

Carraro, Carlo; Marchiori, Carmen; Orefice, Sonia

**Working Paper**

## Endogenous Minimum Participation in International Environmental Treaties

Nota di Lavoro, No. 113.2003

**Provided in Cooperation with:**

Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei (FEEM)

*Suggested Citation:* Carraro, Carlo; Marchiori, Carmen; Orefice, Sonia (2003) : Endogenous Minimum Participation in International Environmental Treaties, Nota di Lavoro, No. 113.2003, Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei (FEEM), Milano

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/118141>

**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.*

# **Endogenous Minimum Participation in International Environmental Treaties**

Carlo Carraro, Carmen Marchiori  
and Sonia Oreffice

NOTA DI LAVORO 113.2003

**DECEMBER 2003**

CTN – Coalition Theory Network
--------------------------------

Carlo Carraro, *University of Venice, CEPR, CEPS, CESifo  
and Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei*

Carmen Marchiori, *University College London and Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei*

Sonia Oreffice, *University of Chicago and Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei*

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](http://www.feem.it/web/attiv/_wp.html)

Social Science Research Network Electronic Paper Collection:  
[http://papers.ssrn.com/abstract\\_id=XXXXXX](http://papers.ssrn.com/abstract_id=XXXXXX)

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

# Endogenous Minimum Participation in International Environmental Treaties

## Summary

Many international treaties come into force only after a minimum number of countries have signed and ratified the treaty. Why do countries agree to introduce a minimum participation constraint among the rules characterising an international treaty? This question is particularly relevant in the case of environmental treaties dealing with global commons, where free-riding incentives are strong. Is a minimum participation rule a way to offset these free-riding incentives? Why do countries that know they have an incentive to free-ride accept to “tie their hands” through the introduction of a minimum participation constraint? This paper addresses the above questions by analysing a three-stage non-cooperative coalition formation game. In the first stage, countries set the minimum coalition size that is necessary for the treaty to come into force. In the second stage, countries decide whether to sign the treaty. In the third stage, the equilibrium values of the decision variables are set. At the equilibrium, both the minimum participation constraint and the number of signatories – the coalition size – are determined. This paper shows that a non-trivial partial coalition, sustained by a binding minimum participation constraint, forms at the equilibrium. This paper thus explains why in international negotiations all countries often agree on a minimum participation rule even when some of them do not intend to sign the treaty. The paper also analyses the optimal size of the minimum participation constraint.

**Keywords:** Agreements, Climate, Negotiations, Policy, Incentives

**JEL:** H0, H4, 03

*A previous version of this paper was circulated under the title “ $\alpha$ -Rules and Equilibrium Endogenous Coalitions”. The Authors are grateful to Scott Barrett, Maria Paz Espinosa and the participants at the 4th Workshop of the Coalition Theory Network, Aix-en-Provence, 8-9 January 1999 and at the 1999 EAERE Conference, Oslo, 24-26 June 1999, for helpful comments and remarks on the previous version of the paper. This new version benefited from comments by Michael Finus, Jeff Frenkel, Jim Hammitt, Marita Laukkanen, Cynthia Lin, Rob Stavins, Martin Weitzman and the participants at the 2003 EAERE Conference, Bilbao, 28-30 June, 2003. The usual disclaimer applies.*

*Address for correspondence*

Carlo Carraro  
Department of Economics  
University of Venice  
S. Giobbe 873  
30121 Venice  
Italy  
Phone: +39 041 2349166  
Fax: +39 041 2349176  
E-mail: ccarraro@unive.it

# ENDOGENOUS MINIMUM PARTICIPATION IN INTERNATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL TREATIES

## 1. Introduction

Several articles have recently provided a thorough economic analysis of a country's incentives to sign an international treaty.<sup>1</sup> Particular attention has been given to international environmental treaties, because they are often aimed at providing a global public good and are therefore characterised by strong free-riding incentives. This recent literature, by using a non-cooperative game-theoretic approach, has also explored which policy strategies and negotiation rules can be designed to increase the number of signatories of an international environmental treaty (Cf. Carraro and Galeotti, 2003 for a survey).

A feature of many international treaties that has been largely neglected by the theoretical literature is the clause that a treaty will only come into force if a minimum number of signatories or a minimum degree of effectiveness is achieved. For example, in the case of the Kyoto Protocol, the clause is twofold: the Protocol comes into force only if at least 55 countries sign it and the signatories represent at least 55% of total emissions. More generally, almost all international environmental treaties contain a minimum participation clause. According to Rutz (2001), only 2 out of the 122 multilateral environmental agreements provided by the Center for International Earth Science Information Network do not contain any minimum participation rule. In 81 cases, the participation rule asks for a minimum number of signatories. In 22 cases, unanimity is required for the treaty to come into force, namely all negotiating countries must sign and ratify the agreement for it to be effective. In the remaining 17 cases, the minimum participation rule is coupled to other requirements, i.e. for these agreements it is not sufficient that a certain number of countries ratify the treaty, but these countries have to satisfy other, additional criteria.<sup>2</sup>

Despite the importance of the minimum participation rule (and of the unanimity rule as a particular case), very few theoretical studies have analysed this issue. A previous study by Black, Levi and de Meza (1992) shows that the introduction of a minimum participation constraint increases the number of signatories of an international environmental agreement. However, it does not prove that countries actually have an incentive to introduce a minimum participation constraint among the rules of a given treaty. Similarly, Rutz (2001) shows, in a very specific case, that a minimum participation rule, if it exists, can result in an increase in the number of signatories. However, the rule is imposed exogenously and is therefore not an equilibrium outcome of the game. In addition, in Black, Levi and de Meza (1992) the minimum participation constraint is designed to solve a profitability problem (cooperation becomes profitable only if a minimum number of

---

<sup>1</sup> Good recent surveys are in Barrett (2002), Carraro and Marchiori (2003), Finus (2002).

<sup>2</sup> For example, the Montreal Protocol on the ozone layer asks for 11 instruments of ratification representing at least two-thirds of 1986 estimated global consumption of the controlled substances.

countries sign the agreement), whereas in this paper the goal is to solve a stability problem (cooperation is undermined by the presence of free-riders).

This paper aims to address the following questions: Why do countries agree to have a minimum participation constraint among the clauses characterising an international treaty? Is a minimum participation rule a way to offset free-riding incentives? Why do countries that know they have an incentive to free-ride, accept to “tie their hands” through the introduction of a minimum participation constraint? What is the endogenous equilibrium level of the minimum participation constraint?

