Helsinki
Center
of
Economic
Research

Discussion Papers

International Biodiversity Management with Technical Change

Tapio Palokangas
University of Helsinki, HECER and IIASA

Discussion Paper No. 330
May 2011

ISSN 1795-0562

HECER – Helsinki Center of Economic Research, P.O. Box 17 (Arkadiankatu 7), FI-00014 University of Helsinki, FINLAND, Tel +358-9-191-28780, Fax +358-9-191-28781,
E-mail info-hecer@helsinki.fi, Internet www.hecer.fi

HECER
Discussion Paper No. 330

International Biodiversity Management with Technical Change*

Abstract

I consider the case where the conservation of land yields utility through biodiversity, firms improve their efficiency by in-house R\&D and a large number of jurisdictions establish a self-interested central planner for biodiversity management. I compare the regulation of land use with direct subsidies for conserved land and obtain following results. Regulation promotes biodiversity and economic growth. Because revenue-rasing taxes hamper growth, the replacement of regulation by subsidies decreases biodiversity, growth and welfare. Applied to NATURA 2000 in the EU, this suggests that regulation without any budget may be the appropriate degree of authority for the Commission.

JEL Classification: 041, H23, F15

Keywords: biodiversity, conservation subsidies, in-house R&D, land-use regulation, lobbying, technical change.

Tapio Palokangas

Department of Political and Economic Studies
University of Helsinki
P.O. Box 17
FI-00014 University of Helsinki
FINLAND

e-mail: tapio.palokangas@helsinki.fi

* The author is grateful to Timothy Swanson and Duncan Knowler for their constructive comments.

1 Introduction

This document considers optimal institutional design of biodiversity management under lobbying, with a special focus on the following problems. Should biodiversity management be run by jurisdictions or a central planner? How much authority should this planner get? Are regulatory powers sufficient, or should the central planner have a budget to finance conservation subsidies?

The framework for this study is based on the following experience. The "central planner" called the European Commission (EC) manages biodiversity and two directives regulate nature conservation in the the European Union (EU) (cf. Ostermann 1998):

- Birds Directive 79/409/EEC on the conservation of wild birds;
- Habitats Directive 92/43/EEC on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora.

The Habitats Directive calls for the establishment of a network of designated sites, called Natura 2000, which will consist of sites designated under the Habitats Directive (Special Areas of Conservation, SACS) and the Birds Directive (Special Protection Areas, SPAS). These directives contain annexes with habitats and species listed as being of Community interest, and whose conservation requires the designation of sites by the Member States. A Member State is obliged to guarantee a "Favorable Conservation Status", which is defined in the Habitats Directive, to a Natura 2000 site with the obligations of monitoring and reporting.

Non-governmental organizations (NGOs) play a crucial role in the highly complex political structure of the EU. Weber and Christophersen (2002) describe the political influence of the forest-owner associations (CEPF and BNFF) and the environmental NGOs (WWF and Fern) on the process of implementing the EU habitats directive (HD). They highlight the relationship between the involvement of interest groups in the political process and the acceptance of legislation among their members. In this paper, I examine the political equilibrium in which the interest groups representing the member countries lobby the Commission over biodiversity management.

There are three reasons why EU policy relies heavily on regulation rather than on other mechanisms to achieve its objectives (Ledoux et al. 2000).

- Until 1987, EU environmental policy lacked a proper legal basis in the founding Treaty of Rome. Consequently, all environmental policies had to rely on the "implied powers" of Article 235 of the Treaty, which stipulated the use of directives and nothing else.

- With the ratification of the 1999 Amsterdam Treaty, the EU can only adopt eco-taxes and other fiscal measures with the unanimous agreement of every state (Jordan 1998). This need for unanimity represents both a huge hurdle to ecological tax reform and a continuing institutional inducement to rely on regulation.

- The founding Member States gave the EU a powerful institutional incentive to regulate wherever possible by vesting it with so few financial resources of its own. From the Commission's perspective, regulation has the benefit of being paid for by private actors in the Member States rather than the EU itself (Majone 1996).

In this study, I consider biodiversity management in three cases:

- There is no such international authority as the Commission.

- The current situation in the EU: regulation by the Commission.

- The Commission gets more authority: it can use subsidies and distribute the costs of these to the member countries.

The comparison of these cases reveals whether or not the Commission's present authority is adequate.

MacArthur and Wilson (1967) show that the total number of species is an increasing function of the habitat area. On the assumption that the number of species yields utility, Swanson (1994), Barbier and Schulz (1997) and Endres and Radke (1999) consider the optimal area of habitat, comparing the benefits of its maintenance with the opportunity cost of using land in production. These models analyze the effects of an external shock (e.g. a change in trade policy) on biodiversity. Rowthorn and Brown (1999) introduce exogenous technical change into the optimal habitat model, finding that a country with a high discount rate preserves more land when the elasticity of substitution between consumption and species exceeds unity.

Without endogenous technical change, the optimal choice of a habitat is merely that of allocating land between conservation and production. With endogenous technical change, there may be the following positive link between biodiversity and economic growth. The protection of biodiversity requires transferring land from production to conservation. If this decreases output, then employment in production and wages fall. Lower wages encourage labor-intensive R&D to expand, thus speeding up technical change and economic growth. Because this link may play an important role in the analysis, I introduce in-house R&D into the optimal habitat model.

