International Journal of Innovative Research in Computer Science & Technology (IJIRCST)
ISSN: 2347-5552, Volume-8, Issue-6, November 2020
https://doi.org/10.55524/ijircst.2020.8.6.11
www.ijircst.org

Advancement in Technology and the Long-Term Need for Energy

Anjali Choudhary

ABSTRACT: This study examines how to include technology advancement into energy-economy models and how that affects long-term energy demand predictions. The models range from an exogenous yearly change in energy efficiency to an endogenous explanation of energy technology innovation. Technological advancement is frequently cited as the primary factor to the differences in energy demand forecasts from various models. Endogenous growth and industrial organization theories have significant implications for efforts to endogamies technical innovation and the diffusion of new energy technologies. The article surveys several theoretical and empirical theories of technological development. This study compares two different models of household energy consumption in Denmark. Two macro econometric models, one for Denmark and the other for the US, are compared. The two models' energy demand projections vary, and it's up to us to prove that the assumptions about technological development are the cause. The forecast relies on assumptions regarding energy efficiency improvements in older models. Vintage modelling is less essential for long-term forecasts. Long-term vintage modelling has a constraint that explains some of the differences in predictions between the two kinds of models. The current electric appliance model does not properly represent the new energy-consuming equipment that will be available in the future. This category has to be modelled more thoroughly for long-term predictions.

KEYWORD: Energy Demand, Energy-Economy Modelling, Exogenous, Innovation, Technological Development.

I. INTRODUCTION

When it comes to predicting long-term energy consumption, technological advancement is critical[1]. One of the major reasons of the highly different findings produced analyzing the prices of carbon gas emissions utilizing lowest part and top approaches reduction is frequently considered to be the disparity in assumptions made regarding technological development.

Manuscript Received November 19, 2020
Anjali Choudhary, Assistant Professor, Department of Management Studies, Vivekananda Global University, Jaipur, India (Email: anjali.choudhary@vgu.ac.in)

One of the goals of research that liken classical findings is to develop model assumptions about technological development that are comparable. In recent years, the argument concerning the implementation of CO2 emissions mitigation plans and programs has been more linked to the problem of technological development. Recent economic advancements have significant consequences for predicting technical growth in the fields of innovation and long-term energy consumption[2]. Because they contain behavioral links and a systematic methodology for examining incremental advancements in information and technological spillovers throughout industries, top approaches are well to long-term invention research. The use of innovative hypotheses in actual electricity modeling were rather limited until lately, but this field of modeling is currently attracting a lot of interest [3].

In contrast to a top-down-based model, In terms of creativity and long-term power usage, the underside historical approach investigated in the second part of this research has significant drawbacks[4]. In the historic paradigm, the effectiveness of individual electric instrument is clearly specified, but the total effectiveness of household electrical equipment is not ignores the innovative element of domestic energy consumption. Models of the energy economy describe technological development in many diverse ways. Simultaneously, technological change is a critical component of model characteristics and the long-term forecast outcomes that a model may provide. Autonomy energy saving increase is abbreviated as AEEI, while exogenous technology invention is abbreviated as ETI. This section gives a summary of the different methodologies, while the next article delves into particular issues related to modeling innovation[5].

The distinct strategies to modeling energy computing improvements are linked to the distinct orientations of the prototype, whether they are related to classical economic expansion concept, intracellular expansion hypothesis, factory institution, technology literary works, macro-econometric classic designs, or innovation enhancement and simulation designs[6]. The classical development theory is an example of this, technical advancement is an exogenously supplied driving force for development, while in endogenous growth theory, explanations of technological progress growth are focused with long-term problems. Similarly, growth-based energy-economy models include representations of technological development that range from exogenous to endogenous[7].

