



# NOTA DI LAVORO

67.2009

---

**Climate Change Assessment  
and Agriculture in General  
Equilibrium  
Models: Alternative Modeling  
Strategies**

---

By **Ruslana Rachel Palatnik**,  
Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Italy,  
Natural Resource & Environmental  
Research Center, University of Haifa,  
and Department of Economics and  
Management, The Max Stern Academic  
College of Emek Yezreel, Israel

**Roberto Roson**, Dip. Scienze  
Economiche, Università Ca' Foscari di  
Venezia

## SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT Series

Editor: Carlo Carraro

### Climate Change Assessment and Agriculture in General Equilibrium Models: Alternative Modeling Strategies

By Ruslana Rachel Palatnik, Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Italy, Natural Resource & Environmental Research Center, University of Haifa, and Department of Economics and Management, The Max Stern Academic College of Emek Yezreel, Israel

Roberto Roson, Dip. Scienze Economiche, Università Ca' Foscari di Venezia

#### Summary

Agricultural sectors play a key role in the economics of climate change. Land as an input to agricultural production is one of the most important links between economy and the biosphere, representing a direct projection of human action on the natural environment. Agricultural management practices and cropping patterns have a vast effect on biogeochemical cycles, freshwater availability and soil quality. Agriculture also plays an important role in emitting and storing greenhouse gases. Thus, to consistently investigate climate policy and future pathways for the economic and natural environment, a realistic representation of agricultural land-use is essential. Computable General Equilibrium (CGE) models have increasingly been used to this purpose. CGE models simulate the simultaneous equilibrium in a set of interdependent markets, and are especially suited to analyze agricultural markets from a global perspective. However, modelling agricultural sectors in CGE models is not a trivial task, mainly because of differences in temporal and geographical aggregation scales. The aim of this study is to overview some proposed modelling strategies, by reviewing the available literature and highlighting the different trade-offs involved in the various approaches.

**Keywords:** Computable General Equilibrium (CGE), Partial Equilibrium (PE), Agriculture, Land Use, Climate Change

**JEL Classification:** C68, D58, Q24, Q51, Q54

*This paper has been produced within the framework of the project CIRCE - Climate Change and Impact Research: the Mediterranean Environment, contract N. 036961, funded by the European Commission within the Sixth Framework Programme*

*Address for correspondence:*

Ruslana Rachel Palatnik  
Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei  
Castello 5252  
I-30123 Venezia  
Italy  
E-mail: [ruslana.palatnik@feem.it](mailto:ruslana.palatnik@feem.it)

# Climate Change Assessment and Agriculture in General Equilibrium Models: Alternative Modeling Strategies

Ruslana Rachel Palatnik<sup>1\*</sup>, Roberto Roson<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Climate Change Modelling and Policies Programme,  
Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Castello, 5252 - I-30123 Venezia, Italy.  
Natural Resource & Environmental Research Center,  
University of Haifa, Haifa 31905, Israel.  
Department of Economics and Management,  
The Max Stern Academic College Of Emek Yezreel, Mailbox 19300, Israel.

<sup>2</sup>Dip. Scienze Economiche,  
Università Cá Foscari di Venezia,  
Cannaregio 873 - I-30121 Venezia, Italy

## Abstract

Agricultural sectors play a key role in the economics of climate change. Land as an input to agricultural production is one of the most important links between economy and the biosphere, representing a direct projection of human action on the natural environment. Agricultural management practices and cropping patterns have a vast effect on biogeochemical cycles, freshwater availability and soil quality. Agriculture also plays an important role in emitting and storing greenhouse gases. Thus, to consistently investigate climate policy and future pathways for the economic and natural environment, a realistic representation of agricultural land-use is essential. Computable General Equilibrium (CGE) models have increasingly been used to this purpose. CGE models simulate the simultaneous equilibrium in a set of interdependent markets, and are especially suited to analyze agricultural markets from a global perspective. However, modeling agricultural sectors in CGE models is not a trivial task, mainly because of differences in temporal and geographical aggregation scales. The aim of this study is to overview some proposed modeling strategies, by reviewing the available literature and highlighting the different trade-offs involved in the various approaches.

*Keywords:* Computable General Equilibrium (CGE), Partial Equilibrium (PE), Agriculture, Land Use, Climate Change

*JEL Classification:* C68, D58, Q24, Q51, Q54

\* Corresponding author, email: [ruslana.palatnik@feem.it](mailto:ruslana.palatnik@feem.it)

*This paper has been produced within the framework of the project CIRCE - Climate Change and Impact Research: the Mediterranean Environment, contract N. 036961, funded by the European Commission within the Sixth Framework Programme*

## 1. Introduction

Relationships between greenhouse effects and agricultural activity are usually and firstly considered in terms of the impact of climate change on agriculture. Food production will be particularly sensitive to climate change, because crop yields depend in large part on prevailing climate conditions (temperature and rainfall patterns).

Agriculture currently accounts for 24% of world output, employs 22% of the global population, and occupies 40% of the land area. 75% of the poorest people in the world (the one billion people who live on less than \$1 a day) live in rural areas and rely on agriculture for their livelihood (Bruinsma, 2003). Forecasts predict that agriculture in higher-latitude developed countries is likely to benefit from moderate warming (2 –3°C). However, even small amounts of climate change in tropical regions will lead to declines in yield. The agricultural sector is one of the most at risk to the damaging impacts of climate change in developing countries (Stern, 2006).

Agricultural emissions mainly come from a large number of small emitters (farms), over three quarters of which are in developing and transition economies. In its climate change report on Mitigation, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC, 2001) clearly assesses that transport and energy production industries constitute the main anthropogenic GHG sources, and states that "agriculture contributes only about 4% of global [i.e. world-wide] carbon emissions from energy use, but over 20% of anthropogenic GHG emissions in terms of MtC-eq/yr<sup>1</sup>, mainly from methane (55-60% of total CH<sub>4</sub> emissions) and nitrous oxide (65-80% of total N<sub>2</sub>O emissions) as well as carbon from land clearing". The IPCC (2007) report states that "the largest growth in global GHG emissions between 1970 and 2004 has come from the energy supply sector (an increase of 145%). The growth in direct emissions in this period from transport was 120%, industry 65% and land use, land use change, and forestry (LULUCF) 40%. Between 1970 and 1990 direct emissions from agriculture grew by 27%".

Emissions from agriculture and land use occur through different processes (IPCC, 1996, Alcamo et al., 1998): enteric fermentation and animal waste disposal and fermentation, anaerobic process when growing rice, nitrification and de-nitrification linked with fertilisation, and also land clearing, burning of biomass, of fuel wood, of agricultural waste, and of savannah. Non-CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from agriculture amount to 14% of total GHG emissions. Of this, fertilizer use and livestock each account for one third of emissions. Over half of GHG emissions are from developing countries. Agriculture is also indirectly responsible for emissions from land-use change (agriculture is a key driver of deforestation), industry (in the production of fertilizer), and transport (in the

---

<sup>1</sup> MtC-eq/yr are millions of tons of carbon equivalent GHG per year, with global warming potentials of methane, nitrous oxide and other GHG other than carbon dioxide, used as conversion coefficients for non-CO<sub>2</sub> gases.

movement of goods). Increasing demand for agricultural products, due to rising population and income per capita, is expected to lead to continued rises in emissions from this source. Total non-CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are expected to double in the period 2000-2050 (Stern, 2006).