To consider the political economy of biodiversity management, I introduce lobbying into the the optimal habitat model. This can be examined either by the *all-pay auction model* in which the lobbyist making the greater effort wins with certainty, or the *menu-auction model* in which the lobbyists announce their bids contingent on the politician's actions. In the all-pay auction model, lobbying expenditures are incurred by all the lobbyists before the politician takes an action. In the menu-auction model, it is not possible for a lobbyist to spend money and effort on lobbying without getting what he lobbied for. A good example of the all-pay auction is Johal and Ulph's environmental-policy model (2002) in which local interest groups lobby to influence the probability of getting their favorite type of government elected. I however opt for the menu-auction model, because that better characterizes the case in which the central planner's decision variables lobbied over (e.g., regulatory constraints, subsidies) are continuous and the interest groups obtain marginal improvements in their position by lobbying. I assume in this document that the central planner is self-interested, households love biodiversity, goods are produced from labor and land and biodiversity is an increasing function of habitat land in all jurisdictions of the economy.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents the structure of the economy and section 3 the model for a single jurisdiction. Section 4 constructs the Pareto optimum for the economy as a reference case. Sections 5 and 6 examine the two alternatives of biodiversity management: direct regulation and conservation subsidies.

2 The model

Consider an economy with a large number of jurisdictions which are placed evenly over the limit $[0, 1]$.[1] All jurisdictions produce the same consumption good at the price p. Each jurisdiction j possesses one unit of labor, of which the amount l_j is devoted to production and the rest z_j to R&D, and one unit of land, of which the amount n_j is devoted to production and the rest b_j to conservation:

$$1 = l_j + z_j, \quad 1 = n_j + b_j. \tag{1}$$

MacArthur and Wilson (1967) show empirically that the number of species expected to survive in an island is proportional to the area of that island. Following Rowthorn and Brown (1999), I assume that in each jurisdiction j, the area devoted to conservation, b_j, functions like an "island" in the MacArthur-Wilson sense. Thus, *biodiversity* in the economy, b, can be specified simply

[1] If the jurisdictions were heterogeneous, then there could be multiple equilibria.

as the sum of conserved areas in the economy:

$$b \doteq \int_0^1 b_k dk. \tag{2}$$

With perfect markets for goods, labor and land, the agents in jurisdiction j behave as if they were a single revenue-maximizing agent (hereafter jurisdiction j) possessing all resources in that jurisdiction. Its utility starting at time T is[2]

$$\int_T^\infty c_j b^\delta e^{-\rho(\theta - T)} d\theta, \quad \delta > 0, \quad \rho > 0, \tag{3}$$

where θ is time, ρ the constant rate of time preference, c_j its consumption, b biodiversity, and δ a parameter with the following characterization: the higher δ, the more the households appreciate biodiversity in the economy, b. Because there is no money in the model that would pin down the nominal price level at any time, I can choose the monetary unit so that the consumer price $(1+\tau)p$, where p is the producer price and τ is the consumption tax, is equal to the externality effect b^δ in the model:

$$(1+\tau)p = b^\delta \quad \text{or} \quad p = b^\delta/(1+\tau). \tag{4}$$

2.1 Technology

When jurisdiction j develops a new technology, it increases its total factor productivity (TFP) by the constant $a > 1$. Its TFP is then equal to a^{γ_j}, where γ_j is its technology serial number. Given TFP, jurisdiction j is subject to the CES production function $f(l_j, n_j)$ with constant returns to scale, where l_j (n_j) is the input of labor (land):

$$\begin{aligned} &y_j = a^{\gamma_j} f(l_j, n_j), \quad f_l > 0, \quad f_n > 0, \quad f_{ll} < 0, \quad f_{ln} = -f_{ll} l_j / n_j, \\ &f_{nn} = -f_{ln} l_j / n_j = f_{ll} (l_j/n_j)^2, \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

[2] With the general form of the utility function, $\int_T^\infty c_j^{1-\beta} b^\delta e^{-\rho(\theta-T)} d\theta$, where $\beta \in [0,1)$ is a constant, it would be very difficult to find a stationary state in the model.

where the subscript l denotes the partial derivative with respect to l_j (n_j). In this one-good economy, total consumption is equal to total production:

$$\int_0^1 c_j dj = \int_0^1 y_k dk. \tag{6}$$

Because the labor market is competitive, the producer real wage (rent) w_j (r_j) is determined by the marginal product of labor (land):

$$w_j = \partial y_j / \partial l_j = a^{\gamma_j} f_l(l_j, n_j), \quad r_j = \partial y_j / \partial l_j = a^{\gamma_j} f_n(l_j, n_j). \tag{7}$$

Noting (5) and (7), the expenditure shares of land ξ and labor $1 - \xi$ are

$$\frac{w_j l_j}{y_j} = \frac{l_j f_l(l_j, n_j)}{f(l_j, n_j)} = \frac{f_l(l_j/n_j, 1)}{f(l_j/n_j, 1)} = 1 - \xi\left(\frac{l_j}{n_j}\right), \quad \frac{n_j f_n(l_j, n_j)}{f(l_j, n_j)} \doteq \xi\left(\frac{l_j}{n_j}\right). \tag{8}$$

2.2 Research and development

The improvement of technology in jurisdiction j depends on labor devoted to R&D in that jurisdiction, z_j. In a small period of time dt, the probability that R&D will lead to development of a new technology with a jump from γ_j to $\gamma_j + 1$ is given by $\lambda z_j dt$, while the probability that R&D will remain without success is given by $1 - \lambda z_j dt$, where the constant λ is productivity in R&D. Noting (1), this defines a Poisson process χ_j with

$$d\chi_j = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{with probability } \lambda z_j dt, \\ 0 & \text{with probability } 1 - \lambda z_j dt, \end{cases} \quad z_j = 1 - l_j, \tag{9}$$

where $d\chi_j$ is the increment of the process χ_j. The expected growth rate of productivity a^{γ_j} is given by

$$g_j \doteq E\left[\log a^{\gamma_j + 1} - \log a^{\gamma_j}\right] = (\log a)\lambda z_j = (\log a)\lambda(1 - l_j), \tag{10}$$

where E is the expectation operator (cf. Aghion and Howitt 1998, p. 59).

