

NBER WORKING PAPER SERIES

DATA-INTENSIVE INNOVATION AND THE STATE:
EVIDENCE FROM AI FIRMS IN CHINA

Martin Beraja
David Y. Yang
Noam Yuchtman

Working Paper 27723
<http://www.nber.org/papers/w27723>

NATIONAL BUREAU OF ECONOMIC RESEARCH
1050 Massachusetts Avenue
Cambridge, MA 02138
August 2020, Revised August 2021

We are especially grateful for the extraordinary research assistance provided by Haoran Gao, Andrew Kao, Shuhao Lu, and Wenwei Peng. We also thank Shiyun Hu, Junxi Liu, Shengqi Ni, Yucheng Quan, Linchuan Xu, Peilin Yang, and Guoli Yin, for their excellent work as research assistants as well. Many appreciated suggestions, critiques and encouragement were provided by Daron Acemoglu, Dominick Bartelme, Ryan Bubb, Paco Buera, Ernesto Dal Bó, Dave Donaldson, Ruben Enikolopov, Raquel Fernández, Richard Freeman, Chad Jones, Pete Klenow, Monica Martinez-Bravo, Andy Neumeyer, Juan Pablo Nicolini, Arianna Ornaghi, Maria Petrova, Torsten Persson, Nancy Qian, Andrei Shleifer, Chris Tonetti, Dan Trefler, John Van Reenen, and Daniel Xu, as well as many seminar and conference participants. Yuchtman acknowledges financial support from the British Academy under the Global Professorships program. The views expressed herein are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Bureau of Economic Research.

NBER working papers are circulated for discussion and comment purposes. They have not been peer-reviewed or been subject to the review by the NBER Board of Directors that accompanies official NBER publications.

© 2020 by Martin Beraja, David Y. Yang, and Noam Yuchtman. All rights reserved. Short sections of text, not to exceed two paragraphs, may be quoted without explicit permission provided that full credit, including © notice, is given to the source.

Data-intensive Innovation and the State: Evidence from AI Firms in China
Martin Beraja, David Y. Yang, and Noam Yuchtman
NBER Working Paper No. 27723
August 2020, Revised August 2021
JEL No. E0,H4,L5,L63,O25,O30,O40,P00,P16,Z21

ABSTRACT

Developing AI technology requires data. In many domains, government data far exceeds in magnitude and scope data collected by the private sector, and AI firms often gain access to such data when providing services to the state. We argue that such access can stimulate commercial AI innovation in part because data and trained algorithms are shareable across government and commercial uses. We gather comprehensive information on firms and public security procurement contracts in China's facial recognition AI industry. We quantify the data accessible through contracts by measuring public security agencies' capacity to collect surveillance video. Using a triple-differences strategy, we find that data-rich contracts, compared to data-scarce ones, lead recipient firms to develop significantly and substantially more commercial AI software. Our analysis indicates a contribution of government data to the rise of China's facial recognition AI firms, and suggests that states' data collection and provision policies could shape AI innovation.

Martin Beraja
Department of Economics, E52-504
MIT
77 Massachusetts Avenue
Cambridge, MA 02139
and NBER
martinberaja@gmail.com

Noam Yuchtman
London School of Economics
Houghton St.
London WC2A 2AE
United Kingdom
and CEPR
n.yuchtman@lse.ac.uk

David Y. Yang
Department of Economics
Harvard University
Littauer Center M-31
Cambridge, MA 02138
and NBER
davidyang@fas.harvard.edu

1 Introduction

Artificial intelligence and machine learning (“AI” for brevity) technologies hold the potential to transform the modern world. Developing AI is *data-intensive*. Up to now, economists have emphasized how data collected by private firms shapes the process of AI innovation (Agrawal et al., eds, 2019; Jones and Tonetti, 2018). Yet, throughout history and up to the present, states have also collected massive quantities of data (Scott, 1998). Because of states’ dominant role in domains such as public security, health care, education, and basic science, government data collected in these areas exceeds in magnitude and scope available data collected by the private sector, or may lack private substitutes altogether.

A common way in which private AI firms gain access to valuable government data is by providing services to the state. Consider the facial recognition AI industry in China — a leading AI sector in a country at the technological frontier.¹ In order to develop accurate facial recognition algorithms, firms in this sector require enormous amounts of training data — for example, video streams of faces from different angles. The public security units of the Chinese state collect precisely this form of data through their surveillance apparatus, and contract with AI firms to process such data. AI firms providing services to these public security units thus gain access to government surveillance data, which can be inputs into improved algorithms and thus innovation.

Importantly, innovation stimulated by government data can go well beyond the government sector. To the extent that government data or trained algorithms are *shareable*, they can be used to develop AI products for much larger commercial markets — for instance, facial recognition platforms for retail stores. Moreover, firms receiving access to government data may learn how to manage and productively utilize large datasets, another valuable input into commercial innovation. Therefore, receiving a procurement contract allowing access to government data may fuel commercial AI innovation, potentially overcoming the crowd-out of resources allocated to serving the state.

In this paper, we ask: does access to government data when providing AI services to the state stimulate commercial AI innovation? We answer this question in the context of the facial recognition AI sector in China. We collect comprehensive data on AI public security contracts and AI firms’ software production, and we classify AI procurement contracts as data-rich or data-scarce depending on the size of the local surveillance

¹China is the world’s largest producer of AI research (see the “China AI Development Report, 2018,” available online at <https://bit.ly/2IWAo7R>. Facial recognition AI is among the top three AI technologies in terms of projected revenues (Perrault et al., 2019).




Figure 1: Figure displays four metrics relevant to China’s AI development, relative to their levels in 2014. First, the percentage of global corporate investment in AI originating from China, sourced from NetBase Quid (initial value = 4%). Second, the number of facial recognition AI contracts procured by the Chinese government, sourced from the Chinese Government Procurement Database (initial value = 1,899). Third, the cumulative amount of AI software produced by Chinese firms, sourced from the Ministry of Industry and Information Technology (initial value = 33,340). Fourth, the number of surveillance cameras procured by the Chinese government, sourced from the Chinese Government Procurement Database (initial value = 755,134).

camera network. We find that the receipt of a data-rich contract differentially stimulates commercial AI software innovation. Our findings suggest that access to government data has contributed to Chinese firms’ emergence as leading innovators in facial recognition AI technology — indeed, this has coincided with the expansion of the Chinese government’s procurement of AI and surveillance capacity (see Figure 1). More generally, our findings indicate a role for the state in data-intensive economies that goes beyond regulating privately collected data out of anti-trust or privacy concerns (e.g., Tirole, 2020; Aridor et al., 2020). States’ AI procurement and policies of government data collection and provision could, whether intentionally or not, stimulate and shape AI innovation in a range of sectors.

We begin by presenting a simple partial equilibrium model of AI software production. There are two types of data — government and private — that are gross substitutes in the production of new AI software (i.e., product innovation). Importantly, government data can only be accessed through obtaining a contract to produce government AI for the state. Software production is also a function of other non-shareable inputs (such as labor) as well as sharable ones (such as data management software). These elements allow for the possibility of both crowding-in and crowding-out of commercial AI innovation when

firms contract with the state. The model allows us to specify the parameter of interest in our estimation — the change in commercial software production resulting from a change in government data accessed by the firm — and clarifies the mechanisms through which government data could affect commercial innovation. Finally, the model highlights key threats to identification: in particular, firm characteristics correlated with receipt of (data-rich) contracts and productive inputs accessed through procurement contracts alongside government data.

Reflecting this model, our empirical strategy compares changes in firm software output following the receipt of *data-rich* versus *data-scarce* government contracts. In order to operationalize it, we overcome three data challenges. First, linking AI firms to government contracts. To do so, we collect data on (approximately) the universe of Chinese facial recognition AI firms and link this data to a separate database of Chinese government contracts, issued by all levels of the government. Second, quantifying AI firms' software production and, as important, classifying firms' software by intended use. We do this by compiling data on all Chinese facial recognition AI firms' software development based on the digital product registration records maintained by the Chinese government. Using a Recurrent Neural Network model, we categorize software products based on whether they are directed towards the commercial market or government use. Third, measuring the amount of government data to which AI firms receive access. To do this, we focus on contracts awarded by public security agencies to AI firms. Within this set of contracts, we measure the data provided by a contract using the agency's local surveillance network capacity to capture high-resolution video of faces on the streets: namely, the number of high-resolution surveillance cameras that had previously been purchased by government units in the public security agency's prefecture. We define a data-rich contract as one that came from a public security agency located in a prefecture with above-median surveillance capacity at the time the contract was awarded, whereas a data-scarce contract is one coming from a public security agency located in a prefecture with below-median surveillance capacity.

With these newly constructed datasets, we estimate our parameter of interest: the causal effect of access to government data on commercial AI innovation. We compare the post-contract increase in software releases of firms that receive data-rich and data-scarce public security contracts. This comparison allows us to hold fixed firms' (time-invariant *and* time-varying) selection into receipt of a public security contract. Moreover, by exploiting variation in data-richness within the set of public security contracts, it also allows us to pin down the importance of access to *government data* rather than other benefits of government contracts, such as capital, reputation, and political connections. We find that

receipt of a data-rich contract *differentially* increases commercial software production, relative to receipt of a data-scarce contract, by around 2 new software products over 3 years. Importantly, we identify a significant effect of data-rich contracts on government software production over the same period as well, indicating that the increase in commercial innovation overcomes the crowding out of non-shareable inputs used to produce government software.

We evaluate key threats to identification highlighted in the model. First, firm characteristics affecting software production may be correlated with receipt of (data-rich) public security contracts. We directly account for fixed firm characteristics correlated with receipt of a data-rich contract in our empirical specification by including firm fixed effects. While we cannot directly control for unobserved time-varying sources of selection into data-rich contracts, it is reassuring that our event-study estimates show no differential software production prior to receipt of a data-rich contract, suggesting software production among firms receiving data-rich and data-scarce contracts would have followed parallel trends. We can also directly account for the time-varying effects of selection into contracts based on firms' underlying productivity, as measured by their pre-contract characteristics such as software production, establishment year, and capitalization. Second, productive inputs may be accessed through data-rich procurement contracts alongside government data. We consider and rule out the following alternative mechanisms through which data-rich contracts may stimulate firms' commercial innovation: access to capital, distinct tasks required by data-rich contracts, reputational consequences, access to markets and associated commercial opportunities, and connections with the local governments.

