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Abstract

This paper analyses recent energy intensity trends for 40 major economies within a structural decomposition analysis framework. Our main focus lies on the question whether improvements in energy intensity were caused by structural change towards a greener economy or by technological improvements. We account for intersectoral trade by using the World Input-Output database and adjust sector-specific energy use via the environmentally extended input-output analysis. We find strong differences between consumption and production-based energy consumption across sectors, particularly in the construction and electricity industry. Using the three factor Logarithmic Mean Divisia Index method, our decomposition analysis shows that recent energy intensity reductions were mostly driven by technological advances. Structural changes within countries played only a minor role, whereas international trade by itself even increased global energy intensity. Compared to a previous study that only used production-based sectoral energy data, we find structural effects on energy intensity reductions to be systematically weaker under consumption-based data. The differences are particularly striking on a country-level, e.g. for Japan and Turkey.
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1 Introduction

In the last decades, climate change caused by anthropogenic emissions of greenhouse gases, particularly CO$_2$, has become a major concern for the world community. To a large extent, CO$_2$ emissions are caused by the global energy use. While ever increasing living standards lead to continuously rising energy consumption, it has also been an inevitable ingredient for economic growth.\(^1\) However, in order to meet the 2 degree Celsius target of the Copenhagen Accord 2009\(^2\) and to avoid the possibly catastrophic consequences of even stronger global warming, countries have to reduce their carbon emissions significantly. This will, as we will argue further below, require also a substantial reduction of energy consumption. Considering the increasing energy demand that, so far, has come along with economic growth, such climate change targets and continued growth seem to be an insuperable contradiction. Nevertheless, a large body of literature on green growth suggests a way to harmonize both goals, and thus, to achieve a sustainable path of economic growth.\(^3\)

\[\text{Figure 1: Development of energy intensity (ratio of global energy use to world GDP) since 1990 (base year)}\]

Following the literature on green growth, there are at least two ways to achieve economic growth and simultaneously limit global warming. First, policy can aim at decoupling energy consumption from CO$_2$ emissions via the use of renewable energy. This approach has, however, so far failed on a global scale and has its limits even when taking into account future technological improvements.\(^4\) Second, one can attempt to decouple economic growth from energy consumption and, hence, reduce the energy intensity (the ratio of energy use to output). Over the course of the last decades, the global energy intensity has been constantly decreasing (see Figure 1),\(^5\) giving rise to some scope for this second path of green growth.

In our paper we will investigate three different pathways of how the energy intensity of an economy can be reduced. First, technological progress can render production more efficient with respect to energy use. Second, the production of relatively energy intensive goods and services can be outsourced to other countries. This approach, however, only decreases the domestic energy-intensity
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\(^1\)See e.g. Ayres et al. (2013)
\(^2\)See Chappe (2015)
\(^3\)For a discussion and introduction to green growth, see Bowen and Bankhaus (2011). Furthermore, OECD (2013) provides an overview of green growth policies.
\(^4\)See Wirl and Yegorov (2015)
\(^5\)The data in Figure 1 stems from the World Bank Indicators "GDP at market prices (constant 2010 USD)" and "Energy use (kg of oil equivalent)", available at [http://data.worldbank.org/indicator](http://data.worldbank.org/indicator).
but not necessarily global energy intensity. Third, structural change within a country towards sectors with a relatively low energy use per unit of output can lower the energy intensity of the economy. In this paper we want to shed light on the question, to which extent changes in these three factors explain the decreasing global energy intensity. We do so by following an empirical approach exploiting the World Input-Output Database (WIOD), providing information about intersectoral trade within and across countries alongside with WIOD environmental accounts which entail data on sector-specific energy use. However, we adjust energy use as provided in the WIOD with respect to intersectoral trade using the environmentally extended input-output analysis (EEIOA). This enables us to determine the magnitude of energy use that a sector ultimately causes through its final demand by also considering energy consumption embodied in trade. For example, consider the construction sector that not only uses energy in its production processes, such as fuel and electricity for vehicles and machinery, but also relies on inputs from other sectors. The production of these inputs, however, requires energy that is not considered in the WIOD environmental accounts but that we take account of through the EEIOA. Such an adjustment transforms the WIOD data into a consumption-based accounting of sectoral energy use, whereas WIOD itself take the view of production-based energy consumption. While the latter approach is important in assessing the sources of energy use in production processes, the former perspective is necessary to measure a country’s or industry’s actual share in the responsibility for the total energy consumption. We analyze the role of changes of structural shifts within economies and the world using the consumption-based approach and apply the Logarithmic Mean Divisia Index (LMDI), as proposed by Ang and Choi (1997). Additionally, we contrast our results to a decomposition using production-based energy consumption.

Our work is most importantly related to Voigt et al. (2014) who investigate to which extent energy intensity developments have been due to structural and technological change, based on an analysis of WIOD environmental accounts. They find that, while structural change has played an important role in explaining energy efficiency trends in some countries, in particular in the USA, global energy intensity has improved largely due to technological advancements. The study does not, however, adjust for energy use embodied in trade by using trade information from the WIOD and, thus, only considers the production-based perspective. Consequently, Voigt et al. (2014), solely implement an index decomposition analysis (IDA). In contrast, this paper employs a structural decomposition analysis (SDA) and uses information on intersectoral trade relationships. By employing the LMDI method within a SDA framework, we are following an approach that was only recently established as traditionally LMDI is used in the context of IDAs (see Su and Ang (2012)). For example, Wachsmann et al. (2009) apply an SDA to energy use in Brazil using national input-output tables. Furthermore, Wood (2009) conducts a structural decomposition of greenhouse gas emissions in the Australian economy. Both studies use an additive LMDI decomposition method, while we will resort to a multiplicative version of the LMDI to obtain a better comparability of our results to Voigt et al. (2014). An emerging literature applies the SDA to WIOD data, but differs to this paper with respect to the used decomposition method and the focus of analysis. For example, Zhong (2016) applies an averaging technique of perfect decomposition methods to study emission and energy use trends. Xu and Dietzenbacher (2014) analyze global emission trends instead of energy use by employing an SDA using the WIOD. Finally, Peters et al. (2011) study CO₂ emissions embodied in trade and focus on a country-level analysis and on identifying the extent of carbon leakage. To our knowledge, a structural decomposition analysis on global energy intensity trends using the LMDI method has not been conducted yet.
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6In fact, trade can increase global energy intensity, if production is outsourced to countries with a higher energy use per output. This problematic aspect of international trade has been called Carbon Leakage in the context of CO₂ emissions. Peters et al. (2011) study the extent of international Carbon Leakage. Jakob and Marschinski (2013) discuss the implications of Carbon Leakage with respect to trade policies.

7See Hoekstra et al. (2003) as well as Su and Ang (2012) for a discussion of differences with respect to the LMDI method.
More generally our analysis is based on the growing literature of structural change. A recent article from Mulder (2015) highlights the importance of structural effects in manufacturing sectors for OECD countries in the period from 1980 to 2005. He focuses particularly on the reasons of cross-country differences in energy intensity and finds that structural change is a diverging force. Metcalf (2008) investigates energy intensity trends on US national and state level. At the national level he finds that roughly 75% of the reduction in energy intensity between 1970 and 2003 can be attributed to the technology effect. He also estimates that per capita income and energy prices have a significant impact on the energy efficiency within a sector but do not influence the structural composition of the economy considerably. Huntington (2010) uses a less aggregated sector structure of the US economy for the period 1997 to 2006. His results indicate a much stronger structural effect: Almost 40% of energy intensity reduction are due to structural shifts.