2.3 The central planner

The central planner does not observe the level of productivity, a^{γ_j}, but observes the producer real wage w_j and the producer rent r_j in each jurisdiction

j. I assume that the only revenue-raising tax is the tax τ on consumption expenditure $p \int_0^1 c_k dk$, where p is the consumption price and c_k consumption in jurisdiction k.[3] With a subsidy η to R&D expenditure $w_j z_j$ and a subsidy s to expenditure on conserved land, $r_j b_j$, the central planner's budget is

$$\tau \int_0^1 c_k dk = \int_0^1 (\eta w_j z_j + s r_j b_j) dj. \tag{11}$$

The central planner decides on the minimum proportion of conserved land, $\underline{b}$, for all jurisdictions j:

$$b_j \geq \underline{b} \in [0,1] \text{ for } j \in [0,1]. \tag{12}$$

When this constraint is binding, the planner exercises *direct regulation*.

In order to avoid multiple equilibria, I assume that the jurisdictions are biased for a low tax rate:

Assumption 1 *If the jurisdictions face two candidates for the central planner so that both of these offer the same level of welfare for them but with a different tax rate* τ*, then they vote for the one with a lower tax rate* τ*.*

3 Jurisdictions

Jurisdiction j pays political contributions R_j to the central planner. I assume, for simplicity, that the central planner consists of civil servants, of which a constant proportion $g_j \in [0,1]$ inhabits jurisdiction j. It is then true that

$$\int_0^1 g_k dk = 1. \tag{13}$$

Thus, each jurisdiction j gets a constant share g_j of total contributions

$$R = \int_0^1 R_k dk. \tag{14}$$

[3]This corresponds well to the institutions of the EU.

Without political contributions, jurisdiction j earns output y_j and subsidies $\eta w_j z_j + s r_j b_j$ in terms of the consumption good. Given the consumption tax τ, this income is in terms of consumption equal to $(\eta w_j z_j + s r_j b_j)/(1+\tau)$. Noting (1), (5) and (7), the ratio of this 'legal' income relative to productivity, a^{γ_j}, is defined as follows:

$$
\begin{aligned}
&(y_j + \eta w_j z_j + s r_j b_j)/[(1+\tau)a^{\gamma_j}] \\
&= \big[f(l_j, n_j) + \eta z_j f_l(l_j, n_j) + s f_n(l_j, n_j) b_j\big]/(1+\tau) \\
&= \big[f(l_j, 1-b_j) + (1-l_j)\eta f_l(l_j, 1-b_j) + s f_n(l_j, 1-b_j) b_j\big]/(1+\tau) \\
&\doteq \phi(l_j, b_j, s, \eta, \tau).
\end{aligned} \tag{15}
$$

The budget constraint of jurisdiction j is given by

$$(1+\tau)pc_j = p(y_j + \eta w_j z_j + s r_j b_j) + g_j R - R_j, \tag{16}$$

where c_j is consumption, τ the consumption tax, p the price of the consumption good, $y_j + \eta w_j z_j + s r_j b_j$ the 'legal' income, R_j the contributions to the central planner and $g_j R$ the proportion of total contributions in jurisdiction j. Noting (4), (15) and (16), consumption in jurisdiction j is determined by

$$
\begin{aligned}
c_j &= (y_j + \eta w_j z_j + s r_j b_j)/(1+\tau) + (g_j R - R_j)/[p(1+\tau)] \\
&= a^{\gamma_j}\phi(l_j, b_j, s, \eta, \tau) + (g_j R - R_j) b^{-\delta}.
\end{aligned} \tag{17}
$$

Noting (3) and (17), the expected utility of jurisdiction j starting at time T is given by

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Gamma_j &= E\int_T^\infty c_j b^\delta e^{-\rho(\theta-T)} d\theta \\
&= E\int_T^\infty a^{\gamma_j}\frac{b^\delta}{1+\tau}\phi(l_j, b_j, s, \eta, \tau) e^{-\rho(\theta-T)} d\theta + \frac{g_j R - R_j}{\rho},
\end{aligned} \tag{18}
$$

where E is the expectation operator. Jurisdiction j maximizes (18) by labor input l_j and conserved land b_j subject to technical change (9) and the regulatory constraint (12), taking the tax τ, the subsidies (s, η), biodiversity b, and the contributions (R_j, R) as given. This maximization and the symmetry throughout the regions $j \in [0,1]$ imply the results (cf. Appendix A):

(i) $l_j = l,\ b_j = b$ *and* $n_j = 1 - b_j = 1 - b$ *for* $j \in [0,1]$, (19)

(ii) the equilibrium value of the function ϕ*:*

$$\phi(l, b, s, \eta, \tau) = f(l, 1-b), \tag{20}$$

(iii) the first-order condition for conserved land b_j*:*

$$(1-s)\xi\left(\frac{l}{1-b}\right) = \left[(1-l)\eta - \frac{slb}{1-b}\right]\frac{l f_{ll}(l,1-b)}{f(l,1-b)} \quad \text{for } b > \underline{b}, \tag{21}$$

(iv) the first-order condition for labor input in production, l_j*:*

$$(1-\eta)\left[1 - \xi\left(\frac{l}{1-b}\right)\right] + \left[(1-l)\eta - \frac{slb}{1-b}\right]\frac{l f_{ll}(l,1-b)}{f(l,1-b)} = \frac{(a-1)\lambda l}{\rho + (1-a)\lambda(1-l)}, \tag{22}$$

(iv) the value function Γ_j*:*

$$\Gamma_j(b, \gamma_j, s, \eta, \tau, R, R_j), \quad \partial\Gamma_j/\partial R_j = -1/\rho,$$

$$\frac{\partial \Gamma_j}{\partial b} = \frac{b^{\delta-1}\Omega_j}{1+\tau}\left[\frac{b}{1-b}\left\{(s-1)\xi\left(\frac{l}{1-b}\right) + \left[(1-l)\eta - \frac{sl}{1-b}\right]\frac{l f_{ll}(l,1-b)}{f(l,1-b)}\right\} + \delta\right] \quad \text{for } b = \underline{b},$$

$$\frac{\partial \Gamma_j}{\partial b} = \frac{b^{\delta}}{1+\tau}\delta\frac{\Omega_j}{b} = \delta\frac{b^{\delta-1}\Omega_j}{1+\tau} \quad \text{for } b > \underline{b}, \tag{23}$$

where Ω_j is the maximum value of $E\int_T^\infty a^{\gamma_j}\phi e^{-\rho(\theta-T)}d\theta$.

