

86



Prices versus Quantities in a Vintage Capital Model

Thierry Bréchet, Tsvetomir Tsachev, Vladimir Veliov

March 2009

ENVIRONMENTAL ECONOMICS & MANAGEMENT MEMORANDUM



UCL
Université
catholique
de Louvain

Chair Lhoist Berghmans
in Environmental Economics
and Management

Center for Operations Research
and Econometrics (CORE)

CORE DISCUSSION PAPER
2009/15

Prices versus quantities in a vintage capital model

Thierry BRECHET¹, Tsvetomir TSACHEV²
and Vladimir M. VELIOV³

March 2009

Abstract

The heterogeneity of the available physical capital with respect to productivity and emission intensity is an important factor for policy design, especially in the presence of emission restrictions. In a vintage capital model, reducing pollution requires to change the capital structure through investment in cleaner machines and to scrap the more polluting ones. In such a setting we show that emission tax and auctioned emission permits may yield contrasting outcomes. We also show that some failures in the permits market may undermine its efficiency and that imposing the emission cap over longer periods plays a regularizing role in the market.

¹ Université catholique de Louvain, CORE and Louvain School of Management, Chair Lhoist Berghmans in Environmental Economics and Management, B-1348 Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium. E-mail: Thierry.brechet@uclouvain.be. This author is also member of ECORE, the newly created association between CORE and ECARES.

² Institute of Mathematics and Informatics, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, 1113 Sofia, Bulgaria. E-mail: tsachev@math.bas.bg

³ Institute of Mathematical Methods in Economics, Vienna Institute of Technology, A-1040 Vienna, Austria. E-mail: veliov@tuwien.ac.at

This research was partly financed by the Austrian Science Foundation (FWF) under grant No P18161-N13 and by the Belgian Science Policy under the CLIMNEG project (SD/CP/05A).

This paper presents research results of the Belgian Program on Interuniversity Poles of Attraction initiated by the Belgian State, Prime Minister's Office, Science Policy Programming. The scientific responsibility is assumed by the authors.

1 Introduction

It is well-established in the economic literature that regulating pollution through prices (*e.g.* emission charges) or quantities (*e.g.* emission quotas) is equivalent. Both yield the same resource allocation and welfare level. In his seminal paper Weitzman [16] showed that such equivalence does not hold anymore when information is imperfect, be it on pollution abatement costs or damages. Following Weitzman, many papers elaborated on the uncertainty issue and the choice of policy instrument (for some recent papers, see Zhao [17], Krysiac [12]). A few authors introduced alternative motives for which this equivalence may not hold. As examples, Finkelshtain and Kisley [8] found political motives, and Kelly [10] stressed the role of general equilibrium effects. The contribution of our paper is to show that this equivalence may not hold even under perfect information, but simply because the capital stock that generates pollution is not homogeneous. In a vintage capital model, reducing pollution requires to change the capital structure through investment in cleaner machines and scrapping the more polluting ones. In such a setting we show that emission tax and auction emission permits may yield contrasting outcomes.

The heterogeneity of the available physical capital with respect to productivity and emission intensity is an important factor for policy design, especially in the presence of emission restrictions. To decide which machines to scrap and which machines to buy is an indispensable right of the firm's management. The vintage model of a firm that we employ is essentially a version of the one introduced in [1, 2] and investigated by several authors (see also [6, 7] and the bibliography therein). In particular, the model allows for investing and scrapping in technologies of any vintage.¹ Polluting emissions are regulated either by a tax or with auctioned pollution permits.

When the price of emission is endogenized with an auction (and not set as a tax) it has to be determined by a market equilibrium equation that involves the emission paths resulting from the optimal behavior of the participating firms. The derivation and the investigation of this equation is the main goal of this paper. It turns out that the equation for the auction price of emissions (being a Fredholm integral equation of the first kind) is ill-posed, in the sense that (i) it may fail to have a solution; (ii) it may have multiple solutions; (iii) it may not have a positive solution (in which case the solution does not represent a market price); (iv) the solution, even if it exists and is unique and positive, may be highly volatile and fluctuating. For this reason we introduce period-wise restrictions on the emission, which correspond to the *commitment periods* in the terminology of the Kyoto protocol. It is argued below that such a period-wise emission restriction plays a regularizing role on the auction price of emissions. Namely, a sufficiently large commitment period ensures existence, uniqueness (under somewhat restrictive conditions) and (according to numerical evidence) positiveness of the solution of the auction price equation. In addition it decreases the volatility of the auction market.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we present the basic model of a firm facing exogenous cost for emissions, and we characterize its optimal behavior. The model is of vintage-type, that is,

¹This is a substantial difference with the delay-differential equation models, see [3, 4].

the physical capital is differentiated with respect to technologies of different dates. In Section 3 we present some properties and analytic expressions of the emission of the firm along its optimal path as a function of the exogenous costs. Based on this, in Section 4 we investigate the equilibrium equation for the auction of emission permits and introduce period-wise emission restrictions (commitment periods) as a tool for regularization of the auction price. Then in Section 5 we present some numerical results supporting the regularizing role of the period-wise emission restrictions.

2 The firm's problem with exogenous price of emission

The model of the firm presented below is a version of the PDE-vintage models introduced in [1, 2] and further investigated and applied in a large number of contribution (see [6, 7] and the literature therein). The formal difference of our model with the abovementioned ones is technical and not essential from a methodological point of view.

First we describe the basic model of a firm that is composed of machines of different vintages (technologies) τ : $K(\tau, s)$ will denote the capital stock of vintage τ and of age s . That is, $K(\tau, t - \tau)$ is the stock of vintage τ that exists at time $t \geq \tau$. The maximal life-time of machines of each technology will be denoted by ω , and the depreciation rate of each technology – by δ . Both are assumed independent of the vintage just for notational convenience. At any time $t > 0$ the firm may invest with intensity $I(\tau, s)$ in machines of vintage τ that are of age s at time t (so that $s = t - \tau$).

The planning horizon of the firm is $[0, \infty)$, therefore the stock of machines of vintage $\tau \in [-\omega, 0]$ which are present in the firm at time $t = 0$ is considered as exogenous and will be denoted by $K_0(\tau)$. These machines have age $-\tau$ at time $t = 0$ and may be in use until they reach age ω . Machines of vintage $\tau > 0$ may be in use for ages $s \in [0, \omega]$, and their stock at age zero equals zero. Therefore $K_0(\tau)$ will be defined as zero for $\tau > 0$. The ages of possible use of any vintage can be written as $[s_0(\tau), \omega]$, where $s_0(\tau) = \max\{0, -\tau\}$.

Summarizing, the dynamics of each vintage $\tau \in [-\omega, \infty)$ is given by the equation

$$\dot{K}(\tau, s) = -\delta K(\tau, s) + I(\tau, s), \quad K(\tau, s_0(\tau)) = K_0(\tau), \quad s \in [s_0(\tau), \omega], \quad (1)$$

where “dot” means everywhere the derivative with respect to s (the argument representing the age).

The productivity of machines of vintage τ is denoted by $f(\tau)$, while $g(\tau)$ denotes the emission per machine of vintage τ . The firm faces costs due to emissions at an exogenous price $v(t)$ per unit of emission (this price will be endogenized later on). Due to this cost the firm may decide to (possibly temporarily) switch off a part of the machines. Let us denote by $W(\tau, s) \in [0, 1]$ the fraction of the machines of vintage τ that operate at age s .

The cost of investment I in s years old machines of any vintage will be denoted by $C(s, I)$.

The present value (at time $t = 0$) of the total production of machines of vintage τ , discounted with a rate r , is

$$e^{-r\tau} \int_{s_0(\tau)}^{\omega} e^{-rs} f(\tau) K(\tau, s) W(\tau, s) ds,$$

the cost of emission is

$$e^{-r\tau} \int_{s_0(\tau)}^{\omega} e^{-rs} v(\tau + s) g(\tau) K(\tau, s) W(\tau, s) ds,$$

and the investment costs are

$$e^{-r\tau} \int_{s_0(\tau)}^{\omega} e^{-rs} C(s, I(\tau, s)) ds.$$

The firm maximizes the aggregated over time discounted net revenue, that is, solves the problem

$$\max_{I \geq 0, W \in [0,1]} \int_{-\omega}^{\infty} e^{-r\tau} \int_{s_0(\tau)}^{\omega} e^{-rs} [(f(\tau) - v(\tau + s)g(\tau))K(\tau, s)W(\tau, s) - C(s, I(\tau, s))] ds d\tau \quad (2)$$

subject to (1).

The emission of the firm at time $t > 0$ is given by the expression

$$E(t) = \int_{t-\omega}^t g(\tau) K(\tau, t - \tau) W(\tau, t - \tau) d\tau. \quad (3)$$

Remark 1 Due to the specific form of the problem there is an easy way to define optimality even though the optimal value in (2) may be infinite. Namely (I^*, W^*, K^*) is a solution of (2), (1) if for any $T > 0$ the restriction of these functions to $D_T = \{(\tau, s) : \tau \in [-\omega, T], s \in [s_0(\tau), \omega]\}$ is an optimal solution of the problem in which the integration in (2) is carried out on D_T .

Problem (2), (1) fits to the general framework of heterogeneous optimal control systems developed in [15]. However, the present problem can be treated also by the classical Pontryagin optimality conditions for ODEs since it decomposes along vintages: every technology vintage $\tau \in [-\omega, \infty)$ is managed separately by solving the problem

$$\max_{i \geq 0, w \in [0,1]} \int_{s_0(\tau)}^{\omega} e^{-rs} [(f(\tau) - v(\tau + s)g(\tau))k(s)w(s) - C(s, i(s))] ds \quad (4)$$

subject to

$$\dot{k}(s) = -\delta k(s) + i(s), \quad k(s_0(\tau)) = K_0(\tau), \quad s \in [s_0(\tau), \omega]. \quad (5)$$

If for any fixed $\tau \in [-\omega, \infty)$ the triple $(i(\cdot), w(\cdot), k(\cdot)) = (I(\tau, \cdot), W(\tau, \cdot), K(\tau, \cdot))$ is a solution of this problem, then (I, W, K) is a solution of (2), (1) and vice versa.²

² This is not a self-evident fact, but can easily be proven in natural space settings for the two problems and on the assumptions made below.