Nevertheless, agriculture can contribute to GHG sequestration and abatement, mainly through reforestation, forest management, bio-fuels and soil carbon stocking,<sup>2</sup> changes in practices and land uses. Farmers and herders may also directly react to climate policies, imposing a carbon price to GHG-emitting activities.

The potential role of emitting sectors for mitigation, abatement or sequestration options are currently debated. Could and should agriculture modify its present land-use patterns and agricultural practices for the explicit purpose of reducing emissions, while satisfying the world demand for food and other agricultural products? This study overviews some modelling approaches which have been proposed, to address this and similar questions.

We distinguish between Partial Equilibrium (PE) and Computable General Equilibrium (CGE) models. PE models depict markets for a selected set of products. Implicitly, they consider these markets as having no effects on the rest of the economy, and thus the rest of the economy is treated as exogenous. They can provide much product detail and are flexible in representing complex agricultural policy instruments and specific characteristics of agricultural markets. CGE models, instead, operate at a higher aggregation in terms of industries and products, but they can capture implications of international trade for the economy as a whole, covering the circular flow of income and expenditure and depicting inter-industry relations. CGE models are therefore well suited to portray the manifold interactions between agriculture and other sectors in the economy.

Moreover, PE modeling has not yet been able to fully account for the opportunity costs of alternative agriculture and land-based mitigation strategies, which are determined by heterogeneous and dynamic environmental and economic conditions of land<sup>3</sup> and economy-wide feedbacks that reallocate inputs, international production, and consumers' budgets. CGE economic models are well suited to evaluate these kinds of tradeoffs (Hertel et al., 2009a).

Research on GHG abatement or sequestration options in agriculture employing CGE models stems from a need to evaluate and compare net abatement options of all emitting sectors. However, there are also disadvantages associated with the general equilibrium approach. Critics argue that the CGE models are overly simplistic and do not capture many important characteristics of the agricultural economy. They also argue that the CGE parameters need more solid econometric foundations.

---

<sup>2</sup> For a review on carbon sequestration in terrestrial ecosystems, refer to <http://csite.esd.ornl.gov>.

<sup>3</sup> See Hubacek and van den Bergh (2006) for a review of changing concepts of land in economic theory.

The aim of this paper is to overview modeling strategies to improve the representation of the agricultural sectors in general equilibrium models. A CGE modeler normally needs to choose between two main alternatives: whether to develop an integrated assessment model (IAM), i. e. to couple a top-down CGE model with a bottom-up PE agricultural land-use model, or to improve the relevant functional structure inside the CGE model itself. Each possibility has its own advantages and drawbacks in terms of data requirements, computational practices and accuracy. This review provides a comparison between a number of approaches proposed in the literature, possibly providing guidelines for modelers in this field.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 overviews some modeling approaches adopted to refine the modeling of agricultural and other land-using sectors in CGE models. Section 3 illustrates the development of enhancing land-related economic behavior in CGE models. Models accounting for ecological aspects of land heterogeneity are presented in Section 4. Section 5 introduces the integrated assessment approach. Section 6 outlines some major achievements, potentials and difficulties of the reviewed studies. The last section draws some conclusions and discusses directions for future development.

## **2. Overview of Agriculture and Land Use Modeling Approaches**

This survey focuses on CGE modeling related to agricultural and climate change assessment. There are several important advantages offered by the CGE approach over PE models, even though partial equilibrium models are capable of including detailed biophysical land use characteristics, and to better capture some local environmental and economic effects. Traditional agricultural PE economic analysis has tended to focus on commodities, and associated factor returns. In contrast, welfare in a CGE model is computed directly in terms of household utility and not by some abstract summation of producer, consumer and taxpayer surpluses. Additionally, a CGE model insures for finite resources and accounting consistency by relying on Social Accounting Matrices (SAM). This allows capturing inter-industry linkages between agricultural and non- agricultural sectors of economy and provides an economy-wide perspective of analysis, which is especially important in the context of climate change.

Especially in the past decade, different attempts have been made to extend top-down computable general equilibrium models to allow for more detailed analyses of agricultural industries. Two broad approaches have been adopted. The first approach is to improve the modeling of land within the CGE framework, mainly the transition of land between different uses, like crop production, livestock and forestry. In section 3 we present several researches following this direction. Another step is distinguishing between various land classes that have different

characteristics and productivities and are only suitable for some uses. A few models adopting this strategy, which requires a high level of informational detail, are discussed in section 4.

The alternative approach is linking a macro-economic CGE model with a detailed, sectoral model of agricultural land use. Some examples in this area are discussed in section 5.

Table 1 lists the studies presented in this review.

**Table 1: CGE models covered in the review**

<b>Modeling Framework</b>	<b>Reference</b>	<b>Temporal resolution and coverage</b>	<b>Spatial resolution and coverage</b>	<b>Motivation</b>
<b>1. CGE Models Extended for Land-Use Analyses</b>				
CGE for USA	Hertel and Tsigas (1988).	Comparative static; base-year 1977	USA, 7 agricultural sectors	Analyze effects of eliminating farm and food tax preferences in 1977.
GTAP	Hertel (1997)	Comparative static; base-year 2004	Latest available version GTAP7 allows for 113 regional and 57 sectoral disaggregation, Global	Evaluate effects of agricultural policies on commodity markets and trade.
GTAPE-L	Burniaux and Lee (2003)	Comparative static; base-year 1997	5 regions; Global	Exemplify the incorporation of land/land use in GTAP; assessing GHG mitigation policies with focus on land-use impacts
GTAP-AGR	Keeney and Hertel (2005)	Comparative static; base-year 1997	23 regions, global; 5 agricultural sectors	Assess the implications of multilateral changes in agricultural policies
G-Cubed (Agriculture)	McKibbin & Wang (1998)	Dynamic, 1-year step; 1993-2070	12 regions, Global; 4 agricultural out of 12 total sectors	Explore the impact of international and domestic stocks like trade liberalization on US agriculture
CGE for Canada	Robidoux et al. (1989)	Comparative static;	Canada	Analyze Canadian farm policies
CGE for Philippines	Abdula (2005)	Comparative static;	Small open economy Philippines	Study the conflict between food and bio-fuel production
GTAP-based CGE for Poland	Ignaciuk (2006, chapter 5)	Comparative static 1997	Small open economy (Poland)	Explore the potential of biomass as a source of energy
GTAPEM	Hsin et al. (2004), Brooks and Dewbre (2006)	Comparative static; 2001-2020	7 regions, global; 8 agricultural sectors	Analyze the impact of agriculture and non-agriculture reform, with a particular focus on the effects of OECD agricultural policy on developing countries.
GTAP/Supply Curve	Baltzer and	Comparative	22 regions global;15	Analyze changes in global wheat supply and