4 The Pareto optimum

Assume a *benevolent* central planner that claims no political contributions, $R_j = 0$ for all j, uses subsidies (s, η) to both R&D and conserved land, and maximizes the expected value of the geometric average of the utility of the jurisdictions in the whole economy:

$$E\int_T^\infty c b^\delta e^{-\rho(\theta-T)}d\theta \quad \text{with} \quad \log c \doteq \int_0^1 \log c_j dj. \tag{24}$$

Because the planner controls the allocation of resources completely by the subsidies (s, η), it attains the Pareto optimum (l^P, b^P) (cf. Appendix B):

$$\left[1 - \xi\left(\frac{l^P}{1-b^P}\right)\right]\left[\rho + (1-a)\lambda(1-l^P)\right] = (a-1)\lambda l^P, \tag{25}$$

$$\frac{b^P}{1-b^P}\xi\left(\frac{l^P}{1-b^P}\right) = \delta. \tag{26}$$

5 Direct regulation

Assume a *self-interested* central planner that has no budget of its own, $s = \eta = \tau = 0$, controls the proportion of conserved land directly by setting $b = \underline{b}$, and maximizes the present value of the expected flow of the political contributions at time T [cf. (13)],[4]

$$E\int_T^\infty \int_0^1 R_j e^{-\rho(\theta-T)} d\theta = \frac{1}{\rho}\int_0^1 R_j dj. \tag{27}$$

In line with Grossman and Helpman (1994), I construct a common agency game as follows. First, the jurisdictions set their political contributions R_j conditional on the central planner's prospective policy b, taking total contributions R as given.[5] Second, the central planner sets b and collects the contributions. Third, the jurisdictions maximize their expected utility given the contributions R_j and R. The game is solved in reverse order: first for a jurisdiction (stage 3) and then for the political equilibrium (stages 2 and 1).

With direct regulation, labor input l_j is the only instrument and (22) the only equilibrium condition for jurisdiction j. Noting (12), the value function

[4]This is a modification of the idea of Grossman and Helpman (1994), who assume that a policy maker's welfare is a linear function of both the political contributions and the utilities of the lobbies. This characterizes the fact that the policy maker cares about (a) its revenue from political contributions and (b) the possibility of being re-elected, which depends of the utility of the electorate (i.e. the members of the lobbies). I simplify this setup by ignoring the utilities of the lobbies. Because the policy instruments must maximize the utility of each lobby in equilibrium [cf. condition (iii) in Appendix C], the results would not change if I used Grossman and Helpman's original welfare function.

[5]The crucial point in the common agency game is that each jurisdiction j can credibly commit itself to its contribution function $R_j(b)$.

(23) and the equilibrium condition (22) for jurisdiction j take the form

$$\Gamma_j(b^R, \gamma_j, 0, 0, 0, R, R_j), \tag{28}$$

$$(a-1)\lambda l^R = \left[\rho + (1-a)\lambda(1-l^R)\right]\left[1 - \xi\left(\frac{l^R}{1-b^R}\right)\right]. \tag{29}$$

The central planner maximizes the present value (27). Each jurisdiction j maximizes the value of its optimal program, (28), by influencing the central planner by its contributions R_j, but taking total contributions R as given. Because b^R is a policy and $R_j(b^R)$ the strategy of jurisdiction j, the equilibrium conditions of this game are [cf. (*ii*) and (*iii*) in Appendix C]

$$b = \arg\max_{b^R} \frac{1}{\rho}\int_0^1 R_j(b^R)dj, \tag{30}$$

$$b = \arg\max_{b^R} \Gamma_j(b^R, \gamma_j, 0, 0, 0, R, R_j(b^R)) \text{ for } j \in [0,1]. \tag{31}$$

With (23) and $\eta = s = \tau = 0$, the condition (31) is equivalent to

$$0 = \frac{\partial \Gamma_j}{\partial b} + \frac{\partial \Gamma_j}{\partial R_j}R_j' = (b^R)^{\delta-1}\Omega_j\left[-\frac{b^R}{1-b^R}\xi\left(\frac{l^R}{1-b^R}\right) + \delta\right] - \frac{1}{\rho}R_j'$$

and

$$R_j' = \rho(b^R)^{\delta-1}\Omega_j\left[\delta - \frac{b^R}{1-b^R}\xi\left(\frac{l^R}{1-b^R}\right)\right]. \tag{32}$$

Finally, given (32), the condition (30) is equivalent to

$$0 = \frac{1}{\rho}\int_0^1 R_j' dj = \left[\delta - \frac{b^R}{1-b^R}\xi\left(\frac{l^R}{1-b^R}\right)\right](b^R)^{\delta-1}\int_0^1 \Omega_j dj. \tag{33}$$

This and the equation (29) satisfy the conditions (25) and (26). I conclude:

Proposition 1 *Direct regulation is Pareto optimal,* $(l^R, b^R) = (l^P, b^P)$.

The central planner, benevolent or self-interested, eliminates the externality due to biodiversity as a macroeconomic decision-maker.

