

**The Socio-Economic Value
of Natural Riverbanks
in the Netherlands**

E.C.M. Ruijgrok and E.E.M. Nillesen

NOTA DI LAVORO 64.2004

APRIL 2004

NRM - Natural Resources Management

E.C.M. Ruijgrok and E.E.M. Nillesen, *Witteveen+Bos*

This paper can be downloaded without charge at:

The Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei Note di Lavoro Series Index:
<http://www.feem.it/Feem/Pub/Publications/WPapers/default.htm>

Social Science Research Network Electronic Paper Collection:
<http://ssrn.com/abstract=XXXXXX>

The opinions expressed in this paper do not necessarily reflect the position of
Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei

The Socio-Economic Value of Natural Riverbanks in the Netherlands

Summary

Ecologists and economists both use a different approach to determine the value of nature. Its ecological value can be measured using criteria like rarity and diversity of species in an ecosystem. The economic value can be determined using non-market valuation techniques. This paper focuses on an empirical application of the Contingent Valuation Method (CVM) to find out whether this valuation method is a suitable method to estimate the economic value of natural riverbanks in the Netherlands. Natural riverbanks will provide habitat for species that particularly depend on the land water transit area. Since common riverbanks do not provide this habitat, natural river banks increase biodiversity in the Netherlands. On the basis of technical and ecological characteristics nine different types of natural riverbanks were distinguished. For each type a laymen description was made. This description served as a basis for economic valuation by means of CVM.

The results of the CVM study shows that the average willingness to pay for non-use of a natural riverbank varied between 16 and 25 Dutch guilders per household year. The willingness to pay for recreational use ranged from 1,07 to 2,50 guilders per visit. The generated outcomes proved to be consistent with results from other studies. At first sight, the economic value of natural riverbanks seemed to be higher than their construction and maintenance cost.

Keywords: Nature friendly river banks, Land water interactions, Economic value, Nature, CVM, Non-use value

This paper has been presented at the 4th BioEcon Workshop on “Economic Analysis of Policies for Biodiversity Conservation”, Venice, Italy, August 28-29, 2003, organised on behalf of the BIOECON Network by Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Venice International University (VIU) and University College London (UCL).

Address for correspondence:

E.C.M. Ruijgrok
Witteveen +Bos
P.O. Box 2397
3000 CJ Rotterdam
The Netherlands
E-mail: E.Ruijgrok@witbo.nl

1 Introduction

Management of riverbanks has long been a key concern within Dutch water management policies. The Dutch ministry now aims to have a clear indication of when, and to what extent the riverbanks should regain their natural form and course. To be able to make a trade-off between costs of creating natural riverbanks and the benefits, such as increased biodiversity and increased recreational opportunities, these benefits need to be expressed in monetary terms. Amongst others, the contingent valuation method (CVM) is a technique commonly applied within the field of environmental economics to assess the economic value of nature. The aim of this study was to investigate whether the CVM can be used to include the benefits of increased nature quality in cost-benefit-analyses for natural riverbanks. First, a pilot study has been undertaken for two typical types of riverbanks. Results appeared to be consistent and reliable, and a sequential study has been executed to value six other types of riverbanks.


2. Valuation by means of the Contingent Valuation Method

This chapter presents a short introduction to the socio-economic valuation of nature. In paragraph 2.1 it is explained which components of the total economic value of increased nature quality are measured in this study. Paragraph 2.2. introduces the Contingent Valuation Method and in paragraph 2.3 the limitations of this method are briefly discussed.

2.1 Valuation of natural of natural riverbanks

Natural riverbanks have several benefits, the most important being increased biodiversity and the amenity of recreational enjoyment. The value of natural riverbanks can be determined by investigating which welfare functions nature can perform better when a natural riverbank is constructed or maintained, compared to non-natural, steep riverbanks. Figure 2.1.1 provides an overview of the different welfare functions that make up the total economic value of nature.

Figure 2.1.1 The components of the total economic value of nature



Source: Ruijgrok, 2000.

Nature generates welfare for society by means of use and non-use functions. Consequently, the total economic value of nature consists of several components (Pearce and Moran, 1994; Hanley and Spash, 1997). The total economic value is the sum of the use value and the non-use value. The use value comprises a direct use value and an indirect use value. The non-use value consists of an option value, an existence value and a bequest value.

Direct use values pertain to tradable goods such as fish and wood (production values) and to services such as the possibilities for recreationists to enjoy natural beauty (information values). Indirect use values refer to supportive features of ecosystems for direct use, such as climate regulation (regulation values). Option values are values that people attach to keeping the possibility of particular kind of use open for the future, whereas quasi-option values concern some kind of unknown future use. Bequest values pertain to the value people attach to preserve natural assets for future generations. Existence values refer to the fact that people simply want certain functions or species to exist, regardless of whether or not they will ever use them.¹

Natural riverbanks do not contribute substantially to the value of production or regulation functions compared to common river banks. Natural banks mainly perform the non-use function and the information function (read: the recreational perception function) better than common banks. Therefore only these two functions are taken into consideration in this study. Both these functions can be valued by means of CVM.

