

Sahlén, Linda; Aronsson, Thomas; Backlund, Kenneth

Working Paper

Technology Transfers and the Clean Development Mechanism in a North-South General Equilibrium Model

Nota di Lavoro, No. 145.2006

Provided in Cooperation with:

Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei (FEEM)

Suggested Citation: Sahlén, Linda; Aronsson, Thomas; Backlund, Kenneth (2006) : Technology Transfers and the Clean Development Mechanism in a North-South General Equilibrium Model, Nota di Lavoro, No. 145.2006, Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei (FEEM), Milano

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/74076>

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.

**Technology Transfers and the
Clean Development Mechanism in
a North-South General
Equilibrium Model**

Thomas Aronsson, Kenneth Backlund
and Linda Sahlén

NOTA DI LAVORO 145.2006

NOVEMBER 2006

CCMP – Climate Change Modelling and Policy

Thomas Aronsson, Kenneth Backlund and Linda Sahlén, *Department of Economics,
Umeå University*

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=946422>

Technology Transfers and the Clean Development Mechanism in a North-South General Equilibrium Model

Summary

This paper analyzes the potential welfare gains of introducing a technology transfer from Annex I to non-Annex I in order to mitigate greenhouse gas emissions. Our analysis is based on a numerical general equilibrium model for a world economy comprising two regions, North (Annex I) and South (non-Annex I). As our model allows for labor mobility between the formal and informal sectors in the South, we are also able to capture additional aspects of how the transfer influences the Southern economy. In a cooperative equilibrium, a technology transfer from the North to the South is clearly desirable from the perspective of a 'global social planner', since the welfare gain for the South outweighs the welfare loss for the North. However, if the regions do not cooperate, then the incentives to introduce the technology transfer appear to be relatively weak from the perspective of the North; at least if we allow for Southern abatement in the pre-transfer Nash equilibrium. Finally, by adding the emission reductions associated with the Kyoto agreement to an otherwise uncontrolled market economy, the technology transfer leads to higher welfare in both regions.

Keywords: Climate Policy, Technology Transfer, Kyoto Protocol, General Equilibrium, Clean Development Mechanism

JEL Classification: D58, D62, Q52

The authors would like to thank Tomas Sjögren for helpful comments and suggestions. A research grant from FORMAS is also gratefully acknowledged.

This paper was presented at the EAERE-FEEM-VIU Summer School on "Computable General Equilibrium Modeling in Environmental and Resource Economics", held in Venice from June 25th to July 1st, 2006 and supported by the Marie Curie Series of Conferences "European Summer School in Resource and Environmental Economics".

Address for correspondence:

Linda Sahlén
Department of Economics
Umeå University
SE 901 87 Umeå
Sweden
E-mail: linda.sahlen@econ.umu.se

1. Introduction

The importance of international cooperation in order to address the climate problem is widely recognized. This is often exemplified by the Kyoto Conference of 1997, which resulted in a protocol with legally binding emission targets. The protocol sets binding targets for the industrialized countries (Annex I), while there are no such commitments for the developing countries (non-Annex I). A relevant question is how the climate policy can be implemented in a cost-efficient way in a world where only part of the countries faces explicit emission targets. The importance of cost-efficient implementation has been recognized by the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), Art. 3.3., which states that the climate policy should “ensure global benefits at the lowest possible cost”. In practice, this means that, although the emission targets are imposed on a limited number of countries, there is some flexibility in the implementation of these targets which allows for a more cost-efficient outcome than would otherwise be accomplished. One way of increasing the cost-efficiency is to introduce technology transfers from Annex I to non-Annex I.¹ In addition, a technology transfer needs not (necessarily) only be a means of lowering the abatement cost; it may also contribute to economic growth in the host country. However, despite that the idea of technology transfers has received attention in the (academic as well as policy) discussion, it has so far only played a minor role in practice.² In the light of these observations, the purpose of this paper is to examine the welfare effects of technology transfers in terms of a numerical general equilibrium model. Our approach will be explained more thoroughly below.

In the Kyoto protocol, the idea of technology transfers is formalized via the ‘Clean Development Mechanism’ (CDM), allowing Annex I countries to invest in projects aimed at reducing the emissions in non-Annex I countries and, at the same time, relax their own emission targets in exchange for the emission reduction induced by these projects. The purpose of the CDM is “to assist parties not included in Annex I in achieving sustainable development and in contributing to the ultimate objective of the convention and to assist Annex I countries in reaching their targets”.³ Earlier studies typically model the CDM in a way similar to emission trading.⁴ However, this approach fails to recognize the first part of the

¹ See e.g. Forsyth (1999) and Grubb (2000).

² See e.g. Forsyth (1999).

³ See Article 12 in the Kyoto Protocol.

⁴ See e.g. Ellerman, Jacoby and Decaux (1998) and Zhang (2001).

purpose of the CDM (to assist non-Annex I in achieving sustainable development). Another aspect of relevance for our analysis is that the ‘non-carbon welfare effects’ associated with the CDM are potentially very important for the non-Annex I countries, when they decide on whether or not to participate in projects aiming at lower emissions. In case studies focusing on Brazil, China and India, it is shown that these countries could benefit substantially from many viable abatement projects. The non-carbon benefits include, for instance, improved air and water quality, electrification of rural and remote areas, and increased employment.⁵

In this paper, we simulate the welfare effects of introducing a technology transfer in a stylized world-economy comprising two regions; the North (Annex I) and the South (non-Annex I). Our analysis is based on a numerical general equilibrium, in which agents make intertemporal choices. The data and parameters for the regions are, to a large extent, based on the RICE- and DICE-models.⁶ Clearly, the welfare effects of a technology transfer depend on the pre-transfer resource allocation. We consider three different regimes; (i) the regions behave as uncontrolled (or imperfectly controlled) market economies – a regime which is also extended by allowing for the requirement of emission reductions in the North due to the Kyoto protocol, (ii) the pre-transfer resource allocation is a noncooperative Nash equilibrium, and (iii) the pre-transfer resource allocation is a conditional cooperative equilibrium, where ‘conditional’ means that the resource allocation is decided upon in the absence of the option of using the transfer. The first two regimes are interesting in the sense of representing two extreme views on how the regions behave in the absence of cooperation. The uncontrolled market economy means that all externalities generated by each region remain uninternalized at the equilibrium, whereas the noncooperative Nash equilibrium implies that each region internalizes the externalities it imposes on the domestic residents (while the transboundary externalities remain uninternalized). Although the noncooperative Nash equilibrium appears to be the most common alternative to cooperation in earlier literature on international environmental policy, both these regimes have been addressed before in various contexts.⁷ Despite being unrealistic from a (current) practical policy perspective, the conditional cooperative equilibrium is interesting for purposes of comparison, as it allows the preferences

⁵ See e.g. Austin and Faeth (1999).

⁶ See Nordhaus and Yang (1996).

⁷ For a more detailed discussion, see also the theoretical literature dealing with transboundary environmental problems; e.g. Carraro and Siniscalco (1993), Barrett (1994), Tahvonen (1994), Aronsson and Blomquist (2003), Aronsson et al. (2004) and Aronsson et al. (2006).

of both the North and the South (and not just the North as in the other two regimes) to govern the decision underlying the use of the technology transfer.

In addition to the distinction between the three regimes mentioned above, another novelty is that we divide the Southern economy in a formal and an informal sector, which is reasonable since the informal sector seems to play a much more important role in developing economies than in developed economies⁸. This enables us to analyze the effects of labor mobility between the two sectors following a technology transfer. By assumption, the formal sector is more capital intensive than the informal sector and is characterized by higher average productivity. From the perspective of the North, the technology transfer is motivated by the difference in abatement costs between the regions. However, a technology transfer may also be thought of as an investment in a new and more efficient abatement technology, which might increase total factor productivity in the Southern formal sector. The issue of unilateral technology transfers from the North to the South was raised by Yang (1999). He considers the impact of such transfers in a dynamic general equilibrium model, where greenhouse gases give rise to a global externality. At the same time, the technology transfer in Yang's model does not have any direct effects on the Southern economy other than a reduction of greenhouse gas emissions; in other words, Yang did not address the productivity-oriented effect mentioned above. Another difference between Yang's model and ours is that we allow the abatement cost differential between the regions to depend on the abatement efforts chosen by the South. Therefore, the benefits of a technology transfer from the North to the South depend on the level of abatement implemented by the Southern economy prior to the implementation of the transfer.

The outline of the paper is as follows: In section 2, we present the basic structure of our numerical model. Section 3 describes the data as well as the ideas underlying the calibration. The results are presented in section 4. Section 5 gives the concluding remarks.

2. The Numerical Model

Consider a world economy comprising two regions, North (n) and South (s). The model to be described below is, to a large extent, based on the Rice-model developed by Nordhaus and

⁸ See e.g. Ihrig and Moe (2000).

Yang (1996) with the extensions mentioned in the previous section. The model is highly stylized and focuses on environmental interaction. To simplify the analysis, we follow earlier comparable literature by disregarding international factor mobility and trade (although we allow for labor mobility within the Southern economy, as mentioned above). This does not reflect a belief that international factor mobility and trade are unimportant; only that the underlying incentives are not easily captured by our model, which is designed to examine the effects of technology transfers from Annex I to non-Annex I.

