

Document de treball de l'IEB 2014/31

THE DIFFUSION OF PATENTED OIL AND GAS TECHNOLOGY WITH ENVIRONMENTAL USES: A FORWARD PATENT CITATION ANALYSIS

Maria Teresa Costa-Campi, Nestor Duch-Brown

Energy Sustainability

Document de treball de l'IEB

THE DIFFUSION OF PATENTED OIL AND GAS TECHNOLOGY WITH ENVIRONMENTAL USES: A FORWARD PATENT CITATION ANALYSIS

Maria Teresa Costa-Campi, Nestor Duch-Brown

The **Barcelona Institute of Economics (IEB)** is a research centre at the University of Barcelona (UB) which specializes in the field of applied economics. The **IEB** is a foundation funded by the following institutions: Applus, Abertis, Ajuntament de Barcelona, Diputació de Barcelona, Gas Natural and La Caixa.

Within the IEB framework, the **Chair of Energy Sustainability** promotes research into the production, supply and use of the energy needed to maintain social welfare and development, placing special emphasis on economic, environmental and social aspects. There are three main research areas of interest within the program: energy sustainability, competition and consumers, and energy firms. The energy sustainability research area covers topics as energy efficiency, CO₂ capture and storage, R+D in energy, green certificate markets, smart grids and meters, green energy and biofuels. The competition and consumers area is oriented to research on wholesale markets, retail markets, regulation, competition and consumers. The research area on energy firms is devoted to the analysis of business strategies, social and corporate responsibility, and industrial organization. Disseminating research outputs to a broad audience is an important objective of the program, whose results must be relevant both at national and international level.

The **Chair of Energy Sustainability of the University of Barcelona-IEB** is funded by the following enterprises ACS, CEPSA, CLH, Enagas, Endesa, FCC Energia, HC Energia, Gas Natural Fenosa, and Repsol) through FUNSEAM (Foundation for Energy and Environmental Sustainability).

Postal Address:

Chair in Energy Sustainability
Institut d'Economia de Barcelona
Facultat d'Economia i Empresa
Universitat de Barcelona
C/ Tinent Coronel Valenzuela, 1-11
(08034) Barcelona, Spain
Tel.: + 34 93 403 46 46
Fax: + 34 93 403 98 32
ieb@ub.edu
<http://www.ieb.ub.edu>

The IEB working papers represent ongoing research that is circulated to encourage discussion and has not undergone a peer review process. Any opinions expressed here are those of the author(s) and not those of IEB.

THE DIFFUSION OF PATENTED OIL AND GAS TECHNOLOGY WITH ENVIRONMENTAL USES: A FORWARD PATENT CITATION ANALYSIS

Maria Teresa Costa-Campi, Nestor Duch-Brown

ABSTRACT: Relevant advances in the mitigation of environmental impact could be obtained by the appropriate diffusion of existing environmental technologies. In this paper, we look at the diffusion of knowledge related to environmental technologies developed within the oil and gas industry. To assess knowledge spillovers from oil and gas inventions as a measure of technology diffusion, we rely on forward patent citations methodology. Results show that there is a strong likelihood that the citing patent will be eventually linked to environmental technologies if the original oil and gas invention has already environmental uses. Moreover, both intra and intersectoral spillovers produce a "turnabout" effect, meaning that citing patents show the opposite quality level of the cited patent. Our results support the idea that more sector-specific environmental policies, with an emphasis on diffusion, would significantly improve the use of environmental technologies developed within the oil and gas industry.

JEL Codes: Q4, Q55, O31

Keywords: Forward patent citations, petroleum industry, environmental and technology policies

Maria Teresa Costa-Campi
Department of Public Economics,
Chair on Energy and Environmental
Sustainability & IEB
University of Barcelona
Avda. Diagonal 690
08034 Barcelona, Spain
E-mail: mtcosta@ub.edu

Nestor Duch-Brown
Institute for Prospective Technological
Studies, European Commission &
Department of Public Economics,
Chair on Energy and Environmental
Sustainability & IEB
University of Barcelona
Avda. Diagonal 690
08034 Barcelona, Spain
E-mail: nduch@ub.edu

1 Introduction

Most modern economic activities related to production, distribution and consumption require energy to be accomplished efficiently. Consequently, energy is fundamental for the prosperity of any contemporary society. To be used as an input for diverse economic and social activities, energy is produced from many sources, distributed through several systems and consumed in a wide range of forms. Demand and supply of energy vary across countries around the globe depending mainly on geographic, economic and political characteristics. These sets of factors, and maybe others not listed, determine the costs associated to the supply of energy and the intensity of its use. Technology can be used to reduce the cost per unit of energy or to improve the energy requirements to carry out activities and thus is welfare improving.

As with many other economic activities, the energy industry generates externalities –unintended positive or negative consequences on other economic and social agents that are not captured by the price mechanism. In this respect, some energy sources have important negative effects on the environment. For instance, green house gas (GHG) emissions and other pollutants are produced by the combustion of fossil fuels. Oil spills and additional by-products of refining discharged in lakes, rivers and the sea account for a significant amount of water pollution. To correct these market failures, environmental policies are needed to balance out marginal costs and benefits of environmental protection. Technologies such as carbon capture and sequestration (CCS) and flue-gas desulfurization (FGD) to name just two of the most widely known inhibit CO₂ and SO₂ emissions respectively.

According to Carraro et al (2010), by changing relative prices, environmental policies induce technical change towards so called clean technologies. These are technologies that are supposed to deliver the same amount of goods and/or services with less environmental degradation. The change in relative prices comes from the application of different policy tools that normally lie within two broad groups: market instruments and command and control instruments. The latter refer to measures that establish constraints on the volume of pollution each agent can generate. The former set up explicit prices for negative environmental externalities by means of taxes, tradable pollution permits or fees, among others.

The mitigation of these negative environmental effects produced by the energy industry and related activities can also be tackled from the perspective of technology policy. In this case, for instance R&D subsidies for clean technologies can be designed to promote complementary private investments to develop new inventions or modifications to existing ones that alleviate the negative environmental impacts of human activities. Both environmental and technology policies are justified by the existence of two different types of externalities, a situation normally referred to as the "double externality problem" (Carraro et al., 2010).

The case for environmental policy comes from the fact that without appropriate incentives, agents will not be able to benefit from their efforts to protect the environment and this generates an above-optimal level of pollution. The externality associated to R&D and innovations policies relies on the appropriability argument, stating that once the knowledge supporting a new technology or invention is disclosed, it is available to other agents to copy it negatively affecting the benefits to the inventor causing a sub-optimal level of R&D investment. This brief discussion

makes clear that energy and the environment are naturally linked by technology. In this respect, energy policies, environmental policies and technology policies are strategically interconnected and each one has to be designed taking the others into account to enhance their effectiveness.

By promoting the generation of novel clean technologies, environmental policy is said to induce eco-innovations. The bulk of the literature has been concerned with the role of environmental policy to promote the development of new technology by means of innovation¹. However, an additional approach would be to consider that relevant advances in the mitigation of environmental impact could also be obtained by the appropriate *diffusion* of existing environmental technologies.

Diffusion of new technology is known to be a slow process. Jaffe et al. (2002) indicate two potential factors that explain this pattern. On one hand, the expected value of the new technology will vary with the heterogeneity of potential adopters. If adopters are very different, the penetration rate of the new technology will be normally low, at least during the first stages of its development. On the other hand, the adoption of new technology implies an uncertain amount of risk. Prior to adoption, information regarding the relevant characteristics of the novel technology would have to have been diffused first. In addition, Carraro et al. (2010) argue that uncertainty also enters the slow rate of technology diffusion equation. When agents observe a rapid rate of innovation, they will expect a fast degree of technological obsolescence and hence they will be reluctant to adopt the technology. These authors also assert that there is sufficient evidence to support the notion that environmental policy is a relevant instrument to promote innovation and enhance diffusion of novel environmentally-friendly technologies. Here, we will look at the

¹ See Jaffe et al. (2002) and Carraro et al. (2010) for surveys of the literature on the relationship between environmental policies and technical change.

diffusion of knowledge related to environmental technologies developed within the oil and gas industry.

Since its origins, the petroleum industry has undoubtedly contributed to the world's economic growth, to the generation of wealth, has enhanced prosperity and has certainly pushed the standards of living in many countries. In spite of substantial penetration of renewable energies in recent years, the sector has remained central to the energy industry for decades, and it is expected it will maintain this role for some time into the future (IEA, 2013). For instance, it covers nearly all of the energy requirements for transportation in the world and supplies a vast amount of raw materials for chemical products and processes (Hughes and Rudolph, 2011). The oil shocks of the 1970s have been the sole disruptions to an otherwise always increasing production trend during the 20th and the 21st centuries. Moreover, higher demand from developing countries will keep the production trend up, according to the conservative scenario for 2035 elaborated by the International Energy Agency (IEA, 2013).

In this paper we focus on the diffusion of patented oil and gas technologies, with an especial focus on the environmental uses these inventions declare to have. Since the petroleum industry² is responsible for an important amount of the adverse impact on the global environment, knowing to what extent inventions developed within this sector embrace environmentally friendly uses is of great importance to the design of future energy and environmental policies as well as to inform international climate change negotiations.