Our results show that energy intensity in a number of sectors change dramatically, if we consider adjusted data (in particularly for the construction and electricity sector). Nonetheless, the global decomposition results exhibit qualitatively similar trends as under unadjusted data. We find, however, that structural effects are systematically overestimated when using unadjusted energy data. Moreover, our analysis shows that technological improvements within the sectors are the most important factors of decreasing global energy intensity and that these primarily occurred during the times of increasing oil prices from 2004 to 2008, while structural changes within countries only modestly contributed to falling energy intensities. International trade even led to an increasing global energy intensity, indicating that production was outsourced to relatively more energy-intensive regions. On a country level, we find that the structural effect is strongly overestimated in a range of countries when using unadjusted data, particularly in Japan and Turkey. Our result for the US indicates that the structural effect accounts for about 32% of the energy intensity decline. This result is in line with Huntington (2010), but strongly contrasts with Voigt et al. (2014) who find that structural change explains almost 80% of energy intensity decline in the US between 1995 and 2007. Our result, that structural change seems to be a weaker driving force of reductions in the energy intensity than previously assumed, has rather positive implications for environmental policy. As Huntington (2010) notes, such policy is more likely to have an effect on within sector efficiency than on the structural composition of the economy as the latter is often determined by other forces not easily to be influenced by policy-makers. Thus, a strong importance of technological factors in energy efficiency trends creates a possibly large role of policy interventions.

Hence our paper contributes to the existing literature in the following way: First, it provides a complete adjustment of sector specific energy data to depict the direct and, more importantly, indirect energy consumption in each sector and on a country level. Second, we compare our adjustments with unadjusted energy data in order to highlight the importance of the EEIOA for our analysis. Third, we decompose adjusted energy intensity trends into structural effects between countries (trade effect), structural effects within countries, and technological effects, and discuss the differences with respect to a decomposition using unadjusted data. We apply this decomposition not only for the global economy but also on a country level for each of the 40 considered states.

The remainder of the paper is structured as follows: In the following section the data as well as the EEIOA are introduced in detail, followed by a comparison of adjusted and unadjusted energy use in Section 3. Section 4 and 5 introduce the decomposition algorithm and present the main results of this study before Section 6 concludes.

10Throughout the paper, unadjusted data refers to the energy consumption data as given in the WIOD environmental accounts and, thus, represents a production-based accounting of energy use. In contrast, adjusted data refers to the consumption-based accounting obtained after applying the EEIOA to the WIOD data.

11The rather large difference between the result of Voigt et al. (2014) and Huntington (2010) is quite surprising considering the large overlap in the considered time period. While Huntington uses the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) rather than the NACE classification applied in Voigt et al. (2014), this should nevertheless not produce such strongly differing results. As Huntington (2010) is employing the more refined NAICS sectoral structure, he should, if at all, be able to detect a stronger structural change.
2 Data and Methods

2.1 Data sources

Our analysis is based on the World Input-Output Database (WIOD), a public database that provides time-series (covering the period from 1995 to 2011) of intersectoral input-output tables for 40 countries including a model estimation of the rest of the world. It features 35 standardized sectors, that can be further aggregated into agriculture, construction, manufacturing, electricity, transport, and service industry. The 40 countries covered in the database entail 27 member states of the European Union, the BRIC nations as well as other major economies such as the US, Canada, Australia and Japan. Together, these nations comprised more than 80 \% of the world GDP in 2009.

The WIOD has been widely used in trade economics. Data from various national sources have been harmonized in order to enable comparability of data across countries. Moreover, the accompanying WIOD previous-year-prices dataset provides information on price developments on sectoral level, enabling us to deflate each sector independently instead of using aggregate national price deflators which lack important information on the heterogeneity of inflation in each sector. Such a deflation of prices is necessary because otherwise inflation by itself would reduce energy intensities and strongly bias the results of the decomposition analysis.

In addition to the input-output tables, the WIOD is accompanied by environmental satellite accounts providing information about sector-specific gross energy use (EU) in terajoule (TJ), that encompasses the total energy requirements in the industry. Importantly, EU only includes energy consumed in the production process of a given sector, while ignoring indirect energy consumption through trade of goods and services with other sectors. We only use data on EU from production and do not include household energy consumption as our main focus lies on structural effects and technology improvements within sectors.

As international supply chains have been integrated to an increasing extent during the last decades (see Timmer et al. (2014)), it is necessary to account for energy transfers embodied in intersectoral and international trade to obtain a realistic picture of the energy use of a given sector. As an example, we consider the construction sector. In the WIOD environmental accounts, the energy use of the construction sector would be comprised mostly of electricity and fossil fuel consumption by vehicles and machinery deployed in construction works. While this direct energy demand by the construction sector is certainly not negligible, one would grossly underestimate the extent of energy consumption that is required for the final demand this sector is supplying if only this direct energy demand is considered. Obviously, the construction sector is heavily dependent on inputs from other sectors, such as materials from the mining and quarrying sector as well as the wood sector. Moreover, it requires heavy machinery, vehicles, and technical equipment from various manufacturing subsectors. Conversely, the output produced by the construction sector does not only satisfy final demand but also intermediate demand by other sectors. Consider as an example the manufacturing or service sector that require factories and office space for their production processes.

In our globalized and highly integrated economies, the interdependencies between sectors within and between countries through trade are highly developed, such that tracking indirect energy use for each sector would be a very cumbersome, if not impossible task. However, Wassily Leontief has developed a convenient method to calculate direct and indirect inputs required in the production processes of sectors, the Input-Output Analysis. Moreover, he extended this method to study
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12 As the WIOD was released in 2012, Croatia as the 28th member state is not included.
13 The WIOD and its accompanying environmental accounts are freely available at http://www.wiod.org. While this paper will provide a short introduction on the use of input-output tables, detailed information on the database is provided in Timmer et al. (2015). Extensive documentation about the construction of the WIOD is compiled in Dietzenbacher et al. (2013). A technical report on the environmental accounts is provided by Gent (2012).
14 Here, we follow Xu and Dietzenbacher (2014) who took a similar approach in their analysis of global CO\textsubscript{2} emissions trends.
15 Leontief (1936) introduced the Input-Output Analysis for the first time.
material and pollution flows across sectors in his seminal paper "Environmental Repercussions and the Economic Structure" (Leontief, 1970), laying the groundwork for what was later called the environmentally extended input-output analysis. This method allows us to determine the total energy use of a sector, based not only on its direct but also on the indirect energy consumption. Moreover, energy use is merely reallocated across sectors according to trade flows such that double-counting is avoided.

2.2 Input-Output Analysis

In order to adjust for the implicit trade of energy consumption, we apply the environmentally extended input-output analysis (EEIOA), originally proposed by Leontief (1970). This method, in its first application, measured intersectoral pollution transfers by extending the well-known Leontief-Inverse applied in the input-output table analysis to environmental pollution. Miller and Blair (2009) provide an insightful summary of the methodological groundwork by Leontief (1970) and give an introduction to modern applications of the EEIOA. For a better understanding of the EEIOA, we offer the following short example. The WIOD input-output data is generally given in the form of table 1. In this table, we assume the existence of solely two sectors, the manufacturing and the construction sector. Hence a simple 2x2 matrix is sufficient to describe the complete set of intersectoral input-output flows (see the gray shaded area). Within this matrix, entry (x,y) denotes the output created by sector x for the use of sector y. For example, Row (1) contains the monetary value of outputs produced in the construction sector for its own use (first column, value=1) and for the use of the manufacturing sector (second column, value=20). The third column shows the monetary value of goods and services created for final consumption. In each row, total output of a given sector is provided in column (4) and is defined as the sum of column (1) to (3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>from Constr.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>981</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from Manuf.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>981</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Exemplary I/O-Table

The values in columns (1) to (3) are derived from the actual WIOD input-output table for the US in the year 2009 (values are rounded and given in current billion USD). While the final demand in each sector can certainly not be satisfied without considering the numerous other sectors of the US economy, we neglect these in this example to keep our calculations tractable. Nonetheless, we can observe the magnitude of intersectoral dependence. For example, the manufacturing sector delivers a considerable amount of intermediary inputs to the construction sector, while the reverse flow from constructors to manufacturers is rather small.