We use the following notations (neglecting the region-specific indicator);

C	Aggregate consumption
N	Employment
K	Capital stock
$c=C/N$	Consumption per capita
I	Investments
E	CO ₂ emissions
σ	CO ₂ emissions per unit of output
μ	CO ₂ emission control rate (a measure of abatement)
Tr	Technology transfer
T_E	Atmospheric temperature

Let us begin by presenting the consumption part of the model. Each region is characterized by identical individuals⁹ and a variable population. The objective function underlying public policy in each region is assumed to be utilitarian

$$U_0^j = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} N^j(t) u^j(c^j(t)) [1 + \theta]^{-t} \quad (1)$$

for $j = n, s$, where $u^j(\cdot)$ is the instantaneous utility function facing each resident and θ the utility discount rate. Each individual supplies one unit of labor inelastically at each point in time. By analogy to equation (1), the objective function underlying cooperative behavior is also utilitarian, i.e.

$$W_0 = U_0^n + U_0^s \quad (2)$$

⁹ This assumption simplifies the analysis considerably. In the context of the South, it means that the representative agent earns part of his/her income from the formal sector and part from the informal sector.

The instantaneous utility function takes the Cobb-Douglas form

$$u^j(c^j(t)) = [c^j(t)]^\rho \quad (3)$$

in which $\rho \in (0,1)$ is a fixed parameter and reflects the degree of concavity of the instantaneous utility function.

Turning to the production structure, we assume that both regions are characterized by Cobb-Douglas technologies. Despite this similarity, there are several differences between the regions. The production function for the North is written

$$Q^n(t) = \tilde{A}^n(t) \Omega^n(t) K^n(t)^{\gamma^n} N^n(t)^{1-\gamma^n} \quad (4)$$

where $\tilde{A}^n(t) = A^n(t)[1 + \zeta \mu^n(t)]$ represents the level of technology in period t , meaning that we allow for the possibility of ‘abatement driven’ technological change, and $A(t)$ is an exogenous time-dependent function. The expression $\Omega^n(t) = 1/[1 + \theta_1^n TE(t) + \theta_2^n TE(t)^2]$ represents the production externality due to global warming. We will return to the assumptions about the fixed parameters γ^n , ζ , θ_1^n and θ_2^n below. The output net of abatement and transfer expenditures, which can be used for domestic consumption and net investments, is given by

$$Y^n(t) = Q^n(t)[1 - \alpha_1^n(t) \mu^n(t)^{\alpha_2^n}] - \omega(Tr(t)) \quad (5)$$

in which $\omega(Tr(t))$ is the cost of the technology transfer, whereas $\alpha_1^n(t)$ and α_2^n characterize the abatement technology available in period t . The expression within the brackets reflects the cost of abatement in terms of lost output, whereas the final term (the cost of the technology transfer) is determined by the abatement technology available in the Southern region in period t and is, therefore, dependent on the Southern abatement cost. This is described more thoroughly below. Capital formation is governed by

$$K^n(t) = (1 - \delta)K^n(t-1) + I^n(t) \quad (6)$$

where $\delta \in (0,1)$ is the rate of capital depreciation.

In the South, there is a distinction between the formal (f) and informal (i) sectors. The production functions are written

$$Q_f^s(t) = \tilde{A}_f^s(t) \Omega^s(t) K_f^s(t)^{\gamma_f^s} N_f^s(t)^{1-\gamma_f^s} \quad (7)$$

$$Q_i^s(t) = A_i^s(t) \Omega^s(t) K_i^s(t)^{\gamma_i^s} N_i^s(t)^{1-\gamma_i^s} \quad (8)$$

Since the Southern economy comprises two sectors, we have $N_f^s = n_f^s N^s$ and $N_i^s = n_i^s N^s$, where n_f^s and n_i^s represent the share of the labor unit that each individual supplies to the formal and informal sector, respectively. The parameterization of equations (7) and (8) is analogous to that of equation (4). The technology function in equation (7), i.e.

$$\tilde{A}_f^s(t) = A_f^s(t) [1 + \zeta (\mu^s(t) + Tr(t))],$$

reflects the idea that the technological change in the formal sector is driven both by domestic abatement (as in the North) and the technology transfer, whereas $A_i^s(t)$ in equation (8) is an exogenous and time-dependent technology function in the informal sector. The fixed parameter $\zeta > 0$ will be determined below. By analogy to the production structure in the North, the production externality is defined as $\Omega^s(t) = 1/[1 + \theta_1^s TE(t) + \theta_2^s TE(t)^2]$. Finally, the part of output used for domestic private consumption and net investments is given by

$$Y^s(t) = Q^s(t) [1 - \alpha_1^s(t) \mu^s(t)^{\alpha_2^s}] \quad (9)$$

meaning that we allow for abatement efforts also in the South, although our reference case below is based on the assumption that the South does not abate. The capital formation in the two sectors is governed by

$$K_f^s(t) = (1 - \delta) K_f^s(t-1) + I_f^s(t) \quad (10)$$

$$K_i^s(t) = (1 - \delta) K_i^s(t-1) + I_i^s(t) \quad (11)$$

Let us now turn to the external effect. The total emissions of carbon dioxide are given by

$$E(t) = E^n(t) + E_f^s(t) + E_i^s(t) \quad (12)$$

where the three components on the right hand side (measuring emissions in the North, emissions in the formal sector in the South and emissions in the informal sector in the South, respectively) are defined as

$$E^n(t) = \sigma^n(t)[1 - \mu^n(t)]Q^n(t) \quad (13)$$

$$E_f^s(t) = \sigma_f^s(t)[1 - \mu^s(t) - Tr(t)]Q_f^s(t) \quad (14)$$

$$E_i^s(t) = \sigma_i^s(t)Q_i^s(t) \quad (15)$$

The flow of carbon dioxide emissions in equation (12) gives rise to stocks of greenhouse gases in the air and water which, in part, determine how the temperature influences the output. This relationship is described in the Appendix A.

3. Data Sources and Model Calibration

Our model is mainly based on the data and parameters from the RICE-99 and DICE-99 economic models of global warming.¹⁰ From the original RICE-99-model with 13 regions, Japan, the U.S., Europe, other high income countries, Russia and Eastern Europe are aggregated into region North. The North can also be called ‘Annex I’, because it contains all countries that are subject to emission targets in the Kyoto protocol.¹¹ China, India, Africa and other low- and middle income regions are aggregated into the Southern region and can also be seen as the developing countries, which have made no commitments to reduce their emissions. The base year in our model is 1990, and the time horizon is 20 periods, where each period represents one decade. However, following Nordhaus and Yang (1996), we have chosen to present the equilibrium paths of some of the key variables during a shorter time

¹⁰ See Versions 020899, available at <http://www.econ.yale.edu/~nordhaus/homepage/homepage.htm>.

¹¹ A list of the Annex I countries can be found in the Kyoto Protocol. Out of these 40 countries, only the U.S., Australia and Monaco had not yet ratified the Protocol on February 6, 2006.

period; more exactly, the first 13 periods (1990-2110). The welfare analysis for each of the three regimes is conducted by using all 20 periods.

The possible gains for the North, from carrying out the technology transfer, depend on the preexisting level of abatement in the South (i.e. the level chosen prior to the technology transfer). The more domestic abatement the South has already accomplished, the higher will be the cost of abatement. In other words, the South has the opportunity to choose its domestic level of abatement before the North decides upon the technology transfer. This approach differs from Yang (1999); he assumes that the North has access to a given technology, which can be used either for domestic abatement or as a technology transfer, while the cost of the transfer does not depend on the current level of abatement in the South. However, from the perspective of the CDM, it is also interesting to consider situations where the South chooses to abate before the technology transfer is carried out. The reason is that it should not (according to the Kyoto protocol) be possible for the North to capture ‘low-cost’ abatement opportunities in the South, if there is a chance that the abatement project would have been implemented without the CDM.

As we indicated above, another difference in comparison with earlier research is that the production in the South has been divided into a formal and an informal sector. It is a common feature that the informal sector is significantly larger in developing countries than in industrialized countries. Estimates of the informal sector share of GDP in the developing countries average more than one third, while the corresponding share in the OECD is much smaller.¹² This leads to more uncertain estimates of the actual GDP in the developing countries. We assume that there is an additional ‘hidden’ informal sector of about one third of the production in the formal (observed) sector in the Southern economy. The informal sector is more labor intensive than the formal sector, and the average productivity is lower than in the formal sector. This implies that a movement of labor from the informal to the formal sector will most likely lead to higher output in the Southern economy.

We calibrate the model in such a way, that the production in the Southern formal sector corresponds to the observed regional equivalent to GDP, and the industrial emissions of the South are equal to the observed emissions, at the beginning of the planning period. Note that

¹² See Ihrig and Moe (2000).

the observed industrial emissions originate from the formal sector; this assumes that there are no large industries in the informal sector. However, there is also another source of emissions, which is treated as exogenous in the original RICE-99 and DICE-99 models. This source refers to land-use emissions, which mainly originate from the harvesting of forests in the developing countries. At present, these constitute about 20 per cent of the total emissions from the developing countries.¹³ Realizing that a sector without large industries can be a significant source of emissions, we have chosen to transform the exogenous land-use emissions into endogenous emissions in the informal sector. In the reference case (see below), the informal sector emissions decrease over time in a way similar to the path for the exogenous land-use emissions in the original RICE-99 and DICE-99 models. The possibility to control emissions via investments in abatement technologies is assumed only to exist in the formal sector, which means that in order to change the path of the emissions in the informal sector, the size of the informal sector must be changed.