² The petroleum industry includes the exploration, extraction, refining, transportation and commercialization of oil and gas products.

To study knowledge diffusion from oil and gas inventions we rely on forward patent citations. Our data consists on the universe of patent applications filed between 1990 and 2010 related to the oil and gas industry. The dataset consists of half a million patent applications and around 200.000 patent families. We define the exclusive use of oil and gas patent when it only contains IPC codes related to oil and gas activities. These patents diffuse faster (are more cited) than inclusive patents –those that include uses outside the industry. The results show, first, the absence of relevant knowledge externalities derived from patented oil and gas technology since the majority of this knowledge remains within the industry. Importantly, oil and gas patents with environmental applications are only a small fraction of applications in this sector and receive fewer citations than either inclusive patents in other fields or exclusive patents. Second, by separating the nature of the citing patent, we show that the probability of a non oil and gas patent citing oil and gas patent is higher when the patent is not exclusive and especially when it includes links to environmental technologies. These results suggest some orientations to reinforce the effectiveness of both environmental and technology policies.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we describe the data, we discuss the advantages and drawbacks of patents as measures of technology inventions and we clarify how citations can be used to track technological diffusion. We also expose the empirical methodology to be used in the analysis of forward patent citations in the oil and gas industry. The results are then presented in section 3 along with some discussion. Finally, section 4 contains the main conclusions of the research. Here, particular emphasis is put on the policy dimension.

2 Methods

In this section we first describe the dataset used to analyse the diffusion of patented oil and gas technologies and we discuss some advantages and some drawbacks of patents as indicators of invention. In addition, we conduct an explanatory and descriptive analysis of the data. Finally, we explain the methodologies we use for the empirical analysis of forward citations, namely a count data model to assess citation counts and a multilevel model in order to capture the characteristics of both the citing and the cited patents.

2.1 Patents data and exploratory analysis

The objective of this paper is to analyse the diffusion of patented oil and gas technologies. Several indicators are available for that purpose, but following a long tradition in the literature on economics of innovation, we will focus on forward citations to examine the extent of knowledge spillovers arising from oil and gas inventions.

Patent data have a number of attractive features for the analysis of the interactions between technology and the environment (Popp, 2005). For example, the technological breakdown for which patents are available is quite detailed, making them a suitable indicator for the analysis of technology invention and diffusion. Moreover, patents contain citations to previous inventions, as patent applicants are required to include references to previous patents that have been used to develop the new technology or knowledge described in the patent. Hence, they represent a form of knowledge and/or technology flows. However, there are also some issues to

take into account. Not all inventions are patented, so patent citations may underestimate the real amount of knowledge spillovers. Self-citations are also a concern, since they represent internalised knowledge transfer different from true knowledge spillovers represented by citations to other inventors' patents. Finally, patent examiners add citations during the evaluation process and may introduce some bias in the measures of knowledge spillovers. Nevertheless, as shown by Lee and Lee (2013), the literature on patent analysis in the energy sector collapses to very few papers.

The analysis of the diffusion of oil and gas technologies is done with data from the EPO World Patent Statistical Database (PATSTAT). Created and secured by the European Patent Office (EPO), this database includes around 70 million patent documents from more than 100 patent offices around the world. The identification of oil and gas patents is done with the help of the Derwent World Patents Index (DWPI) classification system (Thompson Reuters, 2010). Here, class H refers to petroleum, and contains comprehensive coverage of all aspects of the oil and gas industry, and identifies the relevant IPC codes to search within the PATSTAT database. Table 1 shows the number of applications, families and citations extracted from the database and referred to the petroleum industry according to the DWPI.

Table 1 around here

The same invention can be patented in several countries. To avoid double counting of citations to the same fundamental invention, we focus on patent families (the set of patents covering the same invention in several countries). This means treating multiple filings of a patent as one invention and count citations at the family level

instead of at the individual patent level. In total, our dataset includes 389,607 patent applications in the period 1990-2010, representing 190,284 inventions (families). Figure 1 shows the evolution of both patent applications and families in the period under consideration. The figure shows a notorious increase in the number of patent applications (and families) starting in the second half of the nineties. To what extent this could be the industry's response to the adoption by many countries of the Kyoto protocol is a separate research question, but certainly the data show some time coincidence.

Figure 1 around here

When filing a patent, applicants must indicate the IPC code or codes the invention is related to. IPC codes reflect technological areas as defined by the World Intellectual Property Organisation (WIPO). Similarly to citations, patent examiners can add IPC codes if relevant uses are found during the evaluation process. Hence, a given patent can have many IPC codes (or uses). In order to proceed with the analysis, the original (cited) patent families were classified into two groups: i) *exclusive* patents containing only any of the above mentioned IPC codes related to oil and gas (column 2 in table 2); ii) *inclusive* patents, defined as patent documents containing in addition IPC codes from other non-oil and gas uses.

In addition, we constructed a new variable that takes the value one if the citing patent has linkages with environmental technology; in order to assess the likelihood that an original oil and gas patent can be used in the development of environmental technologies to cope with climate change and energy efficiency objectives. Here, we rely on the WIPO IPC-technology concordance table that identifies the nature of the IPC codes and maps them into technological areas –one

of these being environmental technologies³-. Table 2 shows the share of exclusive and environmental families by sector. On aggregate, around 20% of the oil and gas inventions in the period 1990-2010 were for exclusive use, i.e. without linkages to sectors outside the oil and gas industry. In addition, around 8% of the cited oil and gas families have links with environmental technologies. Around 13% of the citing patents have links with environmental technologies.

Table 2 around here

Once the relevant patent applications (and families) for the oil and gas industry have been identified and selected, we identify and obtain –also from PATSTAT– those patent documents that contain citations to the above-mentioned original oil and gas patents. A total of 141,554 patent families contain citations to the original oil and gas patent families identified, generating 661,482 citations overall. As before, it is possible to identify the citing patent IPC code. By doing so, we are able to determine the use of the oil and gas technology and hence we can carry out a thorough analysis of the quality and features of the citing patent. This will be the core of the multilevel econometric analysis in section 2. For now, we concentrate exclusively in the counts of citations by every original oil and gas invention registered in the period 1990-2010.

Table 3 indicates that, overall, exclusive oil and gas inventions receive on average 5.4 citations throughout their lifetime while inclusive inventions only receive 3. In addition, inventions with environmental linkages receive only 2.7 citations while inventions not related to the environment receive on average 3.5 citations. Similar

³ As defined by the WIPO document, the field of environmental technology covers a variety of different technologies and applications including filters, waste disposal, water cleaning, gas-flow silencers and exhaust apparatus, waste combustion or noise absorption walls, among others. For detailed information see Schmoch (2008).

patterns are observed by sector. These differences are statistically significant in all cases (at sector level and at the aggregate level).

Table 3 around here

One obvious problem with this simple comparison lies in the fact that patents filed in more recent years have had less time to be cited. This will require controlling for the fact that a potential truncation may affect the results in the econometric section. Citations reflect the direction and intensity of knowledge flows. However, citations can also reflect the inherent quality of the patent instead. In what follows, we will use two widely accepted measures of patent quality. On one hand, patent family size that reflects the different number of patent offices where the same invention has been filed. Second, we will use the grant status of the invention indicating if the patent has been granted by the patent office. It is generally accepted that a granted patent is of higher quality than a patent that has not been granted. Table 4 shows information on the quality of cited and citing inventions in the oil and gas industry. In general, we observe that the family size is lower for citing than for cited patents, and that the probability that the invention is granted is higher in the case of cited inventions than for the citing patents.

Table 4 around here

2.2 Econometric analysis

We will assess the existence and relevance of knowledge spillovers from oil and gas patented technologies by means of two different methodologies. First, we will rely

on citation counts to test the existence and significance of intersectoral knowledge spillovers. Second, we will use the characteristics of the citing patents to add more information on the patterns of knowledge diffusion derived from the oil and gas patented technologies. As we already mentioned in previous sections, one fundamental objective will be to analyse the links these patent families have with environmental technologies.

2.2.1 Citation counts

In this sub-section we estimate a simple count data model of the type

$$C_i = \exp(\beta E_i + \gamma X_i) + \epsilon_i \quad (1)$$

where C_i refers to the quantity of citations made to patent i , E_i is a dichotomous variable that indicates if patent i is exclusive -or has environmental uses- or not, the vector X_i includes a set of variables to control for observed characteristics and ϵ_i is the error term. As explained in the previous section, our dataset includes all oil and gas patent families filed in the period 1990-2010. Here, β is the main coefficient of interest, capturing the difference –all other things equal- between the number of citations received by exclusive and inclusive patents, or between those with environmental applications and those without. The count data nature of the dependent variable C_i , suggests estimating equation 1 by poisson pseudo-maximum likelihood (Hausman et al., 1984; Santos-Silva and Tenreyro, 2011).