Finally, we assess the contributions of direct and indirect mechanisms through which government data could affect commercial innovation. We first provide evidence of non-data shareable inputs arising from accessing greater quantities of government data: we find that production of non-AI, data-complementary software (e.g., software supporting data storage and transmission) significantly, and differentially, increases after firms receive data-rich public security contracts. We then evaluate whether such increase in shareable inputs could account for the entirety of the increased commercial innovation that we observe. We use pre-contract data-complementary software production as a summary statistic for firms' potential to benefit from the development of additional non-data shareable inputs arising from a data-rich contract. We find that controlling for this potential to benefit from additional non-data shareable inputs interacted with the full set of time period fixed effects barely changes our estimated effects of government data on commercial AI innovation. This suggests an important direct effect of government data

and improved algorithms due to their being shareable across uses.

Our work most directly contributes to an emerging literature on the economics of AI and data (see, e.g., Aghion et al., 2017; Agrawal et al., 2018; Farboodi et al., 2019; Acemoglu and Restrepo, 2019). We add to this literature by examining the role of *government*-collected data and the direct and indirect ways in which it can shape commercial AI innovation.² We particularly highlight the shareability of government data and trained algorithms across uses within firms, complementing Aghion et al. (2017) and Jones and Tonetti (2018) who study the non-rivalry of private data across firms.

We also contribute to the literature studying government policies that shape innovation (see Bloom et al., 2019 for a review). Our work reveals that government data collection and provision to firms can act as an innovation policy, either intentionally or incidentally. Our work also indicates that government data collection and provision stimulate commercial innovation through mechanisms that share features with other government policies, from space exploration (Alic et al., 1992; Azoulay et al., 2018), to the internet (Greenstein, 2015), to military technology (Moretti et al., 2019; Gross and Sampat, 2020).³ Much like scientific ideas, government data can spur learning by doing and generate other intangible assets; in addition, we highlight that government data (and trained algorithms) themselves can be directly shared across uses, resulting in potentially faster and greater commercial spillovers. Empirically, we identify specific, causal mechanisms through which a shareable input affects commercial innovation at the firm level.

Finally, our work contributes to the literature studying the economic rise of China, joining a large literature that emphasizes the important role of the state (e.g., Lau et al., 2000; Brandt and Rawski, 2008; Song et al., 2011). In highlighting the role of China’s surveillance apparatus in commercial innovation, we contrast with a large literature attempting to explain China’s spectacular growth despite its authoritarian institutions — for example, growth stimulated by competition for promotion (e.g., Li and Zhou, 2005; Jia et al., 2015), or bureaucratic rules of evaluation and rotation (Li, 2019).⁴ We contribute to a nascent literature (e.g., Bai et al., 2019) that identifies mechanisms through which

²In so doing, our analysis complements a recent literature studying the effects of government data on other sectors. For example, Williams (2013) and Nagaraj (2021) study settings in which the non-excludability of government research — mapping the genome and mapping the Earth — shapes private sector outcomes in biotechnology and mineral extraction, respectively.

³Incidental industrial policy is also documented by Slavtchev and Wiederhold (2016) and Nagle (2019). Our finding of a within-firm spillover to products *other than* those contracted on contrasts with firms’ tendency to specialize after a specific government demand shock, as seen in Clemens and Rogers (2020).

⁴On China’s growth and innovation more specifically, see, among others, Song et al., 2011; Khandelwal et al., 2013; Roberts et al., 2017; Cheng et al., 2019; Wei et al., 2017; Bombardini et al., 2018. On various economic distortions caused by China’s political institutions, see, among others, Chen et al., 2013; Fisman and Wang, 2015; He et al., 2020.

China’s autocratic power may actually promote economic growth.

In what follows, we present a simple conceptual framework in Section 2. Section 3 describes the empirical context and the data sources used for the analyses. Section 4 presents the main results. Section 5 concludes with a discussion of implications and direction of future work.

2 Conceptual framework

Consider a firm that produces AI software for both the state (government software) and the private sector (commercial software). Developing both types of software is data-intensive: it requires algorithms trained with data. There are two types of data: one collected by the state (government data) and one collected by the private sector (private data). As noted above, there exist important domains where government data far exceeds in magnitude and scope any private substitutes (e.g., surveillance video from street cameras). Moreover, in many cases government data is not publicly available — a firm only gains access to such government data when obtaining a contract from the state to produce government software.

Formally, a firm that has obtained a contract produces commercial software q_c and government q_g software with the following technologies:

$$\begin{aligned} q_c &= F_c(d_g, d_p, s, n_c; X, C) \\ q_g &= F_g(d_g, d_p, s, n_g; X, C). \end{aligned}$$

We denote by d_g the amount of government data provided by the contract and by d_p other private data inputs that the firm may have access to. Note that the same d_g and d_p enter the production of both types of software. This reflects the fact that government and private data (or the algorithms trained with them) are *shareable* across uses: they can be used to develop software for both government and commercial purposes (i.e., products targeting different customer types).⁵

Software production is also a function of other inputs s that are shareable across uses — such as data management software or firms’ capacity and protocols to handle large datasets — as well as non-shareable inputs n_c and n_g — such as human and physical capital. Finally, we let firm characteristics X (e.g., the firm’s underlying productivity),

⁵Technological or legal reasons may limit the extent to which government data is shareable across uses. Yet, if the algorithms trained with such data can be shared and used for producing commercial software, then access to government data would stimulate commercial innovation through similar mechanisms. For the purposes of this paper, data or trained algorithms being shareable are indistinguishable.

and government contract characteristics C other than the amount of government data (e.g., political connections provided by the contract) shape software production too.

Consider a comparison between two identical firms (fixed X) that have obtained contracts that only differ in the quantity of government data d_g made available to them, but not in other characteristics (fixed C). Given a difference in government data Δd_g and fixed characteristics $\{\bar{X}, \bar{C}\}$, the difference in commercial software production $\Delta q_c(\cdot; \bar{X}, \bar{C})$ is:

$$\frac{\Delta q_c(\cdot; \bar{X}, \bar{C})}{\Delta d_g} = \underbrace{\frac{\partial F_c(\cdot; \bar{X}, \bar{C})}{\partial d_g}}_{\text{Direct effect of data}} + \underbrace{\frac{\partial F_c(\cdot; \bar{X}, \bar{C})}{\partial d_p} \frac{\Delta d_p}{\Delta d_g} + \frac{\partial F_c(\cdot; \bar{X}, \bar{C})}{\partial s} \frac{\Delta s}{\Delta d_g} + \frac{\partial F_c(\cdot; \bar{X}, \bar{C})}{\partial n_c} \frac{\Delta n_c}{\Delta d_g}}_{\text{Indirect effect of data}}.$$

This will be the parameter of interest that we aim to estimate: the causal effect of government data on commercial software development. Note that it is composed of two elements: (i) a direct positive effect of government data that arises due to the shareability of government data (or algorithms); and (ii) an indirect effect which can amplify or dampen — or even reverse — the direct effect. The indirect effect will tend to augment the direct effect when other non-data shareable inputs s increase as well, for example, because the firm's capacity to manage and utilize datasets improves when provided access to more government data (i.e., a form of learning by doing). On the other hand, the indirect effect will tend to offset the direct effect when fulfilling the contract crowds out non-shareable inputs n_c from commercial software production to be used for government software production, or when private data d_p is substituted for by government data d_g .

The expression above reveals that obtaining a contract with greater access to government data can stimulate commercial innovation $\left(\frac{\Delta q_c(\cdot; \bar{X}, \bar{C})}{\Delta d_g} > 0\right)$ when the direct effect due to the shareability of government data and indirect effects arising from other shareable inputs are strong. However, the total effect could be nil when government and private data are sufficiently substitutable (and other non-data shareable inputs do not change), or even negative when the crowding-out of non-shareable inputs due to government software production is sufficiently strong.

This thought experiment illustrates the empirical approach we follow to estimate our parameter of interest: comparing the changes in commercial software output between firms that obtained *data-rich* versus *data-scarce* contracts. It also reveals the two main threats to identification our empirical work will need to account for: (i) firms obtaining data-rich contracts may have different characteristics from those obtaining data-scarce contracts (X differs); and (ii) data-rich contracts may differ from data-scarce contracts along dimensions other than the amount of government data they provide (C differs). When X or C differ alongside d_g , the comparison between firms would not deliver the

parameter of interest but also incorporate the effects of these other confounding factors.

3 The state and China's facial recognition AI industry

3.1 Empirical context

China's facial recognition AI sector is a prototypical setting in which to examine the impact of access to government data on commercial innovation. First, because facial recognition AI is extremely data-intensive: the development of the technology requires access to large datasets containing faces. Second, public security units of the Chinese state contract with facial recognition AI firms to provide them services in order to monitor citizens. Third, because these units collect huge amounts of surveillance data that firms can gain access to when obtaining a contract. Indeed, the value of government data is clear to private sector entrepreneurs: in 2019, a founder of a leading Chinese AI firm stated, "The core reason why [Chinese] AI achieves such tremendous success is due to data availability and related technology. Government data is the biggest source of data for AI firms like us."⁶ Importantly, data acquired privately are not currently a close substitute for government data: in 2019, the former premier, Li Keqiang, stated that, "At this time, 80% of the data in China is controlled by various government agencies."⁷

Applying our conceptual framework to this context, consider an example in which a private firm receives a procurement contract to provide facial recognition software and data analysis services to a municipal police department in China. The firm implicitly receives access to large quantities of government data which are not publicly available. Such data includes video from street surveillance cameras, and, potentially, labeled images with names and faces of individuals. The firm uses this data to train an AI algorithm; e.g., a "tracking" algorithm that matches faces across video feeds or a "detection" algorithm that matches faces from video to the database of individuals. Then, the government data (or a base algorithm trained with it) can be used to produce a separate trained algorithm that results in a commercial AI product; for example, AI software designed for retail firms that may wish to track or detect individual shoppers throughout their stores, and then predict their consumption choices.

⁶Source: Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference, <https://bit.ly/3gdo2T6>.

⁷*Ibid.* It is important to note that Chinese government support of AI innovation is not limited to data provision, but also includes a range of subsidies. Industrial policy that broadly affects all firms (whether or not they receive government data) is thus an important characteristic of the setting we study. It is also more broadly a characteristic of AI innovation around the world.

