

Klepper, Gernot; Peterson, Sonja

Working Paper

Marginal abatement cost curves in general equilibrium: The influence of world energy prices

Nota di Lavoro, No. 2004,136

Provided in Cooperation with:

Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei (FEEM)

Suggested Citation: Klepper, Gernot; Peterson, Sonja (2004) : Marginal abatement cost curves in general equilibrium: The influence of world energy prices, Nota di Lavoro, No. 2004,136, Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei (FEEM), Milano

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/3418>

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.

**Marginal Abatement Cost Curves
in General Equilibrium: The
Influence of World Energy Prices**

Gernot Klepper and Sonja Peterson

NOTA DI LAVORO 136.2004

NOVEMBER 2004

CCMP – Climate Change Modelling and Policy

Gernot Klepper and Sonja Peterson, *Kiel Institute for World Economics*

This paper can be downloaded without charge at:

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

Social Science Research Network Electronic Paper Collection:
<http://ssrn.com/abstract=615665>

Marginal Abatement Cost Curves in General Equilibrium: The Influence of World Energy Prices

Summary

Marginal abatement cost curves (MACCs) are one of the favorite instruments to analyze the impacts of the implementation of the Kyoto Protocol and emissions trading. As shown in this paper one important factor that influences MACCs are energy prices. This leads to the question of how to define MACCs in a general equilibrium context where the overall abatement level world wide influences energy prices and thus national MACCs. We first discuss the mechanisms theoretically and then use the CGE model DART to quantify the effects. The result is, that changes in energy prices resulting from different world wide abatement levels do indeed affect the national MACCs. Also, we compare different possibilities of defining MACCs - of which some turn out to be robust against changes in energy prices while others vary considerably.

Keywords: Climate change, Marginal abatement cost, Energy price, Computable general equilibrium model

JEL Classification: C68, D58, F18, Q41

Address for correspondence:

Gernot Klepper
Kiel Institute for World Economics
Duestenbrooker Weg 120
24100 Kiel
Germany
Phone: +49 0 431 8814 485
Fax: +49 0 431 8814 522
E-mail: gklepper@ifw-kiel.de

1 Introduction

In the last years marginal abatement cost curves (MACCs) have become a standard tool to analyze the impacts of the Kyoto Protocol and emissions trading. Once such curves are available for the different world regions it is very easy to determine permit prices, total abatement cost and regional emissions for different scenarios of international emissions trading. A detailed description of the use of the MACCs is provided in the papers of Ellerman and Decaux (1998) and Criqui, Mima, and Viguir (1999). A number of other authors have followed the approach (Blanchard, Criqui, and Kitous 2002; den Elzen and de Moor 2002; Loeschel and Zhang 2002; Lucas, den Elzen, and van Vuuren 2002; van Steenberghe 2002) analyzing scenarios such as emissions trading with and without the participation of the USA, the use of market power by Russia and the Ukraine, multiple gas abatement and banking.

All these studies implicitly assume that each region/country has its unique marginal abatement cost curve - independent of e.g. the abatement levels of other regions or whether emissions trading is taking place or not. One justification for this assumption is the finding of Ellerman and Decaux (1998) that MACCs are indeed robust with respect to such policy parameters. This is somehow a surprise as Ellerman and Decaux note themselves that with international trade the abatement level in one country influences trade flows such that the MACCs may change in other countries. Their simulations with the EPPA model though, show that the variation in prices is less than 10% between different scenarios for any given level of abatement.

Commonly, the marginal abatement cost for a certain abatement level is derived as the shadow price for the associated emission constraint. As we will discuss, this shadow price is influenced by world energy prices which differ across different abatement scenarios. The reason behind this is that abatement levels in one country influence its energy demand, which might in turn influence the world energy price. With, for example, higher world energy prices regions automatically demand less energy and emit less carbon so that the same emission target becomes less binding. The magnitude of the

difference in shadow prices depends on a number of factors such as trade elasticities and trade structures. This suggests that MACCs depend on world energy prices and may shift across different abatement scenarios.

Against this background, this paper tries to clarify what MACCs are, what factors influence the MACCs in different scenarios and how the MACCs should be used. In addition, the problem of choosing the reference point for the MACC is discussed. We will first explore the energy price effects theoretically in a stylized model and second quantify them using the computable general equilibrium model DART. The main result is that not only theoretically MACCs change with varying energy prices, but that the difference can reach a magnitude that cannot be neglected.

The paper proceeds as follows. The next sections defines marginal abatement cost curves, explains how they are constructed and used in practice and presents estimates for different regions. Section 3 shows in different settings how shadow prices depend on energy prices and how this affects MACCs. Section 4 introduces the computable general equilibrium model DART, defines our scenarios and presents the results of the simulations. Section 7 concludes.

2 Marginal Abatement Cost Curves

The idea of a marginal abatement cost curve (MACC) comes from firm or plant level models of reducing emissions. In production theory the interpretation is straightforward. Given that some activities in the production process lead to emissions of undesired substances and given some abatement technology, the marginal abatement costs represent either the marginal loss in profits from avoiding the last unit of emissions or the marginal cost of achieving a certain emission target given some level of output. Whereas the latter focuses on abatement technologies such as filters for air or water pollutants, the former concept is more interested in the overall adjustment of a firm to an emission constraint including adjustments in the level of output (McKittrick 1999).

The concept of a MACC has been adopted recently for climate policy analyses in the context of a general equilibrium framework. It is argued that an economy as a whole can be treated like a production plant, and hence the concept of a MACC can be applied analogously. Intuitively then, a MACC for an economy represents the social cost of a the last unit of emissions abated in the economy.

As most empirical studies using economy wide MACCs are concerned with CO₂ abatement a number of problems disappear. For CO₂, economical capture or sequestration technologies currently do not exist. Therefore, the question of abatement activities can be ignored and the notion of a MACC in terms of abatement cost at a given output level makes little sense in this case. CO₂ abatement is possible only through a reduction in the use of fossil fuels combined with adjustments in other inputs and a reduction in output. In addition, CO₂ emissions occur in fixed proportions to the burning of the different fossil fuels. This makes a firm level MACC for CO₂ almost trivial and the interpretation of an economy wide MACC somewhat easier.

In practice, MACCs are constructed and used without further reflecting the theoretical concepts. Two general types of models are used to analyze climate policies as well as to generate MACCs for different regions. The first approach is denoted top-down and is based on aggregated microeconomic models. The models are most often computable general equilibrium (CGE) models that may carry a detailed representation of the energy sector. Bottom-up models on the other hand are based on an engineering approach that analyzes the different technical potentials for emission reductions in detail.

In a CGE model, the marginal abatement cost is defined as the shadow cost that is produced by a constraint on carbon emissions for a given region and a given time. This shadow cost is equal to the tax that would have to be levied on the emissions to achieve the targeted level or the price of an emission permit in the case of emissions trading. The more severe the constraint, the higher the marginal abatement costs are. Marginal abatement costs curves are obtained, when the costs associated with different levels of reductions are generated. Ellerman and Decaux (1998) use the EPPA model and run it with proportional reductions by all OECD countries of 1, 5, 10, 15, 20, 30 and 40

percent of 2010 emissions and fit simple analytical curves to the sets of plots. They find that each region has a unique curve independently of how the other regions behave and independent of how the reductions are implemented (emissions trading versus regional constraints).

Besides the EPPA-MACCs many models (Boehringer and Loeschel 2001; Blanchard, Criqui, and Kitous 2002; Criqui, Mima, and Viguir 1999; Loeschel and Zhang 2002) use curves generated from the energy systems model POLES (Criqui, Cattier, Menanteau, and Quido 1996) which is mainly a bottom-up model. Here, the MACCs are constructed the other way around. Different levels of a "shadow carbon tax" are levied on all areas of fossil fuel use. Via technological or implicit behavioral changes and the replacements in the energy conversion systems for which the technologies are explicitly defined in POLES, this leads to adjustments in the final energy demand and to the corresponding levels of emission reductions.

Another rather ad-hoc approach to estimate MACCs is used by Gheri (2001). He uses the shadow costs for the two scenarios where Kyoto is first implemented through unilateral emission reductions and second by international emissions trading which are reported for twelve different models affiliated to the Energy Modelling Forum (Weyant 1999). This approach is only valid though, if the MACCs are indeed robust against changes of policy.