In order to clean the estimates from as many potential confounding factors as possible, we include a number of control variables in X_i . First, differences in patent

office practices across time and technological areas may produce artificial differences in citations intensities. We therefore include a full range of patent office and sector fixed effects. Second, the mean count of citations received and made evolve over time. Specifically, there is a problem related to those patents filed in recent years since the time they have been exposed to citations is considerably shorter than for patents filed in the early years of our sample. Hence, a full collection of time effects (filing year) is also included. Finally, we also control for the type of applicant (individual, company, government, university) by including type of applicant fixed effects since their patenting strategies could also differ. This allows us to effectively compare exclusive and/or environmentally related oil and gas patents filed for instance in the EPO in 2000 with inclusive patents -or patents not related to environmental technologies- filed at the EPO the same year.

As we discussed in the previous section, citations can also reflect the intrinsic quality of the patent instead of knowledge flows. To control for this issue we include two widely accepted measures of patent quality. First, we use the patent family size reflecting the number of different patent offices where the same invention has been filed. Second, we use the grant status of the invention indicating if the patent has been granted by the patent office.

2.2.2 Multilevel analysis

To complement the analysis described in the previous sub-section, we identify the main characteristics of the citing patent to control for the observed characteristics of the technology using oil and gas original inventions. For that purpose, we define four dependent variables capturing the different uses of oil and gas technological knowledge which will allow us to analyse the potential knowledge spillovers derived

from these patented inventions. The knowledge embedded in the original oil and gas patent applications is defined employing the IPC code(s) included in the patents that cite those original inventions. The dependent variables are: i) OUTER, is equal to 1 if the citing patent includes non-oil and gas IPC codes exclusively and 0 otherwise; ii) MIXED, equal to 1 if the citing patent includes both outer and oil and gas codes and 0 otherwise; iii) INNER, equal to 1 if the citing patent includes solely oil and gas IPC codes and 0 otherwise; and iv) ENVIRONMENTAL, equal to 1 if the citing patent has environmental uses and 0 otherwise. These three variables capture the extent to which knowledge derived in the oil and gas industry spills over other sectors and particularly to inventions related to the environment.

For instance, we will consider that the original oil and gas invention has been used for “outer” purposes if the IPC codes of the citing patents do not include oil and gas ones (those included in table 1). This would be the case of intersectoral spillovers. In the same line of argument, if the IPC codes of the citing patents include other codes as well as oil and gas codes, we consider that the oil and gas original patent has been used for mixed purposes and generate “shared” spillovers. Finally, when one of these patents has only oil and gas IPC codes we will say that the knowledge embedded in the reference oil and gas invention have had "inner" uses exclusively. In this case, spillovers are from an intraindustry nature. As before, one particular and interesting case arises within interindustry spillovers when the citing (or cited or both) patents have linkages with environmental technologies (Acosta et al., 2009).

According to this structure, the independent variables can be divided into two groups. The first corresponds to factors that represent characteristics of the citing document. The second contains indicators reflecting the attributes of the original

invention. In what follows, we will concentrate in the quality of both citing and cited patents. Here, we still rely in the two variables used to proxy quality: family size and granted status. In addition, we introduce patent office, application year, sector and type of applicant individual effects as in the previous sub-section to take into account as many confounders as possible.

Two issues condition the appropriate econometric methodology to be used. First, in order to capture relevant spillovers we have defined four different binary dependent variables depending on the use of the oil and gas technology (outer, mixed or inner uses and environmental). Second, and more importantly, the explanatory variables are of two different types. On one hand, we have variables reflecting the characteristics of the citing patents. On the other hand, we also have to consider the attributes of the original oil and gas invention. In this last case, given that some citing patents are linked to the same original patent, the values of these explanatory variables are repeated. These arguments suggest that the multilevel logit model is the more adequate econometric estimation method to analyse the uses of the oil and gas patented technology from the perspective of forward patent citation analysis (Wooldridge, 2003). With these considerations at hand, the empirical model is specified as follows:

$$\Pr(y_{ij} = 1 | \mathbf{u}_j) = H(\mathbf{x}_{ij}\beta + \mathbf{z}_{ij}\mathbf{u}_j)$$

where j indexes the group or cluster (in our case the original patent) and i indexes observations (the citing patent) within group, conditional on a set of random effects \mathbf{u}_j . The row vector \mathbf{x}_{ij} includes the covariates for the fixed effects and the vector \mathbf{z}_{ij} are the random effects consequent covariates. Finally, H is the logistic cumulative distribution function, relating the the probability of success to the linear predictors.

Stating the model from the perspective of a latent linear response variable, we have that

$$y_{ij}^* = \mathbf{x}_{ij}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \mathbf{z}_{ij}\mathbf{u}_j + \epsilon_{ij} \quad (2)$$

where ϵ_{ij} is an stochastic error term distributed as logistic and independent of \mathbf{u}_j .

This type of models is well suited to evaluate the unobserved heterogeneity derived from the characteristics of the original oil and gas patents with the introduction of a comprehensive set of individual effects. In addition, the natural heterogeneity across original patents in which the citing patents are grouped calls for the introduction of random effects in the model. Moreover, this estimation technique allows a more precise estimation of the confidence intervals, by considering random effects due to the aggregation of all the citing patents derived from the same original patent. Severe biases could be introduced in the results if the clustered nature of the data is not appropriately taken into account (Antweiler, 2001; Wooldridge, 2003). The implementation of the estimation method is exposed in more detail in Rabe-Hesketh and Skrondal (2008).

3 Results

In this section we present the results derived from the econometric exercises explained in the previous section. First, we concentrate on and discuss the results derived from the analysis of citation counts. Next, we turn to the explanation of our results regarding the multilevel forward patent citation analysis.

3.1 Results from citation counts

Results from equation 1 are shown in table 5. The results from the econometric analysis indicate that, conditional on patent office, application year, sector, type of applicant and quality, exclusive oil and gas inventions have a larger citation count than inclusive oil and gas patents. On average across the different sectors, exclusive oil and gas patents receive around 77% more citations than inclusive patents, with little variation across specifications. Given that the quality measures introduced in specification 3 are strongly statistically significant, this is our preferred specification. Not surprisingly, more quality patents receive more citations as indicated by the two quality variables.

To what extent oil and gas patents related to environmental technologies are cited? From the previous results we can infer that oil and gas patents linked to environmental technologies will receive fewer citations than exclusive patents since by definition they are in the reference group (oil and gas patents with inclusive use). Table 6 shows the results. In this case, oil and gas inclusive inventions that have links with environmental technologies receive on average around 17% fewer citations than patented oil and gas inventions without links to environmental technologies.

Table 5 around here

Table 6 around here

In tables 7 and 8 we present the results from the regressions at the sector level. Our findings indicate that exclusive oil and gas patents receive between 47% and

91% more citations than inclusive oil and gas patents. Lubricants (column 3) and earth drilling (column 4) exhibit the greatest exclusive invention advantage in terms of citations and also the greatest disadvantage in the case of inventions with environmental linkages. Interestingly, more quality patents systematically receive more citations than less quality patents.

Table 7 around here

Table 8 around here

When we compare the relative intensity of knowledge spillovers from exclusive and inclusive oil and gas patented technologies, our results show that exclusive oil and gas patents are more cited than inclusive patents. This result sheds some light on the existence of intrasectoral spillovers. Inventions made by agents within the oil and gas industry with specific uses to this industry tend to be more cited (used) than diversified knowledge with links to other uses. Particularly interesting are the results concerning inventions with links to environmental technologies, that show a significantly fewer number of citations than those oil and gas inventions not related with environmental technologies. In order to have a clearer picture of what type of patents are citing the original oil and gas inventions considered, in the next section we rely on citing patents characteristics.

3.2 Results from multilevel analysis

Table 9 presents the results when considering exclusive versus inclusive oil and gas original inventions, along with citing and cited patent characteristics. In addition, table 10 includes, besides the variables already cited, the indicator

whether the cited patent contains links to environmental technologies or not. In both tables, all the regressions include the full set of patent office, filing year, sector and type of applicant fixed effects (not shown). We concentrate exclusively in the variables that take into account the quality of the citing and the cited inventions, as well as the indicator variables whether the original patent have exclusive or environmental uses. This distinction is interesting in itself, as environmental technologies lie at the heart of climate change and energy efficiency policies. Hence, our preferred estimations are those including this variable.

The results reveal that the probability that the knowledge embedded in an oil and gas invention diffuses to an invention with inner use (i.e. with exclusive oil and gas uses) is higher when the cited patent has exclusive use. On the other hand, the likelihood that the knowledge embedded in an oil and gas patent diffuses to either mixed uses (i.e. inventions with oil and gas and other uses as well) or outer uses (no uses in oil and gas) is higher when the cited invention is inclusive. Hence, intersectoral spillovers are more likely to occur when the cited patent contains diversified uses whereas intrasectoral spillovers are present when the original patent is restricted to exclusive oil and gas uses.

Table 9 around here

Regarding the links to environmental technology, the results in table 10 indicate that the probability that the knowledge embedded in an oil and gas invention diffuses to an invention with outer use (i.e. without oil and gas uses) is higher when the cited patent has linkages to environmental technologies. This means that intersectoral spillovers are more likely to occur when the original oil and gas invention has environmental uses. On the other hand, the likelihood that the

knowledge embedded in an oil and gas patent diffuses to either mixed uses (i.e. inventions with oil and gas and other uses as well) or inner uses (exclusive uses in the oil and gas industry) is higher when the cited invention has no environmental linkages. In this case, intrasectoral spillovers are more likely when the original patent has no relation to environmental technologies.

