



**HAL**  
open science

# The French biofuels mandates under cost uncertainty - an assesment based on robust optimization

Daphné Lorne, Stéphane Tchong-Ming

► **To cite this version:**

Daphné Lorne, Stéphane Tchong-Ming. The French biofuels mandates under cost uncertainty - an assesment based on robust optimization: Cahiers de l'Economie, Série Recherche, n° 87. 2012. hal-03206367

**HAL Id: hal-03206367**

**<https://ifp.hal.science/hal-03206367>**

Preprint submitted on 23 Apr 2021

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



**The French biofuels mandates under cost  
uncertainty – an assessment based on  
robust optimization**

**Daphné LORNE  
Stéphane TCHUNG-MING**

*Septembre 2012*

**Les cahiers de l'économie - n° 87**

**Série Recherche**

[stephane.tchung-ming@ifpen.fr](mailto:stephane.tchung-ming@ifpen.fr)

La collection "Les cahiers de l'économie" a pour objectif de présenter des travaux réalisés à IFP Energies nouvelles et à IFP School, travaux de recherche ou notes de synthèse en économie, finance et gestion. La forme peut être encore provisoire, afin de susciter des échanges de points de vue sur les sujets abordés. Les opinions émises dans les textes publiés dans cette collection doivent être considérées comme propres à leurs auteurs et ne reflètent pas nécessairement le point de vue d' IFP Energies nouvelles ou d' IFP School.

Pour toute information sur le contenu, prière de contacter directement l'auteur.  
Pour toute information complémentaire, prière de contacter le Centre Économie et Gestion: Tél +33 1 47 52 72 27

*The views expressed in this paper are those of the authors and do not imply endorsement by the IFP Energies Nouvelles or the IFP School. Neither these institutions nor the authors accept any liability for loss or damage incurred as a result of the use of or reliance on the content of this publication.*



# The French biofuels mandates under cost uncertainty – an assessment based on robust optimization <sup>☆</sup>

*Draft paper*

Daphné LORNE <sup>a</sup>

Stéphane TCHUNG-MING <sup>b,\*</sup>

## Abstract

*This paper investigates the impact of primary energy and technology cost uncertainty on the achievement of renewable and especially biofuel policies – mandates and norms – in France by 2030. A robust optimization technique that allows to deal with uncertainty sets of high dimensionality is implemented in a TIMES-based long-term planning model of the French energy transport and electricity sectors. The energy system costs and potential benefits (GHG emissions abatements, diversification) of the French renewable mandates are assessed within this framework. The results of this systemic analysis highlight how setting norms and mandates allows to reduce the variability of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions reductions and supply mix diversification when the costs of technological progress and prices are uncertain. Beyond that, we discuss the usefulness of robust optimization in complement of other techniques to integrate uncertainty in large-scale energy models.*

*JEL classification: C61, Q42, Q48*

*Keywords: Biofuel policies; Energy vulnerability; Climate change; Robust optimization, uncertainty.*

---

<sup>☆</sup> We are grateful to Alireza Tehrani, Amit Kanudia, Denise Van Regemorter, Andrea Diaz and Claire Nicolas for insightful comments and suggestions on this work. Any remaining errors are ours. Earlier versions of this work were presented at the 2012 MONDER Workshop, the Chaire Economie du Climat Seminar, and the 2012 International Energy Workshop.

<sup>a</sup> Economics and Environmental Evaluation Department, IFP Energies nouvelles, 1-4 avenue de Bois-Préau, 92852 Rueil-Malmaison, France. E-mail: [daphne.lorne@ifpen.fr](mailto:daphne.lorne@ifpen.fr).

<sup>b</sup> Economics and Environmental Evaluation Department, IFP Energies nouvelles, 1-4 avenue de Bois-Préau, 92852 Rueil-Malmaison, France. E-mail: [stephane.tchung-ming@ifpen.fr](mailto:stephane.tchung-ming@ifpen.fr) and CREDEN, Université de Montpellier 1, Avenue Raymond Dugrand, CS 79606, 34960 Montpellier Cedex 2, France.

\* Corresponding author

## 1 INTRODUCTION

The global context of European energy policies is generally presented as grounded on three main objectives: competitiveness, security and sustainability. As a part of this global policies, mandates and norms were defined for the transport sector. *The Renewable Energy Directive 2009/28/EC* aims to promote the use of energy from renewable sources in the European Union. Among the main targets there are the 3x20 objectives on the European energy system: (i) 20% of renewables in the energy sector in 2020 (10% in transport); (ii) a reduction in EU greenhouse gas emissions of at least 20% below 1990 levels; (iii) gaining 20% in global energy efficiency. The RED required Member States to submit national renewable energy action plans by 2010 (Kautto and Peck, 2011). These plans provide detailed roadmaps of how each Member State expects to reach its legally binding 2020 target for the share of renewable energy in its final energy consumption (e.g., the French *National Renewable Energy Action Plan*). Finally, the *Fuel Quality Directive* (2009/30/EC), introduces a mechanism to monitor and reduce greenhouse gas emissions from transport fuels. Notably, the article 7a mentions that the fuel suppliers are obliged to reduce their life-cycle GHG emissions per unit of energy from fuel and energy supplied by 6% by 2020, compared to 2010 level.

The need to decarbonize the transport sector has become a growing concern in a context of climate change, energy security and anticipated scarcity of fossil resources. In other terms, introducing biofuels in the transport energy mix is a potential source of *double dividends* because they allow to reduce the carbon footprint of transport<sup>1</sup> and diversify energy supplies

---

<sup>1</sup> The energy and agricultural effects of the EU biofuels targets (on their own, or as part of the more global Climate-energy package) have already led some attention. Kretschmer et al (2009) show in a CGE framework that the sole EU emissions targets do not trigger biofuel production (which might be explained by high marginal abatement costs of fuel and transport technologies compared to other sectors; see e.g. Smokers et al (2009)). Lonza et al. (2011) provide a detailed technical investigation of potential scenarios for transport to reach the renewable energy targets in 2020. In a broader scope, Labriet et al. (2011) analyze the implementation of the EU Renewable Directive in Spain, observing that compared to the actual situation, the main effort to reach the 2020 targets should rely on greening the transport and industry sectors.

simultaneously. From an environmental perspective, mandates and norms are recognized to provide means to reduce environmental damages, although not necessarily as efficient as taxes or markets<sup>2</sup>. The diversification issue is more rarely addressed<sup>3</sup>, and even more rarely quantified. Still, biofuels have been identified as an option to mitigate the various risks of energy dependence (Kher (2005); Russi (2007); Demirbas (2009)). These combined benefits are rarely assessed simultaneously; Criqui and Mima (2012) propose a prospective view of such climate-diversification double dividends strategies.

However, the costs and benefits of imposing biofuels mandates and norms should be assessed in the light of the large uncertainties surrounding this pathway, in terms of availability and costs of biomass and biofuel technologies (Schade and Wieselthaler, 2011). By extension, the potential costs and benefits of the biofuel mandates and quality norms should be assessed with respect to uncertain relative costs of biofuels compared to conventional fuels. Some of the rare examples of such approaches include Rosakis and Sourie (2005) and Schade and Wieselthaler (2011), who use Monte-Carlo simulation to highlight the large variations in biofuel subsidies depending on key macroeconomic variables. Energy systems involve (i) long-lasting, irreversible investments, some of which are today in R&D phase (ii) the use of

---

<sup>2</sup> Recent work indicates that mixes of fossil (carbon) fuel taxes and biofuel subsidies can help stimulate the development of biofuels, as long as part of the revenues from taxes is recycled in the subsidies (Timilsina et al, 2011). Interestingly Lapan and Moschini (2011) complement this result by showing that integral recycling makes the price instrument equivalent to a quantity mandate.

<sup>3</sup> Transport currently relies on fossil fuels for more than 95% of its energy supply; this fact puts the sector in a situation of "energy vulnerability". Percebois (2006) defines this concept as "a situation in which a country is not able to make voluntary energy policy choices, unless at an unbearable economic or political cost"<sup>3</sup>. Vulnerability with respect to a given resource is by nature an externality, because it generates "costs on the economy that [are] not reflected in the market price [of that resource] or in private decisions regarding the use [of that resource] instead of other alternatives" (Bohi and Toman, 1993). These effects shall be considered in the short run (e.g., through price volatility) or in the long run (e.g. through sustainable rises in energy prices that affect the energy system and the economy as a whole). Energy vulnerability has emerged as a great concern in the 1970s because of the oil shocks (Ward and Shively (1981); Kline and Weyant (1983)). As defined by Yergin (1988), the objective of energy security should then be to "assure adequate, reliable supplies of energy at reasonable prices". While both supply and demand side measures are likely to solve part of the issue (Andrews, 2005), diversification of energy supplies have long been identified as a mitigation option (Stirling (1994); Nakawiro and Bhattacharyya (2007); Nakawiro et al (2008); Gnansounou and Dong (2010); Cohen et al (2011)). Although of

very volatile primary energy sources (crude oil, natural gas, coal, biomass, etc.), so that decisions concerning biofuel policies must be taken now for the next decades. Decisions must be taken *in the presence of global uncertainty*, and biofuel policies do not escape this remark. Practically, long-term assessments of biofuel policies should account not only for their *costs*, but also for their potential *multiple benefits*, and in a context of *pervasive uncertainty* that embrace both microeconomic (technology costs) and macroeconomic (energy prices) variables.

