

Assessing Climate Change Impacts: Agriculture

Francesco Bosello and Jian Zhang

NOTA DI LAVORO 94.2005

JULY 2005

CCMP – Climate Change Modelling and Policy
--

Francesco Bosello, *Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei and EEE Program, Abdus Salam International Center of Theoretical Physics*

Jian Zhang, *EEE Program, Abdus Salam International Center of Theoretical Physics*

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=771245>

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, e-mail: working.papers@feem.it

Assessing Climate Change Impacts: Agriculture

Summary

The economy-wide implications of climate change on agricultural sectors in 2050 are estimated using a static computable general equilibrium model. Peculiar to this exercise is the coupling of the economic model with a climatic model forecasting temperature increase in the relevant year and with a crop-growth model estimating climate change impact on cereal productivity. The main results of the study point out on the one hand the limited influence of climate change on world food supply and welfare; on the other hand its important distributional consequences as the stronger negative effects are concentrated on developing countries. The simulation exercise is introduced by a survey of the relevant literature.

Keywords: Climate change, Computable general equilibrium models, Agriculture

JEL Classification: D58, C68, N50, Q54

We had useful discussions about the topics of this paper with Roberto Roson, Richard Tol, Katrin Rehdanz, Kerstin Ronneberger, Filippo Giorgi, Marzio Galeotti, Carlo Carraro, Hom Pant, Guy Jakeman, Huey Lin Lee and Luca Criscuolo. The Ecological and Environmental Economics programme at ICTP-Trieste provided welcome financial support.

Address for correspondence:

Francesco Bosello
Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei
Campo S. Maria Formosa
Castello 5252
30122 Venice
Italy
Phone: +39 0412711459
Fax: +39 0412711461
E-mail: francesco.bosello@feem.it

1. Introduction

The relationships between climate change and agriculture are complex and manifold. They involve climatic and environmental aspects, social and economic responses. These last can take either the form of autonomous reactions or of planned economic or technological policies. This picture is complicated further: indeed climate change and agriculture interdependencies evolve dynamically over time, they often span over a large time and space scale and are still surrounded by large uncertainties.

In what follows we review how the relevant scientific literature approached the problem, starting from the first studies in the early nineties to today's large coupling exercises, emphasizing the different solutions and methodologies used to respond to the different challenges.

Section 2 presents the main issues characterizing the relationship between climate change and agriculture, section 3 offers an historical background introducing when and why these different issues arose in the debate, section 4 describes the different analytical methodologies used, while section 5 summarizes the results obtained highlighting the main findings.

Section 6 proposes a simple integrated assessment simulation exercise coupling a climate model, a crop-growth model and a CGE model to assess the systemic general equilibrium effect of a hypothetical climate change on the agricultural industries in 2050.

Section 7 concludes.

2. Climate change and agriculture: Issues in modeling.

The environmental and the socio-economic dimensions are strongly intertwined in modeling the relationship between climate change and agriculture. Both need to be accurately taken into account in order to eventually produce a reliable picture of the complexities involved. The subsequent sub sections present the most relevant aspects to be considered.

2.1. Environmental issues.

- **The role of temperature.** Higher temperatures will influence production patterns. Directly, as some plant growth and health may benefit from fewer freezes and chills, while some other crops

may be damaged by higher temperatures; or indirectly through the temperature effect on water demand and supply, on the expansion of insects and plant diseases, on weeds expansion into different-latitude habitats.

- **The interaction between soil moisture and changing precipitation patterns (extreme events).** Based on a global warming of 1.4 to 5.8 °C over the next 100 years, climate models project that both evaporation and precipitation will increase, as will the frequency and intensity of rainfalls. While some regions may become wetter, in others the net effect of an intensified hydrological cycle will be a loss of soil moisture and increased erosion. Some regions that are already drought-prone may suffer longer and more severe dry spells. Moreover with changes in precipitation patterns soil moisture will decline in some mid-latitude continental regions during the summer, while rain and snow will probably increase at high latitudes during the winter.

- **The interaction between carbon dioxide concentration and crops' productivity.** In principle, higher levels of CO₂ should stimulate photosynthesis in certain plants as they tend to suppress their photo-respiration. This should be true for the majority of species globally and especially in cooler and wetter habitats, including wheat, rice, barley, cassava and potato. Positive, but smaller effects on yields should be observed for tropical crops as maize, sugar cane, sorghum and millet, which are important for the food security of many developing countries, as well as pasture and forage grasses.

- **Interaction with rangelands, pastures and livestock.** For example, livestock would become costlier if agricultural disruption leads to higher grain prices or can depreciate where it depends more fully on the productivity and quality of the rangelands, which may become degraded.

- **The feedback of agriculture on climate change.** In general, agriculture contributes marginally to total GHG emissions. This apportion is consistently reduced if the forestry sector - usually acting as a negative emitter providing a source of sinks for CO₂ - is considered part of agriculture. Nonetheless, the agricultural sector remains the main emitter of nitrous oxide, coming from fertilizers and manure and methane coming from livestock and wetland or paddy rice farming. Moreover, deforestation is the second largest source of carbon dioxide. Accordingly any effect of climate change on agriculture and forestry inevitably feeds back to the climate system.

2.2. Socioeconomic issues

Agriculture is one of the most important human activities. It is still one of the main sources of income and productive sector in developing countries. In developed countries, notwithstanding its

reduced share in the total economic activity, it still provides a fundamental contribution to welfare and socioeconomic development.

Accordingly, a relevant shock affecting the agricultural sector is likely to originate a whole set of responses in the socio-economic system. These responses span from the farm level up to the world economic level. They can be considered adaptation processes to the changing environment; in some cases they are autonomous reactions driven by self-regulatory mechanisms, in some other cases they respond to specific and planned policy interventions.

- **Adaptation at the farm level.** In history there are numerous examples of farmers' adaptation to changing climatic conditions. These possibilities are today increased by technological development and availability of information. Adaptation strategies vary from changing cultivation timing, mix and location, to preservation of the original environmental conditions (e.g. irrigation programs to counterbalance water scarcity or greenhouses to preserve humidity), to research and development (e.g. selection/production of more climate-change resistant varieties, improved warning system for extreme events etc.).

- **Adaptation at the national level.** Agriculture and forestry are economic sectors part of national economic systems. A climate-change induced shock on agricultural inputs (e.g. land or water) or outputs (e.g. on quantity/quality of crop production) propagates to the rest of the economy: changing prices reflecting changes in scarcity induce an autonomous substitution process between all factors of production, all goods demanded and all goods produced. The higher the flexibility of the economic system the lower is the final effect compared to the direct impact.

- **Adaptation at the global level.** Like sectors, countries cannot be considered in isolation: they are part of the world economic system. Linkages are provided by international flows of factors of production, goods and services. Climate-change shocks on agriculture are likely to be different in the different countries because of nation-specific environmental, socioeconomic and institutional factors. These asymmetries translate in different price changes for domestic goods and factors stimulating international trade flows. These mechanisms may benefit some countries and damage others working both as buffers or multipliers of the initial impact.

- **The role of policy and of planned adaptation:** At each of the three levels described above, autonomous socioeconomic reply can be strengthened or corrected by specific planned strategies decided by policy decision makers. National and international economic regulation, sectoral development strategies, environmental concerns can influence rural development and shape particular path for adaptation.

Summarizing, a modeling effort devoted to investigate the effect of climate change on the agricultural sector should in principle:

- consider changes in climate variables: temperature increase and variability, increase in CO₂ concentration, changes in precipitation patterns,
- consider a set of additional climate-change induced environmental consequences: changes in land quality, water availability, frequency and intensity of extreme events,
- determine the physiological effects on crops' rate of growth and diffusion,
- consider at least the principal farm-level adaptation strategies: changes in cultivation timing, mix and location,
- consider the impact on/of main economic adjustment mechanisms at the national and international level: price effects, shifts in domestic and international supply and demand,
- finally, possibly take into consideration the feedback of the changed conditions on climate.

As can be seen the task is challenging. In particular, it is obvious that such an effort cannot rely on just one kind of modeling tool. On the contrary a comprehensive picture should couple Global Circulation Models (GCM), environmental impact models, crop growth models, land use models and economic models.

In the following sections we are going to analyze how all these issues have been dealt in the relevant literature.

3. Climate change and agriculture: Main topics.

Since the beginning of an agricultural activity (traditionally placed after the last ice age 10,000 years ago), the role of environmental conditions in influencing soil properties, crops' growth and then land productivity and production has always been a paramount interest to farmers and then, much later, to agricultural scientists.

In modern times the empirical and experimental observation has been backed by the use of mathematical models for descriptive and simulation purposes.

Nonetheless these modeling exercises and typologies started to leave the restricted field of agricultural sciences to enter as a fundamental component the larger family of socioeconomic researches only in the 80s of this century.