	Kløverpris (2008)	static; 2001	economic sectors	consequences for agricultural land use caused by an increase in US household demand for wheat.
FARM	Darwin et al. (1996)	Comparative static; 1990-2090	Multi-scale: 8 regions world 0.5 lon/lat ;	Integrate explicit land and water assessment into CGE, environmental focus on climate change
D-FARM	Ianchovichina <i>et al.</i> (2001), Wong et al., (2003).	Recursive dynamic 1997-2007/2020	Multi-scale: 12 world regions	Analyze resource use and technological progress in agriculture
GTAP-AEZ	Lee (2004), Lee et al. (2009)	Comparative Static, 2001	8 agricultural sectors + forestry, 3 world regions	Investigate the role of global land use in determining greenhouse gases mitigation costs
GTAP-Dyn/AEZ modified for land use analyses	Golub et al. (2006)	Recursive dynamic 1997-2025	11 regions, global	Analyze the GHG emissions driven by land use and land-use changes at the global scale.
GTAP-Dyn and Global Timber Model	Golub et al. (2009)	Recursive dynamic 1997-2025	11 regions, global	Enhance the understanding of land-use related GHG emissions
<b>2. Integrated Assessment Models</b>				
GTAP-LEI/IMAGE coupling within EURURALIS	Klijn et al. (2005)	10-year steps; 2001-2030	Multi-scale: national level, sub-national level (NUTS2), grid level; Global with focus on EU15	Integrated assessment to evaluate impacts of different policies on land use in Europe.
GCM-GTAP	Bosello and Zhang (2005)	Comparative static; 1997-2010-2030-2050	8 regions, Global; 4 agricultural out of total 17 sectors.	Estimate the economy-wide implications of climate change on agricultural sectors.
KLUM@GTAP	Ronneberger et al. (2009)	Comparative static; 1997-2050	16 regions, Global; 4 agricultural out of total 17 sectors.	Assess the integrated impacts of climate change on global cropland allocation and its implication for economic development

### 3. Refined CGE models

Conceivably the simplest method of introducing endogenous land-use allocation in a CGE model is constraining industrial land stock through a Constant Elasticity of Transformation (CET) function, by which an aggregate endowment of land is transformed across alternative uses, subject to some transformation parameters, determining the responsiveness of land supply to changes in relative yields. Land owners rent out land to uses that give the highest return, under the CET constraint. Perfect competition on input and output markets assures that all markets, including that of land, clear.

This approach was used by Hertel and Tsigas (1988). Given a specific elasticity of transformation, rental rates differ across uses and acreage response may be calibrated to econometrically estimated values. The Global Trade Analysis Project (GTAP) (Hertel, 1997) also follows this approach, defining the land input as an imperfectly substitutable factor among different crops or land uses.

The Global Trade Analysis Project, Energy - Land model (GTAPE-L) (Burniaux, 2002; Burniaux & Lee, 2003) extends the standard GTAP model to track inter-sectoral land transitions to estimate emissions of CH<sub>4</sub>, CO<sub>2</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O. To get land emission rates, a land transition matrix (which shows changes of land status over a given period of time) is derived from the IMAGE 2.2. model (IMAGE, 2001), based on 1995 net carbon emissions estimates (tons of carbon equivalents). By multiplying the land emission rates with the simulated land use changes, one can estimate the implied variation in GHG emissions due to changes in land use.

Keeney and Hertel (2005) offer another special-purpose version of the GTAP model for agriculture, called GTAP-AGR. The study focuses on factor markets, which play a critical role in determining the incidence of producer subsidies, by modifying both the factor supply and derived demand equations. The authors also modify the specification of consumer demand, assuming separability of food from non-food commodities. Finally, they introduce substitution possibilities amongst feedstuffs used in the livestock industry.

The G-CUBED (Agriculture) model (McKibbin and Wang, 1998; van Tongeren and van Meijl, 1999) is an extension and variant of the G-CUBED model, developed by McKibbin and Wilcoxon (1998), which includes relatively detailed agricultural sectors and a country disaggregation relevant for U.S. agricultural markets. The G-CUBED model combines the disaggregated, econometrically-estimated, intertemporal GE model of the U.S. economy by Jorgenson and Wilcoxon (1990) with the macroeconomic model by McKibbin and Sachs (1991). The G-CUBED (Agriculture) model was primarily designed to analyze impacts of international and domestic shocks on the U.S. agriculture, like the APEC trade liberalization and Asian economic

crisis. However, the model treats land as homogeneous. A specific feature of the model is the imposition of intertemporal optimization under perfect foresight for households and governments in consumption and investment decisions.

The studies above exemplify foremost attempts to deal with agriculture and land in CGE models. Their range of applicability is limited by the way land is represented, as the latter is treated as homogeneous and space-less, ignoring biophysical characteristics and spatial interactions. To overcome these limitations, a distinction between land types and land uses must be introduced, which implies a significant increase in the complexity of the models.

For example, in their CGE model for Canada, Robidoux et al. (1989) specify CES aggregator functions that combine three land types, each of which is used - to some degree - in the production of six different farm products. Their approach is original in the way they estimate benchmark equilibrium rental rates, differentiated by land type. These are obtained by regressing total land rents in each sector on the observed quantity of each land type used in that sector. The basic assumption is that, in equilibrium, the land-specific rental rate (i.e., the coefficient on acreage) must be equal across uses.

Abdula (2005) and Ignaciuk (2006, chapter 5) also follow this approach. Abdula uses a static CGE model for the Philippines and extends it with a bio-fuels sector, to study the conflict between food and bio-fuels production. Since both activities use scarce land, subsidizing biofuels may induce farmers to move away from food production towards the production of inputs for the bio-fuel industry. Land is treated as a heterogeneous factor, including three land types (cropland, pasture and forest, all in fixed supply), some of which are only suitable for particular uses. Ignaciuk (ibid.) considers land contaminated by heavy metals, e.g. through mining and industrial activities in the past, in a GTAP-based CGE model for the Polish economy. Contaminated land can only be used for biofuels production, hence it is excluded from producing food. Therefore, land is explicitly treated as a heterogeneous input.

GTAP-EM (Hsin et al., 2004; Brooks and Dewbre, 2006) is a specially tailored version of GTAP, that inherits some of the features of GTAP-AGR, utilizing domestic support data (PSE) from the OECD. GTAP-EM adds on GTAP-AGR by distinguishing land in the production structure of agricultural sectors into: miscellaneous agricultural land, rice and the group field crops and pastures. For these land types, three different elasticities of transformation are defined. Additional modifications include factor substitution between purchased farm input intermediates, and between the aggregate intermediates and farm-owned inputs.

In general, the problem with the CET approach is that the “transformation” of land from one use to another destroys the ability to track the allocation of hectares across agricultural activities.

Instead of constraining the sum of hectares across uses to equal the total availability of hectares in a given country, the CET function constrains the land rental share weighted sum of hectares to equal the total endowment of land. In this framework, differential land rents reflect differences in the effective productivity of a given hectare of land across uses and it is these effective hectares that are constrained in the aggregate (Hertel et al., 2009a). This is not a big problem only whenever reporting land use shifts as percentage changes is sufficient. It is not the case though in most of the analyses focused on land-use. Also, given the lack of an explicit link to yields and the underlying heterogeneity of land, this model is difficult to validate against the observed data.