We follow the usual notation employed in the input-output analysis literature and define

\[
Z = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 20 \\ 250 & 1200 \end{pmatrix}, \quad y = \begin{pmatrix} 960 \\ 1800 \end{pmatrix}, \quad x = \begin{pmatrix} 981 \\ 3250 \end{pmatrix},
\]

where \( Z \) denotes the interindustry trade matrix, \( y \) the vector of final demand, and \( x \) the vector of total output\(^{16}\). The amount of output produced in each sector depends (i) on the demand by final consumers in each sector and (ii) on the input requirements of the two sectors. The latter is determined by the trade structure given in the input-output table. In this example, in order to produce one unit of output, the construction sector needs \( 1/981 \) units of construction and \( 250/981 \) units of manufactured inputs, while the manufacturing sector requires \( 20/3250 \) units from the

\(^{16}\) Analogous to Table 1 it holds, that \( z_{11} + z_{12} + y_1 = x_1 \) and \( z_{21} + z_{22} + y_2 = x_2 \).
construction industry and 1200/3250 from itself. For each sector, we can now conveniently express total output as the sum of (i) and (ii) in a linear equation:

\[ x_1 = y_1 + (1/981)x_1 + (20/3250)x_2 \]
\[ x_2 = y_2 + (250/981)x_1 + (1200/3250)x_2. \]

Taking the construction sector as an example, total construction output \( x_1 \) equals the final demand faced by the construction industry \( y_1 \), the output absorbed in the sector itself \( (1/981)x_1 \) and output required in the manufacturing sector \( (20/3250)x_2 \). The linear equation system would, of course, hold if we were to enter \( x \) and \( y \) from the exemplary input-output table above. However, having now expressed the intricate relationship between the two industries, we can, for any given final demand structure \( y \), calculate the necessary output in each sector \( x \), such that the economy can meet the demand. To do so, we simply need to solve the linear equation system (1a)-(1b), which can conveniently be done using matrix notation. First we define the structural matrix, \( A \), that captures the trade structure of the economy, given by

\[
A = \begin{pmatrix}
z_{11}/x_1 & z_{12}/x_2 \\
z_{21}/x_1 & z_{22}/x_2
\end{pmatrix}
= \begin{pmatrix}
1/981 & 20/3250 \\
250/981 & 1200/3250
\end{pmatrix}.
\] (2)

The linear equation system (1a)-(1b) can now be expressed as

\[
x = y + A \times x \\
⇔ x = (I - A)^{-1} \times y.
\] (3)

The matrix \( (I - A)^{-1} \) is called Leontief-Inverse and can transform any given final demand structure \( y \) into required total outputs. Furthermore, we can now calculate the extent of outputs from each sector that is needed for the satisfaction of a given industry’s final demand. In other words, we want to identify the resources in an economy that are ultimately required by the consumption of one industry’s final goods and services. This information is not readily available from the input-output table, as the elimination of final demand in sector A would affect the output produced in sector B that is required as input. This, in turn, would affect the output produced in sector A and so on, resulting in an infinite chain of adjustments necessary to calculate the structure of this counter-factual economy with final demand in only one sector. The Leontief-Inverse allows us, however, to make this calculation more convenient. Taking the construction sector as an example, we define \( y = [960; 0]^{17} \), implying that we only want to identify the output required to meet the final consumption of construction goods. Inserting \( y \) into equation (3) evaluates to

\[ [963; 389] = (I - A)^{-1} \times [960; 0], \]

implying that, 963 units of the construction and 389 units of the manufactured output is required to meet the final demand that the construction industry faces. Interestingly, the inputs needed from manufactures strongly exceeds the value of 250 in the input-output table, which describes the extent of direct inputs. This is because in order to produce the required 250 units, the manufacturing sector has to create machinery and equipment for its own production processes adding substantially to the necessary output. Note, that an analogous calculation using the final demand in the manufacturing sector \([0; 1800])\) yields input requirements of \([18; 2861]\) such that the sum of inputs required by final demand in both sectors equal the total output produced, namely \([981; 3250]\). Hence, the Input-Output Analysis simply reallocates the output production across sectors such that double-counting is not a concern.

\[^{17}\text{To economize on space, we express vectors always horizontally. Semicolons, however, indicate a new row, such that } y = [960; 0] \text{ is to be interpreted as the vertical vector } \begin{pmatrix} 960 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \text{ whereas } y = [960 0] \text{ denotes a horizontal vector.}\]
Using the input-output analysis we are, therefore, able to measure the extent of resources that a certain final demand in a sector ultimately requires, considering not only the direct inputs and the infinite chain of indirect inputs resulting from the trade relationship described in the input-output table. In the following, we extend this analysis with respect to energy use in order to measure energy consumption that is associated with an industry’s final demand.

2.3 Environmentally Extended Input-Output Analysis

In order to adjust the energy use according to intersectoral trade, we now extend the input-output analysis with respect to energy use, given by $e = [1950 \ 54400]$ where the first and second vector entries provide energy use (as provided in the WIOD environmental accounts, given in 1000 tera-joule) in the construction and manufacturing sector, respectively. Analogous to (2) we first derive the structural coefficients for the energy use as

$$A_e = \begin{bmatrix} 1950/981 & 54400/3250 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (4)$$

implying the direct energy use of $1950/981$ units for the production of one unit in the construction sector and $54400/3250$ units for one unit of the manufacturing sector. We then extend the linear equation system in (1a)-(1b) to

$$x_1 = y_1 + (1/981)x_1 + (20/3250)x_2 \quad (5a)$$
$$x_2 = y_2 + (250/981)x_1 + (1200/3250)x_2 \quad (5b)$$
$$E = 1950/981x_1 + 54400/3250x_2, \quad (5c)$$

where $E$ denotes total energy use in the economy. In matrix notation, the linear equation system can be written as

$$\begin{pmatrix} x \\ E \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} y + A \times x \\ A_e \times x \end{pmatrix}$$
$$\Leftrightarrow \begin{pmatrix} x \\ E \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} A \times x \\ A_e \times x \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} y \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$$
$$\Leftrightarrow \begin{pmatrix} x \\ E \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} I - A \\ A_e \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \times \begin{pmatrix} y \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$$
$$\Leftrightarrow \begin{pmatrix} x \\ E \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} (I - A)^{-1} \\ A_e(I - A)^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \times \begin{pmatrix} y \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (6)$$

where in the last step, we have taken advantage of block matrix inversion. This extended form of the Leontief-Inverse allows us to determine not only the extent of output requirements associated with a given final demand allocation across sectors, but the ultimate energy requirements the final demand causes. Using again the construction sector as an example, we repeat the above calculation but use the environmentally extended Leontief-Inverse:

$$\begin{pmatrix} 963 \\ 389 \\ 8430 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} (I - A)^{-1} \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \times \begin{pmatrix} 960 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \times \begin{pmatrix} 960 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$ 

Hence, we have evaluated the output in each sector as well as the energy consumption that is associated with the final demand in the construction sector. In this particular example, 8430 units of energy use are associated with the construction sector, implying a large markup relative to the direct production energy use of 1950 provided in the WIOD environmental accounts. This markup is a result of the strong reliance on manufactured, energy-intensive goods and services within the
production processes of the construction sector. Energy consumption in the manufacturing sector is reduced from 54400 to 47920 units. Note, that the sum of adjusted energy use equals the sum of unadjusted energy consumption as the EEIOA simply reallocates energy use across sectors.

