

Asker, John; Cantillon, Estelle

Working Paper

Equilibrium in Scoring Auctions

Nota di Lavoro, No. 148.2004

Provided in Cooperation with:

Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei (FEEM)

Suggested Citation: Asker, John; Cantillon, Estelle (2004) : Equilibrium in Scoring Auctions, Nota di Lavoro, No. 148.2004, Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei (FEEM), Milano

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/118024>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.

Equilibrium in Scoring Auctions

John Asker and Estelle Cantillon

NOTA DI LAVORO 148.2004

DECEMBER 2004

PRA – Privatisation, Regulation, Antitrust
--

John Asker, *Economics Department, Harvard University*
Estelle Cantillon, *Harvard Business School*

This paper can be downloaded without charge at:

The Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei Note di Lavoro Series Index:
<http://www.feem.it/Feem/Pub/Publications/WPapers/default.htm>

Social Science Research Network Electronic Paper Collection:
<http://ssrn.com/abstract=624466>

The opinions expressed in this paper do not necessarily reflect the position of
Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei
Corso Magenta, 63, 20123 Milano (I), web site: www.feem.it, e-mail: working.papers@feem.it

Equilibrium in Scoring Auctions

Summary

This paper studies multi-attribute auctions in which a buyer seeks to procure a complex good and evaluate offers using a quasi-linear scoring rule. Suppliers have private information about their costs, which is summarized by a multi-dimensional type. The scoring rule reduces the multidimensional bids submitted by each supplier to a single dimension, the score, which is used for deciding on the allocation and the resulting contractual obligation. We exploit this idea and obtain two kinds of results. First, we characterize the set of equilibria in quasi-linear scoring auctions with multi-dimensional types. In particular, we show that there exists a mapping between the class of equilibria in these scoring auctions and those in standard single object IPV auctions. Second, we prove a new expected utility equivalence theorem for quasi-linear scoring auctions.

Keywords: Auctions, Procurement

JEL Classification: H57, D44

This paper was presented at the EuroConference on “Auctions and Market Design: Theory, Evidence and Applications”, organised by Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei and Consip and sponsored by the EU, Rome, September 23-25, 2004.

We thank Howard Georgi, Luca Rigotti, Al Roth, as well as seminar audiences at LBS, Ecares, Inform2003, Ohio State University, WZB Berlin for useful conversation and suggestions. Ioannis Ioannou provided excellent research assistance. The financial support of the Division of Research at Harvard Business School is gratefully acknowledged.

Address for correspondence:

John Asker
Economics Department
Harvard University
1875 Cambridge Street
Cambridge MA 02138
USA
E-mail: asker@fas.harvard.edu

1 Introduction

In many procurement situations the buyer cares about attributes other than just price when evaluating the desirability of contracts offered by sellers. Standard non-monetary attributes include lead time, time to completion, and various other measures of quality. Buyers have adopted several practices for dealing with these situations. Some have recourse to fairly detailed request-for-quotes (RFQ) that specify minimum standards that the offers need to satisfy, and then evaluate the submitted bids based on price only.¹ Others decide to select a small set of potential bidders and negotiate on all the dimensions of the contract with each of them.

A third option is to combine the competition induced by the first option with the flexibility of the second by holding a scoring auction. In a scoring auction, bidders submit offers on all dimensions of the good and the buyer uses a scoring rule to evaluate the offers and select the winner. Scoring auctions can be shown to dominate RFQs with minimum standards and the restricted negotiation, at least from an efficiency standpoint.²

In this paper, we study scoring auctions that use quasi-linear scoring rules (i.e. the price enters linearly in the final score). The buyer cares about several (price and non price) attributes of the good and several bidders compete for the contract. Examples of such scoring auctions include “A+B bidding” for highway construction work in the US, where the highway procurement authorities evaluate offers on the basis of their costs as well as time to completion, weighted by a road user cost,³ and auctions for electricity reserve supply (Bushnell and Oren, 1994; Wilson, 2002). The use

¹For example, this is a format proposed by FreeMarkets (see www.freemarkets.com).

²An argument for why scoring auctions dominate RFQs with minimum standards is provided in Che (1993).

³The road user cost is the (per day) value of time lost due to construction. By 2003, 38 states in the US were using “A+B bidding.” “A+B bidding” is used mainly for large projects for which time is a critical factor. Typically, these

of scoring auctions is also gaining favor in private sector procurement, with several procurement software developers incorporating scoring capability in their auction designs.⁴

A key feature of our environment is that suppliers' private information about their costs of providing the good can be multi-dimensional. In particular, this means that the low cost supplier for the base option is not necessarily the low cost supplier when it comes to increasing quality on some other dimension, such as timeliness. As another example, it allows us to consider the likely situation where firms differ in their fixed and variable costs of production.

Our main results are as follows. First, we prove that the multi-dimensionality of suppliers' private information can be reduced to a single dimension (his "pseudotype") that is sufficient to characterize the equilibrium in these auctions when the scoring rule is quasi-linear and private information is independent across bidders (Theorem 1). This allows us to establish a correspondence between the set of scoring auctions and the set of standard single object one dimensional IPV auction environments (Corollary 1). The equilibrium in the scoring auction inherits the properties of the corresponding standard IPV auction (existence and uniqueness of equilibrium, efficiency, ...).

Second, we prove a new expected utility theorem for the buyer when private information is multi-dimensional and independently distributed and the scoring rule is quasi-linear (Theorem 2). Theorem 2 generalizes the classic revenue equivalence theorems of Myerson (1981) and Riley and Samuelson (1981). In particular, it implies that the buyer is indifferent among a first score, a second score, an ascending (the equivalent of the Dutch format in this procurement setting) or a

represent 5-10% of the total highway construction projects in these states. See, for instance, Arizona Department of Transport (2002) and Herbsman et al. (1995).

⁴In the US market, the Oracle Sourcing software (via www.oracle.com) is a good example of this. Verticalnet (via www.verticalnet.com) also provides a scoring capability.

descending scoring auction when bidders are symmetric in their pseudotypes.

There are several papers studying scoring auctions. Che (1993) derives a series of important results for multi-attribute auctions when private information is one-dimensional.⁵ Our paper extends Che's results on equilibrium in scoring auctions, in several ways. First, we allow for multi-dimensional private information. Second, while Che already exploited the idea of pseudotypes to derive an equilibrium in the first and second score auction, our characterization result establishes that no other equilibria exists. Third, our characterization result allows us to prove an expected utility equivalence theorem for all quasi-linear scoring rules, and not only the truthful one. Bushnell and Oren (1994 and 1995) derive the scoring rule necessary for productive efficiency in a two dimensional private information setting . They then implicitly exploit the sufficient statistics property of these auctions to derive a symmetric equilibrium in the second score auction. Our Theorem 1 and Corollary 1 establish that the symmetric equilibrium they derive is indeed the only one.

On a more general level, this paper provides a precise exposition of the applicability of the sufficient statistics approach leveraged by these papers. We show why the use of a sufficient statistic is appropriate in these environments. We are also able to outline the limitations of the approach. In particular we show that, when the scoring rule is not quasi-linear, a sufficient statistic approach will not work. Similarly, our characterization result makes clear why independence of signals is critical. Most importantly, we show that the sufficient statistic approach is a powerful and simple tool for the analysis of equilibrium in a far richer class of scoring auction environments than previously investigated, including when private information is multi-dimensional.

Some recent papers study other auction environments with multi-dimensional private information.

⁵Branco (1997) extends Che's paper to affiliated costs for the suppliers.

Multi-dimensional private information creates much more complex incentive situations, including the non-existence of equilibria (Jackson, 1999) or the loss of monotonicity of these equilibria (Reny and Zamir, 2002). In our case, we are able to reduce the relevant dimensionality of private information to one, by exploiting the one-dimensionality of the allocation rule *and* the independence of types across bidders. We can then appeal to the analogy between our environment and the standard IPV environment. A similar property (though through a much more subtle analogy to the standard IPV model) is exploited by Che and Gale (2002) to rank revenue in auctions with multi-dimensional types and non linear payoffs. In both our and Che and Gale’s approach, the one-dimensionality of the allocation decision and the independence of private information across bidders are necessary for reducing the dimensionality of the relevant private information. No such reduction is possible for multi-unit auctions, or for one object auctions where private information is not independent (see Fang and Morris, 2003, for an example).

A variant of scoring auctions are auction environments that involve the sale or purchase of multiple items but where the auctioneer or the procurement authority cannot commit, at the time of the auction, to the quantity sold or purchased. Examples include the sale of timber rights or the purchase of electricity reserve supply. In these auctions, bidders also submit multi-dimensional bids (often a fixed and a variable price) which are evaluated using a scoring rule. The weight given to the variable price is based on the auctioneer / procurement agency’s estimate. The scoring rule is used for allocating the contract, though the final contract often depends on the realized quantities. This creates interesting incentive problems (see Athey and Levin, 2001 and Chao and Wilson, 2002). We ignore these aspects in the current paper.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 describes the model and introduces the

notion of pseudotypes. Section 3 proves that the pseudotypes are sufficient statistics in our environment, and establishes the correspondence between scoring auctions and regular IPV auctions. Our expected utility equivalence theorem is proved in section 4. Section 5 concludes.

2 Model

2.1 Environment

We consider a buyer seeking to procure an indivisible good for which there are N potential suppliers. The good is characterized by its price, p , and $M \geq 1$ non monetary attributes, $Q \in \mathbb{R}^M$.

Preferences. The buyer values the good (p, Q) at $v(Q) - p$, where $v_Q > 0$ and v_{QQ} is a negative definite matrix. Supplier i 's profit from selling good (p, Q) is given by $p - c(Q, \theta_i)$, where $\theta_i \in \mathbb{R}^K$, $K \geq 1$, is supplier i 's type. We allow suppliers to be flexible with respect to the level of non-monetary attributes they can supply.⁶ We assume that the marginal cost of producing each attribute is positive, $c_Q > 0$, and that c_{QQ} is positive semi-definite. In particular, this allows for costs that are independent across attributes and convex in individual attributes. We normalize the type space by assuming that $c_{\theta_i} > 0$. Note that the buyer and the suppliers are risk neutral.

These assumptions imply that social welfare $v(Q) - c(Q, \theta_i)$ is strictly concave in Q . The first best level of non monetary attributes for each supplier, $Q^{FB}(\theta_i) = \arg \max \{v(Q) - c(Q, \theta_i)\}$ is well-defined and unique.

Information. Preferences are common knowledge among bidders and the buyer, with the exception of suppliers' types, θ_i , $i = 1, \dots, N$, which are privately observed by each bidder. Types are

⁶Rezende (2003) studies an example of a procurement model with fixed levels of non-monetary attributes. In our model, the level of non-monetary attributes is determined during the auction process.

independently distributed according to the well-behaved joint density function $f_i(\theta_i)$ with support on a bounded and convex subset of \mathbb{R}^K , $\Theta_i \subset \mathbb{R}^K$. These density functions are common knowledge.

2.2 Allocation mechanism

We now introduce the scoring auction. We start with two definitions:

A **scoring rule** is a function $S : \mathbb{R}^{M+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : (p, Q) \rightarrow S(p, Q)$, that associates a score to any potential contract between the buyer and a supplier, and represents a continuous preference relation over the contract characteristics (p, Q) . A scoring rule is quasi-linear if it can be expressed as $\phi(Q) - p$ or any monotonic increasing function thereof. We assume that the scoring rule is strictly increasing and concave in non monetary attributes and strictly decreasing in price.⁷

A **scoring auction** is an allocation mechanism where suppliers compete by submitting bids of the type $(p, Q) \in \mathbb{R}^{M+1}$. Bids are evaluated according to a scoring rule. The winner is the bidder with the highest score. Bidders are given scores (s_1, \dots, s_N) to deliver, where these scores are functions of bidders' strategies.⁸ A scoring auction is quasi-linear when it uses a quasi-linear scoring rule.