The following is assumed throughout the paper.

(A1) The exogenous data K_0, f, g are non-negative and continuous, f and g are continuously differentiable, $g > 0, f' > 0, g' \leq 0, r \geq 0, \delta \geq 0$;

(A2) The cost function $C(s, i)$ is two times differentiable in i , the derivatives C'_i and C''_{ii} are continuous in (s, i) , $C(s, 0) = 0, C'_i(s, 0) \geq 0, C''_{ii} \geq \varepsilon_C > 0$;

(A3) The price of emission, $v(\cdot)$, is a measurable bounded function³.

Under these conditions problem (2), (1) has a unique solution $(I^*[v], W^*[v], K^*[v])$. The corresponding emission given by (3) will be denoted by $E^*[v]$.

Since W enters only in the objective function, clearly we have

$$W^*[v](\tau, s) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } f(\tau) - v(\tau + s)g(\tau) \leq 0, \\ 1 & \text{if } f(\tau) - v(\tau + s)g(\tau) > 0. \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

The optimal control i^* of problem (4), (5) for a fixed τ and $v(\cdot)$ is easy to obtain by applying the Pontryagin maximum principle [13]. Namely,

$$i^*(s) = \max \{0, (C'_i)^{-1}(s, \xi^*(s))\}, \quad (7)$$

where $\xi \rightarrow (C'_i)^{-1}(s, \xi)$ is the inverse of the function $i \rightarrow C'_i(s, i)$ and $\xi^*(s)$ is the unique solution of the *adjoint equation*

$$\dot{\xi}(s) = (r + \delta)\xi(s) - (f(\tau) - v(\tau + s)g(\tau))w^*(s), \quad \xi(\omega) = 0. \quad (8)$$

According to (6) the solution ξ is nonnegative, hence $(C'_i)^{-1}(s, \xi^*(s))$ is well defined due to (A2).

3 The emission mapping

An exogenously given price of emission, that is a function $v(t)$ as in assumption (A3), determines the optimal emission of the firm

$$E^*[v](t) = \int_{t-\omega}^t g(\tau)K^*[v](\tau, t - \tau)W^*[v](\tau, t - \tau) d\tau, \quad (9)$$

where $(I^*[v], W^*[v], K^*[v])$ is the optimal solution at the firm level corresponding to v . In this section we investigate in some more details the mapping $v \rightarrow E^*[v]$.

Since the emission restriction takes effect at time \hat{t} , we consider v as equal to zero before \hat{t} . For a technical convenience we assume that $\hat{t} \geq \omega$, although this is not essential.

³ For reasons that will become clear later we formally allow for negative values of $v(t)$.

Denote by \mathcal{V} the space of all measurable and locally bounded functions $v : [0, \infty) \mapsto \mathbf{R}$ that equal zero on $[0, \hat{t})$. The space \mathcal{V} will be sometimes considered as a subspace of $L_\infty^{\text{loc}}(0, \infty)$, the latter consisting of all measurable function that are bounded on every bounded interval $[0, T]$.

The next proposition claims a specific Lipschitz continuity property of E^* . Since we allow for negative values of v we denote $v_- = \min\{0, v\}$. In the text below we shall use also the notation

$$\sigma(\tau, v) = f(\tau) - vg(\tau).$$

Proposition 1 *Assume that (A1)–(A3) hold. There is a constant c and a non-increasing function $[0, \infty) \ni t \longrightarrow \gamma_t > 0$ such that for every $v', v'' \in \mathcal{V}$ and $t > \hat{t}$*

$$|E^*[v'](t) - E^*[v''](t)| \leq c \left[\|v' - v''\|_{L_\infty[t-\omega, t+\omega]} + \frac{f(t+\omega) + \|v'_- + v''_-\|_{L_\infty[t-\omega, t+\omega]}}{\gamma_t} |v'(t) - v''(t)| \right].$$

Proof. The function γ_t can be explicitly defined as $\gamma_t = \inf_{\tau \leq t} \gamma(\tau) > 0$, where $\gamma(\tau) = f'(\tau) - \frac{f(-\omega)}{g(-\omega)}g'(\tau)$, which is strictly positive according to (A2).

For arbitrarily fixed $v', v'' \in \mathcal{V}$ denote $\Delta K = K^*[v'] - K^*[v'']$, $\Delta I = I^*[v'] - I^*[v'']$, $\Delta W = W^*[v'] - W^*[v'']$, $\Delta \xi = \xi^*[v'] - \xi^*[v'']$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} |E^*[v'](t) - E^*[v''](t)| &\leq \int_{t-\omega}^t g(\tau) |\Delta K(\tau, t-\tau)| W^*[v'](\tau, t-\tau) d\tau \\ &\quad + \int_{t-\omega}^t g(\tau) K^*[v''](\tau, t-\tau) |\Delta W(\tau, t-\tau)| d\tau. \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

Using (6) we obtain from the adjoint equation (8), which is satisfied by $\xi[v_k](s)$ for (almost) every τ , that

$$\begin{aligned} |\Delta \xi(\tau, s)| &\leq \int_s^\omega e^{-(r+\delta)(\theta-s)} |\chi(f(\tau) - v'(\tau+\theta)g(\tau)) - \chi(f(\tau) - v''(\tau+\theta)g(\tau))| d\theta \\ &\leq \omega \bar{g} \|v' - v''\|_{L_\infty[\tau, \tau+\omega]}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\chi(x) = x$ for $x > 0$, $\chi(x) = 0$ for $x \leq 0$, $\bar{g} = g(-\omega)$ is an upper bound for g , and we use that χ is Lipschitz continuous with Lipschitz constant equal to one.

From assumption (A2) we easily obtain that $(C'_i)^{-1}(s, \cdot)$ is Lipschitz continuous with Lipschitz constant $1/\varepsilon_C$, thus according to (7)

$$|\Delta I(\tau, s)| \leq \frac{\omega \bar{g}}{\varepsilon_C} \|v' - v''\|_{L_\infty[\tau, \tau+\omega]}.$$

Then from (1) or (5) we obtain that

$$|\Delta K(\tau, s)| \leq \frac{\omega^2 \bar{g}}{\varepsilon_C} \|v' - v''\|_{L_\infty[\tau, \tau + \omega]}, \quad s \in [s_0(\tau), \omega].$$

Thus the first term in (10) can be estimated by

$$\frac{\omega^3 \bar{g}^2}{\varepsilon_C} \|v' - v''\|_{L_\infty[t - \omega, t + \omega]}. \quad (11)$$

To estimate the second term in (10) we first note that by a similar argument as above we estimate

$$\xi[v''](\tau, s) \leq \int_s^\omega e^{-(r+\delta)(\theta-s)} \chi(f(\tau) - v''(\tau + \theta)g(\tau)) d\theta \leq \omega (f(\tau) + \bar{g} \|v''_-\|_{L_\infty[\tau, \tau + \omega]}).$$

Using that the function $(C'_i)^{-1}(s, \cdot)$ is Lipschitz continuous with Lipschitz constant $\leq 1/\varepsilon_C$, which is implied by in a standard way by (A2), and (7) we obtain that

$$I[v''](\tau, s) \leq \frac{\omega}{\varepsilon_C} (f(\tau) + \bar{g} \|v''_-\|_{L_\infty[\tau, \tau + \omega]}).$$

Hence, using that $t \geq \hat{t} \geq \omega$,

$$K[v''](\tau, s) \leq \frac{\omega^2}{\varepsilon_C} (f(\tau) + \bar{g} \|v''_-\|_{L_\infty[\tau, \tau + \omega]}). \quad (12)$$

It remains to estimate the term

$$|\Delta W(\tau, t - \tau)| = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \sigma(\tau, v'(t)) \text{ and } \sigma(\tau, v''(t)) \text{ are both positive or both non-positive,} \\ 1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

in (10). To do this we compare the functions $\sigma(\tau, v'(t))$ and $\sigma(\tau, v''(t))$, assuming without any restriction that $v'(t) \leq v''(t)$. Clearly $\Delta W(\tau, t - \tau) \neq 0$ (and equals one) for some $\tau \in [t - \omega, t]$ if and only if $\sigma(\tau, v''(t)) \leq 0 < \sigma(\tau, v'(t))$.

Note also that if $v < 0$, then $\sigma(\tau, v)$ and $\sigma(\tau, 0)$ have both positive signs, hence the sign of $\sigma(\tau, v)$ does not change if we replace v with $v_+ := \max\{0, v\}$. Since $|v'_+ - v''_+| \leq |v' - v''|$, the estimations below would not change if we replace $v'(t)$ and $v''(t)$ with $v'(t)_+$ and $v''(t)_+$, or equivalently, if we assume that $v'(t) \geq 0$.