This work is grounded on this last observation; its contributions are twofold. From a methodological perspective, we argue that robust optimization techniques are appropriate for introducing cost uncertainty (primary energy sources, technology investment) from many sources in long-term energy models. Similar methods were recently introduced in large-scale prospective models (Babonneau et al, 2012) for different purposes. We explain that in the process of addressing various levels of uncertainty à la Bertsimas and Sim (2004), we "endogenously" generate various relative cost systems that determine the competitiveness of the various pathways included in the model. Those cost scenarios are generated according to a worst-case logic, and is consistent with a specific definition of risk preferences.

This method captures the effect on decisions of numerous uncertainty sources, what stochastic optimization more hardly does. On the other hand, it endogenously accounts for uncertainty, while Monte-Carlo "only" performs advanced sensitivity analysis. Moreover, because it relies on set-based uncertainty models, it avoids the recourse to (often ad hoc) definition of probability densities of uncertain parameters. In short, we propose to test how a robust optimization technique can be used to evaluate a public policy in a system model, accounting for such *systemic uncertainty*.

---

much more general nature, these issues naturally arise in the transport sector (isolated from the rest of the energy system).

We apply this methodology to an appraisal of the French biofuel policies, including the RED, the NREAP and the FQD. Under various uncertainty levels for economic parameters included in the model, we evaluate the technical and hedging extra-costs of the biofuel mandates and norms with respect to a no-policy case. We then highlight the multiple benefits offered by this policies, in terms of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and system diversification. Accounting for uncertainty also allows to reduce the variability of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions reductions and supply mix diversification when the costs of technological progress and prices are uncertain. This highlights another potential benefit for implementing biofuel mandates in the presence of uncertainty – a hedging one.

The paper is structured as follows. In section 2, we present the long-term MIRET model for the French energy-transport system. Section 3 then presents the robust optimization technique implemented and insists on some theoretical implications. In section 4, we describe the scenarios constructed for this study and results on the appraisal of the French biofuel policies. Section 5 concludes on some methodological and policy insights.

## **2 AN ENERGY-TRANSPORT SYSTEM MODEL**

In this section, we present the IFPEN-developed MIRET model: a long-term, multi-period, techno-economic planning model that covers the energy-transport system in detail. Its scope is continental France, and the time horizon is 2030, with 2007 as base-year.

The TIMES model generator is used as a modeling framework. Under this well established paradigm (cite references for history and recent uses), a Reference Energy System is built to cover the stock of equipment and flows for the reference year, the characteristics of future technologies, the potential and costs for primary energy. This being given, the model aims at



providing final energy services / energy (mobility for passengers and freight, electricity, etc.) at minimum cost. To do this, investment and operation decisions are made for the technologies embraced in the model ; subsequent primary energy uses are obtained.

## 2.1 General presentation

The model schematics is presented in Figure 1. It presents a block diagram that links elements described in the model according to four main dimensions: energy supply, technologies, demand and policies (Loulou et al, 2005).




Figure 1: model schematics

The reference energy system is thus composed (from left to right) of:

- a *primary energy supply* block: includes imported fossil energy (crude oil, coal, natural gas), biomass (starch crops – wheat, corn; sugar crops – sugar beet; oil crops – rapeseed, sunflower ; lignocellulosic biomass – forest wood, crop residues, dedicated energy crops), imports ;

- an *energy technology* block, whose technologies transform primary energy into energy vectors and energy services: it includes oil refining with a detailed process-based model derived from IFPEN OURSE model<sup>4</sup> (including 20 process units and products specifications, see Saint-Antonin (1998) or Tehrani (2008) for detailed presentations), biofuel units (first generation – ethanol, FAME<sup>5</sup>, HVO<sup>6</sup>; second generation – ethanol and synthetic FT-Diesel), electricity generation (power plants – all technologies; combined heat and power), preparation of fuels for transport at blending (diesel, biodiesel B30, gasoline grades E5 and E10 and E85, jet fuel – including fossil and bio bases), and end-use technologies for road mobility (personal vehicles and Light – thermal, hybrid, plug-in hybrid / gasoline, diesel, natural gas, flexfuel, electric cars; buses and trucks – thermal, hybrid / gasoline, diesel, biodiesel);
- a *final energy / energy services demands* block: Electricity demand by time period (four days representing each season, the power load being hourly described for each of these days), mobility demands (short and long distance for passenger vehicles and buses, traffic for LUV, demand for freight mobility), demands for exported products (oil products, electricity);
- a *policies* block: includes measures and constraints of several types affecting all sectors. Some are of microscopic nature, such as quality norms for refinery products, number of functioning hours of fuel turbines power plants, etc. Some are macroscopic in nature, e.g. sectoral carbon tax. Three measures aiming to develop biofuels will be detailed below: the National Renewable Energy Action Plan (NREAP) for France, and the enforcement of two European Directives (RED and FQD).

## 2.2 *Basic formalism*

---

<sup>4</sup> Some process units were removed from the initial model, and the quality of the crude supply was fixed to an average "typical crude cocktail".

<sup>5</sup> FAME: Fatty Acid Methyl Ester

<sup>6</sup> HVO: Hydrotreated Vegetable Oils

The objective function of the underlying linear program takes the form:

$$OBJ = \sum_{t \in \text{periods}} DISC(t) \left[ \begin{array}{l} INVCOST(t) + INVTAXSUB(t) + INVDECOM(t) \\ + FIXCOST(t) + FIXTAXSUB(t) + VARCOST(t) \\ - LATEREVENUES(t) \end{array} \right] - SALVAGE$$

It is simply the discounted sum of investment costs (including taxes and subsidies), decommissioning costs, fix costs (including taxes and subsidies) variable costs, and economic value of investments whose life extends beyond the time horizon. Because the energy model used here relies on the principle of intertemporal optimization with perfect foresight (Loulou et al, 2005), it can be stated in the standard form of a single linear program and solved like a static one (Dantzig, 1959). The objective function and constraints then encompass the intertemporal relationships between variables at different dates (e.g., the stock of equipment at time  $t$  is the sum of new investments in  $t$ , plus all investments realized for all  $\tau < t$ , minus all decommissioning occurred until  $t$ ).

The two linear programs ( $P_{ref}$ ) and ( $P_{bio}$ ) refer respectively to the "reference" case and the "biofuel policies" case:

$$\begin{array}{l} (P_{ref}) \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \min c^T x \\ s.c. \\ Ax \geq b \quad (y) \\ Tx = 0 \quad (\tau) \\ Kx \leq k \quad (\lambda) \\ Qx \leq q \quad (\omega) \\ Sx \leq s \quad (\sigma) \\ x \geq 0 \end{array} \right. \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{l} (P_{bio}) \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \min c^T x \\ s.c. \\ Ax \geq b \quad (y) \\ Tx = 0 \quad (\tau) \\ Kx \leq k \quad (\lambda) \\ Qx \leq q \quad (\omega) \\ Sx \leq s \quad (\sigma) \\ Nx \geq n \quad (\eta) \\ Rx \geq 0 \quad (\rho) \\ Fx \leq f \quad (\phi) \\ x \geq 0 \end{array} \right. \end{array}$$

$c$  is the column vector of all discounted unit costs. The equations  $Ax \geq b$  correspond to the final demands of energy and energy services to be satisfied. The equation set  $Tx = 0$  describes the fundamental input-output relationships of each technology, namely the mass or energy

balance of each technology. The set  $Kx \leq k$  includes all capacity constraints, either technology or resource based. For example, (i) the electricity produced by a given technology is limited by the combination of the stock installed and seasonal or hourly availability factors, (ii) the use of scarce resources, e.g. woody biomass, are limited for use for power, heat, combined heat and power and biofuels production.  $Qx \leq q$  accounts for the quality equations of some of the products. This is especially the case of refinery products, whose quality must respect certain specifications to be marketed<sup>7</sup>. Finally, the set  $Sx \leq s$  includes all sorts of institutional constraints (e.g., the French legislation limits the number of functioning hours of certain power plants – notably fuel turbines), calibration constraints and share constraints.

