM(1998) 246 final. Brussels, 29.04.1998.

EC, 2000. Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions. Action Plan to Improve Energy Efficiency in the European Community. COM(2000) 247 final. Brussels, 26.04.2000.

EC, 2005. Green Paper on Energy Efficiency or Doing More with Less. COM(2005) 265 final. Brussels, 22.06.2005.

- 1
2 EC, 2006. Communication from the Commission. Action Plan for Energy Efficiency: Realising the
3 Potential. COM(2006) 545 final. Brussels, 19.10.2006.
- 4
5 EC, 2010. Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the
6 European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions. Energy 2020 – a
7 strategy for competitive, sustainable and secure energy. COM (2010) 639 final, Brussels, 10
8 November 2010.
- 9
10
11
12 EC, 2011a. Impact Assessment. Commission Staff Working Paper, SEC(2011) 780 final. Brussels,
13 22.6.2011.
- 14
15
16 EC, 2011b. Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the
17 European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions. Energy Efficiency
18 Plan 2011. COM(2011) 109 final. Brussels, 8.3.2011.
- 19
20
21
22 European Environment Agency, 2011. Energy efficiency and energy consumption in the household
23 sector (ENER 022) - Assessment published Aug 2011. Available at: [http://www.eea.europa.eu/data-](http://www.eea.europa.eu/data-and-maps/indicators/energy-efficiency-and-energy-consumption-2/assessment-2)
24 and-maps/indicators/energy-efficiency-and-energy-consumption-2/assessment-2.
- 25
26
27
28 Eurostat. http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/statistics/search_database. Accessed on
29 10 June 2012.
- 30
31
32
33 Evans, J., Filippini, M., Hunt, L.C., 2013. The contribution of energy efficiency towards meeting CO2
34 targets, Chapter 8 in Fouquet, R. (Ed.): Handbook of Energy and Climate Change. Edward Elgar,
35 Cheltenham, *forthcoming*.
- 36
37
38
39 Farsi, M., Filippini, M., 2009. An Analysis of Cost-Efficiency in Swiss Multi-utilities. Energy
40 Economics, 31, 306-315.
- 41
42
43
44 Filippini, M., Pachauri S., 2004. Elasticities of electricity demand in urban Indian households. Energy
45 Policy, 32, 429-436.
- 46
47
48
49 Filippini, M., Hunt, L. C., 2011. Energy demand and energy efficiency in the OECD countries: a
50 stochastic demand frontier approach. The Energy Journal, 32(2), 59-80.
- 51
52
53
54
55
56 Filippini, M., Hunt, L.C., 2012. US Residential Energy Demand and Energy Efficiency: A Stochastic
57 Demand Frontier Approach. Energy Economics, 34(5), 1484-1491.
- 58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
- Greene, W., 2005a. Reconsidering Heterogeneity in Panel Data Estimators of the Stochastic Frontier Model. *Journal of Econometrics*, 126, 269-303.
- Greene, W., 2005b. Fixed and random effects in stochastic frontier models. *Journal of Productivity Analysis*, 23, 7-32.
- IEA, 2007. *Energy Use in the New Millenium – Trends in IEA countries*. OECD/IEA, Paris.
- IEA, 2009. *Progress with implementing energy efficiency policies in the G8*. OECD/IEA, Paris.
- IEA, 2012. *Energy Balances of OECD Countries (Edition: 2012)*. ESDS International, University of Manchester, DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5257/iea/ebo/2012>.
- Kopp, R.J., 1981. The Measurement of Productive Efficiency: A Reconsideration, *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 97, 477-503.
- Kumbhakar, S.C., Lovell, C.A.K., 2000. *Stochastic Frontier Analysis*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Kumbhakar, S.C., Ghost, S., McGuckin, J.T., 1991. A Generalized Production Frontier Approach for Estimating Determinants of Inefficiency in US Dairy Farms. *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics*, 9(3), 279-286.
- Mundlak, Y., 1978. On the Pooling of Time Series and Cross-Section Data. *Econometrica*, 46(1), 69-85.
- MURE II. Database on energy efficiency policies and measures. <http://www.muredatabase.org/>. Accessed on 19 June 2012.
- Odyssee, 2011. Database on the energy consumption drivers by end-use, energy efficiency and CO₂ related indicators. <http://www.odyssee-indicators.org/database/database.php> (subscription-based).
- Pitt, M., Lee, L.F., 1981. The Measurement and Sources of Technical Inefficiency in the Indonesian Weaving Industry. *Journal of Development Economics*, 9, 43-64.
- Reinhard S, Lovell C. A. K., Thijssen G. J., 1999. Econometric estimation of technical and environmental efficiency: An application to Dutch dairy farms. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 81, 44-60.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Saussay, A., Saheb, Y., Quirion P., 2012. The Impact of Building Energy Codes on the Energy Efficiency of Residential Space Heating in European countries – A Stochastic Frontier Approach. International Energy Program Evaluation Conference, 12–14 June 2012, Rome.

Schmidt, P., Lovell, C.A.K., 1979. Estimating Technical and Allocative Inefficiency Relative to Stochastic Production and Cost Frontiers. *Journal of Econometrics*, 9, 343-366.

Sorrell, S., 2009. The rebound effect: definition and estimation, Chapter 9 in Hunt, L., and Evans, J. (Eds.): *International Handbook of the Economics of Energy*, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, 199-233.

