

Lanza, Alessandro; Manera, Matteo; Giovannini, Massimo

Working Paper

Oil and Product Price Dynamics in International Petroleum Markets

Nota di Lavoro, No. 81.2003

Provided in Cooperation with:

Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei (FEEM)

Suggested Citation: Lanza, Alessandro; Manera, Matteo; Giovannini, Massimo (2003) : Oil and Product Price Dynamics in International Petroleum Markets, Nota di Lavoro, No. 81.2003, Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei (FEEM), Milano

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/118121>

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.

Oil and Product Price Dynamics in International Petroleum Markets

Alessandro Lanza, Matteo Manera and
Massimo Giovannini

NOTA DI LAVORO 81.2003

SEPTEMBER 2003

| |
|------------------------------------|
| IEM – International Energy Markets |
|------------------------------------|

Alessandro Lanza, *Eni S.p.A., Roma, Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Milano
and CRENoS, Cagliari, Italy*

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

Massimo Giovannini, *Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Milano, Italy*

This paper can be downloaded without charge at:

The Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei Note di Lavoro Series Index:
http://www.feem.it/web/attiv/_wp.html

Social Science Research Network Electronic Paper Collection:
http://papers.ssrn.com/abstract_id=XXXXXX

The opinions expressed in this paper do not necessarily reflect the position of
Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei

Oil and Product Price Dynamics in International Petroleum Markets

Summary

In this paper we investigate crude oil and products price dynamics. We present a comparison among ten price series of crude oils and fourteen price series of petroleum products, considering four distinct market areas (Mediterranean, North Western Europe, Latin America and North America) over the period 1994-2002. We provide first a complete analysis of crude oil and product price dynamics using cointegration and error correction models. Subsequently we use the error correction specification to predict crude oil prices over the horizon January 2002-June 2002. The main findings of the paper can be summarized as follows: a) differences in quality are crucial to understand the behaviour of crudes; b) prices of crude oils whose physical characteristics are more similar to the marker show the following regularities: b1) they converge more rapidly to the long-run equilibrium; b2) there is an almost monotonic relation between Mean Absolute Percentage Error values and crude quality, measured by API° gravity and sulphur concentration; c) the price of the marker is the driving variable of the crude price also in the short-run, irrespective of the specific geographical area and the quality of the crude under analysis.

Keywords: Oil prices, Product prices, Error correction models, Forecasting

JEL: C22, D40, E32

The authors would like to thank Luigi Buzzacchi, Marzio Galeotti, Margherita Grasso and Micheal McAleer for helpful comments. Roberto Asti and Cristiana Boschi provided excellent editorial assistance. This study does not necessarily reflect the views of Eni S.p.A..

Address for correspondence:

Alessandro Lanza
Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei
Corso Magenta, 63
20123 Milano
Italy
Phone: +39-02-52036930
Fax: +39-02-52036946
E-mail: alessandro.lanza@feem.it

Oil and Product Price Dynamics in International Petroleum Markets

(Revised: 31 July 2003)

1. Introduction

Over the last 30 years, oil prices have been closely scrutinized by applied economic literature. Literally hundreds of applied research and policy studies have examined the role played by oil prices in determining economic growth or inflation rates, both in developed and developing countries.

Recently, several studies have contributed to this literature by examining the relation between the price of crude oil and refinery products. If we exclude the specialized literature, however, much less attention has been given to understanding the price dynamics for different crudes, even if the quality of crude oils available to refiners (and consequently their prices) is a critical factor in the strategies employed by refiners around the world.

Oil is not a homogenous commodity: as a number of experts have pointed out (see, The International Crude Oil Market Handbook, 2001) there are over 160 different internationally traded crude oils, all of which vary in terms of characteristics, quality, and market penetration.

Crude oils are classified by density and sulphur content. Lighter crudes generally have a higher share of light hydrocarbons – i.e. higher value products - that can be produced by simple distillation. Heavier crude oils give a greater share of lower-valued products through simple distillation and require additional processing to produce the

desired range of products. Some crude oils also have a higher sulphur content, an undesirable characteristic in terms of both processing and product quality.

The quality of the crude oil determines the level of processing and re-processing necessary to achieve the optimal mix of product output. As a result, price and price differentials between crude oils also reflect the relative ease of refining. For example, a premium crude oil like West Texas Intermediate (WTI), the U.S. benchmark, or Brent, the European benchmark, have a relatively high natural yield of desirable Gasoline. In contrast, almost half of the simple distillation yield from Urals is a heavy residue that must be reprocessed or sold at a discount as crude oil.

Refiners are in competition for an optimal mix of crudes for their refineries, in line with the technology of the particular refinery, the desired output mix and, more important, the relative price of available crudes. In recent years, refiners have been faced with two opposing forces: a combination of consumers' desires for lower prices and government regulations specifying increasingly lighter products of higher quality (the most difficult to produce) and supplies of crude oil that are increasingly heavier, i.e. with higher sulphur content (the most difficult to refine).

The importance of identifying the way in which a given crude is linked to a specific crude benchmark comes directly from market considerations: the pressure of falling margins in the oil products market, combined with some degree of flexibility in supply decisions, obliges refiners to seek opportunities in the free market to improve their profits. Crudes are expected to continue to become heavier with higher sulphur content, while environmental restrictions are expected to significantly reduce the demand for high-sulphur content fuels. As a consequence, light sweet crudes will continue to be available and in even greater demand than today. This is why an understanding of the

price dynamics, and the role played by different crudes, is crucial for the modern oil industry.

Because there are so many different varieties and grades of crude oil, buyers and sellers have found it easier to refer to a limited number of reference, or benchmark, crude oils. Other varieties are then priced at a discount or premium, according to their quality. For any given crude oil, the price is considered to be linked to another crude oil price (usually referred to as the marker). In this very simple scheme, to understand the behaviour of a given crude oil would be sufficient to explain the behaviour of its marker. However, the price difference between these two crudes is non-constant over time. To enrich the relations it is necessary to include variables other than the price marker to explain the oil price dynamics of the given crude.

In principle, several variables could affect this relation and could be used as explanatory variables. Considering data availability, the common assumption is that imbalances in the petroleum product price could reflect most of these missed variables. For example: if, due to extraordinary seasonal factors, Gasoline demand were higher than expected, this would be reflected into the relations between crudes according to various specific characteristics.

This approach has been examined in several different papers. However the specific economic literature on this issue is not very large. Adrangi, Chatrath, Raffiee and Ripple (2001) analyze the price dynamics of a specific crude (the Alaska North Slope) and its relation with US West coast diesel fuel price using a VAR methodology and a bivariate GARCH model to show the casual relationship between the two prices. Asche, Gjolberg and Volker (2003) make use of multivariate framework to test whether

there is a long-term relationship between crude oil and refined product prices in the North Western Europe market.

Gjølberg and Johnsen (1999) analyze co-movements between the prices of crude oil and major refined products during the period 1992-98. Specifically, they explore the existence of long-run equilibrium price relationships, and whether deviations from the estimated equilibrium can be utilized for predictions of short-term price changes and for risk management.

In this paper we present a comparison among crudes considering four distinct market areas (Mediterranean, North Western Europe, Latin America and North America) on ten prices series of crude oils and on fourteen price series of petroleum products.

We provide first a complete analysis of crude oil and product price dynamics using co-integration and error correction models over the period 1994-2002. Subsequently we use the error correction specification to predict crude oil prices over the horizon January 2002-June 2002.

The main findings of the paper can be summarized as follows.

Differences in quality are crucial to understand the behaviour of crudes.

Prices of crude oils whose physical characteristics are more similar to the marker show the following regularities:

- a) they converge more rapidly to the long-run equilibrium.
- b) there is an almost monotonic relation between Mean Absolute Percentage Error values and crude quality, measured by API° gravity and sulphur concentration.

This evidence can be motivated by considering the presence of the marker as an

explanatory variable: the closer the crude to the marker, the higher the contribution of the latter in explaining and predicting the former.

The price of the marker is the driving variable of the crude price also in the short-run, irrespective of the specific geographical area and the quality of the crude under analysis.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 provides a description of the analyzed data. Section 3 discusses the econometric methods and models. In Section 4 the empirical results are reported and commented. The forecasting performance of the estimated models is illustrated in Section 5. Concluding remarks close the paper.

2. Data description

Our analysis is based on ten prices series of crude oils and on fourteen price series of petroleum products. These data cover four distinct market areas: Mediterranean (MED), North Western Europe (NWE), Latin America (LA) and North America (NA). In the first two areas the reference price for crude oil (marker) is represented by Brent, while for the remaining two areas the benchmark crude is WTI. The petroleum products we are considering belong to three different quality categories: unleaded Gasoline, Gasoil and Fuel oil. Within the last class we distinguish between high sulphur Fuel oil (HSFO) and low sulphur Fuel Oil (LSFO). The data frequency is weekly with the exception of the LA market, where only monthly data are available, while the sample covers the period 1994-2002. All crude oil prices are expressed in US\$ per barrel, whilst product prices are in US\$ per metric ton. More details on the dataset are provided in Table 1.

Table 2 and Table 3 report, for both crude oils and petroleum products, the coefficients of variation of price levels and the annualized standard deviation of price

changes. On average, the coefficients of variation for crude prices are the double of the coefficients of variation of product prices, suggesting that the behaviour of crude prices is very close to that of financial assets. Moreover, if we look at the two groups separately, we find an inverse relation between quality (measured by API° gravity) and the coefficient of variation. A possible interpretation is the subsidiary role played by heavy crudes when light crudes become too expensive, while the lower-quality products are more volatile since their price is intimately linked to the price of some specific substitutes (e.g. natural gas).

Table 4 shows the percentage price correlations within crudes and between crudes and products. Higher correlations occur when crudes and products similar in terms of API° gravity are analyzed. The evidence from Tables 3 and 4 should suggest that prices characterized by more similar coefficients of variation (i.e. light crudes and heavy products) are more correlated. However, the coefficient of variation is a measure of long-run volatility, whereas price change correlation captures short-run movements in price variations. Moreover, an increase in the demand of light products has the effect of increasing the supply of both high-quality and low-quality products (see Gjolberg and Johnsen, 1999). Such considerations justify the presence of higher correlation between light (heavy) crudes and the top (bottom) of the barrel.