The program  $P_{bio}$  includes three additional sets of constraints. The transport declaration of the RED,  $Rx \geq 0$ , describes the obligation to incorporate at least 10% (LHV) of renewable energy in transport beyond 2020. It is formulated as follows:

$$\frac{\sum_{AllTransports} LHV_{1G} \times Q_{1G} + 2LHV_{2G} \times Q_{2G} + 2.5Q_{Renelc}}{\sum_{\substack{Terrestrial \\ Transports}} EnergyConsumed} \geq 10\%$$

There, it is worth mentioning that second generation pathways double-counted (i.e., 1MJ of second generation biofuel counts for 2MJ), and that renewable electricity is counted 2.5 times. Moreover, the total energy consumed does not account for the energy consumption of air transportation. This clearly tends to advantage the development of second generation biofuel pathways and the introduction of biofuels as substitutes for jetfuel.

The French NREAP describes, for each renewable energy pathway (biofuels, electricity and heat), the quantitative mandate to be achieved between 2012 and 2020; values are maintained constant beyond that date.

---

<sup>7</sup> Main specifications include (Tehrani, 2008) specific gravity and sulfur content (gasoline and diesel), vapor pressure, octane index, aromatics and olefins contents (gasoline), cetane index (diesel) or viscosity (fuel oil). Under a linear programming framework, it is assumed that the qualities blend in mass or volume. Otherwise, constraints are written as index (Babusiaux, 1990).

Finally, the FQD  $Fx \leq f$ , specifies that the emissions of each liquid fuel pool must reach a given level of reduction with respect to the fossil reference after 2020:

$$\frac{\sum_{\substack{\text{AllBases} \\ \text{InAFuel}}} Q_{\text{Base}} E_{\text{Base}}}{\sum_{\substack{\text{AllBases} \\ \text{InAFuel}}} Q_{\text{Base}}} \leq 0.96 E_{\text{Fossil Ref}} .$$

### 3 UNCERTAIN COSTS AND ROBUSTNESS

Robust optimization (RO) has been developed in mathematical programming since the 1970's. Rather than relying on probabilistic models of uncertainties, RO is based on deterministic and set-based uncertainty models. That is, *"instead of seeking to immunize the solution in some probabilistic sense to stochastic uncertainty, here the decision-maker constructs a solution that is optimal for any realization of the uncertainty in a given set"* (Bertsimas et al, 2007). Soyster (1973) was one of the first to use RO, considering data uncertainty in linear programs. Assuming unknown but symmetric distributions for uncertain parameters, he defines the robust counterpart of the nominal program as the solution to the worst-case deviation. This approach guarantees the feasibility of the solution for any realization of the uncertain parameters; however, it is very conservative. Other RO approaches have been developed since then<sup>8</sup>. Robust optimization is rarely employed in the field of energy-economy modeling; Babonneau et al. (2011) and Babonneau et al. (2012) propose some of the rare examples of implementing robust control strategies. They analyze the effect of primary energy disruption along risky routes or the effect of uncertainty on the level of availability of some technologies. In the sequel of this section, we present a RO method which is capable of capturing many uncertainty sources simultaneously; this allows to introduce "systemic" uncertainty in the MIRET energy model.

### 3.1 The Bertsimas and Sim (2004) RO approach of linear programming – static case

Bertsimas & Sim's (2004) method of robust linear programming was chosen for this work. It is adapted to deal with large uncertainty sets without losing linearity nor dramatically worsening the computational complexity (Gabrel and Murat (2008)). Let  $(P)$  be a linear program defined as:

$$(P) \begin{cases} \min c^T x \\ Ax \geq b, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}. \\ x \geq 0 \end{cases}$$

Assume now that the cost coefficients of  $(P)$  are uncertain<sup>9</sup>; they can vary in a symmetric range  $\tilde{c} = [\bar{c} - \hat{c}, \bar{c} + \hat{c}]$  around the nominal value  $\bar{c}$ ; no specific distribution is assumed.

Bertsimas and Sim (2004) generalize Soyster's approach by noticing that it is unlikely that all parameters will adversely deviate at the same time. More generally, it consists in controlling the degree of "pessimism" on the cost coefficients of the objective function. Let then  $J \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  the subset of potentially deviating cost coefficients, and  $z_i \in [-1, 1], \forall i \in J$  a set of variables such that  $c_i = \bar{c}_i + z_i \hat{c}_i, \forall i \in J$ . Formally, the uncertainty set  $\Upsilon$  is symmetrical and polyhedral,  $\Upsilon = \{\bar{c}_i + z_i \hat{c}_i \mid |z_i| \leq 1, \forall i \in J\}$ . The idea is to control the number  $\Gamma_0 \leq |J|$ , representing the maximal number of costs that may deviate;  $\Gamma_0$  is called the *uncertainty budget*. In the rest of

---

<sup>8</sup> See Ben-Tal et al (2009) for a deeper presentation.

<sup>9</sup> Remark that the method is general enough to address uncertainty for any parameter of the problem, if it is formulated as follows:

$$\begin{cases} \min z \\ \tilde{A}x - \tilde{b}O_m \geq 0, \quad \tilde{A} \in U_A, \quad \tilde{b} \in U_b \\ z - \tilde{c}^T x \geq 0, \quad \tilde{c} \in U_c \\ x \geq 0, \quad O_m = \text{eye}(x_m), \quad x_m = 1 \end{cases}$$

this work, the deviations are constructed as ad-hoc fractions of the nominal values,  $\hat{c}_j = \alpha \bar{c}_j$ .

We then define an uncertainty scenario as a pair  $(\Gamma_0, \alpha)$ ,  $\Gamma_0 \in [0, |J|]$ ,  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ .

If  $x^f$  is a feasible solution to  $(P)$ , the maximum deviation at  $x^f$  for the protection level  $\Gamma_0$  is the solution of the linear program

$$(D) \quad \begin{cases} \max z^T \hat{C}x^f \\ e_{|J|}^T z \leq \Gamma_0 \quad (\varphi) \\ z \leq 1 \quad (\mu) \\ z \geq 0 \end{cases}$$

where  $\hat{C} = \text{diag}(\hat{c})$  and  $e_{|J|}$  is a vector of ones. In short,  $(D)$  identifies the sets of  $\Gamma_0$  costs among  $n$  that – if reaching their maximal value – produce the maximum deviation. This yields a nonlinear formulation; using strong duality, Bertsimas and Sim (2004) obtain an elegant linear formulation of the robust problem,

$$(R) \quad \begin{cases} \min \bar{c}^T x + \Gamma_0 \varphi + e_{|J|}^T \mu \\ Ax \geq b \quad (y) \\ \varphi e_{|J|} + \mu \geq \hat{C}x \quad (z) \\ x \geq 0, \varphi \geq 0, \mu \geq 0 \end{cases}$$

In  $(R)$ , the system modeled is optimized for both the standard decision variables and the identification of the most sensible coefficients of the objective function.

### 3.2 Economic interpretation

The economic interpretation of the robust problem formulated above comprises at least three components.

Firstly, *the extra system cost* due to robustness can be measured (for a given value of  $\Gamma_0$  and a maximum deviation of  $\alpha$ ) as the difference between the two objective functions,

$$\Delta_{rob} = \underbrace{\left[ \bar{c} (x_{rob}^* - x^*) \right]}_{\text{Technical substitutions}} + \underbrace{\left[ \Gamma_0 \varphi^* + e^T \mu^* \right]}_{\text{Hedging}}$$

The global expression may be interpreted as a risk premium associated to the robustness level  $(\Gamma_0, \alpha)$ . The first bracketed term represents the technical substitution cost due to uncertainty. It is due to the fact that accounting for potential cost increases will induce technological substitutions in the energy system that act as hedging strategies against cost increases of the most sensible technologies. The second bracketed term consists in a pure financial cost, in the sense that it comes straightforwardly from the use of technologies that will be used although their cost may increase (in other words, the less substitutable technologies).

Second, we shall observe that varying the uncertainty budget actually corresponds to *endogenously varying the costs coefficients of the objective function*. Using the primal form of the deviation sub-problem, we get the following expression for the objective function at optimum:

$$Obj^* = \left( \bar{c}_J + \underbrace{z^{*T} \hat{C}_J}_{\text{Risk adjustment}} \right) x_J^* + c_J x_J^*$$

This means that at optimum, the relative costs come as a solution of the problem. The terms  $(\bar{c}_J + z^{*T} \hat{c}_J)$  correspond to *risk-adjusted costs* according to a worst-case logic. The dual version of this observation is equally meaningful; the shadow prices of the constraints are now related by

$$\bar{c} + \hat{C}^T z - A^T y \leq 0,$$

which means that the shadow prices of the commodities are likewise risk-adjusted for the pair  $(\Gamma_0, \alpha)$ . This has an important implication: in the process of varying the uncertainty budget, we somehow endogenously generate different relative costs systems on the basis of a risk



assessment (defined by the deviation subproblem). This interpretation gives a sense, as proposed in the sequel of the paper, to performing a systematic sensitivity analysis on the uncertainty budget  $\Gamma_0$ , because it allows to test the model response to various cost regimes<sup>10</sup>.