The incentive for developing and adopting advanced techniques differ based on item market dynamics and R&D spending activity characteristics, according to industrial organization theory[8]. This has served as the foundation for policy-focused models and comparisons of Environment taxes or governmental regulations vs. R&D funding. Learning curves have been attempted to include in descriptions of particular energy technologies since the literature on innovation has been engaged in debates about learning, among other problems.Capital vintages with varying energy efficiency or substitution characteristics between energy and labor have been included to macro econometric vintage models in the energy sector. Models of optimization have shifted their emphasis to particular energy technologies, both in terms of energy source and end-use classes. Since the accessibility and price characteristics of different energy technology are projected to change over future, and the best technology selection has an impact on overall efficient improvement, this broad set of models mainly makes indirect technological advancement assumptions[9].

Individual technological development is assumed, in technological underside frameworks with a very thorough explanation of technical advancement for a huge variety of specific technology, as well as a level of penetration for present innovations As a result, there is a well widespread belief in technological hallucination, but no element of innovation is included. Some of the many methods of technology advancement implementation in energy-economy modelling may be classified as follows:

1. a pace of adoption of known, best-available technology that is endogenous;
2. R&D linked endogenous pace of innovation

Improvement in self-sufficient power efficacy In many top-down models, the AEEI is an exogenous increase in energy efficiency[10]. When predicting, energy efficiency is expected to increase at an exogenous rate of 0.5 to 1.5 percent each year, depending on the model study. Besides from this external element of energy consumption, the price of money, labor, and energy alter the makeup of factor contributions. As a consequence, the intensity of industrial energy varies[11]. The autonomous efficiency change may follow anticipated non-linear temporal trends or the AEEI could be constant. Researchers investigate whether or not to include a technological trend in aggregate energy demand econometric analyses. He claims that there are a number of technical issues with incorporating technological development and, as a result, with utilizing these technology trends in macroeconomic models for forecasting. The primary issue is separating technological advancement from long-term pricing consequences. Jones provides econometric evidence that technological advancement growth is about 1.5 percent per year, which is consistent with long-term pricing elasticities. Income impacts in the long term are not shown to be substantial[12].

This method may be extended to connect efficiency gains to energy costs, although differentiating among valuation increases in factor imports and efficiency-induced price increases improvements would be difficult to demonstrate experimentally. By enabling input costs to interact with a temporal trend, researchers can account for technological advancement. This connection, however, has no clear explanation.There are clear connections to neoclassical macroeconomic traditions as well as debates of embodied and unembodied technology development. Neoclassical growth theory, like the endogenous AEEI in energy modeling, employs technical advancement as an endogenous reason for long-term growth. The presumption of erogeneity of technical advancement in every year's money harvest is similar to that of erogeneity of technological advancement, with the exception of time and capitals vintage size[13].

This establishes a link to the vast collection of older models. There are two types of vintage models. Capital vintages with putty-clay capital characteristics may be included in macro econometric or dynamic general equilibrium models. A technically based bottom-up model, such as the ones utilized in the second half of this article, is a completely distinct kind of antique model[14].For year-to-year variations in energy efficiency, vintage effects via varying energy efficiencies for various vintages of capital may be significant. Vintage models may be used to explain the deception of new or better technology. This kind of vintage capital model has been used to energy-related sectors. There are historical technical models of durable consumer products (appliances) as well as vintage energy supply models. Models for capital vintages in the manufacturing sector and their ecological effectiveness that are more macro economically oriented have also been suggested[15].

Power and manpower replacement are increasingly viable in recent vintages in the OECD Greens paradigm. In this case, a strategy that accelerates investment adaptation or substitution rate would help to increase technical advancements development by allowing energy to be replaced for other inputs to a greater degree. Many optimization models incorporate a backstop technology, which is usually a carbon-free energy generation technology, such as wind power. This may be a current technology that becomes competitive at a very high gasoline price or a very high carbon tax, or a synthetic technology that is expected to be created at extremely high fuel costs. The second scenario assumes that there is a link between fuel costs and innovation. A tremendous amount of R&D may be spent to create this backup technology at high costs or high carbon levies[16].