It seems worth noting that the economic value of nature only pertains to human welfare. Since rational people are willing to pay more for things that bring them much welfare than for things that do not, willingness to pay is an appropriate measure for the value of nature. People from other disciplines and even certain economists (e.g. Dietz *et al.*, 1992) have raised the question whether welfare for humans is the only measure of the value of nature, and whether welfare for other organisms should also be acknowledged? Economic valuation is purely anthropocentric. It does not include an intrinsic value. The latter requires an ecocentric approach. The socio-economic value of nature only captures human welfare, and not welfare of other organisms. Consequently, it seems reasonable not to solely base environmental policies on economic values. The benefits of increased nature quality due natural riverbanks are larger than the economic benefits determined in this study. It might be useful to determine the ecological or intrinsic value of natural riverbanks in addition to its economic value.

2.2 What is CVM?

CVM is a survey method in which respondents are asked how much they are willing to pay for the use or conservation of natural goods². Their stated preferences are assumed to be contingent upon the alternative goods that are offered in a 'hypothetical market'. Essential elements of the survey are: description of the natural good that is to be valued, description of the payment vehicle and description of the hypothetical market (Mitchell and Carson, 1989; Hoevenagel, 1994). *Describing the natural good* includes identifying all valuable attributes of the good. In the case of nature quality related to natural riverbanks, this entails a clear description of the difference between the natural riverbanks and the common riverbanks. The *payment vehicle* pertains to how the money will be paid. For example, one can pay for a good in cash every time it is used or by means of an increased income tax. The *description of the hypothetical market* should include an identification of who will provide and who will pay for the nature improvement. It should be made clear that the payment is a collective action; everybody else will also pay, otherwise respondents may refuse to pay although they appreciate the good. Respondents should also be reminded of the possibility of spending their income on goods other than nature, to prevent overestimates (Hoevenagel, 1994).

¹ Option and quasi-option values may be regarded as use values due to the future use possibilities they imply. They can also be regarded as non-use values, since these values are not realised through actual use.

² Or what compensation they need to be given (i.e. their willingness to accept) in order to accept not being able to use or losing a natural good.

CVM measures stated preferences and it includes the consumers' surplus. It is said to be an appropriate economic valuation method for environmental goods that have no indirect effects on other goods. It is therefore very suited for the valuation of amenities or other easy to perceive aspects of nature, such as natural beauty. CVM does not produce valid measurements when it concerns goods that people are not familiar with. Since natural river banks are not easy to perceive (one can hardly visit them, except by boat) and people are not very familiar with them and their contribution to biodiversity, it is very important to explain the effects of natural riverbanks very well in the CVM-questionnaire.

2.3 Limitations and biases

Although CVM-studies are known to have large data requirements, they do not require secondary data. One can gather all necessary data, i.e. the willingness to pay and its explaining variables such as income and attitude towards nature, by means of one survey (Hoevenagel, 1994).

In CVM-surveys one can encounter various sources of bias, such as samples which are not representative, strategic behaviour of respondents or confusion about the size of the good that is to be valued (part-whole bias). Three main categories of bias can be distinguished:

1. The respondent does not state his or her actual willingness to pay;
2. The design of the questionnaire influences the answers;
3. Unfamiliarity with and difficulty of the questions.

Category 1: The respondent does not state his or her actual willingness to pay

Sometimes respondents do not state their true willingness to pay because they wish to influence the results of the study. This strategic behaviour can be minimised by choosing a realistic payment vehicle. Other times respondents may answer to please the interviewer or in a socially desirable way. This is difficult to prevent, but one can pay attention to giving respondents the opportunity to simply say that they do not agree or are not willing to pay. This is done in the survey design of this study: e.g. respondents are explicitly asked whether they think it is a good idea natural riverbanks are being constructed throughout the Netherlands.

Category 2: The design of the questionnaire influences the answers

The information provided in the questionnaire may influence the willingness to pay. This may happen with closed questions. The starting bid and the range of monetary bids may result in a different willingness to pay than the respondent's actual willingness to pay. To prevent this type of bias, open-ended questions were used in the survey of on natural riverbanks. Of course open-ended questions introduce the risk of relational bias, which means that respondents relate their bids to the prices of other goods. In principle it is okay when they relate entrance fees of nature areas with entrance fees of museums. They can only spend their money once, so they have to choose between different goods. But it becomes problematic when they relate their bid to other things that do not cost anything, such as rain or friendship. Also the payment vehicle may be a source of bias. One must however choose at least one vehicle. When using more vehicles one can determine the sensitivity of the results to the vehicle. One can also register respondents who protest against the selected vehicle. The latter was done in our survey.

Category 3: Unfamiliarity with and difficulty of the questions.