The difference in marginal abatement costs between the regions motivates the transfer from the North to the South. In addition, as we indicated above, there may be an extra gain for the South associated with the transfer. This is recognized by allowing the total factor productivity (TFP) of the regions to depend on the emission control rate. For the Southern economy, both the domestic abatement and the technology transfer affect the TFP. The productivity effect associated with the technology transfer gives rise to labor mobility from the informal to the formal sector in the South. This implies increased output and possibly also higher emissions in the Southern formal sector.

Our choices of parameter values are described in the Appendix B, and Section 4.4 contains a sensitivity analysis for some of these parameters (the parameters we have added by extending the original RICE-99 and DICE-99 models).

4. Simulation results

As mentioned in the introduction, we distinguish between three different resource allocations prior to the introduction of the transfer; (i) the resource allocation is a weakly controlled (or uncontrolled) market economy, which in some of the calculations is extended to reflect the

¹³ See IPCC (2001).

emission targets in the Kyoto protocol, (ii) the resource allocation is a cooperative equilibrium, and (iii) the resource allocation is a noncooperative Nash equilibrium in open-loop form. The comparison to be carried out refers to the present value of future consumption in each region as well as at the global level; entities which are observable (or estimable) in practice. Note also that the three regimes only differ with respect to the environmental policy; we do not explicitly address other aspects of public policy. This enables us to concentrate the comparison to environmental policy aspects, which is in line with earlier, comparable, research. Equilibrium paths for key variables are presented in the Appendix C. Our reference case, by which the other regimes is compared, is the uncontrolled market economy, in which there is no policies to reduce the emissions of greenhouse gases. In each of the pre-transfer resource allocations described above, we present results from a baseline simulation, where the option of using the technology transfer is not available. Other simulations are based on the assumption that the size of the technology transfer is subject to choice (by the global social planner in the cooperative regime and by the North in the noncooperative regimes). We also relate the incentives of using the transfer to whether or not the South is carrying out domestic abatement.

4.1 Imperfectly Controlled Market Economies

The uncontrolled market economy is a projection of what would happen if no government intervention were used to slow down the global warming. Emissions are treated as a side effect of the production, meaning that the welfare effects of these emissions are not incorporated into the decision-problems. In this case, the global temperature increase (relative to the exogenous base temperature) by the year 2110 is simulated to be 2.463 degrees Celsius¹⁴. The emission paths for each region¹⁴ can be seen in Appendix C (Figure 1). It is interesting to note that, within a few decades, the South will be the main emitter of carbon dioxide, while the simulated emission path for the North is relatively constant. However, in terms of emissions per capita, the South will not reach the level of the North during the whole simulation period.

Table 1: Results: Imperfectly Controlled Market Economies

Here

¹⁴ The measure of temperature, degrees Celsius, is the temperature increase in period 13 compared to a base temperature level.

In order to address how the emission reductions implicit in the Kyoto protocol affect the resource allocation and consumption possibilities, the Kyoto restriction is implemented as a scenario where the North faces an emission constraint of stabilizing the emissions to 5% under the 1990 year level by the year 2008-2012 (period 3 in the model). The South is assumed not to take any actions to reduce its emissions. In our analysis, the Kyoto restriction imposed on the North holds during the remaining planning period. Given the Kyoto restriction, the temperature increase is estimated to be about 2.410 degrees Celsius, whereas the temperature increase in the uncontrolled market economy (our reference case) is 2.463 degrees Celsius. This confirms the finding of other studies that the Kyoto protocol will have a modest effect on the mean temperature level. If the option of using the technology transfer is not available (the second line in the table), the present value of consumption for the North is smaller than in the reference case, although the present value of consumption is higher at the global level.¹⁵

Opening up the possibility of using the technology transfer, this option will be used by the North from the period the Kyoto restriction becomes binding. As a consequence, the present value of future consumption increases for both the North and South relative to the case when this option is not available. Interestingly, the present value of future consumption facing the North actually becomes larger than in the uncontrolled market economy. By comparing the second and third rows in the table, we can see that the possibility of using the technology transfer implies a gain for the North of about 540 billion U.S. \$.¹⁶ As such, this gives an indication of the potential gains for the North of using the technology transfer. The gains for the South are mainly explained by increased output accompanied by labor mobility from the informal to the formal sector. The total increase in present value of future consumption for the South, compared to the case in which no transfer is used, is 43 billion U.S. \$. This is partly due to the overall productivity gain (at constant employment shares) and partly to labor mobility. The additional gain associated with labor mobility is relatively small by comparison;

¹⁵ Recall that the North in our model comprises all Annex I countries; also the U.S., Australia and Monaco, which have not yet ratified the protocol.

¹⁶ Since the size of the transfer depends on the abatement already implemented by the South, it is interesting to note that even if the South were to choose the same rate of emission control as in the Nash equilibrium (see below), it would still be in the North's interest to use a positive technology transfer in order to reach the Kyoto target at minimum cost.

about 2-3 billion U.S. \$.¹⁷ The size of the technology transfer, given the emission reduction targets in the Kyoto protocol, is about 5 billion U.S. \$ in the first period and 2 billion in the last period of analysis. As such, it only represents a small part of the wealth of the North, which is shown in the Appendix C (Figure 2).

It is also interesting to compare the size of the transfer in our model during period 3 (which is the period when the Kyoto restriction becomes implemented) with the observed amount of resources spent on such climate projects in the developing countries during the time period 1991-1997. Clearly, the size of the transfer implied by our model exceeds the observed amount of resources spent during that time period.¹⁸ This may either imply that our model exaggerates the incentives to use the technology transfer, or that the Kyoto agreement creates incentives to increase the technology transfer.¹⁹

4.2 The Cooperative Equilibrium

The cooperative equilibrium concept adopted here is based on the assumption that a global social planner maximizes the sum of the region-specific objective function subject to all restrictions described in section 2. This means that the marginal costs and benefits of emission control balance at the global level. It is the latter aspect of cooperation that we would like to capture; we are not assuming that the regions pool all their resources into one single resource constraint.

Table 2: Results: Cooperative equilibrium

Here

In the baseline simulation, which does not allow for the technology transfer from the North to the South, the environmental policy is limited to the emission control rates for the two regions. Clearly, the present value of future consumption is higher in both regions than in the reference case (the uncontrolled market economy), and the temperature increase becomes 2.098 degrees Celsius.

¹⁷ Although this effect appears to be small, note that it implies a movement of the equivalent of about 1-10 million workers in each time period from the informal to the formal sector.

¹⁸ See Michaelowa (2000).

¹⁹ Transaction costs are often described as obstacles in the context of implementation of technology transfers. Our model does not include transaction costs.

Let us now turn to the second row of Table 2, where we introduce the option of using the technology transfer. Our results imply that this option will be used during the entire simulation period. This leads to an increase in the present value of future consumption at the global level. The optimal domestic emission control rates of the North and South do not change much in comparison with the baseline simulation. Therefore, by introducing the technology transfer, the emissions will be reduced. Note that the technology transfer makes the North worse off relative to the baseline simulation. However, the gain for the South outweighs the loss for the North; the implication in the table is that the present value of future consumption increases at the global level. Once again, the welfare gain of the technology transfer for the Southern economy is partly due increased productivity accompanied by labor mobility from the informal to the formal sector. However, the latter (productivity-related) effect only constitutes a small part of the total increase in the present value of future consumption for the Southern economy.

If we impose the restriction that the emission control rate of the South should be equal to zero (the third row in Table 2), then the optimal size of the technology transfer increases relative to the previous simulation, where the Southern emission control rate is chosen freely by the global social planner. The emission control rate for the North does not change significantly, and the considerable size of the technology transfer brings the Southern industrial emissions near the level associated with the previous simulation. This means that the global social planner uses the technology transfer as an imperfect substitute for Southern abatement; the option of which is no longer available. The North becomes worse off, even in comparison with the uncontrolled market economy, while the South becomes much better off. The effect of labor mobility becomes more important when the Southern abatement is set to zero and amounts to about 25 billion U.S. \$ in terms of its contribution to the present value of future consumption. The emission paths are shown in the Appendix C (Figure 3). Note that the emissions path of the North does not change significantly when the technology transfer is introduced; the most important effect is, instead, that the emissions of the South are reduced.

The share of the transfer in the regional equivalent to GDP for the North is shown in the Appendix C (Figure 4), where we concentrate on the scenario giving the highest present value

of future consumption (the second row in Table 2). The cost of the transfer ranges from 0.15 billion 1990 U.S. \$ in the first time period to 17 billion U.S. \$ in period 13, which is shown in the Appendix C (Figure 5). Our model implies a smaller technology transfer than found by Yang (1999)²⁰. Except that the North and South in our model do not include exactly the same countries as the corresponding regions in Yang's model, one reason for a smaller technology transfer in our case is that the cost of the transfer depends on the level of domestic abatement implemented in the South. The larger the Southern emission control rate, the smaller the marginal abatement cost differential between the regions. Notice that these numbers for the transfer are based on the simulation, where the emission control rate of the South is positive. If, on the other hand, the emission control rate of the Southern economy is not a decision variable for the global social planner, the results change dramatically. In the latter case, the size of the transfer ranges from 2 billion U.S. \$ in the first period up to 433 billion U.S. \$, which is considerably higher than in the corresponding estimates by Yang. Therefore, in our model, the assumptions about which abatement policy options are available in the South are of considerable importance for the optimal size of the technology transfer.