Taken together, the literature shows that the MACCs vary considerably across different models and depend on the different model types and model assumptions e.g. on baseline growth and baseline emissions. Nevertheless, all models more or less produce the same ranking of marginal abatement costs across economies.

In the literature there are two ways to visualize MACCs: either with absolute emission reductions on the abscissa or with percentage reductions relative to the benchmark in a certain year (usually 2010). Figure 1 shows the marginal abatement cost curves for the Annex B regions of the DART model, when each country unilaterally undertakes an emission reduction in both graphical visualizations. For a comparison we also include




Figure 1: Typical marginal abatement cost curves

some curves from the EPPA and the POLES model¹ taken from Criqui et al. (1999) and Ellerman and Decaux (1998). Although the curves differ across models, they result in the same ranking. The same amount of emission reductions is cheapest in the USA, followed by Eastern Europe and the Foreign Soviet Union (FEB) and Western Europe (WEU). The reductions are most expensive in Japan (JPN) and the remaining Annex B countries (ANC = Canada, Australia, New Zealand). Regarding relative targets, the same percentage reduction relative to the benchmark is more equal across the regions but differs more across models. To keep the figure clear, we only included the EPPA curves for WEU and the USA. Abatement is again most expensive in Japan, followed now by Western Europe and the USA, ANC and finally FEB.

It is clear that MACCs are influenced by factors such as the initial level of energy prices, the energy supply structure and the potential for developing carbon free energy resources (Criqui, Mima, and Viguir 1999). Also, den Elzen and Both (2002) note that it is well possible that MACCs are dependent of the behavior of the rest of the world. Nevertheless, these issues have not been explored yet. We will discuss in the next section for different settings, how MACCs depend on world fossil fuel prices and how they have to be defined in a general equilibrium context.

3 The Role of Fossil Fuel Prices

Although the first intuition for regional MACCs, discussed in the last section, sounds convincing, there exist a number of traps if one tries to define in exact terms the idea of a MACC for an economy. The main aspect differentiating firm level MACCs from economy wide MACCs is the treatment of prices. At firm level output and input prices are exogenously given. Hence, the marginal abatement costs of meeting a certain emission target consist of a combination of output reduction and end-of-pipe emission reductions, all evaluated at given prices. In a general equilibrium framework though,

¹The curves from the EPPA and the POLES model are only approximated from graphs and not generated using the exact data. Also, the regional aggregation is not exactly the same across models.

many prices are determined endogenously. One could in analogue to the firm level approach evaluate the MACC at constant prices. This would constitute an appropriate approach as long as only marginal costs in the neighborhood of the original equilibrium are evaluated. For the marginal cost of larger emission reductions it is likely that goods and factor prices will change. As social costs are clearly determined by the variable prices, taking the definition of the MACC seriously implies to work with variable prices.

As mentioned, MACCs are linked to shadow costs of emission constraints. These are thus the starting point for our theoretical analysis. In order to highlight issues that need to be taken into account when MACCs for an economy are to be derived we start with the firm level and then extended the approach to a whole economy. In a final step, we discuss the implications for MACCs derived from the shadow costs based on different approaches.

Emission constraints at firm level

Suppose, there is a firm that uses capital K , labor L , and fossil fuels F as inputs in the production of its output X . Input prices are exogenously given by r , w , and p_F . The price of X is without loss of generality set to 1. The technology is given by a production function G with positive but decreasing marginal products for all inputs. CO₂ emissions e depend on the amount of fossil fuel used in production, i.e. $e = \iota F$ where ι denotes the emission coefficient for F . With this simple emission function, constraining e is equivalent to restricting the input F . The profit maximization problem of the firm is

$$\max_{(K,L,F)} \pi(X) = G(K, L, F) - rK - wL - p_F F - \lambda(e - \iota F) \quad (1)$$

The first order conditions are:

$$G_K = \frac{\partial G(K, L, F)}{\partial K} = r \quad (2)$$

$$G_L = \frac{\partial G(K, L, F)}{\partial L} = w \quad (3)$$

$$G_F = \frac{\partial G(K, L, F)}{\partial F} = p_F + \lambda \quad (4)$$

$$\iota F = e \quad (5)$$

With $F^* = e/\iota$ given by equation (7), the optimal $K^*(w, r, p_F, e)$ and $L^*(w, r, p_F, e)$

are determined by equations (4) and (5). By definition, λ is the shadow price of the emission constraint which is determined by equation (6):

$$\lambda(w, r, p_F, e) = \frac{1}{\iota} G_F(K^*, L^*, \frac{e}{\iota}) - \frac{p_F}{\iota} = \frac{1}{\iota} [G_F - p_F] \quad (6)$$

As $\frac{\partial G}{\partial e} = G_e = \frac{1}{\iota} G_F$ is the value of the marginal product of e to the firm, $\lambda + \frac{1}{\iota} p_F$ is thus nothing but the "social" costs of the emission constraint. For an unconstrained emission level e_0 the social cost would be the same as the private cost, which is $\frac{1}{\iota} p_F$ and $\lambda(e_0) = 0$. Note also that as G_F is decreasing in F , $\frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial e} = \frac{1}{\iota^2} \frac{\partial^2 G(K^*, L^*, \frac{e}{\iota})}{\partial^2 F} < 0$ and λ increases with a stricter target $e' < e$. Whether the curve of different shadow costs $\lambda(e)$ is convex, which is mostly assumed, depends on the properties of G . $\lambda(e)$ is strictly convex if and only if $\frac{\partial^3 G(K^*, L^*, \frac{e}{\iota})}{\partial^3 F} > 0$.

Emission constraints in a small open economy

Using the same approach we can also model emission constraints in a general equilibrium context of a small open economy that faces fixed world prices. The economy is now endowed with fixed amounts \bar{K} and \bar{L} of the two factors capital and labor which are internationally immobile and have market returns r and w . In addition, there is an intermediate input² F (fossil fuel) that is used in the production of the final good X . The use of F is again associated with emissions of ιF . Both goods are produced with a constant returns to scale technology. Again, X uses K, L and F and we denote the production function by G . F only uses K and L and the production function for F is

$$F = H(K, L) \quad (7)$$

Both G and H are increasing, concave and linearly homogeneous. We choose X as a numeraire with price one and assume that the world market price of F is p_F . The equilibrium is determined by the zero-profit conditions for both sectors X and F , the full employment conditions for factors K and L and market clearing for the domestic use of F and the consumption of good X . Introducing an emission constraint, leads to a shadow cost of emissions in the profit maximization of X which we again denote λ .

² F is now treated as an intermediate input, as we can think of fossil fuels as being extracted from a resource stock by using capital and labor. CGE models usually use this approach as does DART.

As it is more convenient to use cost functions, we work directly with the gross price of F which is $p := p_F + \iota\lambda$. Also, we need to differentiate between the total production of F and the domestic use F_D . If we define F_I as fossil fuel imports (resp. exports if negative), then $F_D = F + F_I$. The unit cost functions are now defined as:

$$c^F(w, r) = \min_{(K, L)} (rK + wL : H(K, L) = 1) \quad (8)$$

$$c^X(w, r, p) = \min_{(K, L, F_D)} (rK + wL + pF_D) : G(K, L, F_D) = 1 \quad (9)$$

The following six equations then define the equilibrium. The first two are the free entry or zero profit conditions that result from the constant return to scale technologies. The next three are the full employment respectively market clearing conditions for the factors and the intermediate good. The last equation is the constraint on e .

$$c^F(w, r) = p_F \quad (10)$$

$$c^X(w, r, p) = 1 \quad (11)$$

$$\frac{\partial c^F(w, r)}{\partial w} (F_D - F_I) + \frac{\partial c^X(w, r, p)}{\partial w} X = \bar{L} \quad (12)$$

$$\frac{\partial c^F(w, r)}{\partial r} (F_D - F_I) + \frac{\partial c^X(w, r, p)}{\partial r} X = \bar{K} \quad (13)$$

$$\frac{\partial c^X(w, r, p)}{\partial p} X = F_D \quad (14)$$

$$\iota F_D = e \quad (15)$$

The exogenous parameters are the factor endowments \bar{K} and \bar{L} , the world market price p_F for F and the emission level e which directly determines $F_D = e/\iota$. Besides F_D , the endogenous variables are X, F_I, w, r and λ . The first two equations can be solved for equilibrium factor prices w^* and r^* as a function of the exogenous parameter p_F and of λ^* . With factor prices then determined the next two equations together with $F_D = e/\iota$ solve for X^* and F^* as a function of p_F, \bar{K}, \bar{L}, e and of λ^* . λ^* is determined by the fifth equation and depends on p_F, \bar{K}, \bar{L}, e and p_F . Adding an income equation would deliver us the amount of X that is consumed domestically.