In short, while it is an extremely versatile approach to limiting factor mobility across uses, the CET function suffers from several major limitations. Baltzer and Kløverpris (2008) solve partially this problem by imposing that average productivity for all types of land remains the same. This resolves the acreage inconsistency, but may create another inconsistency, between different concepts used in the allocation of land and in the production function. A more explicit approach to handling land heterogeneity in deeper theoretical foundation would be desirable.

#### **4. Modeling agro-ecological zones (AEZs)**

The approach illustrated above focuses on land types, without considering regional or climatic differences. However, the capacity of a given acre of land to produce a particular farm product varies with soil type, location in the watershed, and climatic conditions.

The Future Agricultural Resources Model (FARM) was developed in the mid 1990s to evaluate impacts of global climate change on the world's agricultural system (Darwin et al., 1995; Darwin et al., 1996). The authors disaggregate land classes into six types, characterized by the length of the growing season, and identify water as an input into the production function of each crop. These land classes are employed differentially across farming and forestry sectors, according to observed patterns of production.

The model has been used to assess the impact of alternative climate change scenarios on patterns of agricultural production, trade, consumption and welfare. While FARM was originally a static model, a dynamic version denoted D-FARM is now available. The latter is a recursive dynamic model based on estimates of annual growth rates of regional GDP, gross domestic investment, population, skilled and unskilled labor (Ianchovichina et al., 2001; Wong and Alavalapati., 2003).

GTAP-AEZ (Lee et al., 2009) continues along these lines, but with much superior data and more structured production functions. This model considers different land inputs which are imperfectly substitutable in the production function within, but not across, climatic zones.

In the first version of GTAP-AEZ (Lee, 2004.), it is assumed that each of the land-using sectors in a specific Agro-Ecological Zones (AEZ) has its unique production function. For example, the wheat sector located in AEZ 1 has a different production function from the wheat sector located in AEZ 6. This allows identifying differences in the productivity of land in different climatic conditions. All six wheat sectors in various AEZs though produce the same homogenous output. For this approach it is necessary to have information on cost shares and respective input shares in the AEZs, which are not yet provided in the GTAP-AEZ data-base.

In the extended version of GTAP-AEZ (Lee et al., 2009) it is assumed, instead, that there is a single national production function for each (agricultural) commodity. Various AEZs are inputs to the national production functions, where they can be combined through a quite high elasticity of substitution.

Golub et al. (2006) move one step further and expand the GTAP-Dyn (Ianchovichina and McDougall, 2001) dynamic general equilibrium model of the global economy to investigate long-run land-use changes at the global scale. They modify both the supply and the demand of land. Consumer demand is translated into derived demands for land through a set of sectoral production functions, differentiating the demand for land by AEZ. On the supply side, land mobility across uses is addressed via sequence of successively more sophisticated models of land supply, beginning with a model in which land is perfectly mobile and undifferentiated, and ending with one in which land mobility across uses is governed by a nested CET function which also accounts for the heterogeneity of land within AEZs. In this final formulation, landowners solve a sequential revenue maximization exercise, in which land is first allocated between forestry and agriculture, then between grazing and crops, and finally, amongst competing crops. Although this ultimate version offers the most sensible representation of land supply, the resulting baseline land rental changes in forestry and grazing seem (to the authors) unrealistically high.

To resolve this problem, Golub et al. (2009) iterate between GTAP-Dyn and the Global Timber Model by Sohngen and Mendelson (2006), to determine forestry input-augmenting productivity growth of forestry processing sectors in GTAP-Dyn. Using the rate of unmanaged forest access predicted by the Global Timber Model, Golub et al. introduce the possibility of conversion of unmanaged forest-land to land used in production, when demand for cropland and pasture is high and land rents are high enough to cover costs of access to unmanaged land.

To summarize, the AEZ methodology is analogous to the CET approach, but it is based on an explicit yield heterogeneity. The main limitations of AEZ are data requirements and corresponding modeling difficulties connected to operating a large-scale model.

## 5. Integrated Assessment Method

Instead of modeling the economics of land use as a part of a CGE model, as was done by the models presented in two previous sections, a detailed bottom-up land allocation model is linked to a CGE in some Integrated Assessment Models. On the basis of relative prices estimated by a CGE, a land use model can predict how land is allocated among competing uses. A certain land allocation could therefore be taken as exogenous in the CGE model. Generally the process is iterated until a reasonable convergence can be found.

Within the EURURALIS project the IMAGE model has been coupled to GTAPEM (Hsin et al., 2004; Klijn et al., 2005). Crop yields and a feed conversion factor, determined by IMAGE, are exchanged with production of food and animal products and a management factor (describing the management induced yield changes) as calculated by GTAPEM (van Meijl et al., 2006). The advantage of coupling the two comprehensive models lies in detailed and exhaustive process representation. Moreover, this is one of the few approaches, where a feedback between economy and vegetation is at least partly realized. However, the land allocation tool of the coupled framework is still based on empirically estimated rules according to land potential, largely ignoring economic motivations of allocation decisions.

Bosello and Zhang (2005) offer another integrated assessment exercise to evaluate climate change impact on agriculture. They couple a global circulation model GCM containing a crop-growth model, with a global CGE model based on GTAP-E. The climatic scenario is endogenously produced by the economic model, which is benchmarked to reproduce a hypothetical world economic system in 2010, 2030 and 2050. Their results confirm both the limited impact of climate change on agricultural sectors, largely determined by the smoothing effect of economic adaptation, but also the relative higher penalization of the developing world. The authors admit that this exercise suffers from some major limitations such as: simplifications and generalizations of both climatic conditions and crop responses in addition to a narrow number of observations.

KLUM@GTAP (Ronneberger et al., 2009) is another coupling exercise in which a static global GTAP-based CGE model is linked to the land use model KLUM. KLUM is a land allocation PE model, in which, for each hectare of land, a representative farmer maximizes her expected profits. Risk-aversion ensures that she prefers multi-product land uses over monoculture. The biophysical aspects of land are included indirectly, as area specific yields differ for each unit of land. In the coupling experiment, yield changes due to climate change in 2050 (as reported by Tan et al., 2003) are applied to KLUM, which calculates the corresponding changes in land uses. These in turn are fed into the GTAP-based model to obtain management induced yield and price changes (through changes in input combinations), which consequently are fed back into KLUM.

Although the experiment shows that the results of the coupled and uncoupled simulations can differ substantially, it also shows that linking the models comes up against serious difficulties. One of the problems is that GTAP has its land data in value terms with prices normalized to unity, while the KLUM database uses a quantity format. This fact makes land data incomparable between the models. To overcome this limitation, a key parameter in GTAP (the elasticity of substitution between land, capital and labour) had to be tripled, to make the model less sensitive to the input that comes from the KLUM model. Without this intervention, the results of the two models would not converge.

In summary, the ideal case of a joint solution of a GE and PE is no different from the solution of a single extended GE. Assuming that the original GE is given in reduced form and the PE as a constrained optimization problem, the extended IAM is constructed by merging the original GE equations with the Kuhn-Tucker conditions of the PE. Some of the previously exogenous items (the parameters) of the GE and the PE become endogenous in the new equation system, and new functions are added that map GE variables to PE parameters and vice versa (Banse and Grethe, 2008).