Finally, when it comes to uncertainty, one naturally expects to find some *connections with risk preferences*. There exists a relationship between robust linear programs and risk-averse optimization; the link relies on the analysis of the uncertainty sets of the robust programs with respect to specific families of risk measures (Bertsimas and Brown (2009); Natarajan et al (2009)). Formally, the robust program ( $R$ ) defined above is equivalent to the risk-averse problem

$$(P_{r-a}) \begin{cases} \min z \\ \rho_{r-a}(z - \tilde{c}^T x) \leq 0 \\ Ax \geq b \\ x \geq 0 \end{cases}$$

where  $\rho_{r-a}(\cdot)$  is a coherent risk measure<sup>11</sup> (Artzner et al, 1999), generated by a combination of Conditional-Value-at-Risk measures<sup>12</sup> (Bertsimas and Brown, 2009). Consequently, the robust version of the energy model used in this work will show a *taste for diversity*.

---

<sup>10</sup> Other approaches, e.g. Bertsimas and Sim (2004), address the determination of an optimal uncertainty budget.

<sup>11</sup> Artzner et al (1999) define a coherent risk measure  $\rho(\cdot)$  as satisfying the four following axioms:

- monotonicity:  $\forall (X, Y) \in \mathcal{H}^2, X \leq Y \Rightarrow \rho(X) \leq \rho(Y)$ . *Intuition:  $\leq$  defines statewise dominance ( $X \geq Y \Leftrightarrow \forall \omega \in \Omega, X(\omega) \geq Y(\omega)$ ). Monotonicity means that if  $X$  performs better than  $Y$  for any realization of the uncertain parameters, then  $X$  cannot perform worse than  $Y$  in terms of risk.*
- translation invariance:  $\forall (X, t) \in \mathcal{H} \times \mathbb{R}, \rho(X + t) = \rho(X) - t$ . *Intuition: if the cost is increased by a certain amount  $t$ , then the risk is linearly reduced by the same amount.*

### 3.3 Integration in an intertemporal framework

The energy model used in this paper relies on intertemporal optimization under perfect foresight. Therefore, the two following principles should be used to formulate the problem (Bertsimas and Thiele, 2006):

- uncertainty should propagate over time: deviated parameters in  $t$  will be deviated in each subsequent period, for at least the same amount;
- consequently, there should be one uncertainty budget per period.

Let then  $t_0$  be the first period at which parameters become uncertain ; let  $J_\tau, \forall \tau \geq t_0$  the set of uncertain parameters for any subsequent period. According to the first principle, we should have  $J_\tau \subseteq J_{\tau+1}, \forall \tau \geq t_0$ . According to the second principle, the maximum uncertainty budget in any period should be  $\Gamma_\tau^{\max} = \sum_{t \leq \tau} |J_t|$ . We get the formulation finally integrated in the model:

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \bar{c}^T x + \sum_{\tau=t_0}^T \left( \Gamma_\tau \lambda_\tau + \sum_{\delta=t_0}^{\tau} \mu_\delta \right) \\ & Ax \geq b \\ & \lambda_\tau + \mu_\delta \geq \hat{c}_{j,\delta} x_{j,\tau}, \forall \tau \geq t_0, \forall \delta \leq \tau, \forall j \in J_\tau \\ & x \geq 0, \lambda \geq 0, \mu \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

This formulation clearly shows the consequence of propagating uncertainty over time: more weight is given to early period, which implies that early diversification is to be expected.

- 
- subadditivity:  $\forall (X, Y) \in \mathcal{H}^2, \rho(X + Y) \leq \rho(X) + \rho(Y)$ . *Intuition: adding up the costs of two system can not increase risk with respect to their separate risk exposures.*

positive homogeneity:  $\forall (X, \alpha) \in \mathcal{H} \times \mathbb{R}_+, \rho(\alpha X) = \alpha \rho(X)$ . *Intuition: similar positions positively add up.*

<sup>12</sup> The CVaR is defined as the expected value of losses beyond the Value-at-Risk of a given position . The VaR itself is the value of losses that can be guaranteed at a given level, e.g. 95%. See Natarajan et al (2009) for a proof in the case of a discrete uniform distribution, and Bertsimas and Brown (2009) in the general case.

## 4 ASSESSING THE FRENCH BIOFUEL POLICIES UNDER UNCERTAINTY

In this section, we apply the methodology explained in the two previous sections to analyze the rationales of the French biofuel mandates, and provide both policy insights and methodological remarks.

### 4.1 Scenarios

The scenarios implemented to run the model include four main components: primary energy supply, technologies, demands and policies.

Table 1 provides a list of the main sources used to elaborate the scenarios. Some of these assumptions are detailed in appendix.

| Scenario components | Sector                                 | Data sources                   |
|---------------------|--|--------------------------------|
| Primary energy      | Fossil energy                          | IEA (2011)                     |
|                     | Agricultural biomass                   | INRA                           |
|                     | Woody biomass                          | FCBA                           |
| Energy technologies | Refining                               | Internal IFPEN                 |
|                     | Biofuels                               | Internal IFPEN                 |
|                     | Road mobility (Passengers and Freight) | Internal IFPEN                 |
|                     | Power plants                           | EDF, IEA (2010), MINEFI (2008) |
| Demand scenarios    | Other oil products                     | IFPEN/LEPII                    |
|                     | Pass. And Freight mobility             | CAS (2009)                     |
|                     | Electricity                            | RTE (2011)                     |
| Policies            | Carbon price                           | IEA (2011)                     |
|                     | Biofuels                               | EC (2009), EC (2010)           |

**Table 1: sources for numerical assumptions**

Two clear-cut atmospheres are described. In the *Reference Scenario (Ref)*, no renewable energy production target is enforced. However, the actual promotion mechanisms (subsidies to investments in new technologies or feed-in tariffs) for the integration of renewable electricity and fuels are described. A value of CO<sub>2</sub> is integrated as a part of the WEO New

Policy Scenario. It covers the perimeter of ETS-eligible installations, which excludes the transport sector (no carbon tax system in the transport sector). Existing norms of energy efficiency applying to end-use technologies are implemented. In the *Biofuel Policies Scenario (Pol)*, The French NREAP objectives are enforced for the period 2010-2020, and maintained for the period 2020-2030 at their 2020 value. The RED is enforced beyond 2020 to ensure a lower rate of integration of renewable fuels in the transport sector (10%). Finally, the Fuel Quality Directive limits the carbon footprint of fuel production pathways. Otherwise, all other numerical assumptions are the same as in the *Ref* scenario. The three policies are evaluated at the same, as a renewable energy policies pack.

One important policy element regarding fuels for transport is the tax regime. In both *Ref* and *Pol* scenarios, taxes and incentives are kept at their current levels. This includes the domestic tax on petroleum products for fossil fuels, tax exemptions and subsidies for ethanol, biodiesel and E85 fuels.

**The uncertainty model** We assume that investment costs of new technologies available from 2015 and beyond are not known with certainty. For each of these technologies, the uncertainty model follows that described in section 3.1 ( $\alpha = 0.1$  and  $\alpha = 0.2$  are chosen for sensitivity analysis). On top of that, it is assumed that the unit costs of primary energy are also subject to uncertainty. This concerns fossil primary energy (crude, natural gas and coal), biomass (agricultural crops, imported vegetable oils, dedicated energy crops and agricultural and forest residues), and final energy imported (electricity, ethanol). And at last, the price of CO<sub>2</sub> is also considered in the uncertainty set, as a part of the WEO NPS price scenario<sup>13</sup>. These assumptions are summarized in Table 2.