While on firm level an exogenous change of p_F to $p_F - \Delta$ leads to a change of λ to $\lambda + \Delta/\iota$ so that the gross price of fossil fuel under an emission constraint remains the

same, the case is now more difficult. In the appendix we show that

$$d\lambda = -\frac{dp_F}{\iota}(1 + C(e, p_F)) \quad (16)$$

C is a constant that depends on the level of the emission target e . The first term $\frac{dp_F}{\iota}$ captures the effects that were already present at firm level: to keep the demand for F in the X sector constant, the change in p_F is accompanied by the same change in λ scaled by the emission factor. But now, a decrease (or increase) in p_F does not only change the input price of F in the X sector, but also the world market price of X in relation to the price of F , which represents the terms of trade. For non-nested production functions it is possible to show that $C(e, p_F) > 0^3$. Note also, that the change in λ captures two effects: the fall in input prices in the X sector and a shift of production between the two sectors which corresponds to the decrease in output in the firm level example.

There are other analogies to the firm level case. It is possible to show (Copeland and Taylor 2003; Woodland 1982) that the system of equations (10)-(15) is equivalent to maximizing the national income function where the underlying technology T is described by the production functions G and H and the emission constraint:

$$GDP(\bar{K}, \bar{L}, p_F, e) = \max_{(X, F)}(X + p_F F : (X, F) \in T(X, F, e)) \quad (17)$$

A useful property of the GDP function is that the returns to capital and labor are obtained by differentiating with respect to the relevant factor endowment.

$$\frac{\partial GDP(\bar{K}, \bar{L}, p_F, e)}{\partial K} = r \quad \frac{\partial GDP(\bar{K}, \bar{L}, p_F, e)}{\partial L} = w \quad (18)$$

equivalently we have,

$$\frac{\partial GDP(\bar{K}, \bar{L}, p_F, e/\iota)}{\partial F} = p_F + \iota\lambda \Leftrightarrow \lambda = \frac{1}{\iota} \frac{\partial GDP(K, L, p_F, e/\iota)}{\partial F} - \frac{1}{\iota} p_F \quad (19)$$

and the GDP function analogous to the production or output function in the firm level case. This relationship can also be used to determine the marginal change in GDP due

³This is shown in the appendix. For general (including nested) production functions we were unable to determine the sign of $C(e, p_F)$. As $C(e, p_F)$ captures the terms of trade effect, the intuition suggests that always $C(e, p_F) > 0$: With a decrease in p_F the economy will tend to produce more X and less F , increasing the demand for F_D in the X sector. This in turn will increase λ even further.

to a marginal change in the emission target:

$$\frac{\partial GDP(\bar{K}, \bar{L}, p_F, e/\iota)}{\partial e} = \frac{1}{\iota} \frac{\partial GDP(\bar{K}, \bar{L}, p_F, e/\iota)}{\partial F} = \frac{p_F}{\iota} + \lambda \quad (20)$$

If e_0 are unconstrained emissions, the total loss in GDP of reducing emissions to e^* is

$$dGDP = \int_{e^*}^{e_0} (\lambda(e) + p_F/\iota) de = \int_{e^*}^{e_0} \lambda(e) de + (e_0 - e^*) p_F/\iota \quad (21)$$

Thus, the area under the MACC is only one part of the total loss in GDP.

Emission constraints in a large open economy

The next step would be to skip the assumption of exogenous world market prices and to assume a large open economy. As the algebra of an appropriate model becomes very tedious while the basic effects remain the same, we will only give the intuition of the differences to the small economy case.

A corresponding scenario for an exogenous shock on p_F would be the introduction of a stricter environmental policy abroad which reduces the foreign demand for F and in turn drives down p_F . As the relative price of X increases, the domestic country shifts factors from the F to the X sector and increases the output of X . At the same time, as F becomes cheaper, the X sector will use more F and less labor and capital. These two effects, which are the same as in the case of the small open economy and which are reflected in equation (16), will increase the domestic demand for F . To keep emissions and thus F on a constant level λ has to rise. The only difference to the small economy case is now that with less F and more X being produced domestically, the price of X decreases relative to the price of F , which implies that p_F rises. Part of the external decrease in p_F is offset by the domestic shift of production which decreases λ . Thus, in a large open economy an external shock on p_F also affects λ but this effect is less severe than in a small open economy because of an adaptation of the terms of trade.

Summarized, it is thus not p_F that influences the domestic shadow cost but the emission constraint within the economy e and the emission constraints in the rest of the world e^* that determine p_F . The influence of different emission constraints in the rest of the

world on the shadow cost of the domestic economy can now be described by

$$\frac{d\lambda(e, e^*)}{de^*} = -\frac{1}{\iota}(1 + D(e, e^*))\frac{dp_F}{de^*} \quad (22)$$

An interpretation of MACCs

So far, we have avoided the term MACC in this theoretical part and only talked about shadow costs of emission constraints. We will now discuss how these can be used to derive MACCs under changing fossil fuel prices. Again, we start at the firm level, where the implications of different definitions can be illustrated using a social cost curve.

At firm level all prices are exogenous. The relationship between the price of fossil fuels p_F and the shadow costs of an emission constraint, $\lambda(e)$ is

$$\frac{d\lambda(e)}{dp_F} = -\frac{1}{\iota} \quad \text{or} \quad d\lambda(e) = -\frac{1}{\iota}dp_F \quad (23)$$

This implies that for given factor and output prices, $\lambda(e) + \frac{1}{\iota}p_F$, the social costs of constraining energy use and emissions at e is simply the sum of the fossil fuel price divided by the emission coefficient for CO₂ and the shadow price of the constraint. For the cases of a small and a large open economy the relation between p_F and $\lambda(e)$ is not linear anymore. Nevertheless, as equations (16) and (22) show they are still closely linked. Figure 2 shows a typical social cost function.

The graph of the social cost is composed of the market price of fossil fuel measured in emission units and the shadow price of the emission constraint. Now take the case given in equation (23). If no emission constraint is imposed this curve simply depicts the unconstrained emission levels at alternative fossil fuel prices. E.g., at some fossil fuel price p_F/ι the emissions would be $e_0(p_F)$; similarly for $(p_F - \Delta)/\iota$ they would be $e_0(p_F - \Delta)$. If an emission target of e^* is imposed (as it is the case in the Kyoto Protocol) the social cost is - irrespectively of the prevailing price of fossil fuels - represented by point B on the social cost curve. For p_F/ι , $\lambda(e^*, p_F)$ is the part of the social cost that represents the shadow cost of the emission constraint. For $(p_F - \Delta)/\iota$ this part increases by Δ/ι . Hence, marginal abatement costs depend to a large degree on the underlying fossil fuel price.




Figure 2: The social cost curve

There are now two ways in which the traditional MACCs can be derived from this social cost function. The first way consists of showing the MACC in terms of units of emissions abated, i.e. the difference between unconstrained emissions and the constrained emissions (figure 3a). The MACCs, as usually drawn, would have A as the origin and take the mirror image of the graph of AB in figure 2. This graph would be defined for a specific price p_F . In the case of a different reference situation (e.g. due to other policies outside the economy under consideration which result in different fossil fuel prices) such as $p_F - \Delta$ the new graph would be $A'B'$. The two graphs are illustrated in Figure 3a. In such a representation of MACCs all curves go through the origin but they have different shapes depending on the fossil fuel price at the reference point of no emission control. Figure 3a also shows that the same abatement effort a has different marginal abatement costs depending on the initial fossil fuel price and, therefore, different initial emissions levels⁴.

⁴Note that B'' equals B on the social cost curve in figure 2.