Two important facts contributed to this process:

- Firstly the growing recognition of a demographic/poverty issue. Early warnings came from the 1972 “Meadows Report” and the 1974 UN-FAO World Food Conference in Rome. Subsequently, with a world population projected to increase to more than 8.9 billions by 2050, with about 85% of that population living in developing countries, it appeared crucial to study food production and security both under the perspective of adequacy of total supply to an increasing demand and in term of its socially equitable/sustainable distribution among richer and poorer world regions.
- Secondly the recognition of a global climate change issue. Since the beginning of the 1980s, many climatologists predicted significant global warming in the coming decades due to increasing atmospheric concentration of carbon dioxide and other trace gases. In 1988 the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) was established by the United Nations Environmental Programme (UNEP) and the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) to assess the scientific, technical and socioeconomic information relevant for the understanding of human induced climate change, its potential impacts and options for mitigation and adaptation. Major possible changes in atmospheric, soil and hydrological regimes were forecasted to occur with a direct impact on food supply and demand.

The need to answer to the concerns posed by population growth and climate change on food production with their implications for welfare and socioeconomic development induced a flourishing modeling literature characterized, since its beginning, by the attempt to melt ecological and economic aspects. With the increasing knowledge accumulated on socioeconomic and environmental dynamics as well as the development and improvement of computational capacity of computers, modeling exercises became wider in scope and finer in methodology.

Food security was the main issue in earlier 1990s (Kane et al., 1992) and the investigation was generally focused on regional or domestic agricultural impact. (see e.g.: Louise, 1988; Martin et al., 1988; Adams et al., 1990; Sian Mooney and Arthur, 1990). Quite soon the recognition of the global nature of climate change and of the interdependencies between economies led successively to various attempts to introduce international trade into the picture (see e.g.: Rosenzweig et al., 1993; Reilly, 1994; Fischer et al., 1993; Adams et al., 1990). The mid 90s saw two further important steps toward reality. The first was the explicit consideration of adaptation opportunities. The previous researches only considered the passive impact of climate change on agriculture assuming no changes in farmers behavior (the so-called “dumb-farmer hypothesis”). Ignoring adaptation is obviously inadequate and can lead to serious misjudgment of the likely

impact. Farmers' response to the climate and natural environmental change was thus taken into account (see e.g.: Mendelsohn 1994, 1999, Reilly 1994, Adams et al., 1988, 2000). The second, was the recognition of the physical and economic relationship of the agricultural sector with the rest of the economy. Competing uses of typical agricultural inputs like water and land were introduced (see e.g.: Darwin, 1995; Tsigas, 1996; Darwin, 1999).

Finally sustainability, vulnerability and uncertainty appeared in the research agenda. Latter studies examined vulnerability defined in terms of yield, farm profitability, regional economy and hunger explicitly considering uncertainty about future climate-change impacts (Reilly, 1999; Schimmelpfennig et al., 1996). The measure of uncertainty related to extreme events and optimal risk management is one of the main topics under this line. In particular, with the increasing accumulation of meteorological evidence, the role of extreme events in particular of El Niño and La Niña Southern Oscillation (ENSO) driven phenomena appeared into the investigation (see e.g. Adams et al., 1999; Adams et al., 2003).

4. Climate change and agriculture: Comparing methodologies

Since the first modeling exercises to the last studies, many different methodological approaches and techniques have been used. Notwithstanding differences two broad categories appeared: what can be called “agriculturally oriented” and “economically oriented” researches. The first strand of studies concentrates on the ecological and biological response of soils and crops to climatic variation, considering economic interactions only partially and in a very simplified form. The second emphasized market mechanisms, analyzing agriculture as an industry part of the economic system necessarily oversimplifying the natural mechanisms at the base of crop growth and reaction to climate.

It is however important to stress how today the increasing tendency to a wider multidisciplinary has blurred this distinction. As said, seminal studies already interfaced climatic information, crop growth models and at least some economic feedback. Then, the development in computer capacity and software flexibility allowed to build increasingly large and complex modeling frameworks called Integrated Assessment models (see e.g. the IMAGE model (IMAGE team, 2001), the IGSM-MIT model (Prinn et al., 1999), the AIM model (Kainuma et al. 2002)). Within these models, in which agriculture is only a part of the picture, Global Circulation Models, environmental impact models and economic models are linked together in a balanced and coherent manner. In principle this approach allows either specificity or a bottom-up perspective,

as any sub model can be developed to a high level of detail, and comprehensiveness or the top-down view, given that no impact on any sector is considered in isolation and a general picture can be drawn.

4.1. The treatment of crops' response.

The first step in assessing the climate change impact on agriculture is to describe and simulate the bio-physical reactions of different crops to changing environmental conditions. As said, in the literature both a bottom-up and a top-down vein can be identified.

The first is based on the use of plant physiology models and of vegetation distribution models. The first set of models, considering a wide range of environmental and plant characteristics, basically describes how a given vegetal specimen grows and reproduces, the second on the basis of different climatic factors describes how vegetation distributes. Jointly these models can thus simulate how crops' varieties change their rate of growth and diffusion across the cultivated land responding to climate. Examples of plant physiology models are: CERES–Maize (Ritchie et al., 1989), CERES-Wheat (Godwin et al., 1989), SOYGRO (Jones et al., 1988) for major grains, SIM-POTATO (Hodges et al., 1992) for potatoes.

Examples of vegetation models are MAPPS (Neilson, 1993, 1995), DOLY (Woodward et al., 1995) and LPJ model (Criscuolo et al., 2004).

Impact assessment exercises using this approach are for example: Adams et al. 1995; Adams et al. 1999.

The top-down approach does not model directly the physiological mechanism driving plant reaction, but infers evolution in crop productivity through observation. Observing different yields of the same crops at different latitudes or during different periods of the year it is possible to derive what crops reaction would be to changing climatic conditions. This approach called *spatial analog* is based on statistical estimation and uses cross sectional data. Accordingly it depends on the data reliability and representatives and on the ability of statistical analysis to isolate confounding effects (Schimmelpfennig et al., 1996).

The method of spatial analogs is widely used see e.g.: Mendelsohn et al., 1994, Chen et al. 2000, Darwin et al., 1995, 1999, 2001.

4.2. The treatment of human response.

The crucial aspect of human responses at the farm level has been incorporated in most advanced agricultural studies only recently.

Basically two approaches can be identified.

The first is the above mentioned spatial approach. Already used to simulate crops' responses as an alternative to crop models, it has been applied to describe human reactions as well. The second is referred to as the "structural" approach. The distinction is not always clear in the literature; moreover those labels are somewhat misleading as both approaches share the "analogous regions concept" (Darwin, 1999): by looking at the choices, strategies and technologies being adopted now by farmers in different locations under different climatic regimes, it is possible to infer how farmers are likely to respond to a changing climate when it will take analogue characteristics. Consequently it is also possible to consider the capacity of these adaptation strategies to reduce the initial negative impact (or to enhance the positive one) in term of land values.

The true difference between the two approaches relies on the way this information is used.

In spatial analogue models, no matter how farm-level adaptation is estimated (through cross-sectional statistic and econometric techniques like e.g. in Mendelsohn et al (1994), (1996), Chen et al. (2000) or through geographic information systems like in the FARM GIS exercise (Darwin, 1999)), the consequent variation in land values is assumed to reflect exactly the welfare implication of climate-change impacts on agriculture. In other words it is assumed that the crop and farmer responses to climate are already present in the observed data such that the biophysical and economic adjustments imposed by climate change have been made across the landscape or time. This methodology would present the advantage of bypassing the need to accurately model yield and water demand and supply physical implications of climate change as well as economic adjustments (McCarl et al. 2001). According to Mendelsohn et al., (1996) this can be legitimate if changes in land prices would not feed back on agricultural prices and on the prices of all the other inputs and outputs in the rest of the economy. Nevertheless this is unrealistic and constitutes also one of the major drawbacks of this approach if used in isolation. Indeed neglecting price changes, the feedback on domestic and foreign supply and demand are completely lost.

The structural approach, on the contrary goes one step further as changes in land values are fed into more or less sophisticated economic modules to explicitly consider the responses of all the economic agents. This methodology requires a sufficient structural detail on farm management practices and becomes particularly problematic when it has to be applied to the large scale

(region, country or macroregion) as usually only few existing observations have to be considered representative of behaviors and adjustments in vast areas (Schimmelpfennig et al., 1996).

Next section will explicitly focus on the way the economic dimension has been treated by the structural approach.

Here we conclude reporting three important criticisms common to the two approaches, related to the nature of the “analog region concept” highlighted by Schneider (1997). This procedure can be reliable only if: variations across time and space are equivalent, only one steady state occurs per set of exogenous conditions and the - by necessity - limited amount of climatic variables usually considered, is able to capture all the relevant information about climate change and its impacts on agriculture. All these three conditions are unlikely to hold therefore this calls for additional cautiousness in interpreting results.

