

# Carbon emissions intensity reduction target for China's power industry: An efficiency and productivity perspective

Yujiao Xian <sup>a,b</sup>, Ke Wang <sup>a,c,d,\*</sup>, Xunpeng Shi <sup>e,f,g</sup>, Chi Zhang <sup>h</sup>, Yi-Ming Wei <sup>a,c,d</sup>, Zhimin Huang <sup>a,i</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Center for Energy and Environmental Policy Research & School of Management and Economics, Beijing Institute of Technology, Beijing, China

<sup>b</sup> Productivity and Efficiency Measurement Laboratory & Department of Industrial and Systems Engineering, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX, USA

<sup>c</sup> Sustainable Development Research Institute for Economy and Society of Beijing, Beijing, China

<sup>d</sup> Beijing Key Lab of Energy Economics and Environmental Management, Beijing, China

<sup>e</sup> Australia-China Relations Institute, University of Technology Sydney, Ultimo, NSW, Australia

<sup>f</sup> Center of Hubei Cooperative Innovation for Emissions Trading System, Hubei University of Economics, Wuhan, Hubei, China.

<sup>g</sup> Energy Studies Institute, National University of Singapore, Singapore

<sup>h</sup> School of Chemical Science and Engineering, Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden

<sup>i</sup> Robert B. Willumstad School of Business, Adelphi University, Garden City, NY, USA

## Graphical abstract:



**Abstract:** This paper proposes a scenario analysis to address whether the national and provincial CO<sub>2</sub> emissions intensity reduction target during 2016–2020 would be achievable for China's power industry with the identification of change on carbon productivity. This productivity indicator is further decomposed to investigate contributions of different sources to productivity growth when there exists technological heterogeneity. Evaluation results show that even if all electricity-generating units in each region were able to adopt the best practice, the nationwide 18% intensity reduction target is not feasible through improving technical efficiency or upgrading technology on electricity generation and carbon abatement in a short or medium term. The existence of regional technological heterogeneity in power generation and associated CO<sub>2</sub> emissions reduction processes implies the necessity of more differentiated regulations and policies for emission reduction across China's regions and inter-regional technology transfer. The emerging national emission trading scheme could easy some challenges in formulating emission policy for heterogeneous regions.

**Key words:** Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA); Endogenous directional distance function (DDF); Meta-technology frontier; Heterogeneity; Technological gap

\* Corresponding author. Tel: 86-10-68918651. E-mail address: kewang2083@gmail.com (K. Wang).

**Highlights:**

- Largest CO<sub>2</sub> intensity reduction potential in China's provinces is quantified
- Endogenous technique is used to capture largest reduction ratio
- Meta-technology approach is applied to identify technological heterogeneity
- Scenario analysis is utilized to project possible CO<sub>2</sub> intensity reduction
- CO<sub>2</sub> intensity reduction target is not easy to achieve for China's power industry

# Carbon emissions intensity reduction target for China's power industry: An efficiency and productivity perspective

Yujiao Xian<sup>a,b</sup>, Ke Wang<sup>a,c,d,\*</sup>, Xunpeng Shi<sup>e,f,g</sup>, Chi Zhang<sup>h</sup>, Yi-Ming Wei<sup>a,c,d</sup>, Zhimin Huang<sup>a,i</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Center for Energy and Environmental Policy Research & School of Management and Economics, Beijing Institute of Technology, Beijing, China

<sup>b</sup> Productivity and Efficiency Measurement Laboratory & Department of Industrial and Systems Engineering, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX, USA

<sup>c</sup> Sustainable Development Research Institute for Economy and Society of Beijing, Beijing, China

<sup>d</sup> Beijing Key Lab of Energy Economics and Environmental Management, Beijing, China

<sup>e</sup> Australia-China Relations Institute, University of Technology Sydney, Ultimo, NSW, Australia

<sup>f</sup> Center of Hubei Cooperative Innovation for Emissions Trading System, Hubei University of Economics, Wuhan, Hubei, China.

<sup>g</sup> Energy Studies Institute, National University of Singapore, Singapore

<sup>h</sup> School of Chemical Science and Engineering, Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden

<sup>i</sup> Robert B. Willumstad School of Business, Adelphi University, Garden City, NY, USA

## Graphical abstract:



**Abstract:** This paper proposes a scenario analysis to address whether the national and provincial CO<sub>2</sub> emissions intensity reduction target during 2016-2020 would be achievable for China's power industry with the identification of change on carbon productivity. This productivity indicator is further decomposed to investigate contributions of different sources to productivity growth when

\* Corresponding author. Tel: 86-10-68918651. E-mail address: kewang2083@gmail.com (K. Wang).

1 there exists technological heterogeneity. Evaluation results show that even if all  
2 electricity-generating units in each region were able to adopt the best practice, the nationwide 18%  
3 intensity reduction target is not feasible through improving technical efficiency or upgrading  
4 technology on electricity generation and carbon abatement in a short or medium term. The existence  
5 of regional technological heterogeneity in power generation and associated CO<sub>2</sub> emissions reduction  
6 processes implies the necessity of more differentiated regulations and policies for emission reduction  
7 across China's regions and inter-regional technology transfer. The emerging national emission  
8 trading scheme could easy some challenges in formulating emission policy for heterogeneous  
9 regions.  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

22 **Key words:** Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA); Endogenous directional distance function (DDF);  
23 Meta-technology frontier; Heterogeneity; Technological gap  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

## 30 **1 Introduction**

31  
32  
33 Global warming and climate change has increasingly become a public concern and a serious  
34 challenge in energy policy-making for all governments. The temperature of global surface increased  
35 0.74 ± 0.18 °C during 20th century (IPCC, 2013). In the United Nations Framework Convention on  
36 Climate Change (UNFCCC) Conference of the Parties (COP) in Paris of 2015, there is a globally  
37 accepted target (2°C) and ambition target (1.5°C) for limiting global temperature rise.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

45 The increase of fossil fuel consumption, which is the main driving force of global warming and  
46 climate change, has led to the global socio-economic development and large-scale CO<sub>2</sub> emissions  
47 (Chen et al., 2018). As the world's largest emitter of CO<sub>2</sub>, China had announced a series of  
48 agreements and targets on climate change mitigation. For example, on the Copenhagen climate  
49 change summit in 2009, China announced that it would reduce its CO<sub>2</sub> emissions intensity of GDP  
50 (i.e., CO<sub>2</sub> emissions per unit of GDP) by 40-45 percent by 2020 relative to the 2005-level (Paltsev et  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

al., 2012). Furthermore, in the COP 2015 in Paris, the Chinese government had made three major commitments in its Intended Nationally Determined Contribution (INDC) regarding CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. The first is to peak its CO<sub>2</sub> emissions no later than 2030. The second is to reduce its CO<sub>2</sub> emissions intensity of GDP by 60-65 percent by 2030 relative to its 2005-level. The third is to increase the share of non-fossil energy in the total primary energy supply to 20 percent by 2030 (Bjorn, 2016). To meet these targets, China implemented a series of policies and regulations in each Five-Year Plan (FYP) period. FYP, which is formulated by the Chinese government, guides the national economy and social development and environmental protection. Table 1 presents some nationwide targets in 11<sup>th</sup>, 12<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> FYP. According to the nationwide 18% reduction target, each province in China also implemented its regional CO<sub>2</sub> emissions intensity (i.e., CO<sub>2</sub> emissions per unit of total output value) reduction target of 13<sup>th</sup> FYP.

**Table 1 Nationwide targets on energy conservation and carbon control**

Periods	Reduction targets	
	Energy intensity (SCC, 2007; SCC, 2011a)	CO <sub>2</sub> emissions intensity (SCC, 2011b; SCC, 2016)
11 <sup>th</sup> FYP (2006-2010)	20%	-
12 <sup>th</sup> FYP (2011-2015)	16%	17%
13 <sup>th</sup> FYP (2016-2020)	-	18%

*Note:* Energy intensity is final energy consumption per unit of GDP; CO<sub>2</sub> emissions intensity is CO<sub>2</sub> emissions per unit of GDP.

Achieving the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions intensity reduction target in China's electricity generation sector plays a crucial role in the national efforts to control CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and other air pollutants (Wang et al., 2016b; Wang et al., 2018b). According to the International Energy Agency (IEA, 2011), China's power sector, which is dominated by the consumption of fossil fuels and nonrenewable energies, accounts for about 50% of China's total CO<sub>2</sub> emission in 2010. Whether the CO<sub>2</sub> emission targets for the electricity sector is achievable is an issue that is important to the Chinese policy makers and the global community that is fighting with climate change. For the Chinese policy makers, another question, which is also significant for formulating the policies that promote the energy and

environmental efficiency, is how to further reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions ([Hampf and Rødseth, 2015](#)).

The present paper has two aims. The first aim is to evaluate the feasibility of the nationwide (18%) and provincial CO<sub>2</sub> emissions intensity reduction target for China's power industry in 13<sup>th</sup> FYP given its existing technologies of generation and emission control. The second aim is to identify the ways in which the reduction targets can be reached from the perspective of productivity change. Thus, this study evaluates the carbon productivity of China's power industry in the 12<sup>th</sup> FYP period and identify the driving forces for their improvement.

An evaluation of carbon efficiency and productivity of power industry sector for China's 30 provinces is offered using an endogenous directional distance function (DDF) proposed by [Färe et al. \(2013\)](#) to identify the largest efficiency improvement potential and the meta-technology frontier approach to solve the problem of the technological heterogeneity among provinces. Understanding the technological frontier is significant for identifying the feasibility of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions intensity reduction target. Improving the carbon efficiency and productivity is an important way to achieve the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions intensity reduction target. Meanwhile, the factorial decomposition of productivity change in the past trends could help researchers to identify the drivers in objective variable, i.e., the reduction on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions intensity.