This paper addresses the above questions by analysing a non-cooperative game of coalition formation. In the recent theoretical literature on international agreements, the decision of countries to sign a treaty is often modelled as a two-stage game (see Barrett, 1997b, 2002; Carraro and Siniscalco, 1998; Tulkens, 1998; Carraro and Galeotti, 2002; Carraro and Marchiori, 2002; Finus, 2002, for a few surveys). In the first stage (the *coalition stage*), countries non-cooperatively decide whether or not to sign the treaty by anticipating the consequences of their decision on the economic variables under their control. Then, in the second stage of the game (the *policy stage*), the equilibrium value of these variables is set. In this paper, an additional stage precedes the coalition and policy stages. In this first stage, called the *minimum participation stage*, countries select the number of countries that must sign the treaty for it to come into force. This decision is taken non cooperatively and unanimously by anticipating its implications on the second and third stage of the game. Therefore, in this paper, the minimum participation rule is endogenous.

Using the above theoretical framework, this paper shows that, at the equilibrium, a non-trivial coalition will form, and will be sustained by a binding minimum participation constraint. Therefore, it also shows that the number of signatories is increased by the presence of a minimum participation rule, even when this rule is endogenous. Consequently, the paper proves that there is an incentive for countries to adopt a minimum participation rule. In addition, the paper explores under what conditions it is optimal for countries to adopt the unanimity rule (we have seen that, in many treaties, minimum participation coincides with unanimous participation).

The idea that a non-trivial partial coalition can belong to the equilibrium structure of a coalition formation environmental game is not new. The aforementioned literature on international environmental agreements has already achieved this conclusion. In particular, it shows that (see Carraro and Marchiori, 2002):

- (i) Even in cases where there are positive spillovers (e.g. in the case of public good provision) and even without any commitment to cooperation, countries may form a coalition, i.e. may decide to sign a treaty in order to cooperate to achieve a common target (Cf. Carraro and Siniscalco, 1992; Barrett, 1994 among others).

- (ii) This coalition is usually formed by a subgroup of the  $n$  negotiating countries (Cf. Barrett, 1994).
  - (iii) The sometimes small initial coalition can be expanded by means of transfers or through “issue linkage”, but only under some restrictive conditions (Cf. Carraro and Siniscalco, 1993, 1995; Botteon and Carraro, 1997a,b).
  - (iv) The outcome of the game strictly depends on the membership rules (open membership, exclusive membership, coalition unanimity, ...) that are adopted by the  $n$  negotiating countries (Carraro and Marchiori, 2002).
  - (v) When multiple coalitions can and do form, the equilibrium is characterised by several, often small, coalitions (Bloch, 1997; Ray and Vhora, 1996, 1997; Yi, 1997, 2002).
- (i) The novel feature of this paper is the endogenisation of the minimum participation constraint and an analysis of a country’s incentives to adopt it despite the presence of incentives to free-ride on the other countries’ emission abatement.

In the following sections, the minimum participation rule will be denoted by  $\alpha$ , where  $\alpha$  is the share of the  $n$  negotiating countries that must sign the treaty for it to come into force. The value of  $\alpha$  can vary between 0 and 1. If  $\alpha=0$ , no restriction is introduced and a treaty comes into force whatever the number of its signatories. This is the so-called “open membership” rule, one of the most commonly assumed membership rules (see Yi, 1997, 2002; Carraro and Marchiori, 2003). If  $\alpha=1$ , a treaty comes into force only if all countries decide to sign the treaty. In this case, we have what is termed the “coalition unanimity” rule (Tulkens, 1998; Carraro and Marchiori, 2003) or full participation constraint. If  $\alpha=0.55$ , and countries are symmetric, we will have the 55% rule introduced in the Kyoto Protocol. Therefore, by endogenising  $\alpha$ , we can determine whether it is optimal for countries to opt for the open membership rule, the coalition unanimity rule or any other minimum participation rule defined by  $\alpha \in [0,1]$ .

The structure of the paper is as follows. Section 2 provides the main assumptions and definitions. Section 3 analyses the coalition game for a given value of  $\alpha$ . Section 4 endogenises  $\alpha$  and determines its equilibrium value. A concluding section summarises the main results and describes the scope for further research.

## 2. Assumptions and Definitions

Assume negotiations take place among  $n$  countries,  $n \geq 3$ , each indexed by  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . Let  $c \in [1,n]$  denote the number of cooperating countries.<sup>3</sup> As stated above, countries play a three-stage game. In the first stage – the *minimum participation stage* – countries unanimously choose the minimum participation rule  $\alpha$ ,  $\alpha \in [0,1]$ ,

---

<sup>3</sup> When  $c=1$ , the coalition structure is trivial. All players are singleton and play non-cooperatively against each other.

i.e. the share of the  $n$  countries that must sign the treaty for it to come into force. As a consequence, only if  $c \geq \alpha n$ , can a coalition form at the equilibrium. In the second stage – the *coalition stage* – countries decide non-cooperatively whether or not to sign the environmental treaty (i.e. to join the coalition). In the third stage, they play the non-cooperative *policy stage*, where countries that signed the agreement play as a single player and divide the resulting payoff according to a given burden-sharing rule (any of the rules derived from cooperative game theory). The remaining countries play non cooperatively against the coalition and against each other.<sup>4</sup>

This three-stage game can be represented as a *game in normal form* denoted by  $\Gamma = (N, \{X_i\}_{i \in N}, \{u_i\}_{i \in N})$ , where  $N$  is a finite set of players,  $X_i$  the strategy set of player  $i$ , and  $u_i$  the payoff function of player  $i$ , assigning to each profile of strategies a real number, i.e.  $u_i : \prod_{i \in N} X_i \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . The payoff function is a twice continuously differentiable function. A *coalition*  $C$  is any non-empty subset of  $N$ . A *coalition structure*  $\pi = \{C_1, C_2, \dots, C_m\}$  is a partition of the player set  $N$ , i.e.  $C_i \cap C_j = \emptyset$  for  $i \neq j$  and  $\bigcup_{i=1}^m C_i = N$ .

Since the formation of a coalition creates externalities, the appropriate framework to deal with this game is a *game in partition function form*, in which the payoff of each player depends on the entire coalition structure to which he belongs (Bloch, 1997; Ray and Vohra, 1997, 1999; Yi, 2003). This is why we convert the game in normal form into a game in partition function form. The set of all feasible coalition structures is denoted by  $\Pi$ . A *partition function*  $P: \Pi \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a mapping which associates each coalition structure  $\pi$  with a vector in  $\mathbb{R}^{|\pi|}$ , representing the worth of all coalitions in  $\pi$ . In particular,  $P(C_i; \pi)$  assigns a worth to each coalition  $C_i$  in a coalition structure  $\pi$ . When the rule of payoff division among coalition members is fixed, the description of gains from cooperation is made by a *per-member partition function*  $p: \Pi \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ , a mapping which associates each coalition structure  $\pi$  with a vector of individual payoffs in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . In particular  $p(C_i; \pi)$  represents the payoff of a player belonging to the coalition  $C_i$  in the coalition structure  $\pi$ .<sup>5</sup>

Under suitable assumptions (A.2 and A.3 below), the third stage of the game can be reduced to a partition function (Bloch 1997; Yi, 1997, 2003). Therefore, the study of coalition formation consists of the study of the second stage of the game, i.e. of a country's decision of whether or not to join the group of cooperating countries. To compute the equilibrium of the game, we assume that:

---

<sup>4</sup> These behavioural assumptions coincide with those defining the PANE equilibrium of Eyckmans and Tulkens (2001). They can be contrasted with the traditional cooperative game approach (e.g. Chander and Tulkens, 1995, 1997) and with the repeated game approach (Barrett, 1994, 1997). Moreover, note that the regulatory approach often proposed in public economics is not applicable given the absence of a supranational authority.