For example, in a first score scoring rule, the winner must deliver a contract that generates the

⁷It can be shown that any other scoring rule (i.e. putting no weight or negative weight on some attributes) is dominated from the buyer's point of view by the truthful scoring rule, $S(p, Q) = v(Q) - p$.

⁸The fact that the resulting obligations from the auction are in terms of scores rather than contract characteristics means that only the score of bidders' bid matters. The (p, Q) components of the bids are not binding. While this may appear to contradict standard practice, it does not. Indeed, contracts often recognize that suppliers may not be able to fully commit to some levels of non-monetary attributes and therefore include penalties and rewards for under- and over-supply of such attributes. For example, even though the resulting obligations in the US highway construction projects using "A+B bidding" are in terms of price and a fixed time to completion, delays or faster than planned completion are penalized / rewarded at exactly the same rates as in the scoring rule. This makes the effective resulting obligation in terms of score, instead of specific levels of price and time to completion.

value of his winning score. In a second score scoring auction, the winner must deliver a contract that generates the value of the second highest score submitted.

Consider supplier i with type θ_i who has won the contract to supply the good with score to fulfill s_i . Supplier i will choose the good characteristics (p, Q) that maximize his profit, i.e.⁹

$$\max_{(p, Q)} \{p - c(Q, \theta_i)\} \quad \text{subject to } \phi(Q) - p = s_i \quad (1)$$

Substituting for p into the objective function yields

$$\max_Q \{\phi(Q) - c(Q, \theta_i) - s_i\} \quad (2)$$

Define

$$k(\theta_i) = \max_Q \{\phi(Q) - c(Q, \theta_i)\}$$

We shall call $k(\theta_i)$ supplier i 's pseudotype. It is the maximum level of apparent social surplus that supplier i can generate. Bidders' pseudotypes are well-defined as soon as the scoring rule is given. They are decreasing in types since costs are increasing in types. The set of supplier i 's possible pseudotypes is an interval in \mathbb{R} . The density of pseudotypes inherits the smooth properties of f_i .

With this definition, supplier i 's profit when he wins with probability x_i and needs to deliver score s_i is given by¹⁰

$$x_i (k(\theta_i) - s_i) - (1 - x_i)s_i = x_i k(\theta_i) - s_i \quad (3)$$

⁹Note that if supplier i must deliver score s_i without winning the contract, the only way he can fulfill the score is with money.

¹⁰The notation we adopt assumes that s_i is to be fulfilled whether or not the contract is won. This does not assume that we are restricting ourselves to auction formats where bidders have obligations whether they win or not. Instead, s_i can be interpreted as an *expected* level of obligation. The fact that in (2), the optimal choice of Q does not depend on s_i makes it irrelevant when the obligation must be fulfilled.

An important feature of (3) is that bidder i 's preference over contracts of the type (x_i, s_i) is entirely captured by his pseudotype. Only quasi-linear scoring rules have this property. Indeed, consider a more general scoring rule $S(p, Q)$ and revisit bidder i 's optimization problem in this more general case:

$$\max_{(p, Q)} \{p - c(Q, \theta_i)\} \quad \text{subject to } S(p, Q) = s_i$$

Let $\Psi(Q, s_i)$ the price required to generate a score of s_i with non-monetary attributes Q (Ψ is well-defined since S is strictly decreasing in p and strictly increasing in Q ; it is strictly decreasing in Q and strictly increasing in s_i). The objective function of bidder i becomes

$$\max_Q \{\Psi(Q, s_i) - c(Q, \theta_i)\},$$

and his expected payoff from contract (x_i, s_i) is given by:

$$u(x_i, s_i; \theta_i) = x_i \max_Q \{\Psi(Q, s_i) - c(Q, \theta_i)\} - (1 - x_i)s_i$$

Suppose we could organize types in equivalence classes such that all types in a given class share the same preferences over contracts. Concretely, suppose that types θ_i and $\hat{\theta}_i \neq \theta_i$ belong to such a class. It must be that¹¹

$$u(x_i, s_i; \theta_i) = u(x_i, s_i; \hat{\theta}_i) \text{ if and only if } u(\hat{x}_i, \hat{s}_i; \theta_i) = u(\hat{x}_i, \hat{s}_i; \hat{\theta}_i) \quad (4)$$

for all pairs of contracts $(x_i, s_i), (\hat{x}_i, \hat{s}_i)$.

Let $Q(\theta_i, s_i) = \arg \max_Q \{\Psi(Q, s_i) - c(Q, \theta_i)\}$. Condition (4) requires in particular that $\frac{\partial}{\partial s_i} \Psi(Q(\theta_i, s_i), s_i) = \frac{\partial}{\partial s_i} \Psi(Q(\hat{\theta}_i, s_i), s_i)$. This equality will in general not be satisfied for $\hat{\theta}_i \neq \theta_i$ unless Ψ is separable in

¹¹In principle, the requirement of equal preferences only entails that $u(x_i, s_i; \theta_i) \geq u(\hat{x}_i, \hat{s}_i; \theta_i)$ if and only if $u(x_i, s_i; \hat{\theta}_i) \geq u(\hat{x}_i, \hat{s}_i; \hat{\theta}_i)$ for all pairs of contracts $(x_i, s_i), (\hat{x}_i, \hat{s}_i)$. The stronger requirement in (4) follows from the normalization of utilities embodied in the assumption of risk neutrality.

Q and s_i .¹² In turn, this requires that the scoring rule be quasi-linear ($\Psi(Q, s_i) = \phi(Q) - s_i$ for a quasi-linear scoring rule).

Notation: For the remainder of this paper, we adopt the following notation and conventions. The outcome function of a scoring auction is a vector of probabilities of winning (x_1, \dots, x_N) and scores to fulfill by each supplier, (s_1, \dots, s_N) . (If the outcome in a given scoring auction is stochastic, these are *distributions* over vectors of probabilities of winning and scores.) The arguments in these functions are the bids submitted by all suppliers, $\{(p_i, Q_i)\}_{i=1}^N$.¹³ Later in the paper, we will switch to a direct revelation mechanism approach where the outcome will be a function of suppliers' pseudotypes, $(k_1, \dots, k_N) \in \mathbb{R}^N$. To avoid introducing too much new notation, we shall make these the arguments of the x and s functions. Similarly, we shall also write $x_i(k_i)$ to denote the expectation of x_i over the types of the other suppliers, $E_{k_{-i}} x_i(k_i, k_{-i})$. The arguments will be spelled out whenever confusion is possible.

3 A sufficient statistics result

Suppliers' pseudotypes are sufficient statistics in this environment if knowing the distribution of suppliers' pseudotypes is all one needs in order to describe the set of possible equilibria of the auction and evaluate the buyer's expected payoff in each case. Suppliers' original multi-dimensional types become redundant.

In this section, we prove that pseudotypes are sufficient statistics. Specifically, we show that the sets of equilibria in the scoring auction and in a auction where bidders are constrained to submit a bid only as a function of their pseudotypes coincide. Proving this result requires two preliminary

¹²Indeed, $Q(\theta_i, s_i) \neq Q(\hat{\theta}_i, s_i)$ usually for $\hat{\theta}_i \neq \theta_i$.

¹³Or, more generally, in the case of dynamic formats, the strategies of the bidders.

steps. First, we show that all equilibria of the scoring auction are outcome equivalent to an equilibrium where suppliers are forced to submit bids only as a function of their pseudotypes. We define two equilibria as *outcome equivalent* if they both lead to the same distribution of outcomes (x_1, \dots, x_N) and (s_1, \dots, s_N) . Second, we prove that equilibria in scoring auctions are essentially pure as a function of pseudotypes.

Lemma 1: *All equilibria of a quasi-linear scoring auction are outcome equivalent to an equilibrium where bidders with the same pseudotypes adopt the same strategies.*

Proof: The proof proceeds in two steps.

Step 1: If there exists an equilibrium in this game, one of them is such that bidders with the same pseudotypes adopt the same strategy.

Consider any equilibrium $(\mathcal{E}_1, \dots, \mathcal{E}_N)$ where \mathcal{E}_i is a mapping from Θ_i to a distribution over $(p, Q) \in \mathbb{R}^{M+1}$. Then for all i , for all θ_i and all (p_i^*, Q_i^*) in the support of supplier i 's equilibrium strategy,

$$(p_i^*, Q_i^*) \in \arg \max_{p, Q} E_{\theta_{-i}} [x_i((p, Q), (p_{-i}^*, Q_{-i}^*)) k_i(\theta_i) - s_i((p, Q), (p_{-i}^*, Q_{-i}^*))] \quad (5)$$

where the expression for bidder i 's expected profit derives from (3). In (5), bidders' private information enters their objective function only through their pseudotypes. Hence, bidder i of type θ_i is actually indifferent among the strategies played by the other bidders with the same pseudotype. Therefore, we can construct a new equilibrium $(\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_1, \dots, \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_N)$, such that:

1. $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_i(\theta_i) = \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_i(\hat{\theta}_i)$ whenever $k(\theta_i) = k(\hat{\theta}_i)$.
2. Define $\Theta_i(k) = \{\theta_i \in \Theta_i | k(\theta_i) = k\}$, the set of supplier i 's types with pseudotype equal to k . For each k in the support of bidder i 's pseudotypes, the distribution of $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_i$ for a given $\theta_i \in \Theta_i(k)$ replicates the aggregate distribution of \mathcal{E}_i over all $\theta_i \in \Theta_i(k)$.

By construction, the distribution of bidder i 's opponents' strategies under this new equilibrium is the same as before from bidder i 's perspective. Moreover, $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_i$ is a best response for bidder i . Hence it is an equilibrium. Moreover, in this equilibrium, bidders' strategies are only a function of their pseudotypes.

Step 2: All other equilibria are outcome equivalent to an equilibrium in which bidders bid only according to their pseudotypes.

This follows directly from step 1 since, by construction, $(\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_1, \dots, \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_N)$ and $(\mathcal{E}_1, \dots, \mathcal{E}_N)$ lead to the same distribution of (p, Q) and therefore scores and outcomes. QED.

An aspect of Lemma 1 worth stressing is the role played by the assumption that types are independent across bidders. Without it, bidders' private information would enter their expected payoff in (5), both through their pseudotypes and through their expectations over their opponents' types. In that case, the argument for the outcome equivalence between all equilibria in the scoring auction and those where suppliers are constrained to bid only according to their pseudotypes breaks down.

Lemma 1 implies that the set of possible outcomes (x_1, \dots, x_N) and (s_1, \dots, s_N) can be generated by equilibria where suppliers bid exclusively on the basis of their pseudotypes. However, it does not imply that nothing is lost by restricting attention to these equilibria. Outcome equivalence does not imply utility equivalence for the buyer. To see this consider the following example.