Due to (A2) (implying that $\sigma(\tau, v)$ is strictly increasing for $v \geq 0$) and (A3) the set

$$\{\tau \in [t - \omega, t] : \sigma(\tau, v''(t)) \leq 0 < \sigma(\tau, v'(t))\} \quad (13)$$

(if nonempty) is an interval $(\tilde{\tau} - \nu, \tilde{\tau}]$, where $\sigma(\tilde{\tau}, v''(t)) = 0$ and $\sigma(\tilde{\tau} - \nu, v'(t)) \geq 0$. Then

$$\sigma(\tilde{\tau} - \nu, v''(t)) = \sigma(\tilde{\tau}, v''(t)) - \dot{\sigma}(\tilde{\tau}, v''(t)) \nu = -\dot{\sigma}(\tilde{\tau}, v''(t)) \nu,$$

where $\tilde{\tau} \in [\tilde{\tau} - \nu, \tilde{\tau}]$. Subtracting the above equality from $\sigma(\tilde{\tau} - \nu, v'(t)) \geq 0$ we obtain that

$$(v''(t) - v'(t))g(\tilde{\tau} - \nu) \geq \dot{\sigma}(\tilde{\tau}, v''(t))\nu = (f'(\tilde{\tau}) - v''(t)g'(\tilde{\tau}))\nu. \quad (14)$$

Since

$$0 \geq \sigma(\tilde{\tau}, v''(t)) = f(\tilde{\tau}) - v''(t)g(\tilde{\tau}),$$

we have according to (A2) that

$$v''(t) \geq \frac{f(\tilde{\tau})}{g(\tilde{\tau})} \geq \frac{f(-\omega)}{g(-\omega)}.$$

Then (14) and $g'(\tilde{\tau}) \leq 0$ imply

$$(v''(t) - v'(t))g(\tilde{\tau} - \nu) \geq \left(f'(\tilde{\tau}) - \frac{f(-\omega)}{g(-\omega)}g'(\tilde{\tau}) \right)\nu = \gamma(\tilde{\tau})\nu \geq \gamma_t\nu.$$

Hence

$$\nu \leq \frac{\bar{g}}{\gamma_t}(v''(t) - v'(t)).$$

Thus the measure of the set in (13) does not exceed $\frac{\bar{g}}{\gamma_t}|v''(t) - v'(t)|$. Combining this with (12), (11) and (10) we obtain the claim of the proposition. Q.E.D.

Lemma 1 *For every $v \in \mathcal{V}$ and $t \geq \hat{t}$ the value $E^*[v](t)$ depends only on the restriction of v to $[t - \omega, t + \omega]$.*

Proof. The proof of this lemma is straightforward: $E^*[v](t)$ depends only on $K^*[v](\tau, t - \tau)$ for $\tau \in [t - \omega, t]$ (see (9)), $K^*[v](\tau, t - \tau)$ depends only on $I^*[v](\tau, s)$ with $s \in [0, \omega]$, the latter depends only on $\xi^*[v](\tau, s)$, which on its turn, depends on $v(\theta)$ with $\theta \in [\tau, \tau + \omega]$ (see (8)). Q.E.D.

The analysis of the market price of emissions in the next section involves a rather complicated functional equation for v . Together with the general case we consider also a particular cost function $C(s, I)$ for which the equation substantially simplifies.

(A4) $C(s, I) = 1/2 c(s)I^2$, where $c(s) > 0$, $s \in [0, \omega]$, is a measurable non-increasing function.

The advantage of the above assumption, which is still economically meaningful, is that the optimal investment becomes a linear function of the “shadow price” of the capital stock. Namely, (7) becomes

$$I^*[v](\tau, s) = \frac{\xi^*(\tau, s)}{c(s)}, \quad s \in [0, \omega], \quad (15)$$

where $\xi(\tau, \cdot)$ is the solution of the adjoint equation (8), that is,

$$\dot{\xi}(\tau, s) = (r + \delta)\xi(\tau, s) - \sigma(\tau, v(\tau + s))W^*[v](\tau, s), \quad \xi(\tau, \omega) = 0. \quad (16)$$

Notice that due to (A1) the function $\tau \rightarrow \sigma(\tau, v)$, restricted to an interval $[t - \omega, t]$, either has a definite sign or has a single zero in this interval, denoted further by $\theta(t, v)$. In addition, we set $\theta(t, v) = t - \omega$ or $\theta(t, v) = t$ if $\sigma(\tau, v) > 0$ or $\sigma(\tau, v) < 0$ in $[t - \omega, t]$, respectively. With this notation we have, according to (6), that $W^*[v](\tau, t - \tau) = 1$ for $t \in (\tau, \tau + \omega)$ if and only if $\tau \in (\theta(t, v(t)), t)$.

Lemma 2 *Let assumptions (A1) and (A4) hold and let $v \in \mathcal{V}$. Then for every $t \geq \hat{t}$*

$$\begin{aligned} E^*[v](t) &= \int_{\theta(t, v(t))}^t \int_{\theta(t, v(t)) \vee \theta(\alpha, v(\alpha))}^{\alpha} g(\tau)\kappa(t, \tau, \alpha - \tau)\sigma(\tau, v(\alpha)) \, d\tau \, d\alpha \\ &+ \int_t^{\theta(t, v(t)) + \omega} \int_{\theta(t, v(t)) \vee \theta(\alpha, v(\alpha))}^t g(\tau)\kappa(t, \tau, t - \tau)\sigma(\tau, v(\alpha)) \, d\tau \, d\alpha \\ &+ \int_{\theta(t, v(t)) + \omega}^{t + \omega} \int_{\theta(\alpha, v(\alpha))}^t g(\tau)\kappa(t, \tau, t - \tau)\sigma(\tau, v(\alpha)) \, d\tau \, d\alpha, \end{aligned}$$

where $a \vee b := \max\{a, b\}$ and

$$\kappa(t, \tau, \beta) = \int_0^{\beta} \frac{1}{c(s)} e^{-\delta(t - \tau - s) - (r + \delta)(\beta - s)} \, ds.$$

The proof of this lemma uses the Cauchy formula for the solution ξ of the adjoint equation (16), the formula (15) for the optimal control, the Cauchy formula for the corresponding solution $K^*[v]$ of (1), and (9). This results in an expression for $E^*[v](t)$ in the form of a triple integral depending only on the data and v , from which one can derive the expression in the lemma after a sequence of changes of the order and the variables of integration. We skip the cumbersome calculations.

Definition. We call the price function $v \in \mathcal{V}$ *regular* if $f(\tau) - v(t)g(\tau) > 0$ for all $\tau \geq 0$ and $t \in (\tau, \tau + \omega)$.

In other words, regularity means that the price $v(t)$ does not invoke switch-off of existing machines. In the context of the emission restrictions the existence of a regular auction price (see next section) would mean that the environmental goals can be achieved only by appropriate investment policies (without premature scrapping).

For a regular $v \in \mathcal{V}$ the expression for $E^*[v]$ substantially simplifies, since $\theta(t, v(t)) = t - \omega$ for all $t \geq \hat{t}$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} E^*[v](t) &= \int_{t - \omega}^t \int_{t - \omega}^{\alpha} g(\tau)\kappa(t, \tau, \alpha - \tau)\sigma(\tau, v(\alpha)) \, d\tau \, d\alpha \\ &+ \int_t^{t + \omega} \int_{\alpha - \omega}^t g(\tau)\kappa(t, \tau, t - \tau)\sigma(\tau, v(\alpha)) \, d\tau \, d\alpha. \end{aligned}$$

Having in mind the definition of $\sigma(\tau, v)$ we split each of the above outer integrals into two parts: one term depending on v , the other – independent of v . The resulting expression that is independent of v is exactly the emission corresponding to $v(t) \equiv 0$. Having in mind also that $v(t) = 0$ for $t < \hat{t}$ we obtain the following lemma.

Lemma 3 *Let assumptions (A1) and (A4) hold and let $v \in \mathcal{V}$ be regular. Then for every $t \geq \hat{t}$*

$$E^*[v](t) = E^*[0](t) - \int_{\hat{t} \vee (t-\omega)}^{t+\omega} \varphi(t, \alpha) v(\alpha) d\alpha, \quad (17)$$

where

$$\varphi(t, \alpha) = \int_{t \vee (\alpha-\omega)}^{t \wedge \alpha} g(\tau)^2 \kappa(t, \tau, t \wedge \alpha - \tau) d\tau$$

and $a \vee b = \max\{a, b\}$, $a \wedge b = \min\{a, b\}$.

The following properties of the kernel $\varphi(t, \cdot)$ play a role in the study of the auction price of emissions defined in the next section.

Lemma 4 *Let assumptions (A1) and (A4) hold. Then for every $t > \hat{t}$ the function $\varphi(t, \cdot) : [t - \omega, t + \omega]$ has the following properties:*

$\varphi(t, t - \omega) = \varphi(t, t + \omega) = \varphi'_\alpha(t, t - \omega) = \varphi'(t, t + \omega) = 0$, $\varphi'_\alpha(t, \alpha)$ is strictly positive (negative) on $(t - \omega, t)$ (on $(t, t + \omega)$, respectively).

That is, the "mass" of the kernel $\varphi(t, \cdot)$ is concentrated mostly around $\alpha = t$.

4 The auction price of permits and its regularization

We consider an economy consisting of n identical firms described by the model considered in Section 2. Let $\hat{E}(t)$ be a cap for the emission permits of the economy for $t \geq \hat{t}$. As before we assume that the cap takes effect at time $\hat{t} \geq \omega$ and is known by the firms at time $t = 0$ for all the future.

The emission permits are auctioned at time \hat{t} . The main issue investigated in this section is: does the auction (the primary market) really determine the price $v(t)$? Since the answer is "NO", we analyze theoretically and numerically the primary market behavior and the appearance of market failure.

The equation for the auction price of emission permits, $v(t)$, is

$$E^*[v](t) = \hat{E}(t)/n, \quad t \geq \hat{t}. \quad (18)$$

The market would determine the price of permits if

- (i) equation (18) has a solution $v(\cdot) \in \mathcal{V}$;
- (ii) the solution is unique;
- (iii) the solution is positive for all t .