Table 10 around here

An important and relevant outcome derived from the results in table 10 is related to the quality of the citing and cited patents. According to our measures of quality, the higher the quality of an oil and gas original patent, the more likely it will be diffused to inner use, the lower the quality of the citing patent will be. Hence, the appearance of intrasectoral spillovers will be more likely. On the other hand, the lower the quality of the original oil and gas invention, the probability it will be used by outer use inventions is higher and, at the same time, the higher the quality of the citing patent will be. Intermediate cases occur with mixed use citations, since both citing and cited inventions are of intermediate quality compared to the extreme cases. Hence, a very interesting pattern emerges, in which intrasectoral spillovers are characterised by high quality cited patents but low quality citing patents –the core of the oil and gas industry- while intersectoral spillovers are defined by low quality cited patents but high quality citing patents. We term this phenomenon as the "*turnabout effect*", by means of which knowledge diffusion makes low quality patents be used to generate high quality patents and vice versa.

One final step in the analysis rests in computing the probability that an original oil and gas invention that is related to environmental technology generates citations by newer inventions also related to environmental technologies. We identify for each

citing patent if it has linkages to environmental technologies and re-estimate equation 2 substituting inner, mixed and outer uses for environmental uses. Results are presented in table 11. As it can be seen, if the original patent has linkages with environmental technologies, the likelihood that the citing patent also has these types of links increases considerably. The "*turnabout effect*" is also present in this case: even though the probability that the knowledge embedded in an oil and gas invention diffuses to environmentally-related inventions is higher for low quality original oil and gas inventions, this is offset by the fact that this probability will increase with the quality of the citing patent.

Table 11 around here

In order to check to what extent this result is robust, we perform the analysis by sector. Table 12 shows the results. As can be seen from the table, the probability that the citing patent declares to have environmental uses is positive and significantly affected by the fact that the original patent also declares linkages to environmental technologies. This result is robust and occurs in all sectors.

The processing sector behaves exactly as the industry. Here, then, the "*turnabout*" effect converts relatively low quality original oil and gas patents into high quality citing patents. The drilling sector –the one that concentrates the most observations– shows a partial or incomplete "*turnabout*" effect since the quality of the citing patent is only partially impulsed –the coefficient on family size is not significant–. A similar situation happens with lubricants, although in this case there is also a mixed quality feature of the original patent, for which the granted status turns out to be not significant.

Finally, the gaseous and liquid fuels sector is the only one in which the citing patent shows lower quality, as the coefficient of the citing family size is negative and statistically significant. However, the corresponding coefficient of the granted status is positive and affects the probability more than proportionally than the decrease derived from the family size effect. These results, on aggregate, indicate that the different sectors –as defined by the IPC codes that form the oil and gas industry- show different patterns with respect to the diffusion of knowledge of the inventions related to environmental technologies.

Table 12 around here

4 Conclusions and policy implications

In this paper we have analysed the diffusion of knowledge generated in the oil and gas industry in the period 1990-2010. To measure knowledge spillovers we use a dataset of more than half a million citations received by 192,284 original inventions. We use two different methodologies. First, we perform simple citation count regressions to assess if oil and gas inventions that have exclusive uses within the sector generate more knowledge spillovers than inclusive inventions (those that also have uses outside the oil and gas industry). Second, we use a multilevel logit to assess intraindustry, shared and interindustry spillovers controlling for both citing and cited patents characteristics. In both cases, we put particular attention to the case of oil and gas inventions that have linkages with environmental technologies.

Our results from the first empirical exercise show that exclusive oil and gas patents are more cited than inclusive patents. This result sheds some light on the existence

of intrasectoral spillovers. Inventions made by agents within the oil and gas industry with specific uses to this industry tend to be more cited (used) than diversified knowledge with links to other uses. Particularly interesting are the results concerning inventions with links to environmental technologies, that present a significantly fewer number of citations than those oil and gas inventions not related with environmental technologies. However, our second empirical application reveals more complex diffusion patterns. From those results we learn that the probability that the knowledge embedded in an oil and gas invention diffuses to an invention with inner use (i.e. with exclusive oil and gas uses) is higher when the cited patent has exclusive use. On the other hand, the likelihood that the knowledge embedded in an oil and gas patent diffuses to either mixed uses (i.e. inventions with oil and gas and other uses as well) or outer uses (no uses in oil and gas) is higher when the cited invention is inclusive. Hence, intersectoral spillovers are more likely to occur when the cited patent contains diversified uses whereas intrasectoral spillovers are present when the original patent is restricted to exclusive oil and gas uses.

In the same line of argument, we show that the probability that the knowledge embedded in oil and gas inventions diffuses to an invention with outer use (i.e. without oil and gas uses) is higher when the cited patent has linkages to environmental technologies. We detect a very interesting phenomenon, where intrasectoral spillovers are characterised by high quality cited patents but low quality citing patents while intersectoral spillovers are defined by low quality cited patents but high quality citing patents. We have named this the "*turnabout effect*", indicating that knowledge diffusion makes low quality patents be used to generate high quality patents. This phenomenon is also present when considering knowledge diffusion from original oil and gas patents with environmental uses (low quality

patents) that are used to generate inventions with linkages to environmental technologies (high quality patents). However, not all the sectors –defined at the IPC code level- comprising the oil and gas industry show the same pattern, suggesting caution in the generalisation of this effect.

Many studies have addressed the increasing complementarities between technology and environmental policies (see Kemp and Pontoglio, 2011; Carraro et al., 2010 and references therein). The intuition behind many of these studies is that, while technology policy is relevant for generating novel technologies, environmental policy is essential to guarantee their diffusion. Our results have important policy implications. First, the lower knowledge spillovers generated by oil and gas original inventions with environmental uses indicates that not all the clean technologies show larger knowledge spillovers than dirty technologies. Hence, there is weak or no justification for supporting more generous subsidies for R&D or ad-hoc R&D programmes devoted to clean technologies developed within the oil and gas industry. A case-by-case analysis would be needed in order to avoid subsidising clean technologies that eventually do not spread out sufficiently to justify the public support received. To what extent this is exclusive of the oil and gas industry or it is also present in other industries where environmental technologies are also relevant (i.e. automotive or lightning, among others) is a matter of future research. Second, when taking into account the characteristics of the citing and the cited patents, our data shows that the environmental use of the original invention significantly increases the probability of interindustry spillovers. Hence, a redirection of innovation policy towards environmental technologies could eventually help to reduce the net cost of environmental policies by activating the "turnabout effect", a mechanism that allows (relative) low quality oil and gas

inventions to be diffused to high quality inventions (more cited and more internationally spread) with links to environmental technologies.

Without a proper environmental policy directed to effectively reduce carbon emissions derived from the combustion of fossil-fuels, there is no incentive for economic agents to adopt expensive technologies that cut emissions without providing supplementary benefits, maybe in terms of savings or cost reductions. On the other hand, by providing benefits to users in the form of cost reductions, technologies dealing with energy efficiency or fuel-saving, for instance, will disseminate easier even in the absence of policy (Popp, 2010). Hence, a further identification of the different environmental uses incorporated in oil and gas patent applications and citations would be of extreme importance to identify the existing incentives for diffusion and adoption of environmental technologies in this sector. This would also help inform both technology and environmental policies of the relative performance of the different instruments used.

Barriers to the diffusion of new technology in general and environmental technology in particular, can produce a sort of technological lock-in: new technologies are expensive hence fail to be adopted and they are not adopted because they are expensive. An important policy intervention in order to avoid this trap into suboptimal policies would require a compromise solution between short-run environmental protection measures while at the same time supporting the development of radical eco-innovations (del Rio et al., 2010).

The higher installed base of dirty technologies represents a clear disadvantage to clean technologies. Rapid development –and in particular diffusion– of clean technologies needs more active policy intervention (Veugelers, 2012). For instance,

patent licensing could be a crucial ingredient in the design of innovation policies directed to spur clean technologies particularly in the energy industry (Aalbers et al., 2013). Other policy instruments well suited to deal with technological diffusion are the establishment of environmental standards, eco-taxes, tradable permits, and investment subsidies. Particularly relevant are those instruments that address the information externalities of diffusion, such as eco-labels or network management (del Rio et al., 2010; Kemp, 2000).

If technologies have been already developed, only government involvement can accelerate the diffusion rate relative to the one the market would provide. The mitigation of environmental threats faces a matching problem. On one hand, the most suitable clean technology is developed in high-income countries. On the other, it is in the developing world where emissions grow more rapidly. Hence, new policies in the future will have to take into account the potential role of international technology transfer schemes as incentive-based mechanisms to promote world-scale diffusion of clean technologies. Popp (2012) suggests that a low cost way to promote spillovers could be achieved by improving absorptive capacity or fostering access to trade. First, the potential of benefiting from knowledge spillovers increase with the measures directed to enhance the absorptive capacity of a country. Hascic and Johnstone (2011), -considering patent filings to be a good proxy for technology transfer- find that absorptive capacity turns out to be more relevant than ordinary technology transfer policies. Second, technology transfer agreements embedded in trade policies can also contribute to knowledge spillovers by providing access to relevant technology. The elimination of trade (both tariff and non-tariff) barriers could help to promote significant advances in the trade flows of environmentally-friendly energy technologies (World Bank, 2008).