Consider two equally likely¹⁴ types, θ_i and $\hat{\theta}_i$, such that $k(\theta_i) = k(\hat{\theta}_i)$ and suppose that in equilibrium, they get a different outcome: (x_i, s_i) and (\hat{x}_i, \hat{s}_i) . By definition, these two types generate expected utility $f_i(\theta_i)s_i + f_i(\hat{\theta}_i)\hat{s}_i$ for the buyer, according to the scoring rule. However, this differs from true expected utility. To know how much expected utility the bidders generate for the buyer, we need to know how they will satisfy their obligations. Each bidder finds the pair (p, Q) that generates the required score in the most advantageous way for him. Let Q and \hat{Q} be the resulting levels of non monetary attributes (they are independent of s and \hat{s}). Since the scoring rule is quasi-linear, the total monetary transfer from the buyer to the bidders is then given by $x_i\phi(Q) - s$ and $\hat{x}_i\phi(\hat{Q}) - \hat{s}$, and the buyer's true expected utility is given by:

$$f_i(\theta_i) \left[x_i (v(Q) - \phi(Q)) + s + \hat{x}_i (v(\hat{Q}) - \phi(\hat{Q})) + \hat{s} \right]$$

This equilibrium is outcome-equivalent to an equilibrium where type θ_i pretends he is $\hat{\theta}_i$ and vice versa. On the face of it, the buyer gets again utility $f_i(\theta_i)(s_i + \hat{s}_i)$ from this equilibrium. However, proceeding as above, we find that his true expected utility is given by

$$f_i(\theta_i) \left[\hat{x}_i (v(Q) - \phi(Q)) + \hat{s} + x_i (v(\hat{Q}) - \phi(\hat{Q})) + s \right]$$

Clearly, the buyer is not indifferent between these two equilibria as soon as $x_i \neq \hat{x}_i$.

The next result ensures that suppliers with the same pseudotypes receive the same equilibrium outcome function (x, s) in any equilibrium, except possibly on a set of measure zero. This rules out the situation described in the previous example. Lemma 2 then implies that outcome equivalent equilibria are also utility equivalent for the buyer, up to a zero measure.

Lemma 2: *All equilibrium strategies in quasi-linear scoring auctions are essentially pure, both when expressed as a function of pseudotypes and (a fortiori) when expressed as a function of types.*

¹⁴This simplifying assumption is inessential for the argument.

Note that since the only relevant bid information for the purpose of the outcome of the auction is the score generated by suppliers' bids, the statement of Lemma 2 should be understood as all the types of supplier i with the same pseudotypes submit bids generating the same outcome (x_i, s_i) at equilibrium, for all i .

Proof: We first note that if there exists a non trivial mixed strategy equilibrium (where non trivial refers to mixing on a non zero measure of types), then, by Lemma 1, there exists a non trivial mixed strategy equilibrium in the pseudotypes space. Therefore, we shall focus on equilibrium strategies as a function of pseudotypes to rule out non trivial mixed strategy equilibria.

For each pseudotype k , define $\underline{x}_i(k)$ and $\bar{x}_i(k)$ as the lowest and highest expected probabilities of getting the contract among all the bids in the support of bidder i 's strategy when he has pseudotype k . (let $\underline{s}_i(k)$ and $\bar{s}_i(k)$ be the resulting score to satisfy). By construction, $\underline{x}_i(k) = \bar{x}_i(k)$ when bidder i of pseudotype k uses a pure strategy.

Define $U_i(k)$ as supplier i 's equilibrium expected payoff when he has pseudotype k . Incentive compatibility implies that

$$\begin{aligned} U_i(k) &= \underline{x}_i(k)k - \underline{s}_i(k) \geq \underline{x}_i(\hat{k})k - \underline{s}_i(\hat{k}) = U_i(\hat{k}) + \underline{x}_i(\hat{k})(k - \hat{k}) \\ U_i(\hat{k}) &= \underline{x}_i(\hat{k})\hat{k} - \underline{s}_i(\hat{k}) \geq \underline{x}_i(k)\hat{k} - \underline{s}_i(k) = U_i(k) - \underline{x}_i(k)(k - \hat{k}) \end{aligned}$$

Hence $\underline{x}_i(k)(k - \hat{k}) \geq \underline{x}_i(\hat{k})(k - \hat{k})$ and $\underline{x}_i(k)$ is monotonically increasing in k . The same argument applies to $\bar{x}_i(k)$. Hence $\underline{x}_i(k)$ and $\bar{x}_i(k)$ are almost everywhere continuous.

A similar argument based on the IC constraint establishes that $\underline{x}_i(k) \geq \bar{x}_i(\hat{k})$ for all $\hat{k} < k$.

Together with the continuity of these functions, this implies that $\underline{x}_i(k) = \bar{x}_i(k)$ (and $\underline{s}_i(k) = \bar{s}_i(k)$) almost everywhere. This rules out mixed strategy equilibria. QED

We are now able to prove the main result of this section:

Theorem 1: *The set of equilibria (mappings from $\Theta_1 \times \dots \times \Theta_N$ to $(p_i, Q_i)_{i=1}^N$) in the unconstrained scoring auction is the same as the set of equilibria in the scoring auction where suppliers are constrained to bid only on the basis of their pseudotypes, except possibly on a measure zero.*

Proof: Lemma 2 implies that all equilibria in the unconstrained scoring auction are equilibria in the constrained auction (they differ at most by a measure zero). To prove that all equilibria in the constrained auction are also equilibria in the unconstrained auction, note that bidders' preferences over strategies (and therefore outcomes x and s) are entirely determined by their pseudotypes (refer to (3) if needed). Therefore, if a strategy is a best response when a bidder is constrained to adopt a strategy based on his pseudotype, this strategy is again a best response for all types θ consistent with that pseudotype. QED

Most theoretical analyses of scoring auctions have implicitly or explicitly taken advantage of the sufficient statistics property of scoring auction to derive an equilibrium in these auctions (Che, 1993, Bushnell and Oren, 1994 and 1995). Theorem 1 suggests that doing so does not discard any other equilibria of interest. While this may not be totally surprising when types are one-dimensional,¹⁵ this result is not trivial for environments where types are multi-dimensional. Indeed, it means that the richness introduced by the higher dimensionality of types has no strategic consequences for the set of equilibria. This property is a consequence of the combination of the quasi-linear scoring rule, the single dimensionality of the allocation decision, and the independence of types across bidders. We cannot reduce the strategic environment to one dimensional private information if

¹⁵In the one dimensional case as in Che (1993), this is not so much a question of sufficient statistics (there is no reduction of the dimensionality of private information per se) as a simple change of variables.

any of these conditions does not hold. As argued in section 1, the quasi-linearity of the scoring rule is necessary to be able to summarize suppliers' preferences over contracts by a single number. As noted after Lemma 1, independence was needed to make supplier's beliefs independent of their types. (Multi-unit auctions offer an example of multi-dimensional allocation mechanisms where there is no reduction of dimensionality possible.)

The next result makes the relationship between scoring auctions and standard one object auctions even more explicit:

Corollary 1: *The equilibrium in scoring auctions inherits the properties of the equilibrium in the related single object auction where (1) bidders are risk neutral, (2) their (private) valuations for the object correspond to the pseudotype k in the original scoring auction and are distributed accordingly, (3) the highest bidder wins, and (4) the payment rule is determined as in the scoring auction, with bidders' scores being replaced by bidders' bids.*

Corollary 1 relies on the expression for suppliers' expected payoff in the direct revelation mechanism equivalent of the scoring auction: $x_i(k)k - s_i(k)$. This is identical to the direct revelation mechanism expression for bidders' expected payoff in the standard independent private values single object auction with risk neutral bidders. For example, Corollary 1 implies that an equilibrium exists in a wide variety of formats (e.g. first price, second price, third price, ascending, all-pay, ...). It is unique in the first price scoring auction. See Krishna (2002) for a survey.

Corollary 1 has practical implications for the derivation of the equilibrium in scoring auctions. Indeed, it forms the basis for the following simple algorithm for deriving equilibria in scoring auctions:

- (1) Given the scoring rule, derive the distribution of pseudotypes, $G_i(k)$;

(2) Solve for the equilibrium in the related IPV auction where valuations are distributed according to $G_i(k)$, $b_i(k)$;

(3) The equilibrium bid in the scoring auction is any (p, Q) such that $S(p, Q) = b_i(k)$. (The actual (p, Q) delivered are easy to derive given $b_i(k)$ and the solution to equation (2).)

4 Expected Utility Equivalence across auction formats

In this section, we extend the Revenue Equivalence Theorem (Myerson, 1981, Riley and Samuelson, 1981) to multi-attribute environments. Theorem 2 extends a result obtained by Che (1993) on the utility equivalence between the first and second scoring auction when types are one-dimensional and the scoring rule corresponds to the buyer's true preferences, i.e. $\phi(Q) = v(Q)$.

Theorem 2 (Expected Utility Equivalence). *Any two scoring auctions that:*

- (a) *use the same quasi-linear scoring rule,*
- (b) *use the same allocation rule $x_i(k_i, k_{-i})$, $i = 1, \dots, N$, and*
- (c) *yield the same expected payoff for the lowest pseudotype \underline{k}_i , $i = 1, \dots, N$.*

generate the same expected utility for the buyer.

Proof: Since the buyer's utility is quasi-linear, his expected utility from a given auction is

$$\sum_{i=1}^N E_{k_i, k_{-i}} [x_i(k_i, k_{-i}) ESS(k_i) - U_i(k_i)] = \sum_{i=1}^N E_{k_i} [x_i(k_i) ESS(k_i) - U_i(k_i)] \quad (6)$$

where $ESS(k_i)$ is the expected social surplus generated by awarding the contract to bidder i with pseudotype k_i .

By Theorem 1, we can focus on equilibria which are only functions of pseudotypes. Incentive compatibility implies that $U_i(k_i)$ is almost everywhere differentiable and that $\frac{d}{dk_i}U_i(k_i) = x_i(k_i)$, where $x_i(k_i)$ is a well-defined function almost everywhere by Lemma 2. Hence, (b) and (c) implies that $U_i(k)$ is the same across both auctions.

Next, fix k_i and let $(p(\theta_i, s_i), Q(\theta_i, s_i))$ be the realized contract of supplier i with type $\theta_i \in \Theta_i(k_i)$, when the score to satisfy is s_i . Because the scoring rule is quasi-linear, $Q(\theta_i, s_i)$ is only a function of the scoring rule and θ_i , and not of s_i (cf. (2)). Hence,

$$ESS(k_i) = E_{\theta_i \in \Theta_i(k_i)}[v(Q) - c(Q, \theta_i)]$$

is independent of s_i and therefore equal across the two auctions given (a). The claim follows.

QED.

Four points are worth noting concerning this result. First, the assumption that the scoring rule is quasi-linear is key. Without it, suppliers' choice of product characteristics (p, Q) would depend on the form of the resulting obligation, that is, the auction format.

Second, the proof of Theorem 2 relies on the fact that any equilibrium is essentially pure as a function of pseudotypes (i.e. x_i are functions). Without this property, expected utility equivalence between two auctions that yield the same distribution of allocations as a function of pseudotypes would only hold when the scoring rule corresponds to the true valuation. Indeed, in that case, the social surplus associated with a bidder of type θ_i is his pseudotype k_i , so $ESS(k_i) = k_i$.

Third, Theorem 2 implies the standard equivalence between the first score auction, the second score auction and the Dutch and English auctions when bidders are symmetric. But note that the symmetry requirement is with respect to the distribution of pseudotypes and not the distribution of types. In particular, some bidders can (stochastically) be stronger for one attribute and others

for another attribute, yet, when it comes to pseudotypes, they can be symmetric.

Finally, one could prove an alternative version of Theorem 2 where (b) is replaced by the requirement that the allocation as a function of the original types, $x_i(\theta_i, \theta_{-i})$, is the same, and (c) is replaced by the requirement that the expected payoff of bidders at a point on the boundary of the types set is the same across auctions. The proof for this alternative version adapts an argument made by Krishna and Perry (2000) in proving a payoff equivalence result for allocation mechanisms with multiple goods and multi-dimensional types. Note however that the conditions for the alternative version are more restrictive than (b) and (c). The result is therefore weaker. In particular, if we used that approach, we could only establish the equivalence between the first score and the second score auction when bidders are symmetric in the original type space.