<sup>5</sup> Bloch (1997) denotes the per-member partition function by the term “valuation”.

A.1. All players decide simultaneously at all stages;<sup>6</sup>

A.2. The third stage emission game has a unique Nash equilibrium for any coalition structure.

This assumption is necessary for the second stage of the game to be reduced to a partition function. In order to convert the strategic form into a partition function, the competition among the coalition and the singletons has also to be specified. The common and perhaps the most natural assumption is that:

A.3. Inside each coalition, players make their policy decisions cooperatively in order to maximise the coalitional surplus, whereas the coalitions and the singletons compete with one another in a non-cooperative way.

The partition function is then obtained as a Nash equilibrium payoff of the game played by the coalition and the singletons. Formally, for a fixed coalition structure  $\pi = \{C_1, C_2, \dots, C_m\}$ , let  $x^* \in X = \prod_{i \in N} X_i$  be a vector of strategies such that:

$$\forall C_i \in \pi, \quad \sum_{j \in C_i} u_j(x_{C_i}^*, x_{N \setminus C_i}^*) \geq \sum_{j \in C_i} u_j(x_{C_i}, x_{N \setminus C_i}^*) \quad \forall x_{C_i} \in \prod_{j \in C_i} X_j$$

Then define  $P(C_i; \pi) = \sum_{j \in C_i} u_j(x^*)$ . In order to simplify the derivation of the partition function, we introduce a further assumption:

A.4. All players are ex-ante identical, which means that each player has the same strategy space in the third stage policy game.

This assumption allows us to adopt an equal-sharing payoff division rule inside a coalition, i.e. each player in a given coalition receives the same payoff as the other members<sup>7</sup>. Furthermore, the symmetry assumption implies that a coalition  $C_i$  can be identified with its size  $c_i$  and a coalition structure can be denoted by  $\pi = \{c_1, c_2, \dots, c_m\}$ , where  $\sum_{i=1}^m c_i = n$ . As a consequence, the payoff received by players depends only on the coalition size and not on the identities of the coalition members. The per-member partition function (partition function hereafter) can thus be denoted by  $p(k; \pi)$ , which represents the payoff of a player belonging to the size- $k$  coalition in the coalition structure  $\pi$ . Finally, let us denote by  $\pi = \{a_{(1)} \dots a_{(r)}\}$   $r$  size- $a$  coalitions in the coalition structure  $\pi$ .

---

<sup>6</sup> By contrast, Barrett (1994) assumes that the group of signatories is Stackelberg leader with respect to non-signatories. In Bloch (1997), it is assumed that players play sequentially.

<sup>7</sup> We consider the equal sharing rule as an assumption, since it is not endogenously determined in the model. However, Ray and Vohra (1999) provides a vindication for this assumption.



Recent developments of the theory of endogenous coalition formation (Cf. Bloch, 1997; Yi, 2003) have stressed the implications of allowing players to join different coalitions (see also Carraro, 1998b). However, in many environmental cases (e.g. the case of climate change or the case of the Montreal protocol), the negotiating agenda focuses on a single agreement. Here we assume that:

*A.5. Players are invited to sign a single agreement. Hence, those that do not sign cannot propose a different agreement. From a game-theoretic viewpoint, this implies that only one coalition can be formed, the remaining defecting players playing as singletons.*

We also need to introduce a technical assumption which is useful to simplify the analysis of the coalition formation game:

*A.6. Each player's payoff function increases monotonically with respect to the coalition size (the number of signatories).<sup>8</sup>*

This last assumption is quite natural in the case of international environmental agreements. Since the global environment is a public good, a country that finds it convenient to reduce its own emissions provides a positive contribution to the welfare of all countries (both inside and outside the coalition).

Finally, the first stage of our game is a sort of constitutional stage in which the rules of the game are set. Therefore, decisions are taken under unanimity and, in addition:

*A.7. Unanimous decisions taken in the first stage of the game are irreversible, i.e. once a minimum participation rule is set, it cannot be modified in the subsequent stages of the game.*

This last assumption is useful to avoid that in the second stage countries ask to renegotiate the minimum participation constraint set in the first stage.

In the next sections, we will analyse the equilibrium of the three-stage game with endogenous minimum participation. Given the partition function described above, we can directly focus on the second stage of the game and then move, by backward induction, to the first stage, in which the optimal minimum participation constraint is determined.

---

<sup>8</sup> This assumption excludes the possibility of “exclusive membership equilibria” where the group of cooperating players can refuse entry to a player which wants to join the coalition (Yi, 1997). Moreover, this assumption is useful to distinguish the minimum coalition size endogenised in this paper from the minimum participation proposed in Black *et al.* (1992). In this latter paper, minimum participation is necessary to make the coalition profitable. In our paper, all non-trivial coalitions are profitable by assumption A.6. Hence, minimum participation can be chosen by countries only to increase the size of the stable coalitions (see below).

### 3. The coalition stage

The second stage of the game is a binary choice game (joining the coalition or behaving as a lone free-rider) whose outcome is a single coalition structure  $\pi = \{c, 1_{(n-c)}\}$ . The main distinctive feature of this game is the presence of positive spillovers, i.e. in any single coalition structure, if some players form a coalition, other players are better off. As a consequence, the partition function of any player outside the coalition (*non member function*) is increasing in  $c$  for all values of  $c \in [1, n]$ . Formally:  $p(1; \pi)$ , where  $\pi = \{c, 1_{(n-c)}\}$ , is an increasing function of  $c$ .