Sometimes respondents do not fully grasp the budget constraint on which they should base their willingness to pay. When it concerns small payments, such as entrance fees for areas, the risk of budget bias is rather small, but when it larger bids are made, such as yearly donations for nature conservation, the risk becomes larger too. Respondent may produce bids they that could never live up to in reality. In the CVM-design of this study, respondents are reminded of the fact that there are other things on which they may wish to spend their income. Other sources of bias pertain to mentioning symbolic values and to not realising that they would actually have to pay the amount (elicitation bias). Also combining questions on the non-use and the (recreational) use value, may lead to biased results, as the answer to the first question influences the answer to the second question. It does, however, save research cost to determine two values in one survey. Finally, an important type of bias is the part-whole bias, which occurs when people value more than they were supposed to. For example, they were asked to value a tree, but they valued the whole forest instead. This can be prevented by using a filter: first, they are asked to value the forest, and than to value the tree. Even if this is done, one cannot fully exclude part whole bias, especially not when valuing such a difficult good, such as natural riverbanks. In the survey design of this study, respondents who are likely to have valued more than just one riverbank, were registered as ‘whole bidders’. It is, however, debatable that part-whole bias can be ascribed to the survey design, because respondents may simply not have additive preferences (Bateman, *et.al*, 1997). In that case one should not even use the word bias.

3 A CVM survey for natural riverbanks

In this chapter, a CVM-survey is set up to determine the non-use value and the recreational perception value of nine different types of natural river banks in the Netherlands. Paragraph 3.1 describes the goods to be valued and the hypothetical market. Paragraph 3.2 provides information about the questionnaire.

3.1 Description of the good and the hypothetical market

A CVM questionnaire was designed to estimate non-use value and the recreational use value of nine different types of natural riverbanks that exist in the Netherlands. The most important ingredients of the questionnaire were a description of natural riverbanks to be valued and the hypothetical market, including a payment vehicle.

Natural riverbanks

A natural riverbank is non steep sandy bank. It is mostly constructed by creating an extra bank inside the river parallel to the existing bank. The protection material (stone or concrete) of original bank material is removed. The extra bank, which is mostly made of stone, separates the river (or canal or lake) from a quiet shallow water area. Depending on the type of bank, the shallow water strip is connected with the river or not.

In the Netherlands nine types of natural banks are distinguished. For each type a location has been selected where the bank can be found. The following types of banks and locations were used in the CVM-study:

- Type 1: River with jetty: Engelse werk
- Type 2: River with extra bank and shallow water strip behind it: Loevesteijn
- Type 3: River without extra bank and with a steep edge: Bocht van Linne
- Type 4: Canal with extra bank and narrow shallow water strip behind it: Helmond
- Type 5: Canal with extra bank and wide shallow water strip behind it: Spaarnwoude
- Type 6: Canal with a perforated dam construction and shallow water area: Noord Hollands Kanaal
- Type 7: Lake with extra bank: Volkerakzoommeer
- Type 8: Tidal water with extra bank: Huys den Donck
- Type 9: Tidal water with nature friendly materials directly applied to the bank: Dijktuin II.

We have chosen to do personal interviews within the vicinity of the chosen locations. We interviewed inhabitants and people who happened to pass by.

Non-use value

The good to be valued was the construction and maintenance of natural riverbanks. For the estimation of the non-use value, which in this case primarily consisted of increased biodiversity, the specific effects on flora and fauna first needed to be assessed. This was done by ecological experts, to ensure that an economic analysis of nature would be based on sound ecological theory. However, it was expected to be too difficult for respondents to grasp all the (technical) effects a natural riverbank might impose on biodiversity. Therefore, the ecological expert description was translated into a laymen description, by means of clear examples of effects on species.

The hypothetical market was kept simple, respondents were asked whether they would be willing to pay an annual donation, to construct and maintain at least one natural riverbank per year.

Perception value

The perception value that is estimated in this CVM-study pertains to recreational use. It is the welfare effect of recreational enjoyment, and not the income generating effect for the recreation sector.

The good to be valued was described and shown on pictures. Respondents were shown one picture of a natural riverbank in the pilot study to visualise the idea of a natural riverbank. The sequel included several pictures of natural riverbanks. Respondent were then requested to rank them for analytical purposes which will be explained in paragraph 3.2.

The hypothetical market included the assumption that an entrance fee was installed for visiting all nature areas in the Netherlands. This was done to indicate that others would also have to pay and that evasion was not possible.

3.2 Questionnaire

The questionnaire for the pilot study included the environmental good, hypothetical market, and payment vehicle as presented in paragraph 3.1. The questionnaire consisted of eight open-ended questions. It started with some general questions like respondents' attitude towards nature, their domicile and postal code. The first introductory question on natural riverbanks is: Do you know what a natural riverbank is? This question is posed to give respondents the opportunity to think about the issue of natural riverbanks, and to perform statistical tests later on to check whether there would be any difference in willingness to pay of people who were already familiar with the concept of natural riverbanks before the interview was held, and those who were not. After this question, respondents are asked several questions concerning the non use value. They were asked whether they considered it a good idea for natural riverbanks to be constructed and maintained throughout the Netherlands. The next question was asked to determine whether or not people would be willing to pay (by means of an annual gift) for construction and maintenance of one specific natural riverbank. If so, they were asked to state the maximum amount they would be willing to pay per year.