4.3 The treatment of the economic dimension.

In the treatment of the economic dimension, it is possible to identify a progressive shift from a partial equilibrium view to a general equilibrium approach.

Studies can be partial in sectoral and/or geographical coverage.

There are studies offering a worldwide coverage, but modeling only the agricultural sectors. In these cases, changes in crops production and productivity – typical supply-side shocks in economic terms – influence agricultural commodity prices affecting domestic demand and import-export fluxes. These on their turn feed back on agricultural production and demand through world food trade models. Usually these studies provide a high disaggregation in term of crop varieties and offer a detailed description of substitution processes within agricultural industries. Nonetheless they fail to capture the crucial aspect of factor reallocation and demand shifts toward sectors different from agriculture. Examples of such studies are e.g. Kane et al. 1992 and Reilly et al. 1994, using the SWAPSIM world food model. This model identifies supply and demand of 20 agricultural commodities for 36 world regions including international trade fluxes, but abstracts from other economic sectors and does not explicitly incorporates resource inputs.

A slightly different class of partial equilibrium researches does consider extensively the role of intersectoral economic effects, but focuses only on the implication for world food production by the agricultural sector. Accordingly results reported do not (and are not intended to) provide a comprehensive assessment of all the welfare effects. Studies like e.g. Fisher et al. 1993 and

Rosenzweig and Parry 1994 belong to this vein. Their assessment of climate change impacts on world food supply is based on the IIASA BLS framework which is a general equilibrium economic system composed by 35 interlinked regional and national models representing all the major economic sectors. Nevertheless the analysis is then confined to impacts on agriculture and the implications for the rest of the economic system are put aside.

Other studies are partial both in the sectoral and geographical coverage as they analyze the agricultural sector in a particular country or region. International allocation movements of goods and factors are usually highly simplified and limited to import/export of agricultural commodities. Climate change impacts on US agricultural sector are the most represented in this strand of literature (see e.g. Adams et al. 1995a, 1999, 2001). Relatively few national studies exist on developing countries (see e.g. Butt et al., 2004; Butt, 2002, Downing, 1992). Typical exercises of this kind have been performed also to evaluate the economic consequences for agriculture of extreme climate-related events (see e.g. Adams et al., 1999 for ENSO consequences for the US agriculture and Adams et al., 1995b and 2002 to assess the value to farmers of an early warning system for extreme events in the US and Mexico respectively).

Finally there are studies treating comprehensively the economic part. Common tools used for this purpose are General Equilibrium Economic Models (GEMs).

GEMs describe the economy through the behaviour of optimising producers and households which demand and supply goods and factors. Adjustment processes to excess demand and supply determine equilibrium prices in all markets. Profit maximisation under perfect competition and free market entrance guarantee zero profits and the optimal distribution of resources. All markets being linked, the main feature of GEMs is exactly the ability to capture the propagation mechanism induced by a localized shock onto the international context via price and quantity changes and vice versa.

At the beginning, GEMs were developed mainly to analyze international trade policies and relationships. Soon, because of their great flexibility, they become a common tool for economists to investigate the consequences of the most diverse economic perturbations including those provoked by climate change. Indeed, notwithstanding their complexity, those consequences can be represented as changes in productivity, production or demand for the different inputs and outputs. This kind of information can be processed by GEMs and the final welfare implications can be determined.

In the specific case of the economic evaluation of climate change impacts on agriculture, the empirical literature proposes different solutions.

The simpler is to impose directly the observed change in the production factor(s) – typically land - stock and/or productivity as an exogenous shock to the economic model. The change in the quality/quantity of the input in the production function generates a readjustment to price and quantity changes whose final result can be measured in terms of welfare and utility. This is for example the approach followed by the study presented in the next section, but also by e.g. Deke et al.(2002) and Darwin and Tol (2001)¹ using respectively the GTAP (Hertel, 1997), DART and FARM economic general equilibrium models.

Often land is considered as a homogeneous production factor. In fact, because of climate and soil characteristics, land in different locations has specific properties and there are limits to crops' switching. One possibility to account for this is to differentiate land according to agro-climatic zones (see e.g. Lee, 2004). In this case there are different land inputs which are imperfectly substitutable in the production function within, but not across climatic zones. Accordingly the reaction of the economic system to prices and quantity is exposed to one more rigidity.

Instead of building land differences “inside” the economic model, another possibility is to do this “outside” the model, developing autonomous modules accounting for different land characteristics and uses. This is the route followed e.g. by the FARM-GIS exercise (Darwin, 1999) where a half-degree grid Geographic Information System is used to identify six land classes and thresholds in crop production possibilities. This module can evaluate changes in land rent due to climatic variation; this information is then processed by the FARM-CGE economic model.

Finally, an alternative methodology couples the yield and economic information with a land use model. These models, starting from prices, predict how land is allocated among competing uses. These are not limited to different cultivation types, but include also urban development. In this way the additional feedback from land/crop prices to land allocation is added. In principle the process should be iterated until a reasonable convergence can be found. This route is computationally and modeling demanding, usually it is pursued in large integrated assessment exercises like the abovementioned IGST, IMAGE, AIM. Each of this exercise couples a land use model with a CGE (respectively EPPA, WORLDSCAN, AIM-CGE).

¹ In these two studies the negative shock on agricultural land stock was a consequence of sea level rise, but the reasoning is exactly the same of a cultivation loss induced directly by climate change.

5. Climate change and agriculture: Comparing results

Table 1: Climate Change Impacts on Agriculture, Selected Studies

Reilly et al., 1994			
	Climate Change Impact on Welfare - Millions of 1989 US \$ - 2 X CO ₂		
	No CO ₂ fert. effect no adaptation	CO ₂ fert. effect no adaptation	CO ₂ fert. effect and adaptation
Region 1: <\$500/capita	-56,692 to -121,063	-2,070 to -19,827	-210 to -14,588
Region 2: \$500-\$2000/capita	-26,171 to -48,095	-1,797 to 15,010	-429 to -10,669
Region 3: >\$2000/capita	-3,870 to -6,661	-603 to -1,021	-328 to -878
E.EUROPE/USSR	-12,494 to -57,471	1,885 to -10,959	2423 to -4,875
OECD	-13,453 to -21,485	2,674 to -15,101	5,822 to -6470
WORLD	-115,471 to -248,124	-126 to 61,225	7,003 to -37,623
Fischer et al., 1993			
	Climate Change Impact on Crop Productivity - % change - 2 X CO ₂		
	No CO ₂ fert. effect no adaptation	CO ₂ fert. effect no adaptation	CO ₂ fert. effect and adaptation
Dvl.ped Countries	-19.27	0.97	6.23
Dvl.ping Countries	-29.57	-7.07	-2.17
WORLD	-26.83	-5.3	-0.07
Rosenzweig et al. 1994			
	Climate Change Impact on Cereal Productivity - % change - Projection for 2060		
	No CO ₂ fert. effect no adaptation	CO ₂ fert. effect and minor changes to existing agric. system	CO ₂ fert. effect and major changes to existing agric. system
Dvl.ped Countries	4.50	4.50	6.50
Dvl.ping Countries	-10.50	-6.50	-10.40
WORLD	-4.50	-0.60	-2.50
Kane et al. 1992			
	Climate Change Impact on Welfare - % change - (from moderate to very adverse). 2 X CO ₂	Climate Change Impacts on Crops Productivity - % change - (from moderate to very adverse). 2 X CO ₂	
US	0.005 - -0.31	-15 - -40	
Canada	-0.047 - -0.21	-20 - -5	
EEC	-0.019 - -0.40	-15 - -10	
Other Europe	-0.010 - -0.10	10 - 15	
Japan	-0.062 - -0.29	-5	
Austria	0.038 - 0.04	-10 - -15	
USSR	0.032 - -0.52	-15	
China	1.280 - -5.48	-20 - -10	
Brazil	-0.017- 0.22	No Change	
Argentina	0.120 - 2.82	No Change	
Pakistan	-0.153 -1.63	No Change	
Thailand	-0.081 - 1.22	No Change	
ROW	-0.002 - -0.84	-10	
WORLD	0.01 - -0.47		

Table 1: Climate Change Impacts on Agriculture, Selected Studies (continued)

