



# NOTA DI LAVORO

91.2011

---

## Oil Price Forecast Evaluation with Flexible Loss Functions

---

By **Andrea Bastianin**, Department of Statistics, University of Milan-Bicocca, and Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Italy

**Matteo Manera**, Department of Statistics, University of Milan-Bicocca, and Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Italy

**Anil Markandya**, BC3 Basque Centre for Climate Change, Bilbao, Spain

**Elisa Scarpa**, Edison Trading, Milan, Italy

## Energy: Resources and Markets Series

Editor: Giuseppe Sammarco

### Oil Price Forecast Evaluation with Flexible Loss Functions

By Andrea Bastianin, Department of Statistics, University of Milan-Bicocca, and Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Italy

Matteo Manera, Department of Statistics, University of Milan-Bicocca, and Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Italy

Anil Markandya, BC3 Basque Centre for Climate Change, Bilbao, Spain

Elisa Scarpa, Edison Trading, Milan, Italy

#### Summary

The empirical literature is very far from any consensus about the appropriate model for oil price forecasting that should be implemented. Relative to the previous literature, this paper is novel in several respects. First of all, we test and systematically evaluate the ability of several alternative econometric specifications proposed in the literature to capture the dynamics of oil prices. Second, we analyse the effects of different data frequencies on the coefficient estimates and forecasts obtained using each selected econometric specification. Third, we compare different models at different data frequencies on a common sample and common data. Fourth, we evaluate the forecasting performance of each selected model using static forecasts, as well as different measures of forecast errors. Finally, we propose a new class of models which combine the relevant aspects of the financial and structural specifications proposed in the literature (“mixed” models). Our empirical findings suggest that, irrespective of the shape of the loss function, the class of financial models is to be preferred to time series models. Both financial and time series models are better than mixed and structural models. Results of the Diebold and Mariano test are not conclusive, for the loss differential seems to be statistically insignificant in the large majority of cases. Although the random walk model is not statistically outperformed by any of the alternative models, the empirical findings seem to suggest that theoretically well-grounded financial models are valid instruments for producing accurate forecasts of the WTI spot price.

**Keywords:** Oil Price, WTI Spot and Futures Prices, Forecasting, Econometric Models

**JEL Classification:** C52, C53, Q32, Q43

*The authors would like to thank Giliola Frey, Marzio Galeotti, Alessandro Lanza, Michael McAleer and Yves Smeers for insightful discussion, as well as seminar participants at the University of Bath, FEEM and the University of Milan-Bicocca for helpful comments. The authors are grateful to Chiara Longo for her research assistance related to a previous version of the paper. Andrea Bastianin gratefully acknowledges the following research grant: “Dote Ricercatori: FSE, Regione Lombardia”.*

*Address for correspondence:*

Matteo Manera  
Department of Statistics  
University of Milan-Bicocca  
Via Bicocca degli Arcimboldi, 8 - Building U7  
20126 Milan  
Italy  
Phone: +39 0264485819  
Fax: +39 0264485878  
E-mail: [matteo.manera@unimib.it](mailto:matteo.manera@unimib.it)

# Oil Price Forecast Evaluation with Flexible Loss Functions

Andrea Bastianin

*Department of Statistics, University of Milan-Bicocca, Italy  
and  
Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Milan, Italy*

Matteo Manera

*Department of Statistics, University of Milan-Bicocca, Italy  
and  
Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Milan, Italy*

Anil Markandya

*BC3 Basque Centre for Climate Change, Bilbao, Spain*

Elisa Scarpa

*Edison Trading, Milan, Italy*

Revised: October 2011

**Keywords.** Oil price; WTI spot and futures prices; Forecasting; Econometric models.

**JEL classification.** C52; C53; Q32; Q43.

**Corresponding author.** Matteo Manera - Department of Statistics - University of Milan-Bicocca - Via Bicocca degli Arcimboldi, 8 - Building U7 - 20126 Milan - Italy - Phone: +39-0264485819 - Fax: +39-0264485878 - E-mail: [matteo.manera@unimib.it](mailto:matteo.manera@unimib.it)

**Acknowledgements.** The authors would like to thank Giliola Frey, Marzio Galeotti, Alessandro Lanza, Michael McAleer and Yves Smeers for insightful discussion, as well as seminar participants at the University of Bath, FEEM and the University of Milan-Bicocca for helpful comments. The authors are grateful to Chiara Longo for her research assistance related to a previous version of the paper. Andrea Bastianin gratefully acknowledges the following research grant: “Dote Ricercatori: FSE, Regione Lombardia”.

# Oil Price Forecast Evaluation with Flexible Loss Functions

**Abstract.** The empirical literature is very far from any consensus about the appropriate model for oil price forecasting that should be implemented. Relative to the previous literature, this paper is novel in several respects. First of all, we test and systematically evaluate the ability of several alternative econometric specifications proposed in the literature to capture the dynamics of oil prices. Second, we analyse the effects of different data frequencies on the coefficient estimates and forecasts obtained using each selected econometric specification. Third, we compare different models at different data frequencies on a common sample and common data. Fourth, we evaluate the forecasting performance of each selected model using static forecasts, as well as different measures of forecast errors. Finally, we propose a new class of models which combine the relevant aspects of the financial and structural specifications proposed in the literature (“mixed” models). Our empirical findings suggest that, irrespective of the shape of the loss function, the class of financial models is to be preferred to time series models. Both financial and time series models are better than mixed and structural models. Results of the Diebold and Mariano test are not conclusive, for the loss differential seems to be statistically insignificant in the large majority of cases. Although the random walk model is not statistically outperformed by any of the alternative models, the empirical findings seem to suggest that theoretically well-grounded financial models are valid instruments for producing accurate forecasts of the WTI spot price.

## 1 Introduction

The relevance of oil in the world economy is undisputable. According to Eni (2010), the world oil production in 2009 amounted to 82,165 thousand barrels per day (tbd). OPEC countries produced 33,363 tbd (40.6% of the world oil production) in 2009, while OECD countries and Europe (25 countries) were responsible of 19,427 tbd (23.6%) and 2,187 tbd (2.7%), respectively. At 1 January 2010 world oil stocks were estimated at 1,191,066 million barrels. If OPEC countries alone hold 80.2% of world oil reserves, OECD and European countries can directly count only on 7% and 0.8%, respectively. Moreover, world oil consumption in 2009 was measured in 85,006 tbd, 59.6% of which originates from the OECD countries. The impact of oil on the financial markets is at least equally important. The NYMEX average daily open interest volume (OIV)<sup>1</sup> on oil futures and options contracts, which was equal to 634,549 contracts during the period 2002-2005, increased to 1,255,986 contracts during the period 2006-2010 (source: Commodity Futures Trading Commission, 2010).

Moreover, the peculiar nature of oil price dynamics has attracted the attention of many researchers in recent years. As an example, in Figure 1 we report the behaviour of the WTI spot price over the period January 1986 - December 2005. From an inspection of this graph, it is easy to verify that both level and volatility of WTI spot price are highly sensitive to specific economic and geo-political events. For instance, the small price fluctuations of the years 1986-1990 are the result of the OPEC's production quotas repeated adjustments. The 1990 sharp increase in WTI spot price is obviously due to the Gulf war. The remarkable price falls of the period 1997-1998 coincide with the pronounced slowdown of Asian economic growth. The reduction in OPEC's production quotas of 1999 has been followed immediately by a sharp price increase. Finally, if the price decreases in 2001 are related to terrorist attack of 11 September, the reduction of the WTI spot price levels recorded in the period 2002-2005 are again justified by falling OPEC production quotas and spare capacity.

The more recent evolution of the WTI spot price demonstrates how oil price forecasting is challenging. On 11 August 2005 oil price has risen to over US\$ 60 per barrel (pb), while one year later it has topped out at the record level of US\$ 77.05 pb. Experts have again attributed the spike in oil price to a variety of economic and geo-political factors, including the North Korean crisis, the Israel-Lebanon conflict, the Iranian nuclear threat and the decline in US oil reserves. At the end of the summer 2006, the WTI oil price has begun to decrease and reached the level of US\$ 56.82 pb

---

<sup>1</sup> Open interest volume is measured as the sum of all long contracts (or, equivalently, as the sum of all short contracts) held by market participants at the end of a trading day. It is a proxy for the flow of money into the oil futures and options market.

on 20 October 2006. In the meantime, OPEC has announced production cuts to stop the sliding price. On 16 January 2007 prices have been even lower: US\$ 51.21 pb for the WTI spot price and US\$ 51.34 for the first position of the NYMEX oil futures contract.

Given the relevance of oil in the world economy and the peculiar characteristics of the oil price time series, it is hardly surprising that considerable effort has been devoted to the development of different types of econometric models for oil price forecasting.

Several specifications have been proposed in the economic literature. Some are based on financial theory and concentrate on the relationship between spot and futures prices (“financial” models). Others assign a key role to variables explaining the characteristics of the physical oil market (“structural” models). These two main groups of models have often been compared to standard time series models, such as the random walk and the pure first-order autoregressive model, which are simple and, differently from financial and structural models, do not rely on additional explanatory variables.

It should be noticed that most of the econometric models for oil price forecasting available in the literature are single-equation, linear reduced forms. Two recent noticeable exceptions are represented by Moshiri and Foroutan (2006) and Dees et al. (2007). The first study uses a single-equation, non-linear artificial neural network model to forecast daily crude oil futures prices over the period 4 April 1983 - 13 January 2003. The second contribution discusses a multiple-equation, linear model of the world oil market which specifies oil demand, oil supply for non-OPEC producers, as well as a price rule including market conditions and OPEC behaviour. The forecasting performance of this model is assessed on quarterly data over the period 1995-2000.

The empirical literature is very far from any consensus about the appropriate model for oil price forecasting that should be implemented. Findings vary across models, time periods and data frequencies. This paper provides fresh new evidence to bear on the following key question: does a best performing model for oil price forecasting really exist, or aren't accurate oil price forecasts anything more than a mere illusion?

Relative to the previous literature, the paper is novel in several respects.

First of all, in this paper we test and systematically evaluate the ability of several alternative econometric specifications proposed in the literature to capture the dynamics of oil prices. We have chosen to concentrate our investigation on single-equation and multiple-equations linear reduced forms, since models of this type are the most widely used in the literature and by the practitioners. In this respect, our study complements the empirical findings presented in Moshiri and Foroutan (2006), which are focused on the forecasting performance of a single non-linear model.