3.2 Data sources

Operationalizing our empirical analysis faces three data-related empirical challenges: first, the need to link AI firms to government contracts; second, the need to compile information on AI firms' software production, and specifically whether a given software is intended for commercial or other uses (e.g. for government use); and, third, the need to measure the quantity of government data to which firms have access. We address these challenges by constructing a novel dataset combining information on Chinese facial recognition AI firms and their software releases, and information on local governments' procurement of AI software and of surveillance cameras.⁸

Linking Chinese facial recognition AI firms to government contracts We identify (close to) all active firms based in China producing facial recognition AI using information from *Tianyancha*, a comprehensive database on Chinese firms that draws information from official, public records.⁹ We extract firms that are categorized as facial recognition AI producers by the database, and we validate the categorization by manually coding firms based on their descriptions and product lists. We complement the *Tianyancha* database with information from *Pitchbook*, a database owned by Morningstar on firms and private capital markets around the world.¹⁰ Using the overlap between sources, we validate the coding of firms identified in the *Tianyancha* database. We also supplement the *Tianyancha* data by adding a small number of AI firms that are listed by *Pitchbook* but omitted by *Tianyancha*. Overall, we identify 7,837 Chinese facial recognition AI firms.¹¹ We also collect an array of firm level characteristics such as founding year, capitalization, major external financing sources, as well as subsidiary and mother firm information.

We extract information on 2,997,105 procurement contracts issued by all levels of the Chinese government between 2013 and 2019 from the Chinese Government Procurement Database, maintained by China's Ministry of Finance.¹² The contract database contains information on the good or service procured, the date of the contract, the monetary size of the contract, the winning bid, as well as, for a subset of the contracts, information on bids that did not win the contract.

⁸Appendix Table A.1 describes the core variables and their sources.

⁹For example, a primary source of firms' information compiled by Tianyancha is the National Enterprise Credit Information Publicity System, maintained by China's State Administration for Industry and Commerce. See Appendix Figure A.1 for an example entry.

¹⁰See Appendix Figure A.2 for an example entry.

¹¹These firms fall into 3 categories: (i) firms specialized in facial recognition AI (e.g., Yitu); (ii) hardware firms that devote substantial resources to develop AI software (e.g., Hik-Vision); and (iii) a small number of distinct AI units within large tech conglomerates (e.g., Baidu AI).

¹²See Appendix Figure A.3 for an example contract.

We focus on contracts awarded by public security agencies to AI firms to analyze data drawn from local surveillance networks. These contracts provide firms with access to massive quantities of data, collected for monitoring purposes. Take, as an example from our dataset, a public security contract signed between an AI firm and a municipal police department in Heilongjiang Province to “increase the capacity of its identity information collection system” on August 29th, 2018. The contract specifies that the AI firm shall provide a facial recognition system that can store and analyze at least 30 million facial images — a substantial amount of data to which the firm obtains access.

We begin with a comprehensive set of public security agency procurement contracts, including 410,510 contracts in total. Within this set of public security contracts, we focus on the ones issued by prefecture level governments. This includes the following four types of public security contracts from the Chinese Government Procurement Database: (i) all contracts for China’s flagship surveillance/monitoring projects — *Skynet Project*, *Peaceful City Project*, and *Bright Transparency Project*; (ii) all contracts with local police departments; (iii) all contracts with the border control and national security units; and, (iv) all contracts with the administrative units for domestic security and stability maintenance, the government’s political and legal affairs commission, and various “smart city” and digital urban management units of the government.

To identify public security contracts procuring facial recognition AI, we match the contracts with the list of facial recognition AI firms, identifying 28,023 procurement contracts involving at least one facial recognition AI firm.¹³ Many firms receive multiple contracts; overall, 1,095 facial recognition AI firms in our dataset receive at least one contract.

Counting and classifying novel facial recognition AI software products We collect all software registration records for our facial recognition AI firms from China’s Ministry of Industry and Information Technology, with which Chinese firms are required to register new software releases and major upgrades. We are able to validate our measure of software releases (using a single large firm), by cross-checking our data against the IPO Prospectus of MegVii, the world’s first facial recognition AI company to file for an IPO.¹⁴ We find that our records’ coverage is comprehensive (at least in the case of MegVii): MegVii’s IPO Prospectus contains 103 software releases, all of which are included in our dataset.

The count of new software releases (and major upgrades) represents *product innova-*

¹³We present the cumulative number of AI procurement contracts in Appendix Figure A.4 (top panel), as well as the flow of new contracts signed in each month (bottom panel). Both public security and non-public security AI contracts have steadily increased since 2013.

¹⁴Source: Hong Kong Stock Exchange, <https://go.aws/37GbAZG>.

tion.¹⁵ Reflecting the economic value of such innovation, we observe that facial recognition AI firms that develop more software have significantly and substantially higher market capitalization (see Appendix Figure A.5). In addition to quantity, we discuss measures of the quality of product development through the release of facial recognition AI software that involves video, a sophisticated and data-demanding facial recognition application (see Section 4.2).

We use a Recurrent Neural Network (RNN) model with tensorflow — a frontier method for analyzing text using machine learning — to categorize software products according to their intended customers and (independently) by their function. Our categorization by customer distinguishes between software products developed for the government (e.g., “smart city — real time monitoring system on main traffic routes”) and software products developed for commercial applications (e.g., “visual recognition system for smart retail”). We allow for a residual category of general application software whose description does not clearly specify the intended user (e.g., “a synchronization method for multi-view cameras based on FPGA chips”). By coding as “commercial” only those products that are specifically linked to commercial applications, and excluding products with ambiguous use, we aim to be conservative in our measure of commercial software products.

Our categorization by function first identifies software products that are directly related to AI (e.g., “a method for pedestrian counting at crossroads based on multi-view cameras system in complicated situations”). Within the category of AI software, we also separately identify a subcategory of software that is particularly data-intensive: video-based facial recognition, which (as opposed to static images) requires N-to-1 or even N-to-N matching algorithms that are extremely data demanding. Finally, we identify a separate category of non-AI software products that are data-complementary, involving data storage, data transmission, or data management (e.g., “a computer cluster for webcam monitoring data storage”).

To implement the two dimensions of categorization using the RNN model, we manually label 13,000 software products to produce a training corpus. We then use word-embedding to convert sentences in the software descriptions into vectors based on word frequencies, where we use words from the full dataset as the dictionary. We use a Long Short-Term Memory (LSTM) algorithm, configured with 2 layers of 32 nodes. We use 90% of the data for algorithm training, while 10% is retained for validation. We run 10,000 training cycles for gradient descent on the accuracy loss function. The categorizations

¹⁵The National Science Foundation defines product innovation as “the market introduction of a new or significantly improved good or service with respect to its capabilities, user-friendliness, components, or subsystems” in its Business Enterprise Research and Development Survey (see <https://www.nsf.gov/statistics/srvyberd/>). See also Bloom et al. (2020).

perform well in general: we are able to achieve 72% median accuracy in categorizing software customer and 98% median accuracy in categorizing software function in the validation data. Appendix Figure A.6 shows the summary statistics of the categorization output by customers and by function; and, Appendix Figure A.7 presents the confusion matrix (Type-I and Type-II errors) of the predictions relative to categorization done by humans.¹⁶

Measuring the quantity of government data to which firms have access Within the set of public security AI contracts, we identify those that are likely to be especially rich in data for facial recognition AI firms. We measure the data provided by a contract using the public security agency’s local surveillance network capacity to capture video of faces on the streets in high-resolution: that is, the number of high-resolution surveillance cameras that had previously been purchased by government units in the agency’s prefecture. This thus captures the amount of *identifiable* facial data that a facial recognition AI firm may gain access to.¹⁷ Specifically, using 5,837 prefectural government contracts for purchases of surveillance cameras, we sum the number of cameras procured in each prefecture up to a certain date and divide this by the prefecture’s population to form a time-varying measure of the video surveillance capacity of a particular prefecture.¹⁸ We measure data-richness using the density of cameras per capita because it proxies for the surveillance network’s ability to observe the same faces multiple times, a key component of training data quality from a machine learning perspective. In a robustness specification below, we instead consider the counts of cameras.

Our empirical definition of a data-rich contract is one with a public security agency located in a prefecture that has above-median surveillance capacity (measured by cameras per capita) at the time the contract was awarded. Figure 2 shows the distribution of data-rich and data-scarce contracts across prefectures according to our definition.¹⁹ We

¹⁶Appendix Table A.2 presents the top words (in terms of frequency) used for the categorization. Appendix Figure A.8 presents the density plots of the algorithm’s category predictions. The algorithm is very accurate in categorizing software for government purposes. The algorithm is relatively conservative in categorizing software products for commercial customers, and relatively aggressive in categorizing them as general purpose. In setting our categorization threshold for commercial software we again aim to be conservative in our measure of commercial software products.

¹⁷Note that the existence of a national ID system in China likely implies that there may be limited variation across local public security agencies in *identified* personal images. Moreover, even if firms did not gain access to identified data, surveillance video alone would still be useful for many AI applications.

¹⁸This measure captures the stock of *newer* surveillance cameras at the time, but not the older ones. The focus on newer cameras is appropriate given their higher resolution and thus greater usefulness in identifying and matching faces (see the Chinese government’s directive on video surveillance: <https://bit.ly/3dqdjU0>). There are on average 77 surveillance camera contracts per prefecture. In Appendix Figure A.9, we present a time series plot of the number of cameras in our data over time.

¹⁹By measuring data-richness at the time of the contract, we ensure that secular trends in surveillance



Figure 2: Figure illustrates public security AI procurement across China. Circle size indicates the number of first AI contracts awarded in the prefecture. Circle shading indicates the fraction of first AI contracts that were data-rich or data-scarce, where the within-prefecture variation comes from changes in the number of surveillance cameras over time.

compare the effects of these data-rich public security contracts to data-scarce public security contracts, where data-scarce contracts are defined as those awarded by a public security agency located in a prefecture that has below-median surveillance capacity at the time the contract was awarded.

