

Sinclair-Desgagné, Bernard; David, Maia

**Working Paper**

## Environmental Regulation and the Eco-Industry

Nota di Lavoro, No. 56.2005

**Provided in Cooperation with:**

Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei (FEEM)

*Suggested Citation:* Sinclair-Desgagné, Bernard; David, Maia (2005) : Environmental Regulation and the Eco-Industry, Nota di Lavoro, No. 56.2005, Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei (FEEM), Milano

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/74074>

**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.*

## **Environmental Regulation and the Eco-Industry**

Maia David and Bernard Sinclair-Desgagné

NOTA DI LAVORO 56.2005

**APRIL 2005**

ETA – Economic Theory and Applications
--

Maia David, *UMR INRA-INAPG Économie publique, Paris*  
Bernard Sinclair-Desgagné, *École polytechnique Paris, CIRANO, CIRAIG, and HEC Montréal*

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=705182>

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

# Environmental Regulation and the Eco-Industry

## Summary

This paper re-examines environmental regulation, under the assumption that pollution abatement technologies and services are provided by an imperfectly competitive environment industry. It is shown that each regulatory instrument (emission taxes and quotas; design standards; and voluntary agreements) has a specific impact on the price-elasticity of the polluters' demand for abatement services, hence on the market power of the eco-industry and the resulting cost of abatement. This implies that the optimal pollution tax will be higher than the marginal social cost of pollution, while a voluntary approach to pollution abatement may fail unless the eco-industry itself is willing to participate.

**Keywords:** Pollution regulation, End-of-pipe pollution abatement, Environment industry

**JEL Classification:** H23, L13, Q58

*Forthcoming in the Journal of Regulatory Economics. We thank Dominique Bureau, Olivier Godard, Émeric Henry, Nicolas Marchetti, Alain-Désiré Nimubona, Anne Perrot, Gilles Rotillon, Katheline Schubert, the editors Michael Crew and Anthony Heyes, and two anonymous referees for helpful discussions and suggestions. We also acknowledge valuable comments from seminar audiences at HEC Montréal, the Universities of Paris I and Toulouse, and the DG-Entreprise of the European Commission in Brussels.*

*Address for correspondence:*

Bernard Sinclair-Desgagné  
HEC Montréal  
3000 Chemin de la Côte-Sainte-Catherine  
H3T 2A7 Montréal Québec  
Canada  
Phone: +1 514 340 6461  
Fax: +1 514 340 6469  
E-mail: [bsd@hec.ca](mailto:bsd@hec.ca)

## 1. Introduction

Pollution abatement goods and services are now largely supplied by a number of specialized firms. In 1997, these firms totalled earnings of \$350 billion, and this figure has been projected to double by 2010.<sup>1</sup> In some countries, such as Germany, France and the Netherlands, their activities account for as much as 2% of the annual GDP (Barton 1997). Unsurprisingly, the “eco-industry” has then become a major topic for industrial policy and international trade discussions.<sup>2</sup> It is also central to most government bodies and institutions concerned with environmental regulation. Yet, someone will hardly find in the environmental economics literature an acknowledgement that there even exists such an industry: pollution abatement is consistently assumed to be set only by polluters, based in turn on relevant technological, regulatory or output market considerations, but absent any explicit market or bilateral relationship with actual suppliers. This paper represents a first attempt to fill this gap.

The basic (textbook) framework to analyze pollution abatement can already be viewed as a partial equilibrium model involving a representative price-taking polluter who may procure the needed goods and services on a perfectly competitive market (under no uncer-

---

<sup>1</sup>For additional data, see the reports by the European Commission (1999), the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (1992, 1996), and the World Trade Organization (1998).

<sup>2</sup>In order to collect reliable data and stimulate rigorous analyses, the OECD and the Statistical Office of the European Commission (Eurostat) have recently developed the following definition of the environment industry (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development/Eurostat 1999): “*The environment industry consists of activities which produce goods and services to measure, prevent, limit, minimize or correct environmental damage to water, air, and soil, as well as problems related to waste, noise and eco-systems. These include cleaner technologies, products and services which reduce environmental risk and minimize pollution and resource use.*” Note that pollution abatement accounts for more than 80% of the industry’s income (Institut Français de l’Environnement 2002).

tainty, asymmetric information, or capacity constraints). In two companion articles that focus on trade and environmental policy and that first bring in the eco-industry, Feess and Muehlheusser (1999, 2002) similarly leave out all strategic actions on the part of environmental service providers.<sup>3</sup> Several empirical studies reveal, however, that significant segments of the eco-industry, such as waste management, are now dominated by a small number of large suppliers (Barton 1997; Baumol 1995; Davies 2002). These environment firms certainly enjoy some market power and matter to each other. To capture such features, this paper amends the basic framework with the alternative assumption that pollution abatement goods and services are delivered either by a Cournot oligopoly (subsection 4.1) or a monopoly (subsection 4.2).<sup>4</sup> In this context, we find that the particular public policy approach chosen to regulate pollution has a definite influence on the market power of environment firms and on the resulting market price of abatement, through its direct impact on the price-elasticity of demand for pollution-abating services. As a consequence, an optimal pollution tax should be set higher than the marginal social cost of damage (otherwise, the elasticity of demand for pollution abatement would be such

---

<sup>3</sup>These papers' objective is to examine whether tighter environmental regulation may benefit a trading nation. Current wisdom about strategic environmental policy (see, for instance, Barrett 1994) recommends that a tax on emissions be smaller than the marginal social cost of pollution damages (as long as countries compete in quantities and the commodities sold on international markets are strategic substitutes). Feess and Muehlheusser show that the opposite conclusion may hold, however, in the presence of an eco-industry where the production of environmental services is subject to a learning curve.

<sup>4</sup>It might actually have been even more realistic to model the eco-industry as an oligopoly with a competitive fringe, for in most market segments many small and medium enterprises (SMEs) still provide specific equipment and services (World Trade Organization 1998). This would have complicated the presentation, however, without changing our basic message that imperfect competition between abatement technology suppliers *is* important for environmental regulation.

that the relatively higher prices reached under imperfect competition would generate too little abatement), and a voluntary approach to pollution abatement may be unsuccessful without the eco-industry's willingness to participate.

The following section will now present our model. Section 3 next contains a brief discussion of what first-best production and abatement levels would be. Section 4 - this paper's main section - then turns to environmental regulation and successively considers the two main types of policy instruments - emission-based (i.e., emissions taxes and quotas) and abatement-based (i.e., design standards and voluntary agreements). Section 5 concludes the paper by discussing some possible extensions of the model and future research topics.

## 2. The Model

Before spelling out our model, it is worth recalling a few stylized facts. The eco-industry can be divided into three broad segments: pollution management, cleaner technologies and products, and resources management (WTO 1998; OECD/Eurostat 1999). The first group is by far the most significant in terms of income; it comprises mostly end-of-pipe activities, such as (in decreasing order of importance) solid waste management, waste water treatment, air pollution control, and contaminated soil and groundwater remediation (European Commission 1999). Competition naturally varies within industry segments and countries, but in the United States and Germany for instance, environment firms are generally of a larger size than the national firm average (Barton 1997).<sup>5</sup> One rationale

---

<sup>5</sup>Ten years ago, for example, *Waste Management Technologies* already accounted for about 10% of

for this is that these firms must currently rely heavily on R&D to compete globally and keep abreast of rapidly evolving environmental regulations. These pieces of information should now fix intuition for the model that follows.

## 2.1. Basic Assumptions

Consider a representative price-taking firm that produces one consumption good while emitting one pollutant. The current price of the consumption good is  $P$ , and the production cost associated with an output level  $x$  is denoted as  $C(x)$ . This cost function is assumed twice differentiable, strictly increasing and convex.

The firm's emission level is given by the function  $e(x, w)$ , where  $w$  represents abatement effort. This emission function is twice continuously differentiable and such that  $e_x > 0$  (production generates pollution),  $e_w < 0$  (abatement effort reduces pollution),  $e_{xx} \geq 0$  (the more the firm produces, the more the last unit delivered pollutes), and  $e_{ww} > 0$  (there are decreasing returns to abatement). In a manner similar to Barnett (1980), Katsoulacos and Xepapadeas (1995), and Farzin and Kort (2001), for instance, we shall focus on end-of-pipe pollution abatement. We therefore assume that  $e(x, w)$  is also additively separable, i.e.,  $e_{xw} = 0$ , for an investment in end-of-pipe abatement does not modify the production process and so does not affect the amount of pollution imputable to each unit produced. Like Katsoulacos and Xepapadeas (1995), let us suppose, furthermore, that the function  $e_w(w)w$  is decreasing in  $w$ , which means that the emission function is not too convex in  $w$ . All these assumptions would be satisfied if, for example,  $e(x, w) = kx - \sqrt{Lw}$ , where

---

total eco-industry earnings in the United States and rivaled the aircraft manufacturer *Lockheed* in size (Karliner 1994).