The models are characterized by indigenizing technology delusion or implementation of best available technologies, with the delusion stated as being reliant on a variety of variables, such as R&D, investment subsidies, fuel costs, market structure, and a particular modelling of business behaviour. Researchers investigate the impact of CO_2 reduction strategies on technological development in a model for Austria. This is an example of a policy that may hasten the adoption of energy-saving technology. However, the research does not address the problem of technical development in the form of energy technology innovation and improvement[17]. The WARM model includes an endogenous illusion of environmentally favorable technology, as well as a governmental tool for subsidizing investment in the best available current technologies[18]. Another intriguing research contrasts an endogenous technological development model to a comparable one with external technology advancement. Their conclusion is that the

ISSN: 2347-5552, Volume-8, Issue-6, November 2020
https://doi.org/10.55524/ijircst.2020.8.6.11
www.ijircst.org

most important assumption is not the description of technological development. These two models are then compared to a third model that has a different production structure formulation. The endogenous vs external explanation of technical development produces a greater variation in outcome than the description of production structure[19]. Another finding is that general equilibrium models that do not account for endogenous technical development tend to exaggerate the economic implications of carbon-based energy policy[20].

A. Power Consumption and Creativity in the Long Run:

In all long-term assessments of energy consumption, the topic of technological development will be dominated by the problem of innovation. Simultaneously, the problem of innovation is the most difficult to solve using empirical economic modelling. As a result, in many empirical models of energy consumption, innovation has been regarded as exogenous. In a variety of ways, innovation has an impact on energy demand:

1. the development of novel energy-delivery methods;
2. development of energy-saving technology (end-use technologies);
3. the development of new manufacturing processes, intermediate inputs, and organizations that have an indirect impact on energy consumption;
4. the development of new consumer goods that alter consumption patterns and, as a result, influence energy demand for manufacturing.

II. DISCUSSION

Novel power technology include a broad range of modern hydrocarbons and reduced devices that utilise them. These are the key technologies that will enhance the efficiency of fuel conversion or the use of renewable energy resources. It will be difficult to anticipate the constituent of a significant technical burst through for a particular equipment. The breakthroughs that create an obtainable example machinery commercially feasible, on the other hand, are a little simpler to anticipate since they are linked to a huge number of small improvements that appear over time. The argument might be that these gains are mostly the consequence of applying findings from a shared pool of knowledge, which develops through time. This is one reason why these continuous efficiency improvement (AEEI) variables should be used in energy-economy modelling[21].End-use technologies are the second kind of innovation. For modelling purposes, there is a substantial gap between the end-use technology of enterprises and families. Household workers are reluctant to do investigation or conduct investigations to improve energy conservation. They might be looking for advice on how to employ energy-saving technologies in their houses or select amongst different home equipment manufacturers. However, these actions or the behaviors that drive them can scarcely be described as innovative or modelled. When it comes to end-use technology innovation, the focus would be on business or community investigate efforts. In the majority of instances, modelling has been used to predict business behaviour in the past. The entire advancement of technology has ramifications for energy consumption. There will be technological advancements that increase energy consumption as well as technological advancements that reduce it. Production methods, transportation breakthroughs, and other factors may all contribute to technological advancement. Robotics, in most cases, entails the usage of additional power, just as quicker modes of transportation need the use of more different kinds of energy. Energy usage will be reduced in other cases, like as when commercial enzyme allow for minimal activities or when reorganising a processing routine reduces process duration while saving lights or room heating. As a result, energy efficiency may be influenced by technical advancements that have little to do with increasing energy efficiency directly. Because of this reliance, There are no methods for changing this component of power conservation development via energy or environmental legislation. The dispute over wether fuel and money as manufacturing resources are complements or alternatives is linked to the ancient debate over whether they are complementary or replacements. Both options exist, but it is uncertain which is the more prevalent[22].