4.3 The Noncooperative Nash Equilibrium

The noncooperative Nash equilibrium concept is based on the assumption that the resource allocation in each region is decided upon by a domestic social planner, who treats the policies chosen by the other region as exogenous. As a consequence, since each regional planner only considers the welfare facing the domestic residents, the domestic welfare effects associated with greenhouse gases will become internalized, whereas the transboundary external effect remains uninternalized.

Table 3: Results: Noncooperative Nash Equilibrium

Here

Consider first the baseline simulation, where it is not possible to carry out the technology transfer. This means less emission control and a larger increase in the average temperature – 2.192 degrees Celsius – than in the cooperative equilibrium. However, note that the difference in present value of future consumption between the cooperative equilibrium and the

²⁰ The transfer in the corresponding scenario of Yang's model ranges from about 1 billion to 80 billion U.S. \$.

noncooperative Nash equilibrium is relatively small at the global level; the difference between, on the one hand, these two resource allocations and, on the other, the uncontrolled market economy is much greater. Therefore, if each region chooses its environmental policy in order to maximize its own welfare, while treating the actions of the other region as given, we may actually come relatively close to the global optimum.

Now, consider the effects of introducing the technology transfer. If the South chooses its emission control rate in an optimal way, it is not in North's interest to transfer technology to the South. Although the transfer increases the welfare at the global level, the North would become worse off. This is not surprising; the abatement carried out by the South reduces the abatement cost differential between the regions. If, on the other hand, the emission control rate of the South is restricted to be equal to zero prior to the introduction of the transfer, then the North will choose to make a transfer to the South; the abatement cost differential becomes much greater here than when the Southern emission control rate is subject to choice. However, the present value of future consumption becomes much smaller at the global level, indicating that Southern abatement is important from the perspective of global welfare. The industrial emissions in the cooperative equilibrium and the noncooperative Nash equilibrium are shown in the Appendix C (Figure 6).

4.4 Sensitivity Analysis

We have carried out sensitivity analyses for some of the parameters in the model. The sensitivity analyses refer to (i) the production functions in the South, (ii) the relationship between technological change and abatement, (iii) the ratio between emissions and output, and (iv) the production externality. We only discuss the qualitative results of these sensitivity analyses here. Details are available from the authors upon request.

In the simulations presented in the main text, the parameter attached to the capital stock in the production function for the Southern formal sector, γ_f^s , takes the same value as the corresponding parameter in the northern production function. These estimates originate from the RICE- and DICE-models. On the other hand, the parameter attached to the capital stock in the production function of the Southern informal sector, γ_i^s , is smaller, which is motivated by the assumption of more labor intensive production. The first sensitivity analysis suggests the

qualitative results are not sensitive to small changes in γ_f^s and γ_i^s ; the simulation results still imply a reallocation of labor from the informal to the formal sector in the South. Turning to the second sensitivity analysis, we find that the larger the productivity effect of abatement, i.e. the parameter ζ , the larger will be the reallocation of labor between sectors in the South. Therefore, an increase in the parameter ζ contributes to increase the effect of the technology transfer on the Southern economy. The third simulation eliminates part of the region-specific difference in the ratio between emissions and output. The qualitative results remain as they are in Tables 1-3.

As mentioned above, we have also carried out a sensitivity analysis for the parameters in the damage functions associated with temperature increase, i.e. the production externality. In Tables 1-3, the damage facing the regions due to a temperature increase of 2.5 degrees Celsius is assumed to be of the order of 1 per cent of GDP for the North and 2 per cent of GDP for the South. These assumptions correspond closely with the original RICE and DICE-models. Our sensitivity analysis means that these effects are doubled. Interesting to note here is that the emissions chosen by each region are reduced substantially in comparison with those associated with the original model; for the North, the emissions are reduced well below the levels following from the Kyoto Protocol restriction. In the Nash equilibrium version of the model, the most important qualitative result remains unchanged; the North will not use the technology transfer, as long as the South carries out abatement.

5. Conclusions

This paper deals with the consequences of introducing a technology transfer from the North to the South in the context of a numerical general equilibrium model. Our model comprises two regions, North and South, where the North represents the so called Annex I, or industrialized, countries in the Kyoto protocol, and the South represents the non-Annex I, or developing, countries. We distinguish between three different resource allocations prior to the introduction of the transfer; (i) the resource allocation is an otherwise uncontrolled market economy extended to reflect the emission targets in the Kyoto protocol, (ii) the resource allocation is a cooperative equilibrium, and (iii) the resource allocation is a noncooperative Nash equilibrium in open-loop form.

We find that a technology transfer from the North to the South, if designed appropriately, reduces the emissions and increases welfare at the global level. If the regions behave as Nash competitors prior to the introduction of the technology transfer, and although the transfer leads to higher welfare at the global level, the incentives of using this transfer appear to be weak from the perspective of the North. The reason is that the abatement carried out by the South in our model tends to reduce the abatement cost differential between the regions. On the other hand, if we were to add the restriction that the South does not abate its own emissions, our results suggest that the North will, indeed, make a technology transfer to the South. The intuition is that the abatement cost differential (prior to the introduction of the technology transfer) becomes relatively large in this case. Therefore, if the industrialized countries are concerned with climate change, and the developing countries are only taking trivial steps to reduce their own emissions, our results suggest that it is in the interest of the industrialized countries to transfer environmental technology to achieve abatement in a more cost-efficient way. From the Southern perspective, the technology transfer may imply large benefits; both in terms of a better environment and in terms of technological change followed by a reallocation of resources from the informal to the formal sector.

It is also interesting to analyze the role of the technology transfer in the context of a (hypothetical) cooperative equilibrium, as it implies that the transfer is governed by the preferences of the citizens in the North and the South. In this case, the (Utilitarian) global social planner would use the transfer instrument, because the welfare increase facing the residents in the South outweighs the welfare loss facing the residents in the North. The optimal policy implicit in the cooperative equilibrium implies abatement of the emissions originating from both regions and a technology transfer from the North to the South.

Given the Kyoto Protocol, part of the Annex I countries has agreed to reduce the industrial emissions, while there are no such commitments for the developing countries. What role does the CDM play in combination with the emission reductions in the Kyoto Protocol? In the context of the reference scenario of our model, where the regions were uncontrolled market economies prior to the agreement, we have incorporated the Kyoto Protocol restriction along with the possibility for the North of using the technology transfer. Our results imply that the North will make technology transfers to the South in this case. In addition, although the Kyoto Protocol would be beneficial for the South even without the technology transfer, the use of the transfer contributes to increase the welfare in the South, partly by a reallocation of resources

from the informal to the formal sector. The productivity effect following the transfer can be seen as new employment opportunities in the formal sector, which is one of the non-carbon benefits often mentioned in the discussion of CDM-projects. Therefore, given the assumptions of which our model is based, the technology transfer may contribute to cost-efficient abatement from the perspective of the North and economic development in the South; let be that the magnitude of the latter effect is subject to considerable uncertainty.

Appendix A

Additional notation

M_{AT}	Atmospheric CO ₂ concentrations
M_{UP}	concentrations in upper oceans
M_{LO}	concentrations in lower oceans
T_E	Atmospheric temperature change
T_{LO}	Oceanic temperature change
F	Total radiative forcing
O	Exogenous radiative forcing
Ω	Damage function

Following Nordhaus and Yang (1996), we have

$$M_{AT}(t) = E(t) + b_{11}M_{AT}(t-1) - b_{12}M_{AT}(t-1) + b_{21}M_{UP}(t-1) \quad (\text{A1})$$

$$M_{AT}(0) = M_{AT}^0$$

$$M_{UP}(t) = b_{22}M_{UP}(t-1) + b_{12}M_{AT}(t-1) - b_{21}M_{UP}(t-1) + b_{32}M_{LO}(t-1) - b_{23}M_{UP}(t-1) \quad (\text{A2})$$

$$M_{UP}(0) = M_{UP}^0$$

$$M_{LO}(t) = b_{33}M_{LO}(t-1) - b_{32}M_{LO}(t-1) + b_{23}M_{UP}(t-1) \quad (\text{A3})$$

$$M_{LO}(0) = M_{LO}^0$$

$$F(t) = \eta \left(\frac{\log(M_{AT}(t) / M_{AT}^0)}{\log(2)} \right) + O(t) \quad (\text{A4})$$

$$T_E(t) = T_E(t-1) + \beta_1[F(t) - \lambda T_E(t-1) - \beta_2(T_E(t-1) - T_{LO}(t-1))] \quad (\text{A5})$$