$k$  and  $L$  are positive real numbers.<sup>6</sup>

## 2.2. Enters the Eco-Industry

Now, let the abatement goods and services be delivered by an eco-industry. An individual supplier  $i$  incurs a cost  $G(w_i)$  for producing a quantity  $w_i$  of abatement goods and services, where  $G(\cdot)$  is twice differentiable, strictly increasing, convex, and such that  $G'(0) = 0$ .

In the simplest setting, the eco-industry is made of  $n$  identical firms competing à la Cournot. The case where  $n = 1$  corresponds to a monopoly, while making  $n \rightarrow \infty$  captures perfect competition. The market for abatement is characterized by an inverse demand function  $q(w)$ , where  $w$  stands for total purchases of abatement goods and services. Firm  $i$ 's profits are then

$$\Pi_i = q(w)w_i - G(w_i) \quad , \quad i = 1, \dots, n \quad ,$$

and the first-order condition for profit maximization is precisely<sup>7</sup>

$$\frac{\partial q}{\partial w} w_i + q(w) - G'(w_i) = 0 \quad , \quad i = 1, \dots, n \quad . \quad (1)$$

Since all environment firms are similar, we have that  $w_i = \frac{w}{n}$  at an equilibrium.<sup>8</sup> Let

---

<sup>6</sup>Formally, the function  $e(x, w)$  could take negative values. However, the quantity of pollution generated by a firm being necessarily positive or equal to zero, we only consider levels of  $x$  and  $w$  at which  $e(x, w)$  is positive. This amounts to suppose that the firm never abates more than it pollutes, which is always true at an equilibrium.

<sup>7</sup>Given our assumptions, first-order conditions are necessary and sufficient wherever they appear.

<sup>8</sup>We suppose that the Cournot-Nash equilibrium exists and is unique. This is ensured when the profit functions  $\Pi_i$  are concave in  $w_i$ , i.e., when we have  $\frac{\partial^2 q}{\partial w^2} w_i + 2 \frac{\partial q}{\partial w} - G'' \leq 0$ .



$w' = \frac{\partial w}{\partial q}$  ; equation (1) can now be re-written as

$$q(w) = G'(w_i) - \frac{w}{n} \cdot \frac{1}{w'} \quad , \quad i = 1, \dots, n \quad . \quad (2)$$

When the number of environment firms  $n$  gets large, the price  $q$  paid by the polluting firm for each unit of abatement approximates the marginal cost. This is the situation assumed implicitly throughout the environmental economics literature. In general, however, since  $w'$  is negative (this is proven in section 4), equation (2) reveals that  $q(w) > G'(w_i)$ , so the market price of abatement must exceed the marginal abatement cost. This is a well-known outcome of Cournot competition (or any form of imperfect competition). Also well-known is that the difference between  $q(w)$  and  $G'(w_i)$  - which reflects the environment firms market power - decreases with the price-elasticity of demand for abatement.<sup>9</sup> We shall soon see how various policy instruments affect this elasticity.

### 3. First-Best Abatement

Abatement efforts are motivated, first of all, by the negative contribution of pollution to social well-being. Without loss of generality, let the level of social prejudice  $D$  increase linearly with the amount of emissions, i.e.,  $D = \nu e(x, w)$  with some positive coefficient  $\nu$ . Social welfare is now the sum of consumers' surplus, the polluter's and the eco-industry's

---

<sup>9</sup>Note that  $w' = \varepsilon \frac{w}{q}$ , where  $\varepsilon$  denotes the price-elasticity of demand.

profits, and the social damage due to pollution:

$$W = \int_0^x P(u)du - C(x) - qw + qw - nG\left(\frac{w}{n}\right) - ve(x, w). \quad (3)$$

The first-order conditions for welfare maximization are then

$$P(x^*) - C'(x^*) - ve_x(x^*) = 0, \quad (4)$$

$$-G'\left(\frac{w^*}{n}\right) - ve_w(w^*) = 0. \quad (5)$$

According to (4), the price of the consumption good should embed the marginal cost of producing this good plus the marginal social damage associated with it. And according to (5), abatement goods should also be delivered, up to the level  $w^*$  where the marginal cost  $G'\left(\frac{w^*}{n}\right)$  of the eco-industry equals the marginal social benefit of abatement  $-ve_w(w^*)$ .

The social welfare objective given by (3), however, makes the eco-industry's revenue and the polluting firm's abatement expenses cancel. All transactions over abatement goods and services were thereby ignored. But if the polluting firm is left to maximize its profits, i.e., to solve

$$\max_{x,w} \pi = Px - C(x) - qw ,$$

it will surely select the output level  $x^0$  where the marginal production cost  $C'(x^0)$  equals the market price  $P$  of the consumption good, while setting its abatement orders at  $w^0 = 0$ .

*Without further regulatory intervention, there would therefore be no market for abatement.*

## 4. Regulation

Environmental regulation not only creates a potential market for pollution-abating technologies, it also affects the market power of environment firms. To see this, let us now successively consider some standard policy instruments.

### 4.1. Emission-Based Instruments

Suppose that the regulator introduces a tax  $t$  per unit of emission. The profit-maximizing polluter now behaves as if solving

$$\max_{x,w} \pi^t = Px - C(x) - qw - te(x, w) ,$$

so the output and abatement levels will be such that

$$P - C'(x^t) - te_x(x^t) = 0, \tag{6}$$

$$-q - te_w(w^t) = 0. \tag{7}$$

To satisfy the latter, the polluting firm is then willing to invest in abatement.

By Cramer's rule, equations (6) and (7) imply that the price-derivative of demand for abating services is precisely

$$w'_t = \frac{\partial w^t}{\partial q} = -\frac{1}{te_{ww}} . \tag{8}$$

Since the second-order derivative  $e_{ww}$  is strictly positive,  $w'_t$  is negative; this indicates that, as naturally expected, the polluter's abatement purchases decrease when the price

of the abating goods and services goes up. The magnitude of  $w'_t$  first depends on the convexity of the emission function with respect to abatement effort: if  $e_{ww}$  increases, then  $w'_t$  decreases. This means that, as abatement measures become more effective (at the margin), the polluter's demand for abatement goods and services is less sensitive to their price. What seems important from a policy standpoint, furthermore, is that a larger tax rate  $t$  would similarly bring  $w'_t$  closer to zero. In other words: *when the tax on pollutant emissions goes up, demand for abatement becomes less price-elastic.*

Assuming the regulator is benevolent, the tax level will now be set in order to maximize the following social welfare function:

$$W^t = \int_0^{x^t} P(u)du - C(x^t) - qw^t - te(x^t, w^t) + nq\frac{w^t}{n} - nG(\frac{w^t}{n}) - ve(x^t, w^t) + te(x^t, w^t).$$

Straightforward algebra reduces this expression to<sup>10</sup>

$$W^t = \int_0^{x^t} P(u)du - C(x^t) - nG(\frac{w^t}{n}) - ve(x^t, w^t).$$

It can be shown (see the appendix) that the first-order condition for welfare maximization with respect to  $t$  then yields

$$t^* = v \left[ \frac{e_x(x^t) \frac{dx^t}{dt} + e_w(w^t) \frac{dw^t}{dt}}{e_x(x^t) \frac{dx^t}{dt} + [\frac{w^t e_{ww}}{n} + e_w(w^t)] \frac{dw^t}{dt}} \right]. \quad (9)$$

---

<sup>10</sup>This simplification amounts, of course, to supposing that tax revenues are transferred and redistributed in a neutral way.

Standard comparative statics via equations (6) and (7) entails that  $\frac{dx^t}{dt} < 0$  and  $\frac{dw^t}{dt} > 0$ ; the latter's numerator is therefore negative. And since  $e_w(w)w$  is decreasing by assumption, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} we_{ww} + e_w(w) &< 0, \\ \text{so } \frac{w^t e_{ww}}{n} + e_w(w^t) &< 0, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that the denominator in (9) is also negative. The optimal tax rate is thus positive. Moreover, notice that  $\frac{w^t e_{ww}}{n} \frac{dw^t}{dt} > 0$ . The coefficient of  $\nu$  in the above expression is then greater than 1, so  $t^* > v$ . This finding constitutes our first proposition.

**Proposition 1:** *When abatement goods and services are supplied by environment firms competing à la Cournot, the optimal pollution tax must be larger than the marginal social damage of emissions.*

Observe that, when the number of environment firms  $n$  grows, the coefficient of  $\nu$  tends to one.<sup>11</sup> As competition within the eco-industry increases, the optimal tax on emissions then approximates the marginal prejudice caused by the polluting activity. Proposition 1 is therefore consistent with Pigou (1920)'s classical result.