Second, this paper analyses the effects of different data frequencies (daily, weekly, monthly and quarterly) on the coefficient estimates and forecasts obtained using each selected econometric specification. The factors which potentially affect the goodness of fit and forecasting performance of an econometric model are numerous, the most important being sample period and data frequency. The fact that no unanimous conclusions could be drawn by previous studies on the forecasting performance of similar models may depend, among other things, upon the particular data frequency used in each investigation.

Third, in this paper we compare different models at different data frequencies on a common sample and common data. For this purpose, we have constructed specific data sets which enable us to evaluate different types of econometric specifications involving different explanatory variables on the same sample period. Within our composite data base, the WTI spot oil price as well as the majority of the explanatory variables are recorded at different frequencies.

Fourth, we evaluate the forecasting performance of each selected model using static one step-ahead forecasts, as well as different measures of forecast errors based on symmetric and asymmetric loss functions. At the same time, we present formal statistical procedures for comparing the predictive ability of the models estimated.

Finally, we propose a new class of models, namely the mixed models, which combine the relevant aspects of the financial and structural specifications proposed in the literature.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we briefly review the existing empirical literature related to oil price forecasting. Section 3 presents and describes the data collected for the empirical analysis. In Section 4 the empirical results obtained by forecasting oil prices with alternative econometric models are discussed. The performance of each model is analysed using different measures of forecasting ability and graphical evaluation “within” each class of models (i.e. financial, structural, time series and mixed models). Section 5 summarizes the forecasting performance of the alternative specifications, with particular emphasis on “between”-class analogies and differences. Some conclusions and directions for future research are presented in Section 6.

## **2 The existing literature on oil price forecasting**

The literature on oil price forecasting has focused on two main classes of linear, single-equation, reduced-form econometric models. The first group (“financial” models) includes models which are directly inspired by financial economic theory and based on the market efficiency hypothesis (MEH), while models belonging to the second class (“structural” models) consider the

effects of oil market agents and real variables on oil prices.<sup>2</sup> Both financial and structural models often use pure time series specifications for benchmarking.<sup>3</sup>

## 2.1 Financial models

In general, financial models for oil price forecasting examine the relationship between the oil spot price at time  $t$  ( $S_t$ ) and the oil futures price at time  $t$  with maturity  $T$  ( $F_t$ ), analyzing, in particular, whether futures prices are unbiased and efficient predictors of spot prices. The reference model is:

$$S_{t+1} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 F_t + \varepsilon_{t+1} \quad (1)$$

where the joint null hypothesis of unbiasedness ( $\beta_0=0$  and  $\beta_1=1$ ) should not be rejected, and no autocorrelation should be found in the error terms (efficiency). A rejection of the joint null hypothesis on the coefficients  $\beta_0$  and  $\beta_1$  is usually rationalised by the literature in terms of the presence of a time-varying risk premium.

A sub-group of models, which are also based on financial theory but have been less investigated, exploits the following spot-futures price arbitrage relationship:

$$F_t = S_t e^{(r+\omega-\delta)(T-t)} \quad (2)$$

where  $r$  is the interest rate,  $\omega$  is the cost of storage and  $\delta$  is the convenience yield.<sup>4</sup>

Samii (1992) attempts at unifying the two approaches described in equations (1) and (2) by introducing a model where the spot price is a function of the futures price and the interest rate. Using both daily (20 September 1991 - 15 July 1992) and monthly (January 1984 - June 1992) data on WTI spot price and futures prices with three- and six-month maturity, he concludes that the role

---

<sup>2</sup> As pointed out in the Introduction and at the beginning of Section 2, the models analysed in this paper are linear, single-equation, reduced-forms. In this context, we use the term “structural model” to identify a specification whose explanatory variables capture the real and strategic (as opposed to financial) aspects of the oil market.

<sup>3</sup> Interesting exceptions are Pyndyck (1999) and Radchenko (2005), who propose alternative forecasting models in a pure time series framework. See Section 2.2 for details.

<sup>4</sup> The arbitrage relationship (2) means that the futures price must be equal to the cost of financing the purchase of the spot asset today and holding it until the futures maturity date (which includes the borrowing cost for the initial purchase, or interest rate, and any storage cost), once the continuous dividend yield paid out by the underlying asset (i.e. the convenience yield) has been taken into account. See, among others, Clewlow and Strickland (2000) and Geman (2005) for details on the arbitrage relationship (2) for energy commodities.



played by the interest rate is unclear and that, although the correlation between spot and futures prices is very high, it is not possible to identify which is the driving variable.

An overall comparison of financial and time series models is offered by Zeng and Swanson (1998), who evaluate the in-sample and out-of-sample performance of several specifications. The authors use a daily dataset over the period 4 January 1990 - 31 October 1991 and specify a random walk, an autoregressive model and two alternative Error Correction models (ECM, see Engle and Granger, 1987), each with a different definition of long-run equilibrium. The deviation from the equilibrium level which characterizes the first ECM is equal to the difference between the futures price tomorrow and the futures price today, i.e. the so-called “price spread”. In the second ECM, the error correction term recalls the relationship between spot and futures prices, which involves the cost of storage and the convenience yield, as reported in equation (2). The predictive performance of each model is evaluated using several formal and informal criteria. The empirical evidence shows that the ECM specifications outperform the others. In particular, the ECM based on the cost-of-storage theory performs better than the ECM which specifies the error correction term as the spot-futures price spread.

Bopp and Lady (1991) investigate the performance of lagged futures and spot oil prices as explanatory variables in forecasting the oil spot price. Using monthly data on spot and futures prices for heating oil during the period December 1980 - October 1988, they find empirical support to the cost-of-storage theory.<sup>5</sup> The authors also compare a random walk against the reference financial model. In this case, the empirical evidence suggests that both models perform equally well.

Serletis (1991) analyses daily data on one-month futures price (as a proxy for the spot price) and two-month futures price (quoted at NYMEX) for heating oil, unleaded gasoline and crude oil, relative to the period 1 July 1983 - 31 August 1988 (the time series of gasoline starts on 14 March 1985). He argues that the presence of a time-varying premium worsens the forecasting ability of futures prices.

In the empirical literature on oil prices there is no unanimous consensus about the validity of MEH. For instance, Green and Mork (1991) offer evidence against the validity of unbiasedness and MEH, analysing monthly prices on Mideast Light and African Light/North Sea crude oils over the period 1978-1985. Nevertheless, the authors notice that, if the subsample 1981-1985 is considered, MEH is supported by the data, because of the different market conditions characterizing the two time periods.

---

<sup>5</sup> Two different spot prices are considered, namely the national average price reported by the Energy Information Administration (EIA) in the Monthly Energy Review, and the New York Harbor ex-shore price, while the futures contract is quoted at NYMEX.

The unreliability of unbiasedness and MEH is also pointed out by Moosa and Al-Loughani (1994), who analyse WTI monthly data covering the period January 1986 - July 1990. The authors exploit cointegration between the series on spot price and three-month and six-month futures contracts using an ECM, and show that futures prices are neither unbiased nor efficient. Moosa and Al-Loughani apply a GARCH-in-mean model to take into account the time-varying structure of the risk premium.

Gulen (1998) asserts the validity of MEH by introducing the posted oil price as an additional explanatory variable in the econometric specification. In particular, using monthly data on WTI (spot price and one-month, three-month and six-month futures prices) for the period March 1983 - October 1995, he verifies the explanatory power of the posted price by using both futures and posted prices as independent variables. Empirical evidence from this study suggests that futures prices outperform the posted price, although the latter has some predictive content in the short horizon.

Morana's analysis (2001), based on daily data from 2 November 1982 to 21 January 1999, confirms that the Brent forward price can be an unbiased predictor of the future spot price, but in more than 50 percent of the cases the sign of the changes in oil price cannot be accurately predicted. He compares a financial model with a random walk specification and shows that, when considering a short horizon, both specifications are biased.

Chernenko et al. (2004) test the MEH by focusing on the price spread relationship:

$$S_{t+T} - S_t = \beta_0 + \beta_1(F_t - S_t) + \varepsilon_t \quad (3)$$

Analysing monthly data on WTI for the period April 1989 - December 2003, the authors compare model (3) with a random walk specification and find that the empirical performance of the two models is very similar, confirming the validity of MEH.

The same model (3) is tested by Chin et al. (2005) with a monthly dataset on WTI spot price and three-month, six-month and twelve-month futures prices covering the period January 1999 - October 2004. The empirical findings are, in this case, supportive of unbiasedness and MEH.

Another interesting application of financial models to the oil spot-futures price relationship is proposed by Abosedra (2005), who compares the forecasting ability of the futures price in model (3) with a naïve forecast of the spot price. Specifically, assuming that the WTI spot price can be approximated by a random walk with no drift, he forecasts the daily one-month-ahead price using the previous trading day's spot price and constructs the naïve monthly predictor as a simple average of the daily forecasts. Using data for the period January 1991 - December 2001, he finds that both

the futures price and the naïve forecast are unbiased and efficient predictors for the spot price. The investigation of the relationship between the forecast errors of the two predictors allows the author to conclude that the futures price is a semi-strongly efficient predictor, i.e. the forecast error of the futures price cannot be improved by any information embedded in the naïve forecast.

## 2.2 *Structural models*

Structural models, that is models based on economic fundamentals, emphasise the importance of explanatory variables describing the peculiar characteristics of the oil market. Some examples are offered by variables which are strategic for the oil market (i.e. industrial and government oil inventory levels), “real” variables (e.g. oil consumption and production), and variables accounting for the role played by OPEC in the international oil market.

Kaufmann (1995) models the real import price of oil using as structural explanatory variables the world oil demand, the level of OECD oil stocks, OPEC productive capacity, as well as OPEC and US capacity utilisation (defined as the ratio between oil production and productive capacity). The author also accounts for the strategic behaviour of OPEC and the 1974 oil shock with specific dummy variables. His analysis exploits an annual dataset for the period 1954-1989. Regression results show that his specification is successful in capturing oil price variations between 1956 and 1989, that is the coefficients of the structural variables are significant and the model explains a high percentage of the oil price changes within the sample period.