In practice, it may be difficult to obtain a perfect integration of the models, due to technical as well as to theoretical reasons, and special solution methods may be required in order to reach an equilibrium. Furthermore, the PE and CGE models are often implemented in different software, and the system must be solved iteratively, without any warranty of convergence.

Another challenge in linking models is to obtain a joint baseline. The models may rely on different data sources, use different units of measurement and may be based on different assumptions. The task of the joint baseline calibration is essentially to choose parameters of the mapping and aggregation functions so that if no exogenous shock is introduced, the stand-alone models give precisely the same result as the linked system.

## **6. Major achievements, deficits and potentials**

Two major approaches for more accurate representation of agriculture in CGE models can be found in the reviewed literature. Introducing heterogeneity in available land, as was outlined in sections 3 and 4, enhances the applicability of CGE models in analyses which involve changes in agricultural production. Linking a CGE to a PE land use model, as presented in section 5, improves realism even further, but it may come at a cost, due to technical problems of establishing the link between different models and obtaining convergence in the iteration process.

The surveyed (representative) studies are still not sufficient to provide an all-inclusive analytical framework for the various aspects of modeling agriculture for climate change analysis

such as global coverage; dynamic and long term horizon; multiple GHG emissions; land heterogeneity; water issues; trade-off between different land uses. However, some models, like GTAP-Dyn/AEZ and D-FARM do address many of the above issues. Both models have a detailed and heterogeneous representation of land, based on length of growth periods. An important advantage of the current version of GTAP-Dyn/AEZ is its multi-gas and dynamic approach, while the advantages of D-FARM are the inclusion of water and a broader regional coverage. On the other hand, both models have only a single forest type, do not consider a biofuels sector, and have a limited regional disaggregation. GTAP-Dyn/AEZ currently only has three world regions, while D-FARM contains no more than 12 regions.

A fundamental problem in modeling agriculture and forestry production at the subnational level involves estimation of input usage and production by spatial unit. The GTAP-AEZ model circumvents this problem, by having a single, national production function in which land types from different AEZs substitute for one another. Hertel et al. (2009b) show that this is a legitimate approximation to an approach in which production on each AEZ is modeled separately, provided that: (a) the sub-sectors (i.e., different AEZs) produce identical products, (b) non-land input-output ratios are the same across AEZs, (c) common non-land input prices prevail across AEZs, and (d) the elasticity of substitution between AEZs in a given land use is set very high. These assumptions, in combination with cost minimization and zero pure profits, mean that land rents must vary in direct proportion to yields. It would be useful to test the requisite hypotheses for key countries, using disaggregated data on inputs and prices. Of particular interest is the extent to which non-land input-output ratios vary systematically with AEZs, either due to differences in choice of technique across different land qualities or due to differing input prices. If this proves to be the case, then the simple rule of proportionality between yields and land rents, as well as the capacity of an aggregate production function to capture the impact on the derived demand for land, are both brought into doubt.

Additional disadvantage common to CGE models is due to a non-linear treatment of land in the production functions, for which land cannot be measured in physical units of area, but instead is quantified through monetary units in the value added. This complicates the interpretation of the resulting changes in land allocation. Another weakness of the most developed CGEs for agricultural and climate change analysis (like GTAPEM and GTAP-Dyn/AEZ) is an absence of empirical evidence for the land transformation structure and related elasticities, which may have a crucial effect on the models performance.

Integrated land-use modeling approaches show that some of the intrinsic limitations of PE and GE models can be overcome, to a certain extent. The coupling of IMAGE and GTAP-LEI

(EURURALIS), as well as linking between KLUM and GTAP, aim to improve on the weakness of economic demand module within IMAGE / KLUM respectively, and to advance the representation of land supply in the corresponding GTAP version.

On the other hand, despite certain achievements, the full potential of integrating CGE and PE models does not seem to have been fully explored yet, as the advantages stand against the risk of inconsistencies and redundancies. EURURALIS, for example, lacks endogenous methods to determine whether food demand will be satisfied by expansion of agricultural area rather than by intensification. Beyond a more detailed representation of agricultural management, including the feedback with soil and water is also needed. Irreversibly degraded soil or the exhaustion of freshwater resources are major constraints on future land use. These have not yet been sufficiently tackled by any land-use or CGE model.

## **7. Conclusions and Directions for the Future Work**

In this paper we offered a survey of the various approaches used to describe, model and measure the complex relationships between climate change, agriculture and land-use. Two major strategies were outlined: internal model extension and soft-link coupling of CGE and PE land-use model. The main message that can be grasped from the relevant literature is that climatic, agricultural and economic information need to be consistently melted in order to provide a reliable and sound impact assessment analysis in this field. This is witnessed by the constant effort to expand the comprehensiveness of the investigation. But, despite the achievements and individual strengths of the selected modeling approaches, core problems of global land-use modeling have not yet been resolved.

Up to date, the main advantage of the integrated assessment (coupling) approach is the ability to benefit from the strength of partial equilibrium, which represents in detail agriculture and land use aspects, in the economy-wide comprehensive framework of the CGE model. Yet IAM tackles major difficulties in the sense of data incomparability, computational limitations and sophisticated programming. In addition, establishing the link may demand theoretically or empirically inconsistent compromises. On the contrary, internal extension of a CGE model, through introduction of new structural relations and corresponding parameters, appears to be a more feasible and reliable method but, in spite of recent developments, still incomparable with IAM in terms of accuracy and realism.

Overall, the modeling of global land based climate change mitigation is relatively unripe, with significant opportunities for improving baseline and land use scenarios and better characterizing the emissions and mitigation potential of land. Essential to future land modeling are improvements in

the dynamic modeling of regional land use competition, since the cost of any land based mitigation strategy should consider the opportunity costs of land.

The agricultural soil carbon stock and flux modeling is noticeably absent from current approaches, despite the fact that agricultural soils are thought to offer substantial carbon sequestration potential (IPCC, 2007). Moreover, technological change will alter the emissions rates of agricultural production activities. Explicit consideration of this interaction is important to avoid arbitrary emissions growth and explore emissions uncertainties associated with technological uncertainty.

For the analysis of biofuels into global CGE models there are two main obstacles. The first is data availability. Many of the potentially important biofuel technologies (e.g., ethanol from cellulose) are not currently commercially viable, so they don't appear in data bases recording current market transactions, like SAMs. Introducing them into the model requires coming up with an appropriate profile of costs, sales, and even trade shares, to invoke when they would come into production. Relatedly, there is the question of profitability: how high have energy prices to rise before these technologies enter into commercial production?

There is also a range of problems related with adequately representing forestry in economic models. It takes decades to grow a new forest and growth in the forest stock, as well as sequestration potential, depends critically on the type of forest and its vintage.

Finally, for comprehensive analyses of climate change impacts it is important to include water demand and supply and to distinguish farm land in terms of water access. Berrittella et al. (2007) include water in a global CGE model, but their framework offers only a rudimentary representation of land. Future research will need to integrate such analyses of land and water into a single, global general equilibrium framework.