Existing studies on DDF and productivity change decomposition have faced several challenges. First, in most applications of DDF, the directional vector is selected by the researchers. This selection is arbitrary and does not guarantee capturing the largest efficiency improvement potential ([Adler and Volta, 2016](#); [Wang et al., 2016a](#)). Second, most of the existing studies applying meta-frontier technique only analyzed the group differences from the spatial dimension perspective ([Oh, 2010](#); [Hančlová and Melecký, 2016](#); [Barros and Wanke, 2017](#); [Feng et al., 2018](#)). In other words, most researchers only employed the cross-sectional data to do an analysis. Hence, the other dimension perspective, that is the temporal perspective, should be considered into the meta-frontier technique to do some further analysis. Third, the existing scenario analysis and decomposition analysis only

1 focused on the decomposition of productivity change into efficiency change and technical change  
2 (i.e., best practice gap change) (Du et al. 2014; Lee et al., 2015; Lin and Zhao, 2016). Therefore,  
3 more drivers need be explored in the productivity evaluation via scenario analysis.  
4  
5

6  
7 This study makes the following contributions to the existing literature at the theoretical and the  
8 application level. First, the endogenous DDF approach provides a more reasonable evaluation of the  
9 CO<sub>2</sub> emissions intensity reduction target in China's power industry through identifying the largest  
10 efficiency improvement potential. Second, the meta-technology technique takes into account the  
11 technological heterogeneity of different power industry sectors across China's regions, providing a  
12 more proper estimation of the driving forces of carbon productivity growth in China's power industry.  
13  
14 Third, this study takes both the spatial dimension and the temporal dimension into consideration via  
15 scenario analysis, presenting a more comprehensive investigation on the productivity change from  
16 the perspective of technical efficiency change (*TEC*), best practice gap change (*BPC*), and  
17 technological gap change (*TGC*). Fourth, this is the first study to examine the feasibility of emission  
18 target for China's power generation sector in 13<sup>th</sup> FYP and investigate additional policy option to  
19 achieve the target.  
20  
21

22 This reminder of this paper is organized as follows: Section 2 is the literature review. Section 3  
23 introduces the methodology including the production and environmental technologies and  
24 endogenous efficiency estimation method, the meta-technology frontier approach, and the  
25 Luenberger productivity indicator and its decomposition. Section 4 presents the empirical study of  
26 the examination of the feasibility of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions intensity reduction target and the identification of  
27 productivity change in China's power industry. Section 5 concludes the study.  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

## 37 **2 Method**

38 In this study, to measure the carbon efficiency and productivity, the nonparametric DDF  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

approach based on the DEA technique is employed to estimate the technologies. An endogenous efficiency measure is proposed for Luenberger productivity indicator of meta-technology and its decomposition. A brief explanation of the technical issues will be presented in the next three sub-sections and the scenario design will be explained in section 2.4.

## 2.1 Production and environmental technologies and endogenous efficiency estimation

By considering a production process of  $j=1,2,\dots,n$  observed power industry sectors at provincial level, each province comprises a vector of input  $\mathbf{x}_j = (x_{1j}, x_{2j}, \dots, x_{ij}, \dots, x_{mj}) \in \mathbf{R}_+^m$ , a vector of intended (or good) outputs  $\mathbf{y}_j = (y_{1j}, y_{2j}, \dots, y_{rj}, \dots, y_{sj}) \in \mathbf{R}_+^s$ , and a vector of unintended (or bad) outputs  $\mathbf{u}_j = (u_{1j}, u_{2j}, \dots, u_{fj}, \dots, u_{hj}) \in \mathbf{R}_+^h$ . The production possibility set  $\mathbf{T}$  of this production process is a combination of all technically feasible input-output, and is denoted by:

$$\mathbf{T} = \{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{u}) \in \mathbf{R}_+^{m+s+h} : \mathbf{x} \text{ can produce } (\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{u})\} \quad (1)$$

The production possibility set  $\mathbf{T}$  satisfies the following axioms (Färe and Grosskopf, 2004) on technology: i) Nonempty and closed; ii) Convexity; iii) Inputs are free disposable: If  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{u}) \in \mathbf{T}$  and  $\mathbf{x}' \geq \mathbf{x}$ , then  $(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{u}) \in \mathbf{T}$ ; iv) Intended outputs are free disposable: If  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{u}) \in \mathbf{T}$  and  $\mathbf{y}' \leq \mathbf{y}$ , then  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}', \mathbf{u}) \in \mathbf{T}$ ; v) Unintended outputs and intended outputs are jointly weakly disposable: If  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{u}) \in \mathbf{T}$  and  $0 \leq \rho \leq 1$ , then  $(\mathbf{x}, \rho \mathbf{y}, \rho \mathbf{u}) \in \mathbf{T}$ ; vi) Unintended outputs and intended outputs are null-joint: If  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{u}) \in \mathbf{T}$  and  $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{0}$ , then  $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{0}$ .

The weak disposability axiom indicates that the contraction of unintended outputs is costly since the intended outputs must be decreased correspondingly. More explicitly, inputs would be reallocated between the production of intended outputs and the regulation of unintended outputs. In addition, the null-jointness assumption suggests that there would be no intended outputs without unintended outputs.



On the basis of these axioms this sub-section then describes the preparation of the DDF. Under the background of evaluating environmental efficiency and productivity, [Chambers et al. \(1996a\)](#) and [Chung et al. \(1997\)](#) introduced the DDF. Since the seminal work of [Chambers et al. \(1996a\)](#), the DDF is a widely used approach to analyze the energy and environmental issues ([Picazo-Tadeo et al., 2012](#); [Wang et al., 2013](#); [Halkos et al., 2016](#)). It can help to model the pollution technologies, i.e., expand desirable outputs and control pollution or energy inputs simultaneously.

DDF estimation can be operationalized via both parametric estimation approach and the non-parametric estimation approach. The parametric estimation approach, which is usually employed to estimate the shadow prices of pollution, is based on a regression model such as Stochastic Frontier Analysis (SFA) model. Hence, it needs a specified form of production function for efficiency estimation. The applications of this approach can be found in [Vardanyan and Noh \(2006\)](#), [Färe et al. \(2012\)](#) and [Fetanat and Shafipour \(2017\)](#). The non-parametric estimation approach is based on a mathematical programming model such as data envelopment analysis (DEA) model, and thus, it does not need to specify production function. DEA is an effective efficiency technique in the multiple-input and multiple-output setting without specifying any functional form and pre-assigned weights. This approach has been widely utilized in energy and environmental efficiency measurement, such as [Park et al. \(2008\)](#), [Wang et al. \(2016c\)](#), [Wang et al. \(2016d\)](#), [Barros et al. \(2017\)](#), [Chen et al. \(2017\)](#), [Wanke et al. \(2017\)](#) and [Díaz-Villavicencio et al. \(2017\)](#).

This formulation of DDF, which expands intended (or good) outputs and contracts unintended (or bad) outputs simultaneously, is a better strategy than traditional distance function proposed by [Shephard \(1970\)](#) on efficiency estimation. Its corresponding definition in an output-oriented model is denoted as:

$$\bar{D}(x, y, u; \bar{g}) = \max \left\{ \beta : (x, y + \beta \bar{g}_y, u - \beta \bar{g}_u) \in T \right\} \quad (2)$$

1 In which  $\beta (\geq 0)$  is the inefficiency score of the evaluated province and  $\vec{g} = (\vec{g}_y, -\vec{g}_u)$  is a  
2  
3 directional vector. The province under evaluated is efficient if  $\beta = 0$ , and is inefficient if  $\beta > 0$ . In  
4  
5 addition,  $\beta g_{y_r} / y_r$  is the inefficiency score of intended output  $y_r$ , and  $\beta g_{u_f} / u_f$  is the inefficiency  
6  
7 score of unintended output  $u_f$ .  
8  
9

10  
11 However, for the application of DDF based on DEA technique, the directional vectors are  
12 usually arbitrarily selected by the researchers in advance (Wang et al., 2017; Wang et al., 2018a).  
13  
14 Hence, there would be no trade-offs between intended and unintended outputs in this arbitrary  
15  
16 selection process. Another weakness is that it would underestimate the inefficiency scores when there  
17  
18 are some non-zero slacks on outputs (Fukuyama and Weber, 2009; Barros and Wanke, 2017).  
19  
20 Furthermore, when using the weak disposability axiom mentioned above, there would be a  
21  
22 downward-sloping segment of unintended outputs where the frontier has a negative slope  
23  
24 (Picazo-Tadeo and Prior, 2009; Chen and Delmas, 2012). In this situation, some inefficient points  
25  
26 located on this segment would be misclassification as efficient along with the arbitrary directions. To  
27  
28 overcome these difficulties, Färe et al. (2013) and Hampf and Krüger (2014) proposed an  
29  
30 endogenous technique to select the directional vectors, i.e., maximizing the inefficiency score of the  
31  
32 evaluated province over the directions. The associated DEA model for evaluated province  $j_0$  under  
33  
34 variable return to scale (VRS) can be presented as follows:  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

$$\begin{aligned}
& \max_{\beta, \lambda_j, \alpha_{rj_0}, \delta_{fj_0}} \sum_{r=1}^s \frac{\beta}{\beta \alpha_{rj_0} + 1} \\
& \text{s.t. } x_{ij_0} \geq \sum_{j=1}^n x_{ij} (\lambda_{1j} + \lambda_{2j}), \quad i=1,2,\dots,m \\
& y_{rj_0} + \beta \alpha_{rj_0} y_{rj_0} \leq \sum_{j=1}^n y_{rj} \lambda_{1j}, \quad r=1,2,\dots,s \\
& u_{fj_0} - \beta \delta_{fj_0} u_{fj_0} = \sum_{j=1}^n u_{fj} \lambda_{2j}, \quad f=1,2,\dots,h \\
& \sum_{r=1}^s \alpha_{rj_0} + \sum_{f=1}^f \delta_{fj_0} = 1 \\
& \sum_{j=1}^n (\lambda_{1j} + \lambda_{2j}) = 1 \\
& \beta, \lambda_{1j}, \lambda_{2j}, \alpha_{rj_0}, \delta_{fj_0} \geq 0, \quad j=1,2,\dots,n, r=1,2,\dots,s, f=1,2,\dots,h.
\end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

In our model, the objective function is to maximize the reduction percentage of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions intensity.  $\lambda_{1j}$  and  $\lambda_{2j}$  indicates the intensity variable, whereas  $\alpha$  and  $\delta$  represent the different weights for intended and unintended outputs, respectively. The non-negative constraints on weight variables intimate that only the directions  $\bar{g} = (\bar{g}_y, -\bar{g}_u) = (\alpha \circ y, -\delta \circ u)$  that would not reduce intended outputs or expand unintended outputs can be chosen, where “ $\circ$ ” indicates the Hadamard product for two vectors.