The EEIOA, therefore, enables us to determine the energy use that a given sector’s final consumption demand requires given the intersectoral trade relationship of the economy. This consumption-based measure is what we refer to as adjusted energy consumption in this paper. We apply the EEIOA to the complete WIOD table for each year from 1995 to 2009, featuring 40 countries and 35 sectors. However, we also use input-output relations with the rest of the world model provided in the WIOD and include it as an additional region such that the trade matrix consists of 41x35 rows and columns each year. The input-output analysis (as well as the EEIOA) extends naturally to higher dimensions. In fact, the vector of sector-specific adjusted emissions, which we denote as $\hat{e}$, can be calculated conveniently by the formula

$$\hat{e} = A_{e}(I - A)^{-1}y^T,$$

where we have reduced (6) to the subsystem describing energy use. Equation (7) represents the standard equation for the adjustment of energy or emission data found in structural decomposition analyses.

3 Adjusted vs. Unadjusted Energy Use

This section compares energy use (EU) data from the WIOD environmental accounts (production-based EU) with the measure of trade-adjusted energy consumption presented in the previous section (consumption-based EU). We analyze general differences between adjusted and unadjusted energy use for the year 2007 on an aggregated national and sectoral level. Lastly, we examine time trends of these differences across countries and sectors.

3.1 Country-level analysis

![Figure 2: Gross energy use in 2007 among the world largest energy consumers ranked by adjusted EU](image)

We begin with a country-level analysis where sectoral energy consumption is aggregated nationally. Figure 2 shows the world largest energy users consisting of the USA, China, Japan, Russia, and India in the year 2007.\(^{18}\) In the US, adjusted energy use exceeds the unadjusted value provided in the WIOD environmental accounts by 8.5\%. Hence, final consumption in the US is associated with a larger energy consumption than required for the production of total output in the US. While, to our knowledge, this result has not yet been established in the context of energy consumption,

\(^{18}\)We use the year 2007 as the last year before the global crisis after which large declines in international trade created an exception to the overall pattern of strong adjustment effects.
Peters et al. (2010) have shown that the USA is a net-importer of CO$_2$ emission considering the carbon-intensity of internationally traded goods and services. Considering that energy use and CO$_2$ emissions are highly correlated, i.e. high energy use in a given sector implies large CO$_2$ emissions$^{19}$, our results are consistent with these findings.

China, the second largest energy user in the world, exhibits the exact opposite pattern. Here, adjusted energy consumption lies below the unadjusted value, a difference of 6.7%. To a large part, the results of the USA and China reflect the trade patterns in each country; while the US runs a large trade deficit, China is net exporter of goods and services.$^{20}$

Japan, that exhibits a trade surplus, nonetheless shows a relatively higher adjusted energy consumption. Apparently, Japan’s imports are heavily energy-intensive relative to its exports. In the case of Russia we observe the largest differences of adjusted to unadjusted energy consumption, namely by 40.9%. This is due to the rather energy-intensive exports in Russia, dominated by petroleum and gas production as well as the mineral resource industry. Interestingly, Russia’s adjusted energy consumption lies below Japan’s while in terms of unadjusted energy use they would be ranked in the opposite way. Lastly, India is a net-importer of energy, a likely consequence of its trade deficit.

![Figure 3: Gross energy use in 2007 among largest European economies ranked by adjusted EU](image)

Figure 3 shows energy use among the five largest European economies, consisting of Germany, France, Italy, Great Britain and Spain, in the year 2007. Considering that the latter four countries were running a trade deficit in 2007, it is not surprising that their adjusted energy consumption exceeds the unadjusted values. The degree to which energy is implicitly imported through trade is remarkably stable across countries: In these countries, adjusted EU exceeds unadjusted energy use by about 20%-23%.

In contrast to this similarity across large European economies, Germany shows a different pattern. Despite its immense trade surplus (approx 5% of GDP in 2007), Germany nevertheless exhibits net energy imports. This indicates that the outputs produced in Germany for the use in foreign industries are distinctly less energy-intensive than those goods and services that are imported from foreign sources. However and due to the large trade surplus, Germany’s gap between adjusted and unadjusted energy use amounts to only 13.7% in 2007 and thus, is considerably lower than in the other considered European countries.
3.2 Sector-level analysis

We now focus on seven sectors\(^{21}\) aggregated to a global level for the year 2007. Figure 4 shows adjusted and unadjusted energy use share of the global energy consumption together with information on the industry-specific value added share of the world's GDP. This allows us to compare the energy use of a given sector relative to its market size. Due to its dominance, we focus on the service as well as on the manufacturing sector. While the former contributes nearly 60% of total value added, it only requires less than 8% to the total energy use in the production of its output. In contrast, the manufacturing sector, with a market share of approximately 20%, is responsible for about 50% of global energy use. However, when considering the extent of energy use associated with the final demand that these sectors ultimately satisfy as measured by adjusted energy consumption, this strong difference in sector-specific energy use narrows dramatically. From this consumption-based perspective, the service sector requires close to 30% of world energy use, whereas the share of the manufacturing industry shrinks to about 35%. The adjustment of energy use towards the service sector can be explained by its strong reliance on inputs from other sectors, whereas manufactures deliver a larger share of their outputs for the use of other sectors rather than for final demand.

The electricity, gas, and water supply sector as well as the mining and quarrying industry show a similar pattern as the manufacturers, being predominantly producers of intermediated inputs into other sectors. The construction industry, on the other side, exhibits a qualitatively similar adjustment as the service industry. Notably, it shows the strongest reallocation of energy use across all sectors which indicates a strong reliance on energy-intensive inputs from other sectors.

3.3 Time trends

So far, we have focused only on the differences between adjusted and unadjusted energy use for the year 2007. In this section, however, we will analyze time trends in these differences across selected countries and global sectors. First we refer to Figure 5, that displays energy use trends...
for USA and China over the period from 1995 to 2009 based to the year 1995.\textsuperscript{22} Independent from the measure we apply, we observe an increase of EU in the US until the Great Recession in 2008 and a subsequent strong reduction. The gap between consumption and production-based energy consumption was widening until the recession and only declined slightly due to the slump in trade caused by the recession.\textsuperscript{23} By contrast, China exhibits increases in EU throughout the whole time period. The gap between consumption and production-based EU was initially narrowing and later on remained fairly stable.

We extend the same time trend analysis on the global construction and energy sector. Figure 6 shows the evolution of adjusted and unadjusted energy use (in each case relative to the level in 1995) for both sectors. We observe, that the difference between both measures has considerably increased over the considered time period. This becomes most evident when looking at the construction sector that exhibits relatively stable production energy use since the mid 2000s, but dramatically increasing consumption-based energy use in the same period. The rising integration of global supply chains, see Timmer et al. (2014) has, thus, likely resulted in larger transfer of energy embodied in trade.

\textsuperscript{22}While this is not shown in Figure 5, it is important to know how large the absolute levels of adjusted and unadjusted EU were in each country: In the US, consumption-based EU exceeded the EU in production in all years. In China, however, more energy was used in production than was associated with the country’s consumption throughout the whole time-horizon that we consider.

\textsuperscript{23}See “Trade (% of GDP)” indicator for the US and the world in The World Bank (2016)
4 Decomposition

Our main focus in this paper lies on the question whether structural, trade or technological factors drive the overall trend of global and national energy intensity. First, we clarify these terms: “Structural effects” denote sectoral shifts within a country whereas trade effects denote structural changes between countries. “Technological effects” represent any changes within a specific sector such as those relating to production technology and processes or intrasectoral market share shifts between companies. Note that with this definition technological effects encompass a broad range of factors. Anything that influences the ratio of energy input to consumption within a sector is captured herein. For example, if a manufacturer employs modern machinery instead of workers, it might lead to an increase of the energy intensity within a sector as the machine requires electricity to produce the same amount of output for final consumption. Moreover, consumption shifts from less energy efficient firms to more energy efficient firms, that occur within one single sector, would fall into the category of technological effects.