Our work can be extended into several dimensions. For example, we have concentrated in inter and intraindustry spillovers, but knowledge diffusion can take many other forms: across countries (particularly developed and developing), across applicant types (for example companies, governments, or universities), and also the temporal profile of citations is relevant. Another extension would be to include not only the oil and gas industry, but to analyse more broadly inventions with and without environmental uses. Finally, there is an increasing concern on the crowding out effects of environmental technologies, which call for an analysis of the technologies that are being displaced. All these topics are relevant to assist policy makers in fine tuning both environmental and technology policies in the future. Following Pollitt (2012), even if the liberalisation of energy has improved the quality of policy measures to mitigate negative environmental impacts, the transition to a low carbon economy heavily depends on how much societies are willing to assume the substantial costs implied.

Acknowledgements

We thank Jordi Paniagua, Pablo del Rio, Elisa Trujillo-Baute, Juan Carlos Císcar and participants at the IX Congreso de la Asociación Española para la Economía Energética (AEEE) for helpful comments and suggestions to improve this paper. We also acknowledge support from the Generalitat de Catalunya SGR project 2014-SGR-531. Remaining errors are the responsibility of the authors.

References

- Aalbers, R., Shestalova, V., and Kocsis, V., (2013). Innovation policy for directing technical change in the power sector. *Energy policy* 63: 1240-1250.
- Acosta, M., Coronado, D. and Fernández, A., 2009. Exploring the quality of environmental technology in Europe: evidence from patent citations. *Scientometrics* 80(1): 131-152
- Antweiler, W., (2001). Nested random effects estimation in unbalanced panel data. *Journal of Econometrics*, 101(2): 295-313.
- Carpenter, M.P., Narin, F., Wolf, P., (1981). Citation rates to technologically important patents. *World Patent Information*, 3(4): 160-163.
- Carraro, C., De Cian, E., Nicita, L., Massetti, E., and Verdolini, E., (2010). Environmental policy and technical change: a survey. *International review of environmental and resource economics* 4: 163-219.
- del Rio, P., Carrillo-Hermosilla, J., and Könnölä, T., (2010). Policy strategies to promote eco-innovation. *Journal of industrial ecology* 14(4): 541-557.
- Economides, M. J. and Nikolaou, M., (2011). Technologies for oil and gas production: present and future. *American Institute of chemical engineers*, 57(8): 1974-1982.
- Hausman, J., Hall, B. H., and Griliches, Z. (1984). Econometric models for count data with an application to the patents-R&D relationship. *Econometrica*, 52(4): 909-38.
- Hascic, I. and Johnstone, N., (2011). The Clean Development Mechanism and International Technology Transfer: Empirical Evidence on Wind Power. *Climate Policy*, 11(6): 1303-1314.
- Hughes, L. and Rudolph, J., (2011). Future world oil production: growth, plateau, or peak? *Current opinion in environmental Sustainability*, 3: 225-234.
- IEA (2013). *World Energy Outlook 2013*. Paris: International Energy Agency.

- Jaffe, A., Newell, R. G., and Stavins, R. N., (2002). Environmental policy and technological change. *Environmental and resource economics*, 22: 41-69.
- Lee, K., and Lee, S., (2013). Patterns of technological innovation and evolution in the energy sector: a patent-based approach. *Energy policy*, 59: 415-432.
- Kemp, R., (2000). Technology and Environmental policy. Innovation effects of past policies and suggestions for improvement. *OECD Proceedings Innovation and the Environment*. OECD Paris: 35-61.
- Kemp, R., and Pontoglio, S., (2011). The innovation effects of environmental policy instruments – A typical case of the blind men and the elephant? *Ecological economics*, 72: 28-36.
- Moulton, B.R., (1990). Interpretation of Graphs that Compare the Distribution Functions of Estimators. *Econometric Theory*, 6: 97-102.
- Pollitt, M. G. (2012). The role of policy in energy transitions: lessons from the energy liberalisation era. *Energy policy*, 50: 128-137.
- Popp, D., (2005). Lessons from patents: using patents to measure technological change in environmental models. *Ecological Economics*, 54: 209-226.
- Popp, D., (2010). Innovation and climate policy. NBER Working paper 15673.
- Popp, D., (2012). The role of technological change in green growth. NBER working paper 18506.
- Rabe-Hesheth S., and Skrondal, A., (2008). Multilevel and longitudinal modelling using Stata. StataCorp LP, College Station, Texas.
- Ren, T., (2009). Petrochemicals from oil, natural gas, coal and biomass: energy use, economics and innovation. Unpublished PhD thesis, Utrecht University.
- Santos-Silva, J.M.C., and Tenreyro, S., (2011). Further Simulation Evidence on the Performance of the Poisson-PML Estimator. *Economics Letters*, 112(2): 220–222.

- Schmoch, U., (2008). Concept of a Technology Classification for Country Comparisons. World Intellectual Property Organisation IPC/CE/41/5.
- Thompson Reuters (2010). Derwent World Patents Index. CPI Manual codes. Edition 17. Thompson Reuters, New York.
- Veugelers, R., (2012). Which policy instruments to induce clean innovating? Research policy, 41: 1770-1778.
- Wooldridge, J.M., (2003). Cluster-sample methods in Applied Econometrics. American Economic Review, 93(2), 133-138.
- World Bank, (2008). International Trade and Climate Change: Economic, Legal, and Institutional Perspectives, World Bank, Washington, DC.

Table 1 Number of inventions and citations by sector, 1990-2010

| Sector | IPC code | Applications | Families | Citations |
|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------|-----------------|------------------|
| Processing | C10G | 78,246 | 39,493 | 134,775 |
| Gaseous and liquid fuels | C10L | 55,767 | 29,294 | 77,932 |
| Lubricants | C10M | 61,365 | 29,004 | 80,829 |
| Drilling | E21B | 194,229 | 92,493 | 367,946 |
| Oil and Gas | | 389,607 | 190,284 | 661,482 |

Source: PATSTAT.

Table 2 Uses of oil and gas inventions (in %)

| Sector | Exclusive | Environmental |
|--------------------------|------------------|----------------------|
| Processing | 13.8 | 14.0 |
| Gaseous and liquid fuels | 14.9 | 21.0 |
| Lubricants | 18.3 | 2.0 |
| Drilling | 28.4 | 3.7 |
| Oil and Gas | 21.7 | 8.2 |

Table 3 Mean number of citations by uses of original patents

| | Exclusive | Inclusive | Environmental | Non environmental |
|--------------------------|------------------|------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|
| Processing | 4.9 | 3.2 | 2.8 | 3.5 |
| Gaseous and liquid fuels | 3.6 | 2.5 | 2.3 | 2.7 |
| Lubricants | 4.3 | 2.5 | 2.1 | 2.8 |
| Drilling | 6.0 | 3.2 | 3.3 | 4.0 |
| Oil and Gas | 5.4 | 3.0 | 2.7 | 3.5 |

Table 4 Quality of cited and citing inventions

| | Cited | | Citing | |
|--------------------------|--------------------|----------------|--------------------|----------------|
| | Family size | Granted | Family size | Granted |
| Processing | 6.3 | 0.665 | 6.1 | 0.517 |
| Gaseous and liquid fuels | 5.9 | 0.596 | 5.6 | 0.466 |
| Lubricants | 5.4 | 0.608 | 5.3 | 0.500 |
| Drilling | 4.8 | 0.732 | 4.6 | 0.590 |
| Oil and Gas | 5.4 | 0.687 | 5.1 | 0.549 |

Table 5 Basic results: exclusive use

| | (1) | (2) | (3) |
|--------------|----------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|
| Exclusive | 0.572*** (0.0027) | 0.588*** (0.0027) | 0.588*** (0.0027) |
| Family size | | 0.0165*** (0.00020) | 0.0165*** (0.0002) |
| Granted | | | 0.0551*** (0.0031) |
| Constant | 2.125*** (0.0960) | 1.961*** (0.0960) | 1.926*** (0.0961) |
| Observations | 190,284 | 190,284 | 190,284 |

Note: all estimations include patent office, sector, filing year and type of applicant fixed effects. Robust standard errors in parentheses with *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. The dependent variable is the total number of citations received by invention.

Table 6 Basic results: environmental use

| | (1) | (2) | (3) |
|---------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Environmental | -0.187*** (0.0052) | -0.185*** (0.0052) | -0.185*** (0.0052) |
| Family size | | 0.0133*** (0.0002) | 0.0132*** (0.0002) |
| Granted | | | 0.0499*** (0.0032) |
| Constant | 2.329*** (0.0960) | 2.189*** (0.0960) | 2.159*** (0.0961) |
| Observations | 190,284 | 190,284 | 190,284 |

Note: all estimations include patent office, sector, filing year and type of applicant fixed effects. Robust standard errors in parentheses with *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. The dependent variable is the total number of citations received by invention.