## 2.2 Meta-technology

Since the measurement of carbon efficiency and productivity makes the effort of carbon control accountable, the productivity growth is considered a key indicator in assessing carbon performance change. However, a conventional productivity index is not capable of distinguishing the heterogeneity from differentiated technologies (Battese et al., 2002; Heshmati et al., 2012; Sueyoshi et al., 2018). In recent studies, many researches focus on the technological heterogeneity from a theoretical perspective (Moreira and Bravo-Ureta, 2010; Fallahfani et al., 2012; Makni et al., 2015). In other words, these studies assume that provinces process different level of production technology due to the differences in socioeconomic condition, geographical location, generation fuel mix and industrialization level.

1 To solve this problem, some researchers employed the meta-frontier technique that is capable in  
2 distinguishing production technologies by classifying them into different groups, such as Wanke and  
3 Barros (2016) and Azad et al. (2017). The concept of meta-frontier, which is introduced by Hayami  
4 (1969), is to ensure that all heterogeneous units are assessed based on a common and identical  
5 frontier. In other words, the aim of introducing meta-frontier is to provide a homogeneous frontier  
6 for heterogeneous units (Battese et al. 2004). The meta-frontier can be interpreted as a wrapper of all  
7 possible boundaries that could possibly result from the heterogeneity between units (O'Donnell et al.,  
8 2008).

19 Following the meta-frontier technique, a set of technologies from both the spatial dimension and  
20 the temporal dimension are modelled as follow. Supposing our sample can be divided into  $H$  groups  
21 with different group technology  $T_h$  ( $h=1,2,\dots,H$ ), and the units in each group have similar technology  
22 in each period  $t$  ( $t=1,2,\dots,T$ ). Hereafter, the intertemporal technology of group  $h$  is defined as  
23  $T_h^I = Conv(T_h^1 \cup T_h^2 \cup \dots \cup T_h^T)$ , ( $h=1,2,\dots,H$ ). This production technology contains all observations of  
24 group  $h$  in the entire study period. Moreover, the meta-technology of all groups is defined as  
25  $T^M = Conv(T_1^I \cup T_2^I \cup \dots \cup T_H^I)$ . This production technology covers all observations and envelops all  
26 the intertemporal technologies.

40 Fig. 1 shows a meta-technology model with one intended output and one unintended output.  
41 Supposing there are two groups and their intertemporal technology frontiers (*ITF*) are labeled with  $l_1$   
42 and  $l_2$ , while the meta-technology frontier (*MTF*) encompasses these two frontiers and is labeled with  
43  $m_1$ . In addition, assuming there are three periods for each group. For group 1, the group technology  
44 frontier (*GTF*) for time  $t_1$ ,  $t_2$  and  $t_3$  is respectively labeled with  $g_1$ ,  $g_2$ , and  $g_3$ , whereas the *ITF*  
45 encompassed these three frontiers and is labeled with  $l_1$ .




Fig. 1 *GTF, ITF and MTF*

Thus, applying Eq. (2) to the *GTF, ITF* and *MTF*, respectively:

$$\vec{D}_h(x, y, u; \vec{g}) = \beta_h = \max \left\{ \beta : (x, y + \beta \vec{g}_y, u - \beta \vec{g}_u) \in T_h \right\}, \quad h=1,2,\dots,H. \quad (4)$$

$$\vec{D}_h^I(x, y, u; \vec{g}) = \beta_h^I = \max \left\{ \beta : (x, y + \beta \vec{g}_y, u - \beta \vec{g}_u) \in T_h^I \right\}, \quad h=1,2,\dots,H. \quad (5)$$

$$\vec{D}^M(x, y, u; \vec{g}) = \beta^M = \max \left\{ \beta : (x, y + \beta \vec{g}_y, u - \beta \vec{g}_u) \in T^M \right\}. \quad (6)$$

where  $\vec{D}_h(x, y, u; \vec{g})$  measures the distance between the evaluated unit and the *GTF* of group  $h$ , and

$\vec{D}_h^I(x, y, u; \vec{g})$  measures the distance between the evaluated unit and the *ITF* of group  $h$ , whereas

$\vec{D}^M(x, y, u; \vec{g})$  measures the distance between the evaluated unit and the *MTF*.

### 2.3 Luenberger productivity indicator and its decomposition

Employing the concept of DDF, the Luenberger productivity indicator of meta-technology (*LPIM*) and intertemporal technology (*LPII*) of group  $h$  can be respectively defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} LPIM(x^t, y^t, u^t; x^{t+1}, y^{t+1}, u^{t+1}) &= \vec{D}^M(x^t, y^t, u^t) - \vec{D}^M(x^{t+1}, y^{t+1}, u^{t+1}) \\ &= \beta^M(x^t, y^t, u^t) - \beta^M(x^{t+1}, y^{t+1}, u^{t+1}) \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
LPII_h(\mathbf{x}^t, \mathbf{y}^t, \mathbf{u}^t; \mathbf{x}^{t+1}, \mathbf{y}^{t+1}, \mathbf{u}^{t+1}) &= \vec{D}_h^I(\mathbf{x}^t, \mathbf{y}^t, \mathbf{u}^t) - \vec{D}_h^I(\mathbf{x}^{t+1}, \mathbf{y}^{t+1}, \mathbf{u}^{t+1}) \\
&= \beta_h^I(\mathbf{x}^t, \mathbf{y}^t, \mathbf{u}^t) - \beta_h^I(\mathbf{x}^{t+1}, \mathbf{y}^{t+1}, \mathbf{u}^{t+1})
\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
LPIG_h(\mathbf{x}^t, \mathbf{y}^t, \mathbf{u}^t; \mathbf{x}^{t+1}, \mathbf{y}^{t+1}, \mathbf{u}^{t+1}) &= \vec{D}_h^G(\mathbf{x}^t, \mathbf{y}^t, \mathbf{u}^t) - \vec{D}_h^G(\mathbf{x}^{t+1}, \mathbf{y}^{t+1}, \mathbf{u}^{t+1}) \\
&= \beta_h^G(\mathbf{x}^t, \mathbf{y}^t, \mathbf{u}^t) - \beta_h^G(\mathbf{x}^{t+1}, \mathbf{y}^{t+1}, \mathbf{u}^{t+1})
\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

where  $LPIG_h$  and  $LPII_h$  measure the efficiency (or productivity) change within the groups, and  $LPIM$  measures the efficiency (or productivity) change between the groups.

To identify the sources of productivity change under meta-technology, as mentioned above, most studies only analyze the group differences in the spatial dimension and focus on the decomposition into efficiency change and technical change (i.e., best practice gap change).

From the perspective from both the spatial dimension and the temporal dimension, this study further investigates the productivity change from the contribution of technical efficiency change ( $TEC$ ), best practice gap change ( $BPC$ ) and technological gap change ( $TGC$ ). Similar to the decomposition of Malmquiste-Luenberger index in [Munisamy and Arabi \(2015\)](#),  $LPII_h$  can be also decomposed into technical efficiency change and best practice gap change, whereas we can decompose  $LPIM$  into technical efficiency change, best practice gap change and technology gap change, as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
LPII_h(\mathbf{x}^t, \mathbf{y}^t, \mathbf{u}^t; \mathbf{x}^{t+1}, \mathbf{y}^{t+1}, \mathbf{u}^{t+1}) &= \beta_h^I(\mathbf{x}^t, \mathbf{y}^t, \mathbf{u}^t) - \beta_h^I(\mathbf{x}^{t+1}, \mathbf{y}^{t+1}, \mathbf{u}^{t+1}) \\
&= \underbrace{\left[ \beta_h^G(\mathbf{x}^t, \mathbf{y}^t, \mathbf{u}^t) - \beta_h^G(\mathbf{x}^{t+1}, \mathbf{y}^{t+1}, \mathbf{u}^{t+1}) \right]}_{TEC_h(\mathbf{x}^t, \mathbf{y}^t, \mathbf{u}^t; \mathbf{x}^{t+1}, \mathbf{y}^{t+1}, \mathbf{u}^{t+1})} + \\
&\quad \underbrace{\left[ \left( \beta_h^I(\mathbf{x}^t, \mathbf{y}^t, \mathbf{u}^t) - \beta_h^G(\mathbf{x}^t, \mathbf{y}^t, \mathbf{u}^t) \right) - \left( \beta_h^I(\mathbf{x}^{t+1}, \mathbf{y}^{t+1}, \mathbf{u}^{t+1}) - \beta_h^G(\mathbf{x}^{t+1}, \mathbf{y}^{t+1}, \mathbf{u}^{t+1}) \right) \right]}_{BPC_h(\mathbf{x}^t, \mathbf{y}^t, \mathbf{u}^t; \mathbf{x}^{t+1}, \mathbf{y}^{t+1}, \mathbf{u}^{t+1})}
\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& LPIM(\mathbf{x}^t, \mathbf{y}^t, \mathbf{u}^t; \mathbf{x}^{t+1}, \mathbf{y}^{t+1}, \mathbf{u}^{t+1}) \\
&= \beta^M(\mathbf{x}^t, \mathbf{y}^t, \mathbf{u}^t) - \beta^M(\mathbf{x}^{t+1}, \mathbf{y}^{t+1}, \mathbf{u}^{t+1}) \\
&= \underbrace{\left[ \beta_h^G(\mathbf{x}^t, \mathbf{y}^t, \mathbf{u}^t) - \beta_h^G(\mathbf{x}^{t+1}, \mathbf{y}^{t+1}, \mathbf{u}^{t+1}) \right]}_{TEC_h(\mathbf{x}^t, \mathbf{y}^t, \mathbf{u}^t; \mathbf{x}^{t+1}, \mathbf{y}^{t+1}, \mathbf{u}^{t+1})} + \\
&\quad \underbrace{\left[ \left( \beta_h^I(\mathbf{x}^t, \mathbf{y}^t, \mathbf{u}^t) - \beta_h^G(\mathbf{x}^t, \mathbf{y}^t, \mathbf{u}^t) \right) - \left( \beta_h^I(\mathbf{x}^{t+1}, \mathbf{y}^{t+1}, \mathbf{u}^{t+1}) - \beta_h^G(\mathbf{x}^{t+1}, \mathbf{y}^{t+1}, \mathbf{u}^{t+1}) \right) \right]}_{BPC_h(\mathbf{x}^t, \mathbf{y}^t, \mathbf{u}^t; \mathbf{x}^{t+1}, \mathbf{y}^{t+1}, \mathbf{u}^{t+1})} + \\
&\quad \underbrace{\left[ \left( \beta^M(\mathbf{x}^t, \mathbf{y}^t, \mathbf{u}^t) - \beta_h^I(\mathbf{x}^t, \mathbf{y}^t, \mathbf{u}^t) \right) - \left( \beta^M(\mathbf{x}^{t+1}, \mathbf{y}^{t+1}, \mathbf{u}^{t+1}) - \beta_h^I(\mathbf{x}^{t+1}, \mathbf{y}^{t+1}, \mathbf{u}^{t+1}) \right) \right]}_{TGC_h(\mathbf{x}^t, \mathbf{y}^t, \mathbf{u}^t; \mathbf{x}^{t+1}, \mathbf{y}^{t+1}, \mathbf{u}^{t+1})}
\end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