$$T_E(0) = T_E^0$$

$$T_{LO}(t) = T_{LO}(t-1) + \beta_3[T_E(t-1) - T_{LO}(t-1)] \quad (\text{A6})$$

$$T_{LO}(0) = T_{LO}^0$$

Appendix B

Most parameters in our numerical model, including those presented in the Appendix A, originate from Nordhaus and Yang (1996). As our regions do not fully correspond to those of Nordhaus and Yang (who use a more disaggregated framework), the parameters in our model are weighted averages of those used by Nordhaus and Yang, where each weight is defined as the size of the underlying variable in each country in the original model relative to the size of this variable in our regional framework. Our model also introduces additional structure, and the new parameters are

$$\rho = 0.8 \quad \gamma^n = 0.3 \quad \gamma_t^s = 0.3 \quad \gamma_i^s = 0.1 \quad \zeta = 0.001 \quad \alpha_2^n = 2.15 \quad \alpha_2^s = 2.15$$

$$\delta_k = 0.1$$

Table 4: Time varying parameter values

Period [*]	$\alpha_1^n(t)$	$\alpha_1^s(t)$	$\sigma^n(t)$	$\sigma_f^s(t)$	$\sigma_i^s(t)$
1	0.170	0.130	0.205	0.546	0.670
2	0.134	0.091	0.181	0.451	0.383
3	0.107	0.067	0.162	0.390	0.233
4	0.088	0.051	0.147	0.348	0.150
5	0.073	0.040	0.135	0.316	0.101
6	0.062	0.033	0.124	0.290	0.070
7	0.053	0.028	0.115	0.269	0.051
8	0.046	0.024	0.107	0.249	0.037
9	0.041	0.021	0.101	0.230	0.028
10	0.036	0.019	0.094	0.212	0.022
11	0.033	0.017	0.089	0.193	0.017
12	0.030	0.016	0.084	0.172	0.013
13	0.027	0.015	0.079	0.149	0.010

* Ten year periods

The parameters associated with the CO₂ emissions/output ratio (σ^n , σ_f^s) are calibrated such that the total emissions and temperature paths for the North and South in our baseline scenario closely tracks the corresponding paths in Nordhaus and Yang (1996). The emissions/output ratio for the informal sector (σ_i^s) is composed of the exogenous land use emission path from Nordhaus and Yang. The parameters of the cost functions (α_1^n , α_1^s) are calibrated such that the total emission reductions in our cooperative equilibrium correspond to the emission reductions in the corresponding scenario analyzed by Nordhaus and Yang.

Appendix C

Figure 1.
Industrial Emissions per region, reference case




Figure 2.
Cost of the Technology Transfer, uncontrolled market economy supplemented with the Kyoto restriction




Figure 3.
Industrial emissions per region, cooperative equilibrium




Figure 4.
Transfer in per cent of GDP, cooperative equilibrium




Figure 5.
Cost of the transfer, cooperative equilibrium





Figure 6.
Industrial Emissions, Cooperative and Nash Equilibrium, Tr = 0



References

Aronsson, T. and Blomquist, S. (2003) Optimal Taxation, Global Externalities and Labor Mobility. *Journal of Public Economics* **87**, 2749-2764.

Aronsson, T., Löfgren, K-G. and Backlund, K. (2004). *Welfare Measurement in Imperfect Markets – A Growth Theoretical Approach*. Edward Elgar Publishing Limited: Cheltenham.

Aronsson, T., Jonsson, T. and Sjögren, T. (2006) International Environmental Policy Reforms, Tax Distortions and the Labor Market. *FinanzArchiv* **62**, 199-217.

Austin, D. and Faeth, P. (1999). How much Sustainable Development can we expect from the Clean Development Mechanism? *World resources institute*

Banuri, T. and Gupta, S. (2000). The Clean Development Mechanism and sustainable development: An economic analysis. *Manila: Asian Development Bank*

Barrett, S. (1994) Self-Enforcing International Environmental Agreements. *Oxford Economic Papers* **46**, 878-894.

Carraro, C. and Siniscalor, D. (1993) Strategies for the International Protection of the Environment. *Journal of Public Economics* **52**, 309-328.

Dessy, S. and Pallage, S. (2003) Taxes, inequality and the size of the informal sector *Journal of Development Economics* **70** p. 225-233

Dui'c, N., Alves, L.M. and Carvalho, M. (2001) Potential of Kyoto Protocol Clean Development Mechanism in transfer of energy technologies to developing countries. World Energy Council

Ellerman, A., Jacoby, H. and Decaux. (1998) The Effects on Developing Countries of the Kyoto Protocol and CO₂ Emissions Trading. Staff Report No **41**, MIT Global Change Joint Programme

Forsyth, T. (1999) Flexible Mechanisms of Climate Technology Transfer. *Journal of Environment and Development* **8** 238-257

Gallaher, M. and Delhotal, C. (2005) Modeling the Impact of Technical Change on emissions Abatement Investments in Developing Countries. *Journal of Technology Transfer* **30** 211-225

Grubb, M. (2000). Economic Dimensions of Technological and Global Responses to the Kyoto Protocol. *Journal of Economic Studies* **27** 111-125

Ihrig, Jane and Moe, Karine (2000) The Dynamics of Informal Employment. Federal Reserve Board, International Finance Discussion Paper No. 664

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) (2001) *Climate Change 2001: Scientific Basis*. Cambridge Univ. Press, U.K.

Jotzo, F. and Michaelowa, A. (2002) Estimating the CDM market under the Marrakech Accords. *Climate Policy* **2** 179-196

Michaelowa, A. and Dutschke, M. (2000). Climate Policy and Development - Flexible Instruments and Developing Countries, Edward Elgar. Chapter 1.

Mitchell, R. and Parson, E. (2001) Implementing the Climate Change Regime's Clean Development Mechanism. *Journal of Environment and Development* **10** 125-146

Millock, K. (2002) Technology Transfers in the Clean Development Mechanism: An Incentive Issue. *Environment and Development Economics* **7** 449-466

Nordhaus, W. and Yang, Z. (1996) A Regional Dynamic General-Equilibrium Model of Alternative Climate-Change Strategies *The American Economic Review* **86** 741-765

Painuly, J. (2001) The Kyoto Protocol, Emissions Trading and the CDM: An Analysis from Developing Countries' Perspective. *The Energy journal* **22** 147-169

Philibert, C. (2000) How Could Emissions Trading Benefit Developing Countries? *Energy Policy* **28** 947-956

Tahvonen, O. (1994) Carbon Dioxide Abatement as a Differential Game. *European Journal of Political Economy* **10**, 686-705.

Woerdman, E. (2000) Implementing the Kyoto Protocol: why JI and CDM Show More Promise than International Emissions Trading. *Energy Policy* **28** 29-38

Yang, Z. (1999) Should the North Make Unilateral Technology Transfers to the South? North-South Cooperation and Conflicts in Responses to Global Climate Change. *Resource and Energy Economics* **21** 67-87

Zhang, Z. (2001) Meeting the Kyoto Targets: the Importance of Developing Country Participation. FEEM Working Paper No. **30.2001**

Tables

Table 1: Imperfectly Controlled Market Economies

Scenario	Tr	Δ Temp	PVC _N	PVC _S	PVC _{TOT}
Reference case	-	2.463	-	-	-
Kyoto					
<i>Tr</i> not available	-	2.409	-0.392	0.578	0.186
<i>Tr</i> available	Yes	2.409	0.152	0.621	0.773

*PVC is the present value of future consumption. Each such number is measured by comparison with the reference case, i.e. we subtract the number for the reference case. Trillion US 1990 \$.

Table 2: Cooperative Equilibrium

Scenario	Tr	Δ Temp	PVC _N	PVC _S	PVC _{TOT}
Baseline, μ_s free	-	2.098	0.642	2.106	2.749
<i>Tr</i> available, μ_s free	Yes	1.996	-0.219	2.991	2.773
<i>Tr</i> available, $\mu_s = 0$	Yes	1.990	-1.729	4.491	2.762

*PVC is the present value of future consumption. Each such number is measured by comparison with the reference case, i.e. we subtract the number for the reference case. Trillion US 1990 \$.

Table 3: Non-cooperative Nash equilibrium

Scenario	Tr	Δ Temp	PVC _N	PVC _S	PVC _{TOT}
Baseline, μ_s free	-	2.192	0.798	1.683	2.481
<i>Tr</i> available, μ_s free	No	2.192	0.798	1.683	2.481
<i>Tr</i> available, $\mu_s = 0$	Yes	2.362	0.243	1.015	1.258

*PVC is the present value of future consumption. Each such number is measured by comparison with the reference case, i.e. we subtract the number for the reference case. Trillion US 1990 \$.