Tsigas et al. 1997					
	Climate change impacts on crop productivity - % change - 2 X CO2		Climate change impacts on Welfare - % change - 2 X CO2		
	Without CO2 Fertilisation Effect	With CO2 Fertilisation Effect	Without CO2 Fertilisation Effect	With CO2 Fertilisation Effect	
Canada	-3.00	24.00	-0.02	0.50	
USA	-17.00	2.00	-0.56	0.04	
Mexico	-43.00	-24.00	-6.70	-2.78	
EU	-9.00	11.00	-1.02	0.29	
China	-17.00	3.00	-7.23	0.54	
ASEAN	-34.00	-11.00	-7.59	-1.73	
Australia	-16.00	8.00	-0.21	0.26	
ROW	-22.00	-1.00	-2.48	-0.12	
WORLD			-1.75	0.01	
Rosenzweig and Iglesias, 1994					
	Climate Change Impacts on Crops' Productivity - % Change - 2 X CO2				
	Rice	Maize	Wheat		
Indonesia	-2.5% - + 5.4%	-40%			
Malaysia	-22% - -12%	0%			
Pakistan			-60% to -10%		
Sri Lanka	-2.1% to +3%				
Bangladesh	-6% to +8%				
Mongolia			-74.3% to + 32%		
Kazakhstan			-56% to + 44%		
Czech Republic			-3% to + 16%		
United Kingdom	5% to 15%				
The Gambia		-26% to -15%			
Zimbabwe		-13.6% to -11.5%			
Brazil	-27% to -7%		-46% to -17%		
Argentina	-17% to +4%		-12% to + 6%		
Uruguay			-31% to - 11%		
United States	-23% to 1%	-29% to -15%	-14% to - 2%		
Harasawa et al., 2003					
	Climate Change Impacts on Crops Productivity - % Change – (*)				Social Welfare - % Change – (*)
	Rice	Wheat	Other Grains	Other Crops	
Japan	0.11	-6.6	-15.56	0.11	0.022
China	-0.25	-3.97	-1.39	0.07	-0.21
India	-1.76	-7.64	-1.33	-4.25	-4.89
Canada	105.99	115.07	89.41	-2.26	0.343
USA	0.23	2.87	-4.04	0.25	0.009
EU	2.03	-3.64	-6.50	-0.03	0.003
(*) % change 1990-2100 in the IS92a IPCC emission scenario.					

Table 1: Climate Change Impacts on Agriculture, Selected Studies (continued)

Adams et al. 1999b		
	Benign Case (*)	Adverse Case (**)
	Climate Change Impacts on Welfare - % change Without Adaptation – 2060 Projections	
USA TOTAL	2.70	0.01
	Climate Change Impacts on Welfare - % change With Adaptation – 2060 Projections	
USA TOTAL	2.73	0.42
USA REGION	Climate Change Impacts on Crop Production - % Change in Regional Index Number Without Adaptation – 2060 Projections	
Northeast	44.59	83.49
Lake States	165.91	122.66
Corn Belt	106.28	82.99
Northern Plains	113.54	148.75
Appalachia	96.48	59.02
Southeast	138.65	98.26
Delta States	91.30	70.68
Southern Plains	75.17	59.00
Mountain States	121.97	115.75
Pacific Coast	134.64	129.76
(*) 2.5°C, +7% Precipitation, 530 ppm. CO ₂		
(**) 5°C, +0% Precipitation, 530 ppm. CO ₂		
Adams et al. 1999a		
	Estimated Costs of Strong El Niño and La Niña Events (Millions of 1990 \$)	
USA	- 2543	-6455
Adams et al. 2003		
	Net Present Value of Early Warning System for ENSO Phenomena (Millions of 2001 \$)	
	19-year Period	51-year Period
Mexico	227.5	233.6

1- Climate change impacts on agriculture are of limited extent.

The main finding emerging from the literature is that climate change impacts on agriculture are quite “small”. This is true either under the perspective of impacts on yields and accordingly on food supply and availability or considering more extensively general equilibrium and welfare implications. This outcome is particularly robust as it is confirmed by the most diverse studies endorsing both the spatial and the structural view, adopting a national or a global perspective, considering simplified or complex adaptation procedures. Global studies reviewed, report for the world as a whole a loss ranging from the –2.5% to the –0.07% in term of food production and

ranging from the -0.047% to the 0.01% in term of welfare in case of a doubling CO₂ concentration. In regional studies, welfare changes range between the -5.48% and the $+2.73\%$.

It is interesting to note that in general national and partial equilibrium studies report higher impacts respect to global, general equilibrium studies. As said this confirms the role of intersectoral and international substitution processes as smoothers. There is however an additional subtler reason for that: a general equilibrium approach naturally takes into account the welfare of all the agents within the economic system, and usually losses to one agents turn out to be gains for another. Typical example is a decrease in consumers' surplus that is automatically balanced by the increase in producers'. The net effect is thus reduced.

2- Crucial Role of Adaptation.

It is particularly important to highlight that the limited influence of climate change on agriculture is mainly due to natural or human adaptation mechanisms. In general strong negative impacts highlighted by exercises neglecting adaptation turn into much smaller losses or even slight gains when proper adaptation options are modeled. Interestingly, when it is explicitly taken into account (see e.g. Reilly et al. 1994; Fischer et al. 1993, Rosenzweig et al. 1994), the fertilization effect due to the increased CO₂ concentration - that can be considered as an autonomous natural adaptation process – contributes more to damage reduction than human adaptation. All the studies confirm in any case the fundamental role of economic adaptation in smoothing adverse climatic effects.

It is worth to stress here the uncertainty surrounding the modeling of CO₂ fertilization effect and especially of human adaptation options. There are various views about adaptation. Scientists disagree whether the rate of change of climate and the required adaptations would add significantly to the disruption that farming will experience from future changes in economic conditions, technology and resource availabilities (see e.g. Kane and Reilly, 1993; Reilly 1994). Indeed there are many questions still puzzling regarding to adaptation. For example: how can agriculture adjust? Rapidly and autonomously, slowly and only with careful guidance? Is there little scope for adjustment? Does response of the system require planning by farmers specifically taking into account climate change, and if so what is their capability to detect change and respond (Reilly, 1999)?

This is an important qualification of the highlighted results. Should adaptation be less effective, strong adverse consequences of climate change on agricultural production and welfare cannot be excluded.

3 - Uneven Distribution of Effects

Agricultural sectors in different regions are likely to be affected and to respond differently to climate change. In particular results highlight a higher vulnerability of the developing world. On the one hand this is due to a purely physical fact: the latitude where most part of developing countries are located. Though employing different methods and scenarios, most studies (see e.g. Rosenzweig, et al. 1994, Kane et al. 1992, Darwin et al., 1995) generally support the conclusion that low latitude yields will fall and middle and northern latitude yields will rise with a doubling of CO₂ levels.

On the other hand this is related to their lower capacity to adapt².

Again, negative impacts are not “big”, but this outcome needs to be carefully qualified: apart from uncertainties, many developing countries are already experiencing severe risk of hunger and malnutrition problems. Accordingly even a slight worsening of an already dramatic situation is a worrying eventuality.

4 – Role of Extreme Events

When climate change is considered only as a variation in average conditions, impacts on agriculture can be positive and negative. They become unambiguously negative when extreme events, representing changes in extreme conditions, are taken into account (Adams et al., 1998; Solow et al., 1998, Chen et al., 2000). Also agriculture reflects this typical characterization of the relationship between climate change and adaptation: average change is slow and usually falls within the “coping range” of systems, extreme change is abrupt and often outside this coping range.

6. The modeling exercise

As an introduction of the modeling exercise performed, we firstly describe the approach used and place it in the stream of the reviewed literature.

6.1. The modeling approach.

Our investigation is an integrated assessment exercise, conducted at the world level, coupling with the so-called “soft-link” approach a GCM, an agricultural sub-model and an economic model. The GCM used is a reduced-form of the Schneider-Thompson GCM: starting from CO₂

emissions, it provides information on the expected increase in average world temperature and CO₂ concentration in the atmosphere. This average data is then disaggregated into 22 geo-climatic zones following Giorgi and Mearns (2002) and fed into a crop productivity change module. This module (Tol, 2004) extrapolates changes in yields respect to a given scenario of temperature increase. It is based on data from Rosenzweig and Hillel, 1998 which report detailed results from an internally consistent set of crop modeling studies for 12 world regions and 6 crops' varieties. The role of CO₂ fertilization effect is explicitly taken into account. Finally changes in yields are used as input in the global economic model in order to assess the systemic general equilibrium effects.

To do this, we made an unconventional use of a standard multi-country world CGE model: the GTAP model (Hertel, 1996), in the version modified by Burniaux and Truong (2002), and subsequently extended by ourselves.

In a first step, we derived benchmark data-sets for the world economy “without climate change” at some selected future years (2010, 2030, 2050), using the methodology described in Dixon and Rimmer (2002). This entails inserting, in the model calibration data, forecasted values for some key economic variables, to identify a hypothetical general equilibrium state in the future.

Since we are working on the medium-long term, we focused primarily on the supply side: forecasted changes in the national endowments of labour, capital, land, natural resources, as well as variations in factor-specific and multi-factor productivity.

We obtained estimates of the regional labour and capital stocks by running the G-Cubed model (McKibbin and Wilcoxon, 1998) and of land endowments and agricultural land productivity from the IMAGE model version 2.2 (IMAGE Team, 2001). We ran this model by adopting the most conservative scenario about the climate (IPCC B1), implying minimal temperature changes.