Subsequently, respondents were shown a picture of a different natural riverbank which would provide more habitat for species than the first riverbank would. Respondents were asked if they would be willing to pay an equal, higher or lower amount for the construction of this type of riverbank, and if the amount would be different, they were requested to explain the difference.

This was followed by the question whether respondents would be willing to pay for a natural riverbank that would be far away from their own neighbourhood. If not, they were requested to state any reason for not willing to. If they would be willing to pay, they were asked to state the maximum amount.

After this line of question, some questions were asked to make a shift towards the perception value. For example: Do you think there is sufficient nature in the Netherlands, followed by what respondents themselves would consider to be nature.

In order to determine the perception value, several questions were posed: Do you think natural banks contribute to the beauty of rivers and canals? Do you ever use specified natural walking or cycling tracks? Followed by the hypothetical question that in case a walking or cycling track runs through a natural area, or follows a natural riverbank, how much would you be willing to pay to use one of these tracks? And would

the frequency of using one of these tracks remain the same, if you would have to pay the stated amount each and every single time?

Finally, some questions were asked about the respondents' age and income.

The sequel also focussed on comparison between the different riverbanks. Instead of a comparison between two locations like has been done for the pilot study (i.e. the location of Helmond versus Spaarnwoude) several pictures of different types of natural riverbanks were shown, and respondents were requested to rank them according to their preference. An additional question followed in which they were requested to explain their ranking. Otherwise, the questionnaire of the sequel was equal to that of the pilot study.

4 Survey results

On- site interviews for the pilot study were held at two locations during summer of 1999. Interviews for the pilot study in Helmond were held at the housing area and walking and cycling tracks in the proximity of the natural canalbank. Some interviews were held in the towncenter. This was done to find out whether visitors of nature areas respond differently than others. Interviews for Spaarnwoude were held at the recreational area and along a cycling track.

The sequential study took place during summer 2000 at six different locations all in the proximity of the natural riverbank. Data for the pilot have been combined with that of the sequel and was entered into an excel database. In the analysis a distinction has been made between non-use and recreational use values.

4.1 Non-use values

Overall, the majority of respondents (58,8%) was willing to pay for the construction and maintenance of a natural riverbank in the Netherlands. 16% appeared to be a zero bidder, and another 19% was a protest bidder.

Average willingness to pay for all riverbanks is shown displayed in Table 1. The minimum as well as the maximum willingness to pay are shown as well.

Table 1 Average Willingness To Pay for non-use (guilders per household per year)

Riverbank and location	WTP	Sdev	N	MIN	MAX
Type 1: Engelse werk	28.83	29.63	45	0	500,00
Type 2: Loevestein	23.51	28.68	47	0	255,00
Type 3: Bocht v. Linne	15.85	23.48	47	0	250,00
Type 4: Helmond	26.10	28.51	97	0	1000,00
Type 5: Spaarnwoude	24.19	28.14	99	0	120,00
Type 6: NH Kanaal	14.88	27.46	49	0	500,00
Type 7: Volkerak	24.62	27.38	50	0	25,00
Type 8: Huys d. Donck	21.20	27.57	48	0	100,00
Type 9: Dijk tuin II	18.42	31.81	49	0	1000,00
Overall	22.52	28.29	531	0	1000,00

Acronyms: WTP= willingness to pay, SDev= standard deviation, N= number of measurements, Min=minimum, Max= maximum.

According to table 1 the average willingness to pay (wtp) for non-use for each household varies between 14,88 guilders for NH Kanaal to 28,83 guilders for Engelse werk. These amounts are similar to those of earlier studies. Several Dutch CVM-studies with respect to nature conservation reported willingness to pay ranging from 25 guilders to 45 guilders per household (See for example Hoevenagel, 1994; Brouwer and Slangen, 1997)

T-test have been performed to check whether WTP differed significantly between any of the selected riverbank types. It appeared that there was only a significant difference between the willingness to pay for

Engelse werk and Bocht van Linne, and between Engelse werk and NH Kanaal. Differences between other types of riverbanks appeared not be statistically significant due to high standard deviations.

Demographic characteristics like attitude, sex, income, age, and annual visits have been included in the analysis to find out whether they are determinants for the difference in willingness to pay. None of them showed significant correlation with the willingness to pay. Only ‘age’ and ‘attitude’ were positively correlated.

The sequential study included a question in which respondents had to rank the different types of riverbanks according to their preference. The results of ranking were more or less in compliance with people’s willingness to pay.

Costs and benefits

In order to determine the economic non-use value of natural riverbanks the average willingness to per household per year was multiplied by the number of households in the Netherlands willing to pay this average amount. This resulted in an economic non-use value of 150 million guilders per year. Since constructions costs of natural banks amount to several millions per location, one can conclude that the benefits of investing in biodiversity clearly surpass the costs.