The proposition nevertheless contrasts with several streams of the current literature, notably with the one that postulates an imperfectly competitive *polluting* industry. Under a polluting monopoly, or when polluting firms are identical and their number is exogenous

---

<sup>11</sup>This conclusion obtains from the presence of the term  $\frac{w^t e_{ww}}{n}$  in (9). It therefore remains valid if  $e_{ww}$  goes to zero instead.

(as in the actual setting), it has indeed been shown that the optimal emission tax falls short of the marginal damage cost (see Buchanan 1969; Barnett 1980; and Katsoulacos and Xepapadeas 1995).<sup>12</sup> The intuitive rationale for departing from these standard results runs as follows. When the eco-industry is imperfectly competitive, the price of abatement goods and services will be larger than their marginal cost. In this case (comparing equations (5) and (7)), if the tax  $t$  was to be set equal to the marginal damage  $v$ , then the polluter would settle for an abatement level that is too small relative to the first-best  $w^*$ . In order to lessen this distortion, the regulator must then tax pollutant emissions more severely.<sup>13</sup>

In the present context, we can show that a quota on emissions is equivalent to an emission tax, in the sense that it leads to the same output level and abatement expenses. Our analysis of emission-based instruments is then complete. Let us now consider the alternative set of policy instruments.

## 4.2. Abatement-Based Instruments

Abatement-based regulation is sometimes preferred to an approach centered on emissions. It may be difficult, for instance, to precisely measure a polluter's emissions, as in farming and fishing where non-point source pollution is frequent. The regulator would then rely on policy instruments which target the means a potential polluter is commit-

---

<sup>12</sup>Otherwise, the pollution tax would exacerbate the allocative inefficiency (i.e., the under-production) due to imperfect competition. Note that this recommendation can be revised if polluting firms are different or their number is endogenous (Katsoulacos and Xepapadeas 1995; Long and Soubeyran 1999).

<sup>13</sup>As in Buchanan (1969) and Barnett (1980) celebrated work, the optimal tax  $t^*$  balances the desire to give stronger incentives to abatement with the necessity to limit the contraction of output. Of course, these two distortions could be simultaneously alleviated so that first-best production and abatement levels are implemented if the regulator could combine several policy instruments. This issue is briefly considered in the conclusion of this paper.

ted to take to reduce pollution. This section successively investigates two such instruments: design standards and voluntary agreements. For simplicity, but without impairing our qualitative conclusions, we assume throughout that  $n = 1$  so the eco-industry is a monopoly.

#### 4.2.1 *Design Standards*

To curtail polluting emissions (of sulfure dioxide, say), the regulator can mandate some specific abatement technologies (such as a particular family of scrubbers). In the present model, this command-and-control approach amounts to impose a given abatement level  $\bar{w}$ . We suppose that this design standard can be perfectly and costlessly enforced.

In the standard textbook framework,  $\bar{w}$  is chosen in order to maximize the social welfare function

$$W = \int_0^x P(u)du - C(x) - q^D w + q^D w - G(w) - ve(x, w) \quad (10)$$

with respect to  $w$ , subject to the polluting industry's willingness to produce and to the polluters' and environment firms' respective profit-maximization conditions

$$P(x) - C(x) - qw \geq 0, \quad (11)$$

$$C'(x) = P, \quad (12)$$

$$G'(w) = q^D. \quad (13)$$

Clearly, the first-best abatement level  $w^*$  defined in (5) is implemented if it is feasible, but according to (12) the polluting firm produces up to its absolute profit-maximizing level  $x^0 > x^*$ .

Under a single abatement supplier, however, constraint (13) must be replaced with

$$q^D w - G(w) \geq 0, \text{ and} \tag{14}$$

$$q^D \text{ maximizes } qw - G(w) \text{ subject to (11) and (12) ,} \tag{15}$$

which respectively capture the environment firm's willingness to participate and profit-maximizing behavior. Provided (14) holds, these new conditions do not affect the regulator's choice of standard or the polluters' production effort, which can respectively remain at  $w^*$  and  $x^0$ , but (15) entails that the polluters' participation constraint (11) will *always* be binding. This observation yields a second proposition.

**Proposition 2:** *If the regulator enforces a design standard while abatement goods and services are supplied by a monopoly, then the polluting firms' profits are brought to zero.*

This statement tends to explain why mandatory design standards often meet with strong resistance on the part of polluters. The latter would then lobby the regulator so that a price ceiling on abatement goods and services be also enforced or the current policy be simply abandoned.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup>Specific political economy issues raised by the presence of an eco-industry are further discussed in the conclusion of this paper.



#### 4.2.2 Voluntary Agreements

An alternative abatement-based approach that has become quite common over the last decade is the voluntary agreement. In practice, this approach can take various forms (see the OECD 1999 report). The one we shall consider here is often encountered in Europe: the regulator makes the polluter a take-it-or-leave-it offer  $w^V$  on its abatement level, while threatening to impose an emission tax  $\tau$  if this proposal is rejected.<sup>15</sup>

Compared with the design standard, the opportunity the polluter now has to select between achieving a fixed abatement level or being free to choose one under a given pollution tax certainly increases the price-elasticity of demand for abatement and limits the environment firm's market power. If the market price of abatement is too high, the polluting firm can always reduce its orders and submit itself to the emission tax. This inherent flexibility of the voluntary agreement seems to clearly justify its growing popularity and the corresponding decline of command-and-control approaches. But let us examine the situation more carefully.

In the usual textbook setting, the offer  $w^V$  has to maximize the social welfare function

$$W^V = \int_0^x P(u)du - C(x) - G(w) - ve(x, w) \quad (16)$$

---

<sup>15</sup>Formally, the extensive form of the game is the following. First, the regulator makes an abatement proposal  $w^V$ . Next, polluters accept or refuse the regulator's offer. If they accept,  $w^V$  is enforced; if not, then the regulator raises a tax  $\tau$  per unit of polluting emissions, and the polluters and the eco-industry adjust to it. Subgame perfection requires that  $\tau$  be set in order to maximize the regulator's objective  $W^t = \int_0^{x^t} P(u)du - C(x^t) - G(w^t) - ve(x^t, w^t)$  with respect to  $t$ , where  $x^t$  and  $w^t$  are determined by the polluters' and the environment firms' respective profit maximization under  $t$ . Hence,  $\tau = v$  when the eco-industry is perfectly competitive, and  $\tau = t^*$  when it is a Cournot oligopoly.

with respect to  $w$ , subject to the polluting industry's willingness to accept and to the polluters' and environment firms' respective profit-maximization conditions

$$Px - C(x) - q^V w \geq Px^\tau - C(x^\tau) - q^\tau w^\tau - \tau e(x^\tau, w^\tau) , \quad (17)$$

$$C'(x) = P , C'(x^\tau) + \tau e_x(x^\tau) = P , -\tau e_w(w^\tau) = q^\tau , \quad (18)$$

$$G'(w) = q^V , G'(w^\tau) = q^\tau . \quad (19)$$

Again, we have that the polluters' output  $x^V = x^0$ , so as much of the consumption good is produced as in a situation with no environmental regulation. Notice, however, that the right-hand side of (17) is greater than or equal to zero, so the regulator's choice set can be smaller than under command-and-control. This may not allow the first-best abatement level  $w^*$  to be implemented voluntarily.

If the eco-industry is a monopoly, however, the incentive constraint (19) changes into

$$q^V \text{ maximizes } \Pi^V = qw - G(w) \text{ subject to (11) and (18), and} \quad (20)$$

$$q^\tau \text{ maximizes } \Pi^\tau = qw^\tau - G(w^\tau) \text{ subject to (11) and (18).} \quad (21)$$

On the one hand, condition (21) relaxes the participation constraint (17) by decreasing the value of its right-hand side. This reflects that an emission tax now constitutes a stronger threat, which leaves the regulator greater chances to achieve  $w^*$ . On the other hand, the monopolistic price  $q^V$  set under (20) will usually be so high as to violate (17)

and deter any agreement with the regulator. To fix this, the latter may authorize polluters to renege on a promised abatement level if the environment firm charges too high a price. The following conditions must then substitute for condition (20):

$$q^V \text{ maximizes } \Pi^V = qw - G(w) \text{ subject to (17) and (18) , and} \quad (20')$$

$$\Pi^V \geq \Pi^\tau . \quad (22)$$

According to these, the environment firm will maximize its profits without jeopardizing the voluntary scheme (condition (20')), provided it is better off under this scheme than under an emission tax (condition (22)). This conclusion supports our last proposition.

**Proposition 3.** *In the presence of a monopolistic eco-industry, a voluntary agreement is feasible only if the environment firm is also willing to participate.*

Clearly, under (20') the participation constraint (17) will be binding, so polluters end up being indifferent between accepting the regulator's proposal or opting for the emission tax. As opposed to the command-and-control situation, however, the polluters' profits may now be strictly positive.