In general, neither of the above requirement is fulfilled. The first needs assumptions for the data, and these assumptions are difficult to specify due to the complexity of equation (18) (even in the special case considered in Lemma 3). The second requirement is obviously not fulfilled if, for example, $\hat{E}(t) \equiv 0$, since if v is a solution of (18), then every \tilde{v} with $\tilde{v}(t) > v(t)$ would also be a solution. Even if the above two possibilities could be classified as “academic”, as we show below, a failure of the third requirement could be rather realistic.

In the simplest case, in which the price function v solving (18) is regular, it solves also the equation

$$\int_{\hat{t}_V(t-\omega)}^{t+\omega} \varphi(t, \alpha) v(\alpha) d\alpha = E^*[0](t) - \hat{E}(t) \quad (19)$$

(we skip the division by n considering $\hat{E}(t)$ as already divided by n). This is a Fredholm integral equation of the first kind on the infinite interval $[\hat{t}, +\infty)$. Such equations are inherently ill-posed. To see that it is enough to add to a solution v a highly fluctuating term, such as $\sin(nt)$. Then $v(t) + \sin(nt)$ would be a solution of the same equation with the right-hand side modified by the quantity $\int_{\hat{t}_V(t-\omega)}^{t+\omega} \varphi(t, \alpha) \sin(n\alpha) d\alpha$, which is arbitrarily small when n is large enough. Thus an arbitrarily small disturbance in the right-hand side can lead to a finite (even arbitrarily large) change of the solution. This difficulty is caused by the smoothing effect on v of the integration with φ : high-frequency components of v are “smoothed out”. Therefore one can expect that computing v would tend to amplify any high-frequency component or irregularity of the right-hand side. In effect, the right-hand side of (19) has to be somewhat “smoother” than the solution v in order to obtain satisfactory numerical approximation [9].

A good numerical method to solve a Fredholm integral equation of the first kind should be able to somehow filter out the high-frequency components in the singular value expansion of the solution (if such exists). Different methods of regularization aimed at finding reasonable numerical approximation to the solution are known ([14, 5, 11]). However, we stress that our aim is not just to solve the price equation (19) or some of its more complicated nonlinear versions (say, that resulting from Lemma 2). Our ultimate goal is to imitate the behavior of the auction market, therefore the regularization we apply for solving (18) should be implementable also in the real auction market. We argue below and in the next section that a relevant regularization mean is to formulate the emission constraint (18) period-wise, rather than at any time instant. This amounts to applying *regularization by time-aggregation*, related to the Nyström’s method [5, Chapter 12]. In contrast to the celebrated singular expansion/decomposition this method is directly applicable also in the general (nonlinear) case of (18) and has a clear policy implementation.

Namely, we introduce the discrete version of the emission mapping E^* as follows. Assume that an emission restriction is given period-wise: $\hat{E}_k = \frac{1}{t_k - t_{k-1}} \int_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} \hat{E}(t) dt$ is the cap for the emission

intensity in the time-period $[t_{k-1}, t_k]$. For simplicity we assume that all time periods have the same length $h > 0$, thus $t_k = kh$, and also that $\omega = mh$, $\hat{t} = \hat{k}h$ for appropriate natural numbers m and \hat{k} . Correspondingly, the price of emission will be constant, v_k , on each interval $[t_{k-1}, t_k)$ and zero for $k \leq \hat{k}$. Thus instead of the space \mathcal{V} of price functions we consider

$$\mathcal{V}^h = \{(v_1, v_2, \dots) : v_k \in (-\infty, +\infty), v_k = 0 \text{ for } k \leq \hat{k}\},$$

which can be viewed as a subset of \mathcal{V} by piece-wise constant embedding of \mathcal{V}^h in \mathcal{V} . The emission resulting from $v \in \mathcal{V}^h$ becomes a vector $E^{*h}[v] = (E_1^{*h}[v], E_2^{*h}[v], \dots)$, where

$$E_k^{*h}[v] = \frac{1}{h} \int_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} \int_{t-\omega}^t g(\tau) K^*[v](\tau, t-\tau) W^*[v](\tau, t-\tau) d\tau dt. \quad (20)$$

Lemma 1 can be directly translated to the discrete case. It claims that $E_k^{*h}[v]$ depends only on v_{k-m}, \dots, v_{k+m} .

Then instead of the price equation (18) we consider the equation (skipping again the division by n)

$$E_k^{*h}[v] = \hat{E}_k^h, \quad k \geq \hat{k}. \quad (21)$$

for $v \in \mathcal{V}^h$.

Under the conditions of Lemma 3 the period-wise version of the emission as function of $v \in \mathcal{V}^h$ becomes (after a change of the order of integration):

$$E_k^{*h}[v] = E_k^{*h}[0] - \sum_{i=\hat{k} \vee (k-m-1)}^{k+m} \int_{B_{ki}} \varphi(t, \alpha) dt d\alpha v_i =: \sum_{i=\hat{k} \vee (k-m-1)}^{k+m} a_{ki}^h v_i, \quad k \geq \hat{k}, \quad (22)$$

where B_{ki} is the square $[t_i, t_{i+1}] \times [t_{k-1}, t_k]$ in the (α, t) -plane for $i = k-m, \dots, k+m-1$, while $B_{k, k-m-1}$ is the triangle with vertices $\{(t_{k-m-1}, t_{k-1}), (t_{k-m}, t_{k-1}), (t_{k-m}, t_k)\}$, and $B_{k, k+m}$ is the triangle with vertices $\{(t_{k+m-1}, t_{k-1}), (t_{k+m-1}, t_k), (t_{k+m}, t_k)\}$. However, the numerical analysis given in the next section, as well as the proposition below apply to the general case of an emission map $E_k^{*h}[v]$ defined in (20).

In the rest of this section we address the issue of existence of a solution to the (nonlinear non-smooth) equation (21) for $v \in \mathcal{V}^h$. First of all we claim a certain Lipschitz continuity property of the mapping E^{*h} , similarly as in Proposition 1.

Proposition 2 *Assume that (A1)–(A3) hold. There is a constant c and a function $\gamma_t > 0$ (the same as in Proposition 1) such that for every $v', v'' \in \mathcal{V}^h$ and $k > \hat{k}$*

$$|E_k^{*h}[v'] - E_k^{*h}[v'']| \leq c \left[\max_{k-m < i \leq k+m} |v'_i - v''_i| + \frac{f(t_{k+m}) + \max_{k-m < i \leq k+m} |v'_{i-} + v''_{i-}|}{\gamma_{t_k}} |v'_k - v''_k| \right].$$

The claim of this proposition follows directly from Proposition 1 and (20).

In the existence result presented below we consider the truncated version of equation (21). That is, given the aggregation time-step $h > 0$ we solve the finite system of equations

$$E_k^{*h}[v] = \hat{E}_k, \quad k = \hat{k} + 1, \dots, M, \quad (23)$$

with respect to $v = (v_{\hat{k}+1}, \dots, v_M)$ where M is presumably a large number, so that $T = Mh$ is also “very large”. According to the discrete version of Lemma 1, $E_k^{*h}[v]$ depends only on v_{k-m}, \dots, v_{k+m} . The values v_i for $i = 1, \dots, \hat{k}$ are fixed a priori equal to zero, the values v_{M+1}, \dots, v_{M+m} will be considered as fixed parameters. Thus (23) becomes a system of $M - \hat{k}$ equations for the $M - \hat{k}$ unknown variables $v_{\hat{k}+1}, \dots, v_M$.

It is a rather difficult task to prove that the solutions of (23) would converge to a solution of (21) when $M \rightarrow +\infty$ (this is not simple also in the linear case (22)). The truncation of the time horizon is based on the common belief that the (hypothetical) knowledge of the economic factors thousands of years from now would not essentially influence the behavior of the economic agents in the next 100 years. Still, the plausibility of the truncation is not evident due to the possibly unlimited technological progress (this is clearly exhibited by the requirement (24) in the proof of the proposition below).

Another support for the truncation of the time horizon is provided by our numerical experiments, where the auction price for the next 80 years (to which we restrict the numerical analysis in the next section) remains practically the same when (23) is solved for $T = Mh = 150$ or more years, and also when the parameters v_{M+1}, \dots, v_{M+m} vary in a reasonable range (taking all of them equal to zero is a relevant choice, since it means that no emission cap is posed after time $T = Mh$).

Proposition 3 *Let $M > \hat{k}$ and $\bar{e} > 0$ be arbitrarily fixed. Then there exists \bar{v} such that for every \hat{E}_k , $k = \hat{k} + 1, \dots, M$, with $\hat{E}_k \in [0, \bar{e}]$ and any choice of $v_i \in [0, \bar{v}]$ for $i = M + 1, \dots, M + m$ system (23) has a solution $v_{\hat{k}+1}, \dots, v_M \in [-\bar{v}, \bar{v}]$.*

Proof. First we shall define the number \bar{v} by the requirements

$$\bar{v} \geq 2 \frac{f(Mh)}{g(Mh)}, \quad \bar{v} \geq 2\bar{e}, \quad \frac{h}{2} e^{-h(r+\delta)} (f(\hat{t}) + 0.5 \bar{v} g(\hat{t})) \geq \max_{s \in [0, \omega]} C'_i \left(s, \frac{16 e^{\delta h} \bar{e}}{h(\omega - h) g(\hat{t})} \right). \quad (24)$$

The above definition of \bar{v} applies to the more interesting case $h < \omega$. The alternative case requires minor changes in the last inequality.