4.2 Recreational use values

The majority (58.1%) of respondents was willing to pay for recreational use of a riverbank. 20.1% appeared to be zero bidders, while 19.1% were protest bidders.

Average willingness to pay for recreational use of a natural riverbank has been displayed in table 2.

Table 2 Average willingness to pay for recreational use (guilders per visit)

Riverbank	WTP	SDEV	N	MIN	MAX
Type 1: Engelse werk	1.37	1.61	47	0	10,00
Type 2: Loevestein	1.81	1.68	48	0	7,50
Type 3: Bocht v. Linne	2.50	1.28	49	0	7,50
Type 4: Helmond	1.13	1.52	99	0	10,00
Type 5: Spaarnwoude	1.41	1.50	101	0	5,00
Type 6: NH Kanaal	1.17	1.48	46	0	12,50
Type 7: Volkerak	1.55	1.68	47	0	30,00
Type 8: Huys d. Donck	1.29	1.72	47	0	10,00
Type 9: Dijktuin II	1.07	1.62	42	0	100,00
Overall	1.30	1.55	526	0	100,00

Acronyms: WTP= willingness to pay, SDev= standard deviation, N= number of measurements, Min=minimum, Max= maximum.

Table 2 shows that that the average willingness to pay for the different natural riverbanks ranges from 1.07 guilders for Dijktuin II to 2.50 guilders for de Bocht v. Linne. This is a somewhat remarkable result, as this was amongst the least valued types for non-use. Again, a t-test was performed to test whether the difference would be significant. This appeared not so. With standard deviations generally larger than the coefficients, it then was considered useless to distinguish between the willingness to pay for each type of riverbank. Instead, the overall average of 1.30 guilders was used. Comparing this figure to results from other studies reveals that this is rather low. Ruijgrok (1998) for example reported a willingness to pay ranging from 2 to 4 guilders, for a visit to any of the Dutch coastal zones. Kuik (1991) even found WTP as high as 10 to 15 guilders. The low figure in our case can be however explained by the fact that a riverbank does hardly provide for any recreational opportunities, since it is difficult to access them.

Again, demographic characteristics were being tested for their possible influence on the willingness to pay. Only the variable ‘annual visits’ appeared to be significantly negatively correlated with the willingness to pay. This seems a logical result as willingness to pay is expressed per visit. People who often visit the bank

are likely to pay less than those who only visit once a year. Summed over an entire year the total amount people would have to pay for each and every single visit, would then be extraordinary high.

5. Conclusion

This study aimed to value non-use value pertaining to biodiversity and the recreational perception value of natural riverbanks in the Netherlands. Results showed that some types of riverbanks are valued significantly higher than other types for as far as non-use is concerned. It is therefore recommended for to make a distinction between high-and low valued riverbanks. For the recreational perception value no such distinction could be made. The sample size was sufficient to generate reliable results with respect to non-use values, i.e. results were consistent with those reported from other studies. The sample size was however not sufficient to determine the explaining variables.

The total economic value can eventually be generated by adding up non-use and the recreational perceptions values. However, checking with the empirical results from ranking revealed that beauty was an important criterion for non-use, which implies that recreational perception and non-use cannot be distinguished anymore. On top of this the recreational opportunities are rather limited and the willingness to pay was found to be very low. We therefore recommend to restrict the total economic value calculation to the non-use value. A brief comparison with the costs of constructing and maintaining natural riverbanks, indicated that the economic value of the biodiversity increase provided by natural riverbanks, surpasses the costs. From this, we may conclude that investing the provision of habitat for species dependent on the land water transit area, is an economically sound activity.

Literature

Bateman, I., A. Munro, B. Rhodes, C. Starmer and R. Sugden, "Does part-whole bias exist?", in: *Economic Journal*, Vol. 107, No. 441, pp. 322-332.

Brouwer, R. and L.H.G. Slangen, Contingent valuation of the public benefits of agricultural wildlife management: The case of the Dutch peat meadow land', in: *European Review of Agricultural Economics*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter (1997), pp.1-72.

Dietz, F.J., U. Simonis and J. van der Straaten, *Sustainability and environmental policy*, Berlin: Sigma Verlag (1992).

Hanley, N. and C.L. Spash, *Cost benefit analysis and the environment*, Hants: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited (1993).

Hoevenagel, R., *The Contingent Valuation Method: scope and validity*, Phd-thesis, Amsterdam: Free University (1994).

Kuik, O.J. Benefits of the salvage industry to the southern North Sea, Amsterdam: Institute for Environmental Studies (1991).

Mitchell, R.C., R.T. Carson, *Using Surveys to Value Public Goods, The Contingent Valuation Method*, Washington D.C.: John Hopkins University Press for Resources for the Future (1989).