In the second step we imposed over these benchmark equilibria the climate change shock on agriculture that we model as a change in the productivity of land devoted to the production of the different crops in the different regions.

Tsigas et al. 1997, perform a similar exercise measuring general equilibrium effect of climate change in agriculture using the GTAP model. The basic differences between their and our approach are: firstly the climate scenario, they refer to a doubling of CO₂, while we project directly the temperature increase consistent with the emissions from the economic model;

² Lower capacity does not mean lower knowledge, skill or ability. Rather it refers to the usually lower amount of resources available for adaptation options or to stronger technological or market constraints to

secondly the economic benchmark, they use the model calibrated in 1997, while as said, we pseudo-calibrated the model in 2050; thirdly the economic shocks, they implemented climate change as a Hicks neutral technical change in the crop sectors in each region, that is productivity changes affect uniformly all the production factors used by the agricultural industries while, in our case climate change intervenes, we believe more realistically, only on land-productivity-augmenting technical change.

This exercise suffers also from some major limitations. We mention the following:

- firstly an analysis at the world level requires heroic simplifications and generalizations of both climatic conditions and crop responses. A very narrow number of observations is used to provide information on vast areas inducing an unrealistic uniformity,
- secondly - apart from temperature and CO₂ fertilization effects - other important impacts of climate change on agriculture are missing, primarily interrelations with water availability and with livestock,
- thirdly adaptation at the farm level is partly disregarded especially decisions on cultivation timing as the exercise is purely static. Moreover there is not a land use model defining the optimal allocation of land among competing alternatives; land is a production factor used only by the agricultural sector and not for instance by the residential or the industrial sectors, as a consequence also the mechanism governing the decision on cultivation location results highly simplified,
- finally the exercise concentrates only on few kinds of cereal crops.

Nonetheless, the exercise is particularly useful in highlighting substitution mechanisms and transmission channels within and between economic systems. It allows to represent and disentangle those adaptation mechanisms at work in the modern economies that can amplify or smooth an initial shock and produce a final effect largely different from the original stimulus.

This crucial role of autonomous national and international socioeconomic adaptation is the matter of the next subsection.

the adoption of adaptation opportunities in developing countries respect to developed economies.

6.2. Results and comments.

In what follows we are reporting results for 2050 when, according to our calculations, temperature is expected to increase 0.93°C respect to year 2000. Results for the other benchmark years are qualitatively similar.

As can be seen (tab. 2) the productivity of land used for the cultivation of rice and wheat, generally increases benefiting of the improved fertilization effect due to higher CO_2 concentration. The opposite happens to cereal cultivation. RoA1, CHIND and RoW are partly different: the first two show an increased while the last a decreased land productivity in all crops.

As expected the price of different crops moves in opposition to productivity (tab. 4).

Firstly it is worth noticing that direct productivity shocks are bigger than final general equilibrium effects on GDP. This because the economy can substitute land for other inputs (e.g. capital), or vice versa.

Then, in line with all the more recent literature, effects on GDP are generally small, (negative for USA, EEx and RoW, positive for the other regions) and relatively more negative for developing countries. What is interesting to note here, is how the change in land productivity propagates to GDP and to international capital flows. It is firstly worth recalling the rather peculiar mechanism GTAP uses to allocate capital internationally: a central bank collects savings from the regional households that save a given amount of their income and then proceeds to redistribution. The engine of the entire process is the equalization of the expected rate of return to (price of) capital in all regions. As shown by table 2, GDP is positively (negatively) affected when the net effect on land productivity is an increase (decrease). In the GDP gaining (loosing) regions the positive(negative) aggregate result fosters(depresses) the demand of all inputs including capital, capital increases(decreases) its real price (tab. 4) and subsequently capital inflows(outflows) are stimulated (tab.2).

Also a substitution effect is at play here: when land productivity increases, land prices tend to decrease as a given agricultural output can be produced with a lower amount of land. This causes a substitution away from relatively costly factors, capital and labor, to the cheaper land. Capital price decreases and capital tends to exit the region. (The same reasoning applies, reversed, in case of a land productivity decrease).

If we consider capital prices and flows, due to the (low) degree of substitution between capital and land, the aggregate effect always prevails.

Nevertheless this is not generally true considering the land price where the productivity effects dominate the aggregate effect. An example particularly clear is CHIND: here land productivity unambiguously increases with a positive effect on GDP, but land price decreases.

Note also that generally terms of trade effects act as smoothers: a relative decrease in GDP induces a shift toward domestic goods by domestic and foreign consumers attracted by decreasing prices. This decreases the price of imports and increases the price of exports. Again this is not always the case. In three regions terms of trade effects amplify rather than smooth the GDP result: USA, where changes in terms of trade strengthen the negative performance of production and JPN and CHIND where they reinforce the positive one.

The interplay between terms of trade and capital flows explains also the different sign that sometimes is observable in the household utility index respect to GDP.

Finally tab. 3 reports industrial production. In general positive GDP and productivity changes translate in similar changes in production level, particularly of agricultural industries.

Tab. 2

	Exogenous Shocks on Land Productivity in Different Agricultural Industries (% change w.r.t. baseline)			Endogenous Responses (% change w.r.t. baseline)				
	Rice	Wheat	Cereal Crops	GDP	Private Utility Index	Co2 Emissions	Terms of Trade	Internat. Capital Flows
USA	1.214	1.497	-1.702	-0.023	-0.047	-0.056	-0.183	-0.152
EU	1.811	1.046	-1.134	0.006	-0.005	-0.004	-0.048	0.019
EEFSU	1.856	3.641	-0.822	0.011	0.008	0.001	-0.016	0.037
JPN	0.973	0.399	-1.999	0.004	0.012	0.035	0.023	0.082
RoA1	6.624	8.993	3.619	0.067	0.046	0.032	-0.080	0.1
EEx	1.349	2.063	-1.659	-0.013	0.047	0.010	0.214	-0.002
CHIND	3.962	5.068	0.870	0.212	0.215	0.012	0.095	0.98
RoW	-1.791	-1.599	-4.891	-0.126	-0.099	-0.175	0.076	-0.35

Tab. 3

Endogenous Responses: Industry Output by Region (% change w.r.t. baseline)								
	USA	EU	EEFSU	JPN	RoA1	EEx	CHIND	RoW
Rice	-0.581	-0.498	0.045	-0.086	1.867	-0.015	0.461	-0.505
Wheat	-1.025	-0.507	0.513	-3.835	5.851	-0.94	0.715	-2.604
CerCrops	-0.523	0.867	0.794	0.511	5.304	0.228	1.7	-3.335
VegFruits	-0.386	0.379	0.129	0.206	0.08	-0.111	0.352	-0.355
Animals	-0.348	0.112	0.096	0.024	0.182	-0.077	0.4	-0.435
Forestry	-0.011	0.023	0.023	-0.022	-0.057	0.022	-0.082	0.01
Fishing	0.126	-0.033	0.017	0.004	-0.11	-0.01	0.082	0.032
Coal	0.05	-0.021	-0.012	-0.127	-0.079	-0.008	-0.153	0.194
Oil	0.08	0.005	-0.003	-0.079	-0.071	-0.004	-0.223	0.205
Gas	0.089	0.018	-0.016	-0.053	-0.191	-0.012	-0.666	0.438
Oil_Pcts	-0.077	-0.006	0.015	0.01	0.078	-0.014	0.162	-0.04
Electricity	0.02	-0.006	-0.013	-0.012	-0.135	0.002	-0.051	0.094
Water	0.004	0.003	0.006	-0.008	0.016	0.035	-0.037	0.008
En_Int_ind	0.145	-0.027	-0.042	-0.094	-0.276	-0.076	-0.332	0.257
Oth_ind	-0.165	0.027	0.032	0.058	-0.072	-0.054	0.284	-0.345
MServ	0.015	-0.012	-0.012	-0.002	-0.018	0.007	0.082	0.085
NMserv	0.004	-0.004	0.005	-0.008	0.022	0.034	-0.076	0.017