In Equations (10) and (11), *TEC* measures the change on technical efficiency, identifying the movement towards or against the *GTF*. It reveals the catch-up effort of the evaluated units. *BPC* measures the change in best practice gap (*BPG*), capturing the gap between the *ITF* and each period *GTF*. It reveals the technical change of the evaluated units over time. *TGC* measures the change in technology gap (*TG*), representing the gap between the *MTF* and the *ITF* for each group. It reveals the technological leadership change of the evaluated units, which can be achieved through the generation fuel mix adjustment in this study. Specifically, *TEC* reflects the technical efficiency change through expanding intended outputs and/or reducing pollutants in the short term given the inputs unchanged. *BPC* reflects the technical progress or regress in the medium term within one group that shows no heterogeneity in electricity generation technology. *TGC* reflects the technology progress or regress in the long term between groups with technological heterogeneity.

Note that the positive or negative values of *TEC*, *BPC* and *TGC* respectively indicate technical efficiency improvement or deterioration, technical progress or regress, and technological leadership progress or regress, while zero values on *TEC*, *BPC* and *TGC* indicate no changes.

It should be noticed that the strategy for reducing carbon intensity in this study is from the perspective of optimizing energy consumption structure, improving technical efficiency, and promoting production technology for electricity generation, but without considering the direct reduction of energy consumption. The thermal power generation in China had significantly increased

in the 12<sup>th</sup> FYP and will continue increase in the 13<sup>th</sup> FYP in accordance with the growth trends and the national development policies (NDRC, 2016), and thus, the total emissions are likely to increase continuously. For convenience, all variables, parameters and indicators are presented in Table 2.

**Table 2 Summary of variables, parameters and indicators**

	Inputs	$\mathbf{x}_j = (x_{1j}, x_{2j}, \dots, x_{ij}, \dots, x_{mj}) \in \mathbf{R}_+^m$
Parameters	Intended outputs	$\mathbf{y}_j = (y_{1j}, y_{2j}, \dots, y_{rj}, \dots, y_{sj}) \in \mathbf{R}_+^s$
	Unintended outputs	$\mathbf{u}_j = (u_{1j}, u_{2j}, \dots, u_{fj}, \dots, u_{hj}) \in \mathbf{R}_+^h$
Variables	Inefficiency score under $h_{th}$ group technology frontier	$\vec{D}_h(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{u}; \vec{\mathbf{g}}) = \beta_h$
	Inefficiency score under $h_{th}$ intertemporal group technology frontier	$\vec{D}_h^I(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{u}; \vec{\mathbf{g}}) = \beta_h^I$
	Inefficiency score under meta technology frontier	$\vec{D}^M(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{u}; \vec{\mathbf{g}}) = \beta^M$
	Intensity variable	$\lambda_{1j}, \lambda_{2j}$
	The weight of inefficiency for intended outputs	$\alpha$
	The weight of inefficiency for unintended outputs	$\delta$
Indicators	Group technology frontier	<i>GTF</i>
	Intertemporal technology frontier	<i>ITF</i>
	Meta-technology frontier	<i>MTF</i>
	Productivity change within $h_{th}$ group under group technology frontier	<i>LPIG<sub>h</sub></i>
	Productivity change within $h_{th}$ group under intertemporal group technology frontier	<i>LPII<sub>h</sub></i>
	Productivity change between groups	<i>LPIM</i>
	Technical efficiency change	<i>TEC</i>
	Best practice gap change	<i>BPC</i>
Technology gap change	<i>TGC</i>	

## 2.4 Scenario design

Scenario analysis is a useful tool to project future possible reduction of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions intensity according to various time span conditions. However, the main objective of scenario analysis method is to reveal how much the current CO<sub>2</sub> emissions intensity of the power industry sector would be reduced and then find the feasibility of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions intensity reduction target.

To project the future possible reduction of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions intensity in China's power industry sector, we set four scenarios to provide a comparison of results under different time span conditions in the 12<sup>th</sup> FYP. The possible reduction of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions intensity for the four scenarios was



1 calibrated by the actual reduction during 2014-2015, 2013-2015, 2012-2015 and the entire 12<sup>th</sup> FYP,  
2 respectively. The increasing reduction in longer time span due to more technologies and economic  
3 structure changes overtime suggesting that Scenario 4 will have more reduction potential than the rest  
4 scenarios and Scenario 1 has the least reduction potential.  
5  
6  
7

8  
9 Based on these four scenarios, we could have an in-depth insight into the possible reduction of  
10 CO<sub>2</sub> emissions intensity under different time span conditions.  
11  
12  
13

### 14 15 16 17 18 **3 Dataset** 19

20  
21 This study calculates the largest reduction percentage on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions intensity using a  
22 database containing the power industry sectors of 30 provinces of China that were in operation  
23 during the 12<sup>th</sup> FYP period. Tibet, Hong Kong, Macau and Taiwan are not included in our sample  
24 because their data are missing and they are not involved in the energy saving and emission reduction  
25 policies of China. The motivations to employ the date of the 12<sup>th</sup> FYP period are twofold. First, the  
26 data of the 12<sup>th</sup> FYP is the basis of the 13<sup>th</sup> FYP, and thus, the formulation and realization of  
27 reduction target in the 13<sup>th</sup> FYP both have a direct relationship with the data of the 12<sup>th</sup> FYP. Second,  
28 this paper discusses the possibility of the target realization of carbon intensity reduction from the  
29 perspective of potential. The existing intensity reduction potential is obtained from the existing data  
30 of the 12<sup>th</sup> FYP and has a significant impact on the possibility of the target realization.  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

45 Our technologies consist of three inputs (employee, fuel consumption and installed capacity)  
46 which are used to generate one intended output (gross electricity generation) and one unintended  
47 output (CO<sub>2</sub> emissions) for each provincial power industry sector. The reduction of emissions or  
48 emission intensity at provincial level is usually realized through the strategies of optimizing fuel  
49 consumption structure and increasing utilization efficiency of fuel through improving technical  
50 efficiency over time. The inclusion of the above three operational inputs and one emission output  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1 simultaneously helps to appropriately capture the productivity change and its driving forces, i.e.,  
 2 technical efficiency change, best practice gap change, and technological gap change, which are in  
 3 accordance with these strategies, and thus the identified emission reduction potentials and derived  
 4 policy implications could be specifically targeted to the adjustments on these operational inputs.  
 5  
 6  
 7  
 8  
 9

10 The data on employee are collected from the China Industry Economy Statistical Yearbook  
 11 (2012–2016), while the data on fuel consumption, installed capacity and gross electricity generation  
 12 are collected from the Wind database\*. Moreover, the data on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions is calculated based on  
 13 the fuel consumption that is decomposed into coal, oil and natural gas. In specific, the fuel  
 14 consumption related CO<sub>2</sub> emissions is calculated by using the carbon emission factors for the  
 15 combustion of coal, oil and natural gas obtained from IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas  
 16 Inventories and the conversion factors from physical unit to coal equivalent (ce) collected from  
 17 China’s energy statistical yearbooks. Table 3 reports the summary statistics of our dataset.  
 18  
 19  
 20  
 21  
 22  
 23  
 24  
 25  
 26  
 27  
 28  
 29  
 30

31 **Table 3 Summary statistics of inputs and outputs of China’s 30 provincial power industry sectors**


Inputs and output	Year	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Employee (thousand persons)	Mean	89.92	94.57	95.21	94.53	116.35
	St. Dev.	50.09	53.71	55.10	49.53	70.20
	Minimum	9.20	11.75	12.30	12.20	19.10
	Maximum	212.35	211.20	211.30	212.30	280.70
Fuel consumption (million ton of ce)	Mean	47.49	49.22	52.94	54.62	57.13
	St. Dev.	30.19	30.52	32.80	33.89	33.77
	Minimum	4.90	5.38	6.18	6.51	6.88
	Maximum	113.42	117.03	126.83	127.36	140.01
Installed capacity (million kW)	Mean	35.16	38.13	41.54	45.29	51.73
	St. Dev.	20.39	21.76	23.56	25.43	25.90
	Minimum	4.25	5.02	5.10	5.14	6.35
	Maximum	76.31	77.96	83.53	92.14	99.35
Electricity (billion kWh)	Mean	153.38	160.56	174.76	182.06	190.74
	St. Dev.	98.97	100.81	109.14	112.74	113.35
	Minimum	16.91	19.20	21.52	22.94	24.47
	Maximum	375.56	392.84	428.89	434.67	465.14
CO <sub>2</sub> (million tons)	Mean	130.81	130.17	133.71	129.91	113.23
	St. Dev.	100.78	104.04	100.54	100.34	94.36
	Minimum	11.15	12.06	13.19	10.83	11.46
	Maximum	402.88	417.67	382.12	405.41	401.55

32  
 33  
 34  
 35  
 36  
 37  
 38  
 39  
 40  
 41  
 42  
 43  
 44  
 45  
 46  
 47  
 48  
 49  
 50  
 51  
 52  
 53  
 54  
 55  
 56  
 57  
 58  
 59 \* <http://www.wind.com.cn/>  
 60  
 61  
 62  
 63  
 64  
 65