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>

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

NOTE DI LAVORO PUBLISHED IN 2006

SIEV	1.2006	<i>Anna ALBERINI</i> : <u>Determinants and Effects on Property Values of Participation in Voluntary Cleanup Programs: The Case of Colorado</u>
CCMP	2.2006	<i>Valentina BOSETTI, Carlo CARRARO and Marzio GALEOTTI</i> : <u>Stabilisation Targets, Technical Change and the Macroeconomic Costs of Climate Change Control</u>
CCMP	3.2006	<i>Roberto ROSON</i> : <u>Introducing Imperfect Competition in CGE Models: Technical Aspects and Implications</u>
KTHC	4.2006	<i>Sergio VERGALLI</i> : <u>The Role of Community in Migration Dynamics</u>
SIEV	5.2006	<i>Fabio GRAZI, Jeroen C.J.M. van den BERGH and Piet RIETVELD</i> : <u>Modeling Spatial Sustainability: Spatial Welfare Economics versus Ecological Footprint</u>
CCMP	6.2006	<i>Olivier DESCHENES and Michael GREENSTONE</i> : <u>The Economic Impacts of Climate Change: Evidence from Agricultural Profits and Random Fluctuations in Weather</u>
PRCG	7.2006	<i>Michele MORETTO and Paola VALBONESE</i> : <u>Firm Regulation and Profit-Sharing: A Real Option Approach</u>
SIEV	8.2006	<i>Anna ALBERINI and Aline CHIABAI</i> : <u>Discount Rates in Risk v. Money and Money v. Money Tradeoffs</u>
CTN	9.2006	<i>Jon X. EGUIA</i> : <u>United We Vote</u>
CTN	10.2006	<i>Shao CHIN SUNG and Dinko DIMITRO</i> : <u>A Taxonomy of Myopic Stability Concepts for Hedonic Games</u>
NRM	11.2006	<i>Fabio CERINA</i> (lxxviii): <u>Tourism Specialization and Sustainability: A Long-Run Policy Analysis</u>
NRM	12.2006	<i>Valentina BOSETTI, Mariaester CASSINELLI and Alessandro LANZA</i> (lxxviii): <u>Benchmarking in Tourism Destination, Keeping in Mind the Sustainable Paradigm</u>
CCMP	13.2006	<i>Jens HORBACH</i> : <u>Determinants of Environmental Innovation – New Evidence from German Panel Data Sources</u>
KTHC	14.2006	<i>Fabio SABATINI</i> : <u>Social Capital, Public Spending and the Quality of Economic Development: The Case of Italy</u>
KTHC	15.2006	<i>Fabio SABATINI</i> : <u>The Empirics of Social Capital and Economic Development: A Critical Perspective</u>
CSRM	16.2006	<i>Giuseppe DI VITA</i> : <u>Corruption, Exogenous Changes in Incentives and Deterrence</u>
CCMP	17.2006	<i>Rob B. DELLINK and Marjan W. HOFKES</i> : <u>The Timing of National Greenhouse Gas Emission Reductions in the Presence of Other Environmental Policies</u>
IEM	18.2006	<i>Philippe QUIRION</i> : <u>Distributional Impacts of Energy-Efficiency Certificates Vs. Taxes and Standards</u>
CTN	19.2006	<i>Somdeb LAHIRI</i> : <u>A Weak Bargaining Set for Contract Choice Problems</u>
CCMP	20.2006	<i>Massimiliano MAZZANTI and Roberto ZOBOLI</i> : <u>Examining the Factors Influencing Environmental Innovations</u>
SIEV	21.2006	<i>Y. Hossein FARZIN and Ken-ICHI AKAO</i> : <u>Non-pecuniary Work Incentive and Labor Supply</u>
CCMP	22.2006	<i>Marzio GALEOTTI, Matteo MANERA and Alessandro LANZA</i> : <u>On the Robustness of Robustness Checks of the Environmental Kuznets Curve</u>
NRM	23.2006	<i>Y. Hossein FARZIN and Ken-ICHI AKAO</i> : <u>When is it Optimal to Exhaust a Resource in a Finite Time?</u>
NRM	24.2006	<i>Y. Hossein FARZIN and Ken-ICHI AKAO</i> : <u>Non-pecuniary Value of Employment and Natural Resource Extinction</u>
SIEV	25.2006	<i>Lucia VERGANO and Paulo A.L.D. NUNES</i> : <u>Analysis and Evaluation of Ecosystem Resilience: An Economic Perspective</u>
SIEV	26.2006	<i>Danny CAMPBELL, W. George HUTCHINSON and Riccardo SCARPA</i> : <u>Using Discrete Choice Experiments to Derive Individual-Specific WTP Estimates for Landscape Improvements under Agri-Environmental Schemes: Evidence from the Rural Environment Protection Scheme in Ireland</u>
KTHC	27.2006	<i>Vincent M. OTTO, Timo KUOSMANEN and Ekko C. van IERLAND</i> : <u>Estimating Feedback Effect in Technical Change: A Frontier Approach</u>
CCMP	28.2006	<i>Giovanni BELLA</i> : <u>Uniqueness and Indeterminacy of Equilibria in a Model with Polluting Emissions</u>
IEM	29.2006	<i>Alessandro COLOGNI and Matteo MANERA</i> : <u>The Asymmetric Effects of Oil Shocks on Output Growth: A Markov-Switching Analysis for the G-7 Countries</u>
KTHC	30.2006	<i>Fabio SABATINI</i> : <u>Social Capital and Labour Productivity in Italy</u>
ETA	31.2006	<i>Andrea GALLICE</i> (lxxix): <u>Predicting one Shot Play in 2x2 Games Using Beliefs Based on Minimax Regret</u>
IEM	32.2006	<i>Andrea BIGANO and Paul SHEEHAN</i> : <u>Assessing the Risk of Oil Spills in the Mediterranean: the Case of the Route from the Black Sea to Italy</u>
NRM	33.2006	<i>Rinaldo BRAU and Davide CAO</i> (lxxviii): <u>Uncovering the Macrostructure of Tourists' Preferences. A Choice Experiment Analysis of Tourism Demand to Sardinia</u>
CTN	34.2006	<i>Parkash CHANDER and Henry TULKENS</i> : <u>Cooperation, Stability and Self-Enforcement in International Environmental Agreements: A Conceptual Discussion</u>
IEM	35.2006	<i>Valeria COSTANTINI and Salvatore MONNI</i> : <u>Environment, Human Development and Economic Growth</u>
ETA	36.2006	<i>Ariel RUBINSTEIN</i> (lxxix): <u>Instinctive and Cognitive Reasoning: A Study of Response Times</u>