Figure 3: Two ways of depicting MACCs

The second variant of the graph of a MACC is the representation in emission levels as shown in figure 3b. In this case the abscissa of the social cost representation is kept. However, the graphs of AB and $A'B'$ are shifted downward by the fossil fuel price at the reference situation. Hence, this MACC represents the shadow price of an emission level, i.e. net of the fossil fuel price. A certain abatement effort $a := e_0(p_F) - e^* = e_0(p_F - \Delta) - e'$ would either have marginal costs depicted by B (for an initial p_F) or by B' (for an initial $p_F - \Delta$).

In analog to the first variant of a MACC it is also possible to define a third variant with relative (instead of absolute) abatement on the abscissa. As this simply implies a re-scaling respectively a monotonic transformation of the MACCs in figure 3a, the qualitative results remain the same for such MACCs.

Finally, figure 2 can be used to illustrate the loss in output (corresponding to a loss in GDP in a small open economy). The area $e_0(p_F)AO$ represents the cost of fossil fuels, measured in units of emissions. The additional loss due to the emission target is the area $e^*BAe_0(p_F)$. It equals the area under the $MACC(e, p_F)$ which is e^*BA in figure 3b plus the abated emissions $a = e^* - e_0(p_F)$ multiplied by p_F/ι .

For the purpose of illustrating the impact of the reference situation for deriving the MACC, consider the Kyoto commitment of a relatively small country like Japan. One could derive the MACC by assuming that the rest of the world does not impose any emission constraint and Japan increases its abatement by the quantity a . The MACCs in figure 3a and 3b would be represented by the graph AB . Alternatively, one could start with the AXB countries meeting the Kyoto targets and derive the Japan MACC from that reference situation. This reference situation would consist of a lower fossil fuel price $p_F - \Delta$ and result in a graph like $A'B'$ in both figure 3a and 3b. The quantity of emissions abated and the corresponding cost of the Kyoto Protocol would be B on the upper graph of figure 3a in the first case and B on the lower graph of the same figure in the second case. I.e., in the AXB reference situation more abatement quantities and higher prices are required than in the unilateral reference situation. In the alternative representation of figure 3b the emission target of the Kyoto Protocol is e^* and the corresponding MACCs would either be represented by AB (the left graph) or by $A'B'B''$ (the graph on the right). In this case the higher baseline emissions due to the negative demand effect on fossil fuels of the AXB countries meeting their Kyoto targets becomes apparent through higher baseline emissions $e_0(p_F - \Delta)$.

The question of robustness of MACCs can now be addressed either by looking at the difference in costs for a certain abatement a such as B and B' in figure 3a. Or one could ask for the robustness of the marginal cost estimate for meeting a certain cap such as e^* . In this case the difference of the points B and B'' on the two graphs of both figure 3a and 3b are assessed.

When moving to a general equilibrium setting in a small open economy, the resource constraint on capital and labor needs to be accounted for. The economy now faces an economy wide emissions constraint, a given factor endowment, and exogenous world market prices. As shown in equation (16) changes in p_F and changes in shadow prices λ are in this case not linearly independent due to the term $C(e, p_F)$. As a result, the social cost of a certain emission constraint depends on p_F and there is - different to the firm level case - not one single social cost curve but one curve for each p_F . This

is shown in figure 4. Here, the dotted curve represents the unconstrained emissions that are associated with different p_F . If emissions are now constraint at some given p_F the social cost curve for that p_F starts at A . For a different $p_F - \Delta$ it starts at A' . The MACCs corresponding to the MACCs for the firm level in figure 3a, are the curves going again through AB and $A'B'$. The MACCs corresponding to the curves in figure 3b are now AB and $A'B'C$.




Figure 4: Social cost curves in a small open economy

The most complex case is the one of a large open economy where world market prices become endogenous. Thinking, e.g., of a two country model, the only exogenous parameters are now the factor endowments and policies. With respect to climate policy, it is not p_F that influences the domestic social costs of a certain emission constraint e and any derived MACC but the emission constraints in the rest of the world \bar{e} . Together, e and \bar{e} then determine p_F . The mechanisms through which the economies interact in the world economy become quite complex now. A set of emission constraints (e, \bar{e}) can

be used to derive first a particular social cost curve. This curve now results - for a given \bar{e} and for varying levels of e - in variable fossil fuel prices p_F since these prices are not only determined by \bar{e} (as in the small country case) but also by e itself. Hence, fossil fuel prices vary along a particular social cost curve. This makes the derivation of the part that is not inherit in the fossil fuel price (the MAC) more complex and implies that fossil fuel prices vary along any derived MACC as well. Again the question is as to whether this endogeneity really shows up in empirically derived curves.

If it does, it has consequences for using MACCs. Take an example with two economies, "home" with target e and "foreign" with target \bar{e} . Suppose the $MACC_h(e, \bar{e})$ for home is derived by varying e for a given \bar{e} which is a straightforward exercise. The problem is, there is no corresponding $MACC_f(e, \bar{e})$ of the foreign economy as each emission constraint e will result in a different $MACC_f(e, \bar{e})$. That means to each point on $MACC_h(e, \bar{e})$ corresponds a particular $MACC_f(e, \bar{e})$ and vice versa. In that sense the exercise of using several regional MACCs for establishing shadow prices of emission constraints or for deriving trade flows in an emissions trading system must fail unless the MACCs are insensitive enough with respect to the emission level abroad.

4 Empirical Results

To quantify the strength of the shifts in the MACCs in different scenarios for different regions, we use the CGE model DART.

4.1 Simulations with the DART Model

The DART (**D**ynamic **A**ppplied **R**egional **T**rade) model is a multi-region, multi-sector recursive dynamic CGE model of the world economy developed at the Kiel Institute for World Economics to analyze climate policies. In the version used for this paper it covers 11 sectors and 12 regions and the two production factors labor and capital. The regional aggregation for this study includes the USA, Japan (JPN), Western Europe

(WEU), the Former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe (FEB), and the remaining Annex B parties (ANC: Australia, New Zealand, Canada), that agreed to emission reductions in the Kyoto Protocol. The economic structure of the DART model is fully specified for each region and covers production, final consumption and investment. For a more detailed model description see Klepper et al. (2003).

We now use the DART model to quantify the effects of different reference scenarios on the location and shape of the MACCs. Many different reference situations can be imagined. Since the Kyoto Protocol is an often used simulation scenario we compute the MACCs for the year 2010 at which the Kyoto commitments will be binding. We choose two scenarios for which we compute the MACC:⁵

UNI In the UNI scenario a country reduces its emissions whereas all other countries are assumed to follow a growth path without any emission constraint.

AXB All Annex B countries, except the region for which the MACC is constructed, reduce emissions according to their Kyoto commitment⁶. The reductions are achieved by unilateral emission taxes. As in our model FEB does not reach its target emissions in 2010 they do not face reductions.

For these two scenarios two sets of numbers are computed. The UNI set consists of the results of a unilateral emission reduction schedule between the unconstrained emissions and a 40% reduction relative to benchmark emissions in each of the five Annex B regions mentioned above. The targets are varied in steps of five percentage points. The AXB set consists of the same reductions in each region but under the assumptions that the other Annex B regions meet their Kyoto target.

⁵We do not consider emissions trading here, as with emissions trading the abatement levels of all countries change in comparison to the unilateral action scenario and are dependent on the participants in the trading scheme. We would thus not only see a shift in MACCs, but also a move along one curve. As the focus of this paper is on the shift of the curves, we restrict ourselves to the non-trading case.

⁶The Kyoto targets applied in this study are the targets induced by the agreements in Bonn and Marrakech and include sinks. We use the reductions cited in Boehringer (2001) and derive the targets for our regional aggregation using IEA emission data. The targets are relative to 1990 emission: USA: 96.8%, WEU: 94.8%, ANC: 109%, JPN: 99.2% and FEB 103%.

These data are then used to compute the three representations of MACCs as discussed above. The results for these curves are given in the Appendix tables 1 and 2. Table 1 corresponds to the MACCs shown in figure 3b. Table 2 shows the numbers for the figure 3a, once in terms of abated quantities and once as the percentage abated relative to the unconstrained emissions in the respective scenario.