For decomposing the trend in energy intensity into the effects of trade, sectoral shifts within a country and technology, we use the Log-Mean Divisia Method II (LMDI II) introduced by Ang and Choi (1997). This method has the advantage that it obtains no residual term and therefore completely decomposes the trends in its components. Its original version is applied as a two factor decomposition method for specific countries.

In order to obtain results on a global level we additionally use the three factor LMDI II introduced by Voigt et al. (2014) and apply it to our adjusted energy consumption data to separate the effect of technological improvement as well as structural change within and between countries. But first we introduce the two factor LMDI II which decomposes the trend of energy intensity into technological improvements and structural change between sectors within a country.

4.1 Two factor LMDI II

The energy intensity of a country is defined as the sum of energy use of all its economic sectors divided through the sum of the overall final consumption levels of these sectors. Hence we can write energy intensity as:

\[ I_{j,t} = \sum_i EU_{i,j,t} \frac{CO_{i,j,t}}{CO_{j,t}} = \sum_i CO_{i,j,t} \frac{EU_{i,j,t}}{CO_{i,j,t}} = \sum_i S_{i,j,t} I_{i,j,t} \]  \hspace{1cm} (8)

where

- \( t \in (1995, 2009) \) is the time period
- \( i = 1, ..., 35 \) is the sector index
- \( j = 1, ..., 40 \) indicates the country
- \( EU_{i,j,t} \) is the energy use of sector \( i \) in economy \( j \) in period \( t \)
• \( EU_{j,t} = \sum_i EU_{i,j,t} \) is the energy use of economy \( j \) in period \( t \).
• \( CO_{i,j,t} \) is final consumption of sector \( i \) in economy \( j \) in period \( t \).
• \( CO_{j,t} = \sum_i CO_{i,j,t} \) is the consumption of the whole economy in period \( t \).
• \( S_{i,j,t} = \frac{CO_{i,j,t}}{CO_{j,t}} \) is the consumption share of sector \( i \) in total consumption of the country in period \( t \).
• \( I_{i,j,t} = \frac{EU_{i,j,t}}{CO_{i,j,t}} \) is the energy intensity of sector \( i \) in economy \( j \) and period \( t \).
• \( I_{j,t} = \frac{EU_{j,t}}{CO_{j,t}} \) is total energy intensity of economy \( j \) in period \( t \).

Note, that in the definition by Voigt et al. (2014) energy use is divided by gross output rather than consumption to obtain the energy intensity. In the subsequent sections we will juxtapose results of the decomposition of the unadjusted and adjusted energy use, where the former method will be using the approach by Voigt et al. (2014) and the latter the approach presented here.

As proven in Ang and Choi (1997), changes in energy intensity between period \( t \) and \( t+1 \) can be expressed as

\[
D_{Tot,j,t+1} = \frac{I_{j,t+1}}{I_{j,t}} = D_{Str,j,t+1} D_{Int,j,t+1}. \tag{9}
\]

The components are

\[
D_{Str,j,t+1} = \exp \left[ \sum_i \frac{L(\omega_{i,j,t+1}, \omega_{i,j,t})}{\sum_i L(\omega_{i,j,t+1}, \omega_{i,j,t})} \ln \left( \frac{S_{i,j,t+1}}{S_{i,j,t}} \right) \right] \tag{10}
\]

\[
D_{Int,j,t+1} = \exp \left[ \sum_i \frac{L(\omega_{i,j,t+1}, \omega_{i,j,t})}{\sum_i L(\omega_{i,j,t+1}, \omega_{i,j,t})} \ln \left( \frac{I_{i,j,t+1}}{I_{i,j,t}} \right) \right] \tag{11}
\]

where

\[
L(\omega_{i,j,t+1}, \omega_{i,j,t}) = \frac{\omega_{i,j,t+1} - \omega_{i,j,t}}{\ln \left( \frac{\omega_{i,j,t+1}}{\omega_{i,j,t}} \right)} \tag{12}
\]

and

\[
\omega_{i,j,t} = \frac{EU_{i,j,t}}{EU_{j,t}} \tag{13}
\]

is the share of energy use from a specific sector in the overall energy use of the economy in a country. \( L(\omega_{i,j,t+1}, \omega_{i,j,t}) \) is a logarithmic weight function for country \( j \) which is normalized in (10) and (11) by dividing it through the sum of each country's weight function. \( D_{Str,j,t+1} \) describes how much structural change within a country contributes to the change in overall energy intensity between period \( t \) and \( t+1 \). The higher the share of a sector is, the higher is its weight for total energy intensity. \( D_{Int,j,t+1} \) shows to which extent technological improvements in a sector contribute to the change in overall energy intensity between \( t \) and \( t+1 \) (with "Int" standing for sectoral energy intensity). The lower \( I_{i,j,t} \) is, the more efficient is the use of energy in a particular sector. While it is evident that \( D_{Tot} \) denotes the total change in energy intensity between two periods, the values of
\(D_{\text{Str}}\) and \(D_{\text{Int}}\) can be interpreted counter-factually: \(D_{\text{Str}}\) represents the change in energy intensity caused by structural changes within the economy if technology had remained constant throughout the considered period. Conversely, \(D_{\text{Int}}\) denotes the change in energy intensity associated with technological progress if sectoral market shares had stayed unchanged.

In order to obtain a decomposed time series from 1995 to 2009 the results are chained as in Ang and Lui (2007). All indices are set to 1 for the baseline year 1995. The chained factors indicate the percentage change of each factor as compared to 1995.

4.2 Example

In the following we will briefly demonstrate the differences that arise in decomposing unadjusted and adjusted energy intensity trends. To do so, we establish a stylized example in which an isolated structural or technological change between two periods changes the overall energy consumption of an economy. Depending on whether we use unadjusted or adjusted energy use, we obtain different decomposition results. These differences will be underlying to our main findings presented in the next section.

4.2.1 Isolated structural Change

Consider the simple two-sector economy from section 2.2 in a two period model. We assume that the consumption in the construction sector increases from period 1 to 2. To accommodate the increased consumption in the construction sector, the economy has to increase output in both sectors. As we hold the production technology constant (\(A\) remains unchanged), output in period 2 can be calculated via the Leontief-Inverse. From \(A\) we can easily deduce the new input-output matrix \(Z\). Due to the increased production, energy use (EU) in each sector is scaled up by the same degree as output. Based on the EEIOA, adjusted EU can now be calculated in period 2. The result of such an isolated structural change is illustrated in the transition from Table 2 to 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>to Constr.</th>
<th>to Manuf.</th>
<th>Consumption</th>
<th>Output</th>
<th>EU unadj.</th>
<th>EU adj.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>from Constr.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>8430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from Manuf.</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>3250</td>
<td>54400</td>
<td>47920</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Period 1 economy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>to Constr.</th>
<th>to Manuf.</th>
<th>Consumption</th>
<th>Output</th>
<th>EU unadj.</th>
<th>EU adj.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>from Constr.</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>1160</td>
<td>1181.7</td>
<td>2349</td>
<td>10186.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from Manuf.</td>
<td>301.1</td>
<td>1330</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>3331.1</td>
<td>55757.3</td>
<td>47920.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Period 2 economy - Isolated structural change

Notably, as the construction sector grows, which is the relatively less energy-intensive sector, aggregate energy intensity of the economy falls independent of whether we consider unadjusted energy intensity (given by unadjusted EU divided by output) or adjusted energy intensity (given by adjusted EU divided by consumption).