Pearce, D. and D. Moran, *The Economic Value of Biodiversity*, London: Earthscan Publications Ltd.,

Ruijgrok, E.C.M. Valuation of nature and environment; An overview of Dutch valuation studies, Amsterdam: IVM/VU (1996)

NOTE DI LAVORO DELLA FONDAZIONE ENI ENRICO MATTEI

Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei Working Paper Series

Our Note di Lavoro are available on the Internet at the following addresses:

<http://www.feem.it/Feem/Pub/Publications/WPapers/default.html>

<http://www.ssrn.com/link/feem.html>

NOTE DI LAVORO PUBLISHED IN 2003

PRIV	1.2003	<i>Gabriella CHIESA and Giovanna NICODANO</i> : <u>Privatization and Financial Market Development: Theoretical Issues</u>
PRIV	2.2003	<i>Ibolya SCHINDELE</i> : <u>Theory of Privatization in Eastern Europe: Literature Review</u>
PRIV	3.2003	<i>Wietze LISE, Claudia KEMFERT and Richard S.J. TOL</i> : <u>Strategic Action in the Liberalised German Electricity Market</u>
CLIM	4.2003	<i>Laura MARSILIANI and Thomas I. RENSTRÖM</i> : <u>Environmental Policy and Capital Movements: The Role of Government Commitment</u>
KNOW	5.2003	<i>Reyer GERLAGH</i> : <u>Induced Technological Change under Technological Competition</u>
ETA	6.2003	<i>Efrem CASTELNUOVO</i> : <u>Squeezing the Interest Rate Smoothing Weight with a Hybrid Expectations Model</u>
SIEV	7.2003	<i>Anna ALBERINI, Alberto LONGO, Stefania TONIN, Francesco TROMBETTA and Margherita TURVANI</i> : <u>The Role of Liability, Regulation and Economic Incentives in Brownfield Remediation and Redevelopment: Evidence from Surveys of Developers</u>
NRM	8.2003	<i>Elissaios POPYRAKIS and Reyner GERLAGH</i> : <u>Natural Resources: A Blessing or a Curse?</u>
CLIM	9.2003	<i>A. CAPARRÓS, J.-C. PEREAU and T. TAZDAÏT</i> : <u>North-South Climate Change Negotiations: a Sequential Game with Asymmetric Information</u>
KNOW	10.2003	<i>Giorgio BRUNELLO and Daniele CHECCHI</i> : <u>School Quality and Family Background in Italy</u>
CLIM	11.2003	<i>Efrem CASTELNUOVO and Marzio GALEOTTI</i> : <u>Learning By Doing vs Learning By Researching in a Model of Climate Change Policy Analysis</u>
KNOW	12.2003	<i>Carole MAIGNAN, Gianmarco OTTAVIANO and Dino PINELLI (eds.)</i> : <u>Economic Growth, Innovation, Cultural Diversity: What are we all talking about? A critical survey of the state-of-the-art</u>
KNOW	13.2003	<i>Carole MAIGNAN, Gianmarco OTTAVIANO, Dino PINELLI and Francesco RULLANI (lix)</i> : <u>Bio-Ecological Diversity vs. Socio-Economic Diversity. A Comparison of Existing Measures</u>
KNOW	14.2003	<i>Maddy JANSSENS and Chris STEYAERT (lix)</i> : <u>Theories of Diversity within Organisation Studies: Debates and Future Trajectories</u>
KNOW	15.2003	<i>Tuzin BAYCAN LEVENT, Enno MASUREL and Peter NIJKAMP (lix)</i> : <u>Diversity in Entrepreneurship: Ethnic and Female Roles in Urban Economic Life</u>
KNOW	16.2003	<i>Alexandra BITUSIKOVA (lix)</i> : <u>Post-Communist City on its Way from Grey to Colourful: The Case Study from Slovakia</u>
KNOW	17.2003	<i>Billy E. VAUGHN and Katarina MLEKOV (lix)</i> : <u>A Stage Model of Developing an Inclusive Community</u>
KNOW	18.2003	<i>Selma van LONDEN and Arie de RUIJTER (lix)</i> : <u>Managing Diversity in a Globalizing World</u>
Coalition		
Theory	19.2003	<i>Sergio CURRARINI</i> : <u>On the Stability of Hierarchies in Games with Externalities</u>
Network		
PRIV	20.2003	<i>Giacomo CALZOLARI and Alessandro PAVAN (lx)</i> : <u>Monopoly with Resale</u>
PRIV	21.2003	<i>Claudio MEZZETTI (lx)</i> : <u>Auction Design with Interdependent Valuations: The Generalized Revelation Principle, Efficiency, Full Surplus Extraction and Information Acquisition</u>
PRIV	22.2003	<i>Marco LiCalzi and Alessandro PAVAN (lx)</i> : <u>Tilting the Supply Schedule to Enhance Competition in Uniform-Price Auctions</u>
PRIV	23.2003	<i>David ETTINGER (lx)</i> : <u>Bidding among Friends and Enemies</u>
PRIV	24.2003	<i>Hannu VARTIAINEN (lx)</i> : <u>Auction Design without Commitment</u>
PRIV	25.2003	<i>Matti KELOHARJU, Kjell G. NYBORG and Kristian RYDQVIST (lx)</i> : <u>Strategic Behavior and Underpricing in Uniform Price Auctions: Evidence from Finnish Treasury Auctions</u>
PRIV	26.2003	<i>Christine A. PARLOUR and Uday RAJAN (lx)</i> : <u>Rationing in IPOs</u>
PRIV	27.2003	<i>Kjell G. NYBORG and Ilya A. STREBULAIEV (lx)</i> : <u>Multiple Unit Auctions and Short Squeezes</u>
PRIV	28.2003	<i>Anders LUNANDER and Jan-Eric NILSSON (lx)</i> : <u>Taking the Lab to the Field: Experimental Tests of Alternative Mechanisms to Procure Multiple Contracts</u>
PRIV	29.2003	<i>TangaMcDANIEL and Karsten NEUHOFF (lx)</i> : <u>Use of Long-term Auctions for Network Investment</u>
PRIV	30.2003	<i>Emiel MAASLAND and Sander ONDERSTAL (lx)</i> : <u>Auctions with Financial Externalities</u>
ETA	31.2003	<i>Michael FINUS and Bianca RUNDSHAGEN</i> : <u>A Non-cooperative Foundation of Core-Stability in Positive Externality NTU-Coalition Games</u>
KNOW	32.2003	<i>Michele MORETTO</i> : <u>Competition and Irreversible Investments under Uncertainty</u>
PRIV	33.2003	<i>Philippe QUIRION</i> : <u>Relative Quotas: Correct Answer to Uncertainty or Case of Regulatory Capture?</u>
KNOW	34.2003	<i>Giuseppe MEDA, Claudio PIGA and Donald SIEGEL</i> : <u>On the Relationship between R&D and Productivity: A Treatment Effect Analysis</u>
ETA	35.2003	<i>Alessandra DEL BOCA, Marzio GALEOTTI and Paola ROTA</i> : <u>Non-convexities in the Adjustment of Different Capital Inputs: A Firm-level Investigation</u>