3. Model specification

Crude oil and product prices dynamics can be modelled with an Autoregressive-Distributed Lag (ADL) specification:

$$\alpha(L) p_t^c = \mu + \gamma(L) p_t^m + \vartheta(L) p_t^{y_1} + \xi(L) p_t^{y_2} + u_t \quad (1)$$

where L is the lag operator, $\alpha(L) = 1 - \alpha_1 L - \dots - \alpha_P L^P$, $\gamma(L) = \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 L + \dots + \gamma_Q L^Q$, $\vartheta(L) = \vartheta_0 + \vartheta_1 L + \dots + \vartheta_R L^R$ and $\xi(L) = \xi_0 + \xi_1 L + \dots + \xi_S L^S$. Capital letters P , Q , R and S represent the optimal number of lags of the polynomials $\alpha(L)$, $\gamma(L)$, $\theta(L)$ and $\xi(L)$, respectively. With p_t^c we indicate the price of the selected crude, whereas p_t^m is the price of the marker associated with p_t^c , and $p_t^{y_i}$, $i=1,2$, are the prices of two products; u_t is a white noise process. All variables are log-transformed.

Recent developments in time series econometrics suggest that the first step towards the estimation of model (1) is to check whether or not the different price series are stationary. Augmented Dickey-Fuller (ADF) tests for unit roots have been used and all variables have been found to be integrated of order one, or $I(1)$, with intercept but no trend.¹

Though non-stationary, the oil and product price series may form a linear combination which is stationary, or $I(0)$. If this is the case, the relevant price series are said to be cointegrated. The basic model used to test for the presence of cointegration is given by the static regression

$$p_t^c = \beta_0 + \beta_1 p_t^m + \beta_2 p_t^{y_1} + \beta_3 p_t^{y_2} + \varepsilon_t \quad (2)$$

If the residuals $\hat{\varepsilon}_t$ are $I(0)$, then equation (2) provides the long-run or equilibrium relationship between the relevant price series. When two or more variables are

¹ The complete set of results is reported in Tables A1-A3 of the Appendix.

cointegrated, we know from the Engle-Granger representation theorem that they admit an error correction (ECM) formulation of the type:

$$\Delta p_t^c = \sum_{p=1}^{P-1} \delta_{0p} \Delta p_{t-p}^c + \sum_{q=0}^{Q-1} \delta_{1q} \Delta p_{t-q}^m + \sum_{r=0}^{R-1} \delta_{2r} \Delta p_{t-r}^{y_1} + \sum_{s=0}^{S-1} \delta_{3s} \Delta p_{t-s}^{y_2} + \lambda \hat{\varepsilon}_{t-1} + \eta_t \quad (3)$$

$$\text{where} \quad \hat{\varepsilon}_t = p_t^c - \left(\hat{\beta}_0 + \hat{\beta}_1 p_t^m + \hat{\beta}_2 p_t^{y_1} + \hat{\beta}_3 p_t^{y_2} \right), \quad \hat{\beta}_0 = \hat{\mu} / \left(1 - \sum_{p=1}^P \hat{\alpha}_p \right),$$

$$\hat{\beta}_1 = \sum_{q=0}^Q \hat{\gamma}_q / \left(1 - \sum_{p=1}^P \hat{\alpha}_p \right), \quad \hat{\beta}_2 = \sum_{r=0}^R \hat{\vartheta}_r / \left(1 - \sum_{p=1}^P \hat{\alpha}_p \right), \quad \text{and}$$

$$\hat{\beta}_3 = \sum_{s=0}^S \hat{\xi}_s / \left(1 - \sum_{p=1}^P \hat{\alpha}_p \right).$$

The coefficients β_i in equation (2) can be interpreted as long-run elasticities of the crude price to the marker price and petroleum products prices. In other terms, each β_i measures the percentage variation of crude oil price due to a unit percentage variation of each explanatory variable.

The choice of explaining oil prices in terms of petroleum product prices relies on the theory of derived demand, which states that the price of an input should be determined by its contribution to the market value of the output reflected in its market price (see Adrangi, Chatrath, Raffiee and Ripple, 2001, for a test of the causal relationship flowing from product prices to crude oil price).

Equation (3) incorporates short-run and long-run effects, captured by coefficients δ_{ij} and λ , respectively. In particular, λ is the so-called long-run adjustment coefficient which measures how fast p_t^c converges towards the long-run equilibrium represented by equation (2).

4. Empirical results

For each of the eight selected crudes we should estimate, at least in principle, as many specifications for equation (3) as the number of combinations of products (i.e. six models for MED and NWE, three models for LA and NA).

Given the large number of resulting models, we use a simple criterion to select the best specification for each crude. Following Stock and Watson (1993), we estimate an augmented version of equation (2), formed by adding one lead and one lag to all the independent variables (DOLS estimation). In this way we obtain corrected t -statistics for each estimated coefficient, which allow us to select the specifications of the long-run equation with the largest number of statistically significant parameters. If two or more long-run specifications have the same number of significant coefficients, we select the one whose associated ECM yields the largest number of statistically significant parameters. The final product selection for each crude is reported in the third column of Table 5.

As it is shown in Table 5, the sum of the estimated coefficients β in equation (2) (ignoring the intercept term) is approximately equal to one. Moreover, the null hypothesis that this sum is equal to one is not rejected by the data in 5 cases out of 8.² These coefficients can be interpreted as the contribution (weight) given by each independent variable to the determination of crude oil price. The price of the marker dominates relation (2), while product prices play a sort of compensation role, in order to preserve the one-to-one relation between the crude and the marker. If we exclude Maya

²A corrected Wald test, based on the DOLS coefficient estimates, rejects the null hypothesis at 1% significance level for Kern River and Thums, and at 5% for Iranian.

in the LA area, the β coefficients of the corresponding selected pair of product prices have opposite signs. The contribution of each product to the market value of a particular crude oil is such that a constant balance between price of the crude and price of the marker is maintained in the long-run.

Specifically, $\hat{\beta}_1$ is always larger than one, and its magnitude increases as heavier crudes are considered. These features show that when the price of the marker increases the demand of heavy crude oils increases, which, in turn, forces their price to rise more than proportionally.

Furthermore, when the MED and NWE areas are considered, the long-run coefficients $\hat{\beta}_2$ and $\hat{\beta}_3$ have positive and negative signs, respectively. The converse is true when we concentrate on NA. A possible interpretation of this empirical evidence is that, while Europe is characterized by two highly demanded light products (i.e. Gasoline and Gasoil), only Gasoline has a primary role in North America. As a consequence, an increase in the demand for Gasoline in Europe is met using very light crudes in the production process of Gasoline, while medium-quality crudes are employed to produce Gasoil. On the contrary, the North American refinery system is mainly oriented towards the production of Gasoline, which explains the positive long-run correlation between crude and Gasoline prices.

In all areas each crude price is cointegrated with the price of the marker and the prices of the selected pair of products, according to the ADF tests on the residuals of the long-run equation (2) reported in Table 6.

The best ECM specification is attained with the product pair LSFO-Gasoline for seven crudes out of eight (the only exception is HSFO-Gasoline for Urals NWE). The short-run coefficient of Gasoline in the ECM equation (3) is significant, in all markets

and for all crudes, with the exception of Forcados. The more volatile product in the short-run (Gasoline) is responsible of the short-run dynamics of the crude oil price. It is well known that the refined barrel can be ideally divided in two classes of products: high-quality (light) and low-quality (heavy) products. Hence, the best explanation of both short-run and long-run behaviour of a crude oil price is obtained when we include in the ECM specification the pair formed by the most representative products in each class, that is LSFO-Gasoline (Table 7).

If we combine the information included in Table 1 with Table 7, it is easy to see that the magnitude of the estimated long-run adjustment coefficients is sensitive to the gravity of the specific crude, that is, with the exception of Forcados, a sort of monotonic relation between speed of adjustment and API° emerges. Prices of crude oils whose physical characteristics are more similar to the marker are likely to converge more rapidly to the long-run equilibrium.

Furthermore, the price of the marker is the driving variable of the crude price also in the short-run, irrespective of the specific geographical area and the quality of the crude under analysis (see Table 5)³.

5. Forecasting crude oil prices

We assess the ability of the ECM specification to predict crude oil prices over the horizon January 2002-June 2002 by computing three different sets of forecasts: static, dynamic and simulated. With the exception of LA area, where only monthly data are available, we split the forecasting horizon (24 weeks) into six windows of four weeks, with the purpose of partially neutralizing potential contingent factors that could affect

³ The estimated short-run coefficients of the ECM are reported in Table A4 of the Appendix.

the forecasting evaluation (e.g. changes in OPEC policy). Moreover, in order to make the calculated forecasts comparable, instead of estimating the ECM just once and using the same estimated parameters to calculate forecast values of the dependent variable for each of the six windows, we re-estimate the ECM six times with a rolling-sample technique: in this way, the forecast values in each window depend on updated coefficients estimates from samples of the same size.

While static and dynamic forecasts are self-explanatory, the procedure we use to generate the simulated forecasts needs some explanation. The aim of this exercise is to produce “true” out-of-sample, multistep-ahead forecasts for the crude oil price, given the presence of marker and product prices as exogenous variables in model (3). Let's indicate with T the last in-sample observation for each window. Then:

i) For each variable $\Delta p_t^m, \Delta p_t^{y_1}, \Delta p_t^{y_2}$ and $\hat{\varepsilon}_t$, we estimated an ARMA(1,1) model of the type $x_t = \phi_1 x_{t-1} + u_t + \vartheta_1 u_{t-1}$, $t=2, \dots, T$. Since all estimated ARMA(1,1) models are found to be statistically adequate to capture the behaviour of these series, for each model we calculated the residuals \hat{u}_t .

ii) Each ARMA residual vector \hat{u}_t , $t=2, \dots, T$, is bootstrapped $R=1000$ times, to obtain bootstrapped residuals $\hat{u}_t^{b(r)}$, where $r=1, \dots, R=1000$ indicates the r -th replication and superscript b denotes a bootstrapped series.

iii) Each series $\Delta p_t^m, \Delta p_t^{y_1}, \Delta p_t^{y_2}$ and $\hat{\varepsilon}_t$ is simulated R times out-of-sample ($t=T+1, \dots, T+h$) using the estimated ARMA models of stage (i) and the bootstrapped

residuals of stage (2). That is: $\hat{x}_t^{*(r)} = \hat{\phi}_1 \hat{x}_{t-1}^{*(r)} + \hat{u}_t^{b(r)} + \hat{v}_1 \hat{u}_{t-1}^{b(r)}$, $t=T+1, \dots, T+h$, where the superscript $*$ denotes a simulated series, and $h=4$ ($h=6$ for the crudes of the LA area, since only monthly data are available).

iv) for each series $\Delta p_t^m, \Delta p_t^{y_1}, \Delta p_t^{y_2}$ and $\hat{\varepsilon}_t$, we select, among the R simulated series, that series whose standard deviation is closest to the standard deviation of the actual series (this last calculated using in-sample observations).