5 Concluding remarks

Auctions with multi-dimensional private information are notoriously tricky to analyze. In this paper, we exploit the simple property that multi-attribute auctions with scoring rules reduce the multi-dimensional decision problem into a one-dimensional variable, the score. This score is used both for deciding whom to award the contract and the resulting contractual obligations of the bidders.

We have exploited this idea in two ways. First, we have characterized the set of equilibria in scoring auctions and have argued that a single number, the supplier's pseudotype, is sufficient to describe the equilibrium outcome in these auctions, when the scoring rule is quasi-linear and types are independently distributed. Doing so, we have drawn on the equivalence between the reduced form of a scoring auction and that of a standard single object IPV auction. Second, we have derived a

new expected utility equivalence theorem for scoring auctions. Any two scoring auctions that use the same quasi-linear scoring rule and have the same allocation rule generate the same expected utility for the buyer, *modulo* one additive constant. Both results extend existing theories of scoring auctions.

The “sufficient statistics approach” presented here greatly facilitates the practical analysis of existing scoring auctions since standard techniques and results of auction theory can be applied to scoring auctions (Theorem 1 and Corollary 1). Nevertheless, it is likely to be less helpful to answer questions about the optimal choice of a scoring rule. The reason is that the distribution of pseudotypes is endogenous to the choice of a scoring rule. Therefore choosing the best scoring rule comes down to maximizing the expression for the buyer’s expected utility (6), over the set of distributions of pseudotypes compatible with a scoring rule. We are skeptical that any useful progress on this question can be achieved using this approach. In work in progress, we adapt and extend techniques used in the multi-dimensional screening literature to study the question of buyer optimal scheme in multi-attributes auctions, including the question of the optimal scoring rule.

References

- [1] Arizona Department of Transport (2002), A+B Bidding Guide, <http://www.dot.state.az.us/roads/constgrp/A+BGuide.pdf> (dated 1/18/2002)
- [2] Athey, Susan and Jon Levin (2001), Information and Competition in US Timber Auctions, *Journal of Political Economy*, 109(2), 375-417
- [3] Branco, Fernando (1997), The Design of Multi-dimensional Auctions, *Rand Journal of Economics*, 28(1), 63-81.
- [4] Bushnell, James and Shmuel Oren (1994), Bidder Cost Revelation in Electric Power Auctions, *Journal of Regulatory Economics*, 6(1), 5-26.
- [5] Bushnell, James and Shmuel Oren (1995), Internal Auctions for Efficient Sourcing of Intermediate Products, *Journal of Operations Management*, 12(3-4), 311-320.
- [6] Chao, Hung-po, and Robert Wilson (2002): Incentive-Compatible Evaluation and Settlement Rules: MultiDimensional Auctions for Procurement of Ancillary Services in Power Markets, *Journal of Regulatory Economics*, to appear.
- [7] Che, Yeon-Koo (1993), Design Competition through Multi-dimensional Auctions, *Rand Journal of Economics*, 24(4), 668-680.
- [8] Che, Yeon-Koo and Ian Gale (2002), Auctions with Nonlinear Payoffs and Multidimensional Types, University of Wisconsin and Georgetown mimeo.

- [9] Herbsman, Zohar, Wei Tong Chen and William C. Epstein (1995), Time is Money: Innovative Contracting Methods in Highway Construction, *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 121(3), 273-281.
- [10] Jackson, Matthew (1999), The Non-Existence of Equilibrium in Auctions with Two Dimensional Types, California Institute of Technology, mimeo.
- [11] Krishna, Vijay (2002), *Auction Theory*, Academic Press, San Diego, California.
- [12] Krishna, Vijay and Motty Perry (2000), Efficient Mechanism Design, Penn State mimeo.
- [13] Fang, Hanming and Stephen Morris (2003), Multidimensional Private Value Auctions, Yale mimeo.
- [14] Myerson, Roger (1981), Optimal Auctions, *Mathematics Op. Research*, 6, 58-73.
- [15] Reny, Philip and Shmuel Zamir (2002), On the Existence of Pure Strategy Monotone Equilibria in Asymmetric First-Price Auctions, University of Chicago mimeo.
- [16] Rezende, Leonardo (2003), Biased Procurement, Stanford mimeo.
- [17] Riley, John G. and William Samuelson (1981), Optimal Auctions, *American Economic Review*, 71, 381-392.
- [18] Wilson, Robert (2002), The Architechure of Power Markets, *Econometrica*, 70(4), 1299-1341.

NOTE DI LAVORO DELLA FONDAZIONE ENI ENRICO MATTEI

Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei Working Paper Series

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

<http://www.feem.it/Feem/Pub/Publications/WPapers/default.html>

<http://www.ssrn.com/link/feem.html>

NOTE DI LAVORO PUBLISHED IN 2003

PRIV	1.2003	<i>Gabriella CHIESA and Giovanna NICODANO: <u>Privatization and Financial Market Development: Theoretical Issues</u></i>
PRIV	2.2003	<i>Ibolya SCHINDELE: <u>Theory of Privatization in Eastern Europe: Literature Review</u></i>
PRIV	3.2003	<i>Wietze LISE, Claudia KEMFERT and Richard S.J. TOL: <u>Strategic Action in the Liberalised German Electricity Market</u></i>
CLIM	4.2003	<i>Laura MARSILIANI and Thomas I. RENSTRÖM: <u>Environmental Policy and Capital Movements: The Role of Government Commitment</u></i>
KNOW	5.2003	<i>Reyer GERLAGH: <u>Induced Technological Change under Technological Competition</u></i>
ETA	6.2003	<i>Efrem CASTELNUOVO: <u>Squeezing the Interest Rate Smoothing Weight with a Hybrid Expectations Model</u></i>
SIEV	7.2003	<i>Anna ALBERINI, Alberto LONGO, Stefania TONIN, Francesco TROMBETTA and Margherita TURVANI: <u>The Role of Liability, Regulation and Economic Incentives in Brownfield Remediation and Redevelopment: Evidence from Surveys of Developers</u></i>
NRM	8.2003	<i>Elissaios PAPYRAKIS and Reyner GERLAGH: <u>Natural Resources: A Blessing or a Curse?</u></i>
CLIM	9.2003	<i>A. CAPARRÓS, J.-C. PEREAU and T. TAZDAÏT: <u>North-South Climate Change Negotiations: a Sequential Game with Asymmetric Information</u></i>
KNOW	10.2003	<i>Giorgio BRUNELLO and Daniele CHECCHI: <u>School Quality and Family Background in Italy</u></i>
CLIM	11.2003	<i>Efrem CASTELNUOVO and Marzio GALEOTTI: <u>Learning By Doing vs Learning By Researching in a Model of Climate Change Policy Analysis</u></i>
KNOW	12.2003	<i>Carole MAIGNAN, Gianmarco OTTAVIANO and Dino PINELLI (eds.): <u>Economic Growth, Innovation, Cultural Diversity: What are we all talking about? A critical survey of the state-of-the-art</u></i>
KNOW	13.2003	<i>Carole MAIGNAN, Gianmarco OTTAVIANO, Dino PINELLI and Francesco RULLANI (lix): <u>Bio-Ecological Diversity vs. Socio-Economic Diversity. A Comparison of Existing Measures</u></i>
KNOW	14.2003	<i>Maddy JANSSENS and Chris STEYAERT (lix): <u>Theories of Diversity within Organisation Studies: Debates and Future Trajectories</u></i>
KNOW	15.2003	<i>Tuzin BAYCAN LEVENT, Enno MASUREL and Peter NIJKAMP (lix): <u>Diversity in Entrepreneurship: Ethnic and Female Roles in Urban Economic Life</u></i>
KNOW	16.2003	<i>Alexandra BITUSIKOVA (lix): <u>Post-Communist City on its Way from Grey to Colourful: The Case Study from Slovakia</u></i>
KNOW	17.2003	<i>Billy E. VAUGHN and Katarina MLEKOV (lix): <u>A Stage Model of Developing an Inclusive Community</u></i>
KNOW	18.2003	<i>Selma van LONDEN and Arie de RIJTER (lix): <u>Managing Diversity in a Globalizing World</u></i>
Coalition	19.2003	<i>Sergio CURRARINI: <u>On the Stability of Hierarchies in Games with Externalities</u></i>
Theory	20.2003	<i>Giacomo CALZOLARI and Alessandro PAVAN (lx): <u>Monopoly with Resale</u></i>
Network	21.2003	<i>Claudio MEZZETTI (lx): <u>Auction Design with Interdependent Valuations: The Generalized Revelation Principle, Efficiency, Full Surplus Extraction and Information Acquisition</u></i>
PRIV	22.2003	<i>Marco LiCalzi and Alessandro PAVAN (lx): <u>Tilting the Supply Schedule to Enhance Competition in Uniform-Price Auctions</u></i>
PRIV	23.2003	<i>David ETTINGER (lx): <u>Bidding among Friends and Enemies</u></i>
PRIV	24.2003	<i>Hannu VARTIAINEN (lx): <u>Auction Design without Commitment</u></i>
PRIV	25.2003	<i>Matti KELOHARJU, Kjell G. NYBORG and Kristian RYDQVIST (lx): <u>Strategic Behavior and Underpricing in Uniform Price Auctions: Evidence from Finnish Treasury Auctions</u></i>
PRIV	26.2003	<i>Christine A. PARLOUR and Uday RAJAN (lx): <u>Rationing in IPOs</u></i>
PRIV	27.2003	<i>Kjell G. NYBORG and Ilya A. STREBULAIEV (lx): <u>Multiple Unit Auctions and Short Squeezes</u></i>
PRIV	28.2003	<i>Anders LUNANDER and Jan-Eric NILSSON (lx): <u>Taking the Lab to the Field: Experimental Tests of Alternative Mechanisms to Procure Multiple Contracts</u></i>
PRIV	29.2003	<i>TangaMcDANIEL and Karsten NEUHOFF (lx): <u>Use of Long-term Auctions for Network Investment</u></i>
PRIV	30.2003	<i>Emiel MAASLAND and Sander ONDERSTAL (lx): <u>Auctions with Financial Externalities</u></i>
ETA	31.2003	<i>Michael FINUS and Bianca RUNDSHAGEN: <u>A Non-cooperative Foundation of Core-Stability in Positive Externality NTU-Coalition Games</u></i>
KNOW	32.2003	<i>Michele MORETTO: <u>Competition and Irreversible Investments under Uncertainty</u></i>
PRIV	33.2003	<i>Philippe QUIRION: <u>Relative Quotas: Correct Answer to Uncertainty or Case of Regulatory Capture?</u></i>
KNOW	34.2003	<i>Giuseppe MEDA, Claudio PIGA and Donald SIEGEL: <u>On the Relationship between R&D and Productivity: A Treatment Effect Analysis</u></i>
ETA	35.2003	<i>Alessandra DEL BOCA, Marzio GALEOTTI and Paola ROTA: <u>Non-convexities in the Adjustment of Different Capital Inputs: A Firm-level Investigation</u></i>