We can now apply the two decomposition method described above, one defining energy intensity as quotient of energy use and output, the other as quotient of energy use and consumption. Both methods yield a technological effect of \(D_{\text{Int}} = 1\) which logically follows from assuming an isolated structural effect and no progress in energy-efficiency in each sector. However, the extent of the structural effect differs in each example. While the production-based decomposition gives an effect of \(D_{\text{Str}} = 0.967\), the consumption-based approach yields \(D_{\text{Str}} = 0.986\). Hence, the structural effect appears to be weaker in the consumption-based perspective, by about 1 percentage point. The reason for this lies in the different definition on energy intensity. As consumption increases in the construction sector, not only the construction industry itself has to increase output but also the manufacturing sector due to the inter-sectoral trade which again augments production in the
construction sector and so on. Hence, the increase in consumption triggers a dis-proportionately higher increase in output such that the energy intensity defined with output in the denominator falls more strongly than with consumption in the denominator. Hence, the structural effect appears to be stronger in the production-based decomposition.

In view of an appropriate measure of sectoral responsibility of energy consumption, it is, however, important how much energy is needed for final consumption rather than for intermediate inputs. The production-based measure, thus, overestimates the advances in energy intensity reductions as it also attributes increases in intermediate inputs as contributors to a lower energy intensity. This weaker effect of structural change will re-appear several times in our adjusted decomposition, particularly in the example of Japan and Turkey, but also on a global scale.

4.2.2 Isolated technological progress

In this example, we demonstrate the effect of an isolated technological progress in each sector of our two-sector exemplary economy given in Table 2. We decrease energy use in each sector, resulting also in a lower adjusted energy use, see 4. Note, that consumption, output and inter-sectoral trade remains constant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>from Constr.</th>
<th>to Constr.</th>
<th>to Manuf.</th>
<th>Consumption</th>
<th>Output</th>
<th>EU unadj.</th>
<th>EU adj.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>from Constr.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>6790.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from Manuf.</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>3250</td>
<td>44400</td>
<td>39109.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Period 2 economy - Isolated technological progress

Both decompositions yield that, as expected, the economy-wide decline in energy-intensity is solely driven by technological effects. More importantly, both approaches also assess the magnitude of the technological progress identically, namely $D_{Int} = 0.815$. As technological progress does not change the relation between consumption and output in each sector, the consumption- and production-based decomposition do not differ. Hence, the differences between methods solely arise from the structural component as described in the previous section.

5 Results

In this section, we present the results of the decomposition of adjusted energy use data. First we focus on the decomposition results on a country level and discuss patterns in efficiency gains across countries. Second, we analyze and decompose global energy intensity trends. Finally, we will juxtapose the difference in decomposition results between adjusted and unadjusted data.

5.1 Decomposition on a country level

The country level results are summarized in figure 7. We see that the average energy intensity across the 40 considered countries in 2009 is about 77.6% of the intensity in 1995. The structural component is associated with a decline in energy intensity of about 5.8% and the technological effect of about 17.4% in 2009 compared to 1995. We identify strong technological improvements of up to 54% in some countries. The structural effect is in generally weaker than the technological effect, which was especially strong in the years from 2004 to 2008, most likely driven by the increasing oil and energy prices during that time.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std.dev</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>0.9399421</td>
<td>0.0347579</td>
<td>0.9076318</td>
<td>1.091449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>0.9572299</td>
<td>0.064086</td>
<td>0.8065265</td>
<td>1.094331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>0.95037</td>
<td>0.0653644</td>
<td>0.7907822</td>
<td>1.101078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>0.9340339</td>
<td>0.0867133</td>
<td>0.7407822</td>
<td>1.10537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>0.9038025</td>
<td>0.0931482</td>
<td>0.6918713</td>
<td>1.129824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>0.8928425</td>
<td>0.097894</td>
<td>0.6846996</td>
<td>1.136219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>0.878323</td>
<td>0.1148429</td>
<td>0.6547465</td>
<td>1.247129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>0.8870187</td>
<td>0.1239754</td>
<td>0.6053547</td>
<td>1.215654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>0.8791253</td>
<td>0.1308204</td>
<td>0.5816991</td>
<td>1.16821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>0.8697399</td>
<td>0.1416626</td>
<td>0.5889109</td>
<td>1.153012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>0.83406</td>
<td>0.1508017</td>
<td>0.553775</td>
<td>1.183692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>0.8062226</td>
<td>0.1550811</td>
<td>0.5057618</td>
<td>1.141267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>0.7975943</td>
<td>0.1633702</td>
<td>0.4869122</td>
<td>1.138422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>0.7755952</td>
<td>0.164393</td>
<td>0.4846897</td>
<td>1.111699</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std.dev</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>100.466</td>
<td>0.223112</td>
<td>0.9738502</td>
<td>1.10374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>0.9973837</td>
<td>0.0353828</td>
<td>0.9318368</td>
<td>1.110998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>0.958629</td>
<td>0.0491925</td>
<td>0.838806</td>
<td>1.133703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>0.9767716</td>
<td>0.0565275</td>
<td>0.8191673</td>
<td>1.0986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>0.9774217</td>
<td>0.0680905</td>
<td>0.7167124</td>
<td>1.132259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>0.9749436</td>
<td>0.0700944</td>
<td>0.6643949</td>
<td>1.145907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>0.9713212</td>
<td>0.0821956</td>
<td>0.6606359</td>
<td>1.197197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>0.9640416</td>
<td>0.073964</td>
<td>0.6701025</td>
<td>1.136142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>0.9645689</td>
<td>0.078482</td>
<td>0.68469</td>
<td>1.084858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>0.963333</td>
<td>0.080166</td>
<td>0.6786274</td>
<td>1.097422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>0.954852</td>
<td>0.0941098</td>
<td>0.6721984</td>
<td>1.174267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>0.9434679</td>
<td>0.0913424</td>
<td>0.644545</td>
<td>1.129452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>0.9467514</td>
<td>0.092244</td>
<td>0.6513906</td>
<td>1.193087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>0.941888</td>
<td>0.0876902</td>
<td>0.650878</td>
<td>1.105566</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std.dev</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>0.9895994</td>
<td>0.0336755</td>
<td>0.8765329</td>
<td>1.044178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>0.959103</td>
<td>0.0583405</td>
<td>0.8202078</td>
<td>1.105808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>0.9653438</td>
<td>0.0695929</td>
<td>0.8142751</td>
<td>1.205441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>0.9568888</td>
<td>0.0735155</td>
<td>0.7796931</td>
<td>1.082487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>0.9252324</td>
<td>0.0754339</td>
<td>0.735792</td>
<td>1.116165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>0.9171671</td>
<td>0.0870394</td>
<td>0.700553</td>
<td>1.110304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>0.9058169</td>
<td>0.0997229</td>
<td>0.6566866</td>
<td>1.112162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>0.9207237</td>
<td>0.109353</td>
<td>0.6333377</td>
<td>1.131052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>0.913257</td>
<td>0.1261132</td>
<td>0.5661972</td>
<td>1.142788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>0.9051959</td>
<td>0.1375741</td>
<td>0.5469128</td>
<td>1.147866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>0.8713984</td>
<td>0.1430065</td>
<td>0.5331441</td>
<td>1.151461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>0.8553668</td>
<td>0.144095</td>
<td>0.5416386</td>
<td>1.163451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>0.8438615</td>
<td>0.1580789</td>
<td>0.5183211</td>
<td>1.202765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>0.8258537</td>
<td>0.1454902</td>
<td>0.4648073</td>
<td>1.128145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7: Summarized Country Statistic
Figure 8 shows three scatter plots that depict the relationship between energy intensity improvements (y-axis) and GDP per capita, GDP growth as well as initial energy intensity (on the x-axis) across the 40 countries and the period 1995-2009 considered in the WIOD. The first graph shows that less developed countries tend to have more success in reducing energy intensity than countries with a higher development status, measured by the average GDP per capita (PPP).\(^{27}\) Hence, poorer countries exhibit on average higher relative gains in energy efficiency. In fact, this association is driven by the technological effect on energy efficiency that were most pronounced in poorer countries. By contrast, structural changes tended to be stronger in richer countries.\(^{28}\) Moreover, average GDP growth appears to be correlated with efficiency gains (center graph). Economies that grew at higher rates also exhibited large efficiency gains. Again, the association is shaped by the technological component, while the impact of structural changes seem to be independent of GDP growth. Finally and as shown in the right plot, countries with larger initial energy intensities also tended to improve their energy efficiency much stronger as seen in the graph at the right of Figure 8. Hence, we observe a global convergence of energy-intensities in the considered period.