Summary statistics Table 1 presents summary statistics describing the firms in our sample. Firms receiving different types of contracts differ substantially from each other, so accounting for differences (both observable and unobservable) between the firms receiving data-rich and data-scarce contracts will be crucial to identify the effects of the contracts. Appendix Table A.3 presents summary statistics describing the contracts procuring AI services in our sample.²⁰ Data-scarce and data-rich contracts differ on dimensions other than in the quantity of data to which firms receive access, so accounting for alternative mechanisms (other than data provision) through which data-rich contracts might affect software production will be crucial to identifying the causal effects of interest.

capacity do not skew our measure toward coding later contracts as data-richer.

²⁰In Appendix Table A.4, we provide descriptive statistics for the prefectures where contracts were issued, again disaggregating by the type of agency and by surveillance capacity.

Table 1: Summary statistics — firms and their production

	Any contract		Public security contract		Public security contract by surveillance capacity	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	High	Low
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Panel A: Firm characteristics						
Year firm established	2009.3 (6.4)	2013.8 (4.2)	2008.9 (6.4)	2011.4 (6.1)	2007.5 (7.0)	2010.0 (5.7)
Capitalization (millions USD)	22.8 (210.3)	5.1 (42.8)	26.4 (229.1)	4.1 (14.4)	35.3 (295.0)	19.9 (165.4)
Rounds of investment funding	0.9 (1.7)	0.5 (1.9)	1.0 (1.8)	0.3 (0.8)	1.0 (1.8)	1.0 (1.7)
Observations	1,093	6,041	919	174	387	532
Panel B: Software production before first contract receipt						
Total amount of software	22.7 (37.9)	14.6 (24.5)	23.8 (39.9)	14.8 (16.4)	27.4 (45.0)	21.2 (35.8)
Commercial	9.0 (17.1)	6.3 (12.5)	9.4 (17.9)	6.7 (9.6)	10.1 (20.1)	8.8 (16.1)
Government	7.3 (16.3)	4.0 (8.2)	7.8 (17.2)	4.1 (7.0)	10.0 (17.7)	6.3 (16.6)
AI (video)	1.6 (3.8)	1.0 (2.8)	1.6 (3.9)	1.4 (3.2)	2.0 (4.9)	1.3 (3.0)
Data-complementary	9.2 (16.7)	5.6 (10.8)	9.7 (17.5)	5.9 (8.4)	11.3 (19.4)	8.6 (16.0)
Observations	956	6,042	835	121	345	490

Note: Variables in Panel A come from *Tianyancha*; variables in Panel B come from the Ministry of China's Ministry of Industry and Information Technology. "Total amount of AI software" is classified by sector (commercial or government), and by function (AI-video). Data-complementary software is distinct from AI software. Observations at the firm level. Standard deviations are reported below the means. Columns 1 and 2 split the firms into those receiving any government contract or not. For firms not receiving any contract, Panel B describes all software production during the entire sample period. Conditional on receiving at least one government contract, columns 3 and 4 split the firms into those whose first contract is awarded by a public security agency. Conditional on receiving the first government contract from a public security agency, columns 5 and 6 split the firms depending on whether their first public security contract is awarded by prefectures with high or low levels of surveillance capacity.

4 Empirical analyses

4.1 Empirical model and identification strategy

Our parameter of interest is the change in commercial AI software production resulting from a change in government data that the firm has access to through providing services to the state. We use a triple differences design to identify the effects of accessing government data on facial recognition AI firms' subsequent product development. The empirical strategy exploits variation across time and across firms in the receipt of a public security contract, and across the data-richness of the contracts that firms receive. Specifically, as in an event study design, we compare firms' AI software releases before and after they receive their first public security contracts, controlling for firm and time period fixed effects. To help pin down the importance of access to *government data*, rather than other benefits of government contracts, such as capital, reputation, and political connections, we in addition exploit variation in the data-richness (i.e., surveillance capacity) of the local public security agencies that issue the contracts.

We test whether firms receiving data-rich public security contracts differentially increase their commercial software production following receipt of the contract. To do so, we estimate the following empirical model:

$$y_{it} = \sum_T \beta_{1T} T_{it} Data_i + \sum_T \beta_{2T} T_{it} + \alpha_t + \gamma_i + \epsilon_{it}.$$

The outcome variable, y_{it} , is the cumulative number of commercial software releases by firm i up to the 6-month period t . The explanatory variables of interest are the interaction terms between a set of dummy variables, T_{it} , indicating 6-month time periods before or since firm i received its first contract, and $Data_i$, a dummy variable indicating whether the firm's first contract was data rich, as defined above.²¹ We also include a full set of firm fixed effects, γ_i , and time period fixed effects, α_t , in all specifications. We allow the error term ϵ_{it} to be correlated not only across observations for a single firm, but also across observations for firms that are related by common ownership by a single mother firm. We cluster standard errors at the mother firm-level to be conservative.

The coefficients β_{2T} describe the software production of a firm around the time when it receives its first data-scarce public security contract; the sums of coefficients $\beta_{1T} + \beta_{2T}$ describe the software production of a firm around the time when it receives its first data-rich public security contract. The coefficients on the interaction terms, β_{1T} , thus

²¹We focus on the effect of the initial contract because the receipt of subsequent contracts is endogenous to firms' performance in their initial contracts — therefore being part of the *total effect* one would wish to capture.

non-parametrically capture a firm’s differential production of new software approaching or following the arrival of initial data-rich contracts, relative to data-scarce ones. The $\beta_1 T$ coefficients correspond to our parameter of interest, to the extent that we are able to account for confounding factors such as firms’ selection into data-rich contracts and contract characteristics unrelated to government data.

Our empirical specification allows us to account for a range of such factors. By including time fixed effects, we account for time-varying sources of variation in software production common to all facial recognition firms (for example, government policies promoting AI). We are also able to address a range of concerns regarding firms’ selection into procurement contracts. Note that our triple differences design does not require exogenous assignment of *all* contracts — in fact, we fully account for selection into contracts with public security agencies by examining variation within the set of firms that receive public security contracts. Our identifying assumption is the exogenous access to greater amounts of government data conditional on the receipt of any public security contract and the controls we include. We account for the time-invariant sources of selection into data-rich public security contracts by including firm fixed effects. One remains concerned about time-varying sources of selection into data-rich contracts, which we assess by examining pre-contract levels and trends of software production, and we further address in a robustness specification below by controlling for the time-varying effects of firms’ pre-contract characteristics ($\sum_T T_{it} X_i$). One also may be concerned that data-rich contracts differ from data-scarce contracts along other dimensions than data that could shape software production, which we address in additional robustness specifications by controlling for the time-varying effects of several salient contract characteristics ($\sum_T T_{it} C_i$).

4.2 Baseline estimates of the parameter of interest

We begin our empirical analyses by estimating our baseline specification described in Section 4.1, comparing the effects of public security contracts in prefectures with above-median surveillance capacity (data-rich contracts) with those that have below-median surveillance capacity (data-scarce contracts). In Figure 3, Panel A, we plot the coefficients β_{1T} and their 95% confidence intervals, describing the *differential* cumulative commercial software production around the time when a data-rich public security contract was received, relative to a data-scarce public security contract (all coefficients are presented in Table 2, column 1).

We find that the receipt of a data-rich public security contract is associated with differentially more commercial software production than receipt of a data-scarce public se-




Figure 3: Differential cumulative software releases intended for commercial (left), for government uses (right), resulting from data-rich public security contracts, relative to data-scarce ones, controlling for firm and time period fixed effects. Data-rich contracts are defined as public security contracts in prefectures with above median surveillance capacity.

curity contract: around 1.0 additional software products one year after the contract receipt, increasing to around 1.9 additional software products over a period of 3 years after the contract. Over the 3-year period, this represents an increase in commercial software production of 20.2% relative to the pre-contract level. While we discuss threats to identification in detail below, we note that the absence of pre-contract differences in software production levels or trends suggests a causal effect of a data-rich contract.

This increase in commercial software takes place alongside an increase in government software production. We estimate our baseline model but instead considering government software production as an outcome, and we present the results in Figure 3, Panel B (all coefficients are presented in Table 2, column 2). We find that data-rich public security contracts generate 2.9 additional government software products (an increase by 51.9%) over 3 years after the receipt of the contract, compared to data-scarce contracts. Again, we find no pre-contract differences in levels or trends in government software production. Thus, the increase in commercial software production takes place despite the need to allocate resources to increase government software production.

Importantly, our results on commercial software indeed represent a differential increase in software production, rather than differential crowd-out. We observe an overall positive effect of both data-scarce and data-rich contracts on commercial software production, and differentially larger effects for the latter. We document this in Appendix Figure A.10, which plots the coefficients β_{2T} and $\beta_{1T} + \beta_{2T}$ for commercial software production when a data-scarce and a data-rich public security contract are received, respectively.²²

²²The figure also shows an increase in government software production following the receipt of both data-rich and data-scarce public security contracts.

Table 2: Regression coefficients

	Commercial	Government
	(1)	(2)
4 semiyears before	-0.239 (0.231)	-0.177 (0.268)
3 semiyears before	-0.180 (0.228)	-0.040 (0.264)
2 semiyears before	-0.202 (0.225)	-0.002 (0.261)
Receiving 1st contract	0.868*** (0.239)	0.750*** (0.279)
1 semiyear after	1.663*** (0.250)	1.443*** (0.289)
2 semiyears after	2.219*** (0.258)	2.243*** (0.301)
3 semiyears after	3.122*** (0.287)	2.986*** (0.334)
4 semiyears after	4.017*** (0.309)	3.984*** (0.360)
5 semiyears after	4.857*** (0.337)	4.849*** (0.389)
6 semiyears after	5.811*** (0.378)	5.595*** (0.444)
4 semiyears before × data-rich	0.633 (0.539)	-0.279 (0.620)
3 semiyears before × data-rich	0.222 (0.488)	-0.379 (0.565)
2 semiyears before × data-rich	0.351 (0.463)	-0.209 (0.535)
Receiving 1st contract × data-rich	0.314 (0.438)	0.465 (0.508)
1 semiyear after × data-rich	0.502 (0.451)	0.858 (0.524)
2 semiyears after × data-rich	0.969** (0.449)	0.817 (0.520)
3 semiyears after × data-rich	0.526 (0.470)	1.023* (0.544)
4 semiyears after × data-rich	0.823* (0.487)	1.151** (0.565)
5 semiyears before × data-rich	1.205** (0.515)	1.800*** (0.594)
6 semiyears after × data-rich	1.861*** (0.550)	2.911*** (0.642)

Notes: All regressions estimated on the sample of firms receiving first contracts from public security agencies. Baseline specification controls for time period fixed effects and firm fixed effects. * significant at 10% ** significant at 5% *** significant at 1%.

