Car ownership in relation to income distribution and consumers' spending decisions

François Lescaroux

ÉCOLE DU PÉTROLE ET DES MOTEURS
INSTITUT FRANÇAIS DU PÉTROLE (IFP)
228-232 avenue Napoléon Bonaparte
92852 RUEIL-MALMAISON CEDEX
téléphone : 01 47 52 62 80 - télécopieur : 01 47 52 70 36

Car ownership in relation to income distribution and consumers' spending decisions

François LESCAROUX

November 2007

Les cahiers de l'économie - n° 67

Série Recherche

Car ownership in relation to income distribution and consumers' spending decisions

François LESCAROUX

Address for correspondence: Dr François Lescaroux, Direction des Etudes Economiques, Institut Français du Pétrole, 1 et 4, avenue de Bois-Préau – 92852 Rueil-Malmaison – France.

The author wishes to thank Olivier Rech for helpful discussions and comments.

Abstract

This paper proposes a formal model of per-capita private car ownership based on very simple and general assumptions on income distribution and consumers' spending decisions. The author justifies a theoretical S-shaped curve describing changes in ownership as a function of average per-capita income, income's dispersion and the "Cost/utility" ratio of owning a car. He applies the model on a panel of 64 countries and explains past variations in their ownership rates. Then, projections are performed to the year 2030. They suggest that the actual trends are not sustainable, which implies a need for important technical and sociological evolutions.

Date of final version: June 2007

1.0 Introduction

The increasing needs for mobility at a global level have raised many concerns about the sustainability of our way of living.

From the standpoint of the energy economist, about one half of total oil consumption is used in the transportation sector, where the substitution possibilities are very limited (at least in the medium term). This share should increase in the future as the demand for passenger cars in important emerging countries like China or India is rapidly growing. The surge in oil consumption in the last few years is directly responsible for the oil price hike that has occurred. Moreover, the structural nature of the upward movement in oil demand makes an oil price fall unlikely, unless supply develops even more rapidly. Further, the growing demand for motor fuel puts pressure on the refining sector where the upgrading capacities tend to saturate.

From the environmental economics' point of view, about 25 per cent of global CO_2 emissions from fossil fuels come from the transportation sector alone. The projected growth of this sector raises worries about global warming and clean air because of the limited possibilities of substitution and because of the impossibility to capture the pollutants.

Other important aspects include the needs for infrastructure to develop and for intra-city traffic to adapt and avoid congestion.

As a consequence, a lot of projections of passenger cars' stocks are performed by national and international institutes (IMF, 2005), as well as individual researchers to help politics and industrials in their decision making. Quite all of them rely on S-shaped curves estimated on pooled or panel data, with or without country-specific effects. The most widely used is the Gompertz function (Dargay and Gately, 1997, 1999, Dargay, Gately and Sommer, 2007). Letting *Car* denote the long-run equilibrium level of the passenger car ownership rate and letting *Y* denote real per-capita income, it can be written as:

$$Car_t = Car^{\infty} \cdot \exp(\beta_1 \cdot \exp(\beta_2 \cdot \exp(Y_t))), \qquad (1)$$

where Car^{∞} is the saturation level and β_1 and β_2 are negative parameters defining the shape of the curve.

Other S-shaped curves have been proposed, like the log-logistic function used by Lescaroux and Rech (2007). It can be written as:

$$Car_t = \frac{Car^{\infty}}{1 + \exp\{-\lambda \cdot [\ln(Y_t) - \theta]\}}, \qquad (2)$$

where λ and θ are two positive parameters defining the shape of the curve[1].

---

[1] Button et al. (1993) modelled the vehicle ownership rate as a logistic function of time. As the logarithm of per-capita income can be approximated locally – and roughly – by a linear time trend, the log-logistic function of per-capita income is closely related to the logistic function of time.

Finally, the car ownership rate can be modeled with a truncated log-quadratic specification, as in Medlock and Soligo (2002). It is given by[2]:

$$\ln(Car_t) = \rho_1 + \rho_2 \cdot \ln(Y_t) + \rho_3 \cdot \ln(Y_t)^2 . \qquad (3)$$

The main limit of the forecasts obtained by simulating these various functions has been expressed very clearly – and crudely – by Greenman (1996): "*Forecasting results were found [...] to be very sensitive to the functional form used. The development of these models therefore tended to become an exercise in sophisticated curve fitting without any theoretical guidance as to the appropriate form to use.*" To correct for this problem, Greenman proposed a model of car ownership relying on income and automobile diffusion densities which was fitted to data from the UK and Japan.

Another limit of the previous models (that the model proposed by Greenman overcomes) is that they rely just on the mean of the income distribution and do not take into account the shape of its density. The importance of income distribution on passenger car demand has since been confirmed by Storchmann (2005), who showed that "*high inequality leads to a higher car stock in poor countries, while it leads to a smaller car stock in rich countries*".

Nonetheless, the detailed data on income distribution and households expenditures for transportation that Greenman's model requires make it difficult to use at a large scale, particularly for emerging countries. On the other hand, the model proposed by Storchmann can be implemented practically for a wide set of countries but, for the sake of simplicity and comparability, it is linear in logarithms, which implies constant elasticities. Such a formulation is at odds with most of the recent literature on passenger car demand and Storchmann acknowledge that this simplification "*will be at the expense of consistency*" with an individual model that he constructs first.

In this paper, we adopt an alternative approach to overcome the problem pointed out by Greenman: we propose a formal (non-linear) model of passenger car ownership based on income distribution and consumers' spending decisions which can be estimated at a large scale.

In the next section, we present the theoretical model, derive some properties of its dynamics and propose a practical approximation to the formal relation; we also mention some advantages of our model compared to the main alternatives and comment on the influence of some determinants of the car ownership rate, such as income inequality or car purchase cost. Then, in the third section, we concretely apply the model and explain econometrically the car ownership rate in 64 countries between 1986 and 1998 as a function of average per-capita income, income's dispersion and a country-specific indicator of the "cost/utility" ratio of owning a car. The fourth section presents the results of the projections of car ownership to the year 2030. Finally, the fifth section summarizes our results and consider some implications of the research.

[2] Medlock and Soligo also introduce in their panel model the retail price of motor fuel and country-specific effects.

2.0 A formal model of car ownership based on income distribution and consumers' spending decisions

We consider a given population and assume that its income distribution is well approximated at time *t* by the Log-Normal law, with mean $\overline{Y_t}$ and standard deviation $\beta \cdot \overline{Y_t}$. So, the logarithm of *Y* follows a Normal law with mean *m* and standard deviation σ:

$$\begin{cases} \ln(Y) \sim N(m,\sigma) \\ m = \ln(\overline{Y_t}) - 0.5 \cdot \ln(\beta + 1) \\ \sigma^2 = \ln(\beta + 1) \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

Let $f_Y(y, \overline{Y_t}, \beta \cdot \overline{Y_t})$ be the density function of real per-capita income, $F_Y(y, \overline{Y_t}, \beta \cdot \overline{Y_t})$ its cumulative distribution function, $f_U(u)$ the density function of the standard normal distribution and $F_U(u)$ its cumulative distribution function (CDF).

For each individual *i* in the population, we also consider that owning a car procures a utility U_i. Given *y*, the income level of the individual and *P*, the smallest amount of money needed to own and use a car, individual *i* chooses to buy a car if $P/y \leq U_i$ (for each individual, there exists a "Cost/utility" ratio which acts as an income threshold beyond which he chooses to buy a car). Let *U*, the associated real-valued random variable, have a cumulative distribution function, F_α, and a density function, f_α.
Then the probability for an individual to own a car is:

$$\alpha(y) = P\left(\frac{P}{y} \leq U\right) = 1 - F_\alpha\left(\frac{P}{y}\right). \quad (5)$$

α is a strictly increasing function of *y*, whose value in $y = 0$ is 0 and which tends towards α^∞ when *y* tends towards infinity, with the saturation level α^∞ being[3]:

$$\alpha^\infty = \int_0^{+\infty} f_\alpha(u) \cdot du. \quad (6)$$

Therefore, the car ownership rate as a function of average per-capita income is

$$Car(\overline{Y_t}) = \int_0^{+\infty} \alpha(y) \cdot f_Y(y, \overline{Y_t}, \beta \cdot \overline{Y_t}) \cdot dy \quad (7)$$

In fact, the utility of owning a car depends on many factors, like population densities or access to other transport alternatives, which evolve through time as well as car purchase costs do. Consequently, the function α is not time invariant. We do not indicate this inconsistency to lighten the equations but we keep it in mind.