Formally: $\tilde{x}_t = \min_r \left| Std.Dev.(\hat{x}_t^{*(r)}) - Std.Dev.(x_t) \right|$, where \tilde{x}_t denotes the selected simulated series.

v) we re-estimate the ECM specification (3) over the sample $t=k, \dots, T$, where $k = \max(P, Q, R, S)$, and we calculate the residuals $\hat{\eta}_t$.

vi) Residuals $\hat{\eta}_t$ are bootstrapped R times, thus obtaining $\hat{\eta}_t^{b(r)}$.

vii) The dependent variable p_t^c is simulated R times, using the bootstrapped residuals of the ECM model (stage vi) and the simulated exogenous series (stage iv):

$$\hat{p}_t^{*c(r)} = \hat{p}_{t-1}^{*c(r)} + \sum_{p=1}^{P-1} \hat{\delta}_{0p} \Delta \tilde{p}_{t-p}^c + \sum_{q=0}^{Q-1} \hat{\delta}_{1q} \Delta \tilde{p}_{t-q}^m + \sum_{r=0}^{R-1} \hat{\delta}_{2r} \Delta \tilde{p}_{t-r}^{y_1} + \sum_{s=0}^{S-1} \hat{\delta}_{3s} \Delta \tilde{p}_{t-s}^{y_2} + \hat{\lambda} \tilde{\varepsilon}_{t-1} + \hat{\eta}_{t,t+j}^{b(r)}$$

$t=T+1, \dots, T+h$.

For crudes belonging to the MED, NWE and NA markets, we repeat this procedure for all the 6 windows using the rolling-sample technique illustrated above.

After completion of the three forecasting exercises, we obtain, for the MED, NWE, and NA areas, 24 one-step-ahead (static) forecasts, 24 (dynamic) h -steps-ahead forecasts ($h=1,...,4$) and 24 (simulated) forecast distributions, each formed by $R=1000$ simulated forecasts. All forecasts are collected in six windows of size 4. For the LA area we produce 6 (static) one-step-ahead forecasts, 6 (dynamic) h -steps-ahead forecasts ($h=1,...,4$) and 6 (simulated) forecast distributions.

In order to evaluate the predictive ability of each ECM specifications, we calculate the mean absolute percentage error (MAPE), the Theil's inequality coefficient (decomposed in bias, variance and covariance proportions) and the SR (success ratio), which indicates the percentage number of times the forecasted series has the same sign of the corresponding actual series. Moreover, for the simulated forecasts only, we calculate a range of dispersion measures associated to each forecast distribution, as follows. First, we compute the standard deviations of the distribution of forecasts in each window and in each forecasting period (24 standard deviations). Second, we calculate the mean of the 24 standard deviations. Third, for each window, we calculate the mean of the standard deviations relative to the h -th forecasting point, $h=1,...,4$ (mean of 6 standard deviations).

Results from static and dynamic forecast are reported in Table 9. The following comments apply.

First, due to the different data frequencies, a direct comparison between the LA market and the remaining areas is not possible, although comments that hold for the weekly series can be directly extended to the monthly data.

Second, if we rank the different crudes according to the forecasting performance of the corresponding ECM specifications using the MAPE, the same ranking holds irrespective of whether the forecasts are static or dynamic. The only exception is Iranian heavy, whose dynamic forecasts seem to be relatively better than the static predictions.

Third, there is an almost monotonic relation between MAPE values and crude quality, measured by API° gravity and sulphur concentration. Actually, among the crudes with similar gravity, crudes with less sulphur are characterized by lower MAPE. This evidence can be motivated by considering the presence of the marker as an explanatory variable: the closer the crude to the marker, the higher the contribution of the latter in explaining and predicting the former.

Fourth, from inspection of the Theil's statistic, we experience an increase of the bias proportion and a correspondent reduction of variance and covariance proportions when moving from static to dynamic forecasts. Nonetheless, the values of the Theil's coefficient are generally quite small, indicating a good predictive fit.

Fifth, the low value of the variance proportion in the dynamic forecasts is perfectly consistent with the values of SR.

Results from the simulated forecasts are reported in Table 10. MAPE, Theil's coefficient and SR are calculated on the mean of each forecasted distribution. As expected, the forecasting performance for each model is slightly worse than in the static and dynamic cases. Nevertheless, taking into account the crudes from the LA area, we find that this kind of forecasts performs relatively better for heavier crudes. Actually, MAPE values are almost five times larger than those obtained from the dynamic forecasts in NWE, and almost twice than in NA. Conversely, the heaviest crude in LA

(i.e. Boscan) has MAPE values which are less than twice those of the dynamic forecast, while Maya, the lightest crude in that area, has a MAPE value which is four times larger.

The SR, though lower than in both static and dynamic cases, has values which are higher than 0.50, meaning that the simulated series produce reasonable predictions of the turning points of crude prices.

The second section of Table 10 reports several dispersion measures of the forecasted distributions. The mean of all the standard deviations (SD) indicates that lower predicting variability is associated with higher quality crudes. The overall coherence of the simulation exercise is guaranteed by the values of each standard deviation, which increase as the forecasting horizon increases.

6. Conclusions

This paper presents two different exercises that need to be commented in a separate way even if there are some common interesting features.

The first conclusion is related to the different relation between a given crude, its area-specific market and the related petroleum products. In this paper we investigate crude oil and products price dynamics using cointegration and ECM. Empirical evidence shows that product price are statistically relevant in explaining short- and long-run adjustment in petroleum markets. The relevant product mix also depend on the specific market area and on the characteristics of the selected crude. It is also worth to underline that the long-run adjustment coefficients are sensitive to the gravity of the specific crude. Prices of crude oils whose physical characteristics are more similar to

the marker are likely to converge more rapidly to the long-run equilibrium. Furthermore, the price of the marker is the driving variable of the crude price also in the short-run, irrespective of the specific geographical area and the quality of the crude under analysis.

The second conclusion is related to the part of the paper aimed at assessing the ability of the ECM specification to predict crude oil prices over the horizon January 2002-June 2002. We computed three different sets of forecasts, namely static, dynamic and simulated, and in general the lower predicting variability is associated with higher quality crudes. Also in this case there is almost monotonic relation between MAPE values and crude quality, measured by API° gravity and sulphur concentration. Actually, among the crudes with similar gravity, crudes with less sulphur are characterized by lower MAPE. This evidence can be motivated by considering the presence of the marker as an explanatory variable: the closer the crude to the marker, the higher the contribution of the latter in explaining and predicting the former.

References

- Adrangi, B., A. Chatrath, K. Raffiee and R.D.Ripple (2001), “Alaska North Slope crude oil price and the behaviour of diesel prices in California”, *Energy Economics*, **23**, 29-42.
- Asche, F., O. Gjolberg and T. Völker (2003), “Price relationships in the petroleum market. An analysis of crude oil and refined product prices”, *Energy Economics*, **25**, 289-301.
- Engle, R.F., and C.W.J. Granger (1987), “Co-integration and error correction: representation, estimation and testing”, *Econometrica*, **55**, 251-276.
- Gjolberg, O., and T. Johnsen (1999), “Risk management in the oil industry: can information on long-run equilibrium prices be utilized?”, *Energy Economics*, **21**, 517-527.
- The International Crude Oil Market Handbook (2001), Energy Intelligence Group, Fourth Edition.
- MacKinnon, J.G. (1991), “Critical values for co-integration tests”, in R.F. Engle and C.W.J. Granger (eds.), *Long-run Economic Relationships*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Stock, J. and M. Watson (1993), “A simple estimator of cointegrating vectors in higher order integrated systems”, *Econometrica*, **61**, 783-820.

Table 1. Dataset

| Area: | Mediterranean (MED) | North Western Europe (NWE) | Latin America (LA) | North America (NA) |
|------------|---|---|---|---|
| Marker: | Brent (38.3°, 0.37%) | Brent | WTI (39.6°, 0.24%) | WTI |
| Crudes: | - Urals MED (32°, 1.3%) - Iranian heavy (30.2°, 1.77%) | - Urals NWE (32°, 1.3%) - Forcados (31°, 0.19%) | - Maya (21.8°, 3.33%) - Boscan (10.1°, 5.4%) | - Kern River (13.4°, 1.1%) - Thums (17°, 1.50%) |
| Products: | - Premium Gasoline - Gasoil - Low Sulphur Fuel Oil (LSFO) - High Sulphur Fuel Oil (HSFO) | - Premium Gasoline - Gasoil - Low Sulphur Fuel Oil (LSFO) - High Sulphur Fuel Oil (HSFO) | - Super Unleaded - Gasoil N°2 - Low Sulphur Fuel Oil (LSFO) | - Super Unleaded - Gasoil N°2 - Low Sulphur Fuel Oil (LSFO) |
| Sample: | 10/7/1994-06/28/2002 | 10/7/1994-06/28/2002 | 01/1994-06/2002 | 10/7/1994-06/28/2002 |
| Frequency: | weekly | weekly | monthly | weekly |

Note to Table 1. Sources Platt's and Petroleum Intelligence Weekly (2000); API° gravity and sulphur content (%) are reported in parentheses; HSFO is not traded in LA and NA.

Table 2. Descriptive statistics: crude oil prices

| | | Coefficient of variation (CV) Percent price level | Annualized standard deviation (ASD) Percent price variation |
|-----|------------|--|--|
| | Brent | 9.40 | 33.53 |
| MED | Urals MED | 9.62 | 37.37 |
| | Iranian | 10.47 | 39.23 |
| NWE | Urals NWE | 9.52 | 36.50 |
| | Forcados | 9.42 | 34.70 |
| | WTI | 8.40 | 26.82 |
| LA | Maya | 11.49 | 38.28 |
| | Boscan | 12.67 | 35.48 |
| NA | Kern River | 12.96 | 35.67 |
| | Thums | 11.76 | 31.87 |

Note to Table 2. All prices are expressed in logs. $CV = 100(\hat{\sigma}_p / \hat{\mu}_p)$ where $\hat{\mu}_p = \sum_{t=1}^T p_t / T$ and $\hat{\sigma}_p^2 = \sum_{t=1}^T (p_t - \hat{\mu}_p)^2 / (T-1)$ and $ASD = 100(\sqrt{n} \hat{\sigma}_{\Delta p})$, where n is the number of observations per year, $\hat{\sigma}_{\Delta p}^2 = \sum_{t=1}^T (\Delta p_t - \hat{\mu}_{\Delta p})^2 / (T-1)$ and $\hat{\mu}_{\Delta p} = \sum_{t=1}^T \Delta p_t / T$.