## References

- Abdula, R. (2005) *Climate Change Policy of Bio-Energy: A Computable General Equilibrium Analysis*, paper presented at the International Conference on Energy, Environment and Disasters (INCEED 2005), July 24-30, 2005, Charlotte, NC, USA.
- Alcamo, J., Leemans, R., Kreileman, E. (eds.), (1998) *Global Change Scenarios of the 21<sup>st</sup> century: results from the Image 2.1 Model*, Pergamon Elsevier.
- Baltzer, K. and Kløverpris, J. (2008), Improving the land use specification in the GTAP model, IFS Working Paper 2008-2, Institute of Food and Resource Economics, Denmark.
- Banse M. and H. Grethe, (2008). Top Down, and a little Bottom Up: Modelling EU Agricultural Policy Liberalization with LEITAP and ESIM, Paper presented at the GTAP Conference June 2008, Helsinki, Finland
- Berrittella, M., A.Y. Hoekstra, K. Rehdanz, R. Roson and R.S.J. Tol (2007), 'The Economic Impact of Restricted Water Supply: A Computable General Equilibrium Analysis', *Water Research*, 42, 1799-1813.
- Bosello F., and J. Zhang (2005). Assessing Climate Change Impacts: Agriculture. FEEM Working Paper 94.2005
- Brooks, J. and J. Dewbre (2006). Global trade reforms and income distribution in developing countries. Vol. 3, No. 1, 2006, pp. 86–111
- Bruinsma, J. (ed.) (2003): 'World agriculture: towards 2015/2030', FAO, London: Earthscan
- Burniaux, J.-M. 2002. Incorporating carbon sequestration into CGE models: a prototype GTAP model with land uses. GTAP Resource 1144. Center for Global Trade Analysis, Department of Agricultural Economics, Purdue University, Indianapolis, USA. Electronic version at [http://www.gtap.agecon.purdue.edu/resources/res\\_display.asp?RecordID=1144](http://www.gtap.agecon.purdue.edu/resources/res_display.asp?RecordID=1144) [Accessed February 2008].
- Burniaux, J.-M., & Lee, Huey-Lin. 2003. Modelling Land Use Changes in GTAP. Conference Paper. Sixth Annual Conference on Global Economic Analysis, The Hague, The Netherlands. Electronic version at [http://www.gtap.agecon.purdue.edu/resources/res\\_display.asp?RecordID=1297](http://www.gtap.agecon.purdue.edu/resources/res_display.asp?RecordID=1297) [Accessed February 2008].
- Darwin, R., Tsigas, M., Lewandrowski, J., & Ranases, A. 1995. World Agriculture and Climate Change: Economic Adaptations. Agricultural Economic Report 703. Natural Resources and Environment Division, Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C., USA.
- Darwin, R., Tsigas, M., Lewandrowski, J., & Ranases, A. 1996. Land use and cover in ecological economics. *Ecological Economics*, 17, 157–181.
- Gollub A., Hertel T.W., B. Sohngen, 2009. Land Use Modeling in Recursively-Dynamic GTAP Framework In Hertel, T. W., S. Rose and R. Tol (eds.) *Economic Analysis of Land Use in Global Climate Change Policy*. Abingdon: Routledge
- Gollub A., Hertel T.W., Lee H.-L., Ramankutty N., 2006. *Modeling Land Supply and Demand in the Long Run*, prepared for the ninth annual conference on global economic analysis, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, June 15 -17, 2006. Electronic version at <https://www.gtap.agecon.purdue.edu/resources/download/2745.pdf> [Accessed March 2008].
- Hertel, T. W., H.-L. Lee, S. Rose and B. Sohngen 2006. Land heterogeneity in determining climate change mitigation costs. (Paper presented at the 9th annual conference on global economic analysis, Addis Ababa)

- Hertel, T.W. 1997. *Global trade analysis*. Cambridge.: Cambridge University Press.
- Hertel, T.W. and M.E. Tsigas, 1988, *Tax Policy and U.S. Agriculture: A General Equilibrium Approach*, *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* 70(2):289-302.
- Hertel, T.W., S. Rose and R. S. J. Tol 2009a. *Land Use in Computable General Equilibrium Models: An Overview*. In Hertel, T. W., S. Rose and R. Tol (eds.) *Economic Analysis of Land Use in Global Climate Change Policy*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Hertel, T.W., H.-L. Lee, S. Rose and B. Sohngen 2009b *Modeling Land-use Related Greenhouse Gas Sources and Sinks and their Mitigation Potential*, In Hertel, T. W., S. Rose and R. Tol (eds.) *Economic Analysis of Land Use in Global Climate Change Policy*. Abingdon: Routledge..
- Hsin, H., van Tongeren, F., Dewbre, J., & van Meijl, H. 2004. *A New Representation of Agricultural Production Technology in GTAP*. Conference Paper. 7th Annual Conference on Global Economic Analysis, Washington DC, United States. Electronic version at [http://www.gtap.agecon.purdue.edu/resources/res\\_display.asp?RecordID=1504](http://www.gtap.agecon.purdue.edu/resources/res_display.asp?RecordID=1504) [Accessed March 2008].
- Hubacek, K. and J. C.J.M. van den Bergh (2006), *Changing concepts of land in economic theory: From single to multi-disciplinary approaches*, *Ecological Economics* 56 (2006) 5– 27.
- Ianchovichina, E. and R. McDougall, 2001. *Structure of Dynamic GTAP*. GTAP Technical Paper 17, Center for Global Trade Analysis, available on line at [www.gtap.org](http://www.gtap.org).
- Ianchovichina, E., R. Darwin and R. Shoemaker 2001. *Resource use and technological progress in agriculture: a dynamic general equilibrium analysis*. *Ecological Economics*, 38, 275-291
- Ignaciuk, A.M. 2006. *Economics of multifunctional biomass systems*. Dissertation, Wageningen University, the Netherlands
- IMAGE team 2001. *The IMAGE 2.2 implementation of the SRES scenarios – A comprehensive analysis of emissions, climate change and impacts in the 21st century*. (RIVM CD-ROM publication 481508018, National Institute for Public Health and the Environment, Bilthoven, the Netherlands)
- IPCC (1996) *Guidelines for National Inventories*. reference manual for Agriculture.
- IPCC (2001) *Climate Change 2001*. Third Assessment Report of the IPCC, Cambridge University Press.
- IPCC (2007) *Climate Change 2007: Mitigation of Climate Change*. Fourth Assessment Report of the IPCC, Cambridge University Press. <http://www.ipcc.ch> Retrieved November 2007.
- Keeney R. and T. W. Hertel (2005). *GTAP-AGR: A Framework for Assessing the Implications of Multilateral Changes in Agricultural Policies*. GTAP Technical Paper No.24
- Klijn, J.A., Vullings, L.A.E., van den Berg, M., van Meijl, H., van Lammeren, R., van Rheenen, T, Veldkamp, A., and Verburg, P.H. 2005. *The EURURALIS study: Technical document*. Alterra-rapport 1196., Alterra, Wageningen.
- Lee, H.-L. (2004). *Incorporating Agro-ecological Zoned Data into the GTAP Framework*. Paper presented at the Seventh Annual Conference on Global Economic Analysis, The World Bank, Washington, D.C.
- Lee, H.-L. T. W. Hertel, S. Rose and M. Avetisyan (2009). *An Integrated Global Land Use Data Base For CGE Analysis Of Climate Policy Options*. In Hertel, T. W., S. Rose and R. Tol (eds.) (2009). *Economic Analysis of Land Use in Global Climate Change Policy*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- McKibbin, W., and Z.Wang, 1998. *The G-Cubed (Agriculture) Model: A Tool for Analyzing US Agriculture in a Globalizing World*. *Brooking discussion papers in international economics*

No 139.

