

# Estimating Flexible Demand Systems for Energy Services: A Distributive Analysis Using German Household Data

Miguel Tovar Reaños and Nikolas Wölfing Centre for European Economic Research (ZEW)

7th Atlantic Workshop on Energy and Environmental Economics June 27, 2016

▲ロ ▶ ▲周 ▶ ▲ 国 ▶ ▲ 国 ▶ ● の Q @

Motivation & Backgrounds	Data	Demand system, EASI	Methodology	Simulation (Incidence) 000 0	Compensating policies	Conclusions

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲ 三▶ ▲ 三▶ 三三 - のへぐ

#### Presentation plan

- Motivation
- Literature
- Data and Estimation strategy
- Results



#### Motivation



Figure: Consumer price indices for electricity (left) and gas (right) normalised to 100 in 2010. The solid black line depicts the federal index, regional time series are drawn in grey.



# Motivation (Cont)

- Concerns that low-income households disproportionately bear the costs of increases in energy prices have been raised in Germany
- Regressive redistributive effects might undermine the public acceptance of specific energy policies as well as the general support for a fundamental energy transition.

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□ ● ● ●



## Motivation (Cont)

- Concerns that low-income households disproportionately bear the costs of increases in energy prices have been raised in Germany
- Regressive redistributive effects might undermine the public acceptance of specific energy policies as well as the general support for a fundamental energy transition.
- Little is known about the performance of different demand systems when increases in prices are non-marginal.

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□ ● ● ●



## Motivation (Cont)

- Concerns that low-income households disproportionately bear the costs of increases in energy prices have been raised in Germany
- Regressive redistributive effects might undermine the public acceptance of specific energy policies as well as the general support for a fundamental energy transition.
- Little is known about the performance of different demand systems when increases in prices are non-marginal.

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□ ● ● ●

Motivation & Backgrounds	Data	Demand system, EASI	Methodology	Simulation (Incidence)	Compensating policies	Conclusions
				000		

Motivation (Cont)

• Can we identify vulnerable households?

Motivation & Backgrounds	Data	Demand system, EASI	Methodology	Simulation (Incidence)	Compensating policies	Conclusions
				000		

Motivation (Cont)

• Can we identify vulnerable households?

Motivation & Backgrounds	Data	Demand system, EASI	Methodology	Simulation (Incidence)	Compensating policies	Conclusions
				000		
				Ū.		

Motivation (Cont)

- Can we identify vulnerable households?
- How to compensate the households with larger burdens?

Motivation & Backgrounds	Data	Demand system, EASI	Methodology	Simulation (Incidence)	Compensating policies	Conclusions
				000		
				Ū.		

Motivation (Cont)

- Can we identify vulnerable households?
- How to compensate the households with larger burdens?



- The AID system (Deaton and Muellbauer,1980) and its variations (e.g. the QUAIDS (Banks et al., 1997)) impose restrictions on how the households budget constraint.
- The Exact Affine Stone Index (EASI) demand system proposed by Lewbel and Pendakur (2009) can overcome this limitation
- Application of this methodology anlaysing distributional effects of environmental taxes is particularly scarce
- Creedy and Sleeman (2006) argued hat the environmental economic research mainly focused on efficiency and inequality is largely neglected.



- The AID system (Deaton and Muellbauer,1980) and its variations (e.g. the QUAIDS (Banks et al., 1997)) impose restrictions on how the households budget constraint.
- The Exact Affine Stone Index (EASI) demand system proposed by Lewbel and Pendakur (2009) can overcome this limitation
- Application of this methodology anlaysing distributional effects of environmental taxes is particularly scarce
- Creedy and Sleeman (2006) argued hat the environmental economic research mainly focused on efficiency and inequality is largely neglected.



- The AID system (Deaton and Muellbauer,1980) and its variations (e.g. the QUAIDS (Banks et al., 1997)) impose restrictions on how the households budget constraint.
- The Exact Affine Stone Index (EASI) demand system proposed by Lewbel and Pendakur (2009) can overcome this limitation
- Application of this methodology anlaysing distributional effects of environmental taxes is particularly scarce
- Creedy and Sleeman (2006) argued hat the environmental economic research mainly focused on efficiency and inequality is largely neglected.



# Continuous household budget survey (LWR)

For Germany, the literature in this area is particularly scarce. The reason lies in particular in data availability.

- LWR:Sample size 70,000 observations covering the years 2002-2012
- LWR:Household characteristics such as size, age, number of children, education, etc.
- LWR: Dwelling characteristics, equipment with type of heating system, appliances, etc.

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□ ● ● ●

• Lewbel (1989)'s prices are used to introduce further price variation



#### Non-parametric Engel curves: Expenditure share over log income



▲ロ ▶ ▲周 ▶ ▲ 国 ▶ ▲ 国 ▶ ● の Q @

# The Exact Affine Stone Index

Developed by Lewbel and Pendakur AER, 2009.