Table 3. Descriptive statistics: prices of products

| | Coefficient of variation (CV) | | | | Annualized standard deviation (ASD) | | | |
|----------|-------------------------------|------|------|------|-------------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|
| | MED | NWE | LA | NA | MED | NWE | LA | NA |
| Gasoline | 5.08 | 4.99 | 4.48 | 4.56 | 30.24 | 31.18 | 36.56 | 35.77 |
| Gasoil | 5.58 | 5.14 | 4.86 | 4.90 | 30.64 | 26.53 | 25.10 | 29.38 |
| LSFO | 5.46 | 5.05 | 5.80 | 5.85 | 29.38 | 25.33 | 33.01 | 31.12 |
| HSFO | 6.07 | 5.66 | - | - | 32.41 | 33.74 | - | - |

Notes to Table 3. See Table 2

Table 4. Price change correlations

| | Brent | Urals MED | Iranian | Urals NWE | Forcad. | WTI | Maya | Boscan | Kern River | Thums |
|------------|-------|--------------|---------|--------------|---------|--|------|--------|---------------|-------|
| Brent | 1.00 | | | | | | | | | |
| Urals MED | 0.96 | 1.00 | | | | | | | | |
| Iranian | 0.96 | 0.99 | 1.00 | | | | | | | |
| Urals NWE | 0.98 | - | - | 1.00 | | | | | | |
| Forcados | 0.99 | - | - | 0.97 | 1.00 | | | | | |
| WTI | | | | | | 1.00 | | | | |
| Maya | | | | | | 0.91 | 1.00 | | | |
| Boscan | | | | | | 0.76 | 0.84 | 1.00 | | |
| Kern River | | | | | | 0.68 | - | - | 1.00 | |
| Thums | | | | | | 0.70 | - | - | 0.96 | 1.00 |
| Gasoline | 0.63 | 0.59 | 0.59 | 0.62 | 0.62 | 0.74 ^m 0.57 ^w | 0.70 | 0.53 | 0.44 | 0.45 |
| Gasoil | 0.66 | 0.63 | 0.63 | 0.66 | 0.66 | 0.83 ^m 0.65 ^w | 0.78 | 0.64 | 0.48 | 0.49 |
| LSFO | 0.45 | 0.41 | 0.42 | 0.40 | 0.44 | 0.71 ^m 0.43 ^w | 0.81 | 0.67 | 0.44 | 0.48 |
| HSFO | 0.37 | 0.33 | 0.33 | 0.49 | 0.52 | - | - | - | - | - |

Notes to Table 4. m= monthly; w= weekly.

Table 5. Estimation of the long-run relationship

| | Crudes | Products (y ₁ , y ₂) | R ² | $\hat{\beta}_1$ | $\hat{\beta}_2$ | $\hat{\beta}_3$ |
|-----|------------|--|----------------|--------------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| MED | Urals MED | LSFO, Gasoline | 0.99 | 1.04*** (11.69) | 0.12* (1.72) | -0.16** (-2.58) |
| | Iranian | LSFO, Gasoline | 0.99 | 1.13*** (11.00) | 0.18** (2.34) | -0.24*** (-3.34) |
| NWE | Urals NWE | HSFO, Gasoline | 0.99 | 1.01*** (11.54) | 0.11* (1.83) | -0.13** (-2.14) |
| | Forcados | LSFO, Gasoline | 0.99 | 1.06*** (16.23) | 0.01 (0.43) | -0.08 (-1.51) |
| LA | Maya | LSFO, Gasoline | 0.95 | 1.85*** (4.69) | -0.52* (-1.63) | -0.20 (-0.58) |
| | Boscan | LSFO, Gasoline | 0.91 | 2.04*** (3.53) | -0.87* (-1.85) | 0.03 (0.06) |
| NA | Kern River | LSFO, Gasoline | 0.94 | 1.35*** (3.77) | -0.07 (-0.24) | 0.04 (0.13) |
| | Thums | LSFO, Gasoline | 0.95 | 1.32*** (4.70) | -0.10 (-0.42) | 0.03 (0.11) |

Notes to Table 5. $\hat{\beta}_i$ $i=1, \dots, 3$, are the DOLS estimates of the augmented dynamic regression

$p_t^c = \beta_0 + \beta_1 p_t^m + \beta_2 p_t^{y_1} + \beta_3 p_t^{y_2} + \sum_{i=-r}^r \theta_i \Delta p_{t-i}^m + \sum_{i=-r}^r \phi_i \Delta p_{t-i}^{y_1} + \sum_{i=-r}^r \gamma_i \Delta p_{t-i}^{y_2} + \varepsilon_t$, with $r=1$
(see Stock and Watson, 1993), in parentheses the rescaled t -statistics; * (**)[***] indicates significance
at 10% (5%) [1%]

Table 6. Cointegration tests

| | Crudes | Products (y ₁ , y ₂) | <i>a</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>p</i> | ADF |
|-----|------------|--|----------|----------|----------|---------------------|
| MED | Urals MED | LSFO, Gasoline | no | no | 2 | -5.98*** |
| | Iranian | LSFO, Gasoline | no | no | 2 | -5.98*** |
| NWE | Urals NWE | HSFO, Gasoline | no | no | 2 | -5.33*** |
| | Forcados | LSFO, Gasoline | no | no | 1 | -4.88*** |
| LA | Maya | LSFO, Gasoline | no | no | 0 | -3.82 (57.96***) |
| | Boscan | LSFO, Gasoline | no | no | 0 | -3.79 (53.72***) |
| NA | Kern River | LSFO, Gasoline | no | no | 2 | -5.09*** |
| | Thums | LSFO, Gasoline | no | no | 0 | -5.55*** |

Notes to Table 6. ADF is the calculated *t* test for the null hypothesis of no cointegration (i.e. $\gamma=0$) in the Augmented Dickey-Fuller regression on $\hat{\varepsilon}_t$: $\Delta\hat{\varepsilon}_t = a + bt + \gamma\hat{\varepsilon}_{t-1} + \sum_{i=1}^p \gamma_i \Delta\hat{\varepsilon}_{t-i} + v_t$, where $\hat{\varepsilon}_t$ are the estimated residuals of the DOLS regression; *p* is the order of the augmentation needed to eliminate any autocorrelation in the residuals of the ADF regression; * (**)[***] indicates significance at 10% (5%) [1%] on the basis of the critical values by MacKinnon, (1991); for crudes in the LA area the Johansen's (1991) trace test is reported in parentheses.

Table 7. Selected products and long-run adjustment coefficients

| | MED | NWE | LA | NA |
|---|-----------------------------------|---|--|--------------------------------------|
| Selected products | LSFO-Gasoline (Urals, Iranian) | HSFO-Gasoline (Urals) LSFO-Gasoline (Forcados) | LSFO-Gasoline (Maya, Boscan) | LSFO-Gasoline (Kern River, Thums) |
| Long-run products | LSFO-Gasoline (Urals, Iranian) | HSFO-Gasoline (Urals) - (Forcados) | LSFO (Maya, Boscan) | - |
| Short-run products | Gasoline (Urals, Iranian) | Gasoline (Forcados) | LSFO-Gasoline (Maya, Boscan) | LSFO-Gasoline (Kern River, Thums) |
| Long-run adjustment coefficients ($\hat{\lambda}$) | -0.12 (Urals, Iranian) | -0.11 (Urals) -0.06 (Forcados) | -0.15 (Maya) -0.09 (Boscan) | -0.07 (Kern River, Thums) |

Notes to Table 7. Selected products = pair of products corresponding to the best model specifications (1) and (2); long-run products = products whose coefficients are statistically significant in the long-run relation (1); short-run products = products whose short-run coefficients are statistically significant in model (2); crudes associated with selected products, long-run products, short-run products and long-run adjustment coefficients (see equation (2)) are reported in parentheses.

Table 8. Static and dynamic forecast evaluation of selected ECM models

| | | MED | | NWE | | LA | | NA | |
|-------------------|-------|-----------|---------|-----------|---------|-------|--------|------------|-------|
| | | Urals med | Iranian | Urals NWE | Forcad. | Maya | Boscan | Kern River | Thums |
| Static Forecasts | MAPE | 0.26 | 0.37 | 0.24 | 0.08 | 0.96 | 1.95 | 0.74 | 0.86 |
| | Theil | 0.002 | 0.002 | 0.002 | 0.001 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.004 | 0.005 |
| | BP | 0.29 | 0.06 | 0.31 | 0.54 | 0.29 | 0.49 | 0.26 | 0.28 |
| | VP | 0.29 | 0.35 | 0.29 | 0.14 | 0.003 | 0.03 | 0.44 | 0.35 |
| | CP | 0.42 | 0.59 | 0.41 | 0.32 | 0.71 | 0.49 | 0.30 | 0.37 |
| Dynamic Forecasts | MAPE | 0.55 | 0.52 | 0.52 | 0.19 | 2.08 | 5.32 | 1.48 | 1.39 |
| | Theil | 0.003 | 0.003 | 0.003 | 0.001 | 0.01 | 0.03 | 0.01 | 0.01 |
| | BP | 0.62 | 0.63 | 0.71 | 0.74 | 0.82 | 0.68 | 0.79 | 0.65 |
| | VP | 0.14 | 0.18 | 0.21 | 0.11 | 0.07 | 0.27 | 0.17 | 0.29 |
| | CP | 0.25 | 0.19 | 0.08 | 0.15 | 0.11 | 0.05 | 0.04 | 0.06 |
| | SR | 0.875 | 0.958 | 1.00 | 0.958 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.958 | 0.958 |

Notes to Table 8. Static forecasts indicate one-step-ahead forecasts, dynamic forecasts indicate 4-step-ahead forecasts (6 steps for LA area); MAPE is the mean absolute percentage error, Theil is the Theil's Inequality Coefficient and BP, VP, CP are the bias, variance, and covariance proportions. SR is the mean of the success ratio calculated as the percentage number of times the sign of the forecasted series is the same as the sign of the actual series. All the reported values, with the exception of those referring to LA, are mean values calculated over the 6 forecast windows.