- McKibbin W. J. and Sachs, J.D., 1991. *Global Linkages: Macroeconomic Interdependence and Cooperation in the World Economy*. The Brookings Institution, Washington..
- McKibbin, W.J., and P. Wilcoxon, 1998. The Theoretical and Empirical Structure of the GCubed Model. *Economic Modelling*, 16(1), 123–148.
- Robidoux, B., M. Smart, J. Lester, and L. Beausejour, 1989, *The Agriculture Expanded GETModel: Overview of Model Structure*, unpublished manuscript, Department of Finance, Ottawa, Canada.
- Ronneberger, K., M. Berrittella, F. Bosello and R.S.J. Tol (2009), *KLUM@GTAP: KLUM@GTAP: Spatially-Explicit, Biophysical Land Use in a Computable General Equilibrium Model* In Hertel, T. W., S. Rose and R. Tol (eds.) (2009). *Economic Analysis of Land Use in Global Climate Change Policy*. Abingdon: Routledge
- Sohngen, B. and R. Mendelsohn, 2006. “A Sensitivity Analysis of Carbon Sequestration”. In *Human-Induced Climate Change: An Interdisciplinary Assessment*. Edited by M. Schlezinger. Cambridge University Press.
- Stern, Nicholas (ed.) (2006). *The Economics of Climate Change: The Stern Review*. H.M. Treasury, U.K.
- Tan G., Shibasaki, R., Matsumora, K., and Rajan, K.S. 2003. Global research for integrated agricultural land use change modeling. Asia GIS Conference 2003 Publications. Wuhan Science and Technology Conference and Exhibition Center. Electronic version at <http://www.hku.hk/cupem/asiagis/fall03/Full Paper/Tan Guoxin.pdf> [Accessed May 2005].
- van Meijl, H., van Rheenen, T, Tabeau, A., & Eickhout, B. 2006. The impact of different policy environments on agricultural land use in Europe. *Agriculture Ecosystems and Environment*, 114(1), 21–38.
- Wong, G.Y., and J.R.R. Alavalapati (2003). The land-use effects of a forest carbon policy in the US. *Forest Policy and Economics*, 5, 249-263.

## 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.htm>

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

<http://www.repec.org>

<http://agecon.lib.umn.edu>

<http://www.bepress.com/feem/>

### NOTE DI LAVORO PUBLISHED IN 2009

- SD 1.2009 Michael Hoel: [Bush Meets Hotelling: Effects of Improved Renewable Energy Technology on Greenhouse Gas Emissions](#)
- SD 2.2009 Abay Mulatu, Reyer Gerlagh, Dan Rigby and Ada Wossink: [Environmental Regulation and Industry Location](#)
- SD 3.2009 Anna Alberini, Stefania Tonin and Margherita Turvani: [Rates of Time Preferences for Saving Lives in the Hazardous Waste Site Context](#)
- SD 4.2009 Elena Ojea, Paulo A.L.D. Nunes and Maria Loureiro: [Mapping of Forest Biodiversity Values: A Plural Perspective](#)
- SD 5.2009 Xavier Pautrel : [Macroeconomic Implications of Demography for the Environment: A Life-Cycle Perspective](#)
- IM 6.2009 Andrew Ellul, Marco Pagano and Fausto Panunzi: [Inheritance Law and Investment in Family Firms](#)
- IM 7.2009 Luigi Zingales: [The Future of Securities Regulation](#)
- SD 8.2009 Carlo Carraro, Emanuele Massetti and Lea Nicita: [How Does Climate Policy Affect Technical Change? An Analysis of the Direction and Pace of Technical Progress in a Climate-Economy Model](#)
- SD 9.2009 William K. Jaeger: [The Welfare Effects of Environmental Taxation](#)
- SD 10.2009 Aude Pommeret and Fabien Prieur: [Double Irreversibility and Environmental Policy Design](#)
- SD 11.2009 Massimiliano Mazzanti and Anna Montini: [Regional and Sector Environmental Efficiency Empirical Evidence from Structural Shift-share Analysis of NAMEA data](#)
- SD 12.2009 A. Chiabai, C. M. Travisi, H. Ding, A. Markandya and P.A.L.D Nunes: [Economic Valuation of Forest Ecosystem Services: Methodology and Monetary Estimates](#)
- SD 13.2009 Andrea Bigano, Mariaester Cassinelli, Fabio Sfera, Lisa Guarrera, Sohbet Karbuz, Manfred Hafner, Anil Markandya and Ståle Navrud: [The External Cost of European Crude Oil Imports](#)
- SD 14.2009 Valentina Bosetti, Carlo Carraro, Romain Duval, Alessandra Sgobbi and Massimo Tavoni: [The Role of R&D and Technology Diffusion in Climate Change Mitigation: New Perspectives Using the Witch Model](#)
- IM 15.2009 Andrea Beltratti, Marianna Caccavaio and Bernardo Bortolotti: [Stock Prices in a Speculative Market: The Chinese Split-Share Reform](#)
- GC 16.2009 Angelo Antoci, Fabio Sabatini and Mauro Sodini: [The Fragility of Social Capital](#)
- SD 17.2009 Alexander Golub, Sabine Fuss, Jana Szolgayova and Michael Obersteiner: [Effects of Low-cost Offsets on Energy Investment – New Perspectives on REDD –](#)
- SD 18.2009 Enrica De Cian: [Factor-Augmenting Technical Change: An Empirical Assessment](#)
- SD 19.2009 Irene Valsecchi: [Non-Uniqueness of Equilibria in One-Shot Games of Strategic Communication](#)
- SD 20.2009 Dimitra Vouvaki and Anastasios Xeapapadeas: [Total Factor Productivity Growth when Factors of Production Generate Environmental Externalities](#)
- SD 21.2009 Giulia Macagno, Maria Loureiro, Paulo A.L.D. Nunes and Richard Tol: [Assessing the Impact of Biodiversity on Tourism Flows: A model for Tourist Behaviour and its Policy Implications](#)
- IM 22.2009 Bernardo Bortolotti, Veljko Fotak, William Megginson and William Miracky: [Sovereign Wealth Fund Investment Patterns and Performance](#)
- IM 23.2009 Cesare Dosi and Michele Moretto: [Auctioning Monopoly Franchises: Award Criteria and Service Launch Requirements](#)
- SD 24.2009 Andrea Bastianin: [Modelling Asymmetric Dependence Using Copula Functions: An application to Value-at-Risk in the Energy Sector](#)
- IM 25.2009 Shai Bernstein, Josh Lerner and Antoinette Schoar: [The Investment Strategies of Sovereign Wealth Funds](#)
- SD 26.2009 Marc Germain, Henry Tulkens and Alphonse Magnus: [Dynamic Core-Theoretic Cooperation in a Two-Dimensional International Environmental Model](#)
- IM 27.2009 Frank Partnoy: [Overdependence on Credit Ratings Was a Primary Cause of the Crisis](#)
- SD 28.2009 Frank H. Page Jr and Myrna H. Wooders (lxxxv): [Endogenous Network Dynamics](#)
- SD 29.2009 Caterina Calsamiglia, Guillaume Haeringer and Flip Klijn (lxxxv): [Constrained School Choice: An Experimental Study](#)
- SD 30.2009 Gilles Grandjean, Ana Mauleon and Vincent Vannetelbosch (lxxxv): [Connections Among Farsighted Agents](#)
- SD 31.2009 Antonio Nicoló and Carmelo Rodríguez Álvarez (lxxxv): [Feasibility Constraints and Protective Behavior in Efficient Kidney Exchange](#)
- SD 32.2009 Rahmi İlkiliç (lxxxv): [Cournot Competition on a Network of Markets and Firms](#)
- SD 33.2009 Luca Dall'Asta, Paolo Pin and Abolfazl Ramezanzpour (lxxxv): [Optimal Equilibria of the Best Shot Game](#)
- SD 34.2009 Edoardo Gallo (lxxxv): [Small World Networks with Segregation Patterns and Brokers](#)
- SD 35.2009 Benjamin Golub and Matthew O. Jackson (lxxxv): [How Homophily Affects Learning and Diffusion in Networks](#)