Table 7 Results by sector: exclusive use

| | Processing | Gaseous and liquid fuels | Lubricants | Drilling |
|--------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Exclusive | 0.460*** (0.007) | 0.386*** (0.0093) | 0.560*** (0.0082) | 0.649*** (0.0035) |
| Family size | 0.0174*** (0.0003) | 0.0194*** (0.0006) | 0.0197*** (0.0007) | 0.0130*** (0.0004) |
| Granted | 0.0395*** (0.0071) | 0.0643*** (0.0087) | 0.116*** (0.0085) | 0.0479*** (0.0044) |
| Constant | 2.267*** (0.153) | 1.704*** (0.201) | -0.464 (1.000) | 1.739*** (0.158) |
| Observations | 39,493 | 29,294 | 29,004 | 92,493 |

Note: all estimations include patent office, filing year and type of applicant fixed effects. Robust standard errors in parentheses with *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. The dependent variable is the total number of citations received by invention.

Table 8 Results by sector: environmental use

| | Processing | Gaseous and liquid fuels | Lubricants | Drilling |
|---------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| Environmental | -0.192*** (0.00859) | -0.140*** (0.00948) | -0.330*** (0.0287) | -0.228*** (0.00970) |
| Family size | 0.0161*** (0.000305) | 0.0178*** (0.000576) | 0.0157*** (0.000677) | 0.00807*** (0.000369) |
| Granted | 0.0310*** (0.00705) | 0.0531*** (0.00877) | 0.102*** (0.00846) | 0.0490*** (0.00447) |
| Constant | 2.414*** (0.153) | 1.732*** (0.201) | 0.0905 (1.000) | 2.144*** (0.158) |
| Observations | 39,493 | 29,294 | 29,004 | 92,493 |

Note: all estimations include patent office, filing year and type of applicant fixed effects. Robust standard errors in parentheses with *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. The dependent variable is the total number of citations received by invention.

Table 9 Multilevel logit: exclusive use

| | INNER | MIXED | OUTER |
|----------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Citing: | | | |
| Granted | -0.194*** (0.00724) | 0.0535*** (0.00664) | 0.113*** (0.00709) |
| Family size | -0.0297*** (0.000737) | -0.00176*** (0.000497) | 0.0215*** (0.000556) |
| Cited: | | | |
| Exclusive | 1.938*** (0.00611) | -0.886*** (0.00636) | -1.503*** (0.00754) |
| Granted | 0.0966*** (0.00748) | 0.0120* (0.00691) | -0.110*** (0.00724) |
| Family size | 0.0104*** (0.000501) | -0.00725*** (0.000504) | -0.00189*** (0.000482) |
| Constant | -1.361*** (0.308) | 0.535* (0.293) | -1.523*** (0.303) |
| Observations | 661,482 | 661,482 | 661,482 |

Note: all estimations include patent office, sector, filing year and type of applicant individual effects. Robust standard errors in parentheses with *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.

Table 10 Multilevel logit: exclusive and environmental uses

| | INNER | MIXED | OUTER |
|----------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Citing: | | | |
| Granted | -0.194*** (0.00724) | 0.0540*** (0.00664) | 0.111*** (0.00710) |
| Family size | -0.0303*** (0.000739) | -0.00188*** (0.000498) | 0.0220*** (0.000559) |
| Cited: | | | |
| Exclusive | 1.900*** (0.00618) | -0.895*** (0.00642) | -1.473*** (0.00759) |
| Environmental | -0.579*** (0.0163) | -0.113*** (0.0110) | 0.401*** (0.0110) |
| Granted | 0.0964*** (0.00749) | 0.0119* (0.00691) | -0.110*** (0.00725) |
| Family size | 0.0102*** (0.000503) | -0.00733*** (0.000504) | -0.00163*** (0.000482) |
| Constant | -1.280*** (0.308) | 0.554* (0.293) | -1.600*** (0.303) |
| Observations | 661,428 | 661,445 | 661,412 |

Note: all estimations include patent office, sector, filing year and type of applicant individual effects. Robust standard errors in parentheses with *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.

Table 11 Multilevel logit: citing environmental uses

| | (1) | (2) |
|----------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Citing: | | |
| Granted | 0.176*** (0.0154) | 0.182*** (0.0154) |
| Family size | 0.00625*** (0.000900) | 0.00583*** (0.000925) |
| Cited: | | |
| Exclusive | | -0.749*** (0.0205) |
| Environmental | 3.124*** (0.0133) | 2.953*** (0.0137) |
| Granted | -0.0779*** (0.0158) | -0.0800*** (0.0159) |
| Family size | -0.0252*** (0.00131) | -0.0288*** (0.00134) |
| Constant | -4.839*** (0.885) | -4.598*** (0.888) |
| Observations | 661,482 | 661,482 |


Note: all estimations include patent office, sector, filing year and type of applicant individual effects. Robust standard errors in parentheses with *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.

Table 12 Multilevel logit: citing environmental uses by sector

| | Processing | Gaseous and liquid fuels | Lubricants | Drilling |
|----------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| Citing: | | | | |
| Granted | 0.210*** (0.0237) | 0.223*** (0.0281) | 0.220*** (0.0735) | 0.104*** (0.0331) |
| Family size | 0.0106*** (0.000967) | -0.00969*** (0.00220) | 0.00904 (0.00630) | -0.000864 (0.00322) |
| Cited: | | | | |
| Environmental | 2.111*** (0.0211) | 3.120*** (0.0245) | 3.508*** (0.0757) | 4.372*** (0.0265) |
| Granted | -0.0964*** (0.0243) | -0.00326 (0.0278) | -0.0165 (0.0757) | -0.107*** (0.0358) |
| Family size | -0.0290*** (0.00190) | -0.0144*** (0.00240) | -0.0362*** (0.00698) | -0.0161*** (0.00332) |
| Constant | -5.266*** (1.058) | -3.735*** (1.088) | -7.344*** (1.338) | -4.527*** (1.177) |
| Observations | 134,477 | 77,684 | 79,788 | 366,974 |

Note: all estimations include patent office, sector, filing year and type of applicant individual effects. Robust standard errors in parentheses with *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.

Figure 1 Evolution of the oil and gas patent applications



2011

- 2011/1, **Oppedisano, V; Turati, G.:** "What are the causes of educational inequalities and of their evolution over time in Europe? Evidence from PISA"
- 2011/2, **Dahlberg, M; Edmark, K; Lundqvist, H.:** "Ethnic diversity and preferences for redistribution"
- 2011/3, **Canova, L.; Vaglio, A.:** "Why do educated mothers matter? A model of parental help"
- 2011/4, **Delgado, F.J.; Lago-Peñas, S.; Mayor, M.:** "On the determinants of local tax rates: new evidence from Spain"
- 2011/5, **Piolatto, A.; Schuett, F.:** "A model of music piracy with popularity-dependent copying costs"
- 2011/6, **Duch, N.; García-Estévez, J.; Parellada, M.:** "Universities and regional economic growth in Spanish regions"
- 2011/7, **Duch, N.; García-Estévez, J.:** "Do universities affect firms' location decisions? Evidence from Spain"
- 2011/8, **Dahlberg, M.; Mörk, E.:** "Is there an election cycle in public employment? Separating time effects from election year effects"
- 2011/9, **Costas-Pérez, E.; Solé-Ollé, A.; Sorribas-Navarro, P.:** "Corruption scandals, press reporting, and accountability. Evidence from Spanish mayors"
- 2011/10, **Choi, A.; Calero, J.; Escardíbul, J.O.:** "Hell to touch the sky? Private tutoring and academic achievement in Korea"
- 2011/11, **Mira Godinho, M.; Cartaxo, R.:** "University patenting, licensing and technology transfer: how organizational context and available resources determine performance"
- 2011/12, **Duch-Brown, N.; García-Quevedo, J.; Montolio, D.:** "The link between public support and private R&D effort: What is the optimal subsidy?"
- 2011/13, **Breuilé, M.L.; Duran-Vigeneron, P.; Samson, A.L.:** "To assemble to resemble? A study of tax disparities among French municipalities"
- 2011/14, **McCann, P.; Ortega-Argilés, R.:** "Smart specialisation, regional growth and applications to EU cohesion policy"
- 2011/15, **Montolio, D.; Trillas, F.:** "Regulatory federalism and industrial policy in broadband telecommunications"
- 2011/16, **Pelegrín, A.; Bolancé, C.:** "Offshoring and company characteristics: some evidence from the analysis of Spanish firm data"
- 2011/17, **Lin, C.:** "Give me your wired and your highly skilled: measuring the impact of immigration policy on employers and shareholders"
- 2011/18, **Bianchini, L.; Revelli, F.:** "Green politics: urban environmental performance and government popularity"
- 2011/19, **López Real, J.:** "Family reunification or point-based immigration system? The case of the U.S. and Mexico"
- 2011/20, **Bogliacino, F.; Piva, M.; Vivarelli, M.:** "The impact of R&D on employment in Europe: a firm-level analysis"
- 2011/21, **Tonello, M.:** "Mechanisms of peer interactions between native and non-native students: rejection or integration?"
- 2011/22, **García-Quevedo, J.; Mas-Verdú, F.; Montolio, D.:** "What type of innovative firms acquire knowledge intensive services and from which suppliers?"
- 2011/23, **Banal-Estañol, A.; Macho-Stadler, I.; Pérez-Castrillo, D.:** "Research output from university-industry collaborative projects"
- 2011/24, **Lighthart, J.E.; Van Oudheusden, P.:** "In government we trust: the role of fiscal decentralization"
- 2011/25, **Mongrain, S.; Wilson, J.D.:** "Tax competition with heterogeneous capital mobility"
- 2011/26, **Caruso, R.; Costa, J.; Ricciuti, R.:** "The probability of military rule in Africa, 1970-2007"
- 2011/27, **Solé-Ollé, A.; Viladecans-Marsal, E.:** "Local spending and the housing boom"
- 2011/28, **Simón, H.; Ramos, R.; Sanromá, E.:** "Occupational mobility of immigrants in a low skilled economy. The Spanish case"
- 2011/29, **Piolatto, A.; Trotin, G.:** "Optimal tax enforcement under prospect theory"
- 2011/30, **Montolio, D; Piolatto, A.:** "Financing public education when altruistic agents have retirement concerns"
- 2011/31, **García-Quevedo, J.; Pellegrino, G.; Vivarelli, M.:** "The determinants of YICs' R&D activity"
- 2011/32, **Goodspeed, T.J.:** "Corruption, accountability, and decentralization: theory and evidence from Mexico"
- 2011/33, **Pedraja, F.; Cordero, J.M.:** "Analysis of alternative proposals to reform the Spanish intergovernmental transfer system for municipalities"
- 2011/34, **Jofre-Monseny, J.; Sorribas-Navarro, P.; Vázquez-Grenno, J.:** "Welfare spending and ethnic heterogeneity: evidence from a massive immigration wave"
- 2011/35, **Lyytikäinen, T.:** "Tax competition among local governments: evidence from a property tax reform in Finland"
- 2011/36, **Brühlhart, M.; Schmidheiny, K.:** "Estimating the Rivalness of State-Level Inward FDI"
- 2011/37, **García-Pérez, J.I.; Hidalgo-Hidalgo, M.; Robles-Zurita, J.A.:** "Does grade retention affect achievement? Some evidence from Pisa"
- 2011/38, **Boffa, f.; Panzar, J.:** "Bottleneck co-ownership as a regulatory alternative"