ETA	37.2006	<i>Maria SALGADEO</i> (lxxx): <u>Choosing to Have Less Choice</u>
ETA	38.2006	<i>Justina A.V. FISCHER and Benno TORGLER</i> : <u>Does Envy Destroy Social Fundamentals? The Impact of Relative Income Position on Social Capital</u>
ETA	39.2006	<i>Benno TORGLER, Sascha L. SCHMIDT and Bruno S. FREY</i> : <u>Relative Income Position and Performance: An Empirical Panel Analysis</u>
CCMP	40.2006	<i>Alberto GAGO, Xavier LABANDEIRA, Fidel PICOS And Miguel RODRÍGUEZ</i> : <u>Taxing Tourism In Spain: Results and Recommendations</u>
IEM	41.2006	<i>Karl van BIERVLIET, Dirk Le ROY and Paulo A.L.D. NUNES</i> : <u>An Accidental Oil Spill Along the Belgian Coast: Results from a CV Study</u>
CCMP	42.2006	<i>Rolf GOLOMBEK and Michael HOEL</i> : <u>Endogenous Technology and Tradable Emission Quotas</u>
KTHC	43.2006	<i>Giulio CAINELLI and Donato IACOBUCCI</i> : <u>The Role of Agglomeration and Technology in Shaping Firm Strategy and Organization</u>
CCMP	44.2006	<i>Alvaro CALZADILLA, Francesco PAULI and Roberto ROSON</i> : <u>Climate Change and Extreme Events: An Assessment of Economic Implications</u>
SIEV	45.2006	<i>M.E. KRAGT, P.C. ROEBELING and A. RUIJS</i> : <u>Effects of Great Barrier Reef Degradation on Recreational Demand: A Contingent Behaviour Approach</u>
NRM	46.2006	<i>C. GIUPPONI, R. CAMERA, A. FASSIO, A. LASUT, J. MYSLAK and A. SGOBBI</i> : <u>Network Analysis, Creative System Modelling and DecisionSupport: The NetSyMoD Approach</u>
KTHC	47.2006	<i>Walter F. LALICH</i> (lxxx): <u>Measurement and Spatial Effects of the Immigrant Created Cultural Diversity in Sydney</u>
KTHC	48.2006	<i>Elena PASPALANOVA</i> (lxxx): <u>Cultural Diversity Determining the Memory of a Controversial Social Event</u>
KTHC	49.2006	<i>Ugo GASPARINO, Barbara DEL CORPO and Dino PINELLI</i> (lxxx): <u>Perceived Diversity of Complex Environmental Systems: Multidimensional Measurement and Synthetic Indicators</u>
KTHC	50.2006	<i>Aleksandra HAUKE</i> (lxxx): <u>Impact of Cultural Differences on Knowledge Transfer in British, Hungarian and Polish Enterprises</u>
KTHC	51.2006	<i>Katherine MARQUAND FORSYTH and Vanja M. K. STENIUS</i> (lxxx): <u>The Challenges of Data Comparison and Varied European Concepts of Diversity</u>
KTHC	52.2006	<i>Gianmarco I.P. OTTAVIANO and Giovanni PERI</i> (lxxx): <u>Rethinking the Gains from Immigration: Theory and Evidence from the U.S.</u>
KTHC	53.2006	<i>Monica BARNI</i> (lxxx): <u>From Statistical to Geolinguistic Data: Mapping and Measuring Linguistic Diversity</u>
KTHC	54.2006	<i>Lucia TAJOLI and Lucia DE BENEDICTIS</i> (lxxx): <u>Economic Integration and Similarity in Trade Structures</u>
KTHC	55.2006	<i>Suzanna CHAN</i> (lxxx): <u>“God’s Little Acre” and “Belfast Chinatown”: Diversity and Ethnic Place Identity in Belfast</u>
KTHC	56.2006	<i>Diana PETKOVA</i> (lxxx): <u>Cultural Diversity in People’s Attitudes and Perceptions</u>
KTHC	57.2006	<i>John J. BETANCUR</i> (lxxx): <u>From Outsiders to On-Paper Equals to Cultural Curiosities? The Trajectory of Diversity in the USA</u>
KTHC	58.2006	<i>Kiflemariam HAMDE</i> (lxxx): <u>Cultural Diversity A Glimpse Over the Current Debate in Sweden</u>
KTHC	59.2006	<i>Emilio GREGORI</i> (lxxx): <u>Indicators of Migrants’ Socio-Professional Integration</u>
KTHC	60.2006	<i>Christa-Maria LERM HAYES</i> (lxxx): <u>Unity in Diversity Through Art? Joseph Beuys’ Models of Cultural Dialogue</u>
KTHC	61.2006	<i>Sara VERTOMMEN and Albert MARTENS</i> (lxxx): <u>Ethnic Minorities Rewarded: Ethnostratification on the Wage Market in Belgium</u>
KTHC	62.2006	<i>Nicola GENOVESE and Maria Grazia LA SPADA</i> (lxxx): <u>Diversity and Pluralism: An Economist's View</u>
KTHC	63.2006	<i>Carla BAGNA</i> (lxxx): <u>Italian Schools and New Linguistic Minorities: Nationality Vs. Plurilingualism. Which Ways and Methodologies for Mapping these Contexts?</u>
KTHC	64.2006	<i>Vedran OMANOVIĆ</i> (lxxx): <u>Understanding “Diversity in Organizations” Paradigmatically and Methodologically</u>
KTHC	65.2006	<i>Mila PASPALANOVA</i> (lxxx): <u>Identifying and Assessing the Development of Populations of Undocumented Migrants: The Case of Undocumented Poles and Bulgarians in Brussels</u>
KTHC	66.2006	<i>Roberto ALZETTA</i> (lxxx): <u>Diversities in Diversity: Exploring Moroccan Migrants’ Livelihood in Genoa</u>
KTHC	67.2006	<i>Monika SEDENKOVA and Jiri HORAK</i> (lxxx): <u>Multivariate and Multicriteria Evaluation of Labour Market Situation</u>
KTHC	68.2006	<i>Dirk JACOBS and Andrea REA</i> (lxxx): <u>Construction and Import of Ethnic Categorisations: “Allochthones” in The Netherlands and Belgium</u>
KTHC	69.2006	<i>Eric M. USLANER</i> (lxxx): <u>Does Diversity Drive Down Trust?</u>
KTHC	70.2006	<i>Paula MOTA SANTOS and João BORGES DE SOUSA</i> (lxxx): <u>Visibility & Invisibility of Communities in Urban Systems</u>
ETA	71.2006	<i>Rinaldo BRAU and Matteo LIPPI BRUNI</i> : <u>Eliciting the Demand for Long Term Care Coverage: A Discrete Choice Modelling Analysis</u>
CTN	72.2006	<i>Dinko DIMITROV and Claus-JOCHEN HAAKE</i> : <u>Coalition Formation in Simple Games: The Semistrict Core</u>
CTN	73.2006	<i>Ottorino CHILLEM, Benedetto GUI and Lorenzo ROCCO</i> : <u>On The Economic Value of Repeated Interactions Under Adverse Selection</u>
CTN	74.2006	<i>Sylvain BEAL and Nicolas QUÉROU</i> : <u>Bounded Rationality and Repeated Network Formation</u>
CTN	75.2006	<i>Sophie BADE, Guillaume HAERINGER and Ludovic RENO</i> : <u>Bilateral Commitment</u>
CTN	76.2006	<i>Andranik TANGIAN</i> : <u>Evaluation of Parties and Coalitions After Parliamentary Elections</u>
CTN	77.2006	<i>Rudolf BERGHAMMER, Agnieszka RUSINOWSKA and Harrie de SWART</i> : <u>Applications of Relations and Graphs to Coalition Formation</u>
CTN	78.2006	<i>Paolo PIN</i> : <u>Eight Degrees of Separation</u>
CTN	79.2006	<i>Roland AMANN and Thomas GALL</i> : <u>How (not) to Choose Peers in Studying Groups</u>

CTN	80.2006	<i>Maria MONTERO</i> : <u>Inequity Aversion May Increase Inequity</u>
CCMP	81.2006	<i>Vincent M. OTTO, Andreas LÖSCHEL and John REILLY</i> : <u>Directed Technical Change and Climate Policy</u>
CSRM	82.2006	<i>Nicoletta FERRO</i> : <u>Riding the Waves of Reforms in Corporate Law, an Overview of Recent Improvements in Italian Corporate Codes of Conduct</u>
CTN	83.2006	<i>Siddhartha BANDYOPADHYAY and Mandar OAK</i> : <u>Coalition Governments in a Model of Parliamentary Democracy</u>
PRCG	84.2006	<i>Raphaël SOUBEYRAN</i> : <u>Valence Advantages and Public Goods Consumption: Does a Disadvantaged Candidate Choose an Extremist Position?</u>
CCMP	85.2006	<i>Eduardo L. GIMÉNEZ and Miguel RODRÍGUEZ</i> : <u>Pigou's Dividend versus Ramsey's Dividend in the Double Dividend Literature</u>
CCMP	86.2006	<i>Andrea BIGANO, Jacqueline M. HAMILTON and Richard S.J. TOL</i> : <u>The Impact of Climate Change on Domestic and International Tourism: A Simulation Study</u>
KTHC	87.2006	<i>Fabio SABATINI</i> : <u>Educational Qualification, Work Status and Entrepreneurship in Italy an Exploratory Analysis</u>
CCMP	88.2006	<i>Richard S.J. TOL</i> : <u>The Polluter Pays Principle and Cost-Benefit Analysis of Climate Change: An Application of Fund</u>
CCMP	89.2006	<i>Philippe TULKENS and Henry TULKENS</i> : <u>The White House and The Kyoto Protocol: Double Standards on Uncertainties and Their Consequences</u>
SIEV	90.2006	<i>Andrea M. LEITER and Gerald J. PRUCKNER</i> : <u>Proportionality of Willingness to Pay to Small Risk Changes – The Impact of Attitudinal Factors in Scope Tests</u>
PRCG	91.2006	<i>Raphaël SOUBEYRAN</i> : <u>When Inertia Generates Political Cycles</u>
CCMP	92.2006	<i>Alireza NAGHAVI</i> : <u>Can R&D-Inducing Green Tariffs Replace International Environmental Regulations?</u>
CCMP	93.2006	<i>Xavier PAUTREL</i> : <u>Reconsidering The Impact of Environment on Long-Run Growth When Pollution Influences Health and Agents Have Finite-Lifetime</u>
CCMP	94.2006	<i>Corrado Di MARIA and Edwin van der WERF</i> : <u>Carbon Leakage Revisited: Unilateral Climate Policy with Directed Technical Change</u>
CCMP	95.2006	<i>Paulo A.L.D. NUNES and Chiara M. TRAVISI</i> : <u>Comparing Tax and Tax Reallocations Payments in Financing Rail Noise Abatement Programs: Results from a CE valuation study in Italy</u>
CCMP	96.2006	<i>Timo KUOSMANEN and Mika KORTELAINEN</i> : <u>Valuing Environmental Factors in Cost-Benefit Analysis Using Data Envelopment Analysis</u>
KTHC	97.2006	<i>Dermot LEAHY and Alireza NAGHAVI</i> : <u>Intellectual Property Rights and Entry into a Foreign Market: FDI vs. Joint Ventures</u>
CCMP	98.2006	<i>Inmaculada MARTÍNEZ-ZARZOSO, Aurelia BENGOCHEA-MORANCHO and Rafael MORALES LAGE</i> : <u>The Impact of Population on CO2 Emissions: Evidence from European Countries</u>
PRCG	99.2006	<i>Alberto CAVALIERE and Simona SCABROSETTI</i> : <u>Privatization and Efficiency: From Principals and Agents to Political Economy</u>
NRM	100.2006	<i>Khaled ABU-ZEID and Sameh AFIFI</i> : <u>Multi-Sectoral Uses of Water & Approaches to DSS in Water Management in the NOSTRUM Partner Countries of the Mediterranean</u>
NRM	101.2006	<i>Carlo GIUPPONI, Jaroslav MYSLAK and Jacopo CRIMI</i> : <u>Participatory Approach in Decision Making Processes for Water Resources Management in the Mediterranean Basin</u>
CCMP	102.2006	<i>Kerstin RONNEBERGER, Maria BERRITTELLA, Francesco BOSELLO and Richard S.J. TOL</i> : <u>Klum@Gtap: Introducing Biophysical Aspects of Land-Use Decisions Into a General Equilibrium Model A Coupling Experiment</u>
KTHC	103.2006	<i>Avner BEN-NER, Brian P. McCALL, Massoud STEPHANE, and Hua WANG</i> : <u>Identity and Self-Other Differentiation in Work and Giving Behaviors: Experimental Evidence</u>
SIEV	104.2006	<i>Aline CHIABAI and Paulo A.L.D. NUNES</i> : <u>Economic Valuation of Oceanographic Forecasting Services: A Cost-Benefit Exercise</u>
NRM	105.2006	<i>Paola MINOIA and Anna BRUSAROSCO</i> : <u>Water Infrastructures Facing Sustainable Development Challenges: Integrated Evaluation of Impacts of Dams on Regional Development in Morocco</u>
PRCG	106.2006	<i>Carmine GUERRIERO</i> : <u>Endogenous Price Mechanisms, Capture and Accountability Rules: Theory and Evidence</u>
CCMP	107.2006	<i>Richard S.J. TOL, Stephen W. PACALA and Robert SOCOLOW</i> : <u>Understanding Long-Term Energy Use and Carbon Dioxide Emissions in the Usa</u>
NRM	108.2006	<i>Carles MANERA and Jaume GARAU TABERNER</i> : <u>The Recent Evolution and Impact of Tourism in the Mediterranean: The Case of Island Regions, 1990-2002</u>
PRCG	109.2006	<i>Carmine GUERRIERO</i> : <u>Dependent Controllers and Regulation Policies: Theory and Evidence</u>
KTHC	110.2006	<i>John FOOT (lxxx)</i> : <u>Mapping Diversity in Milan. Historical Approaches to Urban Immigration</u>
KTHC	111.2006	<i>Donatella CALABI</i> : <u>Foreigners and the City: An Historiographical Exploration for the Early Modern Period</u>
IEM	112.2006	<i>Andrea BIGANO, Francesco BOSELLO and Giuseppe MARANO</i> : <u>Energy Demand and Temperature: A Dynamic Panel Analysis</u>
SIEV	113.2006	<i>Anna ALBERINI, Stefania TONIN, Margherita TURVANI and Aline CHIABAI</i> : <u>Paying for Permanence: Public Preferences for Contaminated Site Cleanup</u>
CCMP	114.2006	<i>Vivekananda MUKHERJEE and Dirk T.G. RÜBBELKE</i> : <u>Global Climate Change, Technology Transfer and Trade with Complete Specialization</u>
NRM	115.2006	<i>Clive LIPCHIN</i> : <u>A Future for the Dead Sea Basin: Water Culture among Israelis, Palestinians and Jordanians</u>
CCMP	116.2006	<i>Barbara BUCHNER, Carlo CARRARO and A. Denny ELLERMAN</i> : <u>The Allocation of European Union Allowances: Lessons, Unifying Themes and General Principles</u>
CCMP	117.2006	<i>Richard S.J. TOL</i> : <u>Carbon Dioxide Emission Scenarios for the Usa</u>