Tab. 4

Endogenous Responses: Primary Input (Real) Prices by Regions (% change w.r.t. baseline)								
	USA	EU	EEFSU	JPN	RoA1	EEx	CHIND	RoW
Land	1.948	-0.003	0.422	-0.399	0.873	1.091	-0.745	2.156
Lab	-0.121	-0.037	-0.02	0.015	0.003	-0.088	0.977	-0.414
Capital	-0.121	-0.038	-0.023	0.016	0.034	-0.096	1.04	-0.451
NatlRes	0.304	-0.046	-0.043	-0.048	-0.414	-0.108	-0.103	0.061
Endogenous Responses: Industry Prices by Regions (% change w.r.t. baseline)								
Rice	-0.932	-2.311	-1.726	-0.826	-4.646	-0.916	-4.924	3.515
Wheat	-1.586	-1.569	-3.067	-1.776	-4.37	-1.488	-5.439	0.911
CerCrops	3.374	1.976	1.568	1.761	-0.409	2.635	-0.315	4.395
VegFruits	0.9	0.247	0.335	0.157	0.521	0.618	-0.017	0.73
Animals	1.653	0.181	0.297	0.6	0.495	0.648	-0.113	0.782
Forestry	-0.048	0.058	0.072	0.104	0.034	0.048	0.744	-0.357
Fishing	-0.079	0.053	0.062	0.115	0.031	0.023	0.354	-0.275
Coal	-0.157	-0.011	0.031	0.068	0.083	0.018	0.486	-0.091
Oil	-0.088	0.013	0.034	0.069	0.028	0.015	0.323	-0.085
Gas	-0.21	0.012	0.032	0.109	0.04	0.016	0.55	-0.343
Oil_Pcts	-0.072	0.015	0.033	0.085	0.033	0.017	0.336	-0.089
Electricity	-0.214	0.005	0.029	0.124	0.12	0.017	0.655	-0.339
Water	-0.18	0.007	0.038	0.132	0.125	0.023	0.754	-0.381
En_Int_ind	-0.163	0.018	0.044	0.123	0.095	0.05	0.43	-0.2
Oth_ind	0.131	0.092	0.087	0.093	0.129	0.131	0.069	0.187
MServ	-0.188	0.015	0.045	0.131	0.118	0.037	0.52	-0.339
NMserv	-0.178	0.017	0.046	0.131	0.115	0.055	0.625	-0.293

7. Conclusions

In this paper we offered a survey of the various approaches used to describe, model and measure the complex relationships between climate change and agriculture. The main message that can be grasped from the relevant literature is that climatic, agricultural and economic information need to be consistently melted in order to provide a reliable and sound impact assessment analysis in this field. This is witnessed by the constant effort to expand the comprehensiveness of the investigation that has recently led to the construction of large modeling frameworks coupling global circulation models, crop growth models, land use models and economic, usually general equilibrium, models. A robust finding of all these modeling efforts is that climate change impact on food supply and on welfare are of limited extent. Nevertheless this outcome is largely determined by the working of socio-economic autonomous and planned adaptation processes, whose real costs and potential in limiting adverse consequences from climate change are highly controversial and uncertain. Another robust result is that, notwithstanding adaptation, agricultural sectors in the developing world will be adversely affected with negative consequences either in terms of food availability or of welfare. Considering the already dramatic situation faced by many developing countries even “small” worsening can lead to serious threats to their socio-economic development. This also raises the crucial issue of proper re-distributional policies from developed to developing countries.

Finally we proposed an integrated assessment exercise to evaluate climate change impact on agriculture. As it is standard to the approach we coupled a global circulation model, with a crop-growth model, with an economic model. Original to our approach is the determination of the climatic scenario, endogenously produced by the economic model and the benchmarking of the economic model itself, reproducing a hypothetical world economic system in 2010, 2030 and 2050. The results we get are in line with the existing literature confirming both the limited impact of climate change on agricultural sectors, largely determined by the smoothing effect of economic adaptation, but also the relative higher penalization of the developing world.

References

Adams, R. M. (1999), 'On the Search for the Correct Economic Assessment Method', *Climatic Change*, **41** (3-4), 363-370.

Adams, R. M., Bryant, K. J., McCarl, B. A., Legler, D.M, O'Brian, J., Solow, A and R. Weiher (1995b) 'Value of Improved Long-Range Weather Information, ' *Contemporary Economic Policy*, XIII, 10-19.

Adams, R. M., Chen, C.-C., McCarl, B. A., and Weiher, R. F. (1999), 'The Economic Consequences of ENSO Events for Agriculture', *Climate Research*, **13**, 165-172.

Adams, R. M., Chen, C.-C., McCarl, B. A., and Schimmelpfening, D.E. (2000), ' Climate Variability and Climate change: Implications for Agriculture. In The Long Term Economics of Climate Change, ' Volume 3, *Advances in the Economics of Environmental Resources*. Hall, D and Howarth, R. Eds. Elsevier Science Publisher, New York, NY.

Adams, R. M., Fleming, R. A., Chang, C. C., McCarl, B. A., and Rosenzweig, C. (1995a), 'A Reassessment of the Economic Effects of Global Climate Change on U.S. Agriculture', *Climatic Change*, **30**, 147-167.

Adams, R. M., Glyer, J.D., McCarl, B. A., and Dudek, D.J. (1988), ' The Implications of Global Change for Western Agriculture, ' *Western Journal of Agriculture Economics*, **13**, 348-356.

Adams, R. M., Houston, L. L., McCarl, B. A., Tiscareno, L.M, Matus, G.J. and R. Weiher (2003), 'The Benefits to Mexican Agriculture of an ENSO Early Warning System, ' *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, **115**, 183-194.

Adams, R. M., Hurd, B.H. and J. Reilly (2001), 'Impacts on the US Agricultural Sector', *PEW report Climate Change: Science, Strategies and Solutions* , 47-64.

Adams, R. M., McCarl, B. A., Segerson, K., Rosenzweig, C., Bryant, K. J., Dixon, B. L., Conner, R., Evenson, R. E., & Ojima, D. (1999), ' The Economic Effects of Climate Change on U.S. Agriculture, ' in *The Impact of Climate Change on the United States Economy*, R. O. Mendelsohn & J. E. Neumann, eds. (eds.), Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 18-54.

Adams, R.M., Rosenzweig, C., Peart, R.M., Ritchie, J.T., McCarl, B.A., Glyer, J.D., Curry, R.B., Jones, J.W., Boote, K.J., and Allen Jr. L.H. (1990) , 'Global Climate Change and U.S. Agriculture, ' *Nature* **345**: 219-224.

Arthur, L. (1988), 'The Greenhouse Effect and the Canadian Prairies, ' in G. Johnston, D. Freshwater and P. Favero, eds., *Natural Resource and Environmental Policy Issues*, Boulder, CO: Westview, pp. 233-52.

Bosello, F., Lazzarin, M., Roson, R., and Tol, R.S.J. (2004), 'Economy-Wide Estimates of the Implications of Climate Change: Sea-Level Rise,' FEEM working paper forthcoming.

Burniaux J-M., Truong, T.P., (2002) *GTAP-E: An Energy-Environmental Version of the GTAP Model*, GTAP Technical Paper n.16 (www.gtap.org).

Butt, T.A. (2002), ' The Economic and Food Security Implications of Population, Climate Change, and Technology – A Case Study For Mali,' unpublished PhD Dissertation, Department of Agricultural Economics, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX.

Butt, T.A., McCarl, B., Angerer, J., Dyke, P., Kim, M., Kaitho, R. and J. Smith (2004), 'Agricultural Climate Change Impact, General Concerns and Findings from Mali, Kenya, Uganda and Senegal, ' Presented at the USAID SANREM CRSP Sustainable Natural Resource Management Accomplishment Workshop. Washington D.C., June 15, 2004.

Chen, C.C., B.A. McCarl, and D. Schimmelpfennig (2000), 'Yield Variability as Influenced by Climate: A Statistical Investigation, ' report under USGCRP Assessment <http://ageco.tamu.edu/faculty/mccarl/climchg.html> .

Criscuolo, L., Knorr, W. and E. Ceotto (2003), 'Integrated Ecosystem and Crop Modelling for Global Carbon Cycle Assessment', paper presented at the 2nd NCRR International Summer School Grindelwald, Switzerland.

Darwin, R. F. (1997), ' World Agriculture and Climate Change: Current Questions ', *World Resource Review*, **9** (1), 17-31.

Darwin, R. F. and Tol, R. S. J. (2001), ' Estimates of the Economic Effects of Sea Level Rise, ' *Environmental and Resource Economics*, **19**, 113-129.

Darwin, R. F., Tsigas, M., Lewandrowski, J., & Ranases, A. (1995), *World Agriculture and Climate Change - Economic Adaptations*, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C., 703.

Darwin, R. F. (1999), 'A FARMER's View of the Ricardian Approach to Measuring Agricultural Effects of Climatic Change, ' *Climatic Change*, **41** (3-4), 371-411.

Deke, O., Hooss, K. G., Kasten, C., Klepper, G., & Springer, K. 2001, '*Economic Impact of Climate Change: Simulations with a Regionalized Climate-Economy Model*, ' Kiel Institute of World Economics, Kiel, 1065.

Dixon, P. and Rimmer, M., (2002) *Dynamic General Equilibrium Modeling for Forecasting and Policy*, North Holland.