- 2011/39, **González-Val, R.; Olmo, J.:** "Growth in a cross-section of cities: location, increasing returns or random growth?"
- 2011/40, **Anesi, V.; De Donder, P.:** "Voting under the threat of secession: accommodation vs. repression"
- 2011/41, **Di Pietro, G.; Mora, T.:** "The effect of the l'Aquila earthquake on labour market outcomes"
- 2011/42, **Brueckner, J.K.; Neumark, D.:** "Beaches, sunshine, and public-sector pay: theory and evidence on amenities and rent extraction by government workers"
- 2011/43, **Cortés, D.:** "Decentralization of government and contracting with the private sector"
- 2011/44, **Turati, G.; Montolio, D.; Piacenza, M.:** "Fiscal decentralisation, private school funding, and students' achievements. A tale from two Roman catholic countries"

2012

- 2012/1, **Montolio, D.; Trujillo, E.:** "What drives investment in telecommunications? The role of regulation, firms' internationalization and market knowledge"
- 2012/2, **Giesen, K.; Suedekum, J.:** "The size distribution across all "cities": a unifying approach"
- 2012/3, **Foremny, D.; Riedel, N.:** "Business taxes and the electoral cycle"
- 2012/4, **García-Estévez, J.; Duch-Brown, N.:** "Student graduation: to what extent does university expenditure matter?"
- 2012/5, **Durán-Cabré, J.M.; Esteller-Moré, A.; Salvadori, L.:** "Empirical evidence on horizontal competition in tax enforcement"
- 2012/6, **Pickering, A.C.; Rockey, J.:** "Ideology and the growth of US state government"
- 2012/7, **Vergolini, L.; Zanini, N.:** "How does aid matter? The effect of financial aid on university enrolment decisions"
- 2012/8, **Backus, P.:** "Gibrat's law and legacy for non-profit organisations: a non-parametric analysis"
- 2012/9, **Jofre-Monseny, J.; Marín-López, R.; Viladecans-Marsal, E.:** "What underlies localization and urbanization economies? Evidence from the location of new firms"
- 2012/10, **Mantovani, A.; Vandekerckhove, J.:** "The strategic interplay between bundling and merging in complementary markets"
- 2012/11, **García-López, M.A.:** "Urban spatial structure, suburbanization and transportation in Barcelona"
- 2012/12, **Revelli, F.:** "Business taxation and economic performance in hierarchical government structures"
- 2012/13, **Arqué-Castells, P.; Mohnen, P.:** "Sunk costs, extensive R&D subsidies and permanent inducement effects"
- 2012/14, **Boffa, F.; Piolatto, A.; Ponzetto, G.:** "Centralization and accountability: theory and evidence from the Clean Air Act"
- 2012/15, **Cheshire, P.C.; Hilber, C.A.L.; Kaplanis, I.:** "Land use regulation and productivity – land matters: evidence from a UK supermarket chain"
- 2012/16, **Choi, A.; Calero, J.:** "The contribution of the disabled to the attainment of the Europe 2020 strategy headline targets"
- 2012/17, **Silva, J.I.; Vázquez-Grenno, J.:** "The ins and outs of unemployment in a two-tier labor market"
- 2012/18, **González-Val, R.; Lanaspá, L.; Sanz, F.:** "New evidence on Gibrat's law for cities"
- 2012/19, **Vázquez-Grenno, J.:** "Job search methods in times of crisis: native and immigrant strategies in Spain"
- 2012/20, **Lessmann, C.:** "Regional inequality and decentralization – an empirical analysis"
- 2012/21, **Nuevo-Chiquero, A.:** "Trends in shotgun marriages: the pill, the will or the cost?"
- 2012/22, **Piil Damm, A.:** "Neighborhood quality and labor market outcomes: evidence from quasi-random neighborhood assignment of immigrants"
- 2012/23, **Ploeckl, F.:** "Space, settlements, towns: the influence of geography and market access on settlement distribution and urbanization"
- 2012/24, **Algan, Y.; Hémet, C.; Laitin, D.:** "Diversity and local public goods: a natural experiment with exogenous residential allocation"
- 2012/25, **Martínez, D.; Sjögren, T.:** "Vertical externalities with lump-sum taxes: how much difference does unemployment make?"
- 2012/26, **Cubel, M.; Sanchez-Pages, S.:** "The effect of within-group inequality in a conflict against a unitary threat"
- 2012/27, **Andini, M.; De Blasio, G.; Duranton, G.; Strange, W.C.:** "Marshallian labor market pooling: evidence from Italy"
- 2012/28, **Solé-Ollé, A.; Viladecans-Marsal, E.:** "Do political parties matter for local land use policies?"
- 2012/29, **Buonanno, P.; Durante, R.; Prarolo, G.; Vanin, P.:** "Poor institutions, rich mines: resource curse and the origins of the Sicilian mafia"
- 2012/30, **Anghel, B.; Cabrales, A.; Carro, J.M.:** "Evaluating a bilingual education program in Spain: the impact beyond foreign language learning"
- 2012/31, **Curto-Grau, M.; Solé-Ollé, A.; Sorribas-Navarro, P.:** "Partisan targeting of inter-governmental transfers & state interference in local elections: evidence from Spain"

- 2012/32, **Kappeler, A.; Solé-Ollé, A.; Stephan, A.; Väilä, T.:** "Does fiscal decentralization foster regional investment in productive infrastructure?"
- 2012/33, **Rizzo, L.; Zanardi, A.:** "Single vs double ballot and party coalitions: the impact on fiscal policy. Evidence from Italy"
- 2012/34, **Ramachandran, R.:** "Language use in education and primary schooling attainment: evidence from a natural experiment in Ethiopia"
- 2012/35, **Rothstein, J.:** "Teacher quality policy when supply matters"
- 2012/36, **Ahlfeldt, G.M.:** "The hidden dimensions of urbanity"
- 2012/37, **Mora, T.; Gil, J.; Sicras-Mainar, A.:** "The influence of BMI, obesity and overweight on medical costs: a panel data approach"
- 2012/38, **Pelegrín, A.; García-Quevedo, J.:** "Which firms are involved in foreign vertical integration?"
- 2012/39, **Agasisti, T.; Longobardi, S.:** "Inequality in education: can Italian disadvantaged students close the gap? A focus on resilience in the Italian school system"