1 When calculating the carbon intensity reduction potentials and analyzing the carbon  
2 productivity change, the effect of carry-over activities between two consecutive terms has already  
3 been accounted in this study, namely, the selected inputs and outputs variables are all work in the  
4 current period. On the one hand, the fuel consumption represents the energy consumption during the  
5 current period, whereas the gross electricity generation represents the electricity generation quantity  
6 in the current period. Moreover, since the provincial average working hours have no significant  
7 difference among employees in the power industry, the number of employee can be considered as a  
8 proxy of the labor input in the current period. On the other hand, although carbon emissions have a  
9 long-term impact on society and environment, this study focus on the feasibility and reasonability of  
10 the carbon intensity reduction target which is accounted in each single year. Hence, we use the  
11 annual carbon emissions for analysis.  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

27 Since increasing renewable energy consumption and energy transformation are both important  
28 energy strategies for controlling CO<sub>2</sub> emissions (Qi and Li, 2017), the evaluation in this study is  
29 conducted on four groups: low-fossil-fuel area, medium-fossil-fuel area, high-fossil-fuel area and  
30 fossil-fuel-dominated area. These groups are comprehensively characterized by the level of  
31 economic development, the level of regional carbon emission reduction target, the number of  
32 electricity generation and the share of fossil fuel consumption in the total energy consumption for  
33 electricity generation. The final grouping of these four areas respectively account 0-65%, 65%-85%,  
34 86%-94% and 94%-100% fossil fuel consumption in the total energy consumption for electricity  
35 generation. The main reason for the group classification in this study is the technological  
36 heterogeneity. On the one hand, different energy types have different emission factor, and thus, the  
37 structure of energy consumption in generating electricity would directly affect the quantity of CO<sub>2</sub>  
38 emissions. On the other hand, since each energy type has its corresponding power generator and  
39 technological capacity, this group classification could distinguish different power generators with  
40 different power generation technology. Fig. 2 shows the production technology of electricity  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1 generation and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions for these four groups. It can be seen that there are indeed significant  
 2 differences in the production technology among groups during 12<sup>th</sup> FYP period, and thus, our  
 3  
 4 grouping is meaningful for analysis. Fig. 3 presents the geographical distribution of these four  
 5  
 6  
 7 groups.



8  
 9  
 10  
 11  
 12  
 13  
 14  
 15  
 16  
 17  
 18  
 19  
 20  
 21  
 22  
 23  
 24  
 25  
 26  
 27  
 28  
 29  
 30  
 31  
 32  
 33  
 34  
 35  
 36  
 37  
 38  
 39 **Fig. 2** Different production technologies among areas during 12<sup>th</sup> Five-Year period

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



**Fig. 3** The geographical distribution of four groups with different shares of fossil fuel

**4 Results**

This section first evaluates the feasibility of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions intensity reduction target in the 13<sup>th</sup> FYP under four scenarios, and then presents the results of productivity change and its driving forces.

To evaluate the feasibility of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions intensity reduction target, the largest reduction on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions intensity (i.e., the optimal reduction ratio) is first estimated for each provincial power sector, namely, the largest reduction on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions intensity could be achieved if the electricity generating units adopt best practices, using the endogenous efficiency measurement introduced in Section 2.2. These estimated largest reduction percentages on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions intensity are then compared with the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions intensity reduction target.

Because there is not a special target for China’s power industry sector, we here use three kinds of targets (i.e., the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions intensity target at national level, at provincial level and at firm

level) as a baseline target for the power industry<sup>\*</sup>. At the national level, the government's target of 18% CO<sub>2</sub> emissions intensity reduction during the 13<sup>th</sup> FYP period is adopted as the baseline target. At provincial level, each province had also announced to reduce its corresponding CO<sub>2</sub> emissions intensity of total output value (i.e., CO<sub>2</sub> emissions per unit of total output value) during the 13<sup>th</sup> FYP period, which is set as the baseline target. At the firm level, the government target for the large power generation units, that is, a cap of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions per unit of electricity supply at 550 g CO<sub>2</sub>/kWh during the 13<sup>th</sup> FYP is adopted as the baseline target.

#### 4.1 The feasibility of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions intensity target at national level

Under group technology, intertemporal technology and meta-technology, Fig. 4 depicts the largest reduction on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions intensity at the national level. The nationwide 18% reduction target is compared with the largest reduction percentage on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions intensity for the whole country and for each group. As shown in Fig. 5, our results indicate that, firstly, through technical efficiency improvement in the short term (i.e., expanding electricity generation and reducing CO<sub>2</sub> emissions given the current inputs), the optimal reduction ratio for the whole country could be reduced by 2.09%, 1.92%, 2% and 2.45% on average under the four scenarios, respectively. Ratios of the low-fossil-fuel area, medium-fossil-fuel area, high-fossil-fuel area and fossil-fuel-dominated area could range from 0% to 0.71%, 1.17% to 2.89%, 1.31% to 1.83% and 3.52% to 5.42% on average, respectively. All of these reduction potentials are quite lower than the 18% reduction target.

Secondly, through both the technical efficiency improvement and the technical progress on electricity generation and carbon abatement in the medium term within each group, an average


---

\* Since the provincial average electricity price is regulated and almost steady in China, the gross electricity generation can be considered as an equivalent of the gross industrial output in power industry. Therefore, it is reasonable to compare the reduction target of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions per unit of GDP (or total output value) with the largest reduction percentage of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions per unit of electricity generation in China's power industry sector.

1 7.01%, 9.03%, 12.27% and 13.52% national emission reduction under the four scenarios can be  
2 achieved according to the intertemporal technology. Specifically, the largest reduction ratios of the  
3  
4 low-fossil-fuel area, medium-fossil-fuel area, high-fossil-fuel area and fossil-fuel-dominated area  
5  
6 range from 7.87% to 26.57%, 3.95% to 8.92%, 3.40% to 7.04% and 10.17% to 12.38% on average  
7  
8 respectively. These reduction potentials are much close to the 18% national reduction target. The  
9  
10 largest reduction ratios of the low-fossil-fuel area could be 26.03% and 26.57% in scenario 3 and 4,  
11  
12  
13 and thus achieve the nationwide 18% target.  
14  
15  
16

17 Thirdly, through both the technical efficiency improvement and the technical progress on  
18  
19 electricity generation and carbon abatement within group, as well as the technological transfer  
20  
21 between groups that can be gradually realized in the long term, the national reduction ratio could at  
22  
23 least 40.02% on average according to the meta-technology. In addition, under this circumstance, the  
24  
25 largest reduction ratios of all four areas (32.82%-42.01%, 53.62%-54.89%, 43.07%-44.65% and  
26  
27 24.53%-31.22%) under these four scenarios can be also far higher than the 18% reduction target.  
28  
29  
30  
31

32 The above evaluation reveals that, even if all units were able to adopt their best practice in the  
33  
34 short term or in the medium term, the 18% CO<sub>2</sub> emissions intensity reduction target of the 13<sup>th</sup> FYP  
35  
36 could not be achieved through improving the technical efficiency and upgrading the technology on  
37  
38 electricity generation and carbon abatement. However, this target could be achieved in the medium  
39  
40 and long term, with substantial technical progress in each area associated with technological transfer  
41  
42 among provinces, and effective generation fuel mix adjustment for electricity generation and carbon  
43  
44 abatement.  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65



**Fig. 4** Largest reduction percentage on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions intensity for whole country and each group

#### 4.2 The feasibility of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions intensity target at provincial level

The provincial reduction targets are compared with the largest reduction potential on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions intensity at the provincial level. Fig. 5 shows the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions reduction percentages from adopting best practice in 30 provinces under four scenarios. It can be seen that the largest reduction percentage on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions intensity is various among China's provinces and among different technologies, but the results among four scenarios are similar. Specifically, under all three technologies, the feasible emissions reduction percentage of eight provinces (Sichuan, Qinghai, Zhejiang, Guangdong, Hainan, Shaanxi, Beijing and Jiangsu) is far less than the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions intensity reduction target of 13<sup>th</sup> FYP in all four scenarios. Shanghai and Tianjin can only achieve their corresponding targets under meta-technology during 2014-2015 scenario. One of the most vital reasons may be that due to their advanced development level, these provinces have relatively higher technical efficiencies and thus smaller emission reduction potential. Moreover, in all scenarios, the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions reduction ratios of nine provinces (Hubei, Fujian, Xinjiang, Jiangxi, Chongqing, Hebei, Inner Mongolia, Liaoning, and Ningxia) are higher than their provincial CO<sub>2</sub> emissions intensity reduction target but only under meta-technology. That means, in order to achieve the CO<sub>2</sub>



1 emissions intensity reduction target, these provinces will have to adjust their fuel mix in the medium  
2 and long term.  
3  
4

5 In addition, the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions reduction potential of ten provinces (Yunnan, Guangxi, Gansu,  
6 Hunan, Jilin, Heilongjiang, Shandong, Anhui, Shanxi and Henan) can be higher than their provincial  
7 CO<sub>2</sub> emissions intensity reduction target under both intertemporal technology and meta-technology.  
8 The possible emissions reduction potential of Guizhou could be higher than its 12% regional target  
9 under all three technologies in scenario 3 and 4. In other words, these eleven provinces can achieve  
10 the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions intensity reduction target of 13<sup>th</sup> FYP through the technical progress on electricity  
11 generation and carbon abatement within group and/or the technological transfer between groups.  
12 These results give an important suggestion that, since the maximizing reduction potential on CO<sub>2</sub>  
13 emissions intensity are various among regions, the regulations and policies implemented for CO<sub>2</sub>  
14 emissions control in power industry should be different across China's regions. The results also  
15 suggest that inter-provincial transfer of technologies is necessary as some province can only achieve  
16 their targets through catching up with the *MTF*.  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65



### 4.3 The feasibility of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions intensity target at firm level

In this sub-section, we compare the results of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions intensity of electricity generation (i.e., optimal CO<sub>2</sub> emissions per unit of electricity generation) for each province's power sector with the 550 g CO<sub>2</sub>/kWh target.

Table 4 presents the results of optimal CO<sub>2</sub> emissions intensity of electricity generation using the endogenous efficiency measurement and three technology frontiers introduced in Section 2.2. For the whole country, the target of capping CO<sub>2</sub> emissions intensity of electricity generation at 550 g CO<sub>2</sub>/kWh can only be achieved under *MTF*. It means that the feasibility of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions intensity target for China's power industry sector not only need the technical progress on electricity generation and carbon abatement within group and the technological transfer between groups, but also need to adjust fuel mix for power generation units.