- SD 36.2009 Markus Kinatered (lxxxv): [Team Formation in a Network](#)
- SD 37.2009 Constanza Fosco and Friederike Mengel (lxxxv): [Cooperation through Imitation and Exclusion in Networks](#)
- SD 38.2009 Berno Buechel and Tim Hellmann (lxxxv): [Under-connected and Over-connected Networks](#)
- SD 39.2009 Alexey Kushnir (lxxxv): [Matching Markets with Signals](#)
- SD 40.2009 Alessandro Tavoni (lxxxv): [Incorporating Fairness Motives into the Impulse Balance Equilibrium and Quantal Response Equilibrium Concepts: An Application to 2x2 Games](#)
- SD 41.2009 Steven J. Brams and D. Marc Kilgour (lxxxv): [Kingmakers and Leaders in Coalition Formation](#)
- SD 42.2009 Dotan Persitz (lxxxv): [Power in the Heterogeneous Connections Model: The Emergence of Core-Periphery Networks](#)
- SD 43.2009 Fabio Eboli, Ramiro Parrado, Roberto Roson: [Climate Change Feedback on Economic Growth: Explorations with a Dynamic General Equilibrium Mode](#)
- GC 44.2009 Fabio Sabatini: [Does Social Capital Create Trust? Evidence from a Community of Entrepreneurs](#)
- SD 45.2009 ZhongXiang Zhang: [Is it Fair to Treat China as a Christmas Tree to Hang Everybody's Complaints? Putting its Own Energy Saving into Perspective](#)
- SD 46.2009 Eftichios S. Sartzetakis, Anastasios Xepapadeas and Emmanuel Petrakis: [The Role of Information Provision as a Policy Instrument to Supplement Environmental Taxes: Empowering Consumers to Choose Optimally](#)
- SD 47.2009 Jean-François Caulier, Ana Mauleon and Vincent Vannetelbosch: [Contractually Stable Networks](#)
- GC 48.2009 Massimiliano Mazzanti, Susanna Mancinelli, Giovanni Ponti and Nora Piva: [Education, Reputation or Network? Evidence from Italy on Migrant Workers Employability](#)
- SD 49.2009 William Brock and Anastasios Xepapadeas: [General Pattern Formation in Recursive Dynamical Systems Models in Economics](#)
- SD 50.2009 Giovanni Marin and Massimiliano Mazzanti: [Emissions Trends and Labour Productivity Dynamics Sector Analyses of De-coupling/Recoupling on a 1990-2005 Namea](#)
- SD 51.2009 Yoshio Kamijo and Ryo Kawasaki (lxxxv): [Dynamics, Stability, and Foresight in the Shapley-Scarf Housing Market](#)
- IM 52.2009 Laura Poddi and Sergio Vergalli: [Does Corporate Social Responsibility Affect the Performance of Firms?](#)
- SD 53.2009 Valentina Bosetti, Carlo Carraro and Massimo Tavoni: [Climate Change Mitigation Strategies in Fast-Growing Countries: The Benefits of Early Action](#)
- GC 54.2009 Alireza Naghavi and Gianmarco I.P. Ottaviano: [Firm Heterogeneity, Contract Enforcement, and the Industry Dynamics of Offshoring](#)
- IM 55.2009 Giacomo Calzolari and Carlo Scarpa: [On Regulation and Competition: Pros and Cons of a Diversified Monopolist](#)
- SD 56.2009 Valentina Bosetti, Ruben Lubowski and Alexander Golub and Anil Markandya: [Linking Reduced Deforestation and a Global Carbon Market: Impacts on Costs, Financial Flows, and Technological Innovation](#)
- IM 57.2009 Emmanuel Farhi and Jean Tirole: [Collective Moral Hazard, Maturity Mismatch and Systemic Bailouts](#)
- SD 58.2009 Kelly C. de Bruin and Rob B. Dellink: [How Harmful are Adaptation Restrictions](#)
- SD 59.2009 Rob Dellink, Michel den Elzen, Harry Aiking, Emmy Bergsma, Frans Berkhout, Thijs Dekker, Joyeeta Gupta: [Sharing the Burden of Adaptation Financing: An Assessment of the Contributions of Countries](#)
- SD 60.2009 Stefania Tonin, Anna Alberini and Margherita Turvani: [The Value of Reducing Cancer Risks at Contaminated Sites: Are More Heavily Exposed People Willing to Pay More?](#)
- SD 61.2009 Chiara Costa Duarte, Maria A. Cunha-e-Sá and Renato Rosa: [The Role of Forests as Carbon Sinks: Land-Use and Carbon Accounting](#)
- GC 62.2009 Carlo Altomonte and Gabor Békés: [Trade Complexity and Productivity](#)
- GC 63.2009 Elena Bellini, Gianmarco I.P. Ottaviano, Dino Pinelli and Giovanni Prarolo: [Cultural Diversity and Economic Performance: Evidence from European Regions](#)
- SD 64.2009 Valentina Bosetti, Carlo Carraro, Enrica De Cian, Romain Duval, Emanuele Massetti and Massimo Tavoni: [The Incentives to Participate in, and the Stability of, International Climate Coalitions: A Game-theoretic Analysis Using the Witch Model](#)
- IM 65.2009 John Temple Lang: [Article 82 EC – The Problems and The Solution](#)
- SD 66.2009 P. Dumas and S. Hallegatte: [Think Again: Higher Elasticity of Substitution Increases Economic Resilience](#)
- SD 67.2009 Ruslana Rachel Palatnik and Roberto Roson: [Climate Change Assessment and Agriculture in General Equilibrium Models: Alternative Modeling Strategies](#)

(lxxxv) This paper has been presented at the 14th Coalition Theory Network Workshop held in Maastricht, The Netherlands, on 23-24 January 2009 and organised by the Maastricht University CTN group (Department of Economics, [http://www.feem-web.it/ctn/12d\\_maa.php](http://www.feem-web.it/ctn/12d_maa.php)).