Robustness Given the complex process of constructing our dataset, it is important to note that our findings are robust to varying several salient dimensions of our analysis (see Figure 4).

We begin by assessing the robustness of our results to variation in specifying our outcome of interest — measures of commercial software innovation. First, we restrict attention only to firms’ new software releases (i.e., version 1.0) and major upgrades with a change in the first digit of the release number (i.e., versions 2.0, 3.0, etc.). Our baseline estimates remain largely unchanged, indicating that our results are not driven by minor software updates (see Panel A). An even more demanding check is to restrict attention to software that involves video — the most data demanding form of facial recognition AI. Indeed, we find significantly greater video facial recognition AI software production following receipt of a data-rich contract (see panel B).

Second, we consider the three key parameters of choice in the RNN algorithm that we use to categorize software — timestep, embedding, and nodes. We vary these three parameters, re-configure the RNN LSTM algorithm, re-categorize software, and re-estimate the baseline empirical specification. We find that these algorithm parameter choices have no impact on our results (see Panel C). Third, we restrict attention to commercial software that we can classify with a very high degree of confidence by adjusting the LSTM classification threshold. The baseline specification sets the threshold as 50%. We re-categorize software using higher classification thresholds of 60% and 70%, and these adjustments have no impact on our results (see Panel D).

We then assess the robustness of our results with respect to our definition of data-rich procurement contracts. First, we define data-richness of the contracts based on the absolute count of surveillance cameras, rather than the count per capita as used in the baseline specification. One can see that our results are unaffected by the modified definition (see Panel E). Second, we adjust our classification of (data-rich) public security contracts to exclude any ambiguous government agencies (e.g., contracts with the government headquarters, and smart city management and administrative bureaux could be meant to provide security services just for the government office building). This, too, has no impact on our results (see Panel F). Third, we consider an alternative empirical definition of data-richness of government contracts. Procurement contracts awarded by a public security agency (even in locations with relatively few surveillance cameras) are most likely to provide access to massive, linkable, personal data, collected for monitoring purposes, while contracts with other, non-public security agencies likely provide access to less data.²³

²³Non-public security agencies (e.g., banks or schools) do not have access to large scale surveillance camera networks and cover narrower groups of individuals.

We define a data-rich contract as one that came from a public security agency, whereas a data-scarce contract is one that did not. We re-estimate the baseline specification with this alternative definition of data-richness. The results are qualitatively unchanged (see Panel G). This analysis has the drawback of comparing the effects of types of contracts into which firm selection may differ substantially. However, when we examine the *direction* of selection into public security contracts (relative to non-public security ones), we find that it is often the *opposite* of what we observe when examining selection into data-rich public security contracts (relative to data-scarce public security contracts).²⁴ Finding the same qualitative effects using this alternative definition of data-richness argues against concerns that our results are driven by selection into data-richer contracts.

We next vary the sample used to estimate the baseline model. We consider a balanced panel of firms; an expanded window of time around the receipt of the first contract; and we address potential negative weighting issues in event studies by over-weighting firms receiving no contract by a factor of 1,000 (Borusyak et al., 2017). These changes do not affect our findings (see Panel H).

4.3 Evaluating alternative hypotheses

Motivated by our conceptual framework, we now evaluate whether the increased commercial software production observed following receipt of data-rich procurement contracts may be attributable to firms' characteristics related to selection into data-rich contracts, or characteristics of the contracts other than access to government data.

Firms' selection into data-rich contracts Given the value of government contracts and government data, one naturally expects the sorting of firms into government contracts, in particularly the data-rich ones. Indeed, examining Table 1, Panels A and B, one observes that firms receiving data-rich public security contracts exhibit characteristics plausibly associated with higher underlying productivity: they tend to be older, better capitalized, and to have already produced more software prior to the receipt of first contract.²⁵

²⁴For example, firms receiving public security contracts are better capitalized than firms receiving non-public security contracts (40 vs. 13 million USD; see Table 1), but firms receiving public security contracts in high-surveillance prefectures are less well capitalized than firms receiving public security contracts in low-surveillance prefectures (13 vs. 61 million USD).

²⁵Consistent with selection, we also find that firms submit lower bids for data-rich contracts, and more firms submit bids for data-rich contracts (see Appendix Figure A.11).




Figure 4: Panels replicate results from Figure 3, Panel A (plotted in black circles). Panel A adds results restricting software to only major releases (version X.0). Panel B presents results with AI video software as the outcome. Panel C varies the LSTM categorization model configuration. The grey diamonds show results for a LSTM model trained with a timestep of 10 instead (baseline level = 20), the blue triangles show results for a model trained with 16 embedding size instead (baseline level = 32), and the red squares show results for a model trained with 16 nodes instead (baseline level = 32). Panel D varies the LSTM categorization model's confidence threshold. The grey diamonds and blue triangles use thresholds of 60% and 70%, respectively (baseline level = 50%). Panel E's grey diamonds use above median absolute camera counts to define data-rich contracts (baseline specification uses cameras per capita). Panel F's grey diamonds exclude companies whose first contract may be with an ambiguous entity, or one that contains the keywords "local government" or "government offices" which may be used for either public security or non-public security. Panel G's grey diamonds show results based on an alternative definition of data-richness (public security contracts are classified as data-rich, while non-public security ones are data-scarce). Panel H explores robustness with respect to sample, where the grey diamonds present results with a balanced panel, the blue triangles present results for an extended time frame (-5 quarters to 8 quarters after contract), and the red squares present results over-weighting firms receiving no contract by a factor of 1,000.

Importantly, our empirical specification already accounts for important dimensions of sorting, including *any* form of sorting into public security contracts as well as sorting into data-rich contracts on time-invariant firm characteristics, whether observable or unobserved. Additional results suggest that sorting on time-varying characteristics cannot account for the effects of data-rich contracts that we observe. First, as noted above, we find no evidence of pre-contract differences in software production levels or trends, which one would expect if firms selected into data-rich government contracts as a function of their productivity trends. As another check, we account for firms' unobserved potential for productivity growth following contracts' receipt, by controlling for the time-varying effects of firms' underlying productivity. We proxy for firms' underlying productivity using their establishment year, pre-contract capitalization, rounds of external financing prior to their first procurement contract, and total pre-contract software production. We construct an index of firms' underlying productivity combining these proxies,²⁶ and we control for the time-varying effects of this index. Formally, we interact this index with a full set of time period fixed effects ($\sum_T T_{it} X_i$). As presented in Figure 5, Panel A, we find that these controls do not qualitatively or quantitatively affect our baseline estimates.²⁷

Contract features other than government data Procurement contracts that provide greater access to government data may also provide firms with a range of additional productive benefits. One basic consideration is that contracts may affect firms' software production through the provision of capital. Another possibility is that high-surveillance prefectures may also be richer; if so, a data-rich contract may stimulate additional software production by providing access to a richer commercial market. Yet another possibility is that data-rich contracts may require firms to perform different tasks that could affect subsequent productivity. To evaluate these concerns, we measure firms' access to capital by the monetary value of the contract; we measure market potential by the GDP per capita of the prefecture where a firm's first government contract was issued; and we quantify the requirements of each contract using natural language processing, measuring the distance between the language used in each contract and a random set of non-public security contracts. We construct an index of the non-data benefits of the contract combining these characteristics (again, following Anderson, 2008), and we control for the time-varying ef-

²⁶Specifically, we standardize each element of the index and combine them, weighting by the inverse covariance matrix following Anderson (2008).

²⁷While firms' underlying productivity cannot account for the treatment effect we observe, one might wonder whether it is a source of heterogeneous effects of government data. To test for heterogeneous treatment effects associated with firms' underlying productivity, we estimate the baseline specification on samples of firms split above and below the median level of the productivity index. We find positive effects of similar magnitudes among both samples of firms (see Appendix Figure A.12).




Figure 5: Panels replicate results from Figure 3, Panel A (plotted in black circles). Panel A adds results (plotted in red diamonds) controlling for the time-varying effects of an index of firms’ underlying productivity (an inverse covariance weighted z-score of firms’ establishment year, pre-contract capitalization, rounds of external financing prior to their first procurement contract, and total pre-contract software production). Panel B adds results (plotted in grey diamonds) controlling for the time-varying effects of an index of contract characteristics (an inverse covariance weighted z-score of contract location GDP, tasks specified by the contract text, and contract monetary size). Panel B also adds results (plotted in blue triangles) for the second contract received within the parent organization; results (plotted in red squares) excluding contracts from Beijing and Shanghai; and results (plotted in green x’s) restricting the sample to firms that have their first contract outside of their home province.

fects of this index. Formally, we interact this index with a full set of time period fixed effects ($\sum_T T_{it}C_i$). As presented in Figure 5, Panel B, we find that these controls do not affect our estimates.

Additionally, it is possible that receipt of a data-rich contract may function as a signal of firm quality or potential through which firms could derive additional productive inputs.²⁸ To test whether the differential signaling value of data-rich contracts accounts for our findings, we examine the effects of a firm’s first contract, but limiting our analysis to subsidiary firms belonging to a mother firm that has *already* received a government contract through a different subsidiary. Arguably, the signaling value of these first contracts should be lower (mother firm quality is already observed), while access to data remains potentially extremely valuable. In Figure 5, Panel B, one can see that within this sample of firms there is still a significant differential effect of receiving a data-rich contract.

One may also be concerned that receipt of data-rich procurement contracts may be a result of firms’ political connections, may strengthen such connections, and may stimulate firms’ software production through these connections rather than access to government data. Connections may be differentially valuable with the local governments of Beijing and Shanghai, two specific prefectures that are highly politically significant and exhibit high levels of surveillance in most time periods. To rule out the possibility that our find-

²⁸Perhaps firms obtaining data-rich government contracts receive additional benefits from local industrial policy compared to firms obtaining data-scarce ones; or attract additional external funding, human capital, or customers, all of which contribute to the production of software.

ings are driven by contracts with these two local governments, we estimate our baseline specification, but excluding contracts with Beijing and Shanghai governments. Our findings are qualitatively unchanged (again, see Figure 5, Panel B). Another possibility is that local firms may be able to leverage advantages with local government officials to acquire data-rich contracts and to successfully market commercial software due to stronger political ties. To rule this out, we estimate our baseline model, but excluding contracts signed between firms and any government in their home province. We again find that our results are unaffected (again, see Panel B).