Let us denote by  $Q(c)$  the relative non-member partition function  $p(1; \pi) - p(1; \pi^s)$ , where  $\pi^s = \{1_n\}$ . Similarly, the relative per-member payoff function  $P(c)$  is equal to  $p(c; \pi) - p(1; \pi^s)$ . From A.6, we focus on the case in which  $P(c)$  and  $Q(c)$  are monotonic. As said, this case is relevant because it characterises environmental negotiations and more generally the provision of public goods. Let us start the analysis by considering the case in which no minimum participation rule is introduced. In this case,  $\alpha = 0$  (open membership rule) and the equilibrium of the coalition stage is completely characterised by the following two properties, first derived in cartel literature (D'Aspremont *et al.*, 1983) and then often used also in environmental literature (Carraro and Siniscalco, 1993; Barrett, 1994, and many others).

Profitability. A coalition  $c$  is profitable if each cooperating player gets a payoff larger than the one he would obtain when no coalition forms. Formally:

$$(1) \quad P(c) \geq P(1) = 0,$$

where  $P(c)$  is the relative payoff of a cooperating player when the coalition structure is  $\pi = \{c, 1_{(n-c)}\}$  and  $P(1) = p(1; \pi^s)$  is the relative payoff associated to the singleton structure  $\pi^s = \{1_n\}$ .

- Stability. A coalition is stable if it is both internally and externally stable. It is internally stable if no cooperating player is better off by defecting in order to form a singleton<sup>9</sup>. Formally:<sup>10</sup>

$$(2a) \quad P(c) \geq Q(c-1).$$

It is externally stable if no singleton is better off by joining the coalition  $c$ . Formally:

$$(2b) \quad Q(c) > P(c+1).$$

---

<sup>9</sup> Yi (1997) denotes this condition by the term “stand alone stable”.

<sup>10</sup> We assume that if a player is indifferent as to joining the coalition or defecting, then he joins the coalition.

A useful tool to analyse the stability of a coalition is the stability function  $L(c)$  proposed in Carraro and Siniscalco (1992). This function:

$$(3) \quad L(c) = P(c) - Q(c-1)$$

describes a player's incentive to join a coalition. If  $L(c)$  is positive, there is no incentive to free-ride on the coalition of size  $c$ .

The size of the stable coalition is determined by conditions (1)(2a)(2b), i.e. by the largest integer  $c^*$  smaller than  $c^\wedge$ , where  $c^\wedge$  is defined by  $L(c^\wedge) = 0$  and  $L'(c^\wedge) < 0$  (again assumption A.6 guarantees the uniqueness of  $c^\wedge$ ).<sup>11</sup> The size  $c^*$  identifies the minimal externally stable coalition and the maximal internally stable one. Hence, the equilibrium coalition structure is  $\pi^* = \{c^*, I_{(n-c^*)}\}$ . Note that  $c^*$  is not necessarily greater than one. However, it has been shown in several papers (Cf. Barrett, 1994) that a non-trivial ( $c^* \geq 2$ ) equilibrium (stable) coalition generally exists under A.1-A.6.<sup>12</sup> Let us denote this coalition by  $c^*(\alpha=0)$ . Then:

**Proposition 1:** *Let A.1-A.7 hold. The equilibrium of the coalition game for any value of  $\alpha \in [0,1]$  is the coalition structure:*

$$(4a) \quad \pi^*(\alpha) = \{c^*(\alpha=0), I_{(n-c^*)}\} \text{ for any minimum participation rule such that } 0 \leq \alpha \leq \alpha^*$$

$$(4b) \quad \pi(\alpha) = \{c=\alpha n, I_{(n-c)}\} \text{ for any minimum participation rule such that } \alpha^* < \alpha \leq 1$$

Proof: If  $\alpha \leq \alpha^* = c^*(\alpha=0)/n$ , the equilibrium coalition is not modified by the presence of a minimum participation constraint  $\alpha$ . Indeed, if in the first stage players set a minimum participation rule  $\alpha \leq c^*(\alpha=0)/n$ , the number of signatories necessary for the treaty to come into force is smaller than or equal to the number of countries that would sign the treaty anyway. Hence, the equilibrium coalition remains  $c^*(\alpha=0)$ . If in the first stage players agree on a minimum participation rule  $\alpha > \alpha^* = c^*(\alpha=0)/n$ , then in the second stage they have the choice either to form a coalition of size  $c = \alpha n$ , or not to form any coalitions at all. Indeed, all coalitions larger than  $c$  are unstable, because all coalitions larger than  $c^*(\alpha=0)$  are unstable and  $c > c^*(\alpha=0)$ . Moreover, no coalition smaller than  $c = \alpha n$  can form, by definition of minimum participation. Given that  $Q(c-1) > P(c) > P(1) = 0$  (by assumption A.6) players prefer to form the coalition  $c = \alpha n$ .

Q.E.D.

---

<sup>11</sup> This result, as well as many others on the size of stable coalitions, is shown in Carraro and Marchiori (2003).

Proposition 1 identifies the relationship between the minimum participation rule decided in the first stage of the game and the equilibrium of the coalition stage. This relationship between the value of  $\alpha$  and the equilibrium of the coalition stage, jointly with the incentive structure that supports the equilibrium coalition  $c^*(\alpha=0)$ , are crucial to determine the equilibrium value of  $\alpha$  in the minimum participation stage.

#### 4. The minimum participation stage

The goal of this section is to determine the equilibrium of the minimum participation stage, i.e. to identify which minimum participation constraint is chosen in the first stage of the game. When countries deal with the choice of the membership rule, they consider two aspects:

- 1) *if* it is convenient to introduce a minimum participation constraint rather than to negotiate under the open membership regime;
- 2) *which* minimum participation constraint is optimal.

As noted above, the decision in the first stage of the game is taken independently and simultaneously by all players. As no player can be forced to accept a minimum participation rule he does not agree upon, decisions in the first stage must be taken with the unanimous consensus of all players. In order to achieve a unanimous consensus on a given  $\alpha$ -rule in the first stage, all players must prefer the equilibrium supported by that rule to the one that would emerge without a minimum participation rule. This is the case if, whatever the choice of a player in the second stage, a player's payoff when the minimum participation constraint is introduced is larger than the payoff he would receive in the absence of any minimum participation constraint.

**Proposition 2:** *Let A.1-A.7 hold. In the first stage of the game, all players agree to introduce a minimum participation constraint  $\alpha = c/n$  iff:*

$$(5) \quad P(c) \geq Q[c^*(\alpha=0)]$$

Proof: For all players to agree on a minimum participation constraint, we must have:


- $P(c) \geq P(c^*)$ , i.e. all players who cooperate in  $\{c, 1_{(n-c)}\}$  and in  $\{c^*, 1_{(n-c^*)}\}$  are better off in  $\{c, 1_{(n-c)}\}$ ;

- $Q(c) \geq P(c^*)$ , i.e. all players who are free-riders in  $\{c, l_{(n-c)}\}$  but cooperators in  $\{c^*, l_{(n-c^*)}\}$  are better off in  $\{c, l_{(n-c)}\}$ ;
- $P(c) \geq Q(c^*)$ , i.e. all players who cooperate in  $\{c, l_{(n-c)}\}$  but free-ride in  $\{c^*, l_{(n-c^*)}\}$  are better off in  $\{c, l_{(n-c)}\}$ ;
- $Q(c) \geq Q(c^*)$ , i.e. all players who free-ride both in  $\{c, l_{(n-c)}\}$  and in  $\{c^*, l_{(n-c^*)}\}$  are better off in  $\{c, l_{(n-c)}\}$ .