![Figure 8: Relationship between energy intensity improvement and GDP per capita (left), average GDP growth (center) and initial energy intensity (right)](image)

In the following, we highlight the results of some selected countries of interest, namely USA, India, China, Japan and Turkey. Our choice of the USA and China is motivated by their large share in global energy consumption. The structure of the Indian economy will have an increasing impact on global energy use as well. In addition we discuss decomposition results of Japan and Turkey because the differences to unadjusted data are most pronounced for these countries. In the Appendix A2, we provide the results for all nations. Figure 9 shows the development of energy use in the USA with consumption based energy data (left graph) and production based energy data (right graph). While the trends in energy intensity are quite similar, we can observe a dramatic difference in the contribution of structural and technological effects on overall energy intensity. For non-adjusted data we see, starting at 2002, a strong trend towards the structural effect contributing by about 80% to the overall energy intensity decline. In contrast, the consumption-based approach suggests a much weaker structural effect, being only responsible for about 32% of the total reduction in energy-intensity.

For China and India, differences in both approaches are less significant and indicate both that the structural effect played almost no role. Therefore we just depict the consumption based decomposition for this countries. In both countries, the structural effect was even resulting in a more energy-intensive economy during some years.

\(^{27}\)Here we use GDP per capita (PPP) in constant 2011 international Dollar from the World Bank (2016)

\(^{28}\)See Appendix A2 for a decomposition of energy efficiency gains in a structural and technological component and their relationship to GDP per capita, GDP growth and initial energy intensity.
The outcome for Turkey shows strong differences in particular for the last two years of the time period considered. When decomposing unadjusted data, the technological effect is underestimated by about 10% while the structural effect appears to be strongly exaggerated. Note, that the time trend of the total effect also differs across adjusted and unadjusted data. This gap reflects the
higher energy consumption of Turkey compared to its production-based energy use.

In Japan, structural changes seem responsible for all improvements in national energy efficiency under unadjusted energy consumption data while the pattern dramatically changes if we look at adjusted data. These differences are an indicator of the importance of an environmental extended input-output analysis in evaluating energy intensity trends.

5.2 Decomposition on a global level

In addition to the two factors considered in the country analysis, we also have to account for a third factor on a global level, namely the structural effect between countries, also called the trade effect. It is a well known concern that industrial countries, by tightening their environmental laws, create incentives for heavily polluting industries to move to less-regulated countries. We therefore decompose the global energy intensity trend into a technological effect, structural effect within a country and a structural effect between countries (trade effect). We apply a three factor decomposition analysis, described by Voigt et al. (2014) and in Appendix A1.

On a global scale, adjusted and non-adjusted results show similar patterns. It is evident in both approaches that the trade effect between countries, illustrated by the orange line in Figure 13, has lead to a more energy intensive world economy. As Voigt et al. (2014) note, this was due to the

---

29See e.g. Babiker (2005)
shift of the global economy towards countries like China and India that have relatively high energy intensities. Both approaches also agree, that the structural effect within a country, shown by the blue line in Figure 13, lead to a reduction of global energy intensities. Both approaches also have in common that the technology effect was the main driving force for energy efficiency gains. In particular we can see by examining the red line in Figure 13, that the increasing energy prices between 2004 and 2008 coincided with a strong global improvement due to technology.

To highlight some differences in results of both approaches we calculate the structural and technological effects relative to the total efficiency gains 30. Figure (14) depicts the relative contribution of trade, between country and within country structural effect relative to normalized total effects for both approaches.

The trade effect appears to be weaker over the considered period using adjusted data as can be inferred from the left hand graph of Figure 14. The overestimation of the trade effect under unadjusted data is due to the missing reallocation of energy embodied in trade away from energy-intensive countries such as China and India. In fact, a significant part of energy use in these countries is linked to final demand in less energy-intensive countries, see Section 3. Thus, the global shift in energy use is less pronounced when considering consumption-based rather than production-based energy use.

In addition, unadjusted data overestimate the importance of structural effect within a country, as seen in the second graph in Figure 14. We, thus, observe once again, that when energy-embodied trade is accounted for, structural changes appear to have a weaker effect on the global energy intensity.

The overestimation of structural effects using unadjusted data necessarily results in an underestimation of the technology effect. The contribution of the technology effect trend on overall energy intensity trends is almost double in the case of adjusted data.

6 Conclusion

The fundamental question posed in the green growth literature is whether it is possible to reconcile economic growth with environmental sustainability. This question hinges most importantly on the feasibility of decreasing the emission of greenhouse gases and the exploitation of natural resources in global production processes. Apart from the utilization of renewable energy, widespread and significant reductions in energy intensities can contribute to achieving sustainable growth in the future. This can not only be obtained by technological but also by structural changes. Moreover,

30 We have to calculate the relative contributions because the total levels of energy intensity are different. This is due to the use of consumption data for measuring energy intensity in the consumption based approach.
international trade can affect the global energy intensity. In this paper, we have attempted to shed some light on the importance of these three factors by analyzing recent developments in global and national energy intensities.

Our key contribution lies in the utilization of the World Input-Output database in combination with the accompanying environmental accounts to arrive at a consumption-based measure of energy use on a sectoral level. In contrast to Voigt et al. (2014), we are, thus, able to take into account the energy use of intermediate goods that contribute to the satisfaction of sectoral final demand. Only by doing so, we can meaningfully study the ultimate effect of changes in consumption patterns on national or global energy intensities. Our analysis consists of two stages: First, we compare adjusted and unadjusted energy use across sectors and countries. Second, we decompose trends of adjusted data on a country and global level into technological, trade and structural factors. Furthermore, we juxtapose the decomposition results of adjusted and unadjusted energy use in order to highlight differences to Voigt et al. (2014).

We find large effects of energy use adjustments according to the EEIOA. In particular, the energy use associated with final demand in the construction and service sector exceeds by far the energy consumption in their production processes. This indicates a strong reliance on energy-intensive inputs from other sectors. Conversely, the manufacturing industry as well as the electricity, water and gas sector that, to a large degree, deliver intermediate inputs to other sectors, show lower energy use when adjusted for energy embodied in trade. Overall, we find that the global energy intensity from 1995 to 2009 was declining predominantly due to more efficient technology used within sectors than due to a structural change in the economy. Nevertheless, structural change within countries played a sizable role in the reduction of energy consumption. Furthermore, our analysis shows that international trade by itself led to a higher energy intensity level. This is likely a result of outsourcing production processes to countries with lower levels of energy intensities.