4.4 Assessing mechanisms

As shown in the conceptual framework, government data could stimulate commercial innovation through two mechanisms: either directly, due to the shareability of data and algorithms across uses; or indirectly, through the development of non-data shareable inputs as a result of access to greater amounts of government data (e.g., improved firm capacity to manage and utilize data as a form of firm learning by doing).

We are able to measure one important dimension of non-data shareable inputs: the development of data-complementary (non-AI) software that facilitates more efficient data storage, transmission, and management. Such shareable inputs might arise from firms' learning by doing as a result of access to unprecedented quantities of government data. To examine whether this shareable input differentially responds to the receipt of data-rich public security contracts, we estimate our baseline model in Section 4.2, but considering these data-complementary software products as the outcome of interest. We present the estimates in Figure 6, Panel A. One can see that data-complementary software production differentially increases after the receipt of a data-rich public security contract. We find no evidence of pre-contract differences in data-complementary software production levels or trends; this suggests that receipt of a data-rich contract indeed generates shareable inputs that may induce greater commercial software production.

We next evaluate whether the indirect effect of government data through the development of non-data shareable inputs plays a predominant role in driving the observed increase in commercial AI software production. Specifically, we proxy for firms' potential to benefit from additional shareable inputs following the receipt of data-rich contracts using their *pre-contract* production of data-complementary software. To account for this potential, we estimate our baseline model (with commercial software as the outcome), additionally controlling for pre-contract data-complementary software production interacted with the full set of time period fixed effects. If potential benefits from additional




Figure 6: Panel A replicates results from Figure 3, Panel A, but on data-complementary software releases instead. Panel B replicates results from Figure 3, Panel A (plotted in black dots), and also shows results (plotted in red diamonds) controlling for pre-contract data-complementary software interacted with time indicators.

non-data shareable inputs account for our baseline findings, then these controls would significantly alter our estimates. However, one can see in Figure 6, Panel B, that these controls have very little effect. This suggests an important *direct effect* of shareable government data (and algorithms) on commercial software production.

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we provide the first evidence of a causal effect of government data on commercial AI innovation. We argue that an important mechanism underlying this effect is that data and trained algorithms are shareable across government and commercial uses. Within our empirical context, our findings suggest that the provision of government data to Chinese AI firms servicing the state contributed to their rise as global leaders in facial recognition technologies. More generally, the economic mechanism that we highlight could apply to a range of other important domains where government data is predominant — geospatial and health data being two salient examples.²⁹ This implies that states’ AI procurement and data provision can act as innovation policies that, intentionally or not, could shape the development of AI in many areas.³⁰

Further work is needed to fully understand the normative trade-offs involved in such

²⁹Geospatial data collected by government satellites is used in applications related to transportation, mineral extraction, and energy production. Health data is collected by states in enormous quantities and is extremely valuable for AI-fueled diagnoses and treatment of disease. More concretely, the British National Health Service (NHS) recently signed a contract with Amazon for AI medical services. Developing these requires Amazon to access NHS medical data which is not publicly available and could contribute to the development of Amazon’s commercial AI products. See: <https://bit.ly/3hNGTbT>.

³⁰Note, however, that government provision of data to specific firms could distort the competitive landscape and discourage entry, thus dampening the overall growth of the sector.

policies. All states engage in surveillance to ensure public safety and security. In the modern world, this is likely to involve substantial government data collection and analysis using AI. Similarly, AI technology may be deployed to enhance the effectiveness of public health policies.³¹ Adding to these direct benefits are the potential commercial AI innovation spillovers that we document. However, states' deployment of AI and data-related policies also present distinct costs. States' deployment of AI can potentially infringe on civil liberties, particularly in the case of government surveillance; government data collection and provision may run the risk of violating privacy. Evaluating the normative implications of state AI and data-related policies thus requires measuring such costs — a task complicated by the fact that they are likely to vary across societies with different values and cultural norms.

Finally, our evidence raises questions regarding political economy aspects of data-intensive innovation. Because surveillance states — particularly autocracies — collect enormous amounts of data to monitor their citizens, one naturally wonders whether they may exhibit rapid AI innovation despite their repressive and extractive institutions. At the extreme, might surveillance states and societies with weaker privacy norms have a comparative advantage in AI innovation, and if so, what are the implications for trade policy? Answers to these questions will help us understand the consequences of China's rise as an AI superpower, and more generally, the global economic *and* political landscape in the age of data-intensive innovation.

³¹The United States CDC writes that AI technology, "could support public health surveillance, research and, ultimately, decision making." See <https://bit.ly/2WcfTKD>.

References

- Acemoglu, Daron and Pascual Restrepo**, “The wrong kind of AI? Artificial intelligence and the future of labour demand,” *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society*, December 2019, 13 (1), 25–35.
- Aghion, Philippe, Benjamin F Jones, and Charles I Jones**, “Artificial Intelligence and Economic Growth,” *NBER Working Paper*, October 2017, pp. 1–57.
- Agrawal, Ajay, Joshua Gans, and Avi Goldfarb**, *Prediction Machines The Simple Economics of Artificial Intelligence*, Harvard Business Press, April 2018.
- , —, and —, eds, *The Economics of Artificial Intelligence An Agenda*, University of Chicago Press, 2019.
- Alic, John A, Lewis M Branscomb, Harvey Brooks, and Ashton B Carter**, *Beyond Spinoff Military and Commercial Technologies in a Changing World*, Harvard Business Press, 1992.
- Anderson, Michael L**, “Multiple Inference and Gender Differences in the Effects of Early Intervention: A Reevaluation of the Abecedarian, Perry Preschool, and Early Training Projects,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, December 2008, 103 (484), 1481–1495.
- Aridor, Guy, Yeon-Koo Che, William Nelson, and Tobias Salz**, “The Economic Consequences of Data Privacy Regulation: Empirical Evidence from GDPR,” *Working Paper*, January 2020, pp. 1–67.
- Azoulay, Pierre, Erica Fuchs, Anna Goldstein, and Michael Kearney**, “Funding Breakthrough Research: Promises and Challenges of the “ARPA Model”,” *NBER Working Paper*, June 2018, pp. 1–32.
- Bai, Chong-En, Chang-Tai Hsieh, and Zheng Song**, “Special Deals with Chinese Characteristics,” *Working Paper*, May 2019, pp. 1–48.
- Bloom, Nicholas, Charles I Jones, John Van Reenen, and Michael Webb**, “Are Ideas Getting Harder to Find?,” *American Economic Review*, April 2020, 110 (4), 1104–1144.
- , **John Van Reenen, and Heidi L Williams**, “A Toolkit of Policies to Promote Innovation,” *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, August 2019, 33 (3), 163–184.
- Bombardini, Matilde, Bingjing Li, and Ruoying Wang**, “Import Competition and Innovation: Evidence from China,” *Working Paper*, January 2018, pp. 1–44.
- Borusyak, Kirill, Xavier Jaravel, and Jann Spiess**, “Revisiting Event Study Designs: Robust and Efficient Estimation,” *Working Paper*, 2017, pp. 1–35.
- Brandt, Loren and Thomas G Rawski**, *China’s Great Economic Transformation*, Cambridge University Press, April 2008.

- Chen, Yuyu, Avraham Ebenstein, Michael Greenstone, and Hongbin Li**, “Evidence on the impact of sustained exposure to air pollution on life expectancy from China’s Huai River policy,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 2013.
- Cheng, Hong, Ruixue Jia, Dandan Li, and Hongbin Li**, “The Rise of Robots in China,” *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, May 2019, 33 (2), 71–88.
- Clemens, Jeffrey and Parker Rogers**, “Demand Shocks, Procurement Policies, and the Nature of Medical Innovation: Evidence from Wartime Prosthetic Device Patents,” *NBER Working Paper*, January 2020, pp. 1–94.
- Farboodi, Maryam, Toxana Mihet, Thomas Philippon, and Laura L Veldkamp**, “Big Data and Firm Dynamics,” *NBER Working Paper*, January 2019, pp. 1–11.
- Fisman, Raymond and Yongxiang Wang**, “The Mortality Cost of Political Connections,” *The Review of Economic Studies*, September 2015, 82 (4), 1346–1382.
- Greenstein, Shane**, *How the Internet Became Commercial Innovation, Privatization, and the Birth of a New Network*, Princeton University Press, October 2015.
- Gross, Daniel P and Bhaven N Sampat**, “Inventing the Endless Frontier: the Effects of the World War II Research Effort on Post-War Innovation,” *NBER Working Paper*, June 2020, pp. 1–58.
- He, Guojun, Shaoda Wang, and Bing Zhang**, “Watering Down Environmental Regulation in China,” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, June 2020, 135 (4), 2135–2185.
- Jia, Ruixue, Masayuki Kudamatsu, and David Seim**, “Political Selection in China: the Complementary Roles of Connections and Performance,” *Journal of the European Economic Association*, April 2015, 13 (4), 631–668.
- Jones, Charles I and Christopher Tonetti**, “Nonrivalry and the Economics of Data,” *Working Paper*, October 2018, pp. 1–43.
- Khandelwal, Amit K, Peter K Schott, and Shang-Jin Wei**, “Trade Liberalization and Embedded Institutional Reform: Evidence from Chinese Exporters,” *American Economic Review*, October 2013, 103 (6), 2169–2195.
- Lau, Lawrence J, Yingyi Qian, and Gerard Roland**, “Reform without Losers: An Interpretation of China’s Dual-Track Approach to Transition,” *Journal of Political Economy*, February 2000, 108 (1), 120–143.
- Li, Hongbin and Li-An Zhou**, “Political turnover and economic performance: the incentive role of personnel control in China,” *Journal of Public Economics*, September 2005, 89 (9-10), 1743–1762.
- Li, Weijia**, “Rotation, Performance Rewards, and Property Rights,” *Working Paper*, February 2019, pp. 1–75.