GG	36.2003	<i>Matthieu GLACHANT</i> : <u>Voluntary Agreements under Endogenous Legislative Threats</u>
PRIV	37.2003	<i>Narjess BOUBAKRI, Jean-Claude COSSET and Omrane GUEDHAMI</i> : <u>Postprivatization Corporate Governance: the Role of Ownership Structure and Investor Protection</u>
CLIM	38.2003	<i>Rolf GOLOMBEK and Michael HOEL</i> : <u>Climate Policy under Technology Spillovers</u>
KNOW	39.2003	<i>Slim BEN YOUSSEF</i> : <u>Transboundary Pollution, R&D Spillovers and International Trade</u>
CTN	40.2003	<i>Carlo CARRARO and Carmen MARCHIORI</i> : <u>Endogenous Strategic Issue Linkage in International Negotiations</u>
KNOW	41.2003	<i>Sonia OREFFICE</i> : <u>Abortion and Female Power in the Household: Evidence from Labor Supply</u>
KNOW	42.2003	<i>Timo GOESCHL and Timothy SWANSON</i> : <u>On Biology and Technology: The Economics of Managing Biotechnologies</u>
ETA	43.2003	<i>Giorgio Busetti and Matteo MANERA</i> : <u>STAR-GARCH Models for Stock Market Interactions in the Pacific Basin Region, Japan and US</u>
CLIM	44.2003	<i>Katrin MILLOCK and Céline NAUGES</i> : <u>The French Tax on Air Pollution: Some Preliminary Results on its Effectiveness</u>
PRIV	45.2003	<i>Bernardo BORTOLOTTI and Paolo PINOTTI</i> : <u>The Political Economy of Privatization</u>
SIEV	46.2003	<i>Elbert DIJKGRAAF and Herman R.J. VOLLEBERGH</i> : <u>Burn or Bury? A Social Cost Comparison of Final Waste Disposal Methods</u>
ETA	47.2003	<i>Jens HORBACH</i> : <u>Employment and Innovations in the Environmental Sector: Determinants and Econometrical Results for Germany</u>
CLIM	48.2003	<i>Lori SNYDER, Nolan MILLER and Robert STAVINS</i> : <u>The Effects of Environmental Regulation on Technology Diffusion: The Case of Chlorine Manufacturing</u>
CLIM	49.2003	<i>Lori SNYDER, Robert STAVINS and Alexander F. WAGNER</i> : <u>Private Options to Use Public Goods. Exploiting Revealed Preferences to Estimate Environmental Benefits</u>
CTN	50.2003	<i>László Á. KÓCZY and Luc LAUWERS (Ixi)</i> : <u>The Minimal Dominant Set is a Non-Empty Core-Extension</u>
CTN	51.2003	<i>Matthew O. JACKSON (Ixi)</i> : <u>Allocation Rules for Network Games</u>
CTN	52.2003	<i>Ana MAULEON and Vincent VANNETELBOSCH (Ixi)</i> : <u>Farsightedness and Cautiousness in Coalition Formation</u>
CTN	53.2003	<i>Fernando VEGA-REDONDO (Ixi)</i> : <u>Building Up Social Capital in a Changing World: a network approach</u>
CTN	54.2003	<i>Matthew HAAG and Roger LAGUNOFF (Ixi)</i> : <u>On the Size and Structure of Group Cooperation</u>
CTN	55.2003	<i>Tajji FURUSAWA and Hideo KONISHI (Ixi)</i> : <u>Free Trade Networks</u>
CTN	56.2003	<i>Halis Murat YILDIZ (Ixi)</i> : <u>National Versus International Mergers and Trade Liberalization</u>
CTN	57.2003	<i>Santiago RUBIO and Alistair ULPH (Ixi)</i> : <u>An Infinite-Horizon Model of Dynamic Membership of International Environmental Agreements</u>
KNOW	58.2003	<i>Carole MAIGNAN, Dino PINELLI and Gianmarco I.P. OTTAVIANO</i> : <u>ICT, Clusters and Regional Cohesion: A Summary of Theoretical and Empirical Research</u>
KNOW	59.2003	<i>Giorgio BELLETTINI and Gianmarco I.P. OTTAVIANO</i> : <u>Special Interests and Technological Change</u>
ETA	60.2003	<i>Ronnie SCHÖB</i> : <u>The Double Dividend Hypothesis of Environmental Taxes: A Survey</u>
CLIM	61.2003	<i>Michael FINUS, Ekko van IERLAND and Robert DELLINK</i> : <u>Stability of Climate Coalitions in a Cartel Formation Game</u>
GG	62.2003	<i>Michael FINUS and Bianca RUNDSHAGEN</i> : <u>How the Rules of Coalition Formation Affect Stability of International Environmental Agreements</u>
SIEV	63.2003	<i>Alberto PETRUCCI</i> : <u>Taxing Land Rent in an Open Economy</u>
CLIM	64.2003	<i>Joseph E. ALDY, Scott BARRETT and Robert N. STAVINS</i> : <u>Thirteen Plus One: A Comparison of Global Climate Policy Architectures</u>
SIEV	65.2003	<i>Edi DEFRANCESCO</i> : <u>The Beginning of Organic Fish Farming in Italy</u>
SIEV	66.2003	<i>Klaus CONRAD</i> : <u>Price Competition and Product Differentiation when Consumers Care for the Environment</u>
SIEV	67.2003	<i>Paulo A.L.D. NUNES, Luca ROSSETTO, Arianne DE BLAEIJ</i> : <u>Monetary Value Assessment of Clam Fishing Management Practices in the Venice Lagoon: Results from a Stated Choice Exercise</u>
CLIM	68.2003	<i>ZhongXiang ZHANG</i> : <u>Open Trade with the U.S. Without Compromising Canada's Ability to Comply with its Kyoto Target</u>
KNOW	69.2003	<i>David FRANTZ (Iix)</i> : <u>Lorenzo Market between Diversity and Mutation</u>
KNOW	70.2003	<i>Ercole SORI (Iix)</i> : <u>Mapping Diversity in Social History</u>
KNOW	71.2003	<i>Ljiljana DERU SIMIC (Ixi)</i> : <u>What is Specific about Art/Cultural Projects?</u>
KNOW	72.2003	<i>Natalya V. TARANOVA (Ixi)</i> : <u>The Role of the City in Fostering Intergroup Communication in a Multicultural Environment: Saint-Petersburg's Case</u>
KNOW	73.2003	<i>Kristine CRANE (Ixi)</i> : <u>The City as an Arena for the Expression of Multiple Identities in the Age of Globalisation and Migration</u>
KNOW	74.2003	<i>Kazuma MATOBA (Ixi)</i> : <u>Glocal Dialogue- Transformation through Transcultural Communication</u>
KNOW	75.2003	<i>Catarina REIS OLIVEIRA (Ixi)</i> : <u>Immigrants' Entrepreneurial Opportunities: The Case of the Chinese in Portugal</u>
KNOW	76.2003	<i>Sandra WALLMAN (Ixi)</i> : <u>The Diversity of Diversity - towards a typology of urban systems</u>
KNOW	77.2003	<i>Richard PEARCE (Ixi)</i> : <u>A Biologist's View of Individual Cultural Identity for the Study of Cities</u>
KNOW	78.2003	<i>Vincent MERK (Ixi)</i> : <u>Communication Across Cultures: from Cultural Awareness to Reconciliation of the Dilemmas</u>
KNOW	79.2003	<i>Giorgio BELLETTINI, Carlotta BERTI CERONI and Gianmarco I.P. OTTAVIANO</i> : <u>Child Labor and Resistance to Change</u>
ETA	80.2003	<i>Michele MORETTO, Paolo M. PANTEGHINI and Carlo SCARPA</i> : <u>Investment Size and Firm's Value under Profit Sharing Regulation</u>

ITEM	81.2003	<i>Alessandro LANZA, Matteo MANERA and Massimo GIOVANNINI: <u>Oil and Product Dynamics in International Petroleum Markets</u></i>
CLIM	82.2003	<i>Y. Hossein FARZIN and Jinhua ZHAO: <u>Pollution Abatement Investment When Firms Lobby Against Environmental Regulation</u></i>
CLIM	83.2003	<i>Giuseppe DI VITA: <u>Is the Discount Rate Relevant in Explaining the Environmental Kuznets Curve?</u></i>
CLIM	84.2003	<i>Reyer GERLAGH and Wietze LISE: <u>Induced Technological Change Under Carbon Taxes</u></i>
NRM	85.2003	<i>Rinaldo BRAU, Alessandro LANZA and Francesco PIGLIARU: <u>How Fast are the Tourism Countries Growing? The cross-country evidence</u></i>
KNOW	86.2003	<i>Elena BELLINI, Gianmarco I.P. OTTAVIANO and Dino PINELLI: <u>The ICT Revolution: opportunities and risks for the Mezzogiorno</u></i>
SIEV	87.2003	<i>Lucas BRETSCGHER and Sjak SMULDERS: <u>Sustainability and Substitution of Exhaustible Natural Resources. How resource prices affect long-term R&D investments</u></i>
CLIM	88.2003	<i>Johan EYCKMANS and Michael FINUS: <u>New Roads to International Environmental Agreements: The Case of Global Warming</u></i>
CLIM	89.2003	<i>Marzio GALEOTTI: <u>Economic Development and Environmental Protection</u></i>
CLIM	90.2003	<i>Marzio GALEOTTI: <u>Environment and Economic Growth: Is Technical Change the Key to Decoupling?</u></i>
CLIM	91.2003	<i>Marzio GALEOTTI and Barbara BUCHNER: <u>Climate Policy and Economic Growth in Developing Countries</u></i>
ITEM	92.2003	<i>A. MARKANDYA, A. GOLUB and E. STRUKOVA: <u>The Influence of Climate Change Considerations on Energy Policy: The Case of Russia</u></i>
ETA	93.2003	<i>Andrea BELTRATTI: <u>Socially Responsible Investment in General Equilibrium</u></i>
CTN	94.2003	<i>Parkash CHANDER: <u>The γ-Core and Coalition Formation</u></i>
ITEM	95.2003	<i>Matteo MANERA and Angelo MARZULLO: <u>Modelling the Load Curve of Aggregate Electricity Consumption Using Principal Components</u></i>
ITEM	96.2003	<i>Alessandro LANZA, Matteo MANERA, Margherita GRASSO and Massimo GIOVANNINI: <u>Long-run Models of Oil Stock Prices</u></i>
CTN	97.2003	<i>Steven J. BRAMS, Michael A. JONES, and D. Marc KILGOUR: <u>Forming Stable Coalitions: The Process Matters</u></i>
KNOW	98.2003	<i>John CROWLEY, Marie-Cecile NAVES (Ixi): <u>Anti-Racist Policies in France. From Ideological and Historical Schemes to Socio-Political Realities</u></i>
KNOW	99.2003	<i>Richard THOMPSON FORD (Ixi): <u>Cultural Rights and Civic Virtue</u></i>
KNOW	100.2003	<i>Alaknanda PATEL (Ixi): <u>Cultural Diversity and Conflict in Multicultural Cities</u></i>
KNOW	101.2003	<i>David MAY (Ixi): <u>The Struggle of Becoming Established in a Deprived Inner-City Neighbourhood</u></i>
KNOW	102.2003	<i>Sébastien ARCAND, Danielle JUTEAU, Sirma BILGE, and Francine LEMIRE (Ixi) : <u>Municipal Reform on the Island of Montreal: Tensions Between Two Majority Groups in a Multicultural City</u></i>
CLIM	103.2003	<i>Barbara BUCHNER and Carlo CARRARO: <u>China and the Evolution of the Present Climate Regime</u></i>
CLIM	104.2003	<i>Barbara BUCHNER and Carlo CARRARO: <u>Emissions Trading Regimes and Incentives to Participate in International Climate Agreements</u></i>
CLIM	105.2003	<i>Anil MARKANDYA and Dirk T.G. RÜBBELKE: <u>Ancillary Benefits of Climate Policy</u></i>
NRM	106.2003	<i>Anne Sophie CRÉPIN (Ix): <u>Management Challenges for Multiple-Species Boreal Forests</u></i>
NRM	107.2003	<i>Anne Sophie CRÉPIN (Ix): <u>Threshold Effects in Coral Reef Fisheries</u></i>
SIEV	108.2003	<i>Sara ANIYAR (Ix): <u>Estimating the Value of Oil Capital in a Small Open Economy: The Venezuela's Example</u></i>
SIEV	109.2003	<i>Kenneth ARROW, Partha DASGUPTA and Karl-Göran MÄLER(Ix): <u>Evaluating Projects and Assessing Sustainable Development in Imperfect Economies</u></i>
NRM	110.2003	<i>Anastasios XEPAPADEAS and Catarina ROSETA-PALMA(Ix): <u>Instabilities and Robust Control in Fisheries</u></i>
NRM	111.2003	<i>Charles PERRINGS and Brian WALKER (Ix): <u>Conservation and Optimal Use of Rangelands</u></i>
ETA	112.2003	<i>Jack GOODY (Ix): <u>Globalisation, Population and Ecology</u></i>
CTN	113.2003	<i>Carlo CARRARO, Carmen MARCHIORI and Sonia OREFFICE: <u>Endogenous Minimum Participation in International Environmental Treaties</u></i>
CTN	114.2003	<i>Guillaume HAERINGER and Myrna WOODERS: <u>Decentralized Job Matching</u></i>
CTN	115.2003	<i>Hideo KONISHI and M. Utku UNVER: <u>Credible Group Stability in Multi-Partner Matching Problems</u></i>
CTN	116.2003	<i>Somdeb LAHIRI: <u>Stable Matchings for the Room-Mates Problem</u></i>
CTN	117.2003	<i>Somdeb LAHIRI: <u>Stable Matchings for a Generalized Marriage Problem</u></i>
CTN	118.2003	<i>Marita LAUKKANEN: <u>Transboundary Fisheries Management under Implementation Uncertainty</u></i>
CTN	119.2003	<i>Edward CARTWRIGHT and Myrna WOODERS: <u>Social Conformity and Bounded Rationality in Arbitrary Games with Incomplete Information: Some First Results</u></i>
CTN	120.2003	<i>Gianluigi VERNASCA: <u>Dynamic Price Competition with Price Adjustment Costs and Product Differentiation</u></i>
CTN	121.2003	<i>Myrna WOODERS, Edward CARTWRIGHT and Reinhard SELTEN: <u>Social Conformity in Games with Many Players</u></i>
CTN	122.2003	<i>Edward CARTWRIGHT and Myrna WOODERS: <u>On Equilibrium in Pure Strategies in Games with Many Players</u></i>
CTN	123.2003	<i>Edward CARTWRIGHT and Myrna WOODERS: <u>Conformity and Bounded Rationality in Games with Many Players</u></i>
1000		Carlo CARRARO, Alessandro LANZA and Valeria PAPPONETTI: <u>One Thousand Working Papers</u>