Table 9. Simulated forecast evaluation of selected ECM models

| | | MED | | NEW | | LA | | NA | |
|------------|-------|-----------|---------|-----------|---------|-------|--------|------------|-------|
| | | Urals med | Iranian | Urals NWE | Forcad. | Maya | Boscan | Kern River | Thums |
| Mean | MAPE | 2.42 | 2.26 | 2.40 | 2.09 | 9.83 | 9.56 | 3.54 | 3.22 |
| | Theil | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 0.02 | 0.02 |
| | BP | 0.69 | 0.51 | 0.61 | 0.67 | 0.75 | 0.67 | 0.66 | 0.59 |
| | VP | 0.29 | 0.45 | 0.37 | 0.30 | 0.25 | 0.33 | 0.19 | 0.26 |
| | CP | 0.02 | 0.04 | 0.02 | 0.03 | 0.004 | 0.005 | 0.16 | 0.14 |
| | SR | 0.58 | 0.5 | 0.71 | 0.54 | 0.67 | 0.66 | 0.625 | 0.54 |
| Dispersion | SD | 0.50 | 0.53 | 0.38 | 0.16 | 0.86 | 1.44 | 0.91 | 0.68 |
| | SD1 | 0.25 | 0.27 | 0.19 | 0.09 | - | - | 0.55 | 0.47 |
| | SD2 | 0.45 | 0.48 | 0.35 | 0.15 | - | - | 0.80 | 0.62 |
| | SD3 | 0.58 | 0.62 | 0.45 | 0.19 | - | - | 1.03 | 0.73 |
| | SD4 | 0.70 | 0.73 | 0.51 | 0.22 | - | - | 1.26 | 0.88 |

Notes to Table 9. Simulated forecast stands for ‘true’ out of sample 4 (6) step-ahead forecast. In order to calculate the reported measures of dispersion we proceeded as follows: i) we calculated the standard deviations of the distribution of forecasts in each window and in each forecasting period (24 standard deviations); ii) in order to obtain SD we calculated the mean of all the standard deviations of point i. (mean of 24 standard deviations); iii) in order to obtain SD_k $k=1,...,4$ we calculated the mean by window of the standard deviations referring to k -th forecasting point (mean of 6 standard deviations).

Appendix

Table A1.Unit root tests: Crudes

| | a | b | P | ADF |
|---------------------|-----|----|---|----------------------|
| Brent | yes | no | 1 | -2.06 |
| Δ Brent | no | no | 0 | -15.94 ^{**} |
| Urals med | yes | no | 1 | -2.31 |
| Δ Urals med | no | no | 0 | -15.81 ^{**} |
| Iranian | yes | no | 1 | -2.24 |
| Δ Iranian | no | no | 0 | -15.90 ^{**} |
| Urals NWE | yes | no | 1 | -2.24 |
| Δ Urals NWE | no | no | 0 | -16.07 ^{**} |
| Forcados | yes | no | 1 | -2.18 |
| Δ Forcados | no | no | 0 | -15.60 ^{**} |
| WTI | yes | no | 0 | -1.69 |
| Δ WTI | no | no | 0 | -8.70 ^{**} |
| Maya | yes | no | 0 | -1.82 |
| Δ Maya | no | no | 0 | -8.33 ^{**} |
| Boscan | yes | no | 1 | -2.24 |
| Δ Boscan | no | no | 0 | -6.95 ^{**} |
| Kern River | yes | no | 1 | -2.26 |
| Δ Kern River | no | no | 0 | -15.52 ^{**} |
| Thums | yes | no | 1 | -2.11 |
| Δ Thums | no | no | 0 | -16.00 ^{**} |

Notes to Table A1. ADF is the calculated t test for the null hypothesis of a unit root (i.e. $\gamma=0$) in the series x_t from the Augmented Dickey-Fuller regression: $\Delta x_t = a + bt + \gamma x_{t-1} + \sum_{i=1}^p \lambda_i \Delta x_{t-1} + \eta_t$; p is the order of the augmentation needed to eliminate any autocorrelation in the residuals of the ADF regression; * (**)[***] indicates significance at 10% (5%) [1%] on the basis of the critical values by MacKinnon, J.G. (1991) "Critical Values for Co-Integration Tests", in R.F. Engle and C.W.J. Granger (eds.), *Long-run Economic Relationships*, Oxford, Oxford University Press..

Table A2. Unit root tests: Products, Europe

| | MED | | | | NWE | | | |
|-------------------|-----|----|---|----------------------|-----|----|---|----------------------|
| | a | b | p | ADF | a | b | p | ADF |
| Gasoline | yes | no | 1 | -2.18 | yes | no | 1 | -2.15 |
| Δ Gasoline | no | no | 0 | -14.17 ^{**} | no | no | 0 | -15.02 ^{**} |
| Gasoil | yes | no | 1 | -2.03 | yes | no | 1 | -1.84 |
| Δ Gasoil | no | no | 0 | -14.63 ^{**} | no | no | 0 | -15.12 ^{**} |
| LSFO | yes | no | 1 | -2.50 | yes | no | 1 | -2.16 |
| Δ LSFO | no | no | 0 | -12.51 ^{**} | no | no | 0 | -13.45 ^{**} |
| HSFO | yes | no | 2 | -2.44 | yes | no | 1 | -2.19 |
| Δ HSFO | no | no | 1 | -11.26 ^{**} | no | no | 0 | -15.59 ^{**} |

Notes to Table A2. see Table A1

Table A3. Unit root tests: Products, America

| | LA | | | | NA | | | |
|-------------------|-----|----|---|---------------------|-----|----|---|----------------------|
| | a | b | p | ADF | a | b | p | ADF |
| Gasoline | yes | no | 0 | -2.27 | yes | no | 1 | -2.73 |
| Δ Gasoline | no | no | 0 | -9.51 ^{**} | no | no | 0 | -16.34 ^{**} |
| Gasoil | yes | no | 1 | -1.88 | No | no | 1 | -1.73 |
| Δ Gasoil | no | no | 0 | -7.68 ^{**} | no | no | 0 | -19.25 ^{**} |
| LSFO | yes | no | 0 | -1.73 | yes | no | 1 | -2.37 |
| Δ LSFO | no | no | 0 | -8.92 ^{**} | no | no | 0 | -14.54 ^{**} |

Notes to Table A3. see Table A1

Table A4. ECM model estimates

| | Urals MED | Iranian | Urals NWE | Forcados | Maya | Boscan | Kern River | Thums |
|--|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Products (y ₁ , y ₂) | LSFO, Gasoline | LSFO, Gasoline | HSFO, Gasoline | LSFO, Gasoline | LSFO, Gasoline | LSFO, Gasoline | LSFO, Gasoline | LSFO, Gasoline |
| $\hat{\delta}_{01}$ | 0.51 ^{***} (11.15) | 0.42 ^{***} (8.89) | 0.48 ^{***} (10.56) | 0.30 ^{***} (6.04) | - | - | 0.02 (0.37) | -0.05 (-1.13) |
| $\hat{\delta}_{02}$ | -0.22 ^{***} (-4.46) | -0.15 ^{***} (-2.95) | -0.28 ^{***} (-5.88) | -0.001 (-0.03) | - | - | 0.03 (0.57) | -0.02 (-0.54) |
| $\hat{\delta}_{03}$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0.13 (3.19 ^{***}) | 0.15 (3.53 ^{***}) |
| $\hat{\delta}_{10}$ | 1.11 ^{***} (64.9) | 1.15 ^{***} (59.53) | 1.09 ^{***} (74.96) | 1.04 ^{***} (167.06) | 1.11 ^{***} (13.39) | 0.98 ^{***} (6.74) | 0.73 ^{***} (16.51) | 0.66 ^{***} (17.67) |
| $\hat{\delta}_{11}$ | -0.57 ^{***} (-10.8) | -0.49 ^{***} (-8.49) | -0.52 ^{***} (-10.2) | -0.29 ^{***} (-5.58) | - | - | 0.33 ^{***} (5.84) | 0.34 ^{***} (6.91) |
| $\hat{\delta}_{12}$ | 0.23 ^{***} (4.27) | 0.16 ^{***} (2.77) | 0.30 ^{***} (5.65) | -0.01 (-0.15) | - | - | 0.10 [*] (1.76) | 0.12 ^{**} (2.30) |
| $\hat{\delta}_{13}$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | -0.02 (-0.29) | 0.002 (0.05) |
| $\hat{\delta}_{20}$ | -0.02 (-0.98) | 0.003 (0.17) | -0.02 (-1.44) | -0.01 (-1.19) | 0.34 ^{***} (6.19) | 0.27 ^{***} (2.70) | 0.07 [*] (1.70) | 0.11 ^{***} (2.96) |
| $\hat{\delta}_{21}$ | -0.01 (-0.29) | -0.02 (-0.87) | 0.01 (0.96) | -0.01 (-0.77) | - | - | -0.10 ^{**} (-2.26) | -0.08 ^{**} (-2.03) |
| $\hat{\delta}_{22}$ | 0.01 (0.79) | 0.02 (0.82) | -0.01 (-0.36) | 0.01 (1.24) | - | - | 0.02 (0.36) | 0.03 (0.70) |
| $\hat{\delta}_{23}$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0.01 (0.18) | 0.02 (-0.91) |
| $\hat{\delta}_{30}$ | -0.04 ^{**} (-2.01) | -0.04 [*] (-1.84) | 0.01 (0.29) | -0.02 ^{**} (-2.51) | -0.08 (-1.47) | -0.17 [*] (-1.83) | -0.01 (-0.38) | -0.03 (-0.91) |
| $\hat{\delta}_{31}$ | 0.07 ^{***} (3.26) | 0.04 [*] (1.81) | 0.001 (0.05) | 0.01 (1.54) | - | - | 0.09 ^{**} (2.29) | 0.05 [*] (1.64) |
| $\hat{\delta}_{32}$ | -0.04 ^{**} (-2.04) | -0.02 (-0.75) | -0.02 (-1.45) | 0.01 ^{**} (2.08) | - | - | 0.01 (0.22) | 0.03 (0.77) |
| $\hat{\delta}_{33}$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | -0.05 (-1.37) | -0.04 (-1.31) |
| $\hat{\lambda}$ | -0.12 ^{***} (-5.56) | -0.12 ^{***} (-5.55) | -0.11 ^{***} (-5.45) | -0.06 ^{***} (-4.32) | -0.15 ^{***} (-3.75) | -0.10 ^{**} (-1.96) | -0.07 ^{**} (-4.18) | -0.07 ^{***} (-3.71) |
| BG-stat | 0.01 | 0.63 | 0.71 | 2.07 | 0.61 | 6.21 [*] | 0.36 | 0.94 |
| R2 | 0.95 | 0.94 | 0.97 | 0.99 | 0.90 | 0.64 | 0.64 | 0.67 |

Notes to Table A4. The ECM specification is

$$\Delta p_t^c = \sum_{p=1}^{P-1} \delta_{0p} \Delta p_{t-p}^c + \sum_{q=0}^{Q-1} \delta_{1q} \Delta p_{t-q}^m + \sum_{r=0}^{R-1} \delta_{2r} \Delta p_{t-r}^{y_1} + \sum_{s=0}^{S-1} \delta_{3s} \Delta p_{t-s}^{y_2} + \lambda \hat{\varepsilon}_{t-1} + \eta_t, \text{ where}$$

$P=Q=R=S$; BG- stat is the LM version of the Breusch-Godfrey test for absence of first order residual autocorrelation in the regression; * (**)[***] indicates significance at 10% (5%) [1%]