If these four conditions are satisfied, all players find it convenient to agree on the minimum participation constraint  $\alpha$  that sustains  $\{c, l_{(n-c)}\}$ . Notice that  $c > c^*$  (otherwise the coalition structure is  $\{c^*, l_{(n-c^*)}\}$ ) by Proposition 1. Hence,  $P(c) > P(c^*)$  by Assumption A.6. Moreover,  $Q(c)$  is also monotonically increasing, which implies  $Q(c) > Q(c^*)$  when  $c > c^*$ . These two results, the definition of  $c^*$ , and  $c > c^*$ , imply  $Q(c) > Q(c-1) > P(c) > P(c^*)$ . As a consequence, eq. (5), i.e.  $P(c) \geq Q(c^*)$ , is a necessary and sufficient condition for all players to agree on the selection of a minimum participation rule such that the equilibrium coalition structure becomes  $\{c, l_{(n-c)}\}$ .

Q.E.D.

Inequality (5) can be interpreted as a participation incentive constraint. Its geometric representation, when met for  $c \geq c^*+2$ , is provided by Figure 1.



**Figure 1. Geometric representation of condition (5) when met for  $c \geq c^*+2$**

Is this condition feasible? The answer is certainly positive. Given the monotonicity of the functions  $P(c)$  and  $Q(c)$ , it is possible – if  $n$  is sufficiently large – to find a coalition  $c$  large enough to satisfy  $P(c) \geq Q(c^*)$ . In particular, assume that  $n$  is such that there is a  $c'$  that satisfies  $P(c') = Q[c^*(\alpha=0)]$ . The monotonicity of  $P(c)$  implies that (5) is met for all  $c \in [c', n]$ .

However, (5) is only a necessary condition to identify the minimum participation constraint which is chosen by the  $n$  countries. The inequality (5) defines the set of minimum participation rules that would be voted with the unanimous consensus of all countries. Which rule is actually going to be adopted?

To answer this question, we must write the optimisation problem that each country solves when deciding the optimal minimum participation rule. Given symmetry, in the first stage of the game, a country does not know whether in the coalition stage it will be a cooperator or a free rider. Therefore, it solves:

$$(6) \quad \begin{aligned} \max_c \quad & EP(c) = \frac{c}{n}P(c) + \frac{n-c}{n}Q(c) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & P(c) \geq Q[c^*(\alpha=0)] \quad 1 \leq c \leq n \end{aligned}$$

where  $EP(c)$  is a country's expected payoff in the first stage of the game,  $c/n$  is the probability of being a cooperator in the second stage (given that the rule  $\alpha = c/n$  is chosen in the first stage), whereas  $(n-c)/n$  is the probability of being a free-rider in the second stage of the game.

The equilibrium minimum participation rule  $\alpha^o = c^o/n$  is then the solution of the optimisation problem (6), i.e.  $c^o$  is the maximand of  $EP(c)$  subject to (5). Note that (6) identifies the trade-off that countries face. On the one hand, a high value of  $c$ , namely of  $\alpha$ , increases the payoff of both cooperators and free-riders. On the other hand, a high value of  $\alpha$  reduces the probability of being a free-rider in the second stage, thus reducing the probability of reaping the highest payoff.

Before providing a formal analysis of the above optimisation problem, let us consider a simple economic example. Using a linear quadratic model, and assuming  $n = 9$ , the payoffs of different coalition structures have been computed.<sup>13</sup> These payoffs are summarised in Table 1.

First of all, note that  $c^*(\alpha=0) = 3$ . Hence, when  $\alpha=0$  (open membership), the stable coalition is formed by three players whatever  $n$  (this result was already shown in Carraro and Siniscalco, 1992). The inequality (5)

---

<sup>13</sup> These quadratic cost and linear benefit functions are also used in Barrett (1994, 1997), Carraro and Siniscalco (1992), Chander and Tulkens (1997) and many others. See Carraro and Marchiori (2003) or Finus and Rundshagen (2001) for two recent surveys.

is satisfied by all coalition sizes  $c$  larger or equal to 5. These coalition sizes make all players better off than in the coalition structure  $\{c^*(\alpha=0), 1_{(n-c^*)}\}$ .

**Table 1. A single coalition game with orthogonal free-riding and linear-quadratic functions**

Coalition structure	Per-member partition function (9 players)								
1,1,1,1,1, 1,1,1,1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,1,1,1, 1,1,1,2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	0,5	0,5
1,1,1,1, 1,1,3	6	6	6	6	6	6	2	2	2
1,1,1,1, 1,4	12	12	12	12	12	4,5	4,5	4,5	4,5
1,1,1, 1,5	20	20	20	20	8	8	8	8	8
1,1,1,6	30	30	30	12,5	12,5	12,5	12,5	12,5	12,5
1,1,7	42	42	18	18	18	18	18	18	18
1,8	56	24,5	24,5	24,5	24,5	24,5	24,5	24,5	24,5
9	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32

Let us solve the optimisation problem (6) for the example summarised by Table 1. The values of  $EP(c)$ , for  $c = 5, 6, \dots, 9$ , are:

$$EP(c = 5) = \frac{5}{9} \cdot 8 + \frac{9-5}{9} \cdot 20 = \frac{120}{9}$$

$$EP(c = 6) = \frac{6}{9} \cdot 12,5 + \frac{9-6}{9} \cdot 30 = \frac{165}{9}$$

$$EP(c = 7) = \frac{7}{9} \cdot 18 + \frac{9-7}{9} \cdot 42 = \frac{210}{9}$$

$$EP(c = 8) = \frac{8}{9} \cdot 24,5 + \frac{9-8}{9} \cdot 56 = \frac{252}{9}$$

$$EP(c = 9) = \frac{9}{9} \cdot 32 = \frac{288}{9}$$

In this example,  $EP(c)$  increases with  $c$  for  $c \in [5,9]$ . Therefore, the equilibrium minimum participation constraint is  $\alpha^\circ = 1$ . As a consequence, in this example, all countries not only prefer to “tie their hands” in the first stage, but also decide to “tie all hands”, thus giving up the possibility of free-riding in the second stage in order to reap the benefits arising from full cooperation. As said in the Introduction, 22 out of 122 multilateral environmental agreements share this feature.