4.2 Simulation Results

The numbers in Annex Table 1 are based on absolute emission targets for each region and thus resemble the MACCs in figure 3b. The unconstrained emission level in the scenario UNI differs from that of the scenario AXB and thus the points A and A' in figure 3b represent UNI and AXB. The emission target e^* (figure 3b) could be the Kyoto target marked with an asterisk in table 1. The points B and B'' would correspond to the MAC of Kyoto under UNI and AXB. It is clear that meeting the target e^* would require different abatement levels under the two reference scenarios for computing MACCs. In contrast, the point B' in figure 3b would represent the same abatement level under AXB as under UNI. However, it would not lead to the same emission target.

Table 2a shows the quantities for the MACCs in terms of abatement levels as represented in figure 3a. The origin of the graphs of the MACCs represents the unconstrained emission levels both in UNI and in AXB. Notice, however, that the origin of the two curves refers to different baseline emissions with AXB levels being higher than UNI levels. If we again take the Kyoto target for a particular region, e.g. Japan, that corresponds to a reduction of about 80 MtC. The point B in figure 3a would then result in MACs of 116.13 USD, whereas point B' - the same abatement level under scenario AXB - would result in MACs of 104.35 USD.

Similarly shaped graphs of MACCs as in figure 3a would emerge from the numbers in table 2b. The difference is in the scaling of the abscissa⁷. It should be kept in mind

⁷To be precise, the move from absolute to relative targets does not only imply a re-scaling of the abscissa, but also a shift in the relative position of the two MACCs since the reference situations have different emission levels.

that drawing the MACCs in relative changes yields again different abatement levels since the baseline in UNI and AXB differs. Hence, a certain percentage reduction of x percent would not represent the same absolute reduction in both scenarios.

There are now essentially three ways of defining robustness of the MACCs corresponding to the three representations. The first which is probably used by Ellerman and Decaux (1998) refers to the representation in percentage reductions and compares a certain percentage reduction of $a\%$ in the two scenarios, hence it compares B' and B in figure 3a when drawn not in levels abated but in percentages abated. The second would do the same exercise in absolute abatement levels, hence comparing B and B' in figure 3a. Finally, one can compare the two MACCs in terms of a certain emission target, e.g. the Kyoto target. This would result in a comparison of B and B'' which both represent the same emission target under the two scenarios.

When we compute these differences it turns out that the first approach to checking robustness would always result in deviations of less than 10% in the simulations of DART, supporting the results of Ellerman and Decaux (1998). In fact, the difference is in most countries even below 5%, and only reaches 6% resp. 7% in Japan and ANC. In the second approach with fixed absolute abatement relative to the unconstrained emissions, the difference is still below 10% in most cases and only reaches 11 - 13% for high abatement levels in Japan and ANC. The third variant, however, leads to substantial differences in the MACs for a given emission target, that can reach up to 50% for low abatement levels. For example, in WEU, JPN and ANC the difference between the MAC based on the UNI and one based on the AXB reference for the Kyoto target is above 20%.

In addition, corresponding to the theoretical findings, the simulation results show qualitatively different moves of the MACC UNI to the MACC AXB in the three representations. As an example, figure 5 depicts these three representations for Japan.

For fixed emission targets (table 1, figure 5c) we can see that the MACC is indeed shifted upward through lower fossil fuel prices in AXB as shown in figure 3b. Since




Figure 5: The MACCs for Japan in three different representations

we are computing the general equilibrium effects the presentation in the simplified framework of the firm level MACC needs to be checked against the social cost curves as shown in figure 4. In fact, the numbers computed and the graphs of figure 5 show that the shape of the MACCs which would be determined by the adjustment in the terms-of-trade does not significantly change. Hence, the two social cost curves shown in figure 4 have very similar shape. This indicates that the major influence on the robustness of MACCs is induced by the fossil fuel price effect of different reference scenarios and not by the endogeneity of those prices in a general equilibrium framework. One should be aware, however, that we are computing rather small changes in relative prices based on actual policy proposals. For larger changes the general equilibrium effects may need to be taken into account when assessing the robustness of MACCs.

The strength of the shift imposed by different reference scenarios varies, depending on the region, between 2 and 14 USD/tC. It is influenced among other things by each countries share of Annex B emissions and the importance of energy exports or imports⁸ In the case of the USA, for example, the shift is much smaller (around 5 USD/tC) than for Japan (around 14 USD/tC). The parallel shift also explains, why the relative difference between the two MACCS is higher for lower abatement levels.

In the case of MACCs in terms of emissions abated (table 2, figure 5a & b) the move from UNI to AXB turns the the MACC clockwise around the origin. Finally, the difference between UNI and AXB is from this point of view much smaller then the difference for fixed emission targets. Again, this corresponds to the graphical example where the difference between B and B' in figure 3a is smaller then the difference between B and B'' in figure 3b. As a result MACCs in terms of abatement levels are robust, while MACCs in terms of emission targets are not.

⁸See Klepper & Peterson (2003) for a detailed discussion on the factors influencing the strength of the shift.

5 Conclusions

In the previous sections we have shown theoretically and empirically how marginal abatement cost curves depend on abatement levels in the rest of the world via changes in international fossil fuel prices. We also discussed three different possibilities to derive graphs for MACCs from the social cost curves of emission restrictions: in terms of emission targets, in terms of absolute abatement relative to the unconstrained emission level and finally in terms of relative (percentage) abatement relative to the unconstrained emission levels. For each of these approaches one can define measures of robustness with respect to the reference situation of the simulation exercise. It turns out that even though in all cases MACCs react to energy prices, this reaction is rather small in the two latter cases, so that the MACCs in terms of absolute or relative abatement levels can be termed robust. The MACCs in terms of emission targets though, may change considerably.

The question remains whether there is one "true" representation of a MACC. We believe this is not the case, since the three representations refer to three different ways of looking at the problem. The MACCs in terms of absolute or relative abatement levels show the marginal cost of a certain reduction level starting from a particular reference situation that is not explicitly shown in such graphs. Hence, the impact of fossil fuel prices on the overall social cost is not very transparent. Such MACCs turn out to be quite robust, mainly because absolute and relative abatement levels are taken without reference to particular emission targets. However, the costs of reaching, e.g., the Kyoto target with a fixed emission level, may be better illustrated with the MACCs shown in terms of emission levels. These graphs implicitly take into account the effect of different reference situations influencing fossil fuel prices. They are less robust, mainly because for reaching a certain emission target the abatement levels need to be varied under different reference situations thus leading to an amplification of marginal costs.

Instead of using the MACCs one could directly refer to the social cost curve for achieving a certain emission target. This approach explicitly takes into account the interaction of

marginal abatement costs and fossil fuel prices. In addition, it is the social cost curve that is used to determine the welfare loss in terms of GDP of a certain emission target - not any of the MACCs. As the social cost is the sum of the fossil fuel price and the marginal abatement cost, the information of MACs alone - not accompanied by the associated fossil fuel prices - is of little help.

The theoretical part has shown that in the setting of open economies unique social cost curves of emissions only exist for a particular fossil fuel price - in the case of a small open economy - or for a particular emission level in the rest of the world - in the case of a large open economy. They define a set of curves as illustrated in figure 4. For empirical purposes, however, the simulations have shown that the differences in the shapes of these curves are very small when compared to the differences imposed by the fossil fuel prices. The discussion about the robustness of MACCs is in fact concerned with the shape of different social cost curve at different segments of these curves. In contrast, the open economy effects on the social cost curve determine the distance between the social cost curves under different reference scenarios which do hardly change the shape of a MACC. In summary, the robustness of MACCs with respect to different reference situations is something to check when transferring MACCs derived from a particular simulation exercise to other policy scenarios. The international relative price effects of the open economy framework, on the other hand, do not seem to affect MACCs in a significant way.