6 Conservation subsidies

Assume a self-interested central planner that imposes the conservation subsidy s. Assume furthermore that because the planner cannot fully distinguish between R&D and other labor expenditures, the R&D subsidy η is incentive incompatible. Without losing any generality, I can then choose $\eta = 0$.

In this common agency game, the subsidy s is public policy instrument. With $\eta = 0$, the value function (23) and the equilibrium conditions (21) and (22) for jurisdiction j become

$$\Gamma_j(b^S, \gamma_j, s, 0, \tau, R, R_j), \tag{34}$$

$$s\frac{(l^S)^2 b^S f_{ll}(l^S, 1-b^S)}{(1-b^S)f(l^S, 1-b^S)} = (s-1)\xi\left(\frac{l^S}{1-b^S}\right), \tag{35}$$

$$\frac{(a-1)\lambda l^S}{\rho + (1-a)\lambda(1-l^S)} = 1 - \xi - \frac{s(l^S)^2 f_{ll}}{(1-b^S)f} = 1 - s\xi\left(\frac{l^S}{1-b^S}\right). \tag{36}$$

In this setup, the budget constraint (11) becomes (cf. Appendix D)

$$\tau = \frac{sb^S}{1-b^S}\xi\left(\frac{l^S}{1-b^S}\right). \tag{37}$$

In the three equations (35), (36) and (37), there are three unknown variables τ, l^S and b^S, and one known variable s. This system defines the functions

$$\tau(s), \quad l^S(s), \quad b^S(s). \tag{38}$$

Unfortunately, the derivatives of these functions are mathematically ambiguous. For this reason, I make the plausible assumption that the direct effect of the subsidy s dominates. This implies that the following holds true:

Assumption 2 *An increase in the subsidy s to conserved land increases both the supply of conserved land, $(b^S)' > 0$, and the tax that is needed for financing the increase of the subsidy, $\tau' > 0$.*

The central planner maximizes the present value of the expected flow of the political contributions at time T, (27). Jurisdiction j maximizes the value of its optimal program, (34), by influencing the central planner by its contributions R_j, but taking total contributions R as given. Because s is a policy and $R_j(s)$ the strategy of jurisdiction j, then, given (38), the equilibrium conditions are [cf. (ii) and iii) in Appendix C]:

$$s = \arg\max_s \frac{1}{\rho}\int_0^1 R_j(s)dj, \tag{39}$$

$$s = \arg\max_s \Gamma_j\big(b, \gamma_j, s, 0, \tau(s), R, R_j(s)\big) \text{ for } j \in [0,1]. \tag{40}$$

From (5), (8) and (35) it follows that conserved land is subsidized:

$$s = \Bigg[\underbrace{\xi}_{+} - \underbrace{\frac{(l^S)^2 b^S f_{ll}}{(1-b^S)f}}_{-}\Bigg]^{-1} \underbrace{\xi}_{+} > 0.$$

Given (37), this subsidy $s > 0$ must be financed by the wage tax $\tau > 0$. To show that $(l^S, b^S) \neq (l^P, b^P)$, assume $(l^S, b^S) = (l^P, b^P)$. In that case, relations (25), (36) and (38) lead to the following contradiction:

$$0 = 1 - \xi\left(\frac{l^P}{1-b^P}\right) - \frac{(a-1)\lambda l^P}{\rho + (1-a)\lambda(1-l^P)} =$$

$$1 - \xi\left(\frac{l^S}{1-b^S}\right) - \frac{(a-1)\lambda l^S}{\rho + (1-a)\lambda(1-l^S)} = \frac{s l^S}{1-b^S}\frac{l^S f_{ll}(l^S, 1-b^S)}{f(l^S, 1-b^S)} \neq 0.$$

Thus, $(l^S, b^S) \neq (l^P, b^P)$ holds true. This and Proposition 1 imply that:

Proposition 2 *The equilibrium with conservation subsidies is Pareto sub-optimal,* $(l^S, b^S) \neq (l^P, b^P)$. *Consequently, a switch from regulation to conservation subsidies decreases welfare.*

Because the equilibrium (l^S, b^S) is Pareto suboptimal, then the same welfare can be attained by two tax rates τ (with corresponding subsidies s):

- With a higher tax rate τ, the subsidy s is higher and consequently, the amount of conserved land is bigger than at Pareto optimum, $b^S > b^P$.

- With a lower tax rate τ, the subsidy s is lower and consequently, the amount of conserved land is smaller than at Pareto optimum, $b^S < b^P$.

Given Assumption 1, the highest feasible tax is the tax corresponding to the Pareto optimum. Thus, only the equilibrium with a lower tax rate, $b^S < b^P$, is feasible. Given this, Assumption 2 and Proposition 2, I conclude:

Proposition 3 *A switch from direct regulation into conservation subsidies decreases both the growth rate (i.e. $g^R = g^P > g^S$) and biodiversity in each jurisdiction (i.e. $b^R = b^P > b^S$).*

Because any inefficiency decreases the resources of the economy, there are less resources to be put into R&D and the conservation of biodiversity.

7 Conclusions

This paper considers an economy in which the conservation of land yields utility through biodiversity, firms improve their efficiency by in-house R&D and local interest groups lobby a self-interested central planner over biodiversity management. I compare two policy alternatives: the regulation of land use and subsidies for conserved land. The main findings are the following.

In the case of regulation, the central planner determines the use of land throughout the whole economy, fully internalizing the externality through biodiversity. With subsidies, revenue-raising taxes cause distortions. For this reason, a shift from subsidies to direct regulation increases the resources of the jurisdictions, promoting investment in R&D and economic growth. The transfer of labor from production to R&D decreases the demand for land in production. This promotes the conservation of land and biodiversity.