Let us provide a more general analysis of the optimisation problem (6). The function  $EP(c)$  can be decomposed into four factors:  $c/n$ ,  $P(c)$ ,  $Q(c)$  and  $(n-c)/n$ , because  $EP(c) = (c/n)P(c) + Q(c)[(n-c)/n]$ . The first three factors are increasing with  $c$ , because  $P(c)$  and  $Q(c)$  are monotonic and  $c$  is a positive number. Therefore, only the fourth factor,  $(n-c)$ , is a decreasing function of  $c$ .

Under what conditions is  $EP(c)$  increasing with  $c$  for all values of  $c$  satisfying (5)? This question is relevant because it identifies the case in which  $c^\circ = n$  or  $\alpha^\circ = 1$ , i.e. in which the minimum participation rule requires the ratification by all countries and therefore full cooperation. The answer is provided by the following:

**Proposition 3:** *Let A1-A7 hold. The equilibrium minimum participation rule is  $\alpha^\circ = 1$ , i.e. the treaty comes into force only when all countries sign and ratify it, iff:*



$$(7a) \quad P(n) \geq Q[c^*(\alpha=0)]$$

$$(7b) \quad (1 + \varepsilon_p)P(c)/Q(c) \geq 1$$

where  $\varepsilon_p$  is the positive elasticity of the function  $P(c)$ .

Proof: The first condition, (7a), is the necessary condition already established by Proposition 2. It is met for  $n$  sufficiently large. The second condition, (7b), can be proved as follows. By differentiating  $cP(c) + (n-c)Q(c)$  with respect to  $c$ , we obtain:

$$(8) \quad P(c) - Q(c) + cP'(c) + (n-c)Q'(c)$$

where  $P'(c)$  and  $Q'(c)$  are the first derivative of  $P(c)$  and  $Q(c)$  respectively. Let  $c^+$  be the solution of  $P(c^+) = Q(c^+)$ . Then, (8) is positive for all  $c \in [c^+, n]$  iff:

$$(9) \quad \varepsilon_Q (n-c)/n + (1 + \varepsilon_p)P(c)/Q(c) \geq 1$$

where  $\varepsilon_Q$  and  $\varepsilon_p$  are the positive elasticities of the functions  $Q(c)$  and  $P(c)$  respectively. Note that both terms on the left hand side are positive. However,  $(n-c)/n < 1$  because  $c > c^*$  and  $P(c)/Q(c) < 1$  for  $c > c^*$  by definition of stability. Both  $(n-c)/n$  and  $P(c)/Q(c)$  decreases with  $c$  when  $P$  and  $Q$  are monotonic and  $c^* \geq 2$ . Therefore, unless the elasticities strongly increase with  $c$ , (9) is less likely to be met for high values of  $c$ . The strongest condition to be met for  $EP(c)$  to be increasing for all  $c \geq c^+$ , including  $c = n$ , is (7b), i.e.

$$(1 + \varepsilon_p)P(c)/Q(c) \geq 1$$

which coincides with (9) for  $c = n$ . This condition is satisfied only if  $\varepsilon_p$  is sufficiently large, i.e. the profitability function increases sufficiently rapidly with  $c$ . The intuition is that high and increasing values of  $P(c)$  when  $c$  is close to  $n$  or equal to  $n$  offset the loss induced by the impossibility of free-riding in the second stage.<sup>14</sup>

Q.E.D.

If (7b) is not met, there may exist values of  $c$  for which (9) is negative. In this case, the optimal rule  $\alpha^\circ = c^\circ/n$  is smaller than 1. A minimum participation constraint  $\alpha^\circ < 1$  implies that, at the equilibrium, some

---

<sup>14</sup> Assume  $P(c)$  concave. Its elasticity becomes smaller and smaller as  $c$  moves towards  $n$ . At the same time, by definition of stability, the difference between  $Q(c)$  and  $P(c)$  increases with  $c$ . Therefore,  $P(c)/Q(c) < 1$  also becomes smaller and smaller. As a consequence,  $(1 + \varepsilon_p)P(c)/Q(c)$  may become smaller than one and (7b) may not be met. By contrast, if  $\varepsilon_p$  is large, e.g. because  $P(c)$  is convex, the ratio  $P(c)/Q(c)$  is closer to one and (7b) is more likely to be satisfied for  $c = n$ .

countries free-ride on the cooperative behaviour of the other ones. However, given the constraint  $P(c) \geq Q[c^*(\alpha=0)]$ , the minimum participation rule, even when chosen endogenously and strategically, achieves the goal of inducing an equilibrium coalition which is larger than or equal to the one that would form without minimum participation constraint.<sup>15</sup>

The intuition behind this result is as follows. Even if players perfectly anticipate the consequences of their decision, in the first stage they have an incentive to reduce their freedom to free-ride in order to achieve a larger payoff. However, this does not necessarily lead to the grand coalition (full cooperation), because all players also have an incentive to minimise this limitation to their freedom in order to increase the likelihood of being free-riders. The balance of these two incentives leads to the formation of a coalition which is larger than or equal to the one that would form when  $\alpha = 0$  (no minimum participation constraint), but could be smaller than the grand coalition. The grand coalition is achieved only when the elasticity of  $P(c)$  for  $c$  close to  $n$  is sufficiently large (eq. (7b)).

As a further development of the example of Table 1, consider the following simple economic-environmental model.  $n$  identical countries emit a pollutant that damages a common environmental resource. The welfare  $u_i$  of each country depends on the benefits arising from the use of the environment for production and consumption activities and on the damages resulting from polluting emissions:

$$(10) \quad u_i = B(x_i) - D(X) \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n$$

where  $x_i$  is country  $i$ 's emission level and  $X$  is the total amount of polluting emissions ( $X = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i$ ). Let the benefit function  $B(x_i)$  be quadratic and the cost function (or damage function) be linear:

$$(11) \quad B(x_i) = k(dx_i - x_i^2/2)$$

where  $d$  is the maximum level of emissions and  $k$  is a technological parameter which parametrizes total benefits from emissions (the larger  $k$  is, the larger the benefit)

$$(12) \quad D(x_i, X) = \frac{m}{2} [x_i + (X - x_i)]$$

where  $m$  parametrizes the level of perceived damage from pollution. Using (10)-(12), a country's payoff function is:

---

<sup>15</sup> The proof is easy. For all  $c > c^*$ ,  $Q(c) > P(c-1)$  by definition of stability (eqs. (2)). Therefore,  $Q(c+1) > P(c) \geq Q[c^*(\alpha=0)]$  which implies  $c+1 > c^*$  because  $Q(c)$  is monotonic. This implies  $c \geq c^*$ .

$$(13) \quad u_i = k \left( dx_i - \frac{x_i^2}{2} \right) - \frac{m}{2} [x_i + (X - x_i)]$$