- Moretti, Enrico, Claudia Steinwender, and John Van Reenen**, “The Intellectual Spoils of War? Defense R&D, Productivity and International Spillovers,” *NBER Working Paper*, November 2019, pp. 1–76.
- Nagaraj, Abhishek**, “The Private Impact of Public Data: Landsat Satellite Maps Increased Gold Discoveries and Encouraged Entry,” *Management Science*, 2021.
- Nagle, Frank**, “Government Technology Policy, Social Value, and National Competitiveness,” *Working Paper*, March 2019, pp. 1–52.
- Perrault, Raymond, Yoav Shoham, Erik Brynjolfsson, Jack Clark, John Etchemendy, Barbara Grosz, Terah Lyons, James Manyika, Saurabh Mishra, and Juan Carlos Niebles**, “The AI Index 2019 Annual Report,” Technical Report, AI Index Steering Committee, Human-Centered AI Institute, Stanford University December 2019.
- Roberts, Mark J, Daniel Yi Xu, Xiaoyan Fan, and Shengxing Zhang**, “The Role of Firm Factors in Demand, Cost, and Export Market Selection for Chinese Footwear Producers,” *The Review of Economic Studies*, November 2017, 85 (4), 2429–2461.
- Scott, James C**, *Seeing Like a State How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed*, Yale University Press, 1998.
- Slavtchev, Viktor and Simon Wiederhold**, “Does the Technological Content of Government Demand Matter for Private R&D? Evidence from US States,” *American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics*, April 2016, 8 (2), 45–84.
- Song, Zheng, Kjetil Storesletten, and Fabrizio Zilibotti**, “Growing Like China,” *American Economic Review*, February 2011, 101 (1), 196–233.
- Tirole, Jean**, “Digital Dystopia,” *Working Paper*, February 2020, pp. 1–36.
- Wei, Shang-Jin, Zhuan Xie, and Xiaobo Zhang**, “From “Made in China” to “Innovated in China”: Necessity, Prospect, and Challenges,” *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, February 2017, 31 (1), 49–70.
- Williams, Heidi L**, “Intellectual Property Rights and Innovation: Evidence from the Human Genome,” *Journal of Political Economy*, February 2013, 121 (1), 1–27.

ONLINE APPENDIX

依图

存绿 战略融资 依图科技 高新技术企业

下载报告

999+人工监控 风险监控

电话: 021-5255**** [登录查看](#)

邮箱: [REDACTED] [查看更多](#)

认证成功后即可编辑信息, [去认证](#)

网址: [REDACTED]

地址: [REDACTED] [附近公司](#)

简介: [REDACTED]

浏览量: 11万+

项目品牌: 依图科技 融资历程 7 竞品数量 2

企业架构图 瞬息掌握企业关系

股权穿透图 挖掘深层股权结构

企业受益股东 NEW 大数据挖掘最终受益股东

热点新闻: 旷视科技闯关港股, 何以领先“AI四小龙”? 6天前
 发票抬头 匿名名片 我要投诉 数据纠错 关注

天眼风险

自身风险 14 周边风险 15 预警提醒 171 [查看详情](#)

情报动态

2019-12-25 对外投资新增一家公司贵阳市信捷... [更多动态](#)

公司背景 182

司法风险 5

经营风险 10

公司发展 19

经营状况 999+

知识产权 418

历史信息 8

公司背景

天眼查

法定代表人

[REDACTED]

他有 5 家公司, 分布如下

上海 (共2家) [REDACTED] 等

广东 (共1家) [REDACTED] 等

其他 (共2家) [REDACTED] 等

企业架构图

查看详情

股权结构图

登录查看

注册资本	4375.8331万人民币	实缴资本	853.667万人民币
成立日期	2012-09-29	经营状态	存续
统一社会信用代码	[REDACTED]	工商注册号	310117002967741
纳税人识别号	[REDACTED]	组织机构代码	05506145X
公司类型	有限责任公司(自然人投资或控股)	行业	软件和信息技术服务业
核准日期	2012-09-29	登记机关	徐汇区市场监督管理局
营业期限	2012-09-29至2032-09-28	纳税人资质	-
人员规模	500-999人	参保人数	699
曾用名	-	英文名称	-
注册地址	[REDACTED] 附近公司		
经营范围	网络科技领域内的技术开发、技术服务、技术咨询、技术转让; 计算机软硬件(除计算机信息系统安全专用产品)的设计、开发、销售; 网络工程, 计算机系统集成, 电子设备、新型电子元器件、图形图像识别和处理系统的设计, 机械设备、电子产品、五金交电的销售, 企业管理咨询, 从事货物及技术的进出口业务, 电信业务。【依法须经批准的项目, 经相关部门批准后方可开展经营活动】		

天眼风险 43

位用户正在通过天眼风险发掘企业危机

天眼查

自身风险	14 条	该公司的部分股权处于 [REDACTED] 状态 (9) 更多	
		其他 (5) 更多	
周边风险	15 条	该公司投资的 [REDACTED] 进行了 [REDACTED] (1) 更多	登录查看
		其他 (14) 更多	
预警提醒	171 条	该公司发生了 [REDACTED] 变更 (3) 更多	
		其他 (168) 更多	

企业实名认证

- ✓ 展示认证标识
- ✓ 提升企业评分
- ✓ 编辑联系方式
- ✓ 订阅招标信息

立即认证, 最高领1000元优惠券

问大家

当前有 18人在讨论

我要提问

你的提问将会发送给
1000+ 位业内人士

平均回复时间
58 分钟

看他们怎么讨论本企业

如何看待基因编辑婴儿?

肖毅

D不是鼓励大家弯道超车吗? 这个就是现世报

查看 2 个回答

这个公司是在京东上做手机的吗?

段桐舟 · 湖北

是的, 超级坑, 被骗了36000元

查看 1 个回答

明年2020年何时上科创板?

许成在朱许孟许程里A · 上海

已经在科创板了

查看 1 个回答

[查看全部 7 个回答 >](#)

热门问答

Figure A.1: Example of AI firm record from Tianyancha (excerpt).

Highlights

Employees
1,000
As of 24-Oct-2018




Last Deal Details
Undisclosed
Later Stage VC 06-May-2019

Total Raised to Date
\$355.16M
As of 06-May-2019

[Edit Highlights](#)

Timeline



General Information

Description

Provider and developer of artificial intelligence technology used in the fields of smart cities, smart medical, and smart commerce. The company is engaged in the research of computer vision, image and video intelligent understanding, distributed system and big data application, it offers traffic management software, medical diagnostic technology and intelligent hardware, enabling companies to apply AI technology in their products.

Most Recent Financing Status (as of 13-Feb-2020)

The company raised an undisclosed amount of venture funding from [REDACTED]. Previously, the company raised \$300 million of Series C+ venture funding from [REDACTED].

Website

[REDACTED]

Entity Types Private Company Acquirer

Financing Status Venture Capital-Backed

Year Founded 2012

Legal Name [REDACTED]

Universe Venture Capital

Business Status Generating Revenue

Employees 1,000

Ownership Status Privately Held (backing)

[View Employee History](#)

Industries & Verticals

Primary Industry

Business/Productivity Software

Verticals

Artificial Intelligence & Machi...
Big Data
Digital Health
TMT

What PitchBook Analysts Say

[View More Analyst Insights](#)

"Both incumbents and startups are developing new hardware. While Google is putting their custom tensor processing units (TPUs) to use for many recent breakthroughs, independent leaders such as Cerebras and Graphcore have raised significant capital and developed other novel designs to cater to AI & ML applications."

| 10-Dec-2019 | Cameron Stanfill | Artificial Intelligence & Machine Learning +3

Contact Information

Primary Contact

[REDACTED]
Co-Founder & Chief Executive Officer
Phone: [REDACTED]

Primary Office

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
China
Phone: [REDACTED]

Alternate Offices (4)

Beijing
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
China
Phone: [REDACTED]

Figure A.2: Example of AI firm record from *Pitchbook* (excerpt).

财政部唯一指定政府采购信息网络发布媒体 国家级政府采购专业网站 服务热线: 400-810-1996

政策法规 标讯频道 中央采购 地方采购 案例解读 购买服务 PPP频道 GPA专栏 采购百科 热点专题

中国政府采购网 首页 > 地方标讯 > 中标公告

道路交通安全综合管理平台维护升级项目中标（成交）公告

2016年12月30日 16:26 来源: 中国政府采购网 【打印】 [【显示公告概要】](#)

- 1、项目名称:道路交通安全综合管理平台维护升级项目
- 2、项目编号: [REDACTED]
- 3、项目序列号: [REDACTED]
- 4、项目联系人: [REDACTED]
- 5、项目联系人电话: [REDACTED]
- 6、项目用途、简要技术要求及合同履行日期: 嵌入式“人脸识别”系统软件开发
- 7、采购方式: 公开招标
- 8、采购日期: 2016-12-07
- 9、公告媒体: [REDACTED]
- 10、评审时间: 2016-12-29
- 11、评审地点: [REDACTED]
- 12、评审委员会成员名单: [REDACTED]
- 13、定标日期: 2016-12-29
- 14、中标（成交）信息:

序号	中标供应商	中标供应商地址	主要中标内容	中标金额 (元)
1	网络科技有限公司	[REDACTED]	嵌入式“人脸识别”系统软件开发	639000.00

- 15、PPP项目: 否
- 16、采购人名称: [REDACTED]
 联系地址: [REDACTED]
 项目联系人: [REDACTED]
 联系电话: [REDACTED]
- 17、采购代理机构全称: [REDACTED]
 联系地址: [REDACTED]
 项目联系人: [REDACTED]
 联系电话: [REDACTED]
- 18、采购文件上传 (PDF格式):
 附件: [REDACTED]
- 19、书面推荐供应商参加采购活动的采购人和评审专家推荐意见 (如有):
 无

贵州贵财招标有限责任公司

Deal Time

Products/Services

Monetary Scale

Supplier

Buyer

Figure A.3: Example of a procurement contract record; source: Chinese Government Procurement Database.




Figure A.4: Cumulative number of public security and non-public security contracts (left panel), and the flow of new contracts signed in each month (right panel).





Figure A.5: Binned scatterplot at the firm level of log(firm capitalization) and amount of software produced.



(a) Customers

(b) Function

Figure A.6: Summary statistics of categorization outcomes for software categorizations based on Recurrent Neural Network with Long Short-Term Memory algorithm. Left panel shows categorization by customers; right panel shows categorization by function.