While a great deal of caution should be exercised when a highly stylized game-theoretical model is used to derive results on growth and biodiversity, the following conclusion seems to be justified. The prospect of lobbying changes the outcome of biodiversity management fundamentally. A larger package of policy instruments leads to Pareto improvement with a benevolent central planner, but to Pareto worsening with a self-interested one. In the case of Natura 2000, for instance, regulation without any budget may be an appropriate degree of authority for the Commission. Greater authority narrows biodiversity and slows down economic growth.

Appendix

A Equations (21) and (22) and function (23)

Noting (5) and (8), the function (15) has the partial derivatives:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial\phi}{\partial b_j} &= (s-1)f_n(l_j,1-b_j) - (1-l_j)\eta f_{ln}(l_j,1-b_j) - sf_{nn}(l_j,1-b_j)b_j \\ &= \left\{(s-1)\xi\left(\frac{l_j}{1-b_j}\right) + \left[(1-l_j)\eta - \frac{sl_jb_j}{1-b_j}\right]\frac{l_jf_{ll}(l_j,1-b_j)}{f(l_j,1-b_j)}\right\} \\ &\quad\times\frac{f(l_j,1-b_j)}{1-b_j} = 0 \text{ for } b > \underline{b}, \qquad (41)\\ \frac{\partial\phi}{\partial l_j} &= (1-\eta)f_l(l_j,1-b_j) + (1-l_j)\eta f_{ll}(l_j,1-b_j) + sf_{ln}(l_j,1-b_j)b_j \\ &= (1-\eta)\left[1-\xi\left(\frac{l_j}{1-b_j}\right)\right]\frac{f(l_j,1-b_j)}{l_j} \\ &\quad + \left[(1-l_j)\eta - \frac{sl_jb_j}{1-b_j}\right]f_{ll}(l_j,1-b_j). \qquad (42)\end{aligned}$$

The maximization of the expected utility (18) by (l_j, b_j) s.t. (9) and (12), given $(\tau, s, \eta, b, R_j, R)$, is equivalent to the maximization of

$$E\int_T^\infty a^{\gamma_j}\frac{b^\delta}{1+\tau}\phi(l_j,b_j,s,\eta,\tau)e^{-\rho(\theta-T)}d\theta$$

s.t. (9) and (12), given $(\tau, s, \eta, b, R_j, R)$. The value of this optimal program starting at time T is

$$\Omega_j(\gamma_j,\underline{b},s,\eta,\tau) \doteq \max_{(l_j,b_j)\text{ s.t. }(9),(12)} E\int_T^\infty \frac{b^\delta}{1+\tau}a^{\gamma_j}\phi(l_j,b_j,s,\eta,\tau)e^{-\rho(\theta-T)}d\theta. \qquad (43)$$

The Bellman equation corresponding to the optimal program (43) is given by (cf. Dixit and Pindyck 1994)

$$\rho\Omega_j = \max_{(l_j, b_j)\text{ s.t. (9)}} \Lambda^j(l_j, b_j, \gamma_j, \underline{b}, s, \eta, \tau), \tag{44}$$

where

$$\Lambda^j(l_j, b_j, \gamma_j, \underline{b}, s, \eta, \tau) =$$
$$\frac{b^\delta}{1+\tau} a^{\gamma_j} \phi(l_j, b_j, s, \eta, \tau) + \lambda(1 - l_j)\big[\Omega_j(\gamma_j + 1, \underline{b}, s, \eta, \tau) - \Omega_j(\gamma_j, \underline{b}, s, \eta, \tau)\big]. \tag{45}$$

The first-order conditions corresponding to the Bellman equation (44) and (45) are $\partial\Lambda^j/\partial l_j = 0$ and $\partial\Lambda^j/\partial b_j = 0$. To solve the dynamic program, I assume that the value of the program, Ω_j, is in fixed proportion to the instantaneous utility at the optimum:

$$\Omega_j(\gamma_j, \underline{b}, s, \eta, \tau) = \varphi_j \frac{b^\delta}{1+\tau} a^{\gamma_j} \phi(l_j^*, b_j, s, \eta, \tau) \text{ with } b_j = b_j^* \text{ for } b_j > \underline{b}, \tag{46}$$

where φ_j is a constant and l_j^* and b_j^* are the optimal values of l_j and b_j. From (46) it follows that

$$\Omega_j(\gamma_j + 1, \underline{b}, s, \eta, \tau)/\Omega_j(\gamma_j, \underline{b}, s, \eta, \tau) = a. \tag{47}$$

Inserting (46) and (47) into the Bellman equation (44) and (45) yields

$$1/\varphi_j = \rho + (1 - a)\lambda(1 - l_j) > 0. \tag{48}$$

Noting (41), (42), (45), (47) and (48), the first-order conditions corresponding to the maximization (44) are given by

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{\Omega_j}\frac{\partial\Lambda^j}{\partial b_j} = \frac{b^\delta a^{\gamma_j}}{\Omega_j}\frac{\partial\phi}{\partial b_j} &= \frac{b^\delta a^{\gamma_j}}{(1+\tau)\Omega_j}\frac{f(l_j, 1-b_j)}{1-b_j}\Bigg\{(s-1)\xi\left(\frac{l_j}{1-b_j}\right) \\ &+ \left[(1-l_j)\eta - \frac{sl_j}{1-b_j}\right]\frac{l_j f_{ll}(l_j, 1-b_j)}{f(l_j, 1-b_j)}\Bigg\} = 0 \text{ for } b > \underline{b},\end{aligned} \tag{49}$$

$$\frac{1}{\Omega_j}\frac{\partial\Lambda^j}{\partial l_j} = \frac{b^\delta a^{\gamma_j}}{(1+\tau)\Omega_j}\frac{\partial\phi}{\partial l_j} - \lambda\left[\frac{\Omega_j(\gamma_j + 1, \underline{b}, s, \eta, \tau)}{\Omega_j(\gamma_j, \underline{b}, s, \eta, \tau)} - 1\right] = \frac{1}{\varphi_j\phi}\frac{\partial\phi}{\partial l_j} - (a-1)\lambda$$