More recently, Kaufmann (2004) and Dees et al. (2007) specify a different forecasting model on a quarterly dataset. In particular, the first paper refers to the period 1986-2000, while the second contribution considers the sample 1984-2002. In these studies the authors pay particular attention to OPEC behaviour, using as structural regressors the OPEC quota (defined as the quantity of oil to be produced by OPEC members), OPEC overproduction (i.e. the quantity of oil produced which exceeds the OPEC quota), capacity utilisation and the ratio between OECD oil stocks and OECD oil demand. Using an ECM, the authors show that OPEC is able to influence real oil prices, while their econometric specification is able to produce accurate in-sample static and dynamic forecasts.

A number of authors introduce the role of the relative oil inventory level (defined as the deviation of oil inventories from their normal level) as an additional determinant of oil prices, for this variable is supposed to summarize the link between oil demand and production. In general, two kinds of oil stocks can be considered, namely industrial and governmental. The relative level of industrial oil stocks (*RIS*) is calculated as the difference between the actual level (*IS*) and the normal level of industrial oil stocks (*IS\**), the latter corresponding to the industrial oil inventories de-seasonalised and de-trended. Since the government oil stocks tend to be constant in the short-run,

the relative level of government oil stocks (*RGS*) can be obtained by simply removing the trend component.

Ye et al. (2002), (2005) and (2007) develop three different models based on the oil relative inventory level to forecast the WTI spot price. In their 2002 paper, the authors build up a model on a monthly dataset for the period January 1992-February 2001, where oil prices are explained in terms of the relative industrial oil stocks level and of a variable describing an oil stock level lower than normal. Ye et al. (2005) present a basic monthly model of WTI spot prices which uses, as explanatory variables, three lags of the relative industrial oil stock level, the lagged dependent variable, a set of dummies accounting for the terrorist attack of 11 September 2001 (*D01*) and a “leverage” (i.e. step) dummy equal to one from 1999 onwards (*S99*) and zero before 1999, aimed at picking a structural change of the OPEC behaviour in the oil market<sup>6</sup>. The authors compare this specification with: i) an autoregressive model which includes AR(1) and AR(12) terms and dummies *D01* and *S99*; ii) a structural model where the oil spot price is a function of the one-month lag of the industrial oil inventories, the deviation of industrial oil stocks from the previous year’s level, the one-month lag of the oil spot price, as well as the dummy variables *D01* and *S99*. Each model is estimated over the period 1992-2003. The basic model outperforms the other two specifications: in particular, the time series model is unable to capture oil price variability. The performance of each model is evaluated by calculating out-of-sample forecasts for the period 2000-2003. The forecasting accuracy of the two structural models depends on the presence of oil price troughs or peaks within the sample period. When considering three-month-ahead forecasts, the basic model exhibits a higher forecasting performance in presence of oil price peaks, while the second structural specification outperforms the basic model in presence of oil price troughs. On the basis of this last evidence, Ye et al. (2007), using the same dataset, take into account the asymmetric transmission of oil stock changes to oil prices. The authors define a low (*LIS*) and a high (*HIS*) relative industrial oil stock level as follows:

$$\begin{cases} LIS_t = RIS_t + \sigma_{IS} & \text{if} & RIS_t < -\sigma_{IS} \\ LIS_t = 0 & \text{otherwise} & \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

---

<sup>6</sup> The oil price increases, characterizing the 90s, came to a rapid end in 1997 and 1998 when the impact of the economic crisis in Asia was either ignored or severely underestimated by OPEC who increased its quota by 10 percent January 1, 1998. The combination of lower consumption and higher OPEC production sent prices into a downward spiral. In response, OPEC cut quotas by 1.25 million b/d in April and another 1.335 million in July. Price continued down through December 1998. Prices began to recover in early 1999 and OPEC reduced production another 1.719 million barrels in April. Not all of the quotas were observed but between early 1998 and the middle of 1999 OPEC production dropped by about 3 million barrels per day and was sufficient to move prices above \$25 per barrel.

$$\begin{cases} HIS_t = RIS_t - \sigma_{IS} & \text{if} & RIS_t < \sigma_{IS} \\ HIS_t = 0 & \text{otherwise} & \end{cases}$$

where  $\sigma_{IS}$  indicates the standard deviation of the industrial oil stock level.

The estimated model is:

$$\begin{aligned} S_t = & \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 S_{t-1} + \sum_{j=0}^5 \psi_j D01_{jt} + \lambda S99_t + \sum_{i=0}^k \beta_i RIS_{t-i} + \sum_{i=0}^k (\gamma_i LIS_{t-i} + \delta_i LIS_{t-i}^2) + \\ & + \sum_{i=0}^k (\phi_i HIS_{t-i} + \varphi_i HIS_{t-i}^2) + \varepsilon_t \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

which shows a more accurate forecasting performance than the linear specification proposed by Ye et al. (2005).

Following Ye et al. (2002), Merino and Ortiz (2005) specify an ECM with the percentage of relative industrial oil stocks and “speculation” (defined as the log-run positions held by non-commercials of oil, gasoline and heating oil in the NYMEX futures market) as explanatory variables. Evidence from January 1992 to June 2004 demonstrates that speculation can significantly improve the inventory model proposed by Ye et al., especially in the last part of the sample.

Zamani (2004) proposes a forecasting model based on a quarterly dataset for the period 1988-2004 and specifies an ECM with the following independent variables: OPEC quota, OPEC overproduction,  $RIS$ ,  $RGS$ , non-OECD oil demand and a dummy for the last two quarters of 1990, which accounts for the Iraq war. The accuracy of the in-sample dynamic forecasts is indicative of the model’s capability of capturing the oil price evolution.

In the pure time series framework, two models, which are particularly useful for forecasting oil prices in the long-run, are proposed by Pindyck (1999) and Radchenko (2005). The data used by the authors cover the period 1870-1996 and refer to nominal oil prices deflated by wholesale prices expressed in US dollars (base year is 1967). Pindyck (1999) specifies the following model:

$$\begin{cases} S_t = \rho S_{t-1} + (\beta_1 + \phi_{1t}) + (\beta_2 + \phi_{2t})t + \beta_3 t^2 + \varepsilon_t \\ \phi_{1t} = \alpha_1 \phi_{1,t-1} + v_{1t} \\ \phi_{2t} = \alpha_2 \phi_{2,t-1} + v_{2t} \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

where  $\phi_{1t}$  and  $\phi_{2t}$  are unobservable state variables. He estimates the model with a Kalman filter and confronts its forecasting ability with the following specification:

$$S_t = \rho S_{t-1} + \beta_1 + \beta_2 t + \beta_3 t^2 + \varepsilon_t \quad (7)$$

on the full dataset and three sub-samples, namely 1870-1970, 1970-1980 and 1870-1981. Model (6) offers a better explanation of the fluctuations of oil prices, while specification (7) produces more accurate forecasts.

Radchenko (2005) extends Pindyck's model, allowing the error terms to follow an autoregressive process:

$$\begin{cases} S_t = \rho S_{t-1} + \beta_1 + \phi_{1t} + \phi_{2t} t + \varepsilon_t \\ \phi_{1t} = \alpha_1 \phi_{1,t-1} + \nu_{1t} \\ \phi_{2t} = \alpha_2 \phi_{2,t-1} + \nu_{2t} \\ \varepsilon_t = \varphi \varepsilon_{t-1} + u_t \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

The forecasting horizons are 1986-2011, 1981-2011, 1976-2011 and 1971-2011. Overall, the empirical findings confirm Pindyck's results, although the model is unable to account for OPEC behaviour, leading to unreasonable price declines. Nevertheless, the author suggests that forecasting results can be improved significantly by combining specification (8) with a random walk and an autoregressive model, which can be considered a proxy for future OPEC behaviour.

### 3 Data and Methods

#### 3.1 Data

We have constructed four different datasets, with the following frequencies: daily, weekly, monthly and quarterly. Prices refer to WTI crude oil spot price ( $S_t$ ) and WTI crude oil futures prices contracts with one-month, two-month, three-month and four-month maturity ( $F_{t,1}-F_{t,4}$ ), as reported by EIA. Weekly, monthly and quarterly data have been obtained by aggregating daily observations with simple arithmetic means, taking into account that the futures contract rolls over on the third business day prior to the 25th calendar day of the month preceding the delivery month. The sample covers the period 2 January 1986 - 31 December 2005 (see Figure 1).

Due to the limited availability of structural variables at high frequencies, the daily and weekly datasets include observations on the WTI prices only. Therefore, we have concentrated our analysis

on financial and time series models at daily and weekly frequencies, whereas we have estimated the structural specifications using monthly and quarterly data.

The monthly dataset includes observations over the period January 1988 - August 2005 for the following variables: OECD industrial crude oil stocks (*RIS*); oil demand in the OECD countries (*OD*); the world crude oil production (*WP*); the commodity price index (*PPI*), with June 1982 as basis. All variables are expressed in million barrels per day (mbd) and are obtained from EIA, with the single exception of *PPI*, which is from the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

The quarterly data range from the first quarter of 1993 to the third quarter of 2005 and refer to the following variables: total oil demand, computed (*TOTD*) as the sum of the OECD (*OOD*) and non-OECD (*NOOD*) oil demand, *RIS*, and the OPEC (*OP*) crude oil production.

Moreover, both the monthly and quarterly dataset include a variable labelled as *NCLP* that is a measure of long position held by non-commercial derivative traders. Commercial and noncommercial are the labels currently used by the U.S. Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC) to categorize traders. Commercial traders (commonly called hedgers) are futures market participants whose line of business is in the related cash market. They may speculate at times; however, they mostly hedge cash commitments. Noncommercial traders (commonly called speculators) are participants whose main line of business is unrelated to the cash market. Mostly they speculate, but from time to time they may hedge a cash position. The complete list of the variables employed in the empirical analysis is summarized in Table 1.

## 3.2 Models

We have evaluated the forecasting performance of different econometric models available in the existing literature, which can be subsumed under the two main classes described in Section 2, that of financial and that of structural models. We also propose a new class of models which combine the relevant aspects of financial and structural models (i.e. mixed models), and are based on the assumption that the interaction between financial and macroeconomic variables can improve the understanding of oil price behaviour. Financial, structural and mixed models are confronted with pure time series specifications. As already noted, due to data constraints, structural and mixed forecast are produced only with monthly and quarterly data.

Irrespective of the sampling frequency of the data, all variables, with the only exception of *RIS*, have been transformed into logarithms. We denote the logarithm of a variable with lower-case letters (i.e.  $x_t = \log X_t$ ). Moreover, we use  $\Delta$  (i.e.  $\Delta^k x_t = x_t - x_{t-k}$ ) to indicate the difference operator.