Empirically, it is possible to estimate the function α when households expenditures surveys are available. Greenman (1996) analyzes the cases of the UK and Japan for example. But for most

[3] The support of *U* is the extended real line: for some people, the utility of owning a car may be negative (for example, people who cannot drive). Otherwise, the saturation level should be 1 car per individual.

of the developing countries, these statistics do not exist. Nonetheless, another practical approach is possible. There exists a sequence of simple functions, (α_n), that converges towards α and the convergence is uniform. The car ownership rate can therefore be expressed as:

$$\begin{aligned} Car\left(\overline{Y_t}\right) &= \int_0^{+\infty}\left(\lim_{n\to+\infty}\alpha_n(y)\right)\cdot f_Y\left(y,\overline{Y_t},\beta\cdot\overline{Y_t}\right)\cdot dy \\ &= \lim_{n\to+\infty}\left(\int_0^{+\infty}\alpha_n(y)\cdot f_Y\left(y,\overline{Y_t},\beta\cdot\overline{Y_t}\right)\cdot dy\right). \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

The function $\alpha_n(y)$ can be described by a sequence of real numbers, $\alpha_0, ..., \alpha_{n-1}, Y_0, ..., Y_{n-1}$:

$$\alpha_n(y) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-2}\alpha_i\cdot\mathbf{1}_{[Y_i;Y_{i+1}]} + \alpha_{n-1}\cdot\mathbf{1}_{[Y_{n-1};+\infty]}, \tag{9}$$

where **1** denotes the indicator function ($Y_0 > 0$ and $\alpha_{n-1} = \alpha^\infty$). Define τ_i as:

$$\tau_i\left(\overline{Y_t}\right) = \int_{Y_i}^{+\infty} f_Y\left(y,\overline{Y_t},\beta\cdot\overline{Y_t}\right)\cdot dy = 1 - F_U\left(g_i(Y_t)\right) \tag{10}$$

where

$$g_i(Y_t) = \frac{-\ln\left(\overline{Y_t}\right) + \ln(Y_i) + 0.5\cdot\ln(\beta+1)}{\sqrt{\ln(\beta+1)}}. \tag{11}$$

With $\gamma_i = (\alpha_i - \alpha_{i-1})/\alpha^\infty$, $\gamma_0 = \alpha_0/\alpha^\infty$ and by substituting (9) and (10) in (8), we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} Car\left(\overline{Y_t}\right) &= \lim_{n\to+\infty}\left(\sum_{i=0}^{n-2}\alpha_i\cdot\int_{Y_i}^{Y_{i+1}} f_Y\left(y,\overline{Y_t},\beta\cdot\overline{Y_t}\right)\cdot dy + \alpha_{n-1}\cdot\int_{Y_{n-1}}^{+\infty} f_Y\left(y,\overline{Y_t},\beta\cdot\overline{Y_t}\right)\cdot dy\right) \\ &= \lim_{n\to+\infty}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n-1}(\alpha_i-\alpha_{i-1})\cdot\int_{Y_i}^{+\infty} f_Y\left(y,\overline{Y_t},\beta\cdot\overline{Y_t}\right)\cdot dy\right) + \alpha_0\cdot\int_{Y_0}^{+\infty} f_Y\left(y,\overline{Y_t},\beta\cdot\overline{Y_t}\right)\cdot dy \\ &= \alpha^\infty\cdot\lim_{n\to+\infty}\left(\sum_{i=0}^{n-1}\gamma_i\cdot\tau_i\left(\overline{Y_t}\right)\right). \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

So, the car ownership rate appears as the limit of a sequence of functions Car_n:

$$Car_n\left(\overline{Y_t}\right) = \alpha^\infty\cdot\sum_{i=0}^{n-1}\gamma_i\cdot\tau_i\left(\overline{Y_t}\right). \tag{13}$$

As a first approximation, Car_n can be approached by:

$$Car_n\left(\overline{Y_t}\right) \approx \alpha^{\infty} \cdot \left[1 - F_U\left(\frac{-\ln\left(\overline{Y_t}\right) + \ln\left(\prod_{i=0}^{n-1} Y_i^{\gamma_i}\right) + 0.5 \cdot \ln(\beta + 1)}{\sqrt{\ln(\beta + 1)}}\right)\right]. \quad (14)$$

Let U^* be the truncation of U such that its probability mass is restricted to the subinterval [0; +∞[. When n increases, $\ln\left(\prod_i Y_i^{\gamma_i}\right)$ tends towards the expected value of $\ln(P/U^*)$, denoted $\ln(P^*)$. Consequently, the equation relating the car ownership rate to average per-capita income can be approximated by:

$$Car\left(\overline{Y_t}\right) = \alpha^{\infty} \cdot \left[1 - F_U\left(\frac{-\ln\left(\overline{Y_t}\right) + \ln\left(P^*\right) + 0.5 \cdot \sigma^2}{\sigma}\right)\right]. \quad (15)$$

This means that, on average, a share α^{∞} of the population buys a car when its income level exceeds an income threshold P^*. As discussed before, P^* depends on many factors and it varies both through time and from one country to another. Intuitively, we could expect a positive correlation between P^* and average per-capita income and a negative correlation between P^* and time. We will explore this possibility further in the empirical part of our work.

The cumulative log-normal distribution model has an important advantage against the log-quadratic model and the Gompertz model: its coefficients are directly interpretable. The dispersion of the income distribution acts on the slope of the S-shaped curve while the income threshold acts on the position of the curve along the income axis: the more unequal the distribution of income, the more gentle the slope and the higher the income threshold (that is, the higher the car purchase cost and/or the lower the utility it gives), the most right-translated the curve. Figure 1 shows these influences.

As we will see in the next section, this allows to introduce heterogeneity between countries in a very simple way. On the contrary, the introduction of heterogeneity in the two other models is rather arbitrary. Indeed, it would not be sensible to estimate a separate equation for each country because the estimation procedure needs observations over the whole range of income; as a consequence, some parameters need to be common for all countries. But the parameters in these models are linked and have no sense individually. For example, Medlock and Soligo (2002) let only the intercept vary and Dargay and Gately (1997) let only the parameter which determines the curvature at low-income levels vary, whereas Dargay and Gately (1999) let only the parameter which determines the curvature at high-income levels vary. According to our formal model, such an approach is artificial because the curvatures at high- and low-income levels are linked and determined only by the dispersion of the income distribution (as formulated by Storchmann, "*income inequality tends to move car demand from both sides*").

3.0 Estimation procedure and results

We now turn to the empirical application of the formal model. Up to this point, our formal model was close to the "*individual model*" of Storchmann (2005). Differences arise in the practical approximation to the theoretical model. Storchmann uses a formulation which is linear in logarithms whereas our approach is non-linear. We consider that Equation (15) describes the long-run equilibrium level of the car ownership rate[4], denoted Car^*,

$$Car_t^* = \alpha^\infty \cdot \left[1 - F_U\left(\frac{-\ln\left(\overline{Y_t}\right) + \ln\left(P^*\right) + 0.5 \cdot \sigma^2}{\sigma}\right)\right], \tag{16}$$

and assume a partial adjustment mechanism depending on the rate of change of per-capita income[5]:

$$\ln\left(Car_t\right) = \ln\left(Car_{t-1}\right) + \left[\delta_1 + \delta_2 \cdot h\left(\overline{Y_t}/\overline{Y_{t-1}}\right)\right] \cdot \left[\ln\left(Car_t^*\right) - \ln\left(Car_{t-1}\right)\right], \tag{17}$$

where h is a function to be determined and $\overline{Y_t}$ is the average per-capita income level (2000US$).

We chose to restrict α^∞, δ_1 and δ_2 to be common for all countries. Considering the dispersion parameter σ, it does not need to be estimated. Indeed, in the case of a log-normal distribution, there is a one-to-one relation between the Gini coefficient and the standard deviation of the underlying normal distribution:

$$Gini = 2 \cdot F_U\left(\sigma/\sqrt{2}\right) - 1. \tag{18}$$

Finally, we allow the income threshold parameter to be country-specific. As this parameter reflects the ratio of the cost of owning a car to the utility it procures, it depends of course on the car purchase costs (including taxes), but it depends as well on less easily quantifiable factors, as the access to other transport alternatives or sociological and cultural factors. Therefore, for the first application of the model, we prefer to consider it as a time-invariant country-specific parameter.

---

[4] As in Lescaroux and Rech (2007), the car ownership rate is defined as the number of passenger car per people aged 15 or more.

[5] Lescaroux and Rech (2007) suggest that the speed of adjustment towards the equilibrium level increases with per-capita income but they were not able to identify a statistically significant relationship. Dargay, Gately and Sommer (2007) argue that it is the sign of the growth rate which matters. We pursued in this direction using a continuous function of the rate of change of per-capita income.