In a coalition structure  $\pi = (c, 1_{n-c})$ , countries inside the coalition act cooperatively and choose their emission level by maximising the sum of the payoffs of all members. Hence, for a coalition structure  $\pi$ , the payoff of a cooperating player is:

$$(14) \quad u_c = k \left( dx_c - \frac{x_c^2}{2} \right) - \frac{m}{2} [x_c + ((c-1)x_c + (n-c)x_f)]$$

where  $x_c$  and  $x_f$  are the emission levels of cooperators and free-riders, respectively. Differentiating (14) with respect to  $x_c$  yields  $x_c^* = d - mc/2k$ , which is the optimal emission level for a cooperating country. A free-rider's payoff function is given by the following expression:

$$(15) \quad u_f = k \left( dx_f - \frac{x_f^2}{2} \right) - \frac{m}{2} [x_f + (n-c-1)x_f + cx_c].$$

Differentiating (15) with respect to  $x_f$  yields  $x_f^* = d - m/2k$ . By replacing the values of  $x_c^*$  and  $x_f^*$  into the payoff functions  $u_c$  and  $u_f$ , we obtain the payoffs for cooperators and free-riders as a function of the coalition size  $c$ :

$$P(c) = k \left[ d \left( d - \frac{mc}{2k} \right) - \frac{1}{2} \left( d - \frac{mc}{2k} \right)^2 \right] + \frac{m}{2} \left[ \left( d - \frac{mc}{2k} \right) + (c-1) \left( d - \frac{mc}{2k} \right) + (n-c) \left( d - \frac{m}{2k} \right) \right]$$

$$Q(c) = k \left[ d \left( d - \frac{m}{2k} \right) - \frac{1}{2} \left( d - \frac{m}{2k} \right)^2 \right] + \frac{m}{2} \left[ \left( d - \frac{m}{2k} \right) + (n-c-1) \left( d - \frac{m}{2k} \right) + c \left( d - \frac{mc}{2k} \right) \right]$$

The values shown in Table 1 have been obtained by normalising to zero the payoff functions when  $c=0$  (no-cooperation) and by assuming  $m=2k$  and  $k=d=1$ . The expected utility function  $EP(c)$  is then proportional to:

$$\left[ c \left( d - \frac{mc}{2k} \right) \left( \frac{kd}{2} + \frac{mc}{4} - \frac{mN}{2} \right) + (N-c) \left( d - \frac{m}{2k} \right) \left( \frac{kd}{2} + \frac{m}{4} - \frac{mN}{2} \right) \right]$$

This function increases monotonically with  $c$  in the interval  $[c^+, n]$  iff  $EP(c) - EP(c-1) > 0$  for  $c \in [c^+, n]$ .

This inequality holds because  $EP(c) - EP(c-1) =$

$$c \left( d - \frac{mc}{2k} \right) \left( \frac{kd}{2} + \frac{mc}{4} - \frac{mn}{2} \right) - (c-1) \left( d - \frac{m(c-1)}{2k} \right) \left( \frac{kd}{2} + \frac{m(c-1)}{4} - \frac{mn}{2} \right) +$$

$$- \left( d - \frac{m}{2k} \right) \left( \frac{kd}{2} + \frac{m}{4} - \frac{mn}{2} \right) > 0$$

for  $1 < c < 4/3n$ . Therefore, the expected utility function  $EP(c)$  increases monotonically with  $c$  in the interval  $\left(1, \frac{4}{3}n\right)$ . As a consequence, the equilibrium minimum participation constraint is  $\alpha^\circ = 1$  (coalition unanimity) and the equilibrium coalition size is  $c^\circ = n$  (full cooperation).

This result is a generalisation of the conclusion already achieved when analysing Table 1. As already stated, when  $\alpha = 1$ , all countries join the coalition (sign the environmental treaty) in the second stage of the game. However, in the presence of structural asymmetries, some countries may balk from signing the agreement (the profitability condition is not met for all countries) and therefore the minimum participation constraint  $\alpha = 1$  cannot guarantee full cooperation. In the presence of asymmetries, it may even be counterproductive, because it may lead to no cooperation, unless coupled with a transfer scheme that guarantees the profitability of the agreement for all countries.

## 5. Conclusions

In the previous sections, we analysed a coalition formation game in which, in the first stage of the game, players strategically decide whether to introduce a minimum participation constraint and the size of this constraint. At the equilibrium, the minimum participation constraint is binding and induces more countries to cooperate. This is consistent with the evidence provided by several international agreements. However, the two basic questions proposed in the Introduction were more stringent: (i) why do countries voluntarily decide to introduce a minimum participation constraint that must be met for a treaty to come into force?; and (ii) what is the equilibrium minimum participation rule ?

In words, the answer to the first question is as follows. Countries compare the incentives to cooperate within a larger coalition sustained by the minimum participation constraint with the incentives to free-ride on the public good (e.g. emission abatement) provided by a smaller coalition. If the former incentive dominates the second one, all countries prefer to “tie their own hands” and to introduce a minimum participation constraint.

As for the second question, the optimal minimum participation constraint is defined by the elasticity of the payoff function of cooperating countries. If this elasticity is sufficiently large and increasing for  $c \leq n$ , then all

countries prefer a minimum participation constraint that induces full cooperation. The reason is as follows. If the benefits from cooperation are rapidly increasing with the number of cooperators, no player has an incentive to take the risk of being a free-rider. Note that this conclusion crucially depends on the assumption of symmetric countries.

These results could be used in the design of actual policy agreements. First, a minimum participation rule is generally helpful to enhance the environmental effectiveness of an international agreement. Therefore, international environmental treaties should contain this rule. We have seen that this is actually the case for most existing treaties. Second, the optimal rule is generally coalition unanimity, in particular when the number of negotiating countries is not too large. However, two factors of information are crucial. First, the unanimity constraint is effective only if the profitability condition is met for all countries. Otherwise, it may be counterproductive. Therefore, in real agreements, a minimum participation unanimity rule should be associated with a transfer mechanism that makes the agreement profitable to all countries (e.g. the one proposed in Chander and Tulkens, 1995, 1997). Secondly, the curvature of the coalition's payoff function is also crucial. If benefits from cooperation do not increase with the number of cooperators, or increase too slowly, then it is not optimal to set a minimum participation constraint such that all countries must sign and ratify the treaty for it to come into force.