### 3.2.1 Time Series Models

When evaluating a set of competing forecasts it is important to define a benchmark model; in the case of the price of oil the random walk (*RW*) represents a natural choice:

$$s_t = s_{t-1} + e_t \quad (9)$$

where  $e_t$  is a white noise error. The *RW* model is also known as “no-change forecast”, since it is assumed that the best predictor for the oil price tomorrow is the oil price today.

The second time series model we consider is also a random walk, but in this case we add a drift term (*RWD*):

$$s_t = \delta + s_{t-1} + e_t \quad (10)$$

The strength of these models, that explicitly impose a unit root behaviour for  $s_t$ , is their simplicity in both the estimation and forecasting stages. Actually, while the *RW* model does not need to be estimated, the *RWD* requires just to compute the OLS estimate of the sample average of  $\Delta s_t$ . Finally, we note that the usefulness of random walk models as benchmarks stems from the fact that they often out-perform more complex alternatives (Zeng and Swanson, 1998).

### 3.2.2 Financial models

In Section 3 we have pointed out that, irrespective of the frequency considered, the WTI spot price and the four WTI futures prices involved in the empirical analysis are  $I(1)$ .<sup>7</sup> Moreover, the WTI spot price and each WTI futures price are cointegrated, that is there exists a stationary, long-run equilibrium relationship between the WTI spot price and the WTI futures price at different maturities. Interestingly, these statistical findings can be explained by standard economic theory and used to build a forecasting models for the spot price of oil. In particular, the cost-of-carry model posits that the futures price of storable commodities, such as crude oil, depends on the spot price as well as on the cost of holding the commodity until the delivery date. This cost, known as the cost-of-carry, includes both the storage and the opportunity cost incurred by while awaiting delivery

---

<sup>7</sup> The results of the unit root tests are omitted from the paper to save space. Needless to say, they are available from the authors upon request.



some time in the future (see Pyndyck, 2001, for a survey). Assuming that investors can trade simultaneously in the spot and futures markets, we can write the (log) cost-of-carry model as:

$$f_{t,i} - s_t = d_t + Q_t \quad (11)$$

where the term on the left-hand side is known as the “basis”,  $d_t$  is the (log) cost-of-carry and  $Q_t$  is an adjustment term accounting for the marking-to-market feature of futures markets. As shown by Brenner and Kroner (1995), if we are willing to assume that the log-spot price follows a random walk with drift and that investors are rational, we can use equation (11) to derive the set of financial models:

$$s_t = \alpha + \beta f_{t,i} + \varepsilon_t \quad (12)$$

where  $\alpha$  subsumes the terms on the right-hand side of equation (12) and  $\varepsilon_t$  is an uncorrelated error term. Notice that we can derive a joint test of hypotheses; in fact testing if  $(\alpha, \beta) = (0, 1)$  is both a test of the optimality of  $f_{t,i}$  as a predictor for  $s_t$  and a test of the Efficient Market Hypothesis, i.e. if new information is immediately incorporated into spot prices, then, on average, the futures price should be equal to the spot price.

These considerations form the basis for deriving the operational versions of financial models which are used to produce a second set of forecasts. All these models exploit the cointegrating relation between spot and futures prices. We consider four bivariate Vector Error Correction Models (VECM), denoted as FUT1-FUT4, which exploit the information content of futures contracts with different maturities:

$$\Delta s_t = \beta_{0i} + \beta_{1i} \Delta s_{t-1} + \beta_{2i} \Delta f_{t-1,i} + \gamma_{si} (s_{t-1} - b_{0i} - b_{1i} f_{t-1,i} - b_{2i} t) + e_{t,i} \quad (13)$$

$$\Delta f_{t,i} = \alpha_{0i} + \alpha_{1i} \Delta f_{t-1,i} + \alpha_{2i} \Delta s_{t-1} + \gamma_{fi} (s_{t-1} - b_{0i} - b_{1i} f_{t-1,i} - b_{2i} t) + u_{t,i} \quad (14)$$

for  $i = 1, \dots, 4$ .

The fifth financial model is a multivariate VECM and is denoted as FUT(1-4):

$$\Delta s_t = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \Delta s_{t-1} + \sum_{i=1}^4 \beta_{2i} \Delta f_{t-1,i} + \sum_{i=1}^4 \gamma_{si} (s_{t-1} - b_{0i} - f_{t-1,i} - b_{2i} t) + e_{t,i} \quad (15)$$

$$\Delta f_{t,i} = \alpha_{0i} + \sum_{i=1}^4 \alpha_{1i} \Delta f_{t-1,i} + \alpha_{2,i} \Delta s_{t-1} + \sum_{i=1}^4 \gamma_{fi} (s_{t-1} - b_{0i} - f_{t-1,i} - b_{2i} t) + u_{t,i} \quad (16)$$

for  $i = 1, \dots, 4$ .

There are two main differences between this specification and models FUT1-FUT4. First, FUT(1-4) jointly model the relation between the spot price and the term structure of futures. Second, we impose restrictions on the cointegrating parameters in order to treat futures as unbiased predictors of the spot price. Finally, we also consider a sixth financial model, namely AVG(1-4), which uses the sample average of futures prices  $\bar{f}_t = (1/4)\sum_{i=1}^4 f_{t,i}$ . As model (15)-(16), the intuition for taking the simple average is to exploit the information content of the term structure of future prices. The model can be written as models FUT1-FUT4, with  $\bar{f}_t$  in place of  $f_{t,i}$ .

The lag order of all models has been selected according to well established information criteria, as well as a set Lagrange Multiplier tests for residuals autocorrelation. Estimation and inference of VECMs is carried out following the Johansen's (1995) approach to vector cointegration.<sup>8</sup>

### 3.2.3 Structural and mixed models

Structural and mixed models have been estimated only for monthly and quarterly frequencies, due to the lack of data on the structural variables at higher frequencies.

For monthly data, we propose two different specifications. In the basic mixed model (MIX) the WTI spot price is regressed on the noncommercial long positions (*nclp*), OPEC consumption (*od*), the relative inventory industrial level (*RIS*), a step dummy for 1999 (*S99*), which accounts for a structural change of the OPEC's behaviour in the international oil market, and the world oil production (*wp*):

$$s_t = \alpha + \beta nclp_t + \gamma od_t + \delta RIS_t + \lambda S99_t + \phi wp_t + \varepsilon_t \quad (17)$$

The structural specification (STR) considers as explanatory variables the relative oil inventory level (*RIS*), the commodity price index (*ppi*), the OECD oil demand (*od*), the step dummy *S99* and a set of dummy variables capturing the effects of 11 September 2001 (*D01*):

$$s_t = \alpha + \beta RIS_t + \delta ppi_t + \phi od_t + \lambda S99_t + \gamma D01_t + \varepsilon_t \quad (18)$$

On quarterly data we estimate the following two different types of models:

---

<sup>8</sup> The estimation results for all models, which have been omitted to save space, are available from the authors upon request.

$$s_t = \alpha + \beta RIS_t + \gamma tod_t + \delta nclp_t + \varepsilon_t \quad (19)$$

$$s_t = \alpha + \beta RIS_t + \gamma tod_t + \delta op_t + \varepsilon_t \quad (20)$$

Specification (19) is a mixed model, model (20) is purely structural.

Although oil demand might be naturally thought as endogenous when used as explanatory variable for oil price, in our case endogeneity of oil demand is not a issue, for the previous models are estimated in VECM form. Moreover, it is worth pointing out that for monthly, as well as for quarterly, data seasonality in oil demand and industrial oil stocks has been removed by regressing oil demand and industrial oil stocks on a set of monthly dummies.

### 3.3 Forecast evaluation

The estimation period for time series and financial models runs from January 1986 up to December 2003, while the interval from January 2004 to December 2005 is used for forecast evaluation. Structural and mixed models have been estimated on the sample January 1993 - December 2003, and monthly (quarterly) forecasts have been produced for the period January (first quarter, Q1) 2004 – August (fourth quarter, Q4) 2005.

All models have been selected and estimated once on the estimation sample; then one-step ahead forecasts have been produced by keeping the estimated parameters fixed.

The number of observations used to evaluate the forecasting performance of different models is determined by the sampling frequency of the data: for daily, weekly, monthly and quarterly the number of predictions is 329, 123, 20 and 8, respectively.

Before discussing our forecast evaluation framework, it is worth introducing some notation. We use  $h_{i,t}$  to denote forecast from model  $i$ , the corresponding forecast error is  $u_{i,t}$  and  $L_{i,t}(u_{i,t})$  is a loss function. If not needed, we drop both model and time subscripts.

Our forecast evaluation strategy relies on the family of flexible loss functions put forth by Elliott, Komunjer and Timmermann (2005):

$$L(u; \rho, \phi) = [\phi + (1-2\phi) I(u < 0)] |u|^\rho \quad (??)$$

where  $I(\cdot)$  is the indicator function. The shape of the loss function is determined by two parameters:  $\rho > 0$  and  $0 < \phi < 1$ ; the loss is asymmetric whenever  $\phi \neq 0.5$ . More precisely, over-forecasting is costlier than under-forecasting for  $\phi < 0.5$ ; on the contrary, when  $\phi > 0.5$  positive

forecast errors (under-prediction) are more heavily weighed than negative forecast errors (over-prediction). As shown in Figure 2, special cases of the loss include: the quad-quad loss for  $\rho = 2$  and the lin-lin loss for  $\rho = 1$ . Moreover, we get the mean absolute error (MAE) loss for  $\rho = 1$  and  $\phi = 0.5$  and the mean square error (MSE) loss for  $\rho = 2$  and  $\phi = 0.5$ .

When evaluating forecasts from different models we will focus on quaq-quad losses ( $\rho = 2$ ) with three different values for the asymmetry parameter  $\phi = (0.2, 0.5, 0.8)$ .