## 5. Concluding Remarks

Prices polluters pay to alleviate environmental damages are currently often determined on market segments dominated by a few large suppliers of abatement technologies. While this fact is widely acknowledged in environmental policy discussions, environmental economics still provides little guidance on how to precisely regulate polluting activities in this context.

This paper first sought to convey the message that imperfect competition between environment firms does matter for environmental regulation. Accordingly, we amended the basic (textbook) setting - which involves a representative price-taking polluter and no uncertainty or asymmetric information - by now making the polluting firm acquire abatement goods and services from only one supplier or from many identical suppliers competing à la Cournot. We then showed that taxes on emissions would have to be adjusted upward, and that a voluntary agreement on abatement efforts may not be doable if the eco-industry is reluctant to support it.

The present analysis could be extended in various ways. Other policy instruments - such as abatement subsidies, tradable emission permits, performance standards, and different voluntary schemes - should be considered. Additional segments of the environment industry (cleaner technologies and product; resources management) could be brought in (at the cost of dropping our assumption that the emission function  $e(x, w)$  is additively separable). There could be imperfect competition between polluters as well.<sup>16</sup> Other modes of competition than Cournot could be studied. Entry and exit in the end product sector and in the eco-industry could be made endogenous. Polluting and environment firms could be heterogeneous. And environment firms could be endowed with private information about the cost (or the quality) of their abatement goods and services.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup>Intuitively, since Cournot competition between polluters and between abatement suppliers entails that optimal emission taxes are respectively lower and higher than the marginal social cost of pollution damage, simultaneous Cournot competition in *both* the product and the abatement industries would bring such taxes closer to the Pigouvian level. A formal demonstration of this can be found in Nimubona and Sinclair-Desgagné (2005).

<sup>17</sup>This extension may not constitute a straightforward application of the actual literature on vertical

This paper has focused on the specific form to be taken by some environmental policy instruments in the presence of an oligopolistic eco-industry. An immediate research direction from here would be the comparison of regulatory approaches. At this point, it can be said that when the market for abatement goods and services is perfectly competitive, the optimal emission tax implements the first-best, while a voluntary approach to pollution abatement remains a second-best instrument (because the output  $x^0$  chosen by a polluter is larger than the socially optimal level). When the eco-industry is imperfectly competitive and exercises market power, however, taxing pollution also becomes a second-best policy. Moreover, we have that  $w^* \geq w^V > w^{t*}$  and  $x^0 = x^V > x^{t*}$ ; so the abatement level achieved through a voluntary agreement is higher than the one reachable via a pollution tax (it can even attain the first-best), but the amount of the consumption good produced under a voluntary agreement exceeds the first-best one. It is thus impossible to rank, for all existing cases, an emission tax or quota above or below a voluntary agreement in terms of social welfare. Yet, an unambiguous ranking of policy instruments can be found for specialized versions of the present model.<sup>18</sup>

Related to this topic is the appropriate combination of policy instruments to correct simultaneously for the pollution externality and the output distortion due to imperfect

---

relationships and outsourcing (see, for instance, Perry 1989; or Mookherjee 2003), for the abatement services provided by environment firms are meant to correct a negative externality and are often *not* embedded in the consumption good.

<sup>18</sup>For example, using the functions  $P(x) = 1 - x$ ,  $C(x) = \frac{1}{2}x^2$ ,  $G(w) = gw$  ( $g > 0$ ), and  $e(x, w) = kx - \sqrt{Lw}$  ( $k > 0$ ,  $L > 0$ ), where the parameter  $g$  represents the marginal production cost of the eco-industry,  $k$  is the amount of emissions generated by one unit of the consumption good, and  $L$  captures the efficiency of the available abatement goods and services. Computations can be obtained from the authors upon request.

competition. To be sure, imposing a standard  $w^*$  together with an emission tax that brings about an output level  $x^*$  would achieve the first-best. But as argued by Carraro and Metcalf (2001), administrative costs and political constraints may leave regulators with an incomplete set of instruments to choose from. Moreover, policy coordination between various government bodies (the environmental protection and antitrust agencies, for example) is often far from guaranteed and deserves closer scrutiny.

In practice, the design of environmental policy is also subject to pressures from public opinion and industrial lobbies.<sup>19</sup> The latter are now likely to include some powerful environment firms. Complete theoretical analysis of the political economy of environmental regulation should therefore try to capture the eco-industry's influence in regulatory decisions. The upshot might exhibit some mixed intervention strategies of the type studied by Cadot and Sinclair-Desgagné (1995), which balance the interests of polluters for lower compliance costs with those of environmental firms for greater needs of their specific goods and services.

Finally, renewed attention should be given to the effect of environmental policy on technological change, taking into account the specific role played by the eco-industry.<sup>20</sup> The relative advantage of market-based instruments over direct regulation in providing incentives to adopt new technologies might have to be revised downward, as the desire of competing environment firms to innovate might be enhanced, for instance, under "Best

---

<sup>19</sup>See, for instance, Boyer and Laffont (1999), and the essays collected in Stavins (2004).

<sup>20</sup>Jaffe et al. (2002) provide a good survey of the issues and contributions pertaining to environmental regulation and technological change.

Available Control Technology” regulations. The eco-industry might also bring down the cost of technological updating (through the learning-curve effect pointed out by Feess, E., and G. Muehlheusser (2002), for example) and benefit from spreading new standards and know-how, thereby accelerating the diffusion of cleaner technologies.

## Appendix: The Optimal Pollution Tax - Equation (9)

Total differentiation of  $W^t$  yields:

$$\frac{dW^t}{dt} = [P(x^t) - C'(x^t)] \frac{dx^t}{dt} - G'\left(\frac{w^t}{n}\right) \frac{dw^t}{dt} - v[e_x(x^t) \frac{dx^t}{dt} + e_w(w^t) \frac{dw^t}{dt}] \quad . \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Since, by (5) and (6),

$$-G'\left(\frac{w^t}{n}\right) = -q(w^t) - \frac{w^t}{n} \cdot \frac{1}{w_t'} \quad \text{and} \quad P - C'(x^t) = te_x(x^t) \quad ,$$

(A.1) is equivalent to:

$$\frac{dW^t}{dt} = te_x(x^t) \frac{dx^t}{dt} + [-q(w^t) - \frac{w^t}{w_t'} \cdot \frac{1}{n}] \frac{dw^t}{dt} - v[e_x(x^t) \frac{dx^t}{dt} + e_w(w^t) \frac{dw^t}{dt}] \quad . \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Recalling from (7) and (8) that  $-q(w^t) = te_w(w^t)$  and  $-\frac{w^t}{w_t'} = w^t te_{ww}$  , (A.2) now becomes

$$\frac{dW^t}{dt} = te_x(x^t) \frac{dx^t}{dt} + [e_w(w^t) + \frac{w^t e_{ww}}{n}] t \frac{dw^t}{dt} - v[e_x(x^t) \frac{dx^t}{dt} + e_w(w^t) \frac{dw^t}{dt}] \quad .$$

Setting the latter equal to 0 gives equation (9).

## References

- Barnett, A. H. 1980. "The Pigouvian Tax Rule under Monopoly." *American Economic Review* 70: 1037-1041.
- Barrett, S. 1994. "Strategic Environmental Policy and International Trade." *Journal of Public Economics* 54: 325-358.
- Barton, J. R. 1997. "The North-South Dimension of the Environment and Cleaner Technology Industries." Discussion Paper no. 9803, Institute for New Technologies, United Nations University, Maastricht, The Netherlands.
- Baumol, W. J. 1995. "Environmental Industries with Substantial Start-Up Costs as Contributors to Trade Competitiveness." *Annual Review of Energy and the Environment* 20: 71-81.
- Boyer, M., and J.-J. Laffont. 1999. "Toward a Political Theory of the Emergence of Environmental Incentive Regulation," *Rand Journal of Economics* 30: 137-157.
- Buchanan, J. M. 1969. "External Diseconomies, Corrective Taxes, and Market Structure." *American Economic Review* 59(1): 174-177.
- Cadot, O., and B. Sinclair-Desgagné. 1995. "Environmental Standards and Industrial Policy." *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 29: 228-237.
- Carraro, C., and G. E. Metcalf. 2001. *Behavioral and Distributional Effects of Environmental Policy*. NBER Conference Reports, University of Chicago Press.
- Davies, S. 2002. "Waste Management Multinationals 2002." Mimeo, Public Services International research Unit (PSIRU), School of Computing and Mathematical Sciences, University of Greenwich.
- European Commission. 1999. "The EU Ecoindustry's Export Potential: Final Report to DGXI of the European Commission." Brussels.
- Farzin, H., and P. Kort. 2001. "Pollution Abatement Investment when Environmental Regulation Is Uncertain." *Journal of Public Economic Theory* 2(2): 183-212.
- Feess, E., and G. Muehlheusser. 2002. "Strategic Environmental Policy, Clean Technologies and the Learning Curve." *Environmental and Resource Economics* 23: 149-166.
- Feess, E., and G. Muehlheusser. 1999. "Strategic Environmental Policy, International Trade and the Learning Curve: The Significance of the Environmental Industry." *Review of Economics* 50 (2): 178-194.
- Jaffe, A., R. G. Newell, and R. N. Stavins. 2002. "Technological Change and the Environment." Chapter 11 in *Handbook of Environmental Economics, Vol. I*, edited by K.-G. Mähler and J. R. Vincent. Amsterdam: Elsevier Science.
- Institut Français de l'Environnement (IFEN). 2002. *L'environnement en France*. Paris: Éditions La Découverte.