The CO<sub>2</sub> emissions intensity of electricity generation of low-fossil-fuel area performs best and is smaller than 470 g CO<sub>2</sub>/kWh under all technologies. For medium-fossil-fuel area and high-fossil-fuel area, the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions intensity of electricity generation can only achieve the 550 g CO<sub>2</sub>/kWh target through the joint efforts of technical progress, technology transfer and the adjustment of fuel mix. In addition, it is worth noting that the fossil-fuel-dominated area is hard to achieve the 550 g CO<sub>2</sub>/kWh target.

In addition, the introduction of renewable energy and the adjustment of fuel mix for power generation units are the necessary means to control China's carbon emissions.

**Table 4 Results of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions intensity of electricity generation (g CO<sub>2</sub>/kWh)**


	Scenario 1			Scenario 2			Scenario 3			Scenario 4		
	<i>GTF</i>	<i>ITF</i>	<i>MTF</i>	<i>GTF</i>	<i>ITF</i>	<i>MTF</i>	<i>GTF</i>	<i>ITF</i>	<i>MTF</i>	<i>GTF</i>	<i>ITF</i>	<i>MTF</i>
Total	666	629	367	688	640	394	706	637	399	722	642	407
Low-fossil-fuel area	347	307	186	374	290	188	389	260	188	409	275	466
Medium-fossil-fuel area	695	673	292	715	676	308	717	684	304	731	676	442
High-fossil-fuel area	895	870	482	909	888	499	928	881	510	950	895	391

**4.4 Driving forces of the productivity change**

To design a reasonable target of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions reduction for each region, it is necessary to analyze the driving forces for carbon productivity change in China’s power industry. Hence, the next step of this study is to evaluate the change on carbon performance of China’s power industry sector in 12<sup>th</sup> FYP period and further discuss the sources of carbon productivity growth through utilizing the productivity indicators introduced in Section 2.3.


Fig. 6 shows the technology gap of each group, which represents the extent to which the *ITF* of individual group deviates from the *MTF*. In this figure, since all trends of technology gap of scenario 1, 2 and 3 are the part of scenario 4, and thus, only the results of scenario 4 are discussed here.

From 2011 onwards, low-fossil-fuel area and fossil-fuel-dominated area have represented a premier technology and have formed the *MTF*. It implies that the regions that have relatively high shares of renewable energy consumption in total energy consumption or mainly rely on thermal power for electricity generation, have performed significantly better in electricity generation than the regions with mixed energy consumption during our study period.



**Fig. 6** Technology gap for all four groups

The Luenberger productivity indicator of meta-technology for four groups during 2011-2015 scenario is presented in Fig. 7, measuring the productivity growth in the long term between groups through both improving the technical efficiency and upgrading the technology, as well as through the technological transmission on electricity generation and carbon abatement. As can be seen from this figure, the *LPIM* of medium-fossil-fuel area and high-fossil-fuel area are around zero and the *LPIM* of high-fossil-fuel area experiences a little drop in 2014-2015. Although there are more fluctuation in low-fossil-fuel area and fossil-fuel-dominated area during the study period, this component is also around zero in general. These above observations can be verified by the *T*-test listed in Table 5. This result reveals that, since the technical efficiency, the technology and the technological transfer on electricity generation and carbon abatement show no significant improvement, there is almost no productivity growth among all areas.



**Fig. 7** Productivity change between groups for four areas during 2011-2015

**Table 5** The results of *T*-test for *LPIM*

Group	<i>t</i>	Sig.
Low-fossil-fuel area	0.356	0.746
Medium-fossil-fuel area	0.192	0.860
High-fossil-fuel area	-0.457	0.679
Fossil-fuel-dominated area	-0.507	0.647

Note: Significant level at 5%.

To provide a clear picture, Table 6 presents the average *LPIM* and its decomposition for each group in the 12<sup>th</sup> FYP. The average *LPIM* is calculated by the arithmetic average value of each scenario during the period of 2011-2015. Firstly, in terms of average *TEC*, the low-fossil-fuel area has the highest increase of 0.0022 followed by the medium-fossil-fuel area with 0.0004. While the high-fossil-fuel area and fossil-fuel-dominated area have a decrease in technical efficiency by -0.0095 and -0.0283, respectively. This indicates that the low-fossil-fuel area shows the best performance on the catch-up effect.

Secondly, with respect to the average *BPC*, the medium-fossil-fuel area, high-fossil-fuel area and fossil-fuel-dominated area present the similar technical progress of 0.0195, 0.0203 and 0.0141, whereas the low-fossil-fuel area faces a 0.0082 technical progress. One of the most vital reasons may be due to the fact that the regions based on thermal power for electricity generation need a relatively

advanced technology than the regions that have a relatively high share of renewable energy consumption in total energy consumption.

Finally, the average *TGC* shows an increase in low-fossil-fuel area (0.0206), whereas it shows a reduction in medium-fossil-fuel area (-0.0332), high-fossil-fuel area (-0.0549) and fossil-fuel-dominated area (-0.0441). This result indicates that an enlarged gap between the *ITF* of last three areas and the *MTF*. Since the *TGC* measures the change in technological leadership, it can be interpreted that these three areas show no technological leadership progress.

Regarding the *LPIM* reported in Table 7, the most obvious productivity growth occurs in the low-fossil-fuel area, and this growth is driven by the promotion of technical efficiency and technological leadership. On the contrary, the medium-fossil-fuel area, high-fossil-fuel area and fossil-fuel-dominated area show productivity decline. Technological leadership regress is the primary driving force for the decline in medium-fossil-fuel area, whereas technical efficiency deterioration and technological leadership regress are both the primary driving forces leading to the drop for high-fossil-fuel area and fossil-fuel-dominated area. An interesting observation is that, the scores on *LPIM* decline associated with the increasing proportion of fossil fuel consumption in total energy consumption for electricity generation. Hence, it can be suggested that increasing the share of clean energy in electricity generation may help to accelerate the productivity progress in China's power industry.

**Table 6 *LPIM* and its decomposition for each group in the period of 2011-2015**

<b>Group</b>	<b>Region</b>	<b><i>LPIM</i></b>	<b><i>TEC</i></b>	<b><i>BPC</i></b>	<b><i>TGC</i></b>
Low-fossil-fuel area	Hubei	-0.0560	0	-0.0579	0.0019
	Hunan	-0.0480	0	-0.2009	0.1529
	Guangxi	-0.0210	0	0.0755	-0.0965
	Sichuan	0.0895	0	0.0691	0.0203
	Yunnan	0.1613	0.0156	0.1384	0.0073
	Gansu	-0.0126	0	-0.0813	0.0687
	Qinghai	-0.0101	0	0	-0.0101
	<b>Average</b>	<b>0.0147</b>	<b>0.0022</b>	<b>-0.0082</b>	<b>0.0206</b>
Medium-fossil-fuel area	Jilin	0.0016	0.0206	0.0418	-0.0609

1		Zhejiang	-0.0402	0	0	-0.0402
2		Fujian	-0.0733	0	0	-0.0733
3		Jiangxi	-0.0444	0	-0.0393	-0.0051
4		Guangdong	0.0586	0	0	0.0586
5		Chongqing	-0.0830	0	0	-0.0830
6		Guizhou	-0.0056	-0.0267	0.0607	-0.0396
7		Xinjiang	0.0797	0.0091	0.0926	-0.0220
8		<b>Average</b>	<b>-0.0133</b>	<b>0.0004</b>	<b>0.0195</b>	<b>-0.0332</b>
9						
10		Hebei	-0.0755	0	-0.0281	-0.0474
11		Inner Mongolia	0.0428	0	0.0168	0.0260
12		Liaoning	-0.0047	0	0.0566	-0.0614
13		Heilongjiang	-0.0155	-0.0668	0.0806	-0.0294
14	High-fossil-fuel area	Hainan	-0.1017	0	0	-0.1017
15		Shaanxi	-0.1193	0	0.0164	-0.1357
16		Ningxia	-0.0346	0	0	-0.0346
17		<b>Average</b>	<b>-0.0441</b>	<b>-0.0095</b>	<b>0.0203</b>	<b>-0.0549</b>
18						
19		Beijing	0.0960	0	0	0.0960
20		Tianjin	-0.0309	0	-0.0197	-0.0113
21		Shanxi	-0.2041	-0.1283	0.0099	-0.0857
22		Shanghai	-0.2417	0	-0.0605	-0.1812
23	Fossil-fuel-dominated area	Jiangsu	0.0064	0	0.0059	0.0006
24		Anhui	-0.1500	-0.1077	0.0435	-0.0858
25		Shandong	0.2054	0.0291	0.1021	0.0741
26		Henan	-0.1480	-0.0199	0.0316	-0.1598
27		<b>Average</b>	<b>-0.0584</b>	<b>-0.0283</b>	<b>0.0141</b>	<b>-0.0441</b>
28						
29						
30						
31						
32						

## 5 Discussions

Overall, the feasibility studies show that even if all electricity generation units adopt their best practice, the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions intensity reduction target in 13<sup>th</sup> FYP period is infeasible in the short term and in the medium term. Based on the analyses, several findings can be obtained as follows. The estimation results indicate that the maximum reduction potential of almost all regions would still be below the 13<sup>th</sup> FYP target if only improving the technical efficiency and upgrading the technology on electricity generation and carbon abatement in a short or medium term. A large scale of efficiency improvement is only achievable in the long term associated with the technological transfer among areas, and the effective adjustment of generation fuel mix for electricity generation and carbon abatement. Moreover, the largest reduction potentials on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions intensity are different among



1 regions. Therefore, the targets for CO<sub>2</sub> emissions reduction should be variously assigned across  
2 regions.  
3  
4

5 To inform designing better emission control targets for China's power industry across regions in  
6 the future, the productivity change and its decomposition are also analyzed. The estimation shows  
7 that, i) The low-fossil-fuel area and the fossil-fuel-dominated area have smaller emission reduction  
8 potential than the other areas during our study period. One possible reason is that the low-fossil-fuel  
9 area has a relatively high share of renewable electricity generation, and there is no CO<sub>2</sub> emissions  
10 from the using of renewable energy such as solar power, wind power and hydropower. Therefore,  
11 when generating the same level of electricity, the low-fossil-fuel area has lower CO<sub>2</sub> emissions than  
12 the other areas. In addition, the fossil-fuel-dominated area, which relies on thermal power in  
13 electricity generation, has a better technology with a relatively low fuel consumption rate for  
14 electricity generation.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