The values chosen for the parameters of the loss function allow for a greater flexibility than the traditional model ranking approach based on symmetric losses, such as the MSE. There are several reasons for considering a flexible loss function. First, given that the shape of the loss function often influences the ranking of models, an asymmetric flexible loss function allows to evaluate forecasts taking into account the degree of aversion of the decision maker with respect to under- and over-prediction. Second, in order to consistently evaluate the prediction ability of models, forecasts producers and users should have the same loss function. On the contrary, when the loss function of the forecaster does not coincide with that of the user, the optimality of the forecast can be judged only with respect to the producer's loss function. Therefore, unless the user knows the form of the forecaster's loss function, the evaluation of forecast optimality implies also a test of the functional form of the loss function (see Elliott, Komunjer and Timmermann, 2005; 2008). Third, there is evidence that loss functions of some decision makers are asymmetric (Elliott, Komunjer and Timmermann, 2005; 2008; Patton and Timmermann, 2007). For instance, Auffhammer (2007) estimates the asymmetry parameter of the flexible loss function using the annual forecasts of the United States Energy Information Administration. In the case of the world price of oil, for both the lin-lin and quad-quad losses, the asymmetry parameter,  $\phi$ , is very close one, suggesting that over-predictions are considered much less costly than under-predictions.

In this paper, forecasts evaluation goes one step beyond that of a simple model ranking. As a matter of fact, in order to compare the forecast performance of each specification (at any sampling frequency and for any shape of the loss function), we run the test for equal predictive ability proposed by Diebold and Mariano (1995). The test statistic is based on the loss differential,  $d_{iRW,t} = L_{i,t} - L_{RW,t}$ , where the subscript attached to the second loss function indicates that the  $i$ -th model is evaluated against the random walk ( $RW$ ). Under the null hypothesis,  $H_0: E(d_{iRW}) = 0$ , the Diebold-Mariano test statistic is asymptotically Gaussian. Given that the number of available forecasts produced by our models is, in at least two cases, insufficient in order to guarantee the validity of

asymptotic results, we implement the Diebold and Mariano test corrected for small samples, where the appropriate p-values are computed using the moving block bootstrap of Künsch (1989)<sup>9</sup>.

#### 4 Empirical results

We start the evaluation of forecasts with an heuristic model comparison based on the Approximate Bayesian Model Averaging (ABMA). ABMA is a method to combine forecasts that delivers a set of weights that are functions of the Schwarz Information Criterion (see Garratt, Lee, Pesaran and Shin, 2003).

Results are shown in Figure 3. Irrespective of the sampling frequency of the data, the largest ABMA weights are always associated with models RW and RWD. While this finding is expected, given the parsimony of RW and RWD, nonetheless it is interesting to notice that, at daily and weekly sampling frequencies, ABMA would be essentially equivalent to assign equal weights to each model. Focusing on models for monthly and quarterly data (and keeping in mind the small size of the forecasting sample), we can confirm some of the previous results. In particular, the most heavily weighted models are, once again, RW (first), RWD (second) and AVG(1,4) (third), while the lowest (approximate) posterior probability is assigned to FUT(1,4). The success of the AVG(1,4) model is due to its ability to summarize the whole term structure of futures with two equations only. On the contrary, the multivariate FUT(1,4) model involves five equations and some coefficient restrictions that might not be supported by the data in the forecasting sample. As for the MIX and STR models, they appear on the bottom end of this ranking, with the sum of their weights being not larger than that associated to the third best model, which in turn belongs to the financial class. In summary, our empirical results do not suggest a single winning option, however they clearly indicate the presence of a hierarchical order among the different classes of models, which can be summarized as: time series (first), financial (second), mixed (third), structural (fourth).

There are many ways to test for forecast optimality. One simple approach is to analyze the properties of forecast errors. In particular, it is well known that forecast errors from optimal forecasts should have zero mean. If forecast errors follow a Gaussian white noise process, as it should be for one-step ahead errors, then a standard t-test is the obvious diagnostic tool. However, due to the limited number of observations, we implement a finite-sample corrected t-test by relying on bootstrap standard errors and p-values obtained with the moving block bootstrap of Künsch (1989). Results are shown in Table 2, where the statistic OUR, which measures the incidence of

---

<sup>9</sup> Details on this procedure and a small Monte Carlo study of its performance are reported in an appendix available from the authors upon request.

over- and under-forecasts (i.e. an entry larger than unity suggests that the  $i$ -th model produces more negative forecast errors than positive forecast errors), is also presented.

None of the models for daily data presents a statistically significant bias. As for weekly forecasts, only the RW and FUT(1,4) models show a positive and statistically significant bias. Interestingly, for data sampled at weekly frequency all models produce more under-forecasts than over-forecasts; this result holds also for models that at daily frequency present a value of  $OUR > 1$ .

At monthly and quarterly frequency,  $OUR$  is always below unity, suggesting that all models tend to over-forecast. However, in both cases the class of financial models is the only producing unbiased forecasts and the one with  $OUR$  closer to unity (at least at monthly frequency). This finding can be explained by referring to the cost-of-carry model and its relationship with the Efficient Market Hypothesis. Comparing the size of biases at monthly frequency, we can compile the following model ranking: financial (first), structural (second), time series (third), mixed (fourth).

Figure 4 shows the rankings and the magnitude of the flexible loss functions associated to different models. In panel (a) the MSE ranking is reported. The set of points with the label “overall” on the x-axis represent the ranking of models obtained by summing the loss function over all forecast horizon. First, we can notice that the loss differential across models are not very large in magnitude, suggesting that it will be very hard to identify a best option. Second, when the performance of models across sampling frequencies is compared, we can see that the magnitude of the losses increases. Third, in the majority of cases bivariate financial models make in the first positions. The performance of structural and mixed model changes according to the sampling frequency of the data.

When the loss function becomes asymmetric (see panels (b) and (c)), the only models that have a good and consistent global performance are, once again, those belonging to the financial class. They are outperformed by time series models only when over-forecasting is costlier than under-forecasting. In this case there are interesting exceptions: the mixed model applied to monthly data delivers the lowest loss, while FUT2 is the best option in the case of quarterly data.

In summary, the ranking of models seems to suggest that, irrespective of the shape of the loss function, the class of financial models is to be preferred to time series models. Both financial and time series models are, in turn, better than mixed and structural models.

Finally, we use the Diebold and Mariano test to evaluate if the loss differentials of RWD, financial, structural and mixed models are not statistically significant when the RW model is used as a benchmark. Results reported in Table 3 are not conclusive, for the loss differential seems to be

statistically insignificant in the large majority of cases. Although the RW model is not statistically outperformed by any of the alternative models, the empirical findings seem to suggest that theoretically well-grounded financial models are valid instruments for producing accurate forecasts of the WTI spot price.

## **6 Conclusions**

The relevance of oil in the world economy as well as the specific characteristics of the oil price time series explain why considerable effort has been devoted to the development of different types of econometric models for oil price forecasting.

Several specifications have been proposed in the economic literature. Some are based on financial theory and concentrate on the relationship between spot and futures prices (“financial” models). Others assign a key role to variables explaining the characteristics of the physical oil market (“structural” models).

The empirical literature is very far from any consensus about the appropriate forecasting model that should be implemented. Findings vary across models, time periods and data frequencies.

Relative to the previous literature, the paper is novel in several respects.

First of all, we test and systematically evaluate the ability of several alternative econometric specifications proposed in the literature to capture the dynamics of oil prices. We have chosen to concentrate our investigation on single- as well as multiple-equation, linear reduced forms, since models of this type are the most widely used in the literature and by the practitioners.

Second, we analyse the effects of different data frequencies (daily, weekly, monthly and quarterly) on the coefficient estimates and forecasts obtained using each selected econometric specification. The fact that no unanimous conclusions could be drawn by previous studies on the forecasting performance of similar models may depend, among other things, upon the particular data frequency used in each investigation.

Third, we compare different models at different data frequencies on a common sample and common data. We have constructed specific data sets which enable us to evaluate different types of econometric specifications involving different explanatory variables on the same sample period.

Fourth, we evaluate the forecasting performance of each selected model using static forecasts, as well as different measures of forecast errors.

Finally, we propose a new class of models, namely “mixed” models, which combine the relevant aspects of the financial and structural specifications proposed in the literature.

The empirical findings of this paper can be summarized as follows. According to an heuristic model comparison based on the Approximate Bayesian Model Averaging, a single winning option does not exist, however the presence of a hierarchical order among the different classes of models can be found: time series (first), financial (second), mixed (third), structural (fourth). The finite-sample corrected t-test for the null hypothesis of zero-mean forecast errors, as well as of the statistic OUR, which measures the incidence of over- and under-forecasts show that none of the models for daily data presents a statistically significant bias. For data sampled at weekly frequency all models produce more under-forecasts than over-forecasts. At monthly and quarterly frequency, OUR is always below unity, suggesting that all models tend to over-forecast. However, in both cases the class of financial models is the only producing unbiased forecasts and the one with OUR closer to unity (at least at monthly frequency). Comparing the size of biases at monthly frequency, the following model ranking can be compiled: financial (first), structural (second), time series (third), mixed (fourth). The ranking of models seems to suggest that, irrespective of the shape of the loss function, the class of financial models is to be preferred to time series models. Both financial and time series models are, in turn, better than mixed and structural models. The Diebold and Mariano test is used to evaluate if the loss differentials of financial, structural and mixed models are not statistically significant when the random walk model is used as a benchmark. Results are not conclusive, for the loss differential seems to be statistically insignificant in the large majority of cases. Although the random walk model is not statistically outperformed by any of the alternative models, the empirical findings seem to suggest that theoretically well-grounded financial models are valid instruments for producing accurate forecasts of the WTI spot price.