References

- Blanchard, O., P. Criqui, and A. Kitous, 2002. After the Hague, Bonn and Marrakech: the future international market for emission permits and the issue of hot air. Cahier de Recherche 27, Institute d'Economie et de Politique de l'Energy, Paris.
- Boehringer, C., 2001. Climate Politics From Kyoto to Bonn: From Little to Nothing?!? Discussion Paper 01-49, ZEW, Mannheim.
- Boehringer, C. and A. Loeschel, 2001. Market Power in International Emission Trad-

- ing: The Impacts of U.S. Withdrawal from the Kyoto Protocol. Discussion Paper 01-58, ZEW, Mannheim.
- Copeland, B. R. and S. M. Taylor, 2003. Trade and the Environment - Theory and Evidence. Princeton University Press.
- Criqui, P., F. Cattier, P. Menanteau, and M. Quido, 1996. POLES 2.2 Reference Guide. Technical report, Institute of Energy Policy and Economics.
- Criqui, P., S. Mima, and L. Viguir, 1999. Marginal abatement cost of CO₂ emission reductions, geographical flexibility and concrete ceilings: an assessment using the POLES model. *Energy Policy* 27, 585–601.
- den Elzen, M. G. J. and S. Both, 2002. Modelling emission trading and abatement cost in FAIR1.1. RIVM report 728001/021, Netherland National Institute of Public Health and the Environment (RIVM).
- den Elzen, M. G. J. and A. P. G. de Moor, 2002. Evaluating the Bonn-Marrakech Agreement. *Climate Policy* 2, 111–117.
- Ellerman, D. A. and A. Decaux, 1998. Analysis of Post-Kyoto CO₂ Emission Trading Using Marginal Abatement Curves. Report 40, Massachusetts Institute of Technology - Joint Program on the Science and Policy of Global Change.
- Gherzi, F., 2001. SAP 12. Technical description, C.I.R.E.D.
- Klepper, G. and S. Peterson, 2003. On the Robustness of Marginal Abatement Cost Curves: The Influence of World Energy Prices. Kiel Working Paper 1138, Kiel Institute for World Economics.
- Klepper, G., S. Peterson, and K. Springer, 2003. DART97: A description of the multi-regional, multi-sectoral trade model for the analysis of climate policies. Kiel Working Paper 1149, Kiel Institute for World Economics.
- Loeschel, A. and Z. X. Zhang, 2002. The Economic and Environmental Implications of the US Repudiation of the Kyoto Protocol and the Subsequent Deals in Bonn and Marrakech. *Nota di la Voro* 23.2002, Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei.
- Lucas, P. L., M. G. den Elzen, and D. P. van Vuuren, 2002. Multi-gas abatement

analysis of the Marrakech Accords. Paper prepared for the conference on Global Trading; Kiel 30. September - 1.October 2002.

McKittrick, R., 1999. A Derivation of the Marginal Abatement Cost curve. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 37, 306–314.

van Steenberghe, V., 2002. CO₂ abatement costs and permit's price: Exploring the impact of banking and the role of future commitment. Paper prepared for the conference on Global Trading; Kiel 30. September - 1.October 2002.

Weyant, J. P. (Ed.), 1999. The cost of the Kyoto Protocol - A multi-model evaluation. *The Energy Journal - Special Issue*.

Woodland, A. D., 1982. *International Trade and Resource Allocation*. Amsterdam: North-Holland.

A Shift of the MACC in a small open economy

In this section we show how the MACC for a given emission target \bar{e} shifts with a change in the exogenous price of the fossil fuel p_F . To facilitate the notation we define

$$\begin{aligned} p_F + \lambda\iota &= p \\ \frac{\partial c^i}{\partial j} &= c_j^i \quad \frac{\partial c^i}{\partial j \partial j'} = c_{jj'}^i \quad i = F, X; \quad j, j' = w, r, p \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\forall i, j$

$$c_j^i > 0; \quad c_{jj'}^i > 0 \quad \text{for } j \neq j' \quad \text{and } c_{j2}^i < 0 \quad (24)$$

For better readability we repeat the system of equations describing the equilibrium in the small open economy with the new notation:

$$\begin{aligned}
c^F(w, r) &= p_F \\
c^X(w, r, p) &= 1 \\
c_w^F(w, r)(e/\iota - F_I) + c_w^X(w, r, p)X &= \bar{L} \\
c_r^F(w, r)(e/\iota - F_I) + c_r^X(w, r, p)X &= \bar{K} \\
c_p^X(w, r, p)X &= e/\iota
\end{aligned}$$

Assuming an exogenous change of dp_F taking the total derivative gives

$$\begin{pmatrix} c_w^F & c_r^F & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ c_w^X & c_r^X & \iota c_p^X & 0 & 0 \\ a_1 & a_2 & \iota c_{wp}^X X & c_w^F & c_w^X \\ a_3 & a_4 & \iota c_{rp}^X X & c_r^F & c_r^X \\ c_{pw}^X X & c_{pr}^X X & \iota c_{p^2}^X X & 0 & c_p^X \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} dw \\ dr \\ d\lambda \\ -dF_I \\ dX \end{pmatrix} = -dp_F \begin{pmatrix} -1 \\ c_p^X \\ c_{wp}^X X \\ c_{rp}^X X \\ c_{p^2}^X X \end{pmatrix}$$

A
 b
 c

$$\begin{aligned}
a_1 &= c_{w^2}^F(e/\iota - F_I) + c_{w^2}^X X & a_2 &= c_{wr}^F(e/\iota - F_I) + c_{wr}^X X \\
a_3 &= c_{rw}^F(e/\iota - F_I) + c_{rw}^X X & a_4 &= c_{r^2}^F(e/\iota - F_I) + c_{r^2}^X X
\end{aligned}$$

If A^λ is matrix A with the third column replaced by the vector c the solution for $d\lambda$ is by Cramer's Rule

$$d\lambda = \frac{|A^\lambda|}{|A|} \quad \text{with } |\cdot| = \det(\cdot)$$

Developing A^λ by the third row we obtain:

$$|A^\lambda| = dp_F |B| - \frac{dp_F}{\iota} |A|; \quad B = \begin{pmatrix} c_w^X & c_r^X & 0 & 0 \\ a_1 & a_2 & c_w^F & c_w^X \\ a_3 & a_4 & c_r^F & c_r^X \\ c_{pw}^X X & c_{pr}^X X & 0 & c_p^X \end{pmatrix}$$

$$d\lambda = -\frac{dp_f}{\iota} + dp_f \frac{|B|}{|A|}$$

Under some assumptions it is possible to determine the sign of $|A|$ and $|B|$.

$$\begin{aligned}
|B| &= c_w^X \begin{vmatrix} a_2 & c_w^F & c_w^X \\ a_4 & c_r^F & c_r^X \\ c_{pr}^X X & 0 & c_p^X \end{vmatrix} - c_r^X \begin{vmatrix} a_1 & c_w^F & c_w^X \\ a_3 & c_r^F & c_r^X \\ c_{pw}^X X & 0 & c_p^X \end{vmatrix} \\
&= c_w^X c_{pr}^X X (c_w^F c_r^X - c_w^X c_r^F) - c_r^X c_{pw}^X X (c_w^F c_r^X - c_w^X c_r^F) + c_w^X c_p^X (a_2 c_r^F - a_4 c_w^F) \\
&\quad - c_r^X c_p^X (a_1 c_r^F - a_3 c_w^F) \\
&= X (c_w^X c_{pr}^X - c_r^X c_{pw}^X) (c_w^F c_r^X - c_w^X c_r^F) + c_w^X c_p^X (a_2 c_r^F - a_4 c_w^F) - c_r^X c_p^X (a_1 c_r^F - a_3 c_w^F)
\end{aligned}$$

As $c_j^i > 0$ and due to (30) $a_1, a_4 < 0$ and $a_2, a_3 > 0$ the last two terms (including the sign) are positive. For simple production functions, like e.g. a simple Cobb-Douglas or CES function $c_{pw}^X/c_{pr}^X = c_w^X/c_r^X$ and thus $c_w^X c_{pr}^X - c_r^X c_{pw}^X = 0$ so that the first term is zero and $|B| > 0$. For more complicated production functions that are e.g. nested, the sign of the first term depends on the assumptions about the capital intensity in F and X (second bracket) and the input elasticities in the production of X (first bracket).