---

<sup>13</sup> Not all cost coefficients of technologies are considered in the uncertainty set. Non-energy variable costs and taxes are left aside. However, investments and energy costs cover roughly 80% of the total system cost.

| Scenario components | Sector                                 | Uncertainty source |
|---------------------|--|--------------------|
| Primary energy      | Fossil energy                          | Price              |
|                     | Agricultural biomass                   | Price              |
|                     | Woody biomass                          | Price              |
| Energy technologies | Refining                               | None               |
|                     | Biofuels                               | Investment cost    |
|                     | Road mobility (Passengers and Freight) | Investment cost    |
|                     | Power plants                           | Investment cost    |
| Demand scenarios    | None                                   |                    |
| Policies            | Carbon price                           | Price              |

Table 2 : parameters affected by uncertainty

The overall uncertainty set comprises 91 cost parameters. Under the dynamic uncertainty model chosen, this makes a total of ~900 constraints to be added to the original model<sup>14</sup>. In sequel, the uncertainty budgets at each period are varied proportionally: if  $\Gamma = (\Gamma_t)_{t \geq t_0}$  is the vector of uncertainty budgets over time, then we vary  $h \in [0,1]$  such that  $\Gamma_h = h\Gamma$ .

#### 4.2 Global outlook – total system cost


We obtained from the set of optimizations performed the optimal total system cost, decomposed as the sum of technical and hedging costs, in the *Ref* and *Pol* scenarios. Figure 2 presents the relative energy cost  $REC_{(\Gamma,\alpha)}^{Scen}$ ,  $Scen \in \{Ref, Pol\}$  and total cost

$RTC_{(\Gamma,\alpha)}^{Scen}$ ,  $Scen \in \{Ref, Pol\}$  of each scenario relative to the *Ref* case with no uncertainty:

$$REC_{(\Gamma,\alpha)}^{Scen} = \frac{EC_{(\Gamma,\alpha)}^{Scen}}{EC_{(\Gamma=0,\alpha=0.1)}^{Ref}},$$

$$RTC_{(\Gamma,\alpha)}^{Scen} = \frac{TC_{(\Gamma,\alpha)}^{Scen}}{EC_{(\Gamma=0,\alpha=0.1)}^{Ref}}$$

<sup>14</sup> The TIMES modeling framework does not include such equations; consequently, they were added manually.



**Figure 2: Total system cost**

Increasing the uncertainty budget naturally raises the total system cost under any policy regime. Between no hedge ( $h = 0$ ) and full hedge ( $h = 1$ ), the total cost raises by  $\sim 10\%$  for *Ref* and  $\sim 12\%$  for *Pol*. Setting renewable and biofuels policies clearly induce higher technical system costs. In any case, the implementation of the renewable policies has an additional system cost increasing from  $12\%$  and up to  $13\%$  more, depending on the level of uncertainty. Implementing these policies also exposes the system to greater hedging costs: hedging represents up to  $20\%$  more in the cost decomposition of the objective function in the *Pol* scenario.

The shape of the total cost envelope appears to be concave<sup>15</sup>. More remarkably, the cost decomposition in energy system and hedging costs conserves this property for each of the cost

<sup>15</sup> A standard result of linear programming states that when minimizing cost, the parametric analysis of a linear program based on a cost coefficient yields a concave locus of optimal objectives (Maurin, 1963).

component<sup>16</sup>. Loosely speaking, the least-cost optimization without uncertainty offers some unused (because non-economical) technological substitution options. The standard result of linear programming is that it provides a merit-order based upward sloped supply curve for each of the good consumed in the model; risk adjustments on costs modify this merit order. Some of the unused option economical when costs are adjusted; but, this potential is limited. Consequently, the stock of substitution options become more "scarce" as the uncertainty budget grows and more costs are risk-adjusted – progressively going back to the initial relative costs system.

Hedging costs vary likewise with the uncertainty budget. This situation reflects two phenomena. First, the substitution options may be limited or inexistent for some pathways. In that case, there is no choice but to support the extra cost associated to adverse cost deviations. Second, it may be efficient to support this extra-cost because some technologies have existing stocks; switching to other technologies or pathways would induce high opportunity costs. Assume for example an adverse increase of crude oil price; it offers a good illustration of the two: oil cannot be fully substituted for the production of naphtha (an input for petrochemicals) and is almost the only single energy supply in the transport sector. The fact that its price raises by 10 or 20% does not make the use of the existing vehicles stock irrelevant with respect to anticipating the fleet renewal.

Finally, one shall notice that both energy system and total cost become almost flat beyond a certain uncertainty budget (between 30% and 40%). This means that beyond a certain threshold, the hedging cost defined by all processes whose constraints are active at optimum do not change; all arbitrage opportunities are gone. In this region, all changes in absolute costs do not change relative costs anymore.

---

<sup>16</sup> There is no general theorem in linear programming that states the curvature of subfunctions of the objective when one coefficient varies.

### 4.3 Global outlook – the CO<sub>2</sub> – diversification nexus

On the other hand, one shall quantify the potential gains brought by the implementation of renewable mandate and norms. Figure 3 shows a global warming indicator in the form of cumulated CO<sub>2</sub> emissions over 2010-2030,  $GW_{(\Gamma,\alpha)}^{Scen}$  as a function of the uncertainty budget.

A diversification index was built as on the basis of costs as an average Herfindhal-Hirschman index over 2010-2030. If there are  $M$  economic activities (energy import, energy transformation and/or transport, energy use in final devices etc.), the market share at  $t$  of any

process  $i \in [1, M]$  is  $\sigma_t^i = \frac{c_t^i}{\sum_{j \in [1, M]} c_t^j}$ . All costs (investment annuities, energy supply, fix and variable costs) are taken into account. Then  $HHI_t = 10000 \sum_{i \in [1, M]} (\sigma_t^i)^2$ , and

$HHI_{(\Gamma,\alpha)}^{Scen} = \frac{1}{T-t_0} \sum_{t_0 \leq t \leq T} HHI_{(\Gamma,\alpha),t}^{Scen}$ . Figure 4 plots the average HHI over process market shares<sup>17</sup>, for the period 2010-2030, always with respect to the uncertainty budget.

---

<sup>17</sup> Most technologies/processes included in the model are affected by uncertainty. Comparing shares thus only makes sense on a cost basis, because production levels and installed capacities have different units. In short, diversity needs to be addressed in a systemic way, because uncertainty is addressed that way.






Figure 3: Cumulated CO<sub>2</sub> emissions




Figure 4: Average HHI


The implementation of renewable policies offers benefits in terms of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions (up to -17%) and energy supply diversification (up to -25%); this is consistent with the existing literature on the subject. Interestingly, this result is robust to uncertainty: whatever the cost scenario considered, the *Pol* scenario outperforms the *Ref* one on both criteria.

Second, cost variations for small uncertainty budgets (that is, the most unfavorable increases of cost coefficients,  $h \leq \sim 20\%$ ) trigger technological hedging strategies that induce both reductions in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and diversification. In short, new technologies become competitive, which allows to combine the two benefits. As will be detailed below, biofuels are part of this strategy. It is there interesting to notice that uncertainty can be a driver that yields the combination of both benefits, with orders of magnitude comparable to the implementation of renewable policies: for  $h \sim 10\%$ , emissions and concentration indices are almost comparables in *Ref* and *Pol*.

Increasing the uncertainty budget further ( $h \geq \sim 20\%$ ) shows a rebound, due to further changes in relative costs: the alternative technologies or resources are themselves subject to risk adjustments.

One striking observation out of Figure 3 and Figure 4 is that the variations of the indicators induced by the variation on the level of uncertainty are reduced in the *Pol* scenario. To confirm this, Figure 5 plots the locus of equilibrium HHI/CO<sub>2</sub> points for all hedging levels.

That is, for both *Ref* and *Pol* scenarios, the  $\left( HHI_{(\Gamma, \alpha)}^{Scen}, GW_{(\Gamma, \alpha)}^{Scen} \right)$  couples are plotted. On the figure, the size of each point is proportional to its relative total cost  $RTC_{(\Gamma, \alpha)}^{Scen}$ , while the links between points reflect the incremental total cost.



**Figure 5: the locus of HHI/CO<sub>2</sub> points, *Ref* and *Pol***

The effect of uncertainty on the diversity and climate change measures is ambiguous: changes in the energy and technology costs may improve/worsen either indicator, or even both. This ambiguity is inherent to the existence of pervasive uncertainty in any prospective study: the relative competitiveness of energy sources and technologies are uncertain.

This appears clearly in Figure 5, where the CO<sub>2</sub>(HHI) curves are not monotonic. The "spread" of each of the two curves on the plane reflects the dispersion of potential outcomes, due to uncertainty on cost parameters. It is much smaller in the *Pol* scenario than in the *Ref* scenario. Moreover, the *Pol* curve is translated to the lower left corner, indicating increased average performances over *Ref*.

Overall, these results seem to indicate that although implementing renewable mandates and norms is more costly, they generate benefits in terms of (i) both CO<sub>2</sub> abatements and supply

diversification and (ii) reducing the field of possible outcomes on these criteria, in a context of systemic uncertainty. This is of importance for policy analysis. If uncertainty could be managed at the individual level just like the planner modeled in this study would, then accounting for it would induce multiple benefits. But this is not the case; rather, uncertainty at the investor level would probably limit investments. In such conditions, the cost induced by the implementation of simple policies such as mandates and norms also covers some hedging considerations that ensure a minimal improvement for the criteria considered.