## References

- Abosedra S. (2005), "Futures versus univariate forecast of crude oil prices", *OPEC Review*, **29**, 231-241.
- Auffhammer M. (2007) "The rationality of EIA forecasts under symmetric and asymmetric loss", *Resource and Energy Economics*, **29**, 102-121.
- Bopp A. E., and Lady G. M. (1991), "A comparison of petroleum futures versus spot prices as predictors of prices in the future", *Energy Economics*, **13**, 274-282.
- Brenner R. and Kroner K. (1995), "Arbitrage, Cointegration, and Testing the Unbiasedness Hypothesis in Financial Markets", *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, **30**, 23-42.
- Chinn M. D., LeBlanch M., and Coibion O. (2005), "The predictive content of energy futures: an update on petroleum, natural gas, heating oil and gasoline", *NBER Working Paper* n. 11033.
- Clewlow L., and Strickland C. (2000), *Energy Derivatives: Pricing and Risk Management*, London, Lacima Publications.
- Commodity Futures Trading Commission (2010), *The Commitments of Traders Report*, December 2010 ([www.cftc.org/cftc/cftccotreports.htm](http://www.cftc.org/cftc/cftccotreports.htm)).
- Dees S., Karadeloglou P., Kaufmann R.K. and Sanchez M. (2007), "Modelling the world oil market: assessment of a quarterly econometric model", *Energy Policy*, **35**, 178-191.
- Engle R. F., and Granger C.W.J. (1987), "Co-integration and error correction: representation, estimation and testing", *Econometrica*, **55**, 251-276.
- Elliott, G. Komunjer I. and Timmermann A. (2005), "Estimation and testing of forecast rationality under flexible loss", *Review of Economic Studies*, **72**, 1107-1125.
- Elliott G., Komunjer I. and Timmermann A. (2008), "Biases in macroeconomic forecasts: Irrationality or asymmetric loss?", *Journal of the European Economic Association*, **6**, 122-157.
- Eni (2006), *World Oil and Gas Review*, Rome, Eni SpA, Strategies & Development Department.
- Garratt A., Lee K., Pesaran, H.M. and Shin, Y. (2003), "Forecast uncertainties in macroeconomic modeling: An application to the U.K. economy", *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **98**, 829-838.
- Geman H. (2005), *Commodities and Commodity Derivatives*, Chichester, Wiley.
- Green S. L., and Mork K. A. (1991), "Towards efficiency in the crude oil market", *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, **6**, 45-66.
- Gulen S. G. (1998), "Efficiency in the crude oil futures markets", *Journal of Energy Finance and Development*, **3**, 13-21.
- Johansen S. (1995), *Likelihood-based Inference in Cointegrated Vector Autoregressive Models*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kaufmann R.K. (1995), "A model of the world oil market for Project LINK: Integrating economics, geology, and politics", *Economic Modelling*, **12**, 165-178.
- Kaufmann R.K. (2004), "Does OPEC matter? An econometric analysis of oil prices", *The Energy Journal*, **25**, 67-91.
- Künsch H.R. (1989), "The Jackknife and the Bootstrap for General Stationary Observations", *Annals of Statistics*, **17**, 1217-1241.

- MacKinnon J. G. (1991), "Critical values for cointegration tests". In: R.F. Engle and C. Granger (eds.), *Long-run Economic Relationships*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 267-276.
- MacKinnon J. G. (1996), "Numerical distribution functions for unit root and cointegration tests", *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, **11**, 601-618.
- Merino A., and Ortiz A. (2005), "Explaining the So-called 'Price Premium' in Oil Markets", *OPEC Review*, **29**, 133-152.
- Moosa I. A., and Al-Loughani N. E. (1994), "Unbiasedness and time varying risk premia in the crude oil futures market", *Energy Economics*, **16**, 99-105.
- Morana C. (2001), "A semiparametric approach to short-term oil price forecasting", *Energy Economics*, **23**, 325-338.
- Moroney J.R. and Berg D. (1999), "An integrated model of oil production", *The Energy Journal*, **20**, 105-124.
- Moshiri S. and Foroutan F. (2006), "Forecasting nonlinear crude oil futures prices", *The Energy Journal*, **27**, 81-95.
- Patton A.J. and Timmermann A. (2007), "Testing Forecast Optimality Under Unknown Loss", *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **102**, 1172-1184.
- Pindyck R. S. (1999), "The long-run evolution of energy prices", *The Energy Journal*, **20**, 1-27.
- Pindyck R. S. (2001), "The Dynamics of Commodity Spot and Futures Markets: A Primer", *The Energy Journal*, **22**, 1-29.
- Radchenko S. (2005), "The long-run forecasting of energy prices using the model of shifting trend", University of North Carolina at Charlotte, Working Paper.
- Samii M. V. (1992), "Oil futures and spot markets", *OPEC Review*, **4**, 409-417.
- Serletis A. (1991), "Rational expectations, risk and efficiency in energy futures markets", *Energy Economics*, **13**, 111-115.
- Ye M., Zyren J., and Shore J. (2002), "Forecasting crude oil spot price using OECD petroleum inventory levels", *International Advances in Economic Research*, **8**, 324-334.
- Ye M., Zyren J., and Shore J. (2005), "A monthly crude oil spot price forecasting model using relative inventories", *International Journal of Forecasting*, **21**, 491-501.
- Ye M., Zyren J., and Shore J. (2007), "Forecasting short-run crude oil price using high and low inventory variables", *Energy Policy*, forthcoming.
- Zamani M. (2004), "An econometrics forecasting model of short term oil spot price", Paper presented at the 6th IAEE European Conference.
- Zeng T., and Swanson N. R. (1998), "Predictive evaluation of econometric forecasting models in commodity future markets", *Studies in Nonlinear Dynamics and Econometrics*, **2**, 159-177.

## Tables and Figures

**Table 1** Complete list of variables used in the empirical analysis

Variable	Sample	Frequency	Source	Acronym
WTI spot price	2/1/1986- 31/12/2005	D, W, M, Q	EIA	<i>S</i>
WTI futures price contract $i = 1, \dots, 4$	2/1/1986- 31/12/2005	D, W, M, Q	EIA	$F_i$
Noncommercial long positions	3/1995-8/2005 Q1/1995-Q42005	M, Q	CFTC	<i>NCLP</i>
OECD oil consumption	1/1988-8/2005	M	EIA	<i>OD</i>
OECD industrial oil stocks	1/1988-8/2005 Q1/1993-Q3/2005	M, Q	IEA	<i>RIS</i>
World oil production	1/1988-8/2005	M	EIA	<i>WP</i>
Commodity price index	1/1988-8/2005	M	BLS	<i>PPI</i>
OECD oil demand	Q1/1993-Q3/2005	Q	IEA	<i>OOD</i>
Non-OECD countries oil demand	Q1/1993-Q3/2005	Q	IEA	<i>NOOD</i>
Total Oil Demand	Q1/1993-Q3/2005	Q	Computed as: <i>OOD+NOOD</i>	<i>TOTD</i>
OPEC oil production	Q1/1993-Q3/2005	Q	EIA	<i>OP</i>

*Notes:* D = daily frequency; W = weekly frequency; M = monthly frequency; Q = quarterly frequency; Qi = ith quarter, i=1,2,3,4; EIA = Energy Information Administration; CFTC = U.S. Commodity Futures Commission; BLS = Bureau of Labor Statistics; IEA=International Energy Agency.

**Table 2** Bias of forecast errors and ratio of over- to under-predictions.


	Daily		Weekly		Monthly		Quarterly	
	Bias	Over/Under	Bias	Over/Under	Bias	Over/Under	Bias	Over/Under
RW	0.0526 (0.4259)	0.8156	0.2852 (0.0935)	0.6400	1.5572 (0.0510)	0.5385	3.7256 (0.0006)	0.1429
RWD	0.0448 (0.5049)	0.8380	0.2631 (0.1214)	0.6400	1.4313 (0.0723)	0.6667	3.2794 (0.0043)	0.3333
FUT1	-0.0549 (1.0000)	1.0309	0.4225 (0.0437)	0.6622	0.6692 (0.2939)	0.8182	2.0701 (0.0835)	0.3333
FUT2	-0.2264 (1.0000)	1.3500	0.1667 (0.4290)	0.6849	0.5635 (0.4049)	0.8182	2.0883 (0.0687)	0.3333
FUT3	-0.2132 (1.0000)	1.3333	0.0451 (0.8311)	0.7083	0.3434 (0.6182)	0.8182	1.8374 (0.0690)	0.3333
FUT4	-0.2057 (1.0000)	1.3333	0.0230 (0.9154)	0.7571	0.2068 (0.7581)	0.8182	1.5554 (0.1230)	0.3333
FUT(1,4)	-0.0412 (1.0000)	1.0061	0.4469 (0.0318)	0.5570	0.5353 (0.4376)	0.8182	-0.1200 (1.0000)	0.3333
AVG(1,4)	-0.2775 (1.0000)	1.4191	-0.0183 (1.0000)	0.7083	0.3776 (0.5783)	0.8182	1.7585 (0.0778)	0.3333
MIX					2.4991 (0.0030)	0.5385	2.8809 (0.0407)	0.1429
STR					1.0648 (0.0728)	0.6667	3.4798 (0.0014)	0.1429

Notes: Even columns from 2 to 8 report the bias of the forecast errors; Bootstrap p-values in round brackets denote the probability of accepting the null hypothesis of a forecast bias equal to zero; Bootstrap p-values have been calculated on 9999 moving block bootstrap samples; The length of blocks,  $b$ , is set according to the rule  $b = \text{floor}(4(H/100)^{2/9})$ ; Odds columns from 3 to 9 show the relative occurrence of negative and positive forecast errors; An entry lower than one indicates that there are more positive forecast errors than negative forecast errors and that the model tends to under-forecast the spot price; An entry greater than one suggests that the model tends to over-forecast the spot price.