Decomposing adjusted and unadjusted energy use reveals that the role of structural change is systematically overestimated in previous studies. This is because after adjusting sectoral energy use according to intersectoral trade, changes in structural composition, both within and between countries, appear to have a smaller impact on global energy intensities. Nevertheless, also the unadjusted decomposition identifies technological change as the main driver of reducing energy use relative to output. However, this qualitative similarity on a global level does not hold for each country. For instance, we show, that in some countries, like USA, Japan and Turkey, the technological effect is strongly underestimated. While structural change seems to be the driving factor of energy intensity reductions using unadjusted data, technology plays the dominant role using adjusted energy consumption. Hence, our adjusted measure of energy use indicates that these countries are not exceptions from the general global pattern in which the main force of increasing energy efficiency is technological progress.

Our analysis implies that green growth policy has to take into account the adjustment of sectoral data in order to obtain a correct picture of what can be considered a "green" or "dirty" sector. This is particularly relevant for the theoretical literature on directed technical change and the environment that usually features such a stylized distinction between industries. The interdependencies of sectors through trade of intermediated goods might even give rise to doubts whether such a classification of sectors can be meaningfully applied. More importantly for policy-makers is the fact, that technological advances seem to play the largest role in the energy intensity trends. Given that environmental policy mostly affects within-sector efficiency and structural change itself is rather difficult to influence (Huntington (2010)), such policy is likely able to play a strong role in achieving efficiency goals.

There are several ways to build on this emerging literature analyzing environmental impacts of global production processes based on WIOD and its accompanying environmental accounts. First,
past global trends have shown little evidence of a strong structural break towards relatively cleaner sectors. China has become the largest energy consumer in 2010 and is, therefore, of particular importance for future global energy intensities. In fact, China itself practically did not experience any effect from structural change, and its energy intensity decrease is explained completely by technological progress. More recent literature argues, however, that energy intensity gains in China during the 2010s might be mostly driven by structural change (see Jos et al. (2015)). Thus, it would be an interesting and important field for future research, once the data is available, to analyze whether there is a potential for structural transformation of economies beyond the magnitude shown in this paper for the period up to 2009.\textsuperscript{32} Second, this work and numerous other papers have documented the large extent of emissions and energy embodied in international trade. In fact, we show that increasing outsourcing of energy-intensive production has by itself increased global energy intensities. Thus, an analysis of the effects of carbon border taxation on overall global energy and emission intensities poses another important further research challenge. Finally, technological improvements were identified as the main driver of decreasing energy intensities. WIOD accounts can be used to identify sectors and countries that would benefit most strongly from technology transfers and those that can provide the technology to do so. Considering the large differences in sectoral energy-intensities across countries, there is certainly scope for global energy intensity reductions through technology-transfers to less efficient countries.

\textsuperscript{32}Su and Ang (2012) point out that the construction of input-output tables are rather time-intensive such that there is a large time lag between publication and data used.
A Appendix

A.1 Three factor LMDI II

The three factor LMDI II is similar to the two factor LMDI II and adds international structural change to the components to be decomposed. Therefore we depict global Energy Intensity as follows:

\[ I_t = \sum_j \sum_i \frac{GO_{i,j,t}}{GO_t} \frac{GO_{i,j,t}}{GO_{i,j,t}} \frac{EU_{i,j,t}}{GO_{i,j,t}} = \sum_j \sum_i S_{j,t} S_{i,j,t} I_{i,j,t} \]  \hspace{1cm} (14)

- \( I_t \): global energy intensity at time t.
- \( t \in (1995, 2009) \) is the time period
- \( i = 1, \ldots, 35 \) is the sector index
- \( j = 1, \ldots, 40 \) indicates the country
- \( EU_{i,j,t} \) is the energy use of sector \( i \) in economy \( j \) in period \( t \).
- \( CO_{i,j,t} \) is final consumption of sector \( i \) in economy \( j \) in period \( t \).
- \( CO_j,t = \sum_i CO_{i,j,t} \) is the final consumption of products of sectors in the whole economy.
- \( CO_t = \sum_j CO_j,t \): global final consumption at time \( t \).
- \( S_{i,j,t} = \frac{CO_{i,j,t}}{CO_{j,t}} \) is the consumption share of sector \( i \) in total consumption of the country.
- \( S_{j,t} = \frac{CO_{j,t}}{CO_t} \): share of country \( j \) in global final consumption at time \( t \).
- \( I_{i,j,t} = \frac{EU_{i,j,t}}{CO_{i,j,t}} \) is total energy intensity of economy \( j \) in period \( t \).

Analogous to the two factor LMDI II we can decompose the change in energy intensity as follows:

\[ D_{Tot,j,t+1} = \frac{I_{t+1}}{I_t} = D_{bStr,t+1} D_{wStr,t+1} D_{Int,t+1} \]  \hspace{1cm} (15)

\[ D_{bStr,t+1} = \exp \left[ \sum_j \sum_i \sum \sum \frac{L(\tilde{\omega}_{i,j,t+1}, \tilde{\omega}_{i,j,t})}{1} \ln \left( \frac{S_{j,t+1}}{S_{j,t}} \right) \right] \]  \hspace{1cm} (16)

\[ D_{wStr,t+1} = \exp \left[ \sum_j \sum_i \sum \sum \frac{L(\tilde{\omega}_{i,j,t+1}, \tilde{\omega}_{i,j,t})}{1} \ln \left( \frac{S_{i,j,t+1}}{S_{i,j,t}} \right) \right] \]  \hspace{1cm} (17)

\[ D_{Int,t+1} = \exp \left[ \sum_j \sum_i \sum \sum \frac{L(\tilde{\omega}_{i,j,t+1}, \tilde{\omega}_{i,j,t})}{1} \ln \left( \frac{I_{i,j,t+1}}{I_{i,j,t}} \right) \right] \]  \hspace{1cm} (18)

where

\[ L(\tilde{\omega}_{i,j,t+1}, \tilde{\omega}_{i,j,t}) = \frac{\tilde{\omega}_{i,j,t+1} - \tilde{\omega}_{i,j,t}}{\ln \left( \frac{\tilde{\omega}_{i,j,t+1}}{\tilde{\omega}_{i,j,t}} \right)} \]  \hspace{1cm} (19)

and

\[ \tilde{\omega}_{i,j,t} = \frac{EU_{i,j,t}}{EU_t} \]  \hspace{1cm} (20)

- \( I_{i,j,t} = \frac{EU_{i,j,t}}{CO_{i,j,t}} \) is the energy intensity of sector \( i \) in economy \( j \) and period \( t \).
• \( EU_{j,t} = \sum_i EU_{i,j,t} \) is the energy use of economy \( j \) in period \( t \). Output of the country.

The structural component from the two factor LMDI II is now split into two parts:

\( D_{bStr,t+1} \) is the share of contribution of trade between countries to the change of global energy intensity. The more connected via trade the economies are the more important the between countries effect becomes.

\( D_{wStr,t+1} \) is the share of contribution of structural shifts within a country to global energy intensity. It is the same factor as before, but now related to the global energy use.

A.2 Further scatter plots and decomposition results for all countries

In the following, we present scatter plots of the relationship between the average GDP, average GDP growth and initial energy intensity and the overall energy intensity change (first row), the structural component of this change (second row) and technology component (third row). Furthermore, we provide adjusted decomposition results for all countries not displayed in the main part of this paper.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>GBR</th>
<th>GRC</th>
<th>HUN</th>
<th>IDN</th>
<th>IRL</th>
<th>ITA</th>
<th>JPN</th>
<th>KOR</th>
<th>LTU</th>
<th>LUX</th>
<th>LVA</th>
<th>MEX</th>
<th>MLT</th>
<th>NLD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The diagrams show the trends over the years for Within Country Structural Effect, Technology Effect, and Total Effect.
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