- Downing, T (1992), 'Climate Change and Vulnerable Places: Global Food Security and Country Studies in Zimbabwe, Kenya, Senegal and Chile,' Research Report No. 1, Environmental Change Unit, University of Oxford, Oxford
- Fischer, G., Frohberg, K., Parry, M. L., & Rosenzweig, C. (1993), 'Climate Change and World Food Supply, Demand and Trade,' in *Costs, Impacts, and Benefits of CO₂ Mitigation*, Y. Kaya et al., eds. (eds.), pp. 133-152.
- Fischer, G., Frohberg, K., Parry, M. L., & Rosenzweig, C. (1996), 'Impacts of Potential Climate Change on Global and Regional Food Production and Vulnerability, ' in *Climate Change and World Food Security*, T. E. Downing, ed. (eds.), Springer-Verlag, Berlin, pp. 115-159.
- Giorgi, F. and L.O. Mearns (2001), 'Calculation of Average, Uncertainty Range, and Reliability of Regional Climate Changes from AOGCM Simulations via the Reliability Ensemble Averaging (REA) Method,' *Journal of Climate*, **15**, 1141-1158.
- Godwin, D., Ritchie, J., Singh, U. and Hunt, L. (1989). A User's Guide to CERES-Wheat – V2.10. Muscle Shoals, AL: International Fertilizer Development Center.
- Hertel, T.W., (1997) *Global Trade Analysis: Modeling and applications*, Cambridge University Press.
- Hodges, T., Johnson, S.L. and Johnson, B.S. (1992). 'A Modular Structure for Crop Growth Simulation Models: Implemented in the SIMPOTATO Model, ' *Agronomy Journal* **84**: 911-15.
- IMAGE (2001), *The IMAGE 2.2 Implementation of the SRES Scenarios*, RIVM CD-ROM Publication 481508018, Bilthoven, The Netherlands.
- IPCC. (1996). Climate Change 1995: The IPCC Second Assessment Report, Volume 2: Scientific-Technical Analyses of Impacts, Adaptations, and Mitigation of Climate Change, Watson, R.T., Zinyowera, M.C. and Moss, R.H.(eds). Cambridge University Press: Cambridge and New York.
- Jones, J.W., Boote, K.J., Jagtap, S.S., Hoogenboom, G. and Wilkerson, G.G., (1988). SOYGRO v5.41: Soybean Crop Growth Simulation Model User's Guide. Florida Agricultural Experiment Station Journal No.8304, University of Florida: IFAS.
- Kainuma, M., Matsuoka, Y. and Morita, T. (2003), (eds), *Climate Policy Assessment Asia-Pacific Integrated Modeling*, Springer-Verlag.
- Kane, S., Reilly, J. M., and J. Tobey (1992), 'An Empirical Study of the Economic Effects of Climate Change on World Agriculture', *Climatic Change*, **21**, 17-35.
- Lee, H.L. (2004), 'Incorporating Agro-Ecologically Zoned Land Use Data Into the GTAP Framework, ' Paper Presented at the 7th Annual GTAP Conference on Trade, Poverty and the Environment, Washington D.C., June 17-19.

McCarl, B.A., Adams, R.M. and B.H. Hurd (2001), 'Global climate change impacts on agriculture', DRAFT

McKibbin, W.J., Wilcoxon, P.J., (1998), 'The Theoretical and Empirical Structure of the GCubed Model,' *Economic Modelling*, vol. **16**(1), pp. 123–48.

Mendelsohn, R. O., Nordhaus, W. D., and Shaw, D. (1994), ' The Impact of Global Warming on Agriculture: A Ricardian Analysis', *American Economic Review*, **84** (4), 753-771.

Mendelsohn, R. O., Nordhaus, W. D., and Shaw, D. (1996), 'Climate Impacts on Aggregate Farm Value: Accounting for Adaptation', *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, **80**, 55-66.

Mendelsohn, R. O., Nordhaus, W. D., & Shaw, D. (1999), ' The Impact of Climate Variation on U.S. Agriculture, ' in *The Impact of Climate Change on the United States Economy*, R. O. Mendelsohn & J. E. Neumann, eds. (eds.), Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 55-74.

Mooney, S. and Arthur, L., (1990). ' The Impacts of Climate Change on Agriculture in Manitoba, ' *Canadian Journal of Agricultural Economics*, **38**, 685-94.

Neilson, R.P. (1993). 'Vegetation redistribution: A possible biosphere source of CO₂ during climatic change, ' *Water, Air and Soil Pollution*, **70**, 659-673.

Neilson, R.P. (1995). 'A model for predicting continental scale vegetation distribution and water balance, ' *Ecological Applications*, **5**, 362-385.

Prinn, R., Jacoby, H., Sokolov, A., C. Wang, X. X., Yang, Z., Eckaus, R., Stone, P., Ellerman, D., Melillo, J., Fitzmaurice, J., Kicklighter, D., Holian, G. and Liu Y. (1999), 'Integrated Global System Model for Climate Policy Assessment: Feedbacks and Sensitivity Studies, ' *Climatic Change*, **41**(3/4), 469-546.

Reilly, J. M. (1994), 'Crops and Climate Change', *Nature*, **367**, 118-119.

Reilly, J. M., Hohmann, N., and Kane, S. (1994), 'Climate Change and Agricultural Trade: Who Benefits, Who Loses?', *Global Environmental Change*, **4** (1), 24-36.

Reilly, J. M. and Schimmelpfennig, D. (1999), 'Agricultural impact assessment, vulnerability, and the scope for adaptation,' *Climatic Change*, **43**, 745-788.

Ritchie, J.T., Baer, D.B. and Chou, T.W. (1989). Appendix C, 'The Potential Effects of Global Climate Change on the U.S., ' Smith, J.B. and Tirpak, D.A. eds. Washington, dc: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

Rosenzweig, M. R. and Binswanger, H. P. (1993). 'Wealth, Weather Risk and the Composition and Profitability of Agricultural Investments,' *Economic Journal*, **103**, 56-78.

Rosenzweig, C., and Hillel, D.(1998). ' Climate Change and the Global Harvest: Potential Impacts of the Greenhouse Effect on Agriculture. ' Oxford University Press. New York, N.Y..

Rosenzweig, C. and Iglesias, A. (eds). (1994). Implications of Climate Change for International Agriculture: Crop Modeling Study. EPA 230-B-94-003.

Rosenzweig, C. and Parry, M. L. (1994). 'Potential Impact of Climate Change on World Food Supply, ' *Nature*, **367**, 133-138.

Schimmelpfennig, D., Lewandrowski, J., Reilly, J. M., Tsigas, M., & Parry, I. W. H. (1996). *Agricultural Adaptation to Climate Change -- Issues of Longrun Sustainability*, US Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C., 740.

Schneider, S. (1997), 'Integrated Assessment Modelling of Global Climate Change: Transparent Tools for Policy Making or Opaque Screen Hiding Value-Laden Assumptions?' *Environmental Assessment and Modelling*, **2**, 229-249.

Solow, A. R., Adams, R. F., Bryant, K. J., Legler, D. M., O'Brien, J. J., McCarl, B. A., Nayda, W., and Weiher, R. F. (1998), 'The Value of Improved ENSO Prediction to U.S. Agriculture', *Climatic Change*, **39**, 47-60.

Tsigas, M.E., Frisvold, G.B. and B. Kuhn (1997), 'Global Climate Change in Agriculture' in *Global Trade Analysis: Modeling and Applications*. Thomas W. Hertel, editor, Cambridge University Press.

Woodward, F.I., Smith, T.M. and Emanuel, W.R. (1995), 'A global primary productivity and phytogeography model', *Global Biogeochemical Cycles* **9**, 471-490.

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

CCMP	74.2004	<i>Rob DELLINK and Ekko van IERLAND</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 GUIMERÀ 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 ONOFRI</i> : <u>The Economics of Warm Glow: A Note on Consumer's Behavior and Public Policy Implications</u>
IEM	114.2004	<i>Patrick CAYRADE</i> : <u>Investments in Gas Pipelines and Liquefied Natural Gas Infrastructure What is the Impact on the Security of Supply?</u>
IEM	115.2004	<i>Valeria COSTANTINI and Francesco GRACCEVA</i> : <u>Oil Security. Short- and Long-Term Policies</u>