After having \bar{v} fixed so that (24) are satisfied we denote

$$\mathcal{V}_h^M(\bar{v}) = \{v = (v_{\hat{k}+1}, \dots, v_M) : |v_k| \leq \bar{v}\}.$$

The proof utilizes the Brawer fixed point theorem. Therefore we reformulate system (23) as a fixed point equation:

$$F_k(v) = v_k, \quad k = \hat{k} + 1, \dots, M, \quad \text{where } F_k(v) = v_k + \beta_k(E_k^{*h}[v] - \hat{E}_k),$$

and $\beta_k > 0$ are chosen in such a way that

$$\beta_k \max_{v \in \mathcal{V}_h^M(\bar{v})} E_k^{*h}[v] \leq \frac{\bar{v}}{2}, \quad \beta_k \leq 1.$$

The above maximum exists due to the continuity of $E_k^{*h}[v]$ and the compactness of $\mathcal{V}_h^M(\bar{v})$.

We shall prove that $F(v) = (F_{\hat{k}+1}(v), \dots, F_M(v)) \in \mathcal{V}_h^M(\bar{v})$ for $v \in \mathcal{V}_h^M(\bar{v})$, which would imply the claim of the proposition due to the Brawer fix point theorem, since F is continuous and $\mathcal{V}_h^M(\bar{v}) \subset \mathbf{R}^{M-\hat{k}}$ is convex and compact.

Take an arbitrary $v \in \mathcal{V}_h^M(\bar{v})$ and $k \in \{\hat{k} + 1, \dots, M\}$. All we have to prove is that $-\bar{v} \leq F_k(v) \leq \bar{v}$.

To prove the second inequality we consider two cases:

1. Let $v_k \geq \bar{v}/2$. Then for $\tau \in [\hat{t}, Mh]$ we have $f(\tau) - v_k g(\tau) \leq f(Mh) - 0.5\bar{v}g(Mh) \leq 0$ according to the first inequality in (24). Hence (see (9)) $E_k^{*h}[v] = 0$ and $F_k(v) = v_k - \beta_k \hat{E}_k \leq v_k \leq \bar{v}$.

2. Let $v_k < \bar{v}/2$. Then $F_k(v) \leq v_k + \beta_k E_k^{*h}[v] \leq \bar{v}/2 + \bar{v}/2 = \bar{v}$ according to the choice of β_k .

To prove that $F_k(v) \geq -\bar{v}$ we consider the next two cases.

3. Let $v_k \geq -\bar{v}/2$. Then $F_k(v) \geq -\bar{v}/2 - \beta_k \hat{E}_k \geq -\bar{v}/2 - \bar{e} \geq \hat{v}$ according to the second inequality in (24).

4. Let $v_k < -\bar{v}/2$. Clearly $W^*[v](\tau, s) = 1$ if $\tau + s \in [t_{k-1}, t_k]$. Then from the adjoint equation (8) we have that for $\tau \in [t_k - \omega, t_{k-1}]$

$$\xi[v](\tau, s) = \int_s^\omega e^{-(r+\delta)(\theta-s)} (f(\tau) - v(\tau + \theta)g(\tau)) W^*[v](\tau, \theta) d\theta$$

and if $s \in [t_{k-1} - \tau, t_k - \tau]$ then

$$\xi[v](\tau, s) \geq \int_s^{t_k - \tau} e^{-(r+\delta)(\theta-s)} (f(\tau) - v_k g(\tau)) d\theta,$$

and if $s \in [t_{k-1} - \tau, t_{k-1} - \tau + h/2]$ then

$$\xi[v](\tau, s) \geq e^{-(r+\delta)h} \frac{h}{2} \left(f(\hat{t}) + \frac{\bar{v}}{2} g(\hat{t}) \right).$$

Thus for $\tau \in [t_k - \omega, t_{k-1}]$ and $s \in [t_{k-1} - \tau, t_{k-1} - \tau + h/2]$

$$I^*[v](\tau, s) \geq (C'_i)^{-1} \left(s, e^{-(r+\delta)h} \frac{h}{2} \left(f(\hat{t}) + \frac{\bar{v}}{2} g(\hat{t}) \right) \right) \geq \frac{16 e^{\delta h} \bar{e}}{h(\omega - h)g(\hat{t})} =: I^\#,$$

where we use the last inequality in (24). Then from (1) we obtain that for $\tau \in [t_k - \omega, t_{k-1}]$ and $s \in [t_{k-1} - \tau + h/4, t_{k-1} - \tau + h/2]$

$$K^*[v](\tau, s) \geq \frac{h}{4} e^{-\delta h} I^\# = \frac{4\bar{e}}{(\omega - h)g(\hat{t})}.$$

Finally we estimate

$$\begin{aligned} E_k^{*h}[v] &= \frac{1}{h} \int_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} \int_{t-\omega}^t g(\tau) K^*[v](\tau, t-\tau) W^*[v](\tau, t-\tau) d\tau dt \\ &\geq \frac{1}{h} \int_{t_{k-1}+h/4}^{t_{k-1}+h/2} \int_{t_k-\omega}^{t_{k-1}} g(\tau) K^*[v](\tau, t-\tau) W^*[v](\tau, t-\tau) d\tau dt \\ &= \frac{1}{h} \int_{t_k-\omega}^{t_{k-1}} \int_{t_{k-1}-\tau+h/4}^{t_{k-1}-\tau+h/2} g(\tau) K^*[v](\tau, s) ds d\tau \geq \frac{1}{h} (\omega - h) \frac{h}{4} g(\hat{t}) \frac{4\bar{e}}{(\omega - h)g(\hat{t})} = \bar{e}. \end{aligned}$$

Using this we obtain $F_k(v) \geq v_k + \beta_k (E_k^{*h}[v] - \hat{E}_k) \geq v_k \geq -\bar{v}$. This proves the invariance on $\mathcal{V}_h^M(\bar{v})$ with respect to F and the proposition. Q.E.D.

Thus Proposition 2 ensures at least a positive answer to the issue (i) in the beginning of the section at least for the truncated equation (23). Then in the special case where assumption (A4) and (23) has a regular solution v with the natural choice of the parameters $v_{M+1} = \dots = v_{M+m} = 0$, this must be the unique regular solution (due to the freedom in the choice of the right-hand side \hat{E}_k). Issue (iii) from the beginning of this section remains unclear, and will be somewhat enlightened by the numerical experiments in the next section. Here we only mention that under (A4) and the assumption $\hat{E}(\hat{t}) = E^*[0](\hat{t})$ (that is if the cap starts from the unconstrained emission at \hat{t}) the market equation (18) cannot have a regular positive solution. Indeed, if it has a regular solution v , then v solves also (19). This equation applied for $t = \hat{t}$ shows that v cannot be positive on $(\hat{t}, \hat{t} + \omega)$ due to Lemma 4.

5 Numerical analysis of the market price of emission

In this section we present some experimental results for the auction price of permits assuming that the firms participating to the auction are identical (thus the price is determined by equation (18), if a positive solution exists). In particular we investigate the role of the aggregation step h . Following the terminology used under the Kyoto protocol, we shall call it a *commitment period* and h will

be its length.⁴ The existence and the regularity of the auction price for emission permits will be scrutinized for different h .

The following data specifications are used in the experiments:

$T = 120$ - time horizon;

$\omega = 20$ - maximal age of capital;

$\delta = 0.1$ - depreciation rate of each technology;

$r = 0.04$ - discount rate;

$K_0(\tau)$ for vintages $\tau < 0$ is obtained by solving the firm's optimization problem with $v(\cdot) \equiv 0$ on $[-\omega, T]$;

$K_0(\tau) = 0$ for vintages $\tau > 0$;

$f(\tau) = 3 + 0.03\tau$ for $\tau \in [-\omega, T]$ - the productivity of one unit of capital of vintage τ ;

$g(\tau) = \frac{2.5}{1.7 + \ln(2 + \omega + \tau)} + 0.0002$ for $\tau \in [-\omega, T]$ - the emissions produced by one unit of capital of vintage τ ;

$C(s, i) = 20(1 - s/\omega)i + 0.5i^2$ - the cost of investment i in s -years-old machines of any vintage;

In the figures below the plotted time horizon is 80 years. However, the calculations are made for a time horizon of 120 years, in order to eliminate the truncation error. The results obtained with larger time horizons are visually indistinguishable from the ones given below.

In the first group of plots (figures 1 and 2) a constant emission cap $\hat{E}(t) = 300$ is imposed at time $\hat{t} = 30$. This cap is below the level of emission that would be produced without any emission restriction (represented by the dash-dotted line in the Fig. 1). The solid line represents the emission of the firm obeying the cap. It is remarkable that the reduction of the emission of the firm begins much earlier than $\hat{t} = 30$ - this is the so called anticipation effect. The left plot in Fig. 2 represents the price of the emission permits in the primary market (as auctioned). In fact, it is obtained by using a small commitment periods of $h = 1$ year. The price is highly oscillating close to the time at which the cap is imposed, as it is expected from the explanations given at the beginning of Section 4. The right plot corresponds to a commitment periods of $h = 5$ years, for which the fluctuations of the price are substantially lower. Although the primary market is efficient in the considered test example (that is, it determines a positive price of the emissions) a larger commitment period h clearly decreases the volatility of the market.

In Fig. 3 the emission cap imposed at time $t = 30$ is first constant, starting from the emission level before the beginning of the emission restriction (the dash-dotted line represents the unrestricted emissions), then it decreases quadratically. The solid line represents the emission of the firm obeying the cap. Here it is remarkable that (in contrast to the first scenario) there is no visible reduction of the emission level before time $t = 30$, *i.e.* no visible anticipation effect. This phenomenon will be discussed in more detail in the continuation of the present paper.

⁴Under the Kyoto protocol of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change, the (first) commitment period is a five-year period covering 2008 to 2012.