The model to be estimated econometrically thus becomes:

$$\begin{aligned}\ln\left(Car_{i,t}\right) &= \left[1-\delta_1-\delta_2\cdot h\left(\overline{Y_{i,t}}/\overline{Y_{i,t-1}}\right)\right]\cdot\ln\left(Car_{i,t-1}\right)\\ &+\left[\delta_1+\delta_2\cdot h\left(\overline{Y_{i,t}}/\overline{Y_{i,t-1}}\right)\right]\cdot\ln\left[1-F_U\left(\frac{-\ln\left(\overline{Y_{i,t}}\right)+p_i^*+0.5\cdot\sigma_{i,t}^2}{\sigma_{i,t}}\right)\right]\\ &+\left[\delta_1+\delta_2\cdot h\left(\overline{Y_{i,t}}/\overline{Y_{i,t-1}}\right)\right]\cdot\ln\left(\alpha^\infty\right),\end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

where the subscripts *i* and *t* refer respectively to country *i* and date *t* and p_i^* stands for $\ln(P_i^*)$.

The most demanding variable in Equation (19) is σ because the Gini coefficients are available only for some countries and for a few years. We were nonetheless able to construct a database covering 64 countries between 1986 and 1998 (see Appendix B for more details). Because of its non-linear nature, Equation (19) was estimated using maximum likelihood methods by postulating successively a set of different functions *h*.

After various experiments, the best specification that we estimated is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\ln\left(Car_{i,t}\right) &= \left[1-0.07\cdot\left(\overline{Y_{i,t}}/\overline{Y_{i,t-1}}\right)^2\right]\cdot\ln\left(Car_{i,t-1}\right)\\ &+0.07\cdot\left(\overline{Y_{i,t}}/\overline{Y_{i,t-1}}\right)^2\cdot\ln\left[1-F_U\left(\frac{-\ln\left(\overline{Y_{i,t}}\right)+8.53+0.5\cdot\sigma_{i,t}^2}{\sigma_{i,t}}\right)\right],\end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

where 8.53 is the median value of $\ln(P_i^*)$. It appeared that the choice of the function *h* is not crucial for the other parameters and, notably, α^∞ was not statistically different from 1 in quite all the cases (and still close to 1 when it was significantly different from 1). The detailed estimates of this preliminary specification are reported in Table 1.

The median income threshold is about \$5,500 per-capita (2000US\$), but the dispersion is rather large, with a standard deviation of about 7,000. We made a first step towards explaining the level of the income threshold. We evaluated the cross-correlation between the estimated parameters, P_i^*, and the countries' population densities (at the middle of the time sample, in year 1995). When data were available, we also evaluated the cross-correlation with car prices (in year 2003). The coefficients obtained are respectively 0.34 and 0.41. This confirms that concentration of population and car purchase costs are important determinants of the car ownership rate. The construction of a cross-section time-series database covering these two indicators and some others (measures of urbanization or access to other transport alternatives for example) would enable to model explicitly the "Cost/utility" ratio of owning a car.

Nonetheless, we found that the evolution of the "Cost/utility" ratio as the economy develops is pretty well synthesized, as a first approximation, by the evolution of per-capita income. We evaluated the cross-correlation between the income threshold parameter and average per-capita income: the coefficient obtained is 0.81 (Figure 2 shows the scatter of points). This is not really surprising because the cost of owning a car tends to be positively correlated with per-capita income (the rise in standards of living leads to buy more expensive cars and the greater needs for infrastructure lead to more taxes) while the influence of wealth on the utility of owning a car is ambiguous (the urbanization process and the development of public transportation systems tend to lower it but the demand for leisure and travel increases it).

We tried to take into account in the model the link between the income threshold parameter and per-capita income. From Equation (20), we tried a variety of specifications[6]. The best relationship that we found is as follows:

$$\ln\left(Car_{i,t}\right) = \left[1 - \delta_2 \cdot \left(\overline{Y_{i,t}} / \overline{Y_{i,t-1}}\right)^2\right] \cdot \ln\left(Car_{i,t-1}\right) + \delta_2 \cdot \left(\overline{Y_{i,t}} / \overline{Y_{i,t-1}}\right)^2 \cdot \ln\left[1 - F_U\left(\frac{-\ln\left(\overline{Y_{i,t}}\right) + \left(\gamma \cdot \ln\left(\overline{Y_{i,t}}\right) + \beta_i\right) + 0.5 \cdot \sigma_{i,t}^2}{\sigma_{i,t}}\right)\right], \tag{21}$$

where the β_i are country-specific. Table 2 reports the result of the estimation.

Since the estimated value of α is smaller than 1, this is, from Lemma 1 (Appendix A), a log-concave function of $\ln(\overline{Y_t})$ (as well as Equation (20)), which means that the elasticity of car ownership with respect to average per-capita income is decreasing (see Appendix A for an approximation of the elasticity). This result might be disturbing at first sight because the S-shaped pattern implies that the diffusion process accelerates and then decelerates, but this means that the ratio of the changes first increases and then decreases, not the elasticity.

As before, α^{∞} was estimated to be statistically not different from 1. This value corresponds to the saturation level estimated by Lescaroux and Rech (2007) but it is bigger than the ones estimated by Dargay and Gately (1997, 1999) and Medlock and Soligo (2002). The reason for this discrepancy might be the use of different data or it could result from the different S-shaped functions used.

The average adjustment coefficient is 8.6 per cent (with a minimum of 3.9 per cent and a maximum of 12.5 per cent), which means that 90 per cent of full adjustment takes about 26 years. Nonetheless, in a country which is not developing, the adjustment process can be more than two times slower. Our adjustment coefficient is much smaller than the value of 0.205 estimated by Medlock and Soligo (2002), close to the value of 0.09 estimated by Dargay and Gately (1999), close to the values of 0.095 (for rising income) and 0.084 (for falling income) estimated by Dargay, Gately and Sommer (2007) and higher than the value of 0.03 estimated by Lescaroux and Rech (2007)[7].

The mean and the median income thresholds, $\gamma.\ln(\overline{Y_{i,t}}) + \beta_i$, are about \$8,000 and \$5,600 per-capita (2000US\$) respectively and the standard deviation is about 7,100. The lowest value is

---

[6] We also tried to take into account the temporal decrease of car purchase cost that results from productivity growth in the automobile sector by introducing a time trend in the approximation of $\ln(P_i^*)$, but we could not find a satisfactory specification. This results probably from the shortness of the temporal dimension of our sample.

[7] Their very slow adjustment process results from the estimation of a common equation for all countries.

about \$600 in Ethiopia (maybe because of an important second-hand market)[8] and the biggest values are about \$30,000 in Singapore (because of 1) the quotas established and the booming market for *Certificates of Entitlement* and 2) the incredibly high population density) and in Japan.

The model performs remarkably well in (in-sample) dynamic simulation (see Appendix C). Notably, we are able to reproduce the particular pattern that characterizes countries in Eastern Europe (decrease of average per-capita income in the aftermath of the fall of the Berlin Wall and simultaneous increase of car ownership) and that results partly from the increase in income inequality.

4.0 Projections of passenger car stocks to the year 2030

On the basis of assumptions concerning per-capita income growth and demographic changes to the year 2030 (see Appendix B), we used our model of car ownership to project how the car stock could evolve in each country according to different hypothesis regarding variations in income inequality and changes in the "Cost/utility" ratio.

The reference case corresponds to a "business-as-usual" scenario. On one hand, we assumed that the estimated relationship between the income threshold level and per-capita income would remain stable over the whole forecast sample (this means that we do not take into account the possibility that automakers could propose cheap cars designed for developing countries, which would accelerate the expansion of their car stocks). On the other hand, we also considered that the structures of income distribution would stay the same in each country[9], except in Europe where we imagined that a standardisation of fiscal policies should cause a kind of partial convergence in the Gini coefficients. On the basis of past data, we postulated 5 sub-groups of European countries: very egalitarian Scandinavian countries (Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden), very un-egalitarian Anglo-Saxon countries (Ireland, UK), egalitarian Continental countries (Austria, Bulgaria, Estonia, Germany, Hungary, Latvia, Luxembourg, Netherlands), un-egalitarian Southern countries (Greece, Portugal, Spain) and mixed countries (Belgium, France, Switzerland), halfway between the Continental and the Southern models. The assumptions and results of this projection are reported in Table 3 and Figure 3 summarizes the forecasts[10].
As would be expected, the projections indicate that the growth rates in both car ownership and car stock should be much larger in poor countries than in rich countries. Particularly, Asian developing countries should enter a period of strong acceleration in the diffusion process of private automobile, with average annual ownership's growth rates reaching 11.6 per cent in

[8] Technically, the slowest income threshold is approximately \$450 in the United States. Nonetheless, this coefficient should be biased: as discussed in Lescaroux and Rech, the UN data overestimates the car stock in the United States because they consider since 1987 *all* the pick-ups, minivans and SUVs as passenger cars. To our knowledge, other data sources do not consider *any* pick-up, minivan or SUV as passenger car. So, the UN data might be the least biased.