The most indirect technological impact is the final innovation choice. The development of new consumer goods will alter consumption patterns throughout time. It's unknown if this adjustment will result in increased or decreased energy usage. As will be shown in the following section, this has consequences for energy demand predictions in one instance of home appliance modelling. Will new consumer goods be innovated solely Would newer electrical devices that consume very minimal power, or would technologies that utilise extremely little energy be developed require a comparatively larger quantity of energy continue to be innovated[23].If the goal is to analyze potential Mechanisms of government that have an impact on electricity performance, the most appropriate sector to model is innovation that is particularly concerned with energy technology. WARM is a macroeconomic model for Europe in which technology development is endogenous, according to the researchers. The WARM system is a generalized equilibria economic framework including imperfectly competitive markets, trade, energy market structure, and the impact of technological development that was calculated for 12 EU nations. Environmental policy, according to the modelers, may affect technology development and therefore energy efficiency via two routes:

Firms get government subsidies. R&D would result in new energy-saving and ecologically welcoming technology, and

An speculation incentive for companies that commit to adopt the top obtainable technology would speed up technological development.

III. CONCLUSION

Various methods to describing technology development are used in energy demand modelling. In terms of long-term energy demand predictions and assessing potential policy measures to minimize the environmental effects of energy usage, technological development at the same time is a significant problem for model characteristics. Technological development is either exogenously dictated anandamide controlled by R&D effort, pricing, levies, and marketplace mechanisms, or exogenously controlled by R&D exertion, costs, taxation, and market constructions, prices, taxes, and market structures at the opposite extreme. The problem of new technology innovation is more significant than the illusion of current technologies in terms of long-term energy consumption. Although most empirical models of innovation have been developed in an analytical framework, there are some contemporary instances of empirical models of innovation. Schwarz and Goulder's approach, as well as the WARM prototype, and Dow-model latabadi's are the most intriguing instances of innovation generated by endogenous R&D effort. Environmental economics and, by extension, energy problems have benefited from new economic theory research in the fields of endogenous development and industrial organization. This has shed fresh light on the issue of what motivates businesses to spend in R&D and, as a result, decrease long-term energy consumption. The shift in energy technology is described in macroeconomic energy-economy models in a highly aggregate and generalized way. At the aggregated level, it is conceivable to endogenize technological development, but empirical findings to prove the indigenization are very difficult to come by. Long-term technological development is mainly dependent on invention, Much more attention could be put into incorporating an exogenous account of creativity into the systems that are used to study and implement electricity policies.

REFERENCES

[1] S. Nayak, L. Mohapatra, and K. Parida, “Visible light-driven novel g-C3N4/NiFe-LDH composite photocatalyst with enhanced photocatalytic activity towards water oxidation and reduction reaction,” J. Mater. Chem. A, 2015, doi: 10.1039/c5ta05002b.

[2] L. Mohapatra and K. Parida, “A review on the recent progress, challenges and perspective of layered double hydroxides as promising photocatalysts,” Journal of Materials Chemistry A. 2016, doi: 10.1039/c6ta01668e.

[3] X. Zhang, C. Ma, X. Song, Y. Zhou, and W. Chen, “The impacts of wind technology advancement on future global energy,” Appl. Energy, 2016, doi: 10.1016/j.apenergy.2016.04.029.

[4] R. K. Swain, A. K. Barisal, P. K. Hota, and R. Chakrabarti, “Short-term hydrothermal scheduling using clonal selection algorithm,” Int. J. Electr. Power Energy Syst., 2011, doi: 10.1016/j.ijepes.2010.11.016.

[5] S. Patnaik, D. P. Sahoo, and K. Parida, “An overview on Ag modified g-C3N4 based nanostructured materials for energy and environmental applications,” Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews. 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.rser.2017.09.026.

[6] A. P. Das, L. B. Sukla, N. Pradhan, and S. Nayak, “Manganese biomining: A review,” Bioresource Technology. 2011, doi: 10.1016/j.biortech.2011.05.018.

[7] A. Toshniwal and V. Kheraj, “Development of organic-inorganic tin halide perovskites: A review,” Solar Energy. 2017, doi: 10.1016/j.solener.2017.03.077.

[8] D. K. Padhi, T. K. Panigrahi, K. Parida, S. K. Singh, and P. M. Mishra, “Green Synthesis of Fe3O4/RGO Nanocomposite with Enhanced Photocatalytic Performance for Cr(VI) Reduction, Phenol Degradation, and Antibacterial Activity,” ACS Sustain. Chem. Eng., 2017, doi: 10.1021/acssuschemeng.7b02548.