#### *4.4 The underlying biofuel technology choices*

Beyond the macroscopic perspective presented in sections 4.2 and 4.3, one may question the declination of these observations at the technology level. This is of interest for both (i) policy makers, who practically often recourse to specific policies (mandates, taxes, subsidies) for different technologies and pathways and (ii) technology experts and industrials who question the relevance and risk of investing in the development of some of these technologies.

Figure 6 shows the cumulated 2010-2030 incorporation rate of biofuels in all liquid fuels, as a function of the uncertainty budget. Naturally, biofuels are more widely incorporated in the *Pol* scenario because of the enforced policy constraints. Remarkably, in this scenario, the lower bound of incorporation only reaches 9% in physical terms. This echoes the results of some existing studies, underlining the difficulty of reaching 10% of physical incorporation under the existing policy designs (JRC, 2011). However, uncertainty can naturally trigger the use of biofuels, as highlighted in the left part of the graph: for low values of  $h$ , the use of biofuels increases due to changes in generalized relative costs. The effect is stronger in the *Ref* scenario.




Figure 6: Biofuels incorporation rates




Figure 7: market shares of biofuel units in Ref (left) and Pol (right)

Then, Figure 7 shows the boxplot<sup>18</sup> of the cost-based market share of each biofuel technology, across all uncertainty scenarios, in the *Ref* case (left) and the *Pol* case (right). This allows to measure the potentials and risks attached to each technology for various cost scenarios and policy regimes.

Under the assumptions made, the recourse to 1<sup>st</sup> generation pathways (ethanol, FAME) shows no-to-little variations, because of resource availability constraints. This is true irrespective of the policy scenario considered. HVO pathways offer some potential for the period 2015-2030, although rather "volatile". In 2020 and after, second generation biofuels – and especially BtL – do never emerge in the *Ref* case, and rarely in the *Pol* case (mostly as outlying points). This is due to either (i) the pessimistic nominal cost trajectories of these technologies, or (ii) the technical characteristics of the technologies – efficiencies, or even (iii) the relative failure of policies in place at this time horizon<sup>19</sup>.

In any case, second generation technologies seem rather "risky". This reflects the essential message that biofuel technologies are nowadays not completely competitive. Their market-driven penetration would require large adverse costs increases of competing fuels, more drastic R&D efforts to pull costs down, which could be sustained by more ambitious public policies (IEA, 2012).

## 5 CONCLUSION

---

<sup>18</sup> The box plot summarizes for the populations (i.e., the 2010-2030 average market share for each technology and each uncertainty scenario), the following statistics: minimal value of the sample, 1<sup>st</sup> to 3<sup>rd</sup> quartiles, maximal value. Outliers are also represented.

<sup>19</sup> Another explanation is linked to the earlier availability of HVO with respect to second generation technologies. Because the uncertainty model is built to that cost deviations are carried over across the whole horizon, the decision maker has a tendency towards early diversification; HVO allows to hedge early on, because it is mature earlier.

The analysis undertaken in this work aims at measuring the extra energy system cost associated to the implementation of renewable and biofuel policies in France by 2030. Compared to other existing research, we account for uncertainty of future costs of both technologies and primary energy. For this purpose, a simple energy system model describing the French transport and electricity sectors was augmented with a recent robust optimization technique.

Under this framework, the system cost of the renewable/biofuel policies is augmented between 10% and 20%, depending on the degree of uncertainty considered. However, the potential benefits of such climate policies include the reduction of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and the diversification of pathways for the supply of final energy service demands. These two benefits correspond to a so-called double dividend. Moreover, we highlight that under cost uncertainty and no major modification of tax regimes, the implementation of renewable energy mandates allows to narrow down the performance of the energy system for CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and supply diversification. In that sense, climate policy mandates act as a hedge against adverse cost increases of the major energy system costs. This suggests a third potential dividend for these policies, that should contribute to balance their higher technical cost of implementation. Moreover, uncertainty alone can be a sufficient driver to trigger the use of renewables (as hedges), so that the mandates may be understood as a way of decentralizing the effect of uncertainty about future costs at the agent level. These findings are of interest from a policy perspective, since they highlight a benefit for risk-averse decision makers. The natural extension of this would include the comparison with other climate policy instruments.

From a technology perspective, a focus is given on biofuels, whose choices depend on the level of risk. The idea that uncertainty grows and spreads over time attributes a premium to

early market penetration. The most mature technologies benefit from such a temporal advantage. This may however generate lock-in effects, that reveal other policy challenges: if early action is required for both climate change and radical uncertainty reasons, then the maturation and market penetration of eventually more virtuous pathways (e.g., 2G biofuels) should be accelerated. This may be done through e.g. fiscal measures on competing biofuels, or enhancing R&D efforts. To pursue this analysis, a closer look at the technology dimension of energy systems under uncertainty should be undertaken; this would require to explore other features of the robust optimization technique presented here. In particular, the decomposition of risk-adjusted marginal values would be of interest to pursue a detailed microeconomic analysis at the technology level.

The methodological contribution of this paper aimed at assessing the usefulness of robust optimization to explore the effect of cost uncertainty on an energy system. The technique employed here fits the systemic nature of energy models, since it allows to (i) account for uncertainty on a large number of parameters with parsimony and (ii) explore the effect of cost variations in a systematic way. The effect of macroeconomic uncertainties (energy or carbon prices) can be treated simultaneously as microeconomic uncertainties (technology costs). The natural extension of this approach would consist in integrating correlated uncertainty models, which would require econometric and "technology clusters" analysis.

In a systemic perspective, point projections are "meaningless". Energy modellers are well aware of that; however, the pervasive uncertainty surrounding costs is often paid little attention. In this lead, the methodology tested in this work may be a valuable complement to other techniques such as standard sensitivity analysis, Monte-Carlo analysis and stochastic programming.



## REFERENCES

- Artzner, P., Delbaen, F., Eber, J.M., Heath, D. (1999). Coherent Measures of Risk. *Mathematical Finance*, 9(3): 203-228.
- Babonneau, F., Kanudia, A., Labriet, M., Loulou, R., Vial, J-P. (2012) Energy Security: a robust optimization approach to design a robust European energy supply via TIAM-WORLD. *Environmental Modeling and Assessment*, to appear.
- Babonneau, F., Vial, J.-P., Apparigliato, R. (2011). Robust Optimization for Environmental and Energy Planning.
- Bertsimas, D., Sim, M. (2004). The price of robustness. *Operations Research*, 52(1): 35-53.
- Bertsimas, D., Thiele, A. (2006). A Robust Optimization Approach to Inventory Theory. *Operations Research*, 54(1): 150-168.
- Bertsimas, D., Brown, D. (2009) Constructing uncertainty sets for robust linear optimization. *Operations Research*, 57.
- Bohi, D.R., Toman, M.A. (1993) Energy security: externalities and policies. *Energy Policy*, 11: 1093-1109.
- Cohen, G., Joutz, F., Loungani, P. (2011) Measuring energy security: Trends in the diversification of oil and natural gas supplies. *Energy Policy*, 39: 4860-4869.
- Criqui, P., Mima, S. (2012) European climate—energy security nexus: A model based scenario analysis. *Energy Policy*, 41: 827-841.
- Dantzig, G.B. (1959) On the Status of Multistage Linear Programming Problems. *Management Science*, 6(1).
- Demirbas, A. (2009) Political, economic and environmental impacts of biofuels: A review. *Applied Energy*, 86: 108-117.
- Gabrel, V., Murat, C. (2008). Robustesse et dualité en programmation linéaire. Note de recherche du LAMSADE, n°41.

Gnansounou, E., Dong, J. (2010) Vulnerability of the economy to the potential disturbances of energy supply: A logic-based model with application to the case of China. *Energy Policy*, 38: 2846–2857.

International Energy Agency (2011). World Energy Outlook, OECD.

Kautto, N, Peck, P. (2011) From optional BAPs to obligatory NREAPs: understanding biomass planning in the EU. *Biomass, Bioenergy and Bioproducts*, 5: 305-316.

Kher, R. (2005) Biofuels: The Way Ahead. *Economic and Political Weekly*,40(51): 5376-5378.

Kline, D.M., Weyant, J.P. (1983) Policies to reduce OECD Vulnerability to oil-supply disruptions. *Energy*, 8(3): 199-211.

Kretschmer, B., Narita, D., Peterson, S. (2009). The economic effects of the EU biofuel target. *Energy Economics*, 31:285-294.