NOTE DI LAVORO DELLA FONDAZIONE ENI ENRICO MATTEI

Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei Working Paper Series

Our working papers are available on the Internet at the following addresses:

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

<http://papers.ssrn.com>

| | | |
|--------------------------|---------|--|
| SUST | 1.2002 | <i>K. TANO, M.D. FAMINOW, M. KAMUANGA and B. SWALLOW: <u>Using Conjoint Analysis to Estimate Farmers' Preferences for Cattle Traits in West Africa</u></i> |
| ETA | 2.2002 | <i>Efrem CASTELNUOVO and Paolo SURICO: <u>What Does Monetary Policy Reveal about Central Bank's Preferences?</u></i> |
| WAT | 3.2002 | <i>Duncan KNOWLER and Edward BARBIER: <u>The Economics of a "Mixed Blessing" Effect: A Case Study of the Black Sea</u></i> |
| CLIM | 4.2002 | <i>Andreas LÖSCHEL: <u>Technological Change in Economic Models of Environmental Policy: A Survey</u></i> |
| VOL | 5.2002 | <i>Carlo CARRARO and Carmen MARCHIORI: <u>Stable Coalitions</u></i> |
| CLIM | 6.2002 | <i>Marzio GALEOTTI, Alessandro LANZA and Matteo MANERA: <u>Rockets and Feathers Revisited: An International Comparison on European Gasoline Markets</u></i> |
| ETA | 7.2002 | <i>Effrosyni DIAMANTOUDI and Efthios S. SARTZETAKIS: <u>Stable International Environmental Agreements: An Analytical Approach</u></i> |
| KNOW | 8.2002 | <i>Alain DESDOIGTS: <u>Neoclassical Convergence Versus Technological Catch-up: A Contribution for Reaching a Consensus</u></i> |
| NRM | 9.2002 | <i>Giuseppe DI VITA: <u>Renewable Resources and Waste Recycling</u></i> |
| KNOW | 10.2002 | <i>Giorgio BRUNELLO: <u>Is Training More Frequent when Wage Compression is Higher? Evidence from 11 European Countries</u></i> |
| ETA | 11.2002 | <i>Mordecai KURZ, Hehui JIN and Maurizio MOTOLESE: <u>Endogenous Fluctuations and the Role of Monetary Policy</u></i> |
| KNOW | 12.2002 | <i>Reyer GERLAGH and Marjan W. HOFKES: <u>Escaping Lock-in: The Scope for a Transition towards Sustainable Growth?</u></i> |
| NRM | 13.2002 | <i>Michele MORETTO and Paolo ROSATO: <u>The Use of Common Property Resources: A Dynamic Model</u></i> |
| CLIM | 14.2002 | <i>Philippe QUIRION: <u>Macroeconomic Effects of an Energy Saving Policy in the Public Sector</u></i> |
| CLIM | 15.2002 | <i>Roberto ROSON: <u>Dynamic and Distributional Effects of Environmental Revenue Recycling Schemes: Simulations with a General Equilibrium Model of the Italian Economy</u></i> |
| CLIM | 16.2002 | <i>Francesco RICCI (I): <u>Environmental Policy Growth when Inputs are Differentiated in Pollution Intensity</u></i> |
| ETA | 17.2002 | <i>Alberto PETRUCCI: <u>Devaluation (Levels versus Rates) and Balance of Payments in a Cash-in-Advance Economy</u></i> |
| Coalition Theory Network | 18.2002 | <i>László Á. KÓCZY (liv): <u>The Core in the Presence of Externalities</u></i> |
| Coalition Theory Network | 19.2002 | <i>Steven J. BRAMS, Michael A. JONES and D. Marc KILGOUR (liv): <u>Single-Peakedness and Disconnected Coalitions</u></i> |
| Coalition Theory Network | 20.2002 | <i>Guillaume HAERINGER (liv): <u>On the Stability of Cooperation Structures</u></i> |
| NRM | 21.2002 | <i>Fausto CAVALLARO and Luigi CIRAULO: <u>Economic and Environmental Sustainability: A Dynamic Approach in Insular Systems</u></i> |
| CLIM | 22.2002 | <i>Barbara BUCHNER, Carlo CARRARO, Igor CERSOSIMO and Carmen MARCHIORI: <u>Back to Kyoto? US Participation and the Linkage between R&D and Climate Cooperation</u></i> |
| CLIM | 23.2002 | <i>Andreas LÖSCHEL and ZhongXIANG ZHANG: <u>The Economic and Environmental Implications of the US Repudiation of the Kyoto Protocol and the Subsequent Deals in Bonn and Marrakech</u></i> |
| ETA | 24.2002 | <i>Marzio GALEOTTI, Louis J. MACCINI and Fabio SCHIANTARELLI: <u>Inventories, Employment and Hours</u></i> |
| CLIM | 25.2002 | <i>Hannes EGLI: <u>Are Cross-Country Studies of the Environmental Kuznets Curve Misleading? New Evidence from Time Series Data for Germany</u></i> |
| ETA | 26.2002 | <i>Adam B. JAFFE, Richard G. NEWELL and Robert N. STAVINS: <u>Environmental Policy and Technological Change</u></i> |
| SUST | 27.2002 | <i>Joseph C. COOPER and Giovanni SIGNORELLO: <u>Farmer Premiums for the Voluntary Adoption of Conservation Plans</u></i> |
| SUST | 28.2002 | <i><u>The ANSEA Network: Towards An Analytical Strategic Environmental Assessment</u></i> |
| KNOW | 29.2002 | <i>Paolo SURICO: <u>Geographic Concentration and Increasing Returns: a Survey of Evidence</u></i> |
| ETA | 30.2002 | <i>Robert N. STAVINS: <u>Lessons from the American Experiment with Market-Based Environmental Policies</u></i> |

| | | |
|-----------|---------|---|
| NRM | 31.2002 | <i>Carlo GIUPPONI and Paolo ROSATO: <u>Multi-Criteria Analysis and Decision-Support for Water Management at the Catchment Scale: An Application to Diffuse Pollution Control in the Venice Lagoon</u></i> |
| NRM | 32.2002 | <i>Robert N. STAVINS: <u>National Environmental Policy During the Clinton Years</u></i> |
| KNOW | 33.2002 | <i>A. SOUBEYRAN and H. STAHN : <u>Do Investments in Specialized Knowledge Lead to Composite Good Industries?</u></i> |
| KNOW | 34.2002 | <i>G. BRUNELLO, M.L. PARISI and Daniela SONEDDA: <u>Labor Taxes, Wage Setting and the Relative Wage Effect</u></i> |
| CLIM | 35.2002 | <i>C. BOEMARE and P. QUIRION (lv): <u>Implementing Greenhouse Gas Trading in Europe: Lessons from Economic Theory and International Experiences</u></i> |
| CLIM | 36.2002 | <i>T. TIETENBERG (lv): <u>The Tradable Permits Approach to Protecting the Commons: What Have We Learned?</u></i> |
| CLIM | 37.2002 | <i>K. REHDANZ and R.J.S. TOL (lv): <u>On National and International Trade in Greenhouse Gas Emission Permits</u></i> |
| CLIM | 38.2002 | <i>C. FISCHER (lv): <u>Multinational Taxation and International Emissions Trading</u></i> |
| SUST | 39.2002 | <i>G. SIGNORELLO and G. PAPPALARDO: <u>Farm Animal Biodiversity Conservation Activities in Europe under the Framework of Agenda 2000</u></i> |
| NRM | 40.2002 | <i>S.M. CAVANAGH, W. M. HANEMANN and R. N. STAVINS: <u>Muffled Price Signals: Household Water Demand under Increasing-Block Prices</u></i> |
| NRM | 41.2002 | <i>A. J. PLANTINGA, R. N. LUBOWSKI and R. N. STAVINS: <u>The Effects of Potential Land Development on Agricultural Land Prices</u></i> |
| CLIM | 42.2002 | <i>C. OHL (lvi): <u>Inducing Environmental Co-operation by the Design of Emission Permits</u></i> |
| CLIM | 43.2002 | <i>J. EYCKMANS, D. VAN REGEMORTER and V. VAN STEENBERGHE (lvi): <u>Is Kyoto Fatally Flawed? An Analysis with MacGEM</u></i> |
| CLIM | 44.2002 | <i>A. ANTOCI and S. BORGHESI (lvi): <u>Working Too Much in a Polluted World: A North-South Evolutionary Model</u></i> |
| ETA | 45.2002 | <i>P. G. FREDRIKSSON, Johan A. LIST and Daniel MILLIMET (lvi): <u>Chasing the Smokestack: Strategic Policymaking with Multiple Instruments</u></i> |
| ETA | 46.2002 | <i>Z. YU (lvi): <u>A Theory of Strategic Vertical DFI and the Missing Pollution-Haven Effect</u></i> |
| SUST | 47.2002 | <i>Y. H. FARZIN: <u>Can an Exhaustible Resource Economy Be Sustainable?</u></i> |
| SUST | 48.2002 | <i>Y. H. FARZIN: <u>Sustainability and Hamiltonian Value</u></i> |
| KNOW | 49.2002 | <i>C. PIGA and M. VIVARELLI: <u>Cooperation in R&D and Sample Selection</u></i> |
| Coalition | 50.2002 | <i>M. SERTEL and A. SLINKO (liv): <u>Ranking Committees, Words or Multisets</u></i> |
| Theory | | |
| Network | | |
| Coalition | 51.2002 | <i>Sergio CURRARINI (liv): <u>Stable Organizations with Externalities</u></i> |
| Theory | | |
| Network | | |
| ETA | 52.2002 | <i>Robert N. STAVINS: <u>Experience with Market-Based Policy Instruments</u></i> |
| ETA | 53.2002 | <i>C.C. JAEGER, M. LEIMBACH, C. CARRARO, K. HASSELMANN, J.C. HOURCADE, A. KEELER and R. KLEIN (liii): <u>Integrated Assessment Modeling: Modules for Cooperation</u></i> |
| CLIM | 54.2002 | <i>Scott BARRETT (liii): <u>Towards a Better Climate Treaty</u></i> |
| ETA | 55.2002 | <i>Richard G. NEWELL and Robert N. STAVINS: <u>Cost Heterogeneity and the Potential Savings from Market-Based Policies</u></i> |
| SUST | 56.2002 | <i>Paolo ROSATO and Edi DEFRANCESCO: <u>Individual Travel Cost Method and Flow Fixed Costs</u></i> |
| SUST | 57.2002 | <i>Vladimir KOTOV and Elena NIKITINA (lvii): <u>Reorganisation of Environmental Policy in Russia: The Decade of Success and Failures in Implementation of Perspective Quests</u></i> |
| SUST | 58.2002 | <i>Vladimir KOTOV (lvii): <u>Policy in Transition: New Framework for Russia's Climate Policy</u></i> |
| SUST | 59.2002 | <i>Fanny MISSELDT and Arturo VILLAVICENCO (lvii): <u>How Can Economies in Transition Pursue Emissions Trading or Joint Implementation?</u></i> |
| VOL | 60.2002 | <i>Giovanni DI BARTOLOMEO, Jacob ENGWERDA, Joseph PLASMANS and Bas VAN AARLE: <u>Staying Together or Breaking Apart: Policy-Makers' Endogenous Coalitions Formation in the European Economic and Monetary Union</u></i> |
| ETA | 61.2002 | <i>Robert N. STAVINS, Alexander F. WAGNER and Gernot WAGNER: <u>Interpreting Sustainability in Economic Terms: Dynamic Efficiency Plus Intergenerational Equity</u></i> |
| PRIV | 62.2002 | <i>Carlo CAPUANO: <u>Demand Growth, Entry and Collusion Sustainability</u></i> |
| PRIV | 63.2002 | <i>Federico MUNARI and Raffaele ORIANI: <u>Privatization and R&D Performance: An Empirical Analysis Based on Tobin's Q</u></i> |
| PRIV | 64.2002 | <i>Federico MUNARI and Maurizio SOBRERO: <u>The Effects of Privatization on R&D Investments and Patent Productivity</u></i> |
| SUST | 65.2002 | <i>Orley ASHENFELTER and Michael GREENSTONE: <u>Using Mandated Speed Limits to Measure the Value of a Statistical Life</u></i> |
| ETA | 66.2002 | <i>Paolo SURICO: <u>US Monetary Policy Rules: the Case for Asymmetric Preferences</u></i> |
| PRIV | 67.2002 | <i>Rinaldo BRAU and Massimo FLORIO: <u>Privatisations as Price Reforms: Evaluating Consumers' Welfare Changes in the U.K.</u></i> |
| CLIM | 68.2002 | <i>Barbara K. BUCHNER and Roberto ROSON: <u>Conflicting Perspectives in Trade and Environmental Negotiations</u></i> |
| CLIM | 69.2002 | <i>Philippe QUIRION: <u>Complying with the Kyoto Protocol under Uncertainty: Taxes or Tradable Permits?</u></i> |
| SUST | 70.2002 | <i>Anna ALBERINI, Patrizia RIGANTI and Alberto LONGO: <u>Can People Value the Aesthetic and Use Services of Urban Sites? Evidence from a Survey of Belfast Residents</u></i> |
| SUST | 71.2002 | <i>Marco PERCOCO: <u>Discounting Environmental Effects in Project Appraisal</u></i> |