• Household demand is expressed in budget share form:

$$w_i = \sum_{r=0}^{R} b_r \log(y)^r + \sum_j a_{ij} \log(p_j) + \sum_l d_{il} z_l \log(y) + \sum_l g_{il} z_l$$

with

- *w<sub>i</sub>* the budget share of good *i*. Food, housing, electricity, heating, transportation and communications, education and leisure, and other goods.
- $p_j$  the price of good j
- y implicit utility function which depends on: budget shares, prices and a-parameters
- z<sub>1</sub> dummy variables for socioeconomic characteristics



In all the scenarios a 20% increase in the commodity prices are explored as follows:

- (a) Only electricity prices increase
- (b) Only heating prices increase
- (c) Both, electricity and heating prices increase.
- (d) Only transport and communications prices increase
- (e) Only the price for housing (rents and related services) increases

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ □ のQで



#### Table: Equivalent variation estimates in % of income ( $\Delta$ Electricity prices)

household type	$1^{st}$	2 <sup>nd</sup>	3 <sup>rd</sup>	$4^{th}$
Single +65	0.49	0.32	0.24	0.16
Single no children	0.51	0.28	0.19	0.13
Single with children	0.58	0.43	0.31	0.22
2 adults +65 no children	0.58	0.40	0.30	0.21
2 adults no children	0.61	0.40	0.30	0.20
2 adults one child	0.60	0.42	0.31	0.22
2 adults two children	0.64	0.47	0.36	0.25

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆ 臣▶ ◆ 臣▶ ○ 臣 ○ の Q @

Motivation & Backgrounds	Data	Demand system, EASI	Methodology	Simulation (Incidence) ○●○ ○	Compensating policies	Conclusions

## Table: Equivalent variation estimates in % of income ( $\Delta$ Heating prices)

household type	$1^{st}$	2 <sup>nd</sup>	3 <sup>rd</sup>	$4^{th}$
Single +65	1.26	0.94	0.77	0.60
Single no children	1.15	0.74	0.58	0.42
Single with children	1.20	0.92	0.70	0.49
2 adults +65 no children	1.18	0.95	0.82	0.64
2 adults no children	1.22	0.87	0.69	0.51
2 adults one child	1.18	0.82	0.67	0.51
2 adults two children	1.24	0.87	0.71	0.54



Table: Inequality and Social Welfare over different scenarios ( $\Delta$  indicates difference w.r.t. the reference scenario).

		Δ Gini	Mean equiv-	Sen's index	
Scenario	Gini	in %	alised income	(SW)	$\Delta$ SW(Euro)
Electricity	0.2983	0.30	3064.81	2150.43	-16.52
Heating	0.2984	0.34	3061.71	2148.13	-18.82
Energy	0.2993	0.64	3042.36	2131.73	-35.22
Housing	0.3056	2.76	2881.93	2001.15	-165.80
Transport	0.2989	0.50	3047.45	2136.52	-30.43

#### Based on AID system

#### Based on EASI demand system

Electricity	0.2981	0.24	3074.21	2157.83	-9.12
Heating	0.2985	0.37	3060.03	2146.57	-20.38
Energy	0.2992	0.61	3049.88	2137.42	-29.53
Housing	0.3018	1.48	2979.72	2080.45	-86.50
Transport	0.2986	0.40	3051.29	2140.04	-26.91



We explore three possible counteractive policies for the scenario where both electricity and heating prices increase.

- (a) Policy 1: Flat allocation for all households
- (b) Policy 2: Flat allocation only for households in the first quartile of the income distribution
- (c) Policy 3: a decrease of 10% in electricity and heating prices for the first quartile of the income distribution

▲ロ ▶ ▲周 ▶ ▲ 国 ▶ ▲ 国 ▶ ● の Q @

Motivation & Backgrounds	Data	Demand system, EASI	Methodology	Simulation (Incidence) 000 0	Compensating policies	Conclusions

Table: Inequality and Sen's Index for Social Welfare (monthly, per household and in 2012 prices) for different compensating policies ( $\Delta$  indicates difference w.r.t. the scenario of an increase in electricity and heating prices).

		Δ Gini	Mean equiv-	Sen's index	
Scenario	Gini	in %	alised income	(SW)	$\Delta$ SW
Elec.+Heating	0.2992		3049.88	2137.42	
Policy 1	0.2981	-0.37	3064.74	2151.29	13.87
Policy 2	0.2938	-1.80	3079.31	2174.64	37.22
Policy 3	0.2979	-0.43	3056.74	2146.09	8.67

▲□▶▲□▶▲≡▶▲≡▶ ≡ めぬぐ

Policy 1: Flat allocation for all households;

Policy 2: Flat allocation for low income households;

Policy 3: Reduction in electricity and heating prices for low income households



- (a) The regressivity of an energy price increase is remarkable large in relation to the small budget share these goods account for.
- (b) Flat transfers to all households have only small counteractive distributional effects.
- (c) Flat transfer is structurally comparable to a form of "social tariffs" that have been put forward in Germany as a means of increasing social equity of the energy transition.
- (d) Ignoring nonlinearities in the demand system estimation might lead to a substantially biased evaluation of the distributive effects of consumer price changes in general.

▲ロ ▶ ▲周 ▶ ▲ 国 ▶ ▲ 国 ▶ ● の Q @



Project founded by the German Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF) and the MannheimTaxation (MaTax) ScienceCampus