Zhou, P., Ang, B.W., 2008. Linear programming models for measuring economy-wide energy efficiency performance. *Energy Policy*, 36, 2911-2916.

Footnotes

¹ See Kumbhakar and Lovell (2000) for a discussion on the microeconomic theory of production and on the definition of productive efficiency.

² Another approach to overcome the problem related to the use of simple energy intensity indicators can be found in Index Decomposition Analysis (IDA), which is in principle a bottom-up framework. For details on this method, see Ang (2006). Alternatively, a non-parametric frontier method DEA is used in Zhou and Ang (2008) to measure energy efficiency performance of selected OECD countries.

³ Official EU documents typically view energy efficiency improvements as decreased energy intensity or reduced energy consumption. Since this paper advocates the use of alternative measure of energy efficiency and in order to use consistent terminology throughout the paper, in this section the use of the term ‘energy efficiency improvements’ is explicitly avoided and instead expressions such as energy savings, reduced energy consumption or decreased energy intensity are utilised.

⁴ See Filippini and Pachauri (2004) and Banfi et al. (2005) for an application of household production theory to energy demand analysis.

⁵ Note, that by estimating a production or distance frontier function it is possible using the empirical approach suggested by Reinhard et al.(1999) to estimate an input specific technical efficiency indicator. For instance, Reinhard et al. (1999) estimate the level of water efficiency for a sample of

1 Dutch dairy farms. For a discussion of the concept of input specific technical efficiency, see Kopp
2
3 (1981).

4
5 ⁶ The stochastic frontier function has generally been used in production theory to measure
6
7 econometrically the economic performance of production processes at the firm level. It was
8
9 introduced by Aigner et al. (1977) and since then many modifications of the original method have
10
11 been proposed. See, for example, Kumbhakar and Lovell (2000).

12
13 ⁷ An alternative way to capture the impact of the UEDT on energy consumption is to use time
14
15 dummies as suggested by Filippini and Hunt (2012). This approach is not employed in this study
16
17 since preliminary analysis resulted in insignificant time dummy coefficients.

18
19 ⁸ For a general discussion on the use of SFMs in the energy sector, see Farsi and Filippini (2009).

20
21 ⁹ Battese and Coelli (1995) extended the approach by Kumbhakar, Ghost and McGuckin (1991) to
22
23 accommodate panel data. However, it should be noted that this model does not in fact exploit the
24
25 panel aspect of the data set in order to deal with the unobserved heterogeneity.

26
27 ¹⁰ Note, Filippini and Hunt (2012) utilize the Mundlak's modification to the Pitt and Lee (1981)
28
29 model instead. Limitation of the latter model is the assumption on time invariant inefficiency that
30
31 cannot account for the impact of introduced policy measures.

32
33 ¹¹ Note that the Mundlak's formulation (i.e. with the introduction of this auxiliary equation in a
34
35 random effects model) produces the 'Within Estimator'. In its original form, the Mundlak (1978)
36
37 general panel data regression model is $Q_{it} = X_{it} \beta + AX_i \pi + \gamma_i + v_{it}$; however, Mundlak (1978) showed
38
39 that the estimation of this model using GLS yields: $\hat{\beta}_{GLS} = \hat{\beta}_{within}$ and $\hat{\pi}_{GLS} = \hat{\beta}_{Between} - \hat{\beta}_{within}$. The
40
41 direct interpretation of the coefficients $\hat{\pi}_{GLS}$ is therefore not straightforward. Usually, the discussion
42
43 on the results concentrates on $\hat{\beta}_{within}$.

44
45
46
47 ¹² In this specification, it is assumed that the effects of unobserved country characteristics are captured
48
49 by the coefficients of the group mean of the explanatory variables of Equation (4).

50
51 ¹³ Note, in Filippini and Hunt (2011) and Filippini and Hunt (2012) the focus was not on the impact of
52
53 policy measures on efficiency and for this reason the pooled model by Aignar et al. (1977) and the
54
55 random-effects model by Pitt and Lee (1981) are used as preferred models, respectively. In the latter
56
57 case Mundlak's correction (1978) is introduced, while no such correction proved to be necessary in
58
59 the former case. By ignoring the augmentation of the model provided in Equation (3), Battese and
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 Coelli (1995) model is in essence closer to the pooled model, since it does not exploit the panel aspect
2
3 of the data.

4
5 ¹⁴ MURE (Mesures d'Utilisation Rationnelle de l'Energie) is a part of the ODYSSEE MURE project
6
7 on Monitoring of Energy Demand Trends and Energy efficiency in the EU, supported under the
8
9 Intelligent Energy Europe Programme of the European Commission.

10
11 ¹⁵ The correlation coefficients between the results obtained with all three models were calculated.
12
13 These results show a relatively high correlation between the results obtained with BC95 and BC95M
14
15 and a moderate correlation between the TFE model on one side and the BC95 and BC95M models on
16
17 the other.

18
19 ¹⁶ To note that the European Environment Agency is using the average consumption per dwelling as
20
21 one of the simple indicators representing the level of energy efficiency of the residential sector. See
22
23 [http://www.eea.europa.eu/data-and-maps/indicators/energy-efficiency-and-energy-consumption-](http://www.eea.europa.eu/data-and-maps/indicators/energy-efficiency-and-energy-consumption-2/assessment-2)
24
25 [2/assessment-2.](http://www.eea.europa.eu/data-and-maps/indicators/energy-efficiency-and-energy-consumption-2/assessment-2)
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65