[9] There is a huge literature on income inequality. According to Kuznets (1955), it should first rise and later fall as per-capita income increases. Nonetheless, more recent work indicates that this relationship could have weaken or that its capacity to explain variations in income inequality across countries and over time is very limited (Barro, 2000) or that is does not reflect a "natural" evolution but a purely "accidental" evolution (Piketty, 2005). Because of this lack of consensus, we prefer keep the Gini coefficients constant for the base case.

[10] We checked that the practical implications of this assumption are very limited: for the EU-15 area, in year 2030, the car stock would be smaller by 4 millions of cars (about 1.5 per cent of the European stock) with stable Gini coefficients.

China, 11.0 per cent in Bangladesh, 9.7 per cent in India and 5.8 per cent in Indonesia and in Pakistan. Given the weight of these five countries in the present and future world population, they will account for an increase of almost 0.5 billion of cars (that is, more than one half of the total increase for the 64 countries). By 2030, the top six countries for the passenger car stock should be the United States (299 millions), China (288 millions), India (178 millions), Japan (78 millions), Germany (60 millions) and France (44 millions). From 1998 to 2030, the top six countries for the increase in the car stock should be China (+282 millions), India (+173 millions), the United States (+95 millions)[11], Korea (+29 millions), Japan (+28 millions) and Indonesia (+25 millions).

Nonetheless, as can be seen in Figure 3, the assumptions underlying the projections imply almost a tripling in the total car stock for the 64 countries that we consider, from 529 millions of passenger cars in 1998 to 1,420 millions of passenger cars in 2030[12]. Given the actual level of technology and the expected innovations, such an increase seems hardly sustainable in terms of CO_2 emissions and motor fuel demand.

It is not easy to compare our projections with the projections from other sources because of differences in starting date, geographical coverage and type of vehicles covered. Nonetheless, Table 4 shows for some regions the projected ratios of ownership growth to per-capita income growth which synthesize our results (second column) and the results of Dargay, Gately and Sommer (DGS), the IEA and the Sustainable Mobility Project (SMP)[13].

Overall, our projections indicate a more elastic demand for passenger cars than those of the other sources[14]. Dargay, Gately and Sommer explain that the relatively low ratios projected by the SMP result from assumption of low income-elasticity of ownership. The lack of information about the model used by the IEA prevents from explaining the reason for the discrepancy with their projections. The divergence is very important for non-OECD countries and the world in the 2004 edition. The projections seem closer in the 2006 edition but a deeper look indicate that they are not: the IEA project that the light-duty vehicle stock should climb to 100 millions in China (our value is 288 millions) and 56 millions in India (our value is 178 millions) in 2030. For an unknown reason, their projected number of light-duty vehicles in use worldwide is close to the passenger car stock that we project for our sample (which excludes Russia and Iran notably). The gap between our values and those of Dargay, Gately and Sommer comes mainly from different data sources (as discussed in Lescaroux and Rech) and from the different S-shaped curves used: the Gompertz function implies a lower income-elasticity at low levels of per-capita income, which implies a lower ratio for many non-OECD countries (it is nonetheless difficult to compare them as they do not refer to the same stock of vehicles). Similarly, the IMF (2005) projects a growth in total vehicle stock which seems rather weak compared with our projections: for most of the countries, the vehicle stock that it

---

[11] Although the USA are the most mature market, they will keep being one of the most dynamic markets because of the sustained population growth.

[12] If we do not consider an increase in the "Cost/utility" ratio as per-capita income rises (Equation (20)), the total car stock quadruples, to 1,900 millions of passenger cars, because of the low actual income threshold levels in most of the developing countries. Our approximation of the relationship between the income threshold and per-capita income is rather rough, but it should provide a better idea of what might happen in the future.

[13] As they are reported in Dargay, Gately and Sommer (2007).

[14] For the sake of comparison, ownership rates were expressed as a fraction of total population (and not the population aged 15 or more) in this table. Consequently, the reported values do not correspond to the values in Table 3.

projects is just slightly greater than the passenger car stock that we project (they estimate that the world vehicle stock should reach approximately 1,660 millions by 2030 and our projections indicate that the passenger car stock for a subset excluding notably Russia and Iran should reach 1,420 millions by 2030). These low projections of transportation demand result probably from the calibration of the saturation level at 850 vehicles per 1,000 people and from the *a priori* assumption of low income-elasticities at low levels of per-capita income.

Moreover, our projections already include (at least partially, on the basis of recent experience) the rise in car purchase cost associated to the diffusion of more efficient cars[15] and they neglect the possibility that automakers could propose cheap cars designed for developing countries. This would accelerate the automobile's diffusion in countries like China or India. For these two countries alone, the passenger car stocks would reach respectively 370 and 265 millions if the elasticity of the "Cost/utility" ratio with respect to per-capita income was lowered by 2.5 percentage points ($\gamma' = \gamma - 0.025 = 0.346$) over the projection sample. This would imply an increment of approximately 170 millions of vehicles compared to the reference scenario.

Another issue that could affect the development of private transportation in China is the evolution of income distribution. As a consequence of the very fast economic development, it is actually very un-egalitarian, but this seems to be at odds with the nature of the Chinese society. If we were to assume a linear decrease of the Gini coefficient to 0.35 in 2030, the car stock would be greater by about 20 millions (approximately the size of the car stock in the United Kingdom in 1998). If an equalization of income and a relative decrease of the "Cost/utility" ratio were to occur at the same time, the Chinese car stock should reach 406 millions of vehicles.

Therefore, our modelling of the passenger car stock imply a growth in vehicle ownership, and hence in motor fuel demand, stronger than the growth projected by other sources. The gap is not dramatic in the reference scenario but the alternative simulations suggest that demand could be accelerated by many factors. This raises concerns about the balance between supply and demand and about the related CO_2 emissions.

It seems accordingly that a high rate of technical progress will be needed to "*meet the challenges of sustainability*", or that a large set of countries will have to implement policies aimed at reducing the demand for private transportation; otherwise, the adjustment should come from the market in the form of a gasoline price surge.

5.0 Conclusion

In this paper, we have been able to build a formal model of passenger car ownership rate and to propose a practical approximation which works remarkably well in explaining past in-sample evolutions and meets in the long-run the desired theoretical properties of the car ownership rate.

Given the distribution of income in a particular population, the formal model explains the car ownership rate as a function of the average per-capita income level and a country-specific indicator of the "Cost/utility" ratio of owning a car. When applied over the 1986-1998 period to a set of 64 countries, the model is able to reproduce past changes in ownership rates. As we

[15] When Equation (20) is used, with constant "Cost/utility" ratios, the total car stock reaches 1,900 millions in 2030.

do not consider only the average per-capita income (as other models do) but also the standard deviation of the income distribution, the model can explain differences in the pattern of growth between egalitarian countries (like the Scandinavian countries) and less egalitarian countries (like South-American countries) or breaks in the trajectory followed by a particular country when changes occur in the distribution of income (like in the transition economies). In the present form of the model, the indicators of the "Cost/utility" ratio are estimated, country-specific parameters. It could be desirable to express these parameters as a function of observable indicators in order to evaluate the effects of alternative transportation policies. As a first step in this direction, we showed that the ratios are strongly correlated with car purchase costs and population densities.

We used the estimated model to perform projections to the year 2030. The reference scenario assumes that the relationship between the "Cost/utility" ratio and average per-capita income observed in the near past still holds into the future. We project that the total car stock should be about 3 times greater in 2030 than it was in 1998 (1,420 millions of passenger cars, excluding notably Russia and Iran), but the growth should not be uniform. For example, the Chinese and Indian car stocks should be respectively 45 times and 35 times greater than they are and China and India should become respectively the second and the third countries for the number of passenger cars. On the other hand, the growth of the car stock in the OECD should come mainly from the USA, and it should be triggered there by population growth only.

We performed some alternative projections to highlight the effects of some socio-economic evolutions allready in the tube, like the diffusion of cheap cars in developing countries, or likely to occur in the coming decades, like an equalization of the income distribution in China. These evolutions would lead, more or less, to a stronger growth of the car stock. In particular, a relative fall in car purchase cost would considerably accelerate the diffusion of automobile in middle income populations.