- Katsoulacos, Y., and A. Xepapadeas. 1995. "Environmental Policy under Oligopoly with Endogenous Market Structure." *Scandinavian Journal of Economics* 97(3): 411-420.
- Karliner, J. 1994. "The Environment Industry: Profiting from Pollution." *The Ecologist* 24(2): 59-63.
- Long, N. V., and A. Soubeyran. 1999. "Pollution, Pigouvian Taxes, and Asymmetric International Oligopoly." CIRANO Working Paper, Montréal.
- Mookherjee, D. 2003. "Delegation and Contracting Hierarchies: An Overview." Mimeo, Boston University.
- Nimubona, A.-D., and B. Sinclair-Desgagné. 2005. "The Pigouvian Tax Rule in the Presence of an Eco-Industry." Mimeo, HEC Montréal.
- Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development/Eurostat. 1999. *The Environmental and Services Industry: Manual for Data Collection and Analysis*. Paris: OECD Editions.
- Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. 1999. *Voluntary Approaches to Environmental Policies: An Assessment*. Paris: OECD Editions.
- Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. 1996. *The Global Environmental Goods and Services Industry*. Paris: OECD Editions.
- Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. 1992. *The Environmental Industry in OECD Countries: Situation, Perspectives and Governmental Policies*. Paris: OECD Editions.
- Perry, M. K. 1989. "Vertical Integration: Determinants and Effects." In *Handbook of Industrial Organization, Vol. I*, edited by R. Schmalensee and R. D. Willig. Amsterdam: North Holland.
- Pigou, A. C. 1920. *The Economics of Welfare*. London: Macmillan.
- Stavins, R. N. (ed.). 2004. *The Political Economy of Environmental Regulation*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- World Trade Organization. 1998. "Environmental Services." Chapter IX of the *Committee on Trade and Environment's* Note on "Environmental Benefits of Removing Trade Restrictions and Distortions."

# 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>

<http://www.repec.org>

## NOTE DI LAVORO PUBLISHED IN 2004

IEM	1.2004	Anil MARKANDYA, Suzette PEDROSO and Alexander GOLUB: <u>Empirical Analysis of National Income and So2 Emissions in Selected European Countries</u>
ETA	2.2004	Masahisa FUJITA and Shlomo WEBER: <u>Strategic Immigration Policies and Welfare in Heterogeneous Countries</u>
PRA	3.2004	Adolfo DI CARLUCCIO, Giovanni FERRI, Cecilia FRALE and Ottavio RICCHI: <u>Do Privatizations Boost Household Shareholding? Evidence from Italy</u>
ETA	4.2004	Victor GINSBURGH and Shlomo WEBER: <u>Languages Disenfranchisement in the European Union</u>
ETA	5.2004	Romano PIRAS: <u>Growth, Congestion of Public Goods, and Second-Best Optimal Policy</u>
CCMP	6.2004	Herman R.J. VOLLEBERGH: <u>Lessons from the Polder: Is Dutch CO2-Taxation Optimal</u>
PRA	7.2004	Sandro BRUSCO, Giuseppe LOPOMO and S. VISWANATHAN (lxv): <u>Merger Mechanisms</u>
PRA	8.2004	Wolfgang AUSENNEGG, Pegaret PICHLER and Alex STOMPER (lxv): <u>IPO Pricing with Bookbuilding, and a When-Issued Market</u>
PRA	9.2004	Pegaret PICHLER and Alex STOMPER (lxv): <u>Primary Market Design: Direct Mechanisms and Markets</u>
PRA	10.2004	Florian ENGLMAIER, Pablo GUILLEN, Loreto LLORENTE, Sander ONDERSTAL and Rupert SAUSGRUBER (lxv): <u>The Chopstick Auction: A Study of the Exposure Problem in Multi-Unit Auctions</u>
PRA	11.2004	Bjarne BRENDSTRUP and Harry J. PAARSCH (lxv): <u>Nonparametric Identification and Estimation of Multi-Unit, Sequential, Oral, Ascending-Price Auctions With Asymmetric Bidders</u>
PRA	12.2004	Ohad KADAN (lxv): <u>Equilibrium in the Two Player, k-Double Auction with Affiliated Private Values</u>
PRA	13.2004	Maarten C.W. JANSSEN (lxv): <u>Auctions as Coordination Devices</u>
PRA	14.2004	Gadi FIBICH, Arie GAVIOUS and Aner SELA (lxv): <u>All-Pay Auctions with Weakly Risk-Averse Buyers</u>
PRA	15.2004	Orly SADE, Charles SCHNITZLEIN and Jaime F. ZENDER (lxv): <u>Competition and Cooperation in Divisible Good Auctions: An Experimental Examination</u>
PRA	16.2004	Marta STRYSZOWSKA (lxv): <u>Late and Multiple Bidding in Competing Second Price Internet Auctions</u>
CCMP	17.2004	Slim Ben YOUSSEF: <u>R&amp;D in Cleaner Technology and International Trade</u>
NRM	18.2004	Angelo ANTOCI, Simone BORGHESI and Paolo RUSSU (lxvi): <u>Biodiversity and Economic Growth: Stabilization Versus Preservation of the Ecological Dynamics</u>
SIEV	19.2004	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>
NRM	20.2004	Guido CANDELA and Roberto CELLINI (lxvii): <u>Investment in Tourism Market: A Dynamic Model of Differentiated Oligopoly</u>
NRM	21.2004	Jacqueline M. HAMILTON (lxvii): <u>Climate and the Destination Choice of German Tourists</u>
NRM	22.2004	Javier Rey-MAQUIEIRA PALMER, Javier LOZANO IBÁÑEZ and Carlos Mario GÓMEZ GÓMEZ (lxvii): <u>Land, Environmental Externalities and Tourism Development</u>
NRM	23.2004	Pius ODUNGA and Henk FOLMER (lxvii): <u>Profiling Tourists for Balanced Utilization of Tourism-Based Resources in Kenya</u>
NRM	24.2004	Jean-Jacques NOWAK, Mondher SAHLI and Pasquale M. SGRO (lxvii): <u>Tourism, Trade and Domestic Welfare</u>
NRM	25.2004	Riaz SHAREEF (lxvii): <u>Country Risk Ratings of Small Island Tourism Economies</u>
NRM	26.2004	Juan Luis EUGENIO-MARTÍN, Noelia MARTÍN MORALES and Riccardo SCARPA (lxvii): <u>Tourism and Economic Growth in Latin American Countries: A Panel Data Approach</u>
NRM	27.2004	Raúl Hernández MARTÍN (lxvii): <u>Impact of Tourism Consumption on GDP. The Role of Imports</u>
CSRM	28.2004	Nicoletta FERRO: <u>Cross-Country Ethical Dilemmas in Business: A Descriptive Framework</u>
NRM	29.2004	Marian WEBER (lxvi): <u>Assessing the Effectiveness of Tradable Landuse Rights for Biodiversity Conservation: an Application to Canada's Boreal Mixedwood Forest</u>
NRM	30.2004	Trond BJORN DAL, Phoebe KOUNDOURI and Sean PASCOE (lxvi): <u>Output Substitution in Multi-Species Trawl Fisheries: Implications for Quota Setting</u>
CCMP	31.2004	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>
CCMP	32.2004	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>
CTN	33.2004	Wilson PEREZ: <u>Divide and Conquer: Noisy Communication in Networks, Power, and Wealth Distribution</u>
KTHC	34.2004	Gianmarco I.P. OTTAVIANO and Giovanni PERI (lxviii): <u>The Economic Value of Cultural Diversity: Evidence from US Cities</u>
KTHC	35.2004	Linda CHAIB (lxviii): <u>Immigration and Local Urban Participatory Democracy: A Boston-Paris Comparison</u>