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, Jaroslaw 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&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>
ETA	57.2005	<i>Alain-Désiré NIMUBONA and Bernard SINCLAIR-DESGAGNÉ</i> : <u>The Pigouvian Tax Rule in the Presence of an Eco-Industry</u>
NRM	58.2005	<i>Helmut KARL, Antje MÖLLER, Ximena MATUS, Edgar GRANDE and Robert KAISER</i> : <u>Environmental Innovations: Institutional Impacts on Co-operations for Sustainable Development</u>
SIEV	59.2005	<i>Dimitra VOUVAKI and Anastasios XEPAPADEAS</i> (lxxiii): <u>Criteria for Assessing Sustainable Development: Theoretical Issues and Empirical Evidence for the Case of Greece</u>
CCMP	60.2005	<i>Andreas LÖSCHEL and Dirk T.G. RÜBBELKE</i> : <u>Impure Public Goods and Technological Interdependencies</u>
PRCG	61.2005	<i>Christoph A. SCHALTEGGER and Benno TORGLER</i> : <u>Trust and Fiscal Performance: A Panel Analysis with Swiss Data</u>
ETA	62.2005	<i>Irene VALSECCHI</i> : <u>A Role for Instructions</u>
NRM	63.2005	<i>Valentina BOSETTI and Gianni LOCATELLI</i> : <u>A Data Envelopment Analysis Approach to the Assessment of Natural Parks' Economic Efficiency and Sustainability. The Case of Italian National Parks</u>
SIEV	64.2005	<i>Arianne T. de BLAEIJ, Paulo A.L.D. NUNES and Jeroen C.J.M. van den BERGH</i> : <u>Modeling 'No-choice' Responses in Attribute Based Valuation Surveys</u>
CTN	65.2005	<i>Carlo CARRARO, Carmen MARCHIORI and Alessandra SGOBBI</i> : <u>Applications of Negotiation Theory to Water Issues</u>
CTN	66.2005	<i>Carlo CARRARO, Carmen MARCHIORI and Alessandra SGOBBI</i> : <u>Advances in Negotiation Theory: Bargaining, Coalitions and Fairness</u>
KTHC	67.2005	<i>Sandra WALLMAN</i> (lxxiv): <u>Network Capital and Social Trust: Pre-Conditions for 'Good' Diversity?</u>
KTHC	68.2005	<i>Asimina CHRISTOFOROU</i> (lxxiv): <u>On the Determinants of Social Capital in Greece Compared to Countries of the European Union</u>
KTHC	69.2005	<i>Eric M. USLANER</i> (lxxiv): <u>Varieties of Trust</u>
KTHC	70.2005	<i>Thomas P. LYON</i> (lxxiv): <u>Making Capitalism Work: Social Capital and Economic Growth in Italy, 1970-1995</u>
KTHC	71.2005	<i>Graziella BERTOCCHI and Chiara STROZZI</i> (lxxv): <u>Citizenship Laws and International Migration in Historical Perspective</u>
KTHC	72.2005	<i>Elsbeth van HYLCKAMA Vlieg</i> (lxxv): <u>Accommodating Differences</u>
KTHC	73.2005	<i>Renato SANSA and Ercole SORI</i> (lxxv): <u>Governance of Diversity Between Social Dynamics and Conflicts in Multicultural Cities. A Selected Survey on Historical Bibliography</u>
IEM	74.2005	<i>Alberto LONGO and Anil MARKANDYA</i> : <u>Identification of Options and Policy Instruments for the Internalisation of External Costs of Electricity Generation. Dissemination of External Costs of Electricity Supply Making Electricity External Costs Known to Policy-Makers</u> <u>MAXIMA</u>

IEM	75.2005	<i>Margherita GRASSO and Matteo MANERA: <u>Asymmetric Error Correction Models for the Oil-Gasoline Price Relationship</u></i>
ETA	76.2005	<i>Umberto CHERUBINI and Matteo MANERA: <u>Hunting the Living Dead A “Peso Problem” in Corporate Liabilities Data</u></i>
CTN	77.2005	<i>Hans-Peter WEIKARD: <u>Cartel Stability under an Optimal Sharing Rule</u></i>
ETA	78.2005	<i>Joëlle NOAILLY, Jeroen C.J.M. van den BERGH and Cees A. WITHAGEN (lxxvi): <u>Local and Global Interactions in an Evolutionary Resource Game</u></i>
ETA	79.2005	<i>Joëlle NOAILLY, Cees A. WITHAGEN and Jeroen C.J.M. van den BERGH (lxxvi): <u>Spatial Evolution of Social Norms in a Common-Pool Resource Game</u></i>
CCMP	80.2005	<i>Massimiliano MAZZANTI and Roberto ZOBOLI: <u>Economic Instruments and Induced Innovation: The Case of End-of-Life Vehicles European Policies</u></i>
NRM	81.2005	<i>Anna LASUT: <u>Creative Thinking and Modelling for the Decision Support in Water Management</u></i>
CCMP	82.2005	<i>Valentina BOSETTI and Barbara BUCHNER: <u>Using Data Envelopment Analysis to Assess the Relative Efficiency of Different Climate Policy Portfolios</u></i>
ETA	83.2005	<i>Ignazio MUSU: <u>Intellectual Property Rights and Biotechnology: How to Improve the Present Patent System</u></i>
KTHC	84.2005	<i>Giulio CAINELLI, Susanna MANCINELLI and Massimiliano MAZZANTI: <u>Social Capital, R&D and Industrial Districts</u></i>
ETA	85.2005	<i>Rosella LEVAGGI, Michele MORETTO and Vincenzo REBBA: <u>Quality and Investment Decisions in Hospital Care when Physicians are Devoted Workers</u></i>
CCMP	86.2005	<i>Valentina BOSETTI and Laurent GILOTTE: <u>Carbon Capture and Sequestration: How Much Does this Uncertain Option Affect Near-Term Policy Choices?</u></i>
CSRM	87.2005	<i>Nicoletta FERRO: <u>Value Through Diversity: Microfinance and Islamic Finance and Global Banking</u></i>
ETA	88.2005	<i>A. MARKANDYA and S. PEDROSO: <u>How Substitutable is Natural Capital?</u></i>
IEM	89.2005	<i>Anil MARKANDYA, Valeria COSTANTINI, Francesco GRACCEVA and Giorgio VICINI: <u>Security of Energy Supply: Comparing Scenarios From a European Perspective</u></i>
CCMP	90.2005	<i>Vincent M. OTTO, Andreas LÖSCHEL and Rob DELLINK: <u>Energy Biased Technical Change: A CGE Analysis</u></i>
PRCG	91.2005	<i>Carlo CAPUANO: <u>Abuse of Competitive Fringe</u></i>
PRCG	92.2005	<i>Ulrich BINDSEIL, Kjell G. NYBORG and Ilya A. STREBULAEV (lxv): <u>Bidding and Performance in Repo Auctions: Evidence from ECB Open Market Operations</u></i>
CCMP	93.2005	<i>Sabrina AUCI and Leonardo BECCHETTI: <u>The Stability of the Adjusted and Unadjusted Environmental Kuznets Curve</u></i>
CCMP	94.2005	<i>Francesco BOSELLO and Jian ZHANG: <u>Assessing Climate Change Impacts: Agriculture</u></i>

- (lxv) This paper was presented at the EuroConference on “Auctions and Market Design: Theory, Evidence and Applications” organised by Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei and sponsored by the EU, Milan, September 25-27, 2003
- (lxvi) This paper has been presented at the 4th BioEcon Workshop on “Economic Analysis of Policies for Biodiversity Conservation” organised on behalf of the BIOECON Network by Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Venice International University (VIU) and University College London (UCL) , Venice, August 28-29, 2003
- (lxvii) This paper has been presented at the international conference on “Tourism and Sustainable Economic Development – Macro and Micro Economic Issues” jointly organised by CRENoS (Università di Cagliari e Sassari, Italy) and Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, and supported by the World Bank, Sardinia, September 19-20, 2003
- (lxviii) This paper was presented at the ENGIME Workshop on “Governance and Policies in Multicultural Cities”, Rome, June 5-6, 2003
- (lxix) This paper was presented at the Fourth EEP Plenary Workshop and EEP Conference “The Future of Climate Policy”, Cagliari, Italy, 27-28 March 2003
- (lxx) This paper was presented at the 9th Coalition Theory Workshop on "Collective Decisions and Institutional Design" organised by the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona and held in Barcelona, Spain, January 30-31, 2004
- (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 10th Coalition Theory Network Workshop held in Paris, France on 28-29 January 2005 and organised by EUREQua.
- (lxxiii) This paper was presented at the 2nd Workshop on "Inclusive Wealth and Accounting Prices" held in Trieste, Italy on 13-15 April 2005 and organised by the Ecological and Environmental Economics - EEE Programme, a joint three-year programme of ICTP - The Abdus Salam International Centre for Theoretical Physics, FEEM - Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, and The Beijer International Institute of Ecological Economics
- (lxxiv) This paper was presented at the ENGIME Workshop on “Trust and social capital in multicultural cities” Athens, January 19-20, 2004
- (lxxv) This paper was presented at the ENGIME Workshop on “Diversity as a source of growth” Rome November 18-19, 2004
- (lxxvi) This paper was presented at the 3rd Workshop on Spatial-Dynamic Models of Economics and Ecosystems held in Trieste on 11-13 April 2005 and organised by the Ecological and Environmental Economics - EEE Programme, a joint three-year programme of ICTP - The Abdus Salam International Centre for Theoretical Physics, FEEM - Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, and The Beijer International Institute of Ecological Economics

2004 SERIES

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

2005 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: Anil Markandya)
CSRM	<i>Corporate Social Responsibility and Sustainable Management</i> (Editor: Sabina Ratti)
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>