NOTE DI LAVORO PUBLISHED IN 2004

IEM	1.2004	<i>Anil MARKANDYA, Suzette PEDROSO and Alexander GOLUB: <u>Empirical Analysis of National Income and So2 Emissions in Selected European Countries</u></i>
ETA	2.2004	<i>Masahisa FUJITA and Shlomo WEBER: <u>Strategic Immigration Policies and Welfare in Heterogeneous Countries</u></i>
PRA	3.2004	<i>Adolfo DI CARLUCCIO, Giovanni FERRI, Cecilia FRALE and Ottavio RICCHI: <u>Do Privatizations Boost Household Shareholding? Evidence from Italy</u></i>
ETA	4.2004	<i>Victor GINSBURGH and Shlomo WEBER: <u>Languages Disenfranchisement in the European Union</u></i>
ETA	5.2004	<i>Romano PIRAS: <u>Growth, Congestion of Public Goods, and Second-Best Optimal Policy</u></i>
CCMP	6.2004	<i>Herman R.J. VOLLEBERGH: <u>Lessons from the Polder: Is Dutch CO2-Taxation Optimal</u></i>
PRA	7.2004	<i>Sandro BRUSCO, Giuseppe LOPOMO and S. VISWANATHAN (lxv): <u>Merger Mechanisms</u></i>
PRA	8.2004	<i>Wolfgang AUSSENEGG, Pegaret PICHLER and Alex STOMPER (lxv): <u>IPO Pricing with Bookbuilding, and a When-Issued Market</u></i>
PRA	9.2004	<i>Pegaret PICHLER and Alex STOMPER (lxv): <u>Primary Market Design: Direct Mechanisms and Markets</u></i>
PRA	10.2004	<i>Florian ENGLMAIER, Pablo GUILLEN, Loreto LLORENTE, Sander ONDERSTAL and Rupert SAUSGRUBER (lxv): <u>The Chopstick Auction: A Study of the Exposure Problem in Multi-Unit Auctions</u></i>
PRA	11.2004	<i>Bjarne BRENDSTRUP and Harry J. PAARSCH (lxv): <u>Nonparametric Identification and Estimation of Multi-Unit, Sequential, Oral, Ascending-Price Auctions With Asymmetric Bidders</u></i>
PRA	12.2004	<i>Ohad KADAN (lxv): <u>Equilibrium in the Two Player, k-Double Auction with Affiliated Private Values</u></i>
PRA	13.2004	<i>Maarten C.W. JANSSEN (lxv): <u>Auctions as Coordination Devices</u></i>
PRA	14.2004	<i>Gadi FIBICH, Arie GAVIOUS and Aner SELA (lxv): <u>All-Pay Auctions with Weakly Risk-Averse Buyers</u></i>
PRA	15.2004	<i>Orly SADE, Charles SCHNITZLEIN and Jaime F. ZENDER (lxv): <u>Competition and Cooperation in Divisible Good Auctions: An Experimental Examination</u></i>
PRA	16.2004	<i>Marta STRYSZOWSKA (lxv): <u>Late and Multiple Bidding in Competing Second Price Internet Auctions</u></i>
CCMP	17.2004	<i>Slim Ben YOUSSEF: <u>R&D in Cleaner Technology and International Trade</u></i>
NRM	18.2004	<i>Angelo ANTOCI, Simone BORGHESI and Paolo RUSSU (lxvi): <u>Biodiversity and Economic Growth: Stabilization Versus Preservation of the Ecological Dynamics</u></i>
SIEV	19.2004	<i>Anna ALBERINI, Paolo ROSATO, Alberto LONGO and Valentina ZANATTA: <u>Information and Willingness to Pay in a Contingent Valuation Study: The Value of S. Erasmo in the Lagoon of Venice</u></i>
NRM	20.2004	<i>Guido CANDELA and Roberto CELLINI (lxvii): <u>Investment in Tourism Market: A Dynamic Model of Differentiated Oligopoly</u></i>
NRM	21.2004	<i>Jacqueline M. HAMILTON (lxvii): <u>Climate and the Destination Choice of German Tourists</u></i>
NRM	22.2004	<i>Javier Rey-MAQUIEIRA PALMER, Javier LOZANO IBÁÑEZ and Carlos Mario GÓMEZ GÓMEZ (lxvii): <u>Land, Environmental Externalities and Tourism Development</u></i>
NRM	23.2004	<i>Pius ODUNGA and Henk FOLMER (lxvii): <u>Profiling Tourists for Balanced Utilization of Tourism-Based Resources in Kenya</u></i>
NRM	24.2004	<i>Jean-Jacques NOWAK, Mondher SAHLI and Pasquale M. SGRO (lxvii): <u>Tourism, Trade and Domestic Welfare</u></i>
NRM	25.2004	<i>Riaz SHAREEF (lxvii): <u>Country Risk Ratings of Small Island Tourism Economies</u></i>
NRM	26.2004	<i>Juan Luis EUGENIO-MARTÍN, Noelia MARTÍN MORALES and Riccardo SCARPA (lxvii): <u>Tourism and Economic Growth in Latin American Countries: A Panel Data Approach</u></i>
NRM	27.2004	<i>Raúl Hernández MARTÍN (lxvii): <u>Impact of Tourism Consumption on GDP. The Role of Imports</u></i>
CSRM	28.2004	<i>Nicoletta FERRO: <u>Cross-Country Ethical Dilemmas in Business: A Descriptive Framework</u></i>
NRM	29.2004	<i>Marian WEBER (lxvi): <u>Assessing the Effectiveness of Tradable Landuse Rights for Biodiversity Conservation: an Application to Canada's Boreal Mixedwood Forest</u></i>
NRM	30.2004	<i>Trond BJORN DAL, Phoebe KOUNDOURI and Sean PASCOE (lxvi): <u>Output Substitution in Multi-Species Trawl Fisheries: Implications for Quota Setting</u></i>
CCMP	31.2004	<i>Marzio GALEOTTI, Alessandra GORIA, Paolo MOMBRINI and Evi SPANTIDAKI: <u>Weather Impacts on Natural, Social and Economic Systems (WISE) Part I: Sectoral Analysis of Climate Impacts in Italy</u></i>
CCMP	32.2004	<i>Marzio GALEOTTI, Alessandra GORIA, Paolo MOMBRINI and Evi SPANTIDAKI: <u>Weather Impacts on Natural, Social and Economic Systems (WISE) Part II: Individual Perception of Climate Extremes in Italy</u></i>
CTN	33.2004	<i>Wilson PEREZ: <u>Divide and Conquer: Noisy Communication in Networks, Power, and Wealth Distribution</u></i>
KTHC	34.2004	<i>Gianmarco I.P. OTTAVIANO and Giovanni PERI (lxviii): <u>The Economic Value of Cultural Diversity: Evidence from US Cities</u></i>
KTHC	35.2004	<i>Linda CHAIB (lxviii): <u>Immigration and Local Urban Participatory Democracy: A Boston-Paris Comparison</u></i>
KTHC	36.2004	<i>Franca ECKERT COEN and Claudio ROSSI (lxviii): <u>Foreigners, Immigrants, Host Cities: The Policies of Multi-Ethnicity in Rome. Reading Governance in a Local Context</u></i>
KTHC	37.2004	<i>Kristine CRANE (lxviii): <u>Governing Migration: Immigrant Groups' Strategies in Three Italian Cities – Rome, Naples and Bari</u></i>
KTHC	38.2004	<i>Kiflemariam HAMDE (lxviii): <u>Mind in Africa, Body in Europe: The Struggle for Maintaining and Transforming Cultural Identity - A Note from the Experience of Eritrean Immigrants in Stockholm</u></i>
ETA	39.2004	<i>Alberto CAVALIERE: <u>Price Competition with Information Disparities in a Vertically Differentiated Duopoly</u></i>
PRA	40.2004	<i>Andrea BIGANO and Stef PROOST: <u>The Opening of the European Electricity Market and Environmental Policy: Does the Degree of Competition Matter?</u></i>
CCMP	41.2004	<i>Micheal FINUS (lxix): <u>International Cooperation to Resolve International Pollution Problems</u></i>
KTHC	42.2004	<i>Francesco CRESPI: <u>Notes on the Determinants of Innovation: A Multi-Perspective Analysis</u></i>