KTHC	36.2004	<i>Franca ECKERT COEN and Claudio ROSSI</i> (lxviii): <u>Foreigners, Immigrants, Host Cities: The Policies of Multi-Ethnicity in Rome. Reading Governance in a Local Context</u>
KTHC	37.2004	<i>Kristine CRANE</i> (lxviii): <u>Governing Migration: Immigrant Groups' Strategies in Three Italian Cities – Rome, Naples and Bari</u>
KTHC	38.2004	<i>Kiflemariam HAMDE</i> (lxviii): <u>Mind in Africa, Body in Europe: The Struggle for Maintaining and Transforming Cultural Identity - A Note from the Experience of Eritrean Immigrants in Stockholm</u>
ETA	39.2004	<i>Alberto CAVALIERE</i> : <u>Price Competition with Information Disparities in a Vertically Differentiated Duopoly</u>
PRA	40.2004	<i>Andrea BIGANO and Stef PROOST</i> : <u>The Opening of the European Electricity Market and Environmental Policy: Does the Degree of Competition Matter?</u>
CCMP	41.2004	<i>Micheal FINUS</i> (lxix): <u>International Cooperation to Resolve International Pollution Problems</u>
KTHC	42.2004	<i>Francesco CRESPI</i> : <u>Notes on the Determinants of Innovation: A Multi-Perspective Analysis</u>
CTN	43.2004	<i>Sergio CURRARINI and Marco MARINI</i> : <u>Coalition Formation in Games without Synergies</u>
CTN	44.2004	<i>Marc ESCRIHUELA-VILLAR</i> : <u>Cartel Sustainability and Cartel Stability</u>
NRM	45.2004	<i>Sebastian BERVOETS and Nicolas GRAVEL</i> (lxvi): <u>Appraising Diversity with an Ordinal Notion of Similarity: An Axiomatic Approach</u>
NRM	46.2004	<i>Signe ANTHON and Bo JELLES MARK THORSEN</i> (lxvi): <u>Optimal Afforestation Contracts with Asymmetric Information on Private Environmental Benefits</u>
NRM	47.2004	<i>John MBURU</i> (lxvi): <u>Wildlife Conservation and Management in Kenya: Towards a Co-management Approach</u>
NRM	48.2004	<i>Ekin BIROL, Ágnes GYÓVAI and Melinda SMALE</i> (lxvi): <u>Using a Choice Experiment to Value Agricultural Biodiversity on Hungarian Small Farms: Agri-Environmental Policies in a Transition al Economy</u>
CCMP	49.2004	<i>Gernot KLEPPER and Sonja PETERSON</i> : <u>The EU Emissions Trading Scheme. Allowance Prices, Trade Flows, Competitiveness Effects</u>
GG	50.2004	<i>Scott BARRETT and Michael HOEL</i> : <u>Optimal Disease Eradication</u>
CTN	51.2004	<i>Dinko DIMITROV, Peter BORM, Ruud HENDRICKX and Shao CHIN SUNG</i> : <u>Simple Priorities and Core Stability in Hedonic Games</u>
SIEV	52.2004	<i>Francesco RICCI</i> : <u>Channels of Transmission of Environmental Policy to Economic Growth: A Survey of the Theory</u>
SIEV	53.2004	<i>Anna ALBERINI, Maureen CROPPER, Alan KRUPNICK and Nathalie B. SIMON</i> : <u>Willingness to Pay for Mortality Risk Reductions: Does Latency Matter?</u>
NRM	54.2004	<i>Ingo BRÄUER and Rainer MARGGRAF</i> (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>
NRM	55.2004	<i>Timo GOESCHL and Tun LIN</i> (lxvi): <u>Biodiversity Conservation on Private Lands: Information Problems and Regulatory Choices</u>
NRM	56.2004	<i>Tom DEDEURWAERDERE</i> (lxvi): <u>Bioprospection: From the Economics of Contracts to Reflexive Governance</u>
CCMP	57.2004	<i>Katrin REHDANZ and David MADDISON</i> : <u>The Amenity Value of Climate to German Households</u>
CCMP	58.2004	<i>Koen SMEKENS and Bob VAN DER ZWAAN</i> : <u>Environmental Externalities of Geological Carbon Sequestration Effects on Energy Scenarios</u>
NRM	59.2004	<i>Valentina BOSETTI, Mariaester CASSINELLI and Alessandro LANZA</i> (lxvii): <u>Using Data Envelopment Analysis to Evaluate Environmentally Conscious Tourism Management</u>
NRM	60.2004	<i>Timo GOESCHL and Danilo CAMARGO IGLIORI</i> (lxvi): <u>Property Rights Conservation and Development: An Analysis of Extractive Reserves in the Brazilian Amazon</u>
CCMP	61.2004	<i>Barbara BUCHNER and Carlo CARRARO</i> : <u>Economic and Environmental Effectiveness of a Technology-based Climate Protocol</u>
NRM	62.2004	<i>Elissaios PAPYRAKIS and Reyer GERLAGH</i> : <u>Resource-Abundance and Economic Growth in the U.S.</u>
NRM	63.2004	<i>Györgyi BELA, György PATAKI, Melinda SMALE and Mariann HAJDÚ</i> (lxvi): <u>Conserving Crop Genetic Resources on Smallholder Farms in Hungary: Institutional Analysis</u>
NRM	64.2004	<i>E.C.M. RUIJGROK and E.E.M. NILLESEN</i> (lxvi): <u>The Socio-Economic Value of Natural Riverbanks in the Netherlands</u>
NRM	65.2004	<i>E.C.M. RUIJGROK</i> (lxvi): <u>Reducing Acidification: The Benefits of Increased Nature Quality. Investigating the Possibilities of the Contingent Valuation Method</u>
ETA	66.2004	<i>Giannis VARDAS and Anastasios XEPAPADEAS</i> : <u>Uncertainty Aversion, Robust Control and Asset Holdings</u>
GG	67.2004	<i>Anastasios XEPAPADEAS and Constadina PASSA</i> : <u>Participation in and Compliance with Public Voluntary Environmental Programs: An Evolutionary Approach</u>
GG	68.2004	<i>Michael FINUS</i> : <u>Modesty Pays: Sometimes!</u>
NRM	69.2004	<i>Trond BJØRNDAL and Ana BRASÃO</i> : <u>The Northern Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries: Management and Policy Implications</u>
CTN	70.2004	<i>Alejandro CAPARRÓS, Abdelhakim HAMMOUDI and Tarik TAZDAÏT</i> : <u>On Coalition Formation with Heterogeneous Agents</u>
IEM	71.2004	<i>Massimo GIOVANNINI, Margherita GRASSO, Alessandro LANZA and Matteo MANERA</i> : <u>Conditional Correlations in the Returns on Oil Companies Stock Prices and Their Determinants</u>
IEM	72.2004	<i>Alessandro LANZA, Matteo MANERA and Michael MCALEER</i> : <u>Modelling Dynamic Conditional Correlations in WTI Oil Forward and Futures Returns</u>
SIEV	73.2004	<i>Margarita GENIUS and Elisabetta STRAZZERA</i> : <u>The Copula Approach to Sample Selection Modelling: An Application to the Recreational Value of Forests</u>

CCMP	74.2004	<i>Rob DELLINK and Ekko van IERLAND</i> : <u>Pollution Abatement in the Netherlands: A Dynamic Applied General Equilibrium Assessment</u>
ETA	75.2004	<i>Rosella LEVAGGI and Michele MORETTO</i> : <u>Investment in Hospital Care Technology under Different Purchasing Rules: A Real Option Approach</u>
CTN	76.2004	<i>Salvador BARBERÀ and Matthew O. JACKSON (lxx)</i> : <u>On the Weights of Nations: Assigning Voting Weights in a Heterogeneous Union</u>
CTN	77.2004	<i>Àlex ARENAS, Antonio CABRALES, Albert DÍAZ-GUILERA, Roger GUIMERA and Fernando VEGA-REDONDO (lxx)</i> : <u>Optimal Information Transmission in Organizations: Search and Congestion</u>
CTN	78.2004	<i>Francis BLOCH and Armando GOMES (lxx)</i> : <u>Contracting with Externalities and Outside Options</u>
CTN	79.2004	<i>Rabah AMIR, Effrosyni DIAMANTOUDI and Licun XUE (lxx)</i> : <u>Merger Performance under Uncertain Efficiency Gains</u>
CTN	80.2004	<i>Francis BLOCH and Matthew O. JACKSON (lxx)</i> : <u>The Formation of Networks with Transfers among Players</u>
CTN	81.2004	<i>Daniel DIERMEIER, Hülya ERASLAN and Antonio MERLO (lxx)</i> : <u>Bicameralism and Government Formation</u>
CTN	82.2004	<i>Rod GARRATT, James E. PARCO, Cheng-ZHONG QIN and Amnon RAPOPORT (lxx)</i> : <u>Potential Maximization and Coalition Government Formation</u>
CTN	83.2004	<i>Kfir ELIAZ, Debraj RAY and Ronny RAZIN (lxx)</i> : <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 (lxx)</i> : <u>Economics: An Emerging Small World?</u>
CTN	85.2004	<i>Edward CARTWRIGHT (lxx)</i> : <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 PAPYRAKIS 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 (lxxv)</i> : <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 URG</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 ONOFR</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>