GG	36.2003	<i>Matthieu GLACHANT</i> : <u>Voluntary Agreements under Endogenous Legislative Threats</u>
PRIV	37.2003	<i>Narjess BOUBAKRI, Jean-Claude COSSET and Omrane GUEDHAMI</i> : <u>Postprivatization Corporate Governance: the Role of Ownership Structure and Investor Protection</u>
CLIM	38.2003	<i>Rolf GOLOMBEK and Michael HOEL</i> : <u>Climate Policy under Technology Spillovers</u>
KNOW	39.2003	<i>Slim BEN YOUSSEF</i> : <u>Transboundary Pollution, R&D Spillovers and International Trade</u>
CTN	40.2003	<i>Carlo CARRARO and Carmen MARCHIORI</i> : <u>Endogenous Strategic Issue Linkage in International Negotiations</u>
KNOW	41.2003	<i>Sonia OREFFICE</i> : <u>Abortion and Female Power in the Household: Evidence from Labor Supply</u>
KNOW	42.2003	<i>Timo GOESCHL and Timothy SWANSON</i> : <u>On Biology and Technology: The Economics of Managing Biotechnologies</u>
ETA	43.2003	<i>Giorgio Busetti and Matteo MANERA</i> : <u>STAR-GARCH Models for Stock Market Interactions in the Pacific Basin Region, Japan and US</u>
CLIM	44.2003	<i>Katrin MILLOCK and Céline NAUGES</i> : <u>The French Tax on Air Pollution: Some Preliminary Results on its Effectiveness</u>
PRIV	45.2003	<i>Bernardo BORTOLOTTI and Paolo PINOTTI</i> : <u>The Political Economy of Privatization</u>
SIEV	46.2003	<i>Elbert DIJKGRAAF and Herman R.J. VOLLEBERGH</i> : <u>Burn or Bury? A Social Cost Comparison of Final Waste Disposal Methods</u>
ETA	47.2003	<i>Jens HORBACH</i> : <u>Employment and Innovations in the Environmental Sector: Determinants and Econometrical Results for Germany</u>
CLIM	48.2003	<i>Lori SNYDER, Nolan MILLER and Robert STAVINS</i> : <u>The Effects of Environmental Regulation on Technology Diffusion: The Case of Chlorine Manufacturing</u>
CLIM	49.2003	<i>Lori SNYDER, Robert STAVINS and Alexander F. WAGNER</i> : <u>Private Options to Use Public Goods. Exploiting Revealed Preferences to Estimate Environmental Benefits</u>
CTN	50.2003	<i>László Á. KÓCZY and Luc LAUWERS</i> (Ixi): <u>The Minimal Dominant Set is a Non-Empty Core-Extension</u>
CTN	51.2003	<i>Matthew O. JACKSON</i> (Ixi): <u>Allocation Rules for Network Games</u>
CTN	52.2003	<i>Ana MAULEON and Vincent VANNETELBOSCH</i> (Ixi): <u>Farsightedness and Cautiousness in Coalition Formation</u>
CTN	53.2003	<i>Fernando VEGA-REDONDO</i> (Ixi): <u>Building Up Social Capital in a Changing World: a network approach</u>
CTN	54.2003	<i>Matthew HAAG and Roger LAGUNOFF</i> (Ixi): <u>On the Size and Structure of Group Cooperation</u>
CTN	55.2003	<i>Tajji FURUSAWA and Hideo KONISHI</i> (Ixi): <u>Free Trade Networks</u>
CTN	56.2003	<i>Halis Murat YILDIZ</i> (Ixi): <u>National Versus International Mergers and Trade Liberalization</u>
CTN	57.2003	<i>Santiago RUBIO and Alistair ULPH</i> (Ixi): <u>An Infinite-Horizon Model of Dynamic Membership of International Environmental Agreements</u>