Nonetheless, in the alternative scenarios as well as in the reference scenario, the projected growth of the total car stock seems hardly sustainable in terms of oil demand and related CO_2 emissions. In the absence of important technical evolutions improving fuel efficiency and sociological evolutions reducing vehicle usage, the adjustment should come from the market in the form of a gasoline price surge.

Bagnoli, M. and T. Bergstrom (2005): "Log-concave probability and its applications", *Economic Theory* 26(2), 445-469.
Barro, R.J. (2000): "Inequality and Growth in a Panel of Countries", *Journal of Economic Growth*, 5(1), 5-32.
Button, K., N. Ngoe and J. Hine (1993): "Modeling vehicle ownership and use in low income countries", *Journal of Transport Economics and Policy*, 51-67.
Dargay, J., D. Gately and M. Sommer (2007): "Vehicle ownership and income growth, worldwide: 1960-2030", Working Paper (http://www.econ.nyu.edu/dept/courses/gately/research.htm).
Dargay, J. and D. Gately (1999): "Income's effect on car and vehicle ownership, worldwide: 1960-2015", *Transportation Research Part A* 33: 101-138.
Dargay, J. and D. Gately (1997): "Vehicle ownership to 2015: implications for energy use and emissions", *Energy Policy* 25(14-15): 1121-1127.
Greenman, J.V. (1996): "The car park: diffusion models revisited", *Energy Economics* 18: 107-128.
International Energy Agency (2006): *World Energy Outlook 2006*. Paris.
International Energy Agency (2004): *World Energy Outlook 2004*. Paris.
International Monetary Fund (2005): *World Economic Outlook, April 2005.*
Kuznets, S. (1955): "Economic growth and income inequality", *The American Economic Review*, 45(1): 1-28.
Lescaroux, F. and O. Rech (2007): "The impact of automobile diffusion on the income elasticity of motor fuel demand", *Forthcoming, The Energy Journal*, 28(4).
Medlock III, K.B. and R. Soligo (2002): "Car ownership and economic development with forecasts to the year 2015", *Journal of Transport Economics and Policy* 36(2): 163-188.
Piketty, T. (2005): "The Kuznets' curve, yesterday and tomorrow", in: Banerjee, A., Benabou R., Mookerhee D. (ed.) *Understanding poverty*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
Storchmann, K. (2005): "Long-run gasoline demand for passenger cars: the role of income distribution", *Energy Economics* 27, 25-58.
Sustainable Mobility Project (2004): *Mobility 2030: Meeting the challenges to sustainability*. World Business Council for Sustainable Mobility.
UBS, Union Bank of Switzerland (2003): *Prices and earnings: A comparison of purchasing power around the globe*. Union Bank of Switzerland, Zurich.
United Nations (2006): *World Population Prospects: The 2006 Revision*.

US Department of Energy (2006): *International Energy Outlook 2006*. Washington D.C.
World Bank (2006): *World Development Indicators 2006.*

Appendix A: Mathematics

Lemma 1. Let *Y* be a random variable with a Log-Normal distribution (with mean *m* and standard deviation *s*).

i The cumulative distribution function, $F_Y(y)$, is a log-concave function of ln(*y*).

ii The reliability function, 1 - $F_Y(y)$, is a log-concave function of ln(*y*).

Proof: Result (i) immediate because $F_Y(y)$ is a log-concave function of *y* (Bagnoli and Bergstrom, 2005), so it is a log-concave function of ln(*y*). For Result (ii), notice that for any *y* positive, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}1-F_Y(y) &= 1-\int_0^y \frac{1}{u\cdot s\cdot\sqrt{2\cdot\pi}}\cdot\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\cdot\left(\frac{\ln(u)-m}{s}\right)^2\right)\cdot du\\ &= 1-\int_{-\infty}^{(\ln(y)-m)/s}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\cdot\pi}}\cdot\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\cdot v^2\right)\cdot dv\\ &= 1-\int_{-\infty}^{g(\ln(y))} f_U(v)\cdot dv\\ &= 1-F_U\left(g(\ln(y))\right).\end{aligned}$$

Since 1 - $F_U(y)$ is a log-concave function of *y* (Bagnoli and Bergstrom, 2005), it follows that

1 - $F_Y(y)$ is a log-concave function of ln(*y*).

Approximation of the car ownership elasticity. From Equation (22), there is no exact formulation for the income elasticity of car ownership, ε. Nonetheless, a well-known approximation of the CDF of the log-normal distribution can be obtained based on the logistic distribution (with the notations in (4)):

$$F_Y\left(y,\overline{Y}_t,\beta\cdot\overline{Y}_t\right)\approx\frac{1}{1+\left(\dfrac{\exp(m)}{y}\right)^{\pi/(\sigma\cdot\sqrt{3})}}.$$

Consequently, ε can be approached by the formulation:

$$\varepsilon\left(\overline{Y}_t\right)=\frac{(1-\gamma)\cdot\pi/\left(\sigma\cdot\sqrt{3}\right)}{1+\left(\overline{Y}_t\right)^{\pi(1-\gamma)/(\sigma\cdot\sqrt{3})}\cdot\exp\left\{-\left[0.5\cdot\sigma^2+\beta_i\right]\cdot\pi/\left(\sigma\cdot\sqrt{3}\right)\right\}},$$

which is a positive (because $\gamma< 1$) and strictly decreasing function of $\overline{Y}_t$.

Appendix B: Data sources

We estimated the model using all the countries for which the data on income, population and car ownership were available between 1986 and 1998. This sample results from arbitration between the temporal and the spatial dimensions of our model: the longer the time sample, the lower the number of countries in the sample. Some OECD countries and some big markets are not taken into account for the following reasons. Russia, Poland, the Czech Republic and the Slovak Republic were excluded from the sample because of a lack of some data before 1991. New-Zealand was excluded because of a discontinuity in the car stock series. Iran was excluded because no information was available concerning the distribution of income.

The data sources are various issues of the Statistical Yearbook (United Nations) for the passenger cars in use and the World Bank online database (http://devdata.worldbank.org/dataonline/) for real per-capita GDP, total population, the part of the population in the 0-14 years age group and population density. The Gini indexes come from the World Bank as well but because of the scarcity of Gini index time series, we had to construct approximate measures when the data were unavailable. When we had many observations for a country, we interpolated the missing data linearly. When just one observation was available, we considered the Gini index as constant. When no observation was available between 1986 and 1998, we used the closest value if there was one. Consequently, the income dispersion measures that we use are very rough. The car prices in year 2003 come from the Union Bank of Switzerland's annual survey "*Prices and Earnings Around the Globe*".

The demographic data used in the projections are from the online *UN Population Database* (http://esa.un.org/unpp/index.asp?panel=2). Data on per-capita real income growth using Purchasing Power parity come from the DOE's *International Energy Outlook, 2006*; we assumed the same rate of change for the growth in per-capita real income.

Appendix C: In-sample dynamic simulations

In the following graphs, the ownership rate (on the left) is plotted against the logarithm of per-capita income (at the bottom). The line is the true path and the dotted line is the simulated path.

Figure 1: Influence of the dispersion and threshold parameters on the S-shaped curve



Figure 2: Per-capita income and "Cost/utility" ratio of owning a car



Figure 3: Projections of car stocks by major region



Table 1: Estimated parameters of the car ownership model (Equation (20))

		Coefficient	z-statistic			Coefficient	z-statistic
δ_2		0.07	8.60				
$\ln(P_i^*)$	Algeria	8.15	4.31	$\ln(P_i^*)$	Japan	10.19	3.52
$\ln(P_i^*)$	Argentina	9.18	16.83	$\ln(P_i^*)$	Jordan	8.33	40.39
$\ln(P_i^*)$	Australia	9.15	8.67	$\ln(P_i^*)$	Kenya	7.70	29.29
$\ln(P_i^*)$	Austria	9.44	1.57	$\ln(P_i^*)$	Korea, Rep. of	7.64	1.84
$\ln(P_i^*)$	Bangladesh	7.16	65.73	$\ln(P_i^*)$	Latvia	7.95	66.45
$\ln(P_i^*)$	Belgium	9.43	1.58	$\ln(P_i^*)$	Luxembourg	9.50	0.73
$\ln(P_i^*)$	Botswana	9.00	44.38	$\ln(P_i^*)$	Mexico	8.89	12.04
$\ln(P_i^*)$	Brazil	9.05	61.90	$\ln(P_i^*)$	Morocco	7.76	12.42
$\ln(P_i^*)$	Bulgaria	7.38	10.65	$\ln(P_i^*)$	Mozambique	6.66	261.73
$\ln(P_i^*)$	Burundi	6.58	142.04	$\ln(P_i^*)$	Netherlands	9.69	8.07
$\ln(P_i^*)$	Cameroon	8.10	80.69	$\ln(P_i^*)$	Norway	10.18	5.89
$\ln(P_i^*)$	Canada	9.57	5.55	$\ln(P_i^*)$	Pakistan	7.26	24.13