For A we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|A| &= c_w^F \begin{vmatrix} c_r^X & \iota c_p^X & 0 & 0 \\ a_2 & \iota c_{wp}^X X & c_w^F & c_w^X \\ a_4 & \iota c_{rp}^X X & c_r^F & c_r^X \\ c_{pr}^x X & \iota c_{p^2}^x X & 0 & c_p^X \end{vmatrix} - c_r^F \begin{vmatrix} c_w^X & \iota c_p^X & 0 & 0 \\ a_1 & \iota c_{wp}^X X & c_w^F & c_w^X \\ a_3 & \iota c_{rp}^X X & c_r^F & c_r^X \\ c_{pw}^x X & \iota c_{p^2}^x X & 0 & c_p^X \end{vmatrix} \\
&= (c_w^F c_r^X - c_r^F c_w^X) \begin{vmatrix} \iota c_{wp}^X X & c_w^F & c_w^X \\ \iota c_{rp}^X X & c_r^F & c_r^X \\ \iota c_{p^2}^x X & 0 & c_p^X \end{vmatrix} - \iota c_w^F c_p^X \begin{vmatrix} a_2 & c_w^F & c_w^X \\ a_4 & c_r^F & c_r^X \\ c_{pr}^x X & 0 & c_p^X \end{vmatrix} \\
&\quad + \iota c_r^F c_p^X \begin{vmatrix} a_1 & c_w^F & c_w^X \\ a_3 & c_r^F & c_r^X \\ c_{pw}^x X & 0 & c_p^X \end{vmatrix}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \iota X (c_w^F c_r^X - c_r^F c_w^X) \left[c_p^X (c_w^F c_r^X - c_r^F c_w^X) + c_p^X (c_{wp}^X c_r^F - c_{rp}^X c_w^F) \right] - \\
&\quad \iota c_p^X c_w^F c_{pr}^X X (c_w^F c_r^X - c_w^X c_r^F) - \iota (c_p^X)^2 c_w^F (a_2 c_r^F - a_4 c_w^F) + \\
&\quad \iota c_p^X c_r^F c_{pw}^X X (c_w^F c_r^X - c_w^X c_r^F) + \iota (c_p^X)^2 c_r^F (a_1 c_r^F - a_3 c_w^F) \\
&= \iota [c_p^X X (c_w^F c_r^X - c_r^F c_w^X)^2 - 2c_p^X X (c_w^F c_r^X - c_r^F c_w^X) (c_{rp}^X c_w^F - c_{wp}^X c_r^F) - \\
&\quad (c_p^X)^2 c_w^F (a_2 c_r^F - a_4 c_w^F) + (c_p^X)^2 c_r^F (a_1 c_r^F - a_3 c_w^F)]
\end{aligned}$$

The first term is negative as $c_p^X < 0$. The third and the fourth term are negative due to (30) and as $a_1, a_4 < 0$ and $a_2, a_3 > 0$. For simple Cobb-Douglas and CES functions, the second term has the same sign as

$$-\left(\frac{c_w^F}{c_r^F} - \frac{c_w^X}{c_r^X} \right) \left(\frac{c_w^F}{c_r^F} - \frac{c_{wp}^X}{c_{rp}^X} \right) = -\left(\frac{c_w^F}{c_r^F} - \frac{c_w^X}{c_r^X} \right)^2 < 0$$

Thus together $|A| < 0$. For more complicated production functions, additional assumptions are again necessary to determine the sign of the second term.

For all constant return to scale production functions the results implies for $d\lambda$ that

$$d\lambda(e, p_F) = -\frac{dp_F}{\iota} - \frac{dp_F}{\iota} \frac{\iota|B|}{|A|} = -\frac{dp_F}{\iota} \left(1 + \frac{\iota|B|}{|A|} \right) := -\frac{dp_F}{\iota} (1 + C(e, p_F))$$

For given K, L and p_F the original equilibrium values for w, r, X and F_I depend on the emission target e . Thus both B, A and also $|B|, |A|$ vary with the emission target. For Cobb-Douglas and CES functions it was shown that $C(e, p_F) > 0$.

B Simulation Results

Table 1: Marginal abatement cost curves - I

	Emission Target in GtC	MAC in USD	
		UNI	AXB
USA	1.75	X	0.00
	1.73	0.00	4.53
	1.55	38.32	42.97
	1.38*	85.24	90.25
	1.38	86.24	91.36
	1.21	152.58	158.28
	1.04	250.32	256.94
WEU	1.08	X	0.00
	1.05	0.00	11.07
	0.94*	41.15	51.88
	0.94	41.62	52.35
	0.84	96.24	106.79
	0.73	170.40	180.69
	0.63	274.98	284.85
JPN	0.42	X	0.00
	0.40	0.00	12.13
	0.36	46.43	59.28
	0.32	112.93	126.30
	0.32*	116.13	129.51
	0.28	209.15	222.91
	0.24	352.39	366.38
ANC	0.27	X	0.00
	0.26	0.00	11.05
	0.24	33.67	44.99
	0.23*	46.45	57.70
	0.21	79.66	90.79
	0.18	143.34	154.29
	0.16	234.86	245.47
FEB	0.94	X	0.00
	0.91	0.00	7.00
	0.82	24.34	30.90
	0.73	53.18	59.44
	0.64	88.59	94.76
	0.55	133.88	140.18

* Kyoto target

Table 2: Marginal abatement cost curves - IIa and IIb

	Reduction ¹	MAC in USD			Reduction ¹	MAC in USD	
	in GtC	UNI	AXB		in %	UNI	AXB
USA	0.00	0.00	0.00	USA	0 %	0.00	0.00
	0.17	38.32	37.61		10%	38.32	38.14
	0.34*	85.24	83.26		19.8%*	85.24	84.62
	0.35	86.24	84.33		20%	86.24	85.71
	0.51	152.58	148.25		30%	152.58	151.20
	0.99	250.32	241.85		40%	250.32	247.80
WEU	0.00	0.00	0.00	WEU	0%	0.00	0.00
	0.10*	41.15	37.76		9.9%*	41.15	39.11
	0.11	41.62	38.20		10%	41.62	39.56
	0.21	96.24	87.96		20%	96.24	91.59
	0.32	170.40	154.86		30%	170.40	162.33
	0.42	274.98	247.93		40%	274.98	262.17
JPN	0.00	0.00	0.00	JPN	0%	0.00	0.00
	0.04	46.43	41.89		10%	46.43	43.54
	0.08	112.93	101.50		20%	112.93	106.22
	0.08*	116.13	104.35		20.4%*	116.13	109.20
	0.12	209.15	186.93		0.28	209.15	197.20
	0.16	352.39	312.29		0.24	352.39	333.01
ANC	0.00	0.00	0.00	ANC	0%	0.00	0.00
	0.03	33.67	29.71		10%	33.67	31.15
	0.03*	46.45	40.94		13.1%*	46.45	43.02
	0.05	79.66	70.03		20%	79.66	73.96
	0.08	143.34	125.27		30%	143.34	133.54
	0.01	234.86	203.35		40%	234.86	219.38
FEB	0.00	0.00	0.00	FEB	0%	0.00	0.00
	0.09	24.34	22.82		10%	24.34	23.61
	0.18	53.18	49.70		20%	53.18	51.60
	0.27	88.59	82.55		30%	88.59	86.12
	0.36	133.88	124.29		40%	133.88	130.48