| | | |
|------|----------|--|
| NRM | 72.2002 | <i>Philippe BONTEMS and Pascal FAVARD: <u>Input Use and Capacity Constraint under Uncertainty: The Case of Irrigation</u></i> |
| PRIV | 73.2002 | <i>Mohammed OMRAN: <u>The Performance of State-Owned Enterprises and Newly Privatized Firms: Empirical Evidence from Egypt</u></i> |
| PRIV | 74.2002 | <i>Mike BURKART, Fausto PANUNZI and Andrei SHLEIFER: <u>Family Firms</u></i> |
| PRIV | 75.2002 | <i>Emmanuelle AURIOL, Pierre M. PICARD: <u>Privatizations in Developing Countries and the Government Budget Constraint</u></i> |
| PRIV | 76.2002 | <i>Nichole M. CASTATER: <u>Privatization as a Means to Societal Transformation: An Empirical Study of Privatization in Central and Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union</u></i> |
| PRIV | 77.2002 | <i>Christoph LÜLSFESMANN: <u>Benevolent Government, Managerial Incentives, and the Virtues of Privatization</u></i> |
| PRIV | 78.2002 | <i>Kate BISHOP, Igor FILATOTCHEV and Tomasz MICKIEWICZ: <u>Endogenous Ownership Structure: Factors Affecting the Post-Privatisation Equity in Largest Hungarian Firms</u></i> |
| PRIV | 79.2002 | <i>Theodora WELCH and Rick MOLZ: <u>How Does Trade Sale Privatization Work? Evidence from the Fixed-Line Telecommunications Sector in Developing Economies</u></i> |
| PRIV | 80.2002 | <i>Alberto R. PETRUCCI: <u>Government Debt, Agent Heterogeneity and Wealth Displacement in a Small Open Economy</u></i> |
| CLIM | 81.2002 | <i>Timothy SWANSON and Robin MASON (Iv): <u>The Impact of International Environmental Agreements: The Case of the Montreal Protocol</u></i> |
| PRIV | 82.2002 | <i>George R.G. CLARKE and Lixin Colin XU: <u>Privatization, Competition and Corruption: How Characteristics of Bribe Takers and Payers Affect Bribe Payments to Utilities</u></i> |
| PRIV | 83.2002 | <i>Massimo FLORIO and Katuscia MANZONI: <u>The Abnormal Returns of UK Privatisations: From Underpricing to Outperformance</u></i> |
| NRM | 84.2002 | <i>Nelson LOURENÇO, Carlos RUSSO MACHADO, Maria do ROSÁRIO JORGE and Luís RODRIGUES: <u>An Integrated Approach to Understand Territory Dynamics. The Coastal Alentejo (Portugal)</u></i> |
| CLIM | 85.2002 | <i>Peter ZAPFEL and Matti VAINIO (Iv): <u>Pathways to European Greenhouse Gas Emissions Trading History and Misconceptions</u></i> |
| CLIM | 86.2002 | <i>Pierre COURTOIS: <u>Influence Processes in Climate Change Negotiations: Modelling the Rounds</u></i> |
| ETA | 87.2002 | <i>Vito FRAGNELLI and Maria Erminia MARINA (Iviii): <u>Environmental Pollution Risk and Insurance</u></i> |
| ETA | 88.2002 | <i>Laurent FRANCKX (Iviii): <u>Environmental Enforcement with Endogenous Ambient Monitoring</u></i> |
| ETA | 89.2002 | <i>Timo GOESCHL and Timothy M. SWANSON (Iviii): <u>Lost Horizons. The noncooperative management of an evolutionary biological system.</u></i> |
| ETA | 90.2002 | <i>Hans KEIDING (Iviii): <u>Environmental Effects of Consumption: An Approach Using DEA and Cost Sharing</u></i> |
| ETA | 91.2002 | <i>Wietze LISE (Iviii): <u>A Game Model of People's Participation in Forest Management in Northern India</u></i> |
| CLIM | 92.2002 | <i>Jens HORBACH: <u>Structural Change and Environmental Kuznets Curves</u></i> |
| ETA | 93.2002 | <i>Martin P. GROSSKOPF: <u>Towards a More Appropriate Method for Determining the Optimal Scale of Production Units</u></i> |
| VOL | 94.2002 | <i>Scott BARRETT and Robert STAVINS: <u>Increasing Participation and Compliance in International Climate Change Agreements</u></i> |
| CLIM | 95.2002 | <i>Banu BAYRAMOGLU LISE and Wietze LISE: <u>Climate Change, Environmental NGOs and Public Awareness in the Netherlands: Perceptions and Reality</u></i> |
| CLIM | 96.2002 | <i>Matthieu GLACHANT: <u>The Political Economy of Emission Tax Design in Environmental Policy</u></i> |
| KNOW | 97.2002 | <i>Kenn ARIGA and Giorgio BRUNELLO: <u>Are the More Educated Receiving More Training? Evidence from Thailand</u></i> |
| ETA | 98.2002 | <i>Gianfranco FORTE and Matteo MANERA: <u>Forecasting Volatility in European Stock Markets with Non-linear GARCH Models</u></i> |
| ETA | 99.2002 | <i>Geoffrey HEAL: <u>Bundling Biodiversity</u></i> |
| ETA | 100.2002 | <i>Geoffrey HEAL, Brian WALKER, Simon LEVIN, Kenneth ARROW, Partha DASGUPTA, Gretchen DAILY, Paul EHRLICH, Karl-Goran MALER, Nils KAUTSKY, Jane LUBCHENCO, Steve SCHNEIDER and David STARRETT: <u>Genetic Diversity and Interdependent Crop Choices in Agriculture</u></i> |
| ETA | 101.2002 | <i>Geoffrey HEAL: <u>Biodiversity and Globalization</u></i> |
| VOL | 102.2002 | <i>Andreas LANGE: <u>Heterogeneous International Agreements – If per capita emission levels matter</u></i> |
| ETA | 103.2002 | <i>Pierre-André JOUVET and Walid OUESLATI: <u>Tax Reform and Public Spending Trade-offs in an Endogenous Growth Model with Environmental Externalities</u></i> |
| ETA | 104.2002 | <i>Anna BOTTASSO and Alessandro SEMBENELLI: <u>Does Ownership Affect Firms' Efficiency? Panel Data Evidence on Italy</u></i> |
| PRIV | 105.2002 | <i>Bernardo BORTOLOTTI, Frank DE JONG, Giovanna NICODANO and Ibolya SCHINDELE: <u>Privatization and Stock Market Liquidity</u></i> |
| ETA | 106.2002 | <i>Haruo IMAI and Mayumi HORIE (Iviii): <u>Pre-Negotiation for an International Emission Reduction Game</u></i> |
| PRIV | 107.2002 | <i>Sudeshna GHOSH BANERJEE and Michael C. MUNGER: <u>Move to Markets? An Empirical Analysis of Privatisation in Developing Countries</u></i> |
| PRIV | 108.2002 | <i>Guillaume GIRMENS and Michel GUILLARD: <u>Privatization and Investment: Crowding-Out Effect vs Financial Diversification</u></i> |
| PRIV | 109.2002 | <i>Alberto CHONG and Florencio LÓPEZ-DE-SILANES: <u>Privatization and Labor Force Restructuring Around the World</u></i> |
| PRIV | 110.2002 | <i>Nandini GUPTA: <u>Partial Privatization and Firm Performance</u></i> |
| PRIV | 111.2002 | <i>François DEGEORGE, Dirk JENTER, Alberto MOEL and Peter TUFANO: <u>Selling Company Shares to Reluctant Employees: France Telecom's Experience</u></i> |