		Coefficient	z-statistic			Coefficient	z-statistic
$\ln(P_i^*)$	Chile	8.71	10.71	$\ln(P_i^*)$	Panama	8.82	15.30
$\ln(P_i^*)$	China	7.18	46.51	$\ln(P_i^*)$	Paraguay	7.69	62.21
$\ln(P_i^*)$	Costa Rica	8.48	10.39	$\ln(P_i^*)$	Peru	8.63	23.76
$\ln(P_i^*)$	Denmark	10.11	5.99	$\ln(P_i^*)$	Portugal	7.83	0.91
$\ln(P_i^*)$	Ecuador	8.32	25.69	$\ln(P_i^*)$	Sierra Leone	7.80	82.93
$\ln(P_i^*)$	Egypt	7.94	11.51	$\ln(P_i^*)$	Singapore	10.18	16.04
$\ln(P_i^*)$	El Salvador	8.61	59.08	$\ln(P_i^*)$	South Africa	8.76	15.00
$\ln(P_i^*)$	Estonia	3.82	0.00	$\ln(P_i^*)$	Spain	8.96	1.94
$\ln(P_i^*)$	Ethiopia	6.47	72.61	$\ln(P_i^*)$	Sri Lanka	7.41	28.03
$\ln(P_i^*)$	Finland	9.67	8.41	$\ln(P_i^*)$	Swaziland	8.25	42.94
$\ln(P_i^*)$	France	9.50	1.59	$\ln(P_i^*)$	Sweden	9.84	4.67
$\ln(P_i^*)$	Germany	9.34	4.16	$\ln(P_i^*)$	Switzerland	9.95	2.39
$\ln(P_i^*)$	Greece	9.03	6.62	$\ln(P_i^*)$	Thailand	8.11	29.54
$\ln(P_i^*)$	Hungary	8.33	17.22	$\ln(P_i^*)$	Turkey	8.33	14.25
$\ln(P_i^*)$	India	6.89	35.71	$\ln(P_i^*)$	Uganda	6.91	53.92
$\ln(P_i^*)$	Indonesia	7.51	42.75	$\ln(P_i^*)$	United Kingdom	9.53	4.57
$\ln(P_i^*)$	Ireland	9.36	3.13	$\ln(P_i^*)$	United States	5.77	0.00
$\ln(P_i^*)$	Israel	9.60	7.21	$\ln(P_i^*)$	Uruguay	8.70	6.99
$\ln(P_i^*)$	Italia	9.01	1.49	$\ln(P_i^*)$	Venezuela	9.41	43.16
$\ln(P_i^*)$	Jamaica	8.46	45.56	$\ln(P_i^*)$	Zimbabwe	7.27	14.49
adj-R^2		0.99		Log likelihood		2596.37	
S.E.		0.099		Observations		768	

Table 2: Estimated parameters of the car ownership model (Equation (21))

		Coefficient	z-statistic			Coefficient	z-statistic
δ_2		0.08	7.92	γ		0.37	2.43
βi	Algeria	5.38	3.01	βi	Japan	6.40	2.79
βi	Argentina	5.91	4.16	βi	Jordan	5.54	4.81
βi	Australia	5.56	3.37	βi	Kenya	5.47	5.79
βi	Austria	5.86	1.46	βi	Korea, Rep. of	5.29	3.98
βi	Bangladesh	5.09	5.89	βi	Latvia	5.15	4.34
βi	Belgium	5.84	1.05	βi	Luxembourg	5.85	0.92
βi	Botswana	6.18	5.17	βi	Mexico	5.78	4.08
βi	Brazil	6.03	4.83	βi	Morocco	5.20	4.43
βi	Bulgaria	4.73	3.92	βi	Mozambique	4.77	6.11
βi	Burundi	4.71	6.31	βi	Netherlands	6.06	3.39
βi	Cameroon	5.68	5.70	βi	Norway	6.38	3.11
βi	Canada	5.91	2.89	βi	Pakistan	5.01	5.15
βi	Chile	5.77	4.20	βi	Panama	5.85	4.50
βi	China	5.17	6.17	βi	Paraguay	5.10	4.70
βi	Costa Rica	5.56	4.10	βi	Peru	5.87	4.94
βi	Denmark	6.37	3.22	βi	Portugal	4.93	1.56
βi	Ecuador	5.71	5.14	βi	Sierra Leone	5.72	6.88
βi	Egypt	5.31	4.39	βi	Singapore	6.63	4.19
βi	El Salvador	5.90	5.23	βi	South Africa	5.75	4.35
βi	Estonia	4.60	3.20	βi	Spain	5.59	1.42
βi	Ethiopia	4.73	6.49	βi	Sri Lanka	5.05	5.07
βi	Finland	6.04	3.47	βi	Swaziland	5.61	5.08
βi	France	5.88	1.21	βi	Sweden	6.14	2.70
βi	Germany	5.79	2.89	βi	Switzerland	6.15	1.77

		Coefficient	z-statistic			Coefficient	z-statistic
βi	Greece	5.74	3.48	βi	Thailand	5.49	4.98
βi	Hungary	5.31	4.05	βi	Turkey	5.53	4.45
βi	India	4.77	5.35	βi	Uganda	5.03	6.45
βi	Indonesia	5.15	5.29	βi	United Kingdom	5.91	2.70
βi	Ireland	5.89	2.20	βi	United States	2.29	0.00
βi	Israel	6.08	3.38	βi	Uruguay	5.58	3.58
βi	Italia	5.50	1.18	βi	Venezuela	6.19	4.67
βi	Jamaica	5.59	4.59	βi	Zimbabwe	4.91	4.63
adj-R^2		0.99		Log likelihood		2597.16	
S.E.		0.099		Observations		768	

Table 3: Assumptions and projections of passenger car ownership, 1998-2030

Country	per-capita income (thousands, 2000US$)			Passenger cars per 1000 people aged 15 or more			Passenger car stock (millions)			ratio of growth rates: car ownership to per-capita income	Population (millions)		
	1998	2030	Average annual growth rate (%)	1998	2030	Average annual growth rate (%)	1998	2030	Average annual growth rate (%)		1998	2030	Average annual growth rate (%)
OECD, North America													
Canada	21.2	35.6	1.6	572	757	0.88	13.9	25.1	1.9	0.54	30.1	39.1	0.8
United States	32.7	64.1	2.1	943	997	0.17	203.2	298.6	1.2	0.08	279.0	366.2	0.9
Mexico	5.5	13.5	2.8	157	299	2.04	9.8	30.6	3.6	0.72	96.6	128.1	0.9
OECD, Europe													
Austria	22.7	41.1	1.9	587	850	1.16	3.9	6.3	1.5	0.62	8.1	8.6	0.2
Belgium	20.9	38.1	1.9	534	802	1.28	4.5	7.3	1.5	0.67	10.1	10.8	0.2
Denmark	28.3	51.4	1.9	418	687	1.56	1.8	3.2	1.8	0.83	5.3	5.6	0.2
Finland	21.4	41.7	2.1	481	782	1.53	2.0	3.6	1.8	0.73	5.1	5.5	0.2
France	21.1	38.5	1.9	566	790	1.05	26.8	44.0	1.6	0.55	58.8	66.6	0.4
Germany	22.0	38.9	1.8	604	865	1.13	41.7	59.6	1.1	0.63	82.0	79.3	-0.1
Greece	9.6	20.1	2.3	293	603	2.28	2.7	5.9	2.5	0.97	10.8	11.2	0.1