$$= \big[\rho + (1-a)\lambda(1-l_j)\big]\frac{1}{\phi}\frac{\partial\phi}{\partial l_j} - (a-1)\lambda$$
$$= \big[\rho + (1-a)\lambda(1-l_j)\big]\frac{f(l_j,1-b_j)}{(1+\tau)\phi}\bigg\{(1-\eta)\bigg[1-\xi\bigg(\frac{l_j}{1-b_j}\bigg)\bigg]\frac{1}{l_j}$$
$$+\bigg[(1-l_j)\eta - \frac{sl_jb_j}{1-b_j}\bigg]\frac{f_{ll}(l_j,1-b_j)}{f(l_j,1-b_j)}\bigg\} - (a-1)\lambda = 0. \tag{50}$$

In the system consisting of the central planner budget (11) and the first-order conditions (49) and (50) for all jurisdictions $j\in[0,1]$, there is symmetry throughout $j\in[0,1]$. This implies $l_j = l$ and $b_j = b$ for $j\in[0,1]$. From this, (1), (5), (6), (13), (14), (15) and (17) it follows that

$$\phi(l,b,s,\eta,\tau) = \int_0^1 a^{\gamma_j}\phi(l,b,s,\eta,\tau)dj\Big/\int_0^1 a^{\gamma_k}dk$$
$$= \bigg[\int_0^1 a^{\gamma_j}\phi(l,b,s,\eta,\tau)dj + b^{-\delta}\underbrace{\int_0^1 (g_jR-R_j)dj}_{=0}\bigg]\Big/\int_0^1 a^{\gamma_k}dk$$
$$= \int_0^1 \big[a^{\gamma_j}\phi(l,b,s,\eta,\tau) + (g_jR-R_j)b^{-\delta}\big]dj\Big/\int_0^1 a^{\gamma_k}dk$$
$$= \int_0^1 c_j dj\Big/\int_0^1 a^{\gamma_k}dk = \int_0^1 y_j dj\Big/\int_0^1 a^{\gamma_k}dk = f(l,1-b). \tag{51}$$

This implies (20). Inserting (51), $l_j = l$ and $b_j = b$ back to (49) and (50) yields (21) and (22).

Noting $l_j = l$, $b_j = b$, (15), (43), (46) and (51), the expected utility of jurisdiction j, (18), can be written as follows:

$$\Gamma_j(b,\gamma_j,\underline{b},s,\eta,\tau,R,R_j) \doteq \Omega_j(\gamma_j,\underline{b},s,\eta,\tau) + (g_jR-R_j)/\rho, \quad \frac{\partial\Gamma_j}{\partial R_j} = -\frac{1}{\rho},$$
$$\frac{\partial\Gamma_j}{\partial\underline{b}}\bigg|_{b=\underline{b}} = \frac{b^\delta}{1+\tau}\bigg[\frac{\partial\Omega_j}{\partial b_j} + \delta\frac{\Omega_j}{b}\bigg] = \frac{b^\delta}{1+\tau}\bigg[\frac{\Omega_j}{\phi}\frac{\partial\phi}{\partial b_j} + \delta\frac{\Omega_j}{b}\bigg]$$
$$= \frac{b^\delta}{1+\tau}\bigg\{\frac{\Omega_j}{\phi}\big[(s-1)f_n - (1-l_j)\eta f_{ln} - sf_{nn}\big] + \delta\frac{\Omega_j}{b}\bigg\}$$
$$= \frac{b^\delta\Omega_j}{1+\tau}\bigg[\frac{1}{\phi}\bigg\{(s-1)\frac{f(l_j,1-b_j)}{1-b_j}\xi + \bigg[(1-l)\eta - \frac{sl}{1-b}\bigg]\frac{lf_{ll}}{1-b}\bigg\} + \frac{\delta}{b}\bigg]$$

$$= \frac{b^\delta \Omega_j}{1+\tau}\left[\frac{f(l,1-b)}{(1-b)\phi(l,b,s,\eta,\tau)}\left\{(s-1)\xi + \left[(1-l)\eta - \frac{slb}{1-b}\right]\frac{l f_{ll}}{f}\right\} + \frac{\delta}{b}\right]$$

$$= \frac{b^{\delta-1}\Omega_j}{1+\tau}\left[\frac{b}{1-b}\left\{(s-1)\xi\left(\frac{l}{1-b}\right) + \left[(1-l)\eta - \frac{slb}{1-b}\right]\frac{l f_{ll}(l,1-b)}{f(l,1-b)}\right\} + \delta\right],$$

$$\frac{\partial \Gamma_j}{\partial b} = \frac{b^\delta}{1+\tau}\delta\frac{\Omega_j}{b} = \delta\frac{b^{\delta-1}\Omega_j}{1+\tau} \text{ for } b > \underline{b}.$$

B Equations (25) and (26)

The average serial number of technology in the economy is given by

$$\gamma = \int_0^1 \gamma_j dj. \tag{52}$$

Given the Poisson property of the improvement of technology in jurisdictions $j \in [0,1]$ (cf. Subsection 2.2), one obtains the following. In a small period of time dt, the probability that R&D will lead a jump from γ to $\gamma+1$ is given by $\lambda z\, dt$, while the probability that R&D will remain without success is given by $1-\lambda z\, dt$. Noting (9), this defines a Poisson process χ with

$$d\chi = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{with probability } \lambda(1-l)dt, \\ 0 & \text{with probability } 1-\lambda(1-l)dt, \end{cases} \qquad l \doteq \int_0^1 l_j dj, \tag{53}$$

where $d\chi$ is the increment of the process χ.