CTN	43.2004	<i>Sergio CURRARINI and Marco MARINI: <u>Coalition Formation in Games without Synergies</u></i>
CTN	44.2004	<i>Marc ESCRIHUELA-VILLAR: <u>Cartel Sustainability and Cartel Stability</u></i>
NRM	45.2004	<i>Sebastian BERVOETS and Nicolas GRAVEL (lxvi): <u>Appraising Diversity with an Ordinal Notion of Similarity: An Axiomatic Approach</u></i>
NRM	46.2004	<i>Signe ANTHON and Bo JELLES MARK THORSEN (lxvi): <u>Optimal Afforestation Contracts with Asymmetric Information on Private Environmental Benefits</u></i>
NRM	47.2004	<i>John MBURU (lxvi): <u>Wildlife Conservation and Management in Kenya: Towards a Co-management Approach</u></i>
NRM	48.2004	<i>Ekin BIROL, Ágnes GYOVAI and Melinda SMALE (lxvi): <u>Using a Choice Experiment to Value Agricultural Biodiversity on Hungarian Small Farms: Agri-Environmental Policies in a Transitional Economy</u></i>
CCMP	49.2004	<i>Gernot KLEPPER and Sonja PETERSON: <u>The EU Emissions Trading Scheme. Allowance Prices, Trade Flows, Competitiveness Effects</u></i>
GG	50.2004	<i>Scott BARRETT and Michael HOEL: <u>Optimal Disease Eradication</u></i>
CTN	51.2004	<i>Dinko DIMITROV, Peter BORM, Ruud HENDRICKX and Shao CHIN SUNG: <u>Simple Priorities and Core Stability in Hedonic Games</u></i>
SIEV	52.2004	<i>Francesco RICCI: <u>Channels of Transmission of Environmental Policy to Economic Growth: A Survey of the Theory</u></i>
SIEV	53.2004	<i>Anna ALBERINI, Maureen CROPPER, Alan KRUPNICK and Nathalie B. SIMON: <u>Willingness to Pay for Mortality Risk Reductions: Does Latency Matter?</u></i>
NRM	54.2004	<i>Ingo BRÄUER and Rainer MARGGRAF (lxvi): <u>Valuation of Ecosystem Services Provided by Biodiversity Conservation: An Integrated Hydrological and Economic Model to Value the Enhanced Nitrogen Retention in Renaturated Streams</u></i>
NRM	55.2004	<i>Timo GOESCHL and Tun LIN (lxvi): <u>Biodiversity Conservation on Private Lands: Information Problems and Regulatory Choices</u></i>
NRM	56.2004	<i>Tom DEDEURWAERDERE (lxvi): <u>Bioprospection: From the Economics of Contracts to Reflexive Governance</u></i>
CCMP	57.2004	<i>Katrin REHDANZ and David MADDISON: <u>The Amenity Value of Climate to German Households</u></i>
CCMP	58.2004	<i>Koen SMEKENS and Bob VAN DER ZWAAN: <u>Environmental Externalities of Geological Carbon Sequestration Effects on Energy Scenarios</u></i>
NRM	59.2004	<i>Valentina BOSETTI, Mariaester CASSINELLI and Alessandro LANZA (lxvii): <u>Using Data Envelopment Analysis to Evaluate Environmentally Conscious Tourism Management</u></i>
NRM	60.2004	<i>Timo GOESCHL and Danilo CAMARGO IGLIORI (lxvi): <u>Property Rights Conservation and Development: An Analysis of Extractive Reserves in the Brazilian Amazon</u></i>
CCMP	61.2004	<i>Barbara BUCHNER and Carlo CARRARO: <u>Economic and Environmental Effectiveness of a Technology-based Climate Protocol</u></i>
NRM	62.2004	<i>Elissaios POPYRAKIS and Reyer GERLAGH: <u>Resource-Abundance and Economic Growth in the U.S.</u></i>
NRM	63.2004	<i>Györgyi BELA, György PATAKI, Melinda SMALE and Mariann HAJDÚ (lxvi): <u>Conserving Crop Genetic Resources on Smallholder Farms in Hungary: Institutional Analysis</u></i>
NRM	64.2004	<i>E.C.M. RUIJGROK and E.E.M. NILLESEN (lxvi): <u>The Socio-Economic Value of Natural Riverbanks in the Netherlands</u></i>
NRM	65.2004	<i>E.C.M. RUIJGROK (lxvi): <u>Reducing Acidification: The Benefits of Increased Nature Quality. Investigating the Possibilities of the Contingent Valuation Method</u></i>
ETA	66.2004	<i>Giannis VARDAS and Anastasios XEPAPADEAS: <u>Uncertainty Aversion, Robust Control and Asset Holdings</u></i>
GG	67.2004	<i>Anastasios XEPAPADEAS and Constadina PASSA: <u>Participation in and Compliance with Public Voluntary Environmental Programs: An Evolutionary Approach</u></i>
GG	68.2004	<i>Michael FINUS: <u>Modesty Pays: Sometimes!</u></i>
NRM	69.2004	<i>Trond BJØRNDAL and Ana BRASÃO: <u>The Northern Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries: Management and Policy Implications</u></i>
CTN	70.2004	<i>Alejandro CAPARRÓS, Abdelhakim HAMMOUDI and Tarik TAZDAÏT: <u>On Coalition Formation with Heterogeneous Agents</u></i>
IEM	71.2004	<i>Massimo GIOVANNINI, Margherita GRASSO, Alessandro LANZA and Matteo MANERA: <u>Conditional Correlations in the Returns on Oil Companies Stock Prices and Their Determinants</u></i>
IEM	72.2004	<i>Alessandro LANZA, Matteo MANERA and Michael MCALEER: <u>Modelling Dynamic Conditional Correlations in WTI Oil Forward and Futures Returns</u></i>
SIEV	73.2004	<i>Margarita GENIUS and Elisabetta STRAZZERA: <u>The Copula Approach to Sample Selection Modelling: An Application to the Recreational Value of Forests</u></i>
CCMP	74.2004	<i>Rob DELLINK and Ekko van IERLAND: <u>Pollution Abatement in the Netherlands: A Dynamic Applied General Equilibrium Assessment</u></i>
ETA	75.2004	<i>Rosella LEVAGGI and Michele MORETTO: <u>Investment in Hospital Care Technology under Different Purchasing Rules: A Real Option Approach</u></i>
CTN	76.2004	<i>Salvador BARBERÀ and Matthew O. JACKSON (lxx): <u>On the Weights of Nations: Assigning Voting Weights in a Heterogeneous Union</u></i>
CTN	77.2004	<i>Àlex ARENAS, Antonio CABRALES, Albert DÍAZ-GUILERA, Roger GUIMERA and Fernando VEGA-REDONDO (lxx): <u>Optimal Information Transmission in Organizations: Search and Congestion</u></i>
CTN	78.2004	<i>Francis BLOCH and Armando GOMES (lxx): <u>Contracting with Externalities and Outside Options</u></i>
CTN	79.2004	<i>Rabah AMIR, Effrosyni DIAMANTOUDI and Licun XUE (lxx): <u>Merger Performance under Uncertain Efficiency Gains</u></i>
CTN	80.2004	<i>Francis BLOCH and Matthew O. JACKSON (lxx): <u>The Formation of Networks with Transfers among Players</u></i>
CTN	81.2004	<i>Daniel DIERMEIER, Hülya ERASLAN and Antonio MERLO (lxx): <u>Bicameralism and Government Formation</u></i>

CTN	82.2004	<i>Rod GARRATT, James E. PARCO, Cheng-ZHONG QIN and Amnon RAPOPORT (lxx): <u>Potential Maximization and Coalition Government Formation</u></i>
CTN	83.2004	<i>Kfir ELIAZ, Debraj RAY and Ronny RAZIN (lxx): <u>Group Decision-Making in the Shadow of Disagreement</u></i>
CTN	84.2004	<i>Sanjeev GOYAL, Marco van der LEIJ and José Luis MORAGA-GONZÁLEZ (lxx): <u>Economics: An Emerging Small World?</u></i>
CTN	85.2004	<i>Edward CARTWRIGHT (lxx): <u>Learning to Play Approximate Nash Equilibria in Games with Many Players</u></i>
IEM	86.2004	<i>Finn R. FØRSUND and Michael HOEL: <u>Properties of a Non-Competitive Electricity Market Dominated by Hydroelectric Power</u></i>
KTHC	87.2004	<i>Elissaios PAPHAKIS and Reyer GERLAGH: <u>Natural Resources, Investment and Long-Term Income</u></i>
CCMP	88.2004	<i>Marzio GALEOTTI and Claudia KEMFERT: <u>Interactions between Climate and Trade Policies: A Survey</u></i>
IEM	89.2004	<i>A. MARKANDYA, S. PEDROSO and D. STREIMIKIENE: <u>Energy Efficiency in Transition Economies: Is There Convergence Towards the EU Average?</u></i>
GG	90.2004	<i>Rolf GOLOMBEK and Michael HOEL: <u>Climate Agreements and Technology Policy</u></i>
PRA	91.2004	<i>Sergei IZMALKOV (lxx): <u>Multi-Unit Open Ascending Price Efficient Auction</u></i>
KTHC	92.2004	<i>Gianmarco I.P. OTTAVIANO and Giovanni PERI: <u>Cities and Cultures</u></i>
KTHC	93.2004	<i>Massimo DEL GATTO: <u>Agglomeration, Integration, and Territorial Authority Scale in a System of Trading Cities. Centralisation versus devolution</u></i>
CCMP	94.2004	<i>Pierre-André JOUVET, Philippe MICHEL and Gilles ROTILLON: <u>Equilibrium with a Market of Permits</u></i>
CCMP	95.2004	<i>Bob van der ZWAAN and Reyer GERLAGH: <u>Climate Uncertainty and the Necessity to Transform Global Energy Supply</u></i>
CCMP	96.2004	<i>Francesco BOSELLO, Marco LAZZARIN, Roberto ROSON and Richard S.J. TOL: <u>Economy-Wide Estimates of the Implications of Climate Change: Sea Level Rise</u></i>
CTN	97.2004	<i>Gustavo BERGANTINOS and Juan J. VIDAL-PUGA: <u>Defining Rules in Cost Spanning Tree Problems Through the Canonical Form</u></i>
CTN	98.2004	<i>Siddhartha BANDYOPADHYAY and Mandar OAK: <u>Party Formation and Coalitional Bargaining in a Model of Proportional Representation</u></i>
GG	99.2004	<i>Hans-Peter WEIKARD, Michael FINUS and Juan-Carlos ALTAMIRANO-CABRERA: <u>The Impact of Surplus Sharing on the Stability of International Climate Agreements</u></i>
SIEV	100.2004	<i>Chiara M. TRAVISI and Peter NIJKAMP: <u>Willingness to Pay for Agricultural Environmental Safety: Evidence from a Survey of Milan, Italy, Residents</u></i>
SIEV	101.2004	<i>Chiara M. TRAVISI, Raymond J. G. M. FLORAX and Peter NIJKAMP: <u>A Meta-Analysis of the Willingness to Pay for Reductions in Pesticide Risk Exposure</u></i>
NRM	102.2004	<i>Valentina BOSETTI and David TOMBERLIN: <u>Real Options Analysis of Fishing Fleet Dynamics: A Test</u></i>
CCMP	103.2004	<i>Alessandra GORIA e Gretel GAMBARELLI: <u>Economic Evaluation of Climate Change Impacts and Adaptability in Italy</u></i>
PRA	104.2004	<i>Massimo FLORIO and Mara GRASSENTI: <u>The Missing Shock: The Macroeconomic Impact of British Privatisation</u></i>
PRA	105.2004	<i>John BENNETT, Saul ESTRIN, James MAW and Giovanni URGÀ: <u>Privatisation Methods and Economic Growth in Transition Economies</u></i>
PRA	106.2004	<i>Kira BÖRNER: <u>The Political Economy of Privatization: Why Do Governments Want Reforms?</u></i>
PRA	107.2004	<i>Pehr-Johan NORBÄCK and Lars PERSSON: <u>Privatization and Restructuring in Concentrated Markets</u></i>
SIEV	108.2004	<i>Angela GRANZOTTO, Fabio PRANOVI, Simone LIBRALATO, Patrizia TORRICELLI and Danilo MAINARDI: <u>Comparison between Artisanal Fishery and Manila Clam Harvesting in the Venice Lagoon by Using Ecosystem Indicators: An Ecological Economics Perspective</u></i>
CTN	109.2004	<i>Somdeb LAHIRI: <u>The Cooperative Theory of Two Sided Matching Problems: A Re-examination of Some Results</u></i>
NRM	110.2004	<i>Giuseppe DI VITA: <u>Natural Resources Dynamics: Another Look</u></i>
SIEV	111.2004	<i>Anna ALBERINI, Alistair HUNT and Anil MARKANDYA: <u>Willingness to Pay to Reduce Mortality Risks: Evidence from a Three-Country Contingent Valuation Study</u></i>
KTHC	112.2004	<i>Valeria PAPPONETTI and Dino PINELLI: <u>Scientific Advice to Public Policy-Making</u></i>
SIEV	113.2004	<i>Paulo A.L.D. NUNES and Laura ONOFRI: <u>The Economics of Warm Glow: A Note on Consumer's Behavior and Public Policy Implications</u></i>
IEM	114.2004	<i>Patrick CAYRADE: <u>Investments in Gas Pipelines and Liquefied Natural Gas Infrastructure What is the Impact on the Security of Supply?</u></i>
IEM	115.2004	<i>Valeria COSTANTINI and Francesco GRACCEVA: <u>Oil Security. Short- and Long-Term Policies</u></i>
IEM	116.2004	<i>Valeria COSTANTINI and Francesco GRACCEVA: <u>Social Costs of Energy Disruptions</u></i>
IEM	117.2004	<i>Christian EGENHOFER, Kyriakos GIALOGLOU, Giacomo LUCIANI, Maroeska BOOTS, Martin SCHEEPERS, Valeria COSTANTINI, Francesco GRACCEVA, Anil MARKANDYA and Giorgio VICINI: <u>Market-Based Options for Security of Energy Supply</u></i>
IEM	118.2004	<i>David FISK: <u>Transport Energy Security. The Unseen Risk?</u></i>
IEM	119.2004	<i>Giacomo LUCIANI: <u>Security of Supply for Natural Gas Markets. What is it and What is it not?</u></i>
IEM	120.2004	<i>L.J. de VRIES and R.A. HAKVOORT: <u>The Question of Generation Adequacy in Liberalised Electricity Markets</u></i>
KTHC	121.2004	<i>Alberto PETRUCCI: <u>Asset Accumulation, Fertility Choice and Nondegenerate Dynamics in a Small Open Economy</u></i>
NRM	122.2004	<i>Carlo GIUPPONI, Jaroslaw MYSLAK and Anita FASSIO: <u>An Integrated Assessment Framework for Water Resources Management: A DSS Tool and a Pilot Study Application</u></i>
NRM	123.2004	<i>Margaretha BREIL, Anita FASSIO, Carlo GIUPPONI and Paolo ROSATO: <u>Evaluation of Urban Improvement on the Islands of the Venice Lagoon: A Spatially-Distributed Hedonic-Hierarchical Approach</u></i>