Figure A.7: Confusion matrix of categorization outcomes for software categorizations. True labels are based on training set constructed by human categorizations (performed by two individuals). Predicted labels are outputs based on Recurrent Neural Network with Long Short-Term Memory algorithm. Right panel shows categorization by customers; left panel shows categorization by function.



(a) Customers



(b) Function

Figure A.8: Probability density plots of software categorizations based on Recurrent Neural Network with Long Short-Term Memory algorithm. Top panel shows categorization by customers; bottom panel shows categorization by function.








Figure A.9: Number of new public surveillance cameras in China since 2013, as measured by government procurement contracts for cameras. Source: Chinese Government Procurement Database.



(a) Commercial



(b) Government

Figure A.10: Software development intended for commercial (Panel A) or for government uses (Panel B), resulting from data-rich public security contracts (right column) and data-scarce public security contracts (left column), controlling for firm and time period fixed effects.




Figure A.11: Binned scatterplots of size of bid versus prefecture surveillance capacity, conditional on company fixed effects (left panel); and of number of bidders versus prefecture surveillance capacity (right panel).




Figure A.12: This figure displays the heterogeneous effect of a data-rich public security contract depending on whether firms are above or below median level along an inverse covariance weighted standardised index of underlying firm productivity (composed of the year the firm was founded, the firm’s capitalization, the number of rounds of funding the firm received, and the total amount of pre-contract AI software produced). The specification follows the main event-study specification for data-rich contracts, including firm and time fixed effects. The red diamonds show software production for the above median category, and blue circles the below median category.

Table A.1: List of core variables

English name	Chinese name	Source
Panel A: Raw data		
Software	软件	Chinese Ministry of Industry and Information Technology
AI firms	人工智能公司	Tianyancha, Pitchbook
Prefecture GDP	县GDP	Global Economic Data, Indicators, Charts & Forecasts (CEIC)
Prefecture population	县人口	Global Economic Data, Indicators, Charts & Forecasts (CEIC)
Fim capitalization	公司资本	Tianyancha
Firm rounds of investment funding	公司几轮投资资金	Tianyancha
Monetary size of contracts	合约金额	Chinese Government Procurement Database
Mother firm	母公司	Tianyancha
Panel B: Constructed data		
Software customer and function	软件客户和功能	Software text
Public security contracts	公安合约	Contract text
Camera capacity	摄像机容量	Contract text
Contract runner-up bidders	合约亚军	Contract text

Table A.2: Top predicted words from LSTM model — non-binary categorization of software

<i>Panel A: Customer type</i>								
Government			Commercial			General		
Chinese	English	Freq. (%)	Chinese	English	Freq. (%)	Chinese	English	Freq. (%)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
交通	Traffic	.603	手机	Mobile Phone	.821	视觉	Vision	.474
威视	Prestige	.382	APP	App	.645	学习	Learning	.378
海康	Haikang	.369	IOS	IOS	.438	腾讯	Tencent	.340
平安	Safety	.351	iOS	iOS	.430	三维	3D	.312
海信	Hisense	.318	企业	Enterprise	.331	识别系统	Recognition System	.301
城市	City	.311	金蝶	Kingdee	.327	算法	Algorithm	.270
金融	Finance	.296	电子	Electronics	.307	计算	Computing	.252
安防	Safety	.281	健康	Health	.212	深度	Depth	.225
数字	Numbers	.272	自助	Self-Help	.209	无人机	Drone	.212
中心	Center	.269	手机游戏	Mobile Game	.201	实时	Real-time	.209
公交	Public Transport	.216	助手	Assistance	.196	认证	Certification	.207
社区	Community	.207	支付	Pay	.191	处理	Processing	.196
调度	Scheduling	.200	后台	Backstage	.189	引擎	Engine	.194
中控	Central Control	.191	门禁	Access Control	.176	技术	Technique	.187
人像	Portrait	.163	人工智能	AI	.174	分布式	Distributed	.183
指挥	Command	.161	车载	Vehicle	.174	仿真	Simulation	.179
辅助	Auxiliary	.159	智能家居	Smart Appliance	.169	网易	Netease	.173
摄像机	Camera	.158	工业	Industry	.169	工具软件	Tool Software	.172
万达	Wanda	.148	DHC	DHC	.168	程序	Program	.170
高速公路	Highway	.148	营销	Marketing	.161	互动	Interactive	.166

<i>Panel B: Function type</i>								
AI (all)			Data-Complementary			AI (video)		
Chinese	English	Freq. (%)	Chinese	English	Freq. (%)	Chinese	English	Freq. (%)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
指纹	Fingerprint	.342	存储	Storage	.206	人脸	Face	1.104
训练	Training	.203	可视化	Visualization	.167	深度	Depth	.321
管家	Housekeeper	.201	一体化	Integration	.164	抓拍	Snapshot	.310
文本	Text	.151	分布式	Distributed	.162	商汤	SenseTime	.287
高速公路	Highway	.150	仿真	Simulation	.157	考勤	Attendance	.258
虹膜	Iris	.147	医学影像	Medical Imaging	.148	科达	Kedacom	.258
汽车	Car	.143	通用	General	.144	跟踪	Track	.249
海尔	Haier	.137	集成	Integrated	.141	全景	Panoramic	.224
WPS	WPS	.134	数据管理	Data Management	.136	广电	Broadcastt	.209
翻译	Translate	.126	宇视	UTV	.136	目标	Target/Objective	.189
推荐	Recommend	.124	管控	Manage	.126	车牌	License Plate	.189
图片	Image	.119	高速	High Speed	.126	特征	Feature	.184
测量	Test	.116	媒体	Media/Medium	.125	铂亚	Platinum	.175
征信	Credit	.111	手机软件	Phone Software	.125	预警	Warning	.166
指纹识别	Fingerprint Recognition	.106	设计	Design	.117	运通	American Express	.163
作业	Operation	.106	接口	Interface	.117	指挥	Command	.158
微信	WeChat	.105	开发	Development	.116	统计	Statistics	.149
评估	Assessment	.105	服务器	Server	.116	安居	Safety	.146
灵云	AIcloud	.102	处理软件	Processing Software	.113	SDK	SDK	.141
活体	Living Body	.098	传输	Transmission	.111	布控	Deploymentt	.141

Table A.3: Summary statistics — procurement contracts

	Non-public security contracts		Public security contracts	
	All	All	Data-scarce	Data-rich
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Panel A: All contracts				
Admin level: provincial or above	0.340 (0.474)	0.277 (0.448)	0.138 (0.345)	0.306 (0.461)
Year contract signed	2016.350 (1.612)	2016.199 (1.604)	2016.274 (1.516)	2016.360 (1.530)
Area GDP	4,248.551 (4,979.406)	3,931.975 (4,567.528)	2,629.278 (3,364.656)	5,379.756 (5,272.500)
Area population	479.825 (264.595)	480.804 (263.863)	404.782 (221.149)	569.690 (284.979)
Cameras per million residents	4.311 (8.914)	3.392 (7.493)	0.138 (0.321)	6.920 (9.644)
Observations	15,523	10,677	4,880	4,500
Panel B: First contracts				
Admin level: provincial or above	0.462 (0.499)	0.383 (0.487)	0.272 (0.447)	0.423 (0.496)
Year contract signed	2015.935 (1.840)	2015.594 (1.976)	2015.893 (1.883)	2015.920 (1.875)
Area GDP	5,620.639 (5,493.355)	4,360.677 (4,372.221)	2,987.963 (3,021.635)	4,972.767 (4,780.787)
Area population	562.518 (269.504)	511.312 (266.436)	470.745 (254.547)	553.778 (270.646)
Cameras per million residents	4.951 (10.247)	6.097 (11.624)	0.141 (0.332)	10.575 (13.796)
Observations	796	308	103	137

Note: Observations at the procurement contract level. Standard deviations are reported below the mean. Administrative level of the contract is recorded as central government, provincial level, prefecture level and county level; the mean of an indicator of provincial or above level (provincial and central government) is shown. Area GDP of the issuing administrative level is measured in millions of RMB, population in ten-thousand persons.

Table A.4: Summary statistics — prefectures with low vs. high surveillance capacities

	Low capacity prefectures	High capacity prefectures	Difference
	(1)	(2)	(3)
Panel A: Demographics			
Population (10,000 persons)	387.613 (263.367)	461.803 (250.099)	74.189 (32.603)**
Urban population (1,000 persons)	1,434.740 (1,302.286)	1,806.922 (1,416.332)	372.183 (171.981)**
College students (1,000 persons)	96.034 (186.146)	106.309 (193.176)	10.276 (23.506)
College teachers (1,000 persons)	5.256 (10.285)	5.573 (10.570)	0.318 (1.296)
Broadband household (1000s)	1,164.550 (1,119.982)	1,680.905 (1,306.269)	516.354 (152.231)***
Mobile phone households (1000s)	4,366.004 (4,510.161)	6,113.576 (5,812.991)	1,747.572 (617.955)***
Observations	203	102	305
Panel B: Economics			
Number of contracts	57.369 (117.253)	105.225 (178.565)	47.856 (17.075)***
# of 1st contracts	1.719 (4.615)	3.010 (8.179)	1.291 (0.733)*
Monetary size (10,000 RMB)	2,671.686 (9,762.651)	2,352.398 (9,929.068)	-319.288 (1,202.745)
GDP (100 Million RMB)	1,858.525 (2,107.872)	2,991.609 (3,249.163)	1,133.085 (320.642)***
GDP per capita (RMB)	49,138.492 (37,714.531)	68,544.117 (67,582.133)	19,405.621 (6,261.676)***
Fiscal expenditure (million RMB)	44,718.504 (46,643.832)	56,296.723 (58,102.457)	11,578.219 (6,295.382)*
Fiscal revenue (million RMB)	21,227.164 (39,860.871)	33,746.250 (50,784.539)	12,519.088 (5,433.332)**
Observations	203	102	305

Notes: Prefectures are divided into below (Column 1) and above (Column 2) median in terms of their province-level surveillance-related spending prior to 2015. Broadband households are households with broadband internet connections, mobile phone households are households with a mobile phone, number of 1st contracts refers to the number of firms which had their first contract in the city, while monetary size refers to the average monetary size of all contracts. Fiscal expenditure and revenue refer to spending or revenue received by the city's government.