2013

- 2013/1, **Sánchez-Vidal, M.; González-Val, R.; Viladecans-Marsal, E.:** "Sequential city growth in the US: does age matter?"
- 2013/2, **Hortas Rico, M.:** "Sprawl, blight and the role of urban containment policies. Evidence from US cities"
- 2013/3, **Lampón, J.F.; Cabanelas-Lorenzo, P.; Lago-Peñas, S.:** "Why firms relocate their production overseas? The answer lies inside: corporate, logistic and technological determinants"
- 2013/4, **Montolio, D.; Planells, S.:** "Does tourism boost criminal activity? Evidence from a top touristic country"
- 2013/5, **García-López, M.A.; Holl, A.; Viladecans-Marsal, E.:** "Suburbanization and highways: when the Romans, the Bourbons and the first cars still shape Spanish cities"
- 2013/6, **Bosch, N.; Espasa, M.; Montolio, D.:** "Should large Spanish municipalities be financially compensated? Costs and benefits of being a capital/central municipality"
- 2013/7, **Escardíbul, J.O.; Mora, T.:** "Teacher gender and student performance in mathematics. Evidence from Catalonia"
- 2013/8, **Arqué-Castells, P.; Viladecans-Marsal, E.:** "Banking towards development: evidence from the Spanish banking expansion plan"
- 2013/9, **Asensio, J.; Gómez-Lobo, A.; Matas, A.:** "How effective are policies to reduce gasoline consumption? Evaluating a quasi-natural experiment in Spain"
- 2013/10, **Jofre-Monseny, J.:** "The effects of unemployment benefits on migration in lagging regions"
- 2013/11, **Segarra, A.; García-Quevedo, J.; Teruel, M.:** "Financial constraints and the failure of innovation projects"
- 2013/12, **Jerrim, J.; Choi, A.:** "The mathematics skills of school children: How does England compare to the high performing East Asian jurisdictions?"
- 2013/13, **González-Val, R.; Tirado-Fabregat, D.A.; Viladecans-Marsal, E.:** "Market potential and city growth: Spain 1860-1960"
- 2013/14, **Lundqvist, H.:** "Is it worth it? On the returns to holding political office"
- 2013/15, **Ahlfeldt, G.M.; Maennig, W.:** "Homevoters vs. leasevoters: a spatial analysis of airport effects"
- 2013/16, **Lampón, J.F.; Lago-Peñas, S.:** "Factors behind international relocation and changes in production geography in the European automobile components industry"
- 2013/17, **Guío, J.M.; Choi, A.:** "Evolution of the school failure risk during the 2000 decade in Spain: analysis of Pisa results with a two-level logistic model"
- 2013/18, **Dahlby, B.; Rodden, J.:** "A political economy model of the vertical fiscal gap and vertical fiscal imbalances in a federation"
- 2013/19, **Acacia, F.; Cubel, M.:** "Strategic voting and happiness"
- 2013/20, **Hellerstein, J.K.; Kutzbach, M.J.; Neumark, D.:** "Do labor market networks have an important spatial dimension?"
- 2013/21, **Pellegrino, G.; Savona, M.:** "Is money all? Financing versus knowledge and demand constraints to innovation"
- 2013/22, **Lin, J.:** "Regional resilience"
- 2013/23, **Costa-Campi, M.T.; Duch-Brown, N.; García-Quevedo, J.:** "R&D drivers and obstacles to innovation in the energy industry"
- 2013/24, **Huisman, R.; Stradnic, V.; Westgaard, S.:** "Renewable energy and electricity prices: indirect empirical evidence from hydro power"
- 2013/25, **Dargaud, E.; Mantovani, A.; Reggiani, C.:** "The fight against cartels: a transatlantic perspective"
- 2013/26, **Lambertini, L.; Mantovani, A.:** "Feedback equilibria in a dynamic renewable resource oligopoly: pre-emption, voracity and exhaustion"

- 2013/27, Feld, L.P.; Kalb, A.; Moessinger, M.D.; Osterloh, S.: "Sovereign bond market reactions to fiscal rules and no-bailout clauses – the Swiss experience"
- 2013/28, Hilber, C.A.L.; Vermeulen, W.: "The impact of supply constraints on house prices in England"
- 2013/29, Revelli, F.: "Tax limits and local democracy"
- 2013/30, Wang, R.; Wang, W.: "Dress-up contest: a dark side of fiscal decentralization"
- 2013/31, Dargaud, E.; Mantovani, A.; Reggiani, C.: "The fight against cartels: a transatlantic perspective"
- 2013/32, Saarimaa, T.; Tukiainen, J.: "Local representation and strategic voting: evidence from electoral boundary reforms"
- 2013/33, Agasisti, T.; Murtinu, S.: "Are we wasting public money? No! The effects of grants on Italian university students' performances"
- 2013/34, Flacher, D.; Harari-Kermadec, H.; Moulin, L.: "Financing higher education: a contributory scheme"
- 2013/35, Carozzi, F.; Repetto, L.: "Sending the pork home: birth town bias in transfers to Italian municipalities"
- 2013/36, Coad, A.; Frankish, J.S.; Roberts, R.G.; Storey, D.J.: "New venture survival and growth: Does the fog lift?"
- 2013/37, Giulietti, M.; Grossi, L.; Waterson, M.: "Revenues from storage in a competitive electricity market: Empirical evidence from Great Britain"

2014

- 2014/1, Montolio, D.; Planells-Struse, S.: "When police patrols matter. The effect of police proximity on citizens' crime risk perception"
- 2014/2, García-López, M.A.; Solé-Ollé, A.; Viladecans-Marsal, E.: "Do land use policies follow road construction?"
- 2014/3, Piolatto, A.; Rablen, M.D.: "Prospect theory and tax evasion: a reconsideration of the Yitzhaki puzzle"
- 2014/4, Cuberes, D.; González-Val, R.: "The effect of the Spanish Reconquest on Iberian Cities"
- 2014/5, Durán-Cabré, J.M.; Esteller-Moré, E.: "Tax professionals' view of the Spanish tax system: efficiency, equity and tax planning"
- 2014/6, Cubel, M.; Sanchez-Pages, S.: "Difference-form group contests"
- 2014/7, Del Rey, E.; Racionero, M.: "Choosing the type of income-contingent loan: risk-sharing versus risk-pooling"
- 2014/8, Torregrosa Hetland, S.: "A fiscal revolution? Progressivity in the Spanish tax system, 1960-1990"
- 2014/9, Piolatto, A.: "Itemised deductions: a device to reduce tax evasion"
- 2014/10, Costa, M.T.; García-Quevedo, J.; Segarra, A.: "Energy efficiency determinants: an empirical analysis of Spanish innovative firms"
- 2014/11, García-Quevedo, J.; Pellegrino, G.; Savona, M.: "Reviving demand-pull perspectives: the effect of demand uncertainty and stagnancy on R&D strategy"
- 2014/12, Calero, J.; Escardíbul, J.O.: "Barriers to non-formal professional training in Spain in periods of economic growth and crisis. An analysis with special attention to the effect of the previous human capital of workers"
- 2014/13, Cubel, M.; Sanchez-Pages, S.: "Gender differences and stereotypes in the beauty"
- 2014/14, Piolatto, A.; Schuett, F.: "Media competition and electoral politics"
- 2014/15, Montolio, D.; Trillas, F.; Trujillo-Baute, E.: "Regulatory environment and firm performance in EU telecommunications services"
- 2014/16, Lopez-Rodriguez, J.; Martinez, D.: "Beyond the R&D effects on innovation: the contribution of non-R&D activities to TFP growth in the EU"
- 2014/17, González-Val, R.: "Cross-sectional growth in US cities from 1990 to 2000"
- 2014/18, Vona, F.; Nicolli, F.: "Energy market liberalization and renewable energy policies in OECD countries"
- 2014/19, Curto-Grau, M.: "Voters' responsiveness to public employment policies"
- 2014/20, Duro, J.A.; Teixidó-Figueras, J.; Padilla, E.: "The causal factors of international inequality in CO₂ emissions per capita: a regression-based inequality decomposition analysis"
- 2014/21, Fleten, S.E.; Huisman, R.; Kilic, M.; Pennings, E.; Westgaard, S.: "Electricity futures prices: time varying sensitivity to fundamentals"
- 2014/22, Afcha, S.; García-Quevedo, J.: "The impact of R&D subsidies on R&D employment composition"
- 2014/23, Mir-Artigues, P.; del Río, P.: "Combining tariffs, investment subsidies and soft loans in a renewable electricity deployment policy"
- 2014/24, Romero-Jordán, D.; del Río, P.; Peñasco, C.: "Household electricity demand in Spanish regions. Public policy implications"
- 2014/25, Salinas, P.: "The effect of decentralization on educational outcomes: real autonomy matters!"
- 2014/26, Solé-Ollé, A.; Sorribas-Navarro, P.: "Does corruption erode trust in government? Evidence from a recent surge of local scandals in Spain"
- 2014/27, Costas-Pérez, E.: "Political corruption and voter turnout: mobilization or disaffection?"

2014/28, Cubel, M.; Nuevo-Chiquero, A.; Sanchez-Pages, S.; Vidal-Fernandez, M.: "Do personality traits affect productivity? Evidence from the LAB"

2014/29, Teresa Costa, M.T.; Trujillo-Baute, E.: "Retail price effects of feed-in tariff regulation"

2014/30, Kilic, M.; Trujillo-Baute, E.: "The stabilizing effect of hydro reservoir levels on intraday power prices under wind forecast errors"