ITEM	116.2004	<i>Valeria COSTANTINI and Francesco GRACCEVA: <u>Social Costs of Energy Disruptions</u></i>
ITEM	117.2004	<i>Christian EGENHOFER, Kyriakos GIALOGLOU, Giacomo LUCIANI, Maroeska BOOTS, Martin SCHEEPERS, Valeria COSTANTINI, Francesco GRACCEVA, Anil MARKANDYA and Giorgio VICINI: <u>Market-Based Options for Security of Energy Supply</u></i>
ITEM	118.2004	<i>David FISK: <u>Transport Energy Security. The Unseen Risk?</u></i>
ITEM	119.2004	<i>Giacomo LUCIANI: <u>Security of Supply for Natural Gas Markets. What is it and What is it not?</u></i>
ITEM	120.2004	<i>L.J. de VRIES and R.A. HAKVOORT: <u>The Question of Generation Adequacy in Liberalised Electricity Markets</u></i>
KTHC	121.2004	<i>Alberto PETRUCCI: <u>Asset Accumulation, Fertility Choice and Nondegenerate Dynamics in a Small Open Economy</u></i>
NRM	122.2004	<i>Carlo GIUPPONI, Jaroslav MYSLAK and Anita FASSIO: <u>An Integrated Assessment Framework for Water Resources Management: A DSS Tool and a Pilot Study Application</u></i>
NRM	123.2004	<i>Margaretha BREIL, Anita FASSIO, Carlo GIUPPONI and Paolo ROSATO: <u>Evaluation of Urban Improvement on the Islands of the Venice Lagoon: A Spatially-Distributed Hedonic-Hierarchical Approach</u></i>
ETA	124.2004	<i>Paul MENSINK: <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 PAPYRAKIS and Reyner 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>
ITEM	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>
ETA	137.2004	<i>Herbert DAWID, Christophe DEISSENBERG and Pavel ŠEVČIK: <u>Cheap Talk, Gullibility, and Welfare in an Environmental Taxation Game</u></i>
CCMP	138.2004	<i>ZhongXiang ZHANG: <u>The World Bank's Prototype Carbon Fund and China</u></i>
CCMP	139.2004	<i>Reyer GERLAGH and Marjan W. HOFKES: <u>Time Profile of Climate Change Stabilization Policy</u></i>
NRM	140.2004	<i>Chiara D'ALPAOS and Michele MORETTO: <u>The Value of Flexibility in the Italian Water Service Sector: A Real Option Analysis</u></i>
PRA	141.2004	<i>Patrick BAJARI, Stephanie HOUGHTON and Steven TADELIS (lxxi): <u>Bidding for Incomplete Contracts</u></i>
PRA	142.2004	<i>Susan ATHEY, Jonathan LEVIN and Enrique SEIRA (lxxi): <u>Comparing Open and Sealed Bid Auctions: Theory and Evidence from Timber Auctions</u></i>
PRA	143.2004	<i>David GOLDREICH (lxxi): <u>Behavioral Biases of Dealers in U.S. Treasury Auctions</u></i>
PRA	144.2004	<i>Roberto BURGUET (lxxi): <u>Optimal Procurement Auction for a Buyer with Downward Sloping Demand: More Simple Economics</u></i>
PRA	145.2004	<i>Ali HORTACSU and Samita SAREEN (lxxi): <u>Order Flow and the Formation of Dealer Bids: An Analysis of Information and Strategic Behavior in the Government of Canada Securities Auctions</u></i>
PRA	146.2004	<i>Victor GINSBURGH, Patrick LEGROS and Nicolas SAHUGUET (lxxi): <u>How to Win Twice at an Auction. On the Incidence of Commissions in Auction Markets</u></i>
PRA	147.2004	<i>Claudio MEZZETTI, Aleksandar PEKEČ and Ilia TSETLIN (lxxi): <u>Sequential vs. Single-Round Uniform-Price Auctions</u></i>
PRA	148.2004	<i>John ASKER and Estelle CANTILLON (lxxi): <u>Equilibrium of Scoring Auctions</u></i>
PRA	149.2004	<i>Philip A. HAILE, Han HONG and Matthew SHUM (lxxi): <u>Nonparametric Tests for Common Values in First-Price Sealed-Bid Auctions</u></i>
PRA	150.2004	<i>François DEGEORGE, François DERRIEN and Kent L. WOMACK (lxxi): <u>Quid Pro Quo in IPOs: Why Bookbuilding is Dominating Auctions</u></i>
CCMP	151.2004	<i>Barbara BUCHNER and Silvia DALL'OLIO: <u>Russia: The Long Road to Ratification. Internal Institution and Pressure Groups in the Kyoto Protocol's Adoption Process</u></i>
CCMP	152.2004	<i>Carlo CARRARO and Marzio GALEOTTI: <u>Does Endogenous Technical Change Make a Difference in Climate Policy Analysis? A Robustness Exercise with the FEEM-RICE Model</u></i>
PRA	153.2004	<i>Alejandro M. MANELLI and Daniel R. VINCENT (lxxi): <u>Multidimensional Mechanism Design: Revenue Maximization and the Multiple-Good Monopoly</u></i>
ETA	154.2004	<i>Nicola ACOCELLA, Giovanni Di BARTOLOMEO and Wilfried PAUWELS: <u>Is there any Scope for Corporatism in Stabilization Policies?</u></i>
CTN	155.2004	<i>Johan EYCKMANS and Michael FINUS: <u>An Almost Ideal Sharing Scheme for Coalition Games with Externalities</u></i>
CCMP	156.2004	<i>Cesare DOSI and Michele MORETTO: <u>Environmental Innovation, War of Attrition and Investment Grants</u></i>

CCMP	157.2004	<i>Valentina BOSETTI, Marzio GALEOTTI and Alessandro LANZA: <u>How Consistent are Alternative Short-Term Climate Policies with Long-Term Goals?</u></i>
ETA	158.2004	<i>Y. Hossein FARZIN and Ken-Ichi AKAO: <u>Non-pecuniary Value of Employment and Individual Labor Supply</u></i>
ETA	159.2004	<i>William BROCK and Anastasios XEPAPADEAS: <u>Spatial Analysis: Development of Descriptive and Normative Methods with Applications to Economic-Ecological Modelling</u></i>
KTHC	160.2004	<i>Alberto PETRUCCI: <u>On the Incidence of a Tax on PureRent with Infinite Horizons</u></i>
IEM	161.2004	<i>Xavier LABANDEIRA, José M. LABEAGA and Miguel RODRÍGUEZ: <u>Microsimulating the Effects of Household Energy Price Changes in Spain</u></i>