Figure 1: Emission resulting from an emission restriction posed at time $t = 30$




Figure 2: Auction price of permits with commitment periods of 1 year (left) and auction price with commitment period of 5 years (right) resulting from an emission restriction posed at time $t = 30$




Figure 3: Emissions (left) and the price equation (18) (right) resulting from an emission restriction posed at time $t = 30$

The right plot in Fig. 3 represents the auctioned price of the emission permit. As before it is obtained by using small commitment periods of $h = 1$ year. In contrast to the first scenario, here the auction fails in two time-periods. First this happens immediately after the introduction of the emission cap at time $\hat{t} = 30$, then around the change of the shape of the cap in year $t = 50$: the solution of the auction equation (18) takes negative values. In addition, the solution is highly oscillating around these times. The regularization of the market by posing the cap in commitment periods is seen on Fig. 4. The left plot corresponds to commitment periods of $h = 5$ years. The market still fails immediately after the introduction of the cap, but not around the change of the shape of the cap. The right plot in Fig. 4 represents the price function with commitment periods of 10 years. The market is now efficient and looks quite regular.




Figure 4: Auction price of emission permits for commitment periods $h = 5$ years (left) and $h = 10$ years (right)

References

- [1] E. Barucci and F. Gozzi. Investment in a vintage capital model. *Research in Economics*, **52**:159–188, 1998.
- [2] E. Barucci and F. Gozzi. Technology adoption and accumulation in a vintage capital model. *Journal of Economics*, **74**:1–38, 2001.
- [3] R. Boucekkine, D. de la Croix, and O. Licandro. Modelling vintage structures with DDEs: principles and applications. *Mathematical Population Studies*, **11**:11–29, 2004.
- [4] R. Boucekkine, O. Licandro, L. Puch, and F. del Rio. Vintage capital and the dynamics of the AK model. *Journal of Economic Theory*, **120**:39–72, 2005.
- [5] L.M. Delves and J.L. Mohamed. *Computational Methods for Integral Equations*. Cambridge Univ. Press, 1985.
- [6] G. Feichtinger, R.F. Hartl, P.M. Kort, and V.M. Veliov. Anticipation effects of technological progress on capital accumulation: a vintage capital approach. *J. Econom. Theory*, **126**:143–164, 2006.
- [7] G. Feichtinger, R.F. Hartl, P.M. Kort, and V.M. Veliov. Financially constrained capital investments: the effects of disembodied and embodied technological progress. *Journal of Mathematical Economics*, **44**:459–483, 2008.
- [8] I. Finkelshtain and Y. Kislev. Prices versus Quantities: The Political Perspective. *Journal of Political Economy*, **105**(1):83–100, 1997.
- [9] P.C. Hansen. Numerical methods for analysis and solution of Fredholm integral equations of the first kind. **Inverse Problems**, **8**: 849:872, 1992.
- [10] D.L. Kelly. Price and quantity regulation in general equilibrium. *Journal of Economic Theory*, **125**:36–60, 2005.
- [11] R. Kress. *Linear Integral Equations*. Applied Mathematical Sciences, vol. 82, Springer-Verlag, 1989.
- [12] F.C. Krysiac. Prices vs. quantities: the effects on technology choice. *Journal of Public Economics*. **92**:1275–1287, 2008.
- [13] Pontryagin et al. *The mathematical theory of optimal processes*. Wiley, NY, 1962.
- [14] A.N. Tikhonov and V.Y. Arsenin. *Solutions of Ill-Posed Problems*. Wiley, NY, 1977.
- [15] V.M. Veliov. Optimal Control of Heterogeneous Systems: Basic Theory. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, **346**:227–242, 2008.
- [16] M.L. Weitzman. Prices versus Quantities, *Review of Economic Studies*, **41**:477–491, 1974.

- [17] J. Zhao. Irreversible abatement investment under cost uncertainties: tradable emission permits and emission charges. *Journal of Public Economics*, **87**:2765–2789, 2003.

Recent titles

CORE Discussion Papers

- 2008/60. Yu. NESTEROV. Barrier subgradient method.
- 2008/61. Thierry BRECHET, Johan EYCKMANS, François GERARD, Philippe MARBAIX, Henry TULKENS and Jean-Pascal VAN YPERSELE. The impact of the unilateral EU commitment on the stability of international climate agreements.
- 2008/62. Giorgia OGGIONI and Yves SMEERS. Average power contracts can mitigate carbon leakage.
- 2008/63. Jean-Sébastien TANCREZ, Philippe CHEVALIER and Pierre SEMAL. A tight bound on the throughput of queueing networks with blocking.
- 2008/64. Nicolas GILLIS and François GLINEUR. Nonnegative factorization and the maximum edge biclique problem.
- 2008/65. Geir B. ASHEIM, Claude D'ASPREMONT and Kuntal BANERJEE. Generalized time-invariant overtaking.
- 2008/66. Jean-François CAULIER, Ana MAULEON and Vincent VANNETELBOSCH. Contractually stable networks.
- 2008/67. Jean J. GABSZEWICZ, Filomena GARCIA, Joana PAIS and Joana RESENDE. On Gale and Shapley '*College admissions and stability of marriage*'.
- 2008/68. Axel GAUTIER and Anne YVRANDE-BILLON. Contract renewal as an incentive device. An application to the French urban public transport sector.
- 2008/69. Yuri YATSENKO and Natali HRITONENKO. Discrete-continuous analysis of optimal equipment replacement.
- 2008/70. Michel JOURNÉE, Yurii NESTEROV, Peter RICHTÁRIK and Rodolphe SEPULCHRE. Generalized power method for sparse principal component analysis.
- 2008/71. Toshihiro OKUBO and Pierre M. PICARD. Firms' location under taste and demand heterogeneity.
- 2008/72. Iwan MEIER and Jeroen V.K. ROMBOUTS. Style rotation and performance persistence of mutual funds.
- 2008/73. Shin-Huei WANG and Christian M. HAFNER. Estimating autocorrelations in the presence of deterministic trends.
- 2008/74. Yuri YATSENKO and Natali HRITONENKO. Technological breakthroughs and asset replacement.
- 2008/75. Julio DÁVILA. The taxation of capital returns in overlapping generations economies without financial assets.
- 2008/76. Giorgia OGGIONI and Yves SMEERS. Equilibrium models for the carbon leakage problem.
- 2008/77. Jean-François MERTENS and Anna RUBINCHIK. Intergenerational equity and the discount rate for cost-benefit analysis.
- 2008/78. Claire DUJARDIN and Florence GOFFETTE-NAGOT. Does public housing occupancy increase unemployment?
- 2008/79. Sandra PONCET, Walter STEINGRESS and Hylke VANDENBUSSCHE. Financial constraints in China: firm-level evidence.
- 2008/80. Jean GABSZEWICZ, Salome GVETADZE, Didier LAUSSEL and Patrice PIERETTI. Public goods' attractiveness and migrations.
- 2008/81. Karen CRABBE and Hylke VANDENBUSSCHE. Are your firm's taxes set in Warsaw? Spatial tax competition in Europe.
- 2008/82. Jean-Sébastien TANCREZ, Benoît ROLAND, Jean-Philippe CORDIER and Fouad RIANE. How stochasticity and emergencies disrupt the surgical schedule.
- 2008/83. Peter RICHTÁRIK. Approximate level method.
- 2008/84. Çağatay KAYI and Eve RAMAEKERS. Characterizations of Pareto-efficient, fair, and strategy-proof allocation rules in queueing problems.
- 2009/1. Carlo ROSA. Forecasting the direction of policy rate changes: The importance of ECB words.
- 2009/2. Sébastien LAURENT, Jeroen V.K. ROMBOUTS and Francesco VIOLANTE. Consistent ranking of multivariate volatility models.
- 2009/3. Dunia LÓPEZ-PINTADO and Juan D. MORENO-TERNERO. The principal's dilemma.

Recent titles

CORE Discussion Papers - continued

- 2009/4. Jacek B. KRAWCZYK and Oana-Silvia SEREA. A viability theory approach to a two-stage optimal control problem of technology adoption.
- 2009/5. Jean-François MERTENS and Anna RUBINCHIK. Regularity and stability of equilibria in an overlapping generations model with exogenous growth.
- 2009/6. Nicolas GILLIS and François GLINEUR. Using underapproximations for sparse nonnegative matrix factorization.
- 2009/7. Michel M. DENUIT, Louis EECKHOUDT and Mario MENEGATTI. Correlated risks, bivariate utility and optimal choices.
- 2009/8. Michel M. DENUIT, Louis EECKHOUDT and Mario MENEGATTI. Adding independent risks in an insurance portfolio: which shape for the insurers' preferences?
- 2009/9. Antoine BOMMIER and Stéphane ZUBER. The Pareto principle of optimal inequality.
- 2009/10. Raouf BOUCEKKINE, Jacek B. KRAWCZYK and Thomas VALLEE. Environmental negotiations as dynamic games: Why so selfish?
- 2009/11. Théophile T. AZOMAHOU, Raouf BOUCEKKINE and Phu NGUYEN-VAN. Promoting clean technologies under imperfect competition.
- 2009/12. Patrice PIERETTI and Skerdilajda ZANAJ. On tax competition, public goods provision and jurisdictions' size.
- 2009/13. Jeroen V.K. ROMBOUTS and Lars STENTOFT. Bayesian option pricing using mixed normal heteroskedasticity models.
- 2009/14. Gauthier de MAERE d'AERTRYCKE and Yves SMEERS. The valuation of power futures based on optimal dispatch.
- 2009/15. Thierry BRECHET, Tsvetomir TSACHEV and Vladimir M. VELIOV. Prices versus quantities in a vintage capital model.