30 ii) The *LPIM* of all groups shows almost no growth in the long term because there is no  
31 significant increase in technical efficiency, upgrade in technology and technological transfer on  
32 electricity generation and carbon abatement. This suggests weakness in controlling carbon emissions  
33 and further actions, such as inter-regional technology transfer, more renewable energy introduction  
34 and limiting the operation of the backward capacity, are needed.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

43 iii) With respect to the decomposition of the *LPIM*, the low-fossil-fuel area has the best  
44 performance on the catch-up effect, but presents the lowest technical progress, whereas only this area  
45 shows technological leadership progress. Table 7 summaries the situation of *LPIM* and its  
46 decomposition for each group. On the one hand, the low-fossil-fuel area experience the productivity  
47 growth, and its growth is driven by the technical efficiency improvement and technological  
48 leadership progress. On the other hand, the medium-fossil-fuel area, high-fossil-fuel area and the  
49 fossil-fuel-dominated area experience productivity reductions. Specifically, the technological  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 leadership regress causes the *LPIM* decline of the medium-fossil-fuel area, while the technical  
2 efficiency deterioration and the technological leadership regress both lead to this drop for  
3  
4 high-fossil-fuel area and fossil-fuel-dominated area.  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

**Table 7 Summaries on *LPIM* and its decomposition for each group**

	Definition: share of fossil fuel consumption in total energy consumption for electricity generation	Technology gap	Productivity change	Technical efficiency change	Technical change	Technological leadership change
Low-fossil-fuel area	0-65%	Low	Growth (best)	Improvement (best)	Regress (worst)	Progress (best)
Medium-fossil-fuel area	65%-85%	High	Reduction	Improvement	Progress	Regress
High-fossil-fuel area	85%-94%	High	Reduction	Deterioration	Progress	Regress
Fossil-fuel-dominated area	94%-100%	Low	Reduction	Deterioration	Progress	Regress

## 6 Conclusion

Electricity generation, which accounts for a relatively large share in energy consumption and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, is one of the most important industrial sectors in China's effort to control carbon emission. This article discusses whether the proposed nationwide and provincial CO<sub>2</sub> emissions intensity reduction target of the 13<sup>th</sup> FYP would be achievable for the existing generating units through scenario analysis. It also tries to inform future policy improvement by revealing the driving forces of carbon productivity change.

To capture the feasible reduction in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions intensity, this paper estimates the maximizing reduction potential in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions intensity by increasing the electricity generation and decreasing the related CO<sub>2</sub> emissions under four illustrative scenarios. More specifically, it tries to examine which CO<sub>2</sub> emissions intensity would be feasible if all the electricity-generating units adopt their best practice. In other words, this paper conducts the scenario analysis to identify how much the current CO<sub>2</sub> emissions intensity of the power industry sector would be reduced if the plants operated at various technological frontiers.

The study find that the nationwide 18% CO<sub>2</sub> reduction target is not feasible through improving technical efficiency or upgrading technology on electricity generation and carbon abatement in a short or medium term. The inter-regional technology transfer and the effective adjustment of generation fuel mix for electricity generation are needed to increase the efficiency in the uses of energy and the control of carbon emissions. For most provinces, the 18% reduction target is not difficult to achieve. However, there is significant inter-regional heterogeneity in technologies and thus productivity. It is also found that there is no much potential for all areas to improve overall

1 productivity in a five-year period. By group, only low-fossil-fuel area has little overall productivity  
2  
3 growth (0.0147) driven by technical efficiency improvement and technological leadership progress,  
4  
5 whereas medium-fossil-fuel area experiences overall productivity decline mainly driven by  
6  
7 technological leadership regress, and high-fossil-fuel area and fossil-fuel-dominated area also  
8  
9 experience overall productivity decline driven by both technical efficiency deterioration and  
10  
11 technological leadership regress.  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17

18 The present offers the following policy implication. First, since the largest reduction  
19  
20 percentages on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions intensity are various among regions, the regulations and policies for  
21  
22 CO<sub>2</sub> emissions intensity reduction should be more differentiated across different regions. Second,  
23  
24 considering the limited overall productivity improvement potential in the short and medium term,  
25  
26 and the significant regional heterogeneity, inter-region technology transfer, introducing more  
27  
28 renewable energy and limiting the operation of the backward capacity could promote emission  
29  
30 control as well as productivity growth. This is particular true within the thermal power generation  
31  
32 category where advanced technologies could be transferred from one region to another. Third,  
33  
34 consider high renewable energy share lead to high productivity growth, promoting clean energy  
35  
36 consumption in electricity generation may help to improve the carbon productivity. This suggestion  
37  
38 is actually in line with the development plan of China's power industry for INDC, in which to  
39  
40 increase the share of non-fossil fuels in the total primary energy supply to 20 percent by 2030 is  
41  
42 targeted. Lastly, the emerging national emission trading scheme will make policy formulation for  
43  
44 heterogeneous regions much easier. However, regional specific emission targets under a national  
45  
46 ETS are still necessary to prevent those regions with limited abatement potential being overburden to  
47  
48 buy carbon credits.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 **Acknowledgment**  
5  
6

7 We gratefully acknowledge the financial support from the National Natural Science Foundation  
8 of China (Grant Nos. 71471018, 71521002 and 71761137001), the Social Science Foundation of  
9 Beijing (Grant No. 16JDGLB013), the Joint Development Program of Beijing Municipal  
10 Commission of Education, the Fok Ying Tung Education Foundation (161076), the  
11 National Key R&D Program (Grant No. 2016YFA0602603), the International Clean Energy Talent  
12 Program of Chinese Scholarship Council, and the Key Technology Partnership (KTP) Visiting  
13 Fellow Program at UTS and BIT.  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

31 **References**  
32  
33

- 34 Adler, N., Voltab, N., 2016. Accounting for externalities and disposability: A directional economic  
35 environmental distance function. *Eur. J. Oper. Res.* 250, 314–327.  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40 Azad, M.A.K., Munisamy, S., Masum, A.K.M., Saona, P., Wanke, P.F., 2017. Bank efficiency in  
41 Malaysia: a use of malmquist meta-frontier analysis. *Eurasian Bus. Rev.* 7, 287-311.  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46 Barros, C.P., Wanke, P., 2017. Efficiency in Angolan thermal power plants: Evidence from cost  
47 structure and pollutant emissions. *Energ.* 130, 129-143.  
48  
49  
50  
51 Barros, C.P., Wanke, P., 2017. Technology Gaps and Capacity Issues in African Insurance Companies:  
52 Selected Country Evidence. *J. Int. Dev.* 29(1), 117-133.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

- 1 Barros, C.P., Wanke, P., Dumbo, S., Manso, J.P., 2017. Efficiency in angolan hydro-electric power  
2 station: A two-stage virtual frontier dynamic DEA and simplex regression approach. *Renew. Sust.*  
3  
4 *Energ. Rev.* 78, 588-596.  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9 Battese, G.E., Rao, D.S.P., 2002. Technology gap, efficiency, and a stochastic metafrontier function.  
10  
11 *Int. J. Bus. Econ.* 1(2), 87–93.  
12  
13  
14 Battese, G.E., Rao, D.S.P., O'Donnell, C.J., 2004. A metafrontier production function for estimation  
15  
16 of technical efficiencies and technology gaps for firms operating under different technologies. *J.*  
17  
18 *Prod. Anal.* 21(1), 91-103.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23 Bjorn, L., 2016. Impact of Current Climate Proposals. *Glob. Policy.* 7(1), 109-118.  
24  
25  
26 Chambers, R.G., Chung, Y., Färe, R., 1996a. Benefit and Distance Functions. *J. Econ. Theory.* 70,  
27  
28 407-419.  
29  
30  
31  
32 Chen, C.-M., Delmas, M.A., 2012. Measuring Eco-Inefficiency: A New Frontier Approach. *Oper.*  
33  
34 *Res.* 60(5), 1064-1079.  
35  
36  
37  
38 Chen, Z., Wanke, P., Antunes, J.J.M., Zhang, N., 2017. Chinese airline efficiency under CO2  
39  
40 emissions and flight delays: A stochastic network DEA model. *Energ. Econ.* 68, 89-108,  
41  
42  
43  
44 Chen, J.D., Cheng, S.L., Nikic, V., Song, M.L., 2018. Quo Vadis? Major Players in Global Coal  
45  
46 Consumption and Emissions Reduction. *Transf. Bus. Econ.* 17(1), 112-132.  
47  
48  
49  
50 Chung, Y., Färe, R., Grosskopf, S., 1997. Productivity and undesirable outputs: a directional distance  
51  
52 function approach. *J. Environ. Manage.* 51, 229-240.  
53  
54  
55  
56 Díaz-Villavicencio, G., Didonet, S.R., Dodd, A., 2017. Influencing factors of eco-efficient urban  
57  
58 waste management: Evidence from Spanish municipalities. *J. Clean. Prod.* 164, 1486-1496.  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

- 1 Du, K., Huang, L., Yu, K., 2014. Sources of the potential CO<sub>2</sub> emission reduction in China: A  
2 nonparametric metafrontier approach. *Appl. Energ.* 115, 491–501.  
3  
4  
5  
6 Fallahfani, S., Triantis, K.P., La Garza, J.M., Seaver, W. 2012. Measuring the efficiency of highway  
7 maintenance contracting strategies: A bootstrapped non-parametric meta-frontier approach. *Eur. J.*  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15 Färe, R., Grosskopf, S., 2004. *New Directions: Efficiency and Productivity*. Boston: Kluwer  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21 Färe, R., Grosskopf, S., Pasurka, C.A., Weber, W., 2012. Substitutability among undesirable outputs.  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27 Färe, R., Grosskopf, S., Wittaker, G., 2013. Directional Output Distance Functions: Endogenous  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65
- Feng, C., Wang, M., Zhang, Y., Liu, G.-C., 2018. Decomposition of energy efficiency and energy-saving potential in China: A three-hierarchy meta-frontier approach. *J. Clean. Prod.* 176, 1054-1064.
- Fetanat, A., Shafipour, G., 2017. A hybrid method of LMDI, symmetrical components, and SFA to estimate the distribution of energy-saving potential with consideration of unbalanced components in decomposition analysis, *Energ. Effic.* 10(4), 1041-1059.
- Fukuyama, H., Weber, W.L., 2009. A directional slacks-based measure of technical inefficiency. *Socio-Econ. Plan. Sci.* 43, 274-287.
- Halkos, G. E., Stern, D. I., Tzeremes, N. G., 2016. Population, economic growth and regional environmental inefficiency: evidence from US states. *J. Clean. Prod.* 112, 4288-4295.