Country	per-capita income (thousands, 2000US$)			Passenger cars per 1000 people aged 15 or more			Passenger car stock (millions)			ratio of growth rates: car ownership to per-capita income	Population (millions)		
	1998	2030	Average annual growth rate (%)	1998	2030	Average annual growth rate (%)	1998	2030	Average annual growth rate (%)		1998	2030	Average annual growth rate (%)
Hungary	4.1	9.3	2.5	261	627	2.77	2.2	5.0	2.6	1.09	10.3	9.3	-0.3
Ireland	20.9	47.7	2.6	421	791	1.99	1.2	3.6	3.4	0.76	3.7	5.5	1.2
Italia	17.8	31.6	1.8	637	861	0.94	31.4	43.5	1.0	0.52	57.5	57.5	0.0
Luxembourg	39.1	81.4	2.3	706	954	0.94	0.2	0.5	2.1	0.41	0.4	0.6	1.1
Netherlands	21.9	38.3	1.8	463	713	1.36	5.9	10.3	1.7	0.77	15.7	17.1	0.3
Norway	35.9	64.6	1.9	503	766	1.32	1.8	3.4	2.0	0.71	4.4	5.4	0.6
Portugal	9.8	16.8	1.7	543	890	1.56	4.6	8.2	1.8	0.92	10.1	10.6	0.1
Spain	13.4	25.4	2.0	474	771	1.53	16.1	31.3	2.1	0.76	39.9	46.7	0.5
Sweden	24.8	48.1	2.1	527	804	1.33	3.8	6.7	1.8	0.64	8.9	10.0	0.4
Switzerland	33.0	56.6	1.7	578	776	0.93	3.4	5.3	1.4	0.54	7.2	8.1	0.4
Turkey	3.0	6.0	2.2	86	252	3.42	3.8	18.6	5.1	1.57	66.0	92.5	1.1
United Kingdom	23.0	43.4	2.0	506	748	1.23	23.9	41.1	1.7	0.61	58.5	66.2	0.4
OECD, Pacific													
Australia	19.6	33.3	1.7	650	844	0.82	9.5	17.7	1.9	0.49	18.7	25.3	0.9
Japan	36.7	57.3	1.4	465	737	1.45	49.9	77.7	1.4	1.03	126.4	118.3	-0.2
Korea, Rep. of	9.3	30.2	3.7	210	860	4.51	7.6	36.7	5.1	1.20	46.1	48.4	0.2
South America													
Argentina	8.2	16.0	2.1	196	318	1.53	5.0	12.0	2.7	0.73	36.1	47.5	0.9
Brazil	3.4	6.6	2.1	93	128	1.02	10.8	24.0	2.5	0.49	169.1	236.5	1.1
Chile	4.9	11.4	2.7	115	265	2.63	1.2	4.3	3.9	0.98	15.0	19.8	0.9
Costa Rica	3.9	8.7	2.6	126	296	2.70	0.3	1.4	4.7	1.05	3.7	5.8	1.4
Ecuador	1.4	3.0	2.5	39	92	2.72	0.3	1.2	4.4	1.10	11.9	16.7	1.0
El Salvador	2.1	4.2	2.3	35	92	3.02	0.1	0.6	4.8	1.34	6.0	8.9	1.3
Jamaica	3.1	6.4	2.3	83	237	3.36	0.1	0.5	4.2	1.45	2.5	2.9	0.4
Panama	3.8	8.7	2.6	111	202	1.89	0.2	0.7	3.8	0.73	2.8	4.5	1.4
Paraguay	1.5	2.7	1.9	115	203	1.78	0.4	1.3	4.1	0.93	5.1	8.5	1.6
Peru	2.0	4.6	2.6	40	100	2.91	0.6	2.7	4.6	1.13	24.9	35.6	1.1
Uruguay	6.6	12.4	2.0	234	409	1.76	0.6	1.2	2.3	0.88	3.3	3.6	0.3

Country	per-capita income (thousands, 2000US$)			Passenger cars per 1000 people aged 15 or more			Passenger car stock (millions)			ratio of growth rates: car ownership to per-capita income	Population (millions)		
	1998	2030	Average annual growth rate (%)	1998	2030	Average annual growth rate (%)	1998	2030	Average annual growth rate (%)		1998	2030	Average annual growth rate (%)
Venezuela	5.1	9.8	2.0	92	140	1.32	1.4	4.0	3.3	0.65	23.5	37.1	1.4

Middle East and North Africa													
Algeria	1.7	3.6	2.4	87	188	2.44	1.6	6.5	4.4	1.02	29.6	44.7	1.3
Egypt	1.4	2.9	2.3	37	141	4.24	1.5	11.0	6.4	1.84	64.2	104.1	1.5
Israel	17.6	32.4	1.9	304	521	1.70	1.3	3.7	3.4	0.88	5.8	9.2	1.4
Jordan	1.7	3.7	2.4	72	136	2.00	0.2	0.9	4.7	0.83	4.6	8.6	2.0
Morocco	1.2	2.4	2.1	62	162	3.02	1.1	4.9	4.8	1.42	28.1	39.3	1.1
Asia													
Bangladesh	0.3	0.9	3.3	1	24	10.96	0.1	3.8	13.6	3.36	134.2	217.9	1.5
China	0.8	4.7	5.9	7	239	11.62	6.5	288.2	12.6	1.96	1247.5	1458.4	0.5
India	0.4	1.6	4.3	8	153	9.65	5.1	178.1	11.7	2.24	1009.5	1505.7	1.3
Indonesia	0.8	2.1	3.1	20	122	5.80	2.8	27.3	7.4	1.85	206.0	279.7	1.0
Pakistan	0.5	1.3	3.0	12	74	5.78	0.9	12.8	8.6	1.93	137.7	240.3	1.8
Singapore	19.8	46.3	2.7	129	333	2.99	0.4	1.5	4.3	1.11	3.8	5.2	1.0
Sri Lanka	0.8	2.2	3.3	21	161	6.60	0.3	2.6	7.2	1.99	18.5	20.2	0.3
Thailand	1.9	5.4	3.4	57	219	4.29	2.5	12.6	5.1	1.26	59.4	69.2	0.5
Sub-Saharan Africa													
Botswana	2.7	6.9	3.0	36	102	3.31	0.0	0.2	4.9	1.12	1.7	2.4	1.1
Burundi	0.1	0.2	1.6	2	9	4.73	0.0	0.1	8.4	3.02	6.5	17.2	3.1
Cameroon	0.7	1.3	2.3	13	26	2.21	0.1	0.5	4.9	0.97	15.1	26.9	1.8
Ethiopia	0.1	0.3	2.5	2	3	1.42	0.1	0.3	4.6	0.56	65.8	137.1	2.3
Kenya	0.4	0.8	1.9	14	18	0.77	0.2	0.7	3.7	0.41	29.7	62.8	2.4
Mozambique	0.2	0.5	3.0	5	42	6.57	0.1	0.8	9.0	2.16	17.3	31.1	1.9
Sierra Leone	0.2	0.4	2.9	8	11	1.15	0.0	0.1	3.9	0.39	4.4	9.6	2.5
South Africa	3.0	6.4	2.4	128	186	1.16	3.5	7.2	2.3	0.48	43.8	53.2	0.6
Swaziland	1.3	2.5	2.0	62	97	1.39	0.0	0.1	2.8	0.71	1.0	1.3	0.7
Uganda	0.2	0.5	2.4	4	21	5.30	0.0	0.8	9.1	2.23	23.3	61.5	3.1
Zimbabwe	0.7	0.8	0.4	75	84	0.37	0.5	1.0	2.0	1.02	12.3	16.6	0.9
non-OECD Eastern Europe													
Bulgaria	1.4	7.0	5.1	263	759	3.37	1.8	4.2	2.6	0.66	8.1	6.2	-0.8
Estonia	3.6	20.0	5.5	402	930	2.65	0.5	1.0	2.4	0.49	1.4	1.2	-0.4
Latvia	2.9	17.1	5.7	248	790	3.69	0.5	1.4	3.3	0.65	2.4	2.0	-0.6

Table 4: Comparison of projected ratios of ownership growth to per-capita income growth

	1998-2030 Passenger vehicles	DGS (2007), 2002-2030 Total vehicles	IEA (2004), 2002-2030 Total vehicles	IEA (2006), 2004-2030 Total vehicles	SMP (2004), 2000-2030 Light duty vehicles
OECD	0.57	0.42	0.57		0.40
non-OECD	1.84	1.61	1.12		1.13
China	2.03	2.20	1.38	1.96	1.42
India	2.39	1.98	0.39	2.25	1.23
World	1.13*	0.94	0.61	0.86	0.59

(*) 64 countries.