Books

- H. TULKENS (ed.) (2006), *Public goods, environmental externalities and fiscal competition*. New York, Springer-Verlag.
- V. GINSBURGH and D. THROSBY (eds.) (2006), *Handbook of the economics of art and culture*. Amsterdam, Elsevier.
- J. GABSZEWICZ (ed.) (2006), *La différenciation des produits*. Paris, La découverte.
- L. BAUWENS, W. POHLMEIER and D. VEREDAS (eds.) (2008), *High frequency financial econometrics: recent developments*. Heidelberg, Physica-Verlag.
- P. VAN HENTENRYCKE and L. WOLSEY (eds.) (2007), *Integration of AI and OR techniques in constraint programming for combinatorial optimization problems*. Berlin, Springer.
- P-P. COMBES, Th. MAYER and J-F. THISSE (eds.) (2008), *Economic geography: the integration of regions and nations*. Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- J. HINDRIKS (ed.) (2008), *Au-delà de Copernic: de la confusion au consensus ?* Brussels, Academic and Scientific Publishers.

CORE Lecture Series

- C. GOURIÉROUX and A. MONFORT (1995), *Simulation Based Econometric Methods*.
- A. RUBINSTEIN (1996), *Lectures on Modeling Bounded Rationality*.
- J. RENEGAR (1999), *A Mathematical View of Interior-Point Methods in Convex Optimization*.
- B.D. BERNHEIM and M.D. WHINSTON (1999), *Anticompetitive Exclusion and Foreclosure Through Vertical Agreements*.
- D. BIENSTOCK (2001), *Potential function methods for approximately solving linear programming problems: theory and practice*.
- R. AMIR (2002), *Supermodularity and complementarity in economics*.
- R. WEISMANTEL (2006), *Lectures on mixed nonlinear programming*.

Environmental Economics & Management Memoranda

91. Thierry BRECHET, Henry TULKENS. Beyond BAT : Selecting optimal combinations of available techniques, with an example from the limestone industry. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 90 (2009) :1790-1801.
90. Giorgia OGGIONI, Yves SMEERS. Equilibrium models for the carbon leakage problem. December 2008 (also CORE DP 2008/76)
89. Giorgia OGGIONI, Yves SMEERS. Average power contracts can mitigate carbon leakage. December 2008 (also CORE DP 2008/62)
88. Thierry BRECHET, Johan EYCKMANS, François GERARD, Philippe MARBAIX, Henry TULKENS, Jean-Pascal van YPERSELE. The impact of the unilateral EU commitment on the stability of international climate agreements. (also CORE DP 2008/61)
87. Raouf BOUCEKKINE, Jacek B. KRAWCZYK, Thomas VALLEE. Towards an understanding of tradeoffs between regional wealth, tightness of a common environmental constraint and the sharing rules. (also CORE DP 2008/55)
86. Thierry BRECHET, Tsvetomir TSACHEV, Vladimir VELIOV. Prices versus quantities in a vintage capital model. March 2009 (also CORE DP 2009/15).
85. David DE LA CROIX, Davide DOTTORI. Easter Island's collapse : a tale of a population race. *Journal of Economic Growth*, 13 :27-55, 2008.
84. Thierry BRECHET, Stéphane LAMBRECHT, Fabien PRIEUR. Intertemporal transfers of emission quotas in climate policies. *Economic Modelling*, 26(1) : 126-143, 2009.
83. Thierry BRECHET, Stéphane LAMBRECHT. Family altruism with renewable resource and population growth. *Mathematical Population Studies*, 16 :60-78, 2009.
82. Thierry BRECHET, Alexis GERARD, Giordano MION. Une évaluation objective des nuisances subjectives de l'aéroport de Bruxelles-National. *Regards Economiques*, N° 66, Février 2009.
81. Thierry BRECHET, Johan EYCKMANS. Coalition theory and integrated assessment modeling : Lessons for climate governance. In E. Brousseau, P.A. Jouvét and T. Tom Dedeurwaerder (eds). *Governing Global Environmental Commons: Institutions, Markets, Social Preferences and Political Games*, Oxford University Press, 2009.
80. Parkash CHANDER and Henry TULKENS. Cooperation, stability, and self-enforcement in international environmental agreements : A conceptual discussion. In R. Guesnerie and H. Tulkens (eds). *The Design of Climate Policy*, CESifo Seminar Series, The MIT Press, 2008.
79. Mirabelle MUULS. The effect of investment on bargaining positions. Over-investment in the case of international agreements on climate change. September 2008
78. Pierre-André JOUVET, Philippe MICHEL, Pierre PESTIEAU. Public and private environmental spending : a political economy approach. *Environmental Economics and Policy Studies*, Vol 9 (3) : 177-191 2008.
77. Fabien PRIEUR. The environmental Kuznets curve in a world of irreversibility. *Economic Theory*, 2009.
76. Raouf BOUCEKKINE, Natali HRITONENKO and Yuri YATSENKO. Optimal firm behavior under environmental constraints. April 2008. (also CORE DP 2008/24).
75. Giorgia OGGIONI and Yves SMEERS. Evaluating the impact of average cost based contracts on the industrial sector in the European emission trading scheme. January 2008 (also CORE DP 2008/1).
74. Thierry BRECHET and Pierre-André JOUVET. Environmental innovation and the cost of pollution abatement revisited. *Ecological Economics*, 65 : 262-265, 2008.
73. Ingmar SCHUMACHER and Benteng ZOU. Pollution perception : A challenge for intergenerational equity. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, 55, 296-309, 2008.
72. Thierry BRECHET et Patrick VAN BRUSSELEN. Le pic pétrolier: un regard d'économiste. *Reflets et Perspectives de la vie économique*, Tome XLVI, n° 4, 63-81, 2007.
71. Thierry BRECHET. L'énergie : mutations passées et mutations en cours. *Reflets et Perspectives de la vie économique*, Tome XLVI, n° 4, 5-11, 2007.

70. Marc GERMAIN, Alphonse MAGNUS and Vincent VAN STEENBERGHE. How to design and use the clean development mechanism under the Kyoto Protocol? A developing country perspective. *Environmental & Resource Economics*, 38(1) : 13-30, 2007.
69. Thierry BRECHET et Pierre PICARD. Economische instrumenten voor de regulering van de geluidshinder in de omgeving van luchthavens? *Brussels Studies*, nummer 12, 3 december 2007
68. Thierry BRECHET et Pierre PICARD. Des instruments économiques pour la régulation des nuisances sonores autour des aéroports? *Brussels Studies*, numéro 12, 3 décembre 2007, www.brusselsstudies.be.
67. Thierry BRECHET and Pierre PICARD. Can economic instruments regulate noise pollution in locations near airports? *Brussels Studies*, issue 12, 2007 december the 3rd, www.brusselsstudies.be
66. Pierre-André JOUVET, Pierre PESTIEAU and Gregory PONTIERE. Longevity and Environmental quality in an OLG model. September 2007 (also available as CORE DP 2007/69).
65. Raouf BOUCEKKINE and Marc GERMAIN. Impacts of emission reduction policies in a multi-regional multi-sectoral small open economy with endogenous growth. February 2007 (also available CORE DP 2007/11).
64. Parkash CHANDER and Subhashini MUTHUKRISHNAN. Green consumerism and collective action. June 2007 (also available as CORE DP 2007/58).
63. Jakub GROWIEC and Ingmar SCHUMACHER. Technological opportunity, long-run growth and convergence. July 2007 (also available as CORE DP 2007/57).
62. Maria Eugenia SANIN and Skerdilajda ZANAJ. Environmental innovation under Cournot competition. June 2007. (also available as CORE DP 2007/50)
61. Thierry BRECHET and Stéphane LAMBRECHT. Family altruism with a renewable resource and population growth. October 2006 (also available as CORE DP 2006/35).
60. Thierry BRECHET, François GERARD and Henry TULKENS. Climate Coalitions: a theoretical and computational appraisal. February 2007 (also available as CORE DP 2007/3).
59. Thierry BRECHET. L'environnement dans tous ses états. *Regards Economiques*, n° 50, 26-32, Avril 2007.
58. Thierry BRECHET and Susana PERALTA. The race for polluting permits. March 2007 (also available as CORE DP 2007/27).
57. Giorgia OGGIONI, Ina RUMIANTSEVA and Yves SMEERS. Introduction of CO₂ emission certificates in a simplified model of the Benelux electricity network with small and industrial consumers. Reprint from *Proceedings of the International Conference on Clean Electrical Power*, Capri, Italy, May 21-23, 2007.
56. Agustin PEREZ-BARAHONA. The problem of non-renewable energy resource in the production of physical capital. January 2007 (also available as CORE DP 2007/8).
55. Thierry BRECHET, Benoît LUSSIS. The contribution of the clean development mechanism to national climate policies. *Journal of Policy Modelling*, 28(9), 981-994, December 2006.
54. Ingmar SCHUMACHER. Endogenous discounting via wealth, twin-peaks and the role of technology. November 2006 (also available as CORE DP 2006/104).
53. Ingmar SCHUMACHER. On optimality, endogenous discounting and wealth accumulation. October 2006 (also available as CORE DP 2006/103).
52. Jakub GROWIEC, Ingmar SCHUMACHER. On technical change in the elasticities of resource inputs. November 2006. (also available as CORE DP 2006/63).
51. Maria Eugenia SANIN. Market Design in Wholesale Electricity Markets. October 2006 (also available as CORE DP 2006/100).
50. Luisito BERTINELLI, Eric STROBL and Benteng ZOU. Polluting technologies and sustainable economic development. June 2006 (also available as CORE DP 2006/52).
49. Marc GERMAIN, Alphonse MAGNUS. Prices versus quantities: Stock pollution control with repeated choice of the instrument. October 2005. *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics*, 197 (2006) 437-445.
48. Agustin PEREZ-BARAHONA. Capital accumulation and exhaustible energy resources: a special functions case. September 2006 (also available as CORE DP 2007/9).
47. Philippe TULKENS, Henry TULKENS. The White House and the Kyoto Protocol: Double standards on uncertainties and their consequences. May 2006 (also TERI School of Advanced Studies WP Series #1).