Because there is perfect symmetry throughout jurisdictions $j \in [0,1]$ in the system (2), (53), (21) and (22), there is $l_j = l = l^P$ and $b_j = b = b^P$ for $j \in [0,1]$ in equilibrium. Because there is one-to-one correspondence from (η, s) to (l^P, b^P), one can replace the subsidies (η, s) by (l^P, b^P) as the central planner's policy instruments. Thus, the central planner maximizes (24) by (l^P, b^P) s.t. technical change (53). Noting (5), (17) and (52), one obtains the value function of this maximization as follows:

$$\Delta(l^P, b^P) \doteq E\int_T^\infty c b^\delta e^{-\rho(\theta-T)} d\theta = f(l^P, 1-b^P)(b^P)^\delta E\int_T^\infty a^\gamma e^{-\rho(\theta-T)} d\theta$$
$$= \frac{f(l^P, 1-b^P)(b^P)^\delta}{\rho + (1-a)\lambda l^P}.$$

Noting (8), this leads to the first-order conditions

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial \log \Delta}{\partial l^P} &= \frac{f_l(l^P, 1-b^P)}{f(l^P, 1-b^P)} + \frac{(1-a)\lambda}{\rho + (1-a)\lambda l^P} \\
&= \frac{1}{l^P}\left[1 - \xi\left(\frac{l^P}{b^P}\right)\right] + \frac{(1-a)\lambda}{\rho + (1-a)\lambda l^P} = 0, \\
\frac{\partial \log \Delta}{\partial l^P} &= \frac{\delta}{b^P} - \frac{f_m(l^P, 1-b^P)}{f(l^P, 1-b^P)} = \frac{\delta}{b^P} - \frac{1}{1-b^P}\xi\left(\frac{l^P}{b^P}\right) = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

These equations imply (25) and (26).

C The lobbying game

Following Dixit, Grossman and Helpman (1997), a subgame perfect Nash equilibrium for this game is a policy ζ and a set of contribution schedules $R_1(\zeta), ..., R_J(\zeta)$ such that the following conditions $(i) - (iv)$ hold:

(i) Contributions R_j are non-negative but no more than the contributor's income, $\Gamma_j \geq 0$.

(ii) The policy ζ maximizes the central planner's welfare (27) taking the contribution schedules R_j as given.

(iii) Jurisdiction j cannot have a viable strategy $R_j(\zeta)$ that yields it a higher level of utility than in equilibrium, given the others' contributions.

(iv) Jurisdiction j provides the central planner at least with the level of utility as in the case in which it offers nothing ($R_j = 0$), and the central planner responds optimally given the contribution functions of the other jurisdictions.

D Equation (37)

Given $\eta = 0$, (7), (8), (13), (14), (17), (19) and (20), the central planner budget constraint (11) becomes

$$\tau = \frac{\int_0^1 (\eta w_j z_j + s r_j b_j) dj}{\int_0^1 c_k dk} = \frac{s \int_0^1 r_j b_j dj}{\int_0^1 c_k dk} = \frac{s \int_0^1 a^{\gamma_j} f_n(l_j, n_j) b_j dj}{\int_0^1 c_k dk}$$

$$= \frac{s \int_0^1 a^{\gamma_j} f_n(l_j, n_j) b_j dj}{\int_0^1 a^{\gamma_k} \phi(l_k, b_k, s, \eta, \tau) dk + \underbrace{\int_0^1 (g_k R - R_k) b^{-\delta} dk}_{=0}} = \frac{s \int_0^1 a^{\gamma_j} f_n(l_j, n_j) b_j dj}{\int_0^1 a^{\gamma_k} \phi(l_k, b_k, s, \eta, \tau) dk}$$

$$= s \frac{f_n(l^S, 1 - b^S) b^S}{\phi(l^S, b^S, s, 0, \tau)} = s \frac{f_n(l^S, 1 - b^S) b^S}{f(l^S, 1 - b^S)} = \frac{s b^S}{1 - b^S} \xi \left(\frac{l^S}{1 - b^S} \right).$$

References

Aghion P, Howitt P (1998) Endogenous growth theory. MIT Press, Cambridge (Mass.)

Barbier EB, Schulz C-E (1997) Wildlife, biodiversity and trade. Environment and development economics 2(2):145–172

Dixit A, Pindyck K (1994) Investment under Uncertainty. Princeton University Press, Princeton

Dixit A, Grossman GM, Helpman E (1997) Common agency and coordination: general theory and application to management policy making. Journal of political economy 105(4):752–769

Endres A, Radke V (1999) Land use, biodiversity, and sustainability. Journal of economics 70(1):1–16

Grossman G, Helpman E (1994) Protection for sale. American economic review 84(4):833–850

Johal S, Ulph A (2002) Globalization, lobbying, and international environmental governance. Review of international economics 10(3):387–403

Jordan AJ (1998) Step change or stasis? EC environmental policy after the Amsterdam summit. Environmental politics 7(1):227–236

MacArthur R, Wilson EO (1967) The theory of island biography. Princeton University Press, Princeton

Majone G (1996) Regulating europe. Routledge, London

Ledoux L, Crooks S, Jordan A, Turner K (2000) Implementing EU biodiversity policy: UK experiences. Land use policy 17(4):257–268

Ostermann OP (1998) The need for management of nature conservation sites designated under Natura 2000. Journal of applied ecology 35(6):968–973

Rowthorn B, Brown G (1999) When a high discount rate encourages biodiversity. International economic review 40(2): 315–332

Swanson TM (1994) The economics of extinction revisited and revised: a generalized framework for the analysis of the problems of endangered species and biodiversity losses. Oxford economics papers 46(October):800–821

Weber N, Christophersen T (2002) The influence of non-governmental organizations on the creation of Natura 2000 during the European policy process. Forest policy and economics 4(1):1–12