**Table 3** Diebold-Mariano test

	Daily			Weekly			Monthly			Quarterly		
	$\alpha = 0.2$	$\alpha = 0.5$	$\alpha = 0.8$	$\alpha = 0.2$	$\alpha = 0.5$	$\alpha = 0.8$	$\alpha = 0.2$	$\alpha = 0.5$	$\alpha = 0.8$	$\alpha = 0.2$	$\alpha = 0.5$	$\alpha = 0.8$
RWD	6.9076 (0.0000)	-0.5789 (1.0000)	-9.1184 (1.0000)	3.2281 (0.0067)	-1.3613 (1.0000)	-5.9011 (1.0000)	0.4146 (0.7097)	-1.8669 (1.0000)	-3.3557 (1.0000)	-1.2125 (1.0000)	-3.1140 (1.0000)	-3.6084 (1.0000)
FUT1	3.2063 (0.0009)	-0.8291 (1.0000)	-2.4350 (1.0000)	0.6286 (0.5533)	2.0764 (0.0447)	2.6188 (0.0093)	0.9616 (0.3628)	-0.8743 (1.0000)	-1.9359 (1.0000)	-0.0660 (1.0000)	-1.4913 (1.0000)	-1.8125 (1.0000)
FUT2	7.7983 (0.0000)	0.9841 (0.3172)	-6.2729 (1.0000)	2.8041 (0.0232)	1.1876 (0.2739)	-0.2357 (1.0000)	1.2729 (0.2592)	-0.4074 (1.0000)	-1.8436 (1.0000)	-0.2887 (1.0000)	-1.8150 (1.0000)	-2.1601 (1.0000)
FUT3	7.8468 (0.0000)	1.0686 (0.2838)	-6.8173 (1.0000)	3.6598 (0.0110)	1.7014 (0.0887)	-1.0974 (1.0000)	1.4250 (0.2136)	-0.1844 (1.0000)	-1.8110 (1.0000)	0.0483 (0.9695)	-1.6078 (1.0000)	-2.1715 (1.0000)
FUT4	7.9135 (0.0000)	1.0999 (0.2642)	-6.9774 (1.0000)	3.9062 (0.0062)	2.0717 (0.0411)	-0.9820 (1.0000)	1.4828 (0.2129)	-0.0406 (1.0000)	-1.7293 (1.0000)	0.3183 (0.7529)	-1.4107 (1.0000)	-2.0956 (1.0000)
FUT(1,4)	2.6237 (0.0092)	-0.9382 (1.0000)	-2.2516 (1.0000)	1.4656 (0.1554)	2.1452 (0.0568)	2.2910 (0.0331)	1.3884 (0.2181)	-0.0434 (1.0000)	-1.1652 (1.0000)	1.0430 (0.4128)	0.5027 (0.5785)	-0.9792 (1.0000)
AVG(1,4)	8.1890 (0.0000)	1.5558 (0.1218)	-6.3827 (1.0000)	3.8532 (0.0040)	1.3745 (0.1724)	-1.6460 (1.0000)	1.3702 (0.2343)	-0.2487 (1.0000)	-1.7929 (1.0000)	0.1141 (0.8943)	-1.5665 (1.0000)	-2.1426 (1.0000)
MIX							-0.3199 (1.0000)	1.3912 (0.1931)	2.3679 (0.0779)	0.1125 (0.9016)	-1.0136 (1.0000)	-1.2795 (1.0000)
STR				0.3409 (0.7310)	-0.2419 (1.0000)	-0.6435 (1.0000)				0.3186 (0.7513)	-0.5600 (1.0000)	-0.7745 (1.0000)

Notes: Entries report the calculated Diebold and Mariano statistic; Bootstrap p-values in round brackets denote the probability of accepting the null hypothesis of a zero loss differential; Bootstrap p-values have been calculated on 9999 moving block bootstrap samples; The length of blocks,  $b$ , is set according to the rule  $b = \text{floor}(4(H/100)^{2/9})$ .




**Figure 1** WTI spot price for the period January 1986 - December 2005 (monthly data)




**Figure 2** Generalized loss function


**Notes:** The generalized loss function refers to Elliott, Komunjer and Timmermann (2005); Forecasts are shown on the horizontal axis; The actual value is equal to 10; Over-prediction,  $u < 0$ , (under-prediction,  $u > 0$ ) occurs to the right (left) of the actual value; The graph shows four different loss functions: the mean absolute error (MAE) loss for  $\rho = 1$  and  $\phi = 0.5$  (circles), the mean squared error (MSE) loss for  $\rho = 2$  and  $\phi = 0.5$  (squares), the asymmetric lin-lin (piecewise linear) loss for  $\rho = 1$  and  $\phi = 0.7$  (triangles), and the asymmetric quad-quad loss for  $\rho = 2$  and  $\phi = 0.3$  (stars); The function is defined for  $\rho > 0$  and  $0 < \phi < 1$ ; Over-prediction is costlier than under-prediction when  $\phi < 0.5$ .




**Figure 3** Ranking of models using Approximate Bayesian Model Averaging weights.



(a)



(b)



(c)

Figure 4 Ranking of models using the generalized loss function



## NOTE DI LAVORO DELLA FONDAZIONE ENI ENRICO MATTEI

### Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei Working Paper Series

Our Note di Lavoro are available on the Internet at the following addresses:

<http://www.feem.it/getpage.aspx?id=73&sez=Publications&padre=20&tab=1>  
[http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/JELJOUR\\_Results.cfm?form\\_name=journalbrowse&journal\\_id=266659](http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/JELJOUR_Results.cfm?form_name=journalbrowse&journal_id=266659)  
<http://ideas.repec.org/s/fem/femwpa.html>  
<http://www.econis.eu/LNG=EN/FAM?PPN=505954494>  
<http://ageconsearch.umn.edu/handle/35978>  
<http://www.bepress.com/feem/>

### NOTE DI LAVORO PUBLISHED IN 2011

SD	1.2011	Anna Alberini, Will Gans and Daniel Velez-Lopez: <a href="#">Residential Consumption of Gas and Electricity in the U.S.: The Role of Prices and Income</a>
SD	2.2011	Alexander Golub, Daiju Narita and Matthias G.W. Schmidt: <a href="#">Uncertainty in Integrated Assessment Models of Climate Change: Alternative Analytical Approaches</a>
SD	3.2010	Reyer Gerlagh and Nicole A. Mathys: <a href="#">Energy Abundance, Trade and Industry Location</a>
SD	4.2010	Melania Michetti and Renato Nunes Rosa: <a href="#">Afforestation and Timber Management Compliance Strategies in Climate Policy. A Computable General Equilibrium Analysis</a>
SD	5.2011	Hassan Bencheikroun and Amrita Ray Chaudhuri: <a href="#">“The Voracity Effect” and Climate Change: The Impact of Clean Technologies</a>
IM	6.2011	Sergio Mariotti, Marco Mutinelli, Marcella Nicolini and Lucia Piscitello: <a href="#">Productivity Spillovers from Foreign MNEs on Domestic Manufacturing Firms: Is Co-location Always a Plus?</a>
GC	7.2011	Marco Percoco: <a href="#">The Fight Against Geography: Malaria and Economic Development in Italian Regions</a>
GC	8.2011	Bin Dong and Benno Torgler: <a href="#">Democracy, Property Rights, Income Equality, and Corruption</a>
GC	9.2011	Bin Dong and Benno Torgler: <a href="#">Corruption and Social Interaction: Evidence from China</a>
SD	10.2011	Elisa Lanzi, Elena Verdolini and Ivan Haščič: <a href="#">Efficiency Improving Fossil Fuel Technologies for Electricity Generation: Data Selection and Trends</a>
SD	11.2011	Stergios Athanassoglou: <a href="#">Efficiency under a Combination of Ordinal and Cardinal Information on Preferences</a>
SD	12.2011	Robin Cross, Andrew J. Plantinga and Robert N. Stavins: <a href="#">The Value of Terroir: Hedonic Estimation of Vineyard Sale Prices</a>
SD	13.2011	Charles F. Mason and Andrew J. Plantinga: <a href="#">Contracting for Impure Public Goods: Carbon Offsets and Additionality</a>
SD	14.2011	Alain Ayong Le Kama, Aude Pommeret and Fabien Prieur: <a href="#">Optimal Emission Policy under the Risk of Irreversible Pollution</a>
SD	15.2011	Philippe Quirion, Julie Rozenberg, Olivier Sassi and Adrien Vogt-Schilb: <a href="#">How CO2 Capture and Storage Can Mitigate Carbon Leakage</a>
SD	16.2011	Carlo Carraro and Emanuele Massetti: <a href="#">Energy and Climate Change in China</a>
SD	17.2011	ZhongXiang Zhang: <a href="#">Effective Environmental Protection in the Context of Government Decentralization</a>
SD	18.2011	Stergios Athanassoglou and Anastasios Xepapadeas: <a href="#">Pollution Control with Uncertain Stock Dynamics: When, and How, to be Precautious</a>
SD	19.2011	Jüratè Jaraitè and Corrado Di Maria: <a href="#">Efficiency, Productivity and Environmental Policy: A Case Study of Power Generation in the EU</a>
SD	20.2011	Giulio Cainelli, Massimiliano Mozzanti and Sandro Montresor: <a href="#">Environmental Innovations, Local Networks and Internationalization</a>
SD	21.2011	Gérard Mondello: <a href="#">Hazardous Activities and Civil Strict Liability: The Regulator’s Dilemma</a>
SD	22.2011	Haiyan Xu and ZhongXiang Zhang: <a href="#">A Trend Deduction Model of Fluctuating Oil Prices</a>
SD	23.2011	Athanasios Lapatinas, Anastasia Litina and Eftichios S. Sartzetakis: <a href="#">Corruption and Environmental Policy: An Alternative Perspective</a>
SD	24.2011	Emanuele Massetti: <a href="#">A Tale of Two Countries: Emissions Scenarios for China and India</a>
SD	25.2011	Xavier Pautrel: <a href="#">Abatement Technology and the Environment-Growth Nexus with Education</a>
SD	26.2011	Dionysis Latinopoulos and Eftichios Sartzetakis: <a href="#">Optimal Exploitation of Groundwater and the Potential for a Tradable Permit System in Irrigated Agriculture</a>
SD	27.2011	Benno Torgler and Marco Piatti: <a href="#">A Century of American Economic Review</a>
SD	28.2011	Stergios Athanassoglou, Glenn Sheriff, Tobias Siegfried and Woonghee Tim Huh: <a href="#">Optimal Mechanisms for Heterogeneous Multi-cell Aquifers</a>
SD	29.2011	Libo Wu, Jing Li and ZhongXiang Zhang: <a href="#">Inflationary Effect of Oil-Price Shocks in an Imperfect Market: A Partial Transmission Input-output Analysis</a>
SD	30.2011	Junko Mochizuki and ZhongXiang Zhang: <a href="#">Environmental Security and its Implications for China’s Foreign Relations</a>
SD	31.2011	Teng Fei, He Jiankun, Pan Xunzhang and Zhang Chi: <a href="#">How to Measure Carbon Equity: Carbon Gini Index Based on Historical Cumulative Emission Per Capita</a>
SD	32.2011	Dirk Rübbecke and Pia Weiss: <a href="#">Environmental Regulations, Market Structure and Technological Progress in Renewable Energy Technology – A Panel Data Study on Wind Turbines</a>
SD	33.2011	Nicola Doni and Giorgio Ricchiuti: <a href="#">Market Equilibrium in the Presence of Green Consumers and Responsible Firms: a Comparative Statics Analysis</a>