ETA	124.2004	<i>Paul MENSINK</i> : <u>Instant Efficient Pollution Abatement Under Non-Linear Taxation and Asymmetric Information: The Differential Tax Revisited</u>
NRM	125.2004	<i>Mauro FABIANO, Gabriella CAMARSA, Rosanna DURSI, Roberta IVALDI, Valentina MARIN and Francesca PALMISANI</i> : <u>Integrated Environmental Study for Beach Management: A Methodological Approach</u>
PRA	126.2004	<i>Irena GROSFELD and Iraj HASHI</i> : <u>The Emergence of Large Shareholders in Mass Privatized Firms: Evidence from Poland and the Czech Republic</u>
CCMP	127.2004	<i>Maria BERRITTELLA, Andrea BIGANO, Roberto ROSON and Richard S.J. TOL</i> : <u>A General Equilibrium Analysis of Climate Change Impacts on Tourism</u>
CCMP	128.2004	<i>Reyer GERLAGH</i> : <u>A Climate-Change Policy Induced Shift from Innovations in Energy Production to Energy Savings</u>
NRM	129.2004	<i>Elissaios PAPYRAKIS and Reyner GERLAGH</i> : <u>Natural Resources, Innovation, and Growth</u>
PRA	130.2004	<i>Bernardo BORTOLOTTI and Mara FACCIO</i> : <u>Reluctant Privatization</u>
SIEV	131.2004	<i>Riccardo SCARPA and Mara THIENE</i> : <u>Destination Choice Models for Rock Climbing in the Northeast Alps: A Latent-Class Approach Based on Intensity of Participation</u>
SIEV	132.2004	<i>Riccardo SCARPA, Kenneth G. WILLIS and Melinda ACUTT</i> : <u>Comparing Individual-Specific Benefit Estimates for Public Goods: Finite Versus Continuous Mixing in Logit Models</u>
IEM	133.2004	<i>Santiago J. RUBIO</i> : <u>On Capturing Oil Rents with a National Excise Tax Revisited</u>
ETA	134.2004	<i>Ascensión ANDINA DÍAZ</i> : <u>Political Competition when Media Create Candidates' Charisma</u>
SIEV	135.2004	<i>Anna ALBERINI</i> : <u>Robustness of VSL Values from Contingent Valuation Surveys</u>
CCMP	136.2004	<i>Gernot KLEPPER and Sonja PETERSON</i> : <u>Marginal Abatement Cost Curves in General Equilibrium: The Influence of World Energy Prices</u>
ETA	137.2004	<i>Herbert DAWID, Christophe DEISSENBERG and Pavel ŠEVČÍK</i> : <u>Cheap Talk, Gullibility, and Welfare in an Environmental Taxation Game</u>
CCMP	138.2004	<i>ZhongXiang ZHANG</i> : <u>The World Bank's Prototype Carbon Fund and China</u>
CCMP	139.2004	<i>Reyer GERLAGH and Marjan W. HOFKES</i> : <u>Time Profile of Climate Change Stabilization Policy</u>
NRM	140.2004	<i>Chiara D'ALPAOS and Michele MORETTO</i> : <u>The Value of Flexibility in the Italian Water Service Sector: A Real Option Analysis</u>
PRA	141.2004	<i>Patrick BAJARI, Stephanie HOUGHTON and Steven TADELIS (Ixxi)</i> : <u>Bidding for Incomplete Contracts</u>
PRA	142.2004	<i>Susan ATHEY, Jonathan LEVIN and Enrique SEIRA (Ixxi)</i> : <u>Comparing Open and Sealed Bid Auctions: Theory and Evidence from Timber Auctions</u>
PRA	143.2004	<i>David GOLDREICH (Ixxi)</i> : <u>Behavioral Biases of Dealers in U.S. Treasury Auctions</u>
PRA	144.2004	<i>Roberto BURGUET (Ixxi)</i> : <u>Optimal Procurement Auction for a Buyer with Downward Sloping Demand: More Simple Economics</u>
PRA	145.2004	<i>Ali HORTACSU and Samita SAREEN (Ixxi)</i> : <u>Order Flow and the Formation of Dealer Bids: An Analysis of Information and Strategic Behavior in the Government of Canada Securities Auctions</u>
PRA	146.2004	<i>Victor GINSBURGH, Patrick LEGROS and Nicolas SAHUGUET (Ixxi)</i> : <u>How to Win Twice at an Auction. On the Incidence of Commissions in Auction Markets</u>
PRA	147.2004	<i>Claudio MEZZETTI, Aleksandar PEKEČ and Ilia TSETLIN (Ixxi)</i> : <u>Sequential vs. Single-Round Uniform-Price Auctions</u>
PRA	148.2004	<i>John ASKER and Estelle CANTILLON (Ixxi)</i> : <u>Equilibrium of Scoring Auctions</u>

- (lix) This paper was presented at the ENGIME Workshop on “Mapping Diversity”, Leuven, May 16-17, 2002
- (lx) This paper was presented at the EuroConference on “Auctions and Market Design: Theory, Evidence and Applications”, organised by the Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Milan, September 26-28, 2002
- (lxi) This paper was presented at the Eighth Meeting of the Coalition Theory Network organised by the GREQAM, Aix-en-Provence, France, January 24-25, 2003
- (lxii) This paper was presented at the ENGIME Workshop on “Communication across Cultures in Multicultural Cities”, The Hague, November 7-8, 2002
- (lxiii) This paper was presented at the ENGIME Workshop on “Social dynamics and conflicts in multicultural cities”, Milan, March 20-21, 2003
- (lxiv) This paper was presented at the International Conference on “Theoretical Topics in Ecological Economics”, organised by the Abdus Salam International Centre for Theoretical Physics - ICTP, the Beijer International Institute of Ecological Economics, and Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei – FEEM Trieste, February 10-21, 2003
- (lxv) This paper was presented at the EuroConference on “Auctions and Market Design: Theory, Evidence and Applications” organised by Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei and sponsored by the EU, Milan, September 25-27, 2003
- (lxvi) This paper has been presented at the 4th BioEcon Workshop on “Economic Analysis of Policies for Biodiversity Conservation” organised on behalf of the BIOECON Network by Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Venice International University (VIU) and University College London (UCL), Venice, August 28-29, 2003
- (lxvii) This paper has been presented at the international conference on “Tourism and Sustainable Economic Development – Macro and Micro Economic Issues” jointly organised by CRENoS (Università di Cagliari e Sassari, Italy) and Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, and supported by the World Bank, Sardinia, September 19-20, 2003
- (lxviii) This paper was presented at the ENGIME Workshop on “Governance and Policies in Multicultural Cities”, Rome, June 5-6, 2003
- (lxix) This paper was presented at the Fourth EEP Plenary Workshop and EEP Conference “The Future of Climate Policy”, Cagliari, Italy, 27-28 March 2003
- (lxx) This paper was presented at the 9th Coalition Theory Workshop on "Collective Decisions and Institutional Design" organised by the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona and held in Barcelona, Spain, January 30-31, 2004
- (lxxi) This paper was presented at the EuroConference on “Auctions and Market Design: Theory, Evidence and Applications”, organised by Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei and Consip and sponsored by the EU, Rome, September 23-25, 2004

2003 SERIES

CLIM	<i>Climate Change Modelling and Policy</i> (Editor: Marzio Galeotti)
GG	<i>Global Governance</i> (Editor: Carlo Carraro)
SIEV	<i>Sustainability Indicators and Environmental Valuation</i> (Editor: Anna Alberini)
NRM	<i>Natural Resources Management</i> (Editor: Carlo Giupponi)
KNOW	<i>Knowledge, Technology, Human Capital</i> (Editor: Gianmarco Ottaviano)
IEM	<i>International Energy Markets</i> (Editor: Anil Markandya)
CSRM	<i>Corporate Social Responsibility and Management</i> (Editor: Sabina Ratti)
PRIV	<i>Privatisation, Regulation, Antitrust</i> (Editor: Bernardo Bortolotti)
ETA	<i>Economic Theory and Applications</i> (Editor: Carlo Carraro)
CTN	<i>Coalition Theory Network</i>

2004 SERIES

CCMP	<i>Climate Change Modelling and Policy</i> (Editor: Marzio Galeotti)
GG	<i>Global Governance</i> (Editor: Carlo Carraro)
SIEV	<i>Sustainability Indicators and Environmental Valuation</i> (Editor: Anna Alberini)
NRM	<i>Natural Resources Management</i> (Editor: Carlo Giupponi)
KTHC	<i>Knowledge, Technology, Human Capital</i> (Editor: Gianmarco Ottaviano)
IEM	<i>International Energy Markets</i> (Editor: Anil Markandya)
CSRM	<i>Corporate Social Responsibility and Management</i> (Editor: Sabina Ratti)
PRA	<i>Privatisation, Regulation, Antitrust</i> (Editor: Bernardo Bortolotti)
ETA	<i>Economic Theory and Applications</i> (Editor: Carlo Carraro)
CTN	<i>Coalition Theory Network</i>