Labriet, M., Cabal, H., Lechon, Y., Giannakidis, G., Kanudia, A. (2010). The implementation of the EU renewable directive in Spain. Strategies and challenges. *Energy Policy*, 38: 2272-2281.

Lapan, H., Moschini, G. (2012) Second-best biofuel policies and the welfare effects of quantity mandates and subsidies. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, Accepted.

Lonza, L., Hass, H., Maas, H., Reid, A., Rose, K. D. (2011). EU renewable energy targets in 2020: Analysis of scenarios for transport. *JRC Scientific and Technical Reports*.

Loulou, R., Remme, U., Kanudia, A., Lehtila, A., Goldstein, G. (2005). Documentation of the TIMES model, Part II. Available at [www.etsap.org](http://www.etsap.org).

Nakawiro, T., Bhattacharyya, S.C. (2007) High gas dependence for power generation in Thailand: The vulnerability analysis. *Energy Policy*, 35: 3335–3346.

- Nakawiro, T., Bhattacharyya, S.C., Limmeechokchai, B. (2008) Electricity capacity expansion in Thailand: An analysis of gas dependence and fuel import reliance. *Energy*, 33: 712–723.
- Natarajan, K., D Pachamanova, D., Sim, M. (2009) Constructing Risk Measures from Uncertainty Sets. *Operations Research*, 57(5): 1129-1141.
- Percebois, J. (2006) Dépendance et vulnérabilité : deux façons connexes mais différentes d'aborder les risques énergétiques. *Cahiers du CREDEN*, n°06.03.64.
- Rozakis, S., Sourie, J.-C. (2005). Micro-economic modelling of biofuel system in France to determine tax exemption policy under uncertainty. *Energy Policy*, 33: 171-182.
- Saint-Antonin, V. (1998). Modélisation de l'offre de produits pétroliers en Europe. Thèse de doctorat, Université de Bourgogne – ENSPM, France.
- Schade, B., Wiesenthal, T. Schade (2011). Biofuels: A model based assessment under uncertainty applying the Monte Carlo method. *Journal of Policy Modeling*, 33: 92-126.
- Soyster, A.L. (1973) Convex programming with set-inclusive constraints and applications to inexact linear programming. *Operations Research*, 21: 1154–1157.
- Stirling, A. (1994) Diversity and ignorance in electricity supply investment – Addressing the solution rather than the problem. *Energy Policy*, 3: 195-216.
- Tehrani, A. (2008). Impact de l'évolution de la demande de produits pétroliers sur la consommation d'énergie et les émissions de CO<sub>2</sub> des raffineries. Thèse de doctorat, Université de Bourgogne – ENSPM, France.
- Timilsina, G.R., Csordás, R., Mevel, S. (2011) When does a carbon tax on fossil fuels stimulate biofuels? *Ecological Economics*, 70: 2400-2415.
- Ward, Shively (1981) Oil supply diversification: a panacea for energy vulnerabilities? *Energy Policy – Communications on Energy*, 12.

# The "*Cahiers de l'Économie*" Series

The "*Cahiers de l'économie*" Series of occasional papers was launched in 1990 with the aim to enable scholars, researchers and practitioners to share important ideas with a broad audience of stakeholders including, academics, government departments, regulators, policy organisations and energy companies.

All these papers are available upon request at IFP School. All the papers issued after 2004 can be downloaded at: [www.ifpen.fr](http://www.ifpen.fr)

The list of issued occasional papers includes:

- # 1. **D. PERRUCHET, J.-P. CUEILLE**  
Compagnies pétrolières internationales : intégration verticale et niveau de risque.  
Novembre 1990
- # 2. **C. BARRET, P. CHOLLET**  
Canadian gas exports: modeling a market in disequilibrium.  
Juin 1990
- # 3. **J.-P. FAVENNEC, V. PREVOT**  
Raffinage et environnement.  
Janvier 1991
- # 4. **D. BABUSIAUX**  
Note sur le choix des investissements en présence de rationnement du capital.  
Janvier 1991
- # 5. **J.-L. KARNIK**  
Les résultats financiers des sociétés de raffinage distribution en France 1978-89.  
Mars 1991
- # 6. **I. CADORET, P. RENO**  
Élasticités et substitutions énergétiques : difficultés méthodologiques.  
Avril 1991
- # 7. **I. CADORET, J.-L. KARNIK**  
Modélisation de la demande de gaz naturel dans le secteur domestique : France, Italie, Royaume-Uni 1978-1989.  
Juillet 1991
- # 8. **J.-M. BREUIL**  
Émissions de SO<sub>2</sub> dans l'industrie française : une approche technico-économique.  
Septembre 1991
- # 9. **A. FAUVEAU, P. CHOLLET, F. LANTZ**  
Changements structurels dans un modèle économétrique de demande de carburant.  
Octobre 1991
- # 10. **P. RENO**  
Modélisation des substitutions énergétiques dans les pays de l'OCDE.  
Décembre 1991
- # 11. **E. DELAFOSSE**  
Marchés gaziers du Sud-Est asiatique : évolutions et enseignements.  
Juin 1992
- # 12. **F. LANTZ, C. IOANNIDIS**  
Analysis of the French gasoline market since the deregulation of prices.  
Juillet 1992
- # 13. **K. FAID**  
Analysis of the American oil futures market.  
Décembre 1992
- # 14. **S. NACHET**  
La réglementation internationale pour la prévention et l'indemnisation des pollutions maritimes par les hydrocarbures.  
Mars 1993
- # 15. **J.-L. KARNIK, R. BAKER, D. PERRUCHET**  
Les compagnies pétrolières : 1973-1993, vingt ans après.  
Juillet 1993
- # 16. **N. ALBA-SAUNAL**  
Environnement et élasticités de substitution dans l'industrie ; méthodes et interrogations pour l'avenir.  
Septembre 1993
- # 17. **E. DELAFOSSE**  
Pays en développement et enjeux gaziers : prendre en compte les contraintes d'accès aux ressources locales.  
Octobre 1993
- # 18. **J.P. FAVENNEC, D. BABUSIAUX\***  
L'industrie du raffinage dans le Golfe arabe, en Asie et en Europe : comparaison et interdépendance.  
Octobre 1993
- # 19. **S. FURLAN**  
L'apport de la théorie économique à la définition d'externalité.  
Juin 1994
- # 20. **M. CADREN**  
Analyse économétrique de l'intégration européenne des produits pétroliers : le marché du diesel en Allemagne et en France.  
Novembre 1994
- # 21. **J.L. KARNIK, J. MASSERON\***  
L'impact du progrès technique sur l'industrie du pétrole.  
Janvier 1995
- # 22. **J.P. FAVENNEC, D. BABUSIAUX**  
L'avenir de l'industrie du raffinage.  
Janvier 1995
- # 23. **D. BABUSIAUX, S. YAFIL\***  
Relations entre taux de rentabilité interne et taux de rendement comptable.  
Mai 1995
- # 24. **D. BABUSIAUX, J. JAYLET\***  
Calculs de rentabilité et mode de financement des investissements, vers une nouvelle méthode ?  
Juin 1996