- 1 Hampf, B., Krüger, J.J., 2014. Optimal Directions for Directional Distance Functions: An  
2  
3 Exploration of Potential Reductions of Greenhouse Gases. *Am. J. Agr. Econ.* 97, 920-938.  
4  
5  
6 Hampf, B., Rødseth, K.L., 2015. Carbon dioxide emission standards for U.S. power plants: An  
7  
8 efficiency analysis perspective. *Energ. Econ.* 50, 140–153.  
9  
10  
11 Hančlová, J. Melecký, L. 2016. Application of the Nonparametric DEA Meta-frontier Approach with  
12  
13 Undesirable Outputs in the Case of EU Regions. *Bus. Syst. Res. J.* 7(2), 65-77.  
14  
15  
16  
17 Hayami, Y., 1969. Sources of agricultural productivity gap among selected countries. *Am. J. Agric.*  
18  
19  
20  
21 *Econ.* 51(3), 564–575.  
22  
23  
24 Heshmati, A., Lee, S., Hwang, W., 2012. Performance analysis of power plants under heterogeneous  
25  
26 technologies with meta frontier framework. *Int. J. Econ. Manag. Eng.* 2(1), 5-14.  
27  
28  
29 IEA, 2011. CO<sub>2</sub> Emissions from fuel combustion highlights.  
30  
31 <http://www.iea.org/media/statistics/co2highlights.pdf>. (accessed 01 June 2015).  
32  
33  
34  
35 IPCC, 2013. *Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis*, Cambridge University Press,  
36  
37  
38 Cambridge.  
39  
40  
41 Lee, C., Lee D., Hwang, J., 2015. Platform openness and the productivity of content providers: A  
42  
43 meta-frontier analysis. *Telecommun. Policy.* 39(7), 553-562.  
44  
45  
46  
47 Lin, B., Zhao, H., 2016. Technology gap and regional energy efficiency in China's textile industry: A  
48  
49 non-parametric meta-frontier approach. *J. Clean. Prod.* 137, 21-28.  
50  
51  
52  
53 Makni, R., Benouda, O., Delhoumi, E. 2015. Large scale analysis of Islamic equity funds using a  
54  
55 meta-frontier approach with data envelopment analysis. *Res. Int. Bus. Financ.* 324-337.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

- 1 farms in three southern cone countries: a stochastic meta-frontier model. *J. Prod. Anal.* 33(1),  
2  
3 33-45.  
4  
5
- 6 Munisamy, S., Arabi, B., 2015. Eco-efficiency change in power plants: using a slacks-based measure  
7  
8 for the meta-frontier Malmquist-Luenberger productivity index. *J. Clean. Prod.* 105, 218-232.  
9  
10
- 11 NDRC, 2016. National Development and Reform Commission: The electric power development  
12  
13 planning "in 13th Five-Year" (2016-2020).  
14  
15 <http://www.gov.cn/xinwen/2016-12/22/5151549/files/696e98c57ecd49c289968ae2d77ed583.pdf>.  
16  
17 (accessed 10 June, 2018)  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22
- 23 Oh, D.-h., 2010. A metafrontier approach for measuring an environmentally sensitive productivity  
24  
25 growth index. *Energ. Econ.* 32(1), 146–157.  
26  
27
- 28 O'Donnell, C., Rao, D., Battese, G., 2008. Metafrontier frameworks for the study of firmlevel  
29  
30 efficiencies and technology ratios. *Empir. Econ.* 34 (2), 231–255.  
31  
32  
33
- 34 Paltsev, S., Morris, J., Cai, Y.S., Karplus, V., Jacoby, H., 2012. The role of China in mitigating  
35  
36 climate change. *Energ. Econ.* 34(3), 444–450.  
37  
38  
39
- 40 Park, P. J., Tahara, K., 2008. Quantifying producer and consumer-based eco-efficiencies for the  
41  
42 identification of key ecodesign issues. *J. Clean. Prod.* 16(1), 95-104.  
43  
44  
45
- 46 Picazo-Tadeo, A.J., Beltrán-Esteve, M., Gómez-Limón, J.A., 2012. Assessing eco-efficiency with  
47  
48 directional distance functions. *Eur. J. Oper. Res.* 220, 798–80.  
49  
50  
51
- 52 Picazo-Tadeo, A.J., Prior, D., 2009. Environmental Externalities and Efficiency Measurement. *J.*  
53  
54 *Environ. Manage.* 90, 3332-3339.  
55  
56
- 57 Qi, S, Li, Y., 2017. Threshold effects of renewable energy consumption on economic growth under  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 energy transformation. Chinese J. Popul. Resour. Environ. 15(4): 312-321.

2  
3  
4 SCC, 2007. State Council of the People's Republic of China: Comprehensive Work Plan for Energy  
5  
6 Conservation and Emissions Reduction.

7  
8  
9 [http://www.gov.cn/zwgk/2007-06/03/content\\_634545.htm](http://www.gov.cn/zwgk/2007-06/03/content_634545.htm). (accessed 15 November 2016).

10  
11  
12 SCC, 2011a. State Council of the People's Republic of China: comprehensive work plan for energy  
13  
14 conservation and emissions reduction in the 12<sup>th</sup> five year plan period.

15  
16  
17 [http://www.gov.cn/zwgk/2011-09/07/content\\_1941731.htm](http://www.gov.cn/zwgk/2011-09/07/content_1941731.htm). (accessed 15 November 2016).

18  
19  
20 SCC, 2011b. State Council of the People's Republic of China: work plan for greenhouse emissions  
21  
22 control in the 12<sup>th</sup> five year plan period.

23  
24  
25 [http://www.gov.cn/zhengce/content/2012-01/13/content\\_1294.htm](http://www.gov.cn/zhengce/content/2012-01/13/content_1294.htm). (accessed 15 November 2016).

26  
27  
28 SCC, 2016. State Council of the People's Republic of China: work plan for greenhouse emissions  
29  
30 control in the 13<sup>th</sup> five year plan period.

31  
32  
33 [http://www.gov.cn/zhengce/content/2016-11/04/content\\_5128619.htm](http://www.gov.cn/zhengce/content/2016-11/04/content_5128619.htm). (accessed 15 November  
34  
35  
36  
37 2016).

38  
39  
40 Shephard, R.W., 1970. Theory of Cost and Production Functions. Princeton University Press,  
41  
42 Princeton, NJ.

43  
44  
45 Sueyoshi, T., Li, A., Gao, Y., 2018. Sector sustainability on fossil fuel power plants across Chinese  
46  
47 provinces: Methodological comparison among radial, non-radial and intermediate approaches  
48  
49 under group heterogeneity. J. Clean. Prod. 187, 819-829.  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1 Vardanyan, M., Noh, D.W., 2006. Approximating pollution abatement costs via alternative  
2  
3 specifications of a multi-output production technology: a case of US electric utility industry. J.  
4  
5 Environ. Manage. 80, 177-190.  
6  
7  
8  
9 Wanke, P.F., Barros, C.P., 2016 Efficiency drivers in Brazilian insurance: A two-stage DEA meta  
10  
11 frontier-data mining approach. Econ. Model. 53, 8-22.  
12  
13  
14 Wanke, P.F., Hadi-Vencheh, A., Forghani, A., 2017. A DDF based model for efficiency evaluation in  
15  
16 two-stage DEA. Optim Lett. 1-16.  
17  
18  
19  
20 Wang, K., Wei, Y.M., Zhang, X., 2013. Energy and emissions efficiency patterns of Chinese regions:  
21  
22 a multi-directional efficiency analysis. Appl. Energ. 104, 105-116.  
23  
24  
25  
26 Wang, K., Xian, Y.J., Wei, Y.M., Huang Z., 2016a. Sources of carbon productivity change: A  
27  
28 decomposition and disaggregation analysis based on global Luenberger productivity indicator and  
29  
30 endogenous directional distance function. Ecol. Indic. 66, 545-555.  
31  
32  
33  
34 Wang, K., Lee, C.Y., Zhang, J., Wei, Y.M., 2016b. Operational performance management of the  
35  
36 power industry: A distinguishing analysis between effectiveness and efficiency. Ann. Oper. Res.  
37  
38 doi: 10.1007/s10479-016-2189-1.  
39  
40  
41  
42 Wang, K., Wei, Y.M., 2016c. Sources of energy productivity change in China during 1997-2012: A  
43  
44 decomposition analysis based on the Luenberger productivity indicator. Energ. Econ. 54, 50-59.  
45  
46  
47  
48 Wang, K., Xian, Y., Zhang, J., Li, Y., Che, L., 2016d. Potential carbon emission abatement cost  
49  
50 recovery from carbon emission trading in China: An estimation of industry sector. J. Model.  
51  
52 Manage. 11(3), 842-854.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 Wang, K., Xian, Y., Lee, C.Y., Wei, Y.M., Huang, Z., 2017. On selecting directions for directional  
2  
3 distance functions in a non-parametric framework: A review. *Ann. Oper. Res.* doi:  
4  
5  
6 10.1007/s10479-017-2423-5.  
7

8  
9 Wang, K., Wei, Y.M., Huang, Z., 2018a. Environmental efficiency and abatement efficiency  
10  
11 measurements of China's thermal power industry: A data envelopment analysis based materials  
12  
13 balance approach. *Eur. J. Oper. Res.* 269(1), 35-50.  
14  
15  
16

17 Wang, K., Mi, Z., Wei, Y.M., 2018b. Will pollution taxes improve joint ecological and economic  
18  
19 efficiency of thermal power industry in China? A DEA-based materials balance approach. *J. Ind.*  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

Ecol. doi: 10.1111/jiec.12740.