Appendix C Figures

Algeria



Argentina



Australia



Austria



Bangladesh



Belgium



Botswana



Brazil



Bulgaria



Burundi



Cameroon



Canada



Chile



China



Costa Rica



Denmark



Ecuador



Egypt



El Salvador



Estonia



Ethiopia



Finland



France



Germany



Greece



Hungary



India



Indonesia



Ireland



Israel



Italy



Jamaica



Japan



Jordan



Kenya



Korea, Rep. of



Latvia



Luxembourg



Mexico



Morocco



Mozambique



Netherlands



Norway



Pakistan



Panama



Paraguay



Peru



Portugal



Sierra Leone



Singapore



South Africa



Spain



Sri Lanka



Swaziland



Sweden



Switzerland



Thailand



Turkey



Uganda



United Kingdom



United States



Uruguay



Venezuela



Zimbabwe



Déjà parus

CEG-1. D. PERRUCHET, J.-P. CUEILLE,
Compagnies pétrolières internationales : intégration verticale et niveau de risque.
Novembre 1990

CEG-2. C. BARRET, P. CHOLLET,
Canadian gas exports: modeling a market in disequilibrium.
Juin 1990

CEG-3. J.-P. FAVENNEC, V. PREVOT,
Raffinage et environnement.
Janvier 1991

CEG-4. D. BABUSIAUX,
Note sur le choix des investissements en présence de rationnement du capital.
Janvier 1990

CEG-5. J.-L. KARNIK,
Les résultats financiers des sociétés de raffinage distribution en France 1978-89.
Mars 1991

CEG-6. I. CADORET, P. RENOU,
Élasticités et substitutions énergétiques : difficultés méthodologiques.
Avril 1991

CEG-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

CEG-8. J.-M. BREUIL,
Émissions de SO2 dans l'industrie française : une approche technico-économique.
Septembre 1991

CEG-9. A. FAUVEAU, P. CHOLLET, F. LANTZ,
Changements structurels dans un modèle économétrique de demande de carburant.
Octobre 1991

CEG-10. P. RENOU,
Modélisation des substitutions énergétiques dans les pays de l'OCDE.
Décembre 1991

CEG-11. E. DELAFOSSE,
Marchés gaziers du Sud-Est asiatique : évolutions et enseignements.
Juin 1992

CEG-12. F. LANTZ, C. IOANNIDIS,
Analysis of the French gasoline market since the deregulation of prices.
Juillet 1992

CEG-13. K. FAID,
Analysis of the American oil futures market.
Décembre 1992

CEG-14. S. NACHET,
La réglementation internationale pour la prévention et l'indemnisation des pollutions maritimes par les hydrocarbures.
Mars 1993

CEG-15. J.-L. KARNIK, R. BAKER, D. PERRUCHET,
Les compagnies pétrolières : 1973-1993, vingt ans après.
Juillet 1993

CEG-16. N. ALBA-SAUNAL,
Environnement et élasticités de substitution dans l'industrie ; méthodes et interrogations pour l'avenir.
Septembre 1993

CEG-17. E. DELAFOSSE,
Pays en développement et enjeux gaziers : prendre en compte les contraintes d'accès aux ressources locales.
Octobre 1993

CEG-18. J.P. FAVENNEC, D. BABUSIAUX,*
L'industrie du raffinage dans le Golfe arabe, en Asie et en Europe : comparaison et interdépendance.
Octobre 1993

CEG-19. S. FURLAN,
L'apport de la théorie économique à la définition d'externalité.
Juin 1994

CEG-20. M. CADREN,
Analyse économétrique de l'intégration européenne des produits pétroliers : le marché du diesel en Allemagne et en France.
Novembre 1994

CEG-21. J.L. KARNIK, J. MASSERON,*
L'impact du progrès technique sur l'industrie du pétrole.
Janvier 1995

CEG-22. J.P. FAVENNEC, D. BABUSIAUX,
L'avenir de l'industrie du raffinage.
Janvier 1995

CEG- 23. D. BABUSIAUX, S. YAFIL,*
Relations entre taux de rentabilité interne et taux de rendement comptable.
Mai 1995

CEG-24. D. BABUSIAUX, J. JAYLET,*
Calculs de rentabilité et mode de financement des investissements, vers une nouvelle méthode ?
Juin 1996

CEG-25. J.P. CUEILLE, J. MASSERON,*
Coûts de production des énergies fossiles : situation actuelle et perspectives.
Juillet 1996

CEG-26. J.P. CUEILLE, E. JOURDAIN,
Réductions des externalités : impacts du progrès technique et de l'amélioration de l'efficacité énergétique.
Janvier 1997

CEG-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

CEG-28. C. BAUDOUIN, J.P. FAVENNEC,
Marges et perspectives du raffinage.
Avril 1997

CEG-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

CEG-30. J.P. INDJEHAGOPIAN, F. LANTZ, V. SIMON,
Dynamique des prix sur le marché des fiouls domestiques en Europe.
Octobre 1998

CEG-31. A. PIERRU, A. MAURO,
Actions et obligations : des options qui s'ignorent.
Janvier 1999

CEG-32. V. LEPEZ, G. MANDONNET,
Problèmes de robustesse dans l'estimation des réserves ultimes de pétrole conventionnel.
Mars 1999

CEG-33. J. P. FAVENNEC, P. COPINSCHI,
L'amont pétrolier en Afrique de l'Ouest, état des lieux
Octobre 1999

CEG-34. D. BABUSIAUX,
Mondialisation et formes de concurrence sur les grands marchés de matières premières énergétiques : le pétrole.
Novembre 1999

CEG-35. D. RILEY,
The Euro
Février 2000

CEG-36. et 36bis. D. BABUSIAUX, A. PIERRU,*
Calculs de rentabilité et mode de financement des projets d'investissements : propositions méthodologiques.
Avril 2000 et septembre 2000

CEG-37. P. ALBA, O. RECH,
Peut-on améliorer les prévisions énergétiques ?
Mai 2000

CEG-38. J.P. FAVENNEC, D. BABUSIAUX,
Quel futur pour le prix du brut ?
Septembre 2000

ECO-39. S. JUAN, F. LANTZ,
La mise en œuvre des techniques de Bootstrap pour la prévision économétrique : application à l'industrie automobile
Novembre 2000

ECO-40. A. PIERRU, D. BABUSIAUX,
Coût du capital et étude de rentabilité d'investissement : une formulation unique de l'ensemble des méthodes.
Novembre 2000

ECO-41. D. BABUSIAUX,
Les émissions de CO2 en raffinerie et leur affectation aux différents produits finis
Décembre 2000

ECO-42. D. BABUSIAUX,
Éléments pour l'analyse des évolutions des prix du brut.
Décembre 2000

ECO-43. P. COPINSCHI,
Stratégie des acteurs sur la scène pétrolière africaine (golfe de Guinée).
Janvier 2001

ECO-44. V. LEPEZ,
Modélisation de la distribution de la taille des champs d'un système pétrolier, LogNormale ou Fractale ? Une approche unificatrice.
Janvier 2001

ECO-45. S. BARREAU,
Innovations et stratégie de croissance externe : Le cas des entreprises parapétrolières.
Juin 2001

ECO-46. J.P. CUEILLE,
Les groupes pétroliers en 2000 : analyse de leur situation financière.*
Septembre 2001

ECO-47. T. CAVATORTA,
La libéralisation du secteur électrique de l'Union européenne et son impact sur la nouvelle organisation électrique française
Décembre 2001

ECO-48. P. ALBA, O. RECH,
Contribution à l'élaboration des scénarios énergétiques.
Décembre 2001

ECO-49. A. PIERRU,*
Extension d'un théorème de dualité en programmation linéaire : Application à la décomposition de coûts marginaux de long terme.
Avril 2002

ECO-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

ECO-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

ECO-52. J.P. FAVENNEC,
Géopolitique du pétrole au début du XXI^e^ siècle
Janvier 2003

ECO-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

ECO-54. T. CAVATORTA, M. SCHENCKERY,
Les majors pétroliers vers le multi énergies : mythe ou réalité ?
Juin 2003

ECO-55. P.R. BAUQUIS,*
Quelles énergies pour les transports au XXI^e^ siècle ?
Janvier 2004

ECO-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

ECO-57. N. BRET-ROUZAUT, M. THOM,
Technology Strategy in the Upstream Petroleum Supply Chain.
Mars 2005

ECO-58. A. PIERRU,
Allocating the CO_2 emissions of an oil refinery with Aumann-Shapley prices.
June 2005

ECO-59. F. LESCAROUX,
Les conséquences économiques de la hausse du prix du pétrole.*
Mai 2006

ECO-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

ECO-61. C. I. VASQUEZ JOSSE, A. NEUMANN,
Transatlantic Natural Gas Price and Oil Price Relationships - An Empirical Analysis.
Septembre 2006

ECO-62. E. HACHE,
Une analyse de la stratégie des compagnies pétrolières internationales entre 1999 et 2004.
Juillet 2006

ECO-63 F. BERNARD, A. PRIEUR,
Biofuel market and carbon modeling to evaluate French biofuel policy.
Octobre 2006

ECO-64. E. HACHE,
Que font les compagnies pétrolières internationales de leurs profits ?
Janvier 2007

ECO-65. A. PIERRU,
A note on the valuation of subsidized Loans - Working paper
Janvier 2007

ECO-66. D. BABUSIAUX, P. R. BAUQUIS,*
Que penser de la raréfaction des ressources pétrolières et de l'évolution du prix du brut ?
Septembre 2007

* une version anglaise de cet article est disponible sur demande