## References

- Barrett, S. (1994), "Self-Enforcing International Environmental Agreements", Oxford Economic Papers, 46, 878-894.
- Barrett, S. (1997), "Towards a Theory of International Cooperation" in C. Carraro and D. Siniscalco, eds., New Directions in the Economic Theory of the Environment, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Barrett, S. (2002), Environment and Statecraft, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Black, J., M.D. Levi and D. de Meza (1992), "Creating a Good a Atmosphere. Minimum Participation for Tackling the Greenhouse Effect", Economica, 60, 281-293.
- Bloch, F. (1997), "Non-cooperative Models of Coalition Formation in Games with Spillovers", in C. Carraro and D. Siniscalco, eds., New Directions in the Economic Theory of the Environment, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Botteon, M. and C. Carraro (1997a), "Burden-Sharing and Coalition Stability in Environmental Negotiations with Asymmetric Countries", in C. Carraro, ed., International Environmental Agreements: Strategic Policy Issues, E. Elgar, Cheltenham.
- Botteon, M. and C. Carraro (1997b), " Strategies for Environmental Negotiations: Issue Linkage with Heterogeneous Countries", in H. Folmer and N. Hanley, eds., Game Theory and the Global Environment, E. Elgar, Cheltenham.
- Carraro, C. (1997), ed., International Environmental Agreements: Strategic Policy Issues, E. Elgar, Cheltenham.

- Carraro, C. (1998a), "Environmental Conflict, Bargaining and Cooperation" forthcoming in J. van den Bergh, Handbook of Natural Resources and the Environment, E. Elgar, Cheltenham.
- Carraro, C. (1998b), "Beyond Kyoto: A Game Theoretic Perspective", in the Proceedings of the OECD Workshop on Economic Modelling of Climate Change, OECD, Paris.
- Carraro, C. and M. Galeotti (2003), "The Future Evolution of the Kyoto Protocol. Costs, Benefits, Incentives to Ratification and New International Regimes", in C. Carraro and C. Egenhofer (eds.), Firms, Governments and Climate Policy: Incentive-Based Policies for Long-Term Climate Change, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham.
- Carraro, C. and C. Marchiori (2003), "Stable Coalitions", in C. Carraro, ed., The Endogenous Formation of Economic Coalitions, E. Elgar, Cheltenham.
- Carraro, C. and D. Siniscalco (1992), "The International Protection of the Environment: Voluntary Agreements among Sovereign Countries", in Dasgupta, P., Maler, K.G. and Vercelli, A., eds., The Economics of Transnational Commons, Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Carraro, C. and D. Siniscalco (1993), "Strategies for the International Protection of the Environment", Journal of Public Economics, 52, 309-328.
- Carraro, C. and D. Siniscalco (1995), "Policy Coordination for Sustainability: Commitments, Transfers, and Linked Negotiations", in I. Goldin and A. Winters, eds., The Economics of Sustainable Development, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Carraro, C. and D. Siniscalco (1998), "International Environmental Agreements. Incentives and Political Economy", in European Economic Review, 42, 561-572.
- Chander, P. and H. Tulkens (1995), "A Core-Theoretical Solution for the Design of Cooperative Agreements on Trans-Frontier Pollution", FEEM Working Paper 22.95, FEEM, Milan.
- Chander, P. and H. Tulkens (1997), "The Core of an Economy with Multilateral Environmental Externalities", International Journal of Game Theory, vol. 26, pp. 379-401.
- D'Aspremont, C.A., A. Jacquemin, J.J. Gabszewicz and J. Weymark (1983), "On the Stability of Collusive Price Leadership", Canadian Journal of Economics, 16, 17-25.
- Eyckmans, J. and Tulkens, H. (2001), "Simulating coalitionally stable burden sharing agreements for the climate change problem", CORE Discussion Paper 9926 and CLIMNEG Working Paper 18, Université Catholique de Louvain, Belgium.
- Finus, M. (2002), "Stability and Design of International Environmental Agreements: The Case of Global and Transboundary Pollution", in: Folmer, H. and T. Tietenberg (eds), International Yearbook of Environmental and Resource Economics, 2002/3, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, UK.
- Ray, D. and R. Vohra (1997), "Equilibrium Binding Agreements", Journal of Economic Theory, 73, 30-78.
- Ray, D. and R. Vohra (1999), "A Theory of Endogenous Coalition Structure", *Games and Economic Behaviour*, 26, 286-336.
- Rutz, S. (2001), "Minimum Participation Rules and the Effectiveness of Multilateral Environmental Agreements", Working paper 01/22, Centre for Economic Research, SFIT, Zurich.
- Tulkens, H. (1998), "Cooperation versus Free-riding in International Environmental Affairs: Two Approaches", in H. Folmer and N. Hanley, eds., Game Theory and the Global Environment, E. Elgar, Cheltenham. Also in C. Carraro, ed., Governing the Global Environment, E. Elgar, Cheltenham, 2002.
- Yi, S.S. (1997), "Stable Coalition Structures with Externalities", Games and Economic Behaviour, 20, 201-237.
- Yi, S.S. (2003), "Endogenous Formation of Economic Coalitions. A Survey of the Partition Function Approach", in C. Carraro, ed., The Endogenous Formation of Economic Coalitions, E. Elgar, Cheltenham.

## 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&amp;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&amp;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 MISSFELDT 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&amp;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&amp;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 (Ivi): <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. STREBULAEV (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&amp;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&amp;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 (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&amp;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 <math>\gamma</math>-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 (Ixxiii): <u>Anti-Racist Policies in France. From Ideological and Historical Schemes to Socio-Political Realities</u></i>
KNOW	99.2003	<i>Richard THOMPSON FORD (Ixxiii): <u>Cultural Rights and Civic Virtue</u></i>
KNOW	100.2003	<i>Alaknanda PATEL (Ixxiii): <u>Cultural Diversity and Conflict in Multicultural Cities</u></i>
KNOW	101.2003	<i>David MAY (Ixxiii): <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 (Ixxiii) : <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(Ixiv): <u>Management Challenges for Multiple-Species Boreal Forests</u></i>
NRM	107.2003	<i>Anne Sophie CRÉPIN (Ixiv): <u>Threshold Effects in Coral Reef Fisheries</u></i>
SIEV	108.2003	<i>Sara ANIYAR (Ixiv): <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(Ixiv): <u>Evaluating Projects and Assessing Sustainable Development in Imperfect Economies</u></i>
NRM	110.2003	<i>Anastasios XEPAPADEAS and Catarina ROSETA-PALMA(Ixiv): <u>Instabilities and Robust Control in Fisheries</u></i>
NRM	111.2003	<i>Charles PERRINGS and Brian WALKER (Ixiv): <u>Conservation and Optimal Use of Rangelands</u></i>
ETA	112.2003	<i>Jack GOODY (Ixiv): <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>
	1000	<b>Carlo CARRARO, Alessandro LANZA and Valeria PAPPONETTI: <u>One Thousand Working Papers</u></b>

- (l) 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
- (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

### 2002 SERIES

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

### 2003 SERIES

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