46. Thierry BRECHET, Pierre-André JOUVET. Environmental innovation and the cost of pollution abatement. January 2006 (also available as CORE DP 2006/40).
45. Fabien PRIEUR. The implication of irreversible pollution on the relation between growth and the environment: The degenerate Kuznets curve. February 2006.
44. Thierry BRECHET, Marc GERMAIN, Philippe MONTFORT. Allocation des efforts de dépollution dans des économies avec spécialisation internationale. *Revue Economique*, 57(2), Mars 2006.
43. Ingmar SCHUMACHER and Benteng ZOU. Habit in Pollution, A Challenge for Intergenerational Equity. March 2006 (also available as CORE DP 2006/6).
42. Jean-Charles HOURCADE, P.R. SHUKLA and Sandrine MATHY. Cutting the Climate-Development Gordian Knot – Economic options in a politically constrained world. September 2005.
41. Urs LUTERBACHER. Climate Change, the Kyoto Protocol, and Transatlantic Relations. November 2005.
40. Parkash CHANDER and Henry TULKENS. Cooperation, Stability and Self-Enforcement in International Environmental Agreements: A Conceptual Discussion. July 2005.
39. Paul-Marie BOULANGER et Thierry BRECHET. Le Mécanisme pour un Développement Propre tiendra-t-il ses promesses ? *Reflets et Perspectives de la Vie Economique*, Tome XLIV – 2005 – N° 3, 5-27.
38. Paul-Marie BOULANGER and Thierry BRECHET. Models for policy-making in sustainable development: The state of the art and perspectives for research. *Ecological Economics*, 55, 337-350, 2005.
37. Johan EYCKMANS and Henry TULKENS. Optimal and Stable International Climate Agreements. October 2005. Reprint from "*Economic Aspects of Climate Change Policy : A European and Belgian Perspective*", a joint product of CES-K.U.Leuven and CORE-UCL, edited by Bert Willems, Johan Eyckmans and Stef Proost, published by ACCO, 3000 Leuven (Belgium)
36. Thierry BRECHET and Benoît LUSSIS. The Clean Development Mechanism in Belgian Climate Policy. October 2005. Reprint from "*Economic Aspects of Climate Change Policy : A European and Belgian Perspective*", a joint product of CES-K.U.Leuven and CORE-UCL, edited by Bert Willems, Johan Eyckmans and Stef Proost, published by ACCO, 3000 Leuven (Belgium)
35. Vincent VAN STEENBERGHE. The impact of banking on permits prices and compliance costs. October 2005. Reprint from "*Economic Aspects of Climate Change Policy : A European and Belgian Perspective*", a joint product of CES-K.U.Leuven and CORE-UCL, edited by Bert Willems, Johan Eyckmans and Stef Proost, published by ACCO, 3000 Leuven (Belgium)
34. Johan EYCKMANS, Denise VAN REGEMORTER and Vincent VAN STEENBERGHE. Kyoto-permit prices and compliance costs: an analysis with MacGEM. October 2005. Reprint from "*Economic Aspects of Climate Change Policy : A European and Belgian Perspective*", a joint product of CES-K.U.Leuven and CORE-UCL, edited by Bert Willems, Johan Eyckmans and Stef Proost, published by ACCO, 3000 Leuven (Belgium)
33. Johan EYCKMANS, Bert WILLEMS and Jean-Pascal VAN YPERSELE. Climate Change: Challenges for the World. October 2005. Reprint from "*Economic Aspects of Climate Change Policy : A European and Belgian Perspective*", a joint product of CES-K.U.Leuven and CORE-UCL, edited by Bert Willems, Johan Eyckmans and Stef Proost, published by ACCO, 3000 Leuven (Belgium)
32. Marc GERMAIN, Stef PROOST and Bert SAVEYN. The Belgian Burden Sharing. October 2005. Reprint from "*Economic Aspects of Climate Change Policy : A European and Belgian Perspective*", a joint product of CES-K.U.Leuven and CORE-UCL, edited by Bert Willems, Johan Eyckmans and Stef Proost, published by ACCO, 3000 Leuven (Belgium)
31. Ingmar SCHUMACHER. Reviewing Social Discounting within Intergenerational Moral Intuition. June 2005.
30. Stéphane LAMBRECHT. The effects of a demographic shock in an OLG economy with pay-as-you-go pensions and property rights on the environment: the case of selfish households. January 2005.
29. Stéphane LAMBRECHT. Maintaining environmental quality for overlapping generations: Some Reflections on the US Sky Trust Initiative. May 2005.
28. Thierry BRECHET, Benoît LUSSIS. The contribution of the Clean Development Mechanism to national climate policies. April 2005.
27. Thierry BRECHET, Stéphane LAMBRECHT, Fabien PRIEUR. Intergenerational transfers of pollution rights and growth. May 2005 (also available as CORE DP 2005/42).
26. Maryse LABRIET, Richard LOULOU. From non-cooperative CO₂ abatement strategies to the optimal world cooperation: Results from the integrated MARKAL model. April 2005.

25. Marc GERMAIN, Vincent VAN STEENBERGHE, Alphonse MAGNUS. Optimal Policy with Tradable and Bankable Pollution Permits : Taking the Market Microstructure into Account. *Journal of Public Economy Theory*, 6(5), 2004, 737-757.
24. Marc GERMAIN, Stefano LOVO, Vincent VAN STEENBERGHE. De l'impact de la microstructure d'un marché de permis de polluer sur la politique environnementale. *Annales d'Economie et de Statistique*, n° 74 – 2004, 177-208.
23. Marc GERMAIN, Alphonse MAGNUS, Vincent VAN STEENBERGHE. Should developing countries participate in the Clean Development Mechanism under the Kyoto Protocol ? The low-hanging fruits and baseline issues. December 2004.
22. Thierry BRECHET et Paul-Marie BOULANGER. Le Mécanisme pour un Développement Propre, ou comment faire d'une pierre deux coups. *Regards Economiques*, Ires n° 27, janvier 2005.
21. Sergio CURRARINI & Henry TULKENS. Stable international agreements on transfrontier pollution with ratification constraints. In C. Carraro and V. Fragnelli (eds.), *Game Practice and the Environment*. Cheltenham, Edward Elgar Publishing, 2004, 9-36. (also available as CORE Reprint 1715).
20. Agustin PEREZ-BARAHONA & Benteng ZOU. A comparative study of energy saving technical progress in a vintage capital model. December 2004.
19. Agustin PEREZ-BARAHONA & Benteng ZOU. Energy saving technological progress in a vintage capital model. December 2004.
18. Matthieu GLACHANT. Voluntary agreements under endogenous legislative threats and imperfect enforcement. November 2004.
17. Thierry BRECHET, Stéphane LAMBRECHT. Puzzling over sustainability: an equilibrium analysis. November 2004.
16. Vincent VAN STEENBERGHE. Core-stable and equitable allocations of greenhouse gas emission permits. October 2004. (also available as CORE DP 2004/75).
15. Pierre-André JOUVET Philippe MICHEL, Pierre PESTIEAU. Public and private environmental spending. A political economy approach. September 2004. (also available as CORE DP 2004/68).
14. Thierry BRECHET, Marc GERMAIN, Vincent VAN STEENBERGHE. The clean development mechanism under the Kyoto protocol and the 'low-hanging fruits' issue. July 2004. (also available as CORE DP 2004/81).
13. Thierry BRECHET, Philippe MICHEL. Environmental performance and equilibrium. July 2004. (also available as CORE DP 2004/72).
12. Luisito BERTINELLI, Eric STROBL. The Environmental Kuznets Curve semi-parametrically revisited. July 2004. (also available as CORE DP 2004/51).
11. Axel GOSSERIES, Vincent VAN STEENBERGHE. Pourquoi des marchés de permis de polluer ? Les enjeux économiques et éthiques de Kyoto. April 2004. (also available as IRES discussion paper n° 2004-21).
10. Vincent VAN STEENBERGHE. CO₂ Abatement costs and permits price : Exploring the impact of banking and the role of future commitments. December 2003. (also available as CORE DP 2003/98).
9. Katheline SCHUBERT. Eléments sur l'actualisation et l'environnement. March 2004.
8. Marc GERMAIN. Modélisations de marchés de permis de pollution. July 2003.
7. Marc GERMAIN. Le Mécanisme de Développement Propre : Impacts du principe d'additionnalité et du choix de la baseline. January 2003.
6. Thierry BRECHET et Marc GERMAIN. Les affres de la modélisation. May 2002.
5. Marc GERMAIN and Vincent VAN STEENBERGHE. Constraining equitable allocations of tradable CO₂ emission quotas by acceptability, *Environmental and Resource Economics*, (26) 3, 2003.
4. Marc GERMAIN, Philippe TOINT, Henry TULKENS and Aart DE ZEEUW. Transfers to sustain dynamic core-theoretic cooperation in international stock pollutant control, *Journal of Economic Dynamics & Control*, (28) 1, 2003.
3. Thierry BRECHET, Marc GERMAIN et Philippe MONTFORT. Spécialisation internationale et partage de la charge en matière de réduction de la pollution. (also available as IRES discussion paper n°2003-19).
2. Olivier GODARD. Le risque climatique planétaire et la question de l'équité internationale dans l'attribution de quotas d'émission échangeable. May 2003.
1. Thierry BRECHET. Entreprise et environnement : des défis complémentaires ? March 2002. Revue Louvain.

Environmental Economics & Management Memorandum

Chair Lhoist Berghmans in Environmental Economics and Management
Center for Operations Research & Econometrics (CORE)
Université catholique de Louvain (UCL)
Voie du Roman Pays 34
B-1348 Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium

Hard copies are available upon request : env@core.ucl.ac.be

Papers are available in pdf format on line : <http://www.uclouvain.be/en-21264.html>