[9] K. A. Cook-Chennault, N. Thambi, and A. M. Sastry, “Powering MEMS portable devices - A review of non-regenerative and regenerative power supply systems with special emphasis on piezoelectric energy harvesting systems,” Smart Mater. Struct., 2008, doi: 10.1088/0964-1726/17/4/043001.

[10] P. K. Dash, M. Padhee, and S. K. Barik, “Estimation of power quality indices in distributed generation systems during power islanding conditions,” Int. J. Electr. Power Energy Syst., 2012, doi: 10.1016/j.ijepes.2011.10.019.

[11] R. Sharma and S. Goel, “Performance analysis of a 11.2 kWp roof top grid-connected PV system in Eastern India,” Energy Reports, 2017, doi: 10.1016/j.egyr.2017.05.001.

[12] N. C. Darre and G. S. Toor, “Desalination of Water: a Review,” Current Pollution Reports. 2018, doi: 10.1007/s40726-018-0085-9.

[13] M. Mishra and P. K. Rout, “Detection and classification of micro-grid faults based on HHT and machine learning techniques,” IET Gener. Transm. Distrib., 2018, doi: 10.1049/iet-gtd.2017.0502.

[14] Q. Wang and R. Li, “Drivers for energy consumption: A comparative analysis of China and India,” Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews. 2016, doi: 10.1016/j.rser.2016.04.048.

[15] D. Kandi, S. Martha, and K. M. Parida, “Quantum dots as enhancer in photocatalytic hydrogen evolution: A review,” International Journal of Hydrogen Energy. 2017, doi: 10.1016/j.ijhydene.2017.02.166.

[16] L. Mohjazi, M. Dianati, G. K. Karagiannidis, S. Muhaidat, and M. Al-Qutayri, “RF-powered cognitive radio networks: Technical challenges and limitations,” IEEE Communications Magazine. 2015, doi: 10.1109/MCOM.2015.7081081.

[17] P. K. Dash, M. Padhee, and T. K. Panigrahi, “A hybrid time-frequency approach based fuzzy logic system for power island detection in grid connected distributed generation,” Int. J. Electr. Power Energy Syst., 2012, doi: 10.1016/j.ijepes.2012.04.003.

[18] S. Mansingh, D. K. Padhi, and K. M. Parida, “Enhanced photocatalytic activity of nanostructured Fe doped CeO2 for hydrogen production under visible light irradiation,” Int. J. Hydrogen Energy, 2016, doi: 10.1016/j.ijhydene.2016.05.191.

[19] M. K. Nayak, G. C. Dash, and L. P. Singh, “Heat and mass transfer effects on MHD viscoelastic fluid over a stretching sheet through porous medium in presence of chemical reaction,” Propuls. Power Res., 2016, doi: 10.1016/j.jppr.2016.01.006.

[20] C. C. Elam, C. E. G. Padró, G. Sandrock, A. Luzzi, P. Lindblad, and E. F. Hagen, “Realizing the

ISSN: 2347-5552, Volume-8, Issue-6, November 2020
https://doi.org/10.55524/ijircst.2020.8.6.11
www.ijircst.org

hydrogen future: The International Energy Agency's efforts to advance hydrogen energy technologies," Int. J. Hydrogen Energy, 2003, doi: 10.1016/S0360-3199(02)00147-7.

[21] R. Gevaers, E. Van de Voorde, and T. Vanelslander, "Characteristics of Innovations in Last Mile Logistics - Using Best Practices, Case Studies and Making the Link with Green and Sustainable Logistics," Assoc. Eur. Transp. Contrib., 2009.

[22] D. I. Bleiwas, "Byproduct mineral commodities used for the production of photovoltaic cells," US Geol. Surv. Circ., 2010, doi: 10.3133/cir1365.

[23] F. Scorza, "Towards self energy-management and sustainable citizens' engagement in local energy efficiency Agenda," Int. J. Agric. Environ. Inf. Syst., 2016, doi: 10.4018/IJAEIS.2016010103.