- # 25. J.P. CUEILLE, J. MASSERON\***  
Coûts de production des énergies fossiles : situation actuelle et perspectives.  
Juillet 1996
- # 26. J.P. CUEILLE, E. JOURDAIN**  
Réductions des externalités : impacts du progrès technique et de l'amélioration de l'efficacité énergétique.  
Janvier 1997
- # 27. J.P. CUEILLE, E. DOS SANTOS**  
Approche évolutionniste de la compétitivité des activités amont de la filière pétrolière dans une perspective de long terme.  
Février 1997
- # 28. C. BAUDOIN, J.P. FAVENNEC**  
Marges et perspectives du raffinage.  
Avril 1997
- # 29. P. COUSSY, S. FURLAN, E. JOURDAIN, G. LANDRIEU, J.V. SPADARO, A. RABL**  
Tentative d'évaluation monétaire des coûts externes liés à la pollution automobile : difficultés méthodologiques et étude de cas.  
Février 1998
- # 30. J.P. INDJEHAGOPIAN, F. LANTZ, V. SIMON**  
Dynamique des prix sur le marché des fiouls domestiques en Europe.  
Octobre 1998
- # 31. A. PIERRU, A. MAURO**  
Actions et obligations : des options qui s'ignorent.  
Janvier 1999
- # 32. V. LEPEZ, G. MANDONNET**  
Problèmes de robustesse dans l'estimation des réserves ultimes de pétrole conventionnel.  
Mars 1999
- # 33. J. P. FAVENNEC, P. COPINSCHI**  
L'amont pétrolier en Afrique de l'Ouest, état des lieux  
Octobre 1999
- # 34. D. BABUSIAUX**  
Mondialisation et formes de concurrence sur les grands marchés de matières premières énergétiques : le pétrole.  
Novembre 1999
- # 35. D. RILEY**  
The Euro  
Février 2000
- # 36. D. BABUSIAUX, A. PIERRU\***  
Calculs de rentabilité et mode de financement des projets d'investissements : propositions méthodologiques.  
Avril 2000 & septembre 2000
- # 37. P. ALBA, O. RECH**  
Peut-on améliorer les prévisions énergétiques ?  
Mai 2000
- # 38. J.P. FAVENNEC, D. BABUSIAUX**  
Quel futur pour le prix du brut ?  
Septembre 2000
- # 39. S. JUAN, F. LANTZ**  
La mise en œuvre des techniques de Bootstrap pour la prévision économétrique : application à l'industrie automobile  
Novembre 2000
- # 40. A. PIERRU, D. BABUSIAUX**  
Coût du capital et étude de rentabilité d'investissement : une formulation unique de l'ensemble des méthodes.  
Novembre 2000
- # 41. D. BABUSIAUX**  
Les émissions de CO2 en raffinerie et leur affectation aux différents produits finis  
Décembre 2000
- # 42. D. BABUSIAUX**  
Éléments pour l'analyse des évolutions des prix du brut.  
Décembre 2000
- # 43. P. COPINSCHI**  
Stratégie des acteurs sur la scène pétrolière africaine (golfe de Guinée).  
Janvier 2001
- # 44. V. LEPEZ**  
Modélisation de la distribution de la taille des champs d'un système pétrolier, Log Normale ou Fractale ? Une approche unificatrice.  
Janvier 2001
- # 45. S. BARREAU**  
Innovations et stratégie de croissance externe : Le cas des entreprises parapétrolières.  
Juin 2001
- # 46. J. P. CUEILLE\***  
Les groupes pétroliers en 2000 : analyse de leur situation financière.  
Septembre 2001
- # 47. T. CAVATORTA**  
La libéralisation du secteur électrique de l'Union européenne et son impact sur la nouvelle organisation électrique française  
Décembre 2001
- # 48. P. ALBA, O. RECH**  
Contribution à l'élaboration des scénarios énergétiques.  
Décembre 2001
- # 49. A. PIERRU\***  
Extension d'un théorème de dualité en programmation linéaire : Application à la décomposition de coûts marginaux de long terme.  
Avril 2002
- # 50. T. CAVATORTA**  
La seconde phase de libéralisation des marchés du gaz de l'Union européenne : enjeux et risques pour le secteur gazier français.  
Novembre 2002
- # 51. J.P. CUEILLE, L. DE CASTRO PINTO COUTHINO, J. F. DE MIGUEL RODRÍGUEZ\***  
Les principales compagnies pétrolières indépendantes américaines : caractéristiques et résultats récents.  
Novembre 2002
- # 52. J.P. FAVENNEC**  
Géopolitique du pétrole au début du XXI<sup>e</sup> siècle  
Janvier 2003
- # 53. V. RODRIGUEZ-PADILLA avec la collaboration de T. CAVATORTA et J.P. FAVENNEC,\***  
L'ouverture de l'exploration et de la production de gaz naturel au Mexique, libéralisme ou nationalisme  
Janvier 2003

- # 54. T. CAVATORTA, M. SCHENCKERY**  
Les majors pétroliers vers le multi énergies : mythe ou réalité ?  
Juin 2003
- # 55. P.R. BAUQUIS**  
What energy sources will power transport in the 21st century?  
Janvier 2004
- # 56. A. PIERRU, D. BABUSIAUX**  
Evaluation de projets d'investissement par une firme multinationale : généralisation du concept de coût moyen pondéré du capital et conséquences sur la valeur de la firme.  
Février 2004
- # 57. N. BRET-ROUZAUT, M. THOM**  
Technology Strategy in the Upstream Petroleum Supply Chain.  
Mars 2005
- # 58. A. PIERRU**  
Allocating the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions of an oil refinery with Aumann-Shapley prices.  
June 2005
- # 59. F. LESCAROUX**  
The Economic Consequences of Rising Oil Prices.  
Mai 2006
- # 60. F. LESCAROUX, O. RECH**  
L'origine des disparités de demande de carburant dans l'espace et le temps : l'effet de la saturation de l'équipement en automobiles sur l'élasticité revenu.  
Juin 2006
- # 61. C. I. VASQUEZ JOSSE, A. NEUMANN**  
Transatlantic Natural Gas Price and Oil Price Relationships - An Empirical Analysis.  
Septembre 2006
- # 62. E. HACHE**  
Une analyse de la stratégie des compagnies pétrolières internationales entre 1999 et 2004.  
Juillet 2006
- # 63. F. BERNARD, A. PRIEUR**  
Biofuel market and carbon modeling to evaluate French biofuel policy.  
Octobre 2006
- # 64. E. HACHE**  
Que font les compagnies pétrolières internationales de leurs profits ?  
Janvier 2007
- # 65. A. PIERRU**  
A note on the valuation of subsidized Loans  
Janvier 2007
- # 66. D. BABUSIAUX, P. R. BAUQUIS**  
Depletion of Petroleum Reserves and Oil Price trends  
Septembre 2007
- # 67. F. LESCAROUX**  
Car ownership in relation to income distribution and consumers's spending decisions.  
Novembre 2007
- # 68. D. BABUSIAUX, A. PIERRU**  
Short-run and long-run marginal costs of joint products in linear programming  
Juin 2008
- # 69. E. HACHE**  
Commodities Markets: New paradigm or new fashion?  
Juillet 2008
- # 70. D.BABUSIAUX, A. PIERRU**  
Investment project valuation: A new equity perspective  
Février 2009
- # 71. O. MASSOL, S. TCHUNG-MING**  
Stratégies coopératives dans l'industrie du GNL : l'argument de la rationalisation est-il fondé ?  
Février 2009
- # 72. A. PIERRU, D.BABUSIAUX**  
Valuation of investment projects by an international oil company: A new proof of a straightforward, rigorous method  
Février 2009
- # 73. E. SENTENAC CHEMIN**  
Is the price effect on fuel consumption symmetric? Some evidence from an empirical study  
Avril 2009
- # 74. E. HACHE**  
OBAMA : Vers un green New Deal énergétique ?  
Septembre 2009
- # 75. O. MASSOL**  
Cost function for the natural gas transmission industry: further considerations  
Septembre 2009
- # 76. F. LANTZ, E. SENTENAC CHEMIN**  
Analyse des tendances et des ruptures sur le marché automobile français. Modélisation du taux de diésélisation dans le parc  
Décembre 2010.
- # 77. B. CHÈZE, P. GASTINEAU, J. CHEVALLIER**  
Forecasting air traffic and corresponding Jet-Fuel Demand until 2025  
Décembre 2010.
- # 78. V. BREMOND, E. HACHE, V. MIGNON**  
Does OPEC still exist as a cartel? An empirical investigation  
Mars 2011.
- # 79. I. ABADA, O. MASSOL**  
Security of supply and retail competition in the European gas market. Some model-based insights.  
Mars 2011.
- # 80. E. HACHE, F. LANTZ**  
Oil price volatility: an econometric analysis of the WTI market.  
Avril 2011.
- # 81. I. ABADA, V. BRIAT, O. MASSOL**  
Construction of a fuel demand function portraying interfuel substitution, a system dynamics approach.  
Avril 2011
- # 82. E. LE CADRE, F. LANTZ, P-A. JOUVET**  
The bioenergies development: the role of biofuels and the CO<sub>2</sub> price.  
Décembre 2011
- # 83. E. LE CADRE, F. LANTZ, A. FARNOOSH**  
Bioenergies usages in electricity generation utility means through a modelling approach: application to the French case.  
Décembre 2011

**# 84. I. ABADA, V. BRIAT, S. GABRIEL, O. MASSOL**

A generalized Nash-Cournot model for the north-western European natural gas markets with a fuel substitution demand function: the GaMMES model.  
Décembre 2011

**# 85. O. MASSOL, A. BANAL-ESTAÑOL**

Export diversification and resource-based industrialization: the case of natural gas.  
Décembre 2011

**# 86. B. CHÈZE, P., GASTINEAU, J. CHEVALLIER**

Air traffic energy efficiency differs from place to place: analysis of historical trends by geographical zones using a macro-level methodology.  
Décembre 2011

**# 87. D. LORNE, S. TCHUNG-MING**

The French biofuels mandates under cost uncertainty – an assessment based on robust optimization.  
Septembre 2012

---

\* une version anglaise de cet article est disponible sur demande