#### NOTE DI LAVORO PUBLISHED IN 2005

CCMP	1.2005	<i>Stéphane HALLEGATTE: <u>Accounting for Extreme Events in the Economic Assessment of Climate Change</u></i>
CCMP	2.2005	<i>Qiang WU and Paulo Augusto NUNES: <u>Application of Technological Control Measures on Vehicle Pollution: A Cost-Benefit Analysis in China</u></i>
CCMP	3.2005	<i>Andrea BIGANO, Jacqueline M. HAMILTON, Maren LAU, Richard S.J. TOL and Yuan ZHOU: <u>A Global Database of Domestic and International Tourist Numbers at National and Subnational Level</u></i>
CCMP	4.2005	<i>Andrea BIGANO, Jacqueline M. HAMILTON and Richard S.J. TOL: <u>The Impact of Climate on Holiday Destination Choice</u></i>
ETA	5.2005	<i>Hubert KEMPF: <u>Is Inequality Harmful for the Environment in a Growing Economy?</u></i>
CCMP	6.2005	<i>Valentina BOSETTI, Carlo CARRARO and Marzio GALEOTTI: <u>The Dynamics of Carbon and Energy Intensity in a Model of Endogenous Technical Change</u></i>
IEM	7.2005	<i>David CALEF and Robert GOBLE: <u>The Allure of Technology: How France and California Promoted Electric Vehicles to Reduce Urban Air Pollution</u></i>
ETA	8.2005	<i>Lorenzo PELLEGRINI and Reyer GERLAGH: <u>An Empirical Contribution to the Debate on Corruption Democracy and Environmental Policy</u></i>
CCMP	9.2005	<i>Angelo ANTOCI: <u>Environmental Resources Depletion and Interplay Between Negative and Positive Externalities in a Growth Model</u></i>
CTN	10.2005	<i>Frédéric DEROLAN: <u>Cost-Reducing Alliances and Local Spillovers</u></i>
NRM	11.2005	<i>Francesco SINDICO: <u>The GMO Dispute before the WTO: Legal Implications for the Trade and Environment Debate</u></i>
KTHC	12.2005	<i>Carla MASSIDDA: <u>Estimating the New Keynesian Phillips Curve for Italian Manufacturing Sectors</u></i>
KTHC	13.2005	<i>Michele MORETTO and Gianpaolo ROSSINI: <u>Start-up Entry Strategies: Employer vs. Nonemployer firms</u></i>
PRCG	14.2005	<i>Clara GRAZIANO and Annalisa LUPORINI: <u>Ownership Concentration, Monitoring and Optimal Board Structure</u></i>
CSRM	15.2005	<i>Parashar KULKARNI: <u>Use of Ecolabels in Promoting Exports from Developing Countries to Developed Countries: Lessons from the Indian LeatherFootwear Industry</u></i>
KTHC	16.2005	<i>Adriana DI LIBERTO, Roberto MURA and Francesco PIGLIARU: <u>How to Measure the Unobservable: A Panel Technique for the Analysis of TFP Convergence</u></i>
KTHC	17.2005	<i>Alireza NAGHAVI: <u>Asymmetric Labor Markets, Southern Wages, and the Location of Firms</u></i>
KTHC	18.2005	<i>Alireza NAGHAVI: <u>Strategic Intellectual Property Rights Policy and North-South Technology Transfer</u></i>
KTHC	19.2005	<i>Mombert HOPPE: <u>Technology Transfer Through Trade</u></i>
PRCG	20.2005	<i>Roberto ROSON: <u>Platform Competition with Endogenous Multihoming</u></i>
CCMP	21.2005	<i>Barbara BUCHNER and Carlo CARRARO: <u>Regional and Sub-Global Climate Blocs. A Game Theoretic Perspective on Bottom-up Climate Regimes</u></i>
IEM	22.2005	<i>Fausto CAVALLARO: <u>An Integrated Multi-Criteria System to Assess Sustainable Energy Options: An Application of the Promethee Method</u></i>
CTN	23.2005	<i>Michael FINUS, Pierre v. MOUCHE and Bianca RUNDSHAGEN: <u>Uniqueness of Coalitional Equilibria</u></i>
IEM	24.2005	<i>Wietze LISE: <u>Decomposition of CO2 Emissions over 1980–2003 in Turkey</u></i>
CTN	25.2005	<i>Somdeb LAHIRI: <u>The Core of Directed Network Problems with Quotas</u></i>
SIEV	26.2005	<i>Susanne MENZEL and Riccardo SCARPA: <u>Protection Motivation Theory and Contingent Valuation: Perceived Realism, Threat and WTP Estimates for Biodiversity Protection</u></i>
NRM	27.2005	<i>Massimiliano MAZZANTI and Anna MONTINI: <u>The Determinants of Residential Water Demand Empirical Evidence for a Panel of Italian Municipalities</u></i>
CCMP	28.2005	<i>Laurent GILOTTE and Michel de LARA: <u>Precautionary Effect and Variations of the Value of Information</u></i>
NRM	29.2005	<i>Paul SARFO-MENSAH: <u>Exportation of Timber in Ghana: The Menace of Illegal Logging Operations</u></i>
CCMP	30.2005	<i>Andrea BIGANO, Alessandra GORIA, Jacqueline HAMILTON and Richard S.J. TOL: <u>The Effect of Climate Change and Extreme Weather Events on Tourism</u></i>
NRM	31.2005	<i>Maria Angeles GARCIA-VALIÑAS: <u>Decentralization and Environment: An Application to Water Policies</u></i>
NRM	32.2005	<i>Chiara D'ALPAOS, Cesare DOSI and Michele MORETTO: <u>Concession Length and Investment Timing Flexibility</u></i>
CCMP	33.2005	<i>Joseph HUBER: <u>Key Environmental Innovations</u></i>
CTN	34.2005	<i>Antoni CALVÓ-ARMENGOL and Rahmi İLKILIÇ (Ixxii): <u>Pairwise-Stability and Nash Equilibria in Network Formation</u></i>
CTN	35.2005	<i>Francesco FERI (Ixxii): <u>Network Formation with Endogenous Decay</u></i>
CTN	36.2005	<i>Frank H. PAGE, Jr. and Myrna H. WOODERS (Ixxii): <u>Strategic Basins of Attraction, the Farsighted Core, and Network Formation Games</u></i>

CTN	37.2005	<i>Alessandra CASELLA and Nobuyuki HANAKI</i> (lxxii): <u>Information Channels in Labor Markets. On the Resilience of Referral Hiring</u>
CTN	38.2005	<i>Matthew O. JACKSON and Alison WATTS</i> (lxxii): <u>Social Games: Matching and the Play of Finitely Repeated Games</u>
CTN	39.2005	<i>Anna BOGOMOLNAIA, Michel LE BRETON, Alexei SAVVATEEV and Shlomo WEBER</i> (lxxii): <u>The Egalitarian Sharing Rule in Provision of Public Projects</u>
CTN	40.2005	<i>Francesco FERI</i> : <u>Stochastic Stability in Network with Decay</u>
CTN	41.2005	<i>Aart de ZEEUW</i> (lxxii): <u>Dynamic Effects on the Stability of International Environmental Agreements</u>
NRM	42.2005	<i>C. Martijn van der HEIDE, Jeroen C.J.M. van den BERGH, Ekko C. van IERLAND and Paulo A.L.D. NUNES</i> : <u>Measuring the Economic Value of Two Habitat Defragmentation Policy Scenarios for the Veluwe, The Netherlands</u>
PRCG	43.2005	<i>Carla VIEIRA and Ana Paula SERRA</i> : <u>Abnormal Returns in Privatization Public Offerings: The Case of Portuguese Firms</u>
SIEV	44.2005	<i>Anna ALBERINI, Valentina ZANATTA and Paolo ROSATO</i> : <u>Combining Actual and Contingent Behavior to Estimate the Value of Sports Fishing in the Lagoon of Venice</u>
CTN	45.2005	<i>Michael FINUS and Bianca RUNDSHAGEN</i> : <u>Participation in International Environmental Agreements: The Role of Timing and Regulation</u>
CCMP	46.2005	<i>Lorenzo PELLEGRINI and Reyer GERLAGH</i> : <u>Are EU Environmental Policies Too Demanding for New Members States?</u>
IEM	47.2005	<i>Matteo MANERA</i> : <u>Modeling Factor Demands with SEM and VAR: An Empirical Comparison</u>
CTN	48.2005	<i>Olivier TERCIEUX and Vincent VANNETELBOSCH</i> (lxx): <u>A Characterization of Stochastically Stable Networks</u>
CTN	49.2005	<i>Ana MAULEON, José SEMPERE-MONERRIS and Vincent J. VANNETELBOSCH</i> (lxxii): <u>R&amp;D Networks Among Unionized Firms</u>
CTN	50.2005	<i>Carlo CARRARO, Johan EYCKMANS and Michael FINUS</i> : <u>Optimal Transfers and Participation Decisions in International Environmental Agreements</u>
KTHC	51.2005	<i>Valeria GATTAI</i> : <u>From the Theory of the Firm to FDI and Internalisation: A Survey</u>
CCMP	52.2005	<i>Alireza NAGHAVI</i> : <u>Multilateral Environmental Agreements and Trade Obligations: A Theoretical Analysis of the Doha Proposal</u>
SIEV	53.2005	<i>Margaretha BREIL, Gretel GAMBARELLI and Paulo A.L.D. NUNES</i> : <u>Economic Valuation of On Site Material Damages of High Water on Economic Activities based in the City of Venice: Results from a Dose-Response-Expert-Based Valuation Approach</u>
ETA	54.2005	<i>Alessandra del BOCA, Marzio GALEOTTI, Charles P. HIMMELBERG and Paola ROTA</i> : <u>Investment and Time to Plan: A Comparison of Structures vs. Equipment in a Panel of Italian Firms</u>
CCMP	55.2005	<i>Gernot KLEPPER and Sonja PETERSON</i> : <u>Emissions Trading, CDM, JI, and More – The Climate Strategy of the EU</u>
ETA	56.2005	<i>Maia DAVID and Bernard SINCLAIR-DESGAGNÉ</i> : <u>Environmental Regulation and the Eco-Industry</u>

(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 9<sup>th</sup> Coalition Theory Workshop on "Collective Decisions and Institutional Design" organised by the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona and held in Barcelona, Spain, January 30-31, 2004

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

(lxxii) This paper was presented at the 10<sup>th</sup> Coalition Theory Network Workshop held in Paris, France on 28-29 January 2005 and organised by EUREQua.



**2004 SERIES**

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

**2005 SERIES**

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