¹ Reduction rel. to the unconstrained emissions that differ between UNI and AXB

* Reduction that leads to Kyoto target in UNI

NOTE DI LAVORO DELLA FONDAZIONE ENI ENRICO MATTEI

Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei Working Paper Series

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

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

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

NOTE DI LAVORO PUBLISHED IN 2003

PRIV	1.2003	<i>Gabriella CHIESA and Giovanna NICODANO</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 MARSILIANI 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 POPYRAKIS 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	19.2003	<i>Sergio CURRARINI</i> : <u>On the Stability of Hierarchies in Games with Externalities</u>
Network		
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</i> (Ixi): <u>The Minimal Dominant Set is a Non-Empty Core-Extension</u>
CTN	51.2003	<i>Matthew O. JACKSON</i> (Ixi): <u>Allocation Rules for Network Games</u>
CTN	52.2003	<i>Ana MAULEON and Vincent VANNETELBOSCH</i> (Ixi): <u>Farsightedness and Cautiousness in Coalition Formation</u>
CTN	53.2003	<i>Fernando VEGA-REDONDO</i> (Ixi): <u>Building Up Social Capital in a Changing World: a network approach</u>
CTN	54.2003	<i>Matthew HAAG and Roger LAGUNOFF</i> (Ixi): <u>On the Size and Structure of Group Cooperation</u>
CTN	55.2003	<i>Tajji FURUSAWA and Hideo KONISHI</i> (Ixi): <u>Free Trade Networks</u>
CTN	56.2003	<i>Halis Murat YILDIZ</i> (Ixi): <u>National Versus International Mergers and Trade Liberalization</u>
CTN	57.2003	<i>Santiago RUBIO and Alistair ULPH</i> (Ixi): <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</i> (Iix): <u>Lorenzo Market between Diversity and Mutation</u>
KNOW	70.2003	<i>Ercole SORI</i> (Iix): <u>Mapping Diversity in Social History</u>
KNOW	71.2003	<i>Ljiljana DERU SIMIC</i> (Ixi): <u>What is Specific about Art/Cultural Projects?</u>
KNOW	72.2003	<i>Natalya V. TARANOVA</i> (Ixi): <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</i> (Ixi): <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</i> (Ixi): <u>Glocal Dialogue- Transformation through Transcultural Communication</u>
KNOW	75.2003	<i>Catarina REIS OLIVEIRA</i> (Ixi): <u>Immigrants' Entrepreneurial Opportunities: The Case of the Chinese in Portugal</u>
KNOW	76.2003	<i>Sandra WALLMAN</i> (Ixi): <u>The Diversity of Diversity - towards a typology of urban systems</u>
KNOW	77.2003	<i>Richard PEARCE</i> (Ixi): <u>A Biologist's View of Individual Cultural Identity for the Study of Cities</u>
KNOW	78.2003	<i>Vincent MERK</i> (Ixi): <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: <u>Oil and Product Dynamics in International Petroleum Markets</u></i>
CLIM	82.2003	<i>Y. Hossein FARZIN and Jinhua ZHAO: <u>Pollution Abatement Investment When Firms Lobby Against Environmental Regulation</u></i>
CLIM	83.2003	<i>Giuseppe DI VITA: <u>Is the Discount Rate Relevant in Explaining the Environmental Kuznets Curve?</u></i>
CLIM	84.2003	<i>Reyer GERLAGH and Wietze LISE: <u>Induced Technological Change Under Carbon Taxes</u></i>
NRM	85.2003	<i>Rinaldo BRAU, Alessandro LANZA and Francesco PIGLIARU: <u>How Fast are the Tourism Countries Growing? The cross-country evidence</u></i>
KNOW	86.2003	<i>Elena BELLINI, Gianmarco I.P. OTTAVIANO and Dino PINELLI: <u>The ICT Revolution: opportunities and risks for the Mezzogiorno</u></i>
SIEV	87.2003	<i>Lucas BRETSCGHER and Sjak SMULDERS: <u>Sustainability and Substitution of Exhaustible Natural Resources. How resource prices affect long-term R&D investments</u></i>
CLIM	88.2003	<i>Johan EYCKMANS and Michael FINUS: <u>New Roads to International Environmental Agreements: The Case of Global Warming</u></i>
CLIM	89.2003	<i>Marzio GALEOTTI: <u>Economic Development and Environmental Protection</u></i>
CLIM	90.2003	<i>Marzio GALEOTTI: <u>Environment and Economic Growth: Is Technical Change the Key to Decoupling?</u></i>
CLIM	91.2003	<i>Marzio GALEOTTI and Barbara BUCHNER: <u>Climate Policy and Economic Growth in Developing Countries</u></i>
IEM	92.2003	<i>A. MARKANDYA, A. GOLUB and E. STRUKOVA: <u>The Influence of Climate Change Considerations on Energy Policy: The Case of Russia</u></i>
ETA	93.2003	<i>Andrea BELTRATTI: <u>Socially Responsible Investment in General Equilibrium</u></i>
CTN	94.2003	<i>Parkash CHANDER: <u>The γ-Core and Coalition Formation</u></i>
IEM	95.2003	<i>Matteo MANERA and Angelo MARZULLO: <u>Modelling the Load Curve of Aggregate Electricity Consumption Using Principal Components</u></i>
IEM	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>
CTN	114.2003	<i>Guillaume HAERINGER and Myrna WOODERS: <u>Decentralized Job Matching</u></i>
CTN	115.2003	<i>Hideo KONISHI and M. Utku UNVER: <u>Credible Group Stability in Multi-Partner Matching Problems</u></i>
CTN	116.2003	<i>Somdeb LAHIRI: <u>Stable Matchings for the Room-Mates Problem</u></i>
CTN	117.2003	<i>Somdeb LAHIRI: <u>Stable Matchings for a Generalized Marriage Problem</u></i>
CTN	118.2003	<i>Marita LAUKKANEN: <u>Transboundary Fisheries Management under Implementation Uncertainty</u></i>
CTN	119.2003	<i>Edward CARTWRIGHT and Myrna WOODERS: <u>Social Conformity and Bounded Rationality in Arbitrary Games with Incomplete Information: Some First Results</u></i>
CTN	120.2003	<i>Gianluigi VERNASCA: <u>Dynamic Price Competition with Price Adjustment Costs and Product Differentiation</u></i>
CTN	121.2003	<i>Myrna WOODERS, Edward CARTWRIGHT and Reinhard SELTEN: <u>Social Conformity in Games with Many Players</u></i>
CTN	122.2003	<i>Edward CARTWRIGHT and Myrna WOODERS: <u>On Equilibrium in Pure Strategies in Games with Many Players</u></i>
CTN	123.2003	<i>Edward CARTWRIGHT and Myrna WOODERS: <u>Conformity and Bounded Rationality in Games with Many Players</u></i>
	1000	Carlo CARRARO, Alessandro LANZA and Valeria PAPPONETTI: <u>One Thousand Working Papers</u>

NOTE DI LAVORO PUBLISHED IN 2004

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

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

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

ETA	124.2004	<i>Paul MENSINK: <u>Instant Efficient Pollution Abatement Under Non-Linear Taxation and Asymmetric Information: The Differential Tax Revisited</u></i>
NRM	125.2004	<i>Mauro FABIANO, Gabriella CAMARSA, Rosanna DURSI, Roberta IVALDI, Valentina MARIN and Francesca PALMISANI: <u>Integrated Environmental Study for Beach Management: A Methodological Approach</u></i>
PRA	126.2004	<i>Irena GROSFELD and Iraj HASHI: <u>The Emergence of Large Shareholders in Mass Privatized Firms: Evidence from Poland and the Czech Republic</u></i>
CCMP	127.2004	<i>Maria BERRITTELLA, Andrea BIGANO, Roberto ROSON and Richard S.J. TOL: <u>A General Equilibrium Analysis of Climate Change Impacts on Tourism</u></i>
CCMP	128.2004	<i>Reyer GERLAGH: <u>A Climate-Change Policy Induced Shift from Innovations in Energy Production to Energy Savings</u></i>
NRM	129.2004	<i>Elissaios POPYRAKIS and Reyer GERLAGH: <u>Natural Resources, Innovation, and Growth</u></i>
PRA	130.2004	<i>Bernardo BORTOLOTTI and Mara FACCIO: <u>Reluctant Privatization</u></i>
SIEV	131.2004	<i>Riccardo SCARPA and Mara THIENE: <u>Destination Choice Models for Rock Climbing in the Northeast Alps: A Latent-Class Approach Based on Intensity of Participation</u></i>
SIEV	132.2004	<i>Riccardo SCARPA Kenneth G. WILLIS and Melinda ACUTT: <u>Comparing Individual-Specific Benefit Estimates for Public Goods: Finite Versus Continuous Mixing in Logit Models</u></i>
IEM	133.2004	<i>Santiago J. RUBIO: <u>On Capturing Oil Rents with a National Excise Tax Revisited</u></i>
ETA	134.2004	<i>Ascensión ANDINA DÍAZ: <u>Political Competition when Media Create Candidates' Charisma</u></i>
SIEV	135.2004	<i>Anna ALBERINI: <u>Robustness of VSL Values from Contingent Valuation Surveys</u></i>
CCMP	136.2004	<i>Gernot KLEPPER and Sonja PETERSON: <u>Marginal Abatement Cost Curves in General Equilibrium: The Influence of World Energy Prices</u></i>

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

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)
CSR	<i>Corporate Social Responsibility and Management</i> (Editor: Sabina Ratti)
PRIV	<i>Privatisation, Regulation, Antitrust</i> (Editor: Bernardo Bortolotti)
ETA	<i>Economic Theory and Applications</i> (Editor: Carlo Carraro)
CTN	<i>Coalition Theory Network</i>

2004 SERIES

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