NRM	118.2006	<i>Isabel CORTÉS-JIMÉNEZ and Manuela PULINA: <u>A further step into the ELGH and TLGH for Spain and Italy</u></i>
SIEV	119.2006	<i>Beat HINTERMANN, Anna ALBERINI and Anil MARKANDYA: <u>Estimating the Value of Safety with Labor Market Data: Are the Results Trustworthy?</u></i>
SIEV	120.2006	<i>Elena STRUKOVA, Alexander GOLUB and Anil MARKANDYA: <u>Air Pollution Costs in Ukraine</u></i>
CCMP	121.2006	<i>Massimiliano MAZZANTI, Antonio MUSOLESI and Roberto ZOBOLI: <u>A Bayesian Approach to the Estimation of Environmental Kuznets Curves for CO₂ Emissions</u></i>
ETA	122.2006	<i>Jean-Marie GREETHER, Nicole A. MATHYS, and Jaime DE MELO: <u>Unraveling the World-Wide Pollution Haven Effect</u></i>
KTHC	123.2006	<i>Sergio VERGALLI: <u>Entry and Exit Strategies in Migration Dynamics</u></i>
PRCG	124.2006	<i>Bernardo BORTOLOTTI and Valentina MILELLA: <u>Privatization in Western Europe Stylized Facts, Outcomes and Open Issues</u></i>
SIEV	125.2006	<i>Pietro CARATTI, Ludovico FERRAGUTO and Chiara RIBOLDI: <u>Sustainable Development Data Availability on the Internet</u></i>
SIEV	126.2006	<i>S. SILVESTRI, M PELLIZZATO and V. BOATTO: <u>Fishing Across the Centuries: What Prospects for the Venice Lagoon?</u></i>
CTN	127.2006	<i>Alison WATTS: <u>Formation of Segregated and Integrated Groups</u></i>
SIEV	128.2006	<i>Danny CAMPBELL, W. George HUTCHINSON and Riccardo SCARPA: <u>Lexicographic Preferences in Discrete Choice Experiments: Consequences on Individual-Specific Willingness to Pay Estimates</u></i>
CCMP	129.2006	<i>Giovanni BELLA: <u>Transitional Dynamics Towards Sustainability: Reconsidering the EKC Hypothesis</u></i>
IEM	130.2006	<i>Elisa SCARPA and Matteo MANERA: <u>Pricing and Hedging Illiquid Energy Derivatives: an Application to the JCC Index</u></i>
PRCG	131.2006	<i>Andrea BELTRATTI and Bernardo BORTOLOTTI: <u>The Nontradable Share Reform in the Chinese Stock Market</u></i>
IEM	132.2006	<i>Alberto LONGO, Anil MARKANDYA and Marta PETRUCCI: <u>The Internalization of Externalities in The Production of Electricity: Willingness to Pay for the Attributes of a Policy for Renewable Energy</u></i>
ETA	133.2006	<i>Brighta BERCEA and Sonia OREFFICE: <u>Quality of Available Mates, Education and Intra-Household Bargaining Power</u></i>
KTHC	134.2006	<i>Antonia R. GURRIERI and Luca PETRUZZELLIS: <u>Local Networks to Compete in the Global Era. The Italian SMEs Experience</u></i>
CCMP	135.2006	<i>Andrea BIGANO, Francesco BOSELLO, Roberto ROSON and Richard S.J. TOL: <u>Economy-Wide Estimates of the Implications of Climate Change: A Joint Analysis for Sea Level Rise and Tourism</u></i>
CCMP	136.2006	<i>Richard S.J. TOL: <u>Why Worry About Climate Change? A Research Agenda</u></i>
SIEV	137.2006	<i>Anna ALBERINI, Alberto LONGO and Patrizia RIGANTI: <u>Using Surveys to Compare the Public's and Decisionmakers' Preferences for Urban Regeneration: The Venice Arsenale</u></i>
ETA	138.2006	<i>Y. Hossein FARZIN and Ken-Ichi AKAO: <u>Environmental Quality in a Differentiated Duopoly</u></i>
CCMP	139.2006	<i>Denny ELLERMAN and Barbara BUCHNER: <u>Over-Allocation or Abatement? A Preliminary Analysis of the Eu Ets Based on the 2005 Emissions Data</u></i>
CCMP	140.2006	<i>Horățiu A. RUS (lxxx): <u>Renewable Resources, Pollution and Trade in a Small Open Economy</u></i>
CCMP	141.2006	<i>Enrica DE CIAN (lxxx): <u>International Technology Spillovers in Climate-Economy Models: Two Possible Approaches</u></i>
CCMP	142.2006	<i>Tao WANG (lxxx): <u>Cost Effectiveness in River Management: Evaluation of Integrated River Policy System in Tidal Ouse</u></i>
CCMP	143.2006	<i>Gregory F. NEMET (lxxx): <u>How well does Learning-by-doing Explain Cost Reductions in a Carbon-free Energy Technology?</u></i>
CCMP	144.2006	<i>Anne BRIAND (lxxx): <u>Marginal Cost Versus Average Cost Pricing with Climatic Shocks in Senegal: A Dynamic Computable General Equilibrium Model Applied to Water</u></i>
CCMP	145.2006	<i>Thomas ARONSSON, Kenneth BACKLUND and Linda SAHLÉN (lxxx): <u>Technology Transfers and the Clean Development Mechanism in a North-South General Equilibrium Model</u></i>

(lxxviii) This paper was presented at the Second International Conference on "Tourism and Sustainable Economic Development - Macro and Micro Economic Issues" jointly organised by CRENoS (Università di Cagliari and Sassari, Italy) and Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Italy, and supported by the World Bank, Chia, Italy, 16-17 September 2005.

(lxxix) This paper was presented at the International Workshop on "Economic Theory and Experimental Economics" jointly organised by SET (Center for advanced Studies in Economic Theory, University of Milano-Bicocca) and Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Italy, Milan, 20-23 November 2005. The Workshop was co-sponsored by CISEPS (Center for Interdisciplinary Studies in Economics and Social Sciences, University of Milan-Bicocca).

(lxxx) This paper was presented at the First EURODIV Conference "Understanding diversity: Mapping and measuring", held in Milan on 26-27 January 2006 and supported by the Marie Curie Series of Conferences "Cultural Diversity in Europe: a Series of Conferences.

(lxxxi) This paper was presented at the EAERE-FEEM-VIU Summer School on "Computable General Equilibrium Modeling in Environmental and Resource Economics", held in Venice from June 25th to July 1st, 2006 and supported by the Marie Curie Series of Conferences "European Summer School in Resource and Environmental Economics".

2006 SERIES

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