SD	34.2011	Gérard Mondello: <a href="#">Civil Liability, Safety and Nuclear Parks: Is Concentrated Management Better?</a>
SD	35.2011	Walid Marrouch and Amrita Ray Chaudhuri: <a href="#">International Environmental Agreements in the Presence of Adaptation</a>
ERM	36.2011	Will Gans, Anna Alberini and Alberto Longo: <a href="#">Smart Meter Devices and The Effect of Feedback on Residential Electricity Consumption: Evidence from a Natural Experiment in Northern Ireland</a>
ERM	37.2011	William K. Jaeger and Thorsten M. Egelkraut: <a href="#">Biofuel Economics in a Setting of Multiple Objectives &amp; Unintended Consequences</a>
CCSD	38.2011	Kyriaki Remoundou, Fikret Adaman, Phoebe Koundouri and Paulo A.L.D. Nunes: <a href="#">Are Preferences for Environmental Quality Sensitive to Financial Funding Schemes? Evidence from a Marine Restoration Programme in the Black Sea</a>
CCSD	39.2011	Andrea Ghermanti and Paulo A.L.D. Nunes: <a href="#">A Global Map of Costal Recreation Values: Results From a Spatially Explicit Based Meta-Analysis</a>
CCSD	40.2011	Andries Richter, Anne Maria Eikeset, Daan van Soest, and Nils Chr. Stenseth: <a href="#">Towards the Optimal Management of the Northeast Arctic Cod Fishery</a>
CCSD	41.2011	Florian M. Biermann: <a href="#">A Measure to Compare Matchings in Marriage Markets</a>
CCSD	42.2011	Timo Hiller: <a href="#">Alliance Formation and Coercion in Networks</a>
CCSD	43.2011	Sunghoon Hong: <a href="#">Strategic Network Interdiction</a>
CCSD	44.2011	Arnold Polanski and Emiliya A. Lazarova: <a href="#">Dynamic Multilateral Markets</a>
CCSD	45.2011	Marco Mantovani, Georg Kirchsteiger, Ana Mauleon and Vincent Vannetelbosch: <a href="#">Myopic or Farsighted? An Experiment on Network Formation</a>
CCSD	46.2011	Rémy Oddou: <a href="#">The Effect of Spillovers and Congestion on the Segregative Properties of Endogenous Jurisdiction Structure Formation</a>
CCSD	47.2011	Emanuele Massetti and Elena Claire Ricci: <a href="#">Super-Grids and Concentrated Solar Power: A Scenario Analysis with the WITCH Model</a>
ERM	48.2011	Matthias Kalkuhl, Ottmar Edenhofer and Kai Lessmann: <a href="#">Renewable Energy Subsidies: Second-Best Policy or Fatal Aberration for Mitigation?</a>
CCSD	49.2011	ZhongXiang Zhang: <a href="#">Breaking the Impasse in International Climate Negotiations: A New Direction for Currently Flawed Negotiations and a Roadmap for China to 2050</a>
CCSD	50.2011	Emanuele Massetti and Robert Mendelsohn: <a href="#">Estimating Ricardian Models With Panel Data</a>
CCSD	51.2011	Y. Hossein Farzin and Kelly A. Grogan: <a href="#">Socioeconomic Factors and Water Quality in California</a>
CCSD	52.2011	Dinko Dimitrov and Shao Chin Sung: <a href="#">Size Monotonicity and Stability of the Core in Hedonic Games</a>
ES	53.2011	Giovanni Mastrobuoni and Paolo Pinotti: <a href="#">Migration Restrictions and Criminal Behavior: Evidence from a Natural Experiment</a>
ERM	54.2011	Alessandro Cologni and Matteo Manera: <a href="#">On the Economic Determinants of Oil Production. Theoretical Analysis and Empirical Evidence for Small Exporting Countries</a>
ERM	55.2011	Alessandro Cologni and Matteo Manera: <a href="#">Exogenous Oil Shocks, Fiscal Policy and Sector Reallocations in Oil Producing Countries</a>
ERM	56.2011	Morgan Bazilian, Patrick Nussbaumer, Giorgio Gualberti, Erik Haites, Michael Levi, Judy Siegel, Daniel M. Kammen and Joergen Fenhann: <a href="#">Informing the Financing of Universal Energy Access: An Assessment of Current Flows</a>
CCSD	57.2011	Carlo Orecchia and Maria Elisabetta Tessitore: <a href="#">Economic Growth and the Environment with Clean and Dirty Consumption</a>
ERM	58.2011	Wan-Jung Chou, Andrea Bigano, Alistair Hunt, Stephane La Branche, Anil Markandya and Roberta Pierfederici: <a href="#">Households' WTP for the Reliability of Gas Supply</a>
ES	59.2011	Maria Comune, Alireza Naghavi and Giovanni Prarolo: <a href="#">Intellectual Property Rights and South-North Formation of Global Innovation Networks</a>
ES	60.2011	Alireza Naghavi and Chiara Strozzi: <a href="#">Intellectual Property Rights, Migration, and Diaspora</a>
CCSD	61.2011	Massimo Tavoni, Shoibal Chakravarty and Robert Socolow: <a href="#">Safe vs. Fair: A Formidable Trade-off in Tackling Climate Change</a>
CCSD	62.2011	Donatella Baiardi, Matteo Manera and Mario Menegatti: <a href="#">Consumption and Precautionary Saving: An Empirical Analysis under Both Financial and Environmental Risks</a>
ERM	63.2011	Caterina Gennaioli and Massimo Tavoni: <a href="#">Clean or "Dirty" Energy: Evidence on a Renewable Energy Resource Curse</a>
ES	64.2011	Angelo Antoci and Luca Zarri: <a href="#">Punish and Perish?</a>
ES	65.2011	Anders Akerman, Anna Larsson and Alireza Naghavi: <a href="#">Autocracies and Development in a Global Economy: A Tale of Two Elites</a>
CCSD	66.2011	Valentina Bosetti and Jeffrey Frankel: <a href="#">Sustainable Cooperation in Global Climate Policy: Specific Formulas and Emission Targets to Build on Copenhagen and Cancun</a>
CCSD	67.2011	Mattia Cai, Roberto Ferrise, Marco Moriondo, Paulo A.L.D. Nunes and Marco Bindi: <a href="#">Climate Change and Tourism in Tuscany, Italy. What if heat becomes unbearable?</a>
ERM	68.2011	Morgan Bazilian, Patrick Nussbaumer, Hans-Holger Rogner, Abeeku Brew-Hammond, Vivien Foster, Shonali Pachauri, Eric Williams, Mark Howells, Philippe Niyongabo, Lawrence Musaba, Brian Ó Gallachóir, Mark Radka and Daniel M. Kammen: <a href="#">Energy Access Scenarios to 2030 for the Power Sector in Sub-Saharan Africa</a>
CCSD	69.2011	Francesco Bosello, Carlo Carraro and Enrica De Cian: <a href="#">Adaptation Can Help Mitigation: An Integrated Approach to Post-2012 Climate Policy</a>
ES	70.2011	Etienne Farvaque, Alexander Mihailov and Alireza Naghavi: <a href="#">The Grand Experiment of Communism: Discovering the Trade-off between Equality and Efficiency</a>
CCSD	71.2011	ZhongXiang Zhang: <a href="#">Who Should Bear the Cost of China's Carbon Emissions Embodied in Goods for Exports?</a>

CCSD	72.2011	Francesca Pongiglione: <a href="#"><u>Climate Change and Individual Decision Making: An Examination of Knowledge, Risk Perception, Self-interest and Their Interplay</u></a>
CCSD	73.2011	Joseph E. Aldy and Robert N. Stavins: <a href="#"><u>Using the Market to Address Climate Change: Insights from Theory and Experience</u></a>
CCSD	74.2011	Alexander Brauneis and Michael Loretz: <a href="#"><u>Inducing Low-Carbon Investment in the Electric Power Industry through a Price Floor for Emissions Trading</u></a>
CCSD	75.2011	Jean-Marie Grether, Nicole A. Mathys and Jaime de Melo: <a href="#"><u>Unravelling the Worldwide Pollution Haven Effect</u></a>
ES	76.2011	Benjamin Elsner: <a href="#"><u>Emigration and Wages: The EU Enlargement Experiment</u></a>
CCSD	77.2011	ZhongXiang Zhang: <a href="#"><u>Trade in Environmental Goods, with Focus on Climate-Friendly Goods and Technologies</u></a>
ES	78.2011	Alireza Naghavi, Julia Spies and Farid Toubal: <a href="#"><u>International Sourcing, Product Complexity and Intellectual Property Rights</u></a>
CCSD	79.2011	Mare Sarr and Tim Swanson: <a href="#"><u>Intellectual Property and Biodiversity: When and Where are Property Rights Important?</u></a>
CCSD	80.2011	Valentina Bosetti, Sergey Paltsev, John Reilly and Carlo Carraro: <a href="#"><u>Emissions Pricing to Stabilize Global Climate</u></a>
CCSD	81.2011	Valentina Bosetti and Enrica De Cian: <a href="#"><u>A Good Opening: The Key to Make the Most of Unilateral Climate Action</u></a>
CCSD	82.2011	Joseph E. Aldy and Robert N. Stavins: <a href="#"><u>The Promise and Problems of Pricing Carbon: Theory and Experience</u></a>
CCSD	83.2011	Lei Zhu, ZhongXiang Zhang and Ying Fan: <a href="#"><u>An Evaluation of Overseas Oil Investment Projects under Uncertainty Using a Real Options Based Simulation Model</u></a>
CCSD	84.2011	Luca Di Corato, Michele Moretto and Sergio Vergalli: <a href="#"><u>Land Conversion Pace under Uncertainty and Irreversibility: too fast or too slow?</u></a>
ES	85.2011	Jan Grobovšek: <a href="#"><u>Development Accounting with Intermediate Goods</u></a>
ES	86.2011	Ronald P. Wolthoff: <a href="#"><u>Applications and Interviews. A Structural Analysis of Two-Sided Simultaneous Search</u></a>
CCSD	87.2011	Céline Guivarch and Stéphane Hallegatte: <a href="#"><u>2C or Not 2C?</u></a>
ES	88.2011	Marco Dall'Aglio and Camilla Di Luca: <a href="#"><u>Finding Maxmin Allocations in Cooperative and Competitive Fair Division</u></a>
CCSD	89.2011	Luca Di Corato: <a href="#"><u>Optimal Conservation Policy Under Imperfect Intergenerational Altruism</u></a>
CCSD	90.2011	Ardjan Gazheli and Luca Di Corato: <a href="#"><u>Land-use Change and Solar Energy Production: A Real Option Approach</u></a>
ERM	91.2011	Andrea Bastianin, Matteo Manera, Anil Markandya and Elisa Scarpa: <a href="#"><u>Oil Price Forecast Evaluation with Flexible Loss Functions</u></a>