| | | |
|--------------------------------|----------|---|
| PRIV | 112.2002 | <i>Isaac OTCHERE</i> : <u>Intra-Industry Effects of Privatization Announcements: Evidence from Developed and Developing Countries</u> |
| PRIV | 113.2002 | <i>Yannis KATSOULAKOS and Elissavet LIKOYANNI</i> : <u>Fiscal and Other Macroeconomic Effects of Privatization</u> |
| PRIV | 114.2002 | <i>Guillaume GIRMENS</i> : <u>Privatization, International Asset Trade and Financial Markets</u> |
| PRIV | 115.2002 | <i>D. Teja FLOTHO</i> : <u>A Note on Consumption Correlations and European Financial Integration</u> |
| PRIV | 116.2002 | <i>Ibolya SCHINDELE and Enrico C. PEROTTI</i> : <u>Pricing Initial Public Offerings in Premature Capital Markets: The Case of Hungary</u> |
| PRIV | 1.2003 | <i>Gabriella CHIESA and Giovanna NICODANO</i> : <u>Privatization and Financial Market Development: Theoretical Issues</u> |
| PRIV | 2.2003 | <i>Ibolya SCHINDELE</i> : <u>Theory of Privatization in Eastern Europe: Literature Review</u> |
| PRIV | 3.2003 | <i>Wietze LISE, Claudia KEMFERT and Richard S.J. TOL</i> : <u>Strategic Action in the Liberalised German Electricity Market</u> |
| CLIM | 4.2003 | <i>Laura MARSILLANI and Thomas I. RENSTRÖM</i> : <u>Environmental Policy and Capital Movements: The Role of Government Commitment</u> |
| KNOW | 5.2003 | <i>Reyer GERLAGH</i> : <u>Induced Technological Change under Technological Competition</u> |
| ETA | 6.2003 | <i>Efrem CASTELNUOVO</i> : <u>Squeezing the Interest Rate Smoothing Weight with a Hybrid Expectations Model</u> |
| SIEV | 7.2003 | <i>Anna ALBERINI, Alberto LONGO, Stefania TONIN, Francesco TROMBETTA and Margherita TURVANI</i> : <u>The Role of Liability, Regulation and Economic Incentives in Brownfield Remediation and Redevelopment: Evidence from Surveys of Developers</u> |
| NRM | 8.2003 | <i>Elissaios PAPYRAKIS and Reyner GERLAGH</i> : <u>Natural Resources: A Blessing or a Curse?</u> |
| CLIM | 9.2003 | <i>A. CAPARRÓS, J.-C. PEREAU and T. TAZDAÏT</i> : <u>North-South Climate Change Negotiations: a Sequential Game with Asymmetric Information</u> |
| KNOW | 10.2003 | <i>Giorgio BRUNELLO and Daniele CHECCHI</i> : <u>School Quality and Family Background in Italy</u> |
| CLIM | 11.2003 | <i>Efrem CASTELNUOVO and Marzio GALEOTTI</i> : <u>Learning By Doing vs Learning By Researching in a Model of Climate Change Policy Analysis</u> |
| KNOW | 12.2003 | <i>Carole Maignan, Gianmarco OTTAVIANO and Dino PINELLI (eds.)</i> : <u>Economic Growth, Innovation, Cultural Diversity: What are we all talking about? A critical survey of the state-of-the-art</u> |
| KNOW | 13.2003 | <i>Carole Maignan, Gianmarco OTTAVIANO, Dino PINELLI and Francesco RULLANI (lix)</i> : <u>Bio-Ecological Diversity vs. Socio-Economic Diversity. A Comparison of Existing Measures</u> |
| KNOW | 14.2003 | <i>Maddy JANSSENS and Chris STEYAERT (lix)</i> : <u>Theories of Diversity within Organisation Studies: Debates and Future Trajectories</u> |
| KNOW | 15.2003 | <i>Tuzin BAYCAN LEVENT, Enno MASUREL and Peter NIJKAMP (lix)</i> : <u>Diversity in Entrepreneurship: Ethnic and Female Roles in Urban Economic Life</u> |
| KNOW | 16.2003 | <i>Alexandra BITUSIKOVA (lix)</i> : <u>Post-Communist City on its Way from Grey to Colourful: The Case Study from Slovakia</u> |
| KNOW | 17.2003 | <i>Billy E. VAUGHN and Katarina MLEKOV (lix)</i> : <u>A Stage Model of Developing an Inclusive Community</u> |
| KNOW | 18.2003 | <i>Selma van LONDEN and Arie de RUIJTER (lix)</i> : <u>Managing Diversity in a Globalizing World</u> |
| Coalition Theory Network | 19.2003 | <i>Sergio CURRARINI</i> : <u>On the Stability of Hierarchies in Games with Externalities</u> |
| PRIV | 20.2003 | <i>Giacomo CALZOLARI and Alessandro PAVAN (lx)</i> : <u>Monopoly with Resale</u> |
| PRIV | 21.2003 | <i>Claudio MEZZETTI (lx)</i> : <u>Auction Design with Interdependent Valuations: The Generalized Revelation Principle, Efficiency, Full Surplus Extraction and Information Acquisition</u> |
| PRIV | 22.2003 | <i>Marco LiCalzi and Alessandro PAVAN (lx)</i> : <u>Tilting the Supply Schedule to Enhance Competition in Uniform-Price Auctions</u> |
| PRIV | 23.2003 | <i>David ETTINGER (lx)</i> : <u>Bidding among Friends and Enemies</u> |
| PRIV | 24.2003 | <i>Hannu VARTIAINEN (lx)</i> : <u>Auction Design without Commitment</u> |
| PRIV | 25.2003 | <i>Matti KELOHARJU, Kjell G. NYBORG and Kristian RYDQVIST (lx)</i> : <u>Strategic Behavior and Underpricing in Uniform Price Auctions: Evidence from Finnish Treasury Auctions</u> |
| PRIV | 26.2003 | <i>Christine A. PARLOUR and Uday RAJAN (lx)</i> : <u>Rationing in IPOs</u> |
| PRIV | 27.2003 | <i>Kjell G. NYBORG and Ilya A. STREBULAIEV (lx)</i> : <u>Multiple Unit Auctions and Short Squeezes</u> |
| PRIV | 28.2003 | <i>Anders LUNANDER and Jan-Eric NILSSON (lx)</i> : <u>Taking the Lab to the Field: Experimental Tests of Alternative Mechanisms to Procure Multiple Contracts</u> |
| PRIV | 29.2003 | <i>TangaMcDANIEL and Karsten NEUHOFF (lx)</i> : <u>Use of Long-term Auctions for Network Investment</u> |
| PRIV | 30.2003 | <i>Emiel MAASLAND and Sander ONDERSTAL (lx)</i> : <u>Auctions with Financial Externalities</u> |
| ETA | 31.2003 | <i>Michael FINUS and Bianca RUNDSHAGEN</i> : <u>A Non-cooperative Foundation of Core-Stability in Positive Externality NTU-Coalition Games</u> |
| KNOW | 32.2003 | <i>Michele MORETTO</i> : <u>Competition and Irreversible Investments under Uncertainty</u> |
| PRIV | 33.2003 | <i>Philippe QUIRION</i> : <u>Relative Quotas: Correct Answer to Uncertainty or Case of Regulatory Capture?</u> |
| KNOW | 34.2003 | <i>Giuseppe MEDA, Claudio PIGA and Donald SIEGEL</i> : <u>On the Relationship between R&D and Productivity: A Treatment Effect Analysis</u> |
| ETA | 35.2003 | <i>Alessandra DEL BOCA, Marzio GALEOTTI and Paola ROTA</i> : <u>Non-convexities in the Adjustment of Different Capital Inputs: A Firm-level Investigation</u> |

| | | |
|------|---------|---|
| 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>Taiji 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 (Ixi)</i> : <u>Lorenzo Market between Diversity and Mutation</u> |
| KNOW | 70.2003 | <i>Ercole SORI (Ixi)</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</i> (Ixii): <u>A Biologist's View of Individual Cultural Identity for the Study of Cities</u> |
| KNOW | 78.2003 | <i>Vincent MERK</i> (Ixii): <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> |
| IEM | 81.2003 | <i>Alessandro LANZA, Matteo MANERA and Massimo GIOVANNINI</i> : <u>Oil and Product Dynamics in International Petroleum Markets</u> |

(I) This paper was presented at the Workshop "Growth, Environmental Policies and Sustainability" organised by the Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Venice, June 1, 2001

(li) This paper was presented at the Fourth Toulouse Conference on Environment and Resource Economics on "Property Rights, Institutions and Management of Environmental and Natural Resources", organised by Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, IDEI and INRA and sponsored by MATE, Toulouse, May 3-4, 2001

(lii) This paper was presented at the International Conference on "Economic Valuation of Environmental Goods", organised by Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei in cooperation with CORILA, Venice, May 11, 2001

(liii) This paper was circulated at the International Conference on "Climate Policy – Do We Need a New Approach?", jointly organised by Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Stanford University and Venice International University, Isola di San Servolo, Venice, September 6-8, 2001

(liv) This paper was presented at the Seventh Meeting of the Coalition Theory Network organised by the Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei and the CORE, Université Catholique de Louvain, Venice, Italy, January 11-12, 2002

(lv) This paper was presented at the First Workshop of the Concerted Action on Tradable Emission Permits (CATEP) organised by the Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Venice, Italy, December 3-4, 2001

(lvi) This paper was presented at the ESF EURESCO Conference on Environmental Policy in a Global Economy "The International Dimension of Environmental Policy", organised with the collaboration of the Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Acquafredda di Maratea, October 6-11, 2001

(lvii) This paper was presented at the First Workshop of "CFEWE – Carbon Flows between Eastern and Western Europe", organised by the Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei and Zentrum für Europäische Integrationsforschung (ZEI), Milan, July 5-6, 2001

(lviii) This paper was presented at the Workshop on "Game Practice and the Environment", jointly organised by Università del Piemonte Orientale and Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Alessandria, April 12-13, 2002

(lix) This paper was presented at the ENGIME Workshop on "Mapping Diversity", Leuven, May 16-17, 2002

(Ix) 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

(Ixi) 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

(Ixii) This paper was presented at the ENGIME Workshop on "Communication across Cultures in Multicultural Cities", The Hague, November 7-8, 2002

2002 SERIES

| | |
|-------------|---|
| CLIM | <i>Climate Change Modelling and Policy</i> (Editor: Marzio Galeotti) |
| VOL | <i>Voluntary and International Agreements</i> (Editor: Carlo Carraro) |
| SUST | <i>Sustainability Indicators and Environmental Valuation</i> (Editor: Carlo Carraro) |
| NRM | <i>Natural Resources Management</i> (Editor: Carlo Giupponi) |
| KNOW | <i>Knowledge, Technology, Human Capital</i> (Editor: Dino Pinelli) |
| MGMT | <i>Corporate Sustainable Management</i> (Editor: Andrea Marsanich) |
| PRIV | <i>Privatisation, Regulation, Antitrust</i> (Editor: Bernardo Bortolotti) |
| ETA | <i>Economic Theory and Applications</i> (Editor: Carlo Carraro) |

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> |