KNOW	58.2003	<i>Carole MAIGNAN, Dino PINELLI and Gianmarco I.P. OTTAVIANO</i> : <u>ICT, Clusters and Regional Cohesion: A Summary of Theoretical and Empirical Research</u>
KNOW	59.2003	<i>Giorgio BELLETTINI and Gianmarco I.P. OTTAVIANO</i> : <u>Special Interests and Technological Change</u>
ETA	60.2003	<i>Ronnie SCHÖB</i> : <u>The Double Dividend Hypothesis of Environmental Taxes: A Survey</u>
CLIM	61.2003	<i>Michael FINUS, Ekko van IERLAND and Robert DELLINK</i> : <u>Stability of Climate Coalitions in a Cartel Formation Game</u>
GG	62.2003	<i>Michael FINUS and Bianca RUNDSHAGEN</i> : <u>How the Rules of Coalition Formation Affect Stability of International Environmental Agreements</u>
SIEV	63.2003	<i>Alberto PETRUCCI</i> : <u>Taxing Land Rent in an Open Economy</u>
CLIM	64.2003	<i>Joseph E. ALDY, Scott BARRETT and Robert N. STAVINS</i> : <u>Thirteen Plus One: A Comparison of Global Climate Policy Architectures</u>
SIEV	65.2003	<i>Edi DEFRANCESCO</i> : <u>The Beginning of Organic Fish Farming in Italy</u>
SIEV	66.2003	<i>Klaus CONRAD</i> : <u>Price Competition and Product Differentiation when Consumers Care for the Environment</u>
SIEV	67.2003	<i>Paulo A.L.D. NUNES, Luca ROSSETTO, Arianne DE BLAEIJ</i> : <u>Monetary Value Assessment of Clam Fishing Management Practices in the Venice Lagoon: Results from a Stated Choice Exercise</u>
CLIM	68.2003	<i>ZhongXiang ZHANG</i> : <u>Open Trade with the U.S. Without Compromising Canada's Ability to Comply with its Kyoto Target</u>
KNOW	69.2003	<i>David FRANTZ</i> (Iix): <u>Lorenzo Market between Diversity and Mutation</u>
KNOW	70.2003	<i>Ercole SORI</i> (Iix): <u>Mapping Diversity in Social History</u>
KNOW	71.2003	<i>Ljiljana DERU SIMIC</i> (Ixi): <u>What is Specific about Art/Cultural Projects?</u>
KNOW	72.2003	<i>Natalya V. TARANOVA</i> (Ixi): <u>The Role of the City in Fostering Intergroup Communication in a Multicultural Environment: Saint-Petersburg's Case</u>
KNOW	73.2003	<i>Kristine CRANE</i> (Ixi): <u>The City as an Arena for the Expression of Multiple Identities in the Age of Globalisation and Migration</u>
KNOW	74.2003	<i>Kazuma MATOBA</i> (Ixi): <u>Glocal Dialogue- Transformation through Transcultural Communication</u>
KNOW	75.2003	<i>Catarina REIS OLIVEIRA</i> (Ixi): <u>Immigrants' Entrepreneurial Opportunities: The Case of the Chinese in Portugal</u>
KNOW	76.2003	<i>Sandra WALLMAN</i> (Ixi): <u>The Diversity of Diversity - towards a typology of urban systems</u>
KNOW	77.2003	<i>Richard PEARCE</i> (Ixi): <u>A Biologist's View of Individual Cultural Identity for the Study of Cities</u>
KNOW	78.2003	<i>Vincent MERK</i> (Ixi): <u>Communication Across Cultures: from Cultural Awareness to Reconciliation of the Dilemmas</u>
KNOW	79.2003	<i>Giorgio BELLETTINI, Carlotta BERTI CERONI and Gianmarco I.P. OTTAVIANO</i> : <u>Child Labor and Resistance to Change</u>
ETA	80.2003	<i>Michele MORETTO, Paolo M. PANTEGHINI and Carlo SCARPA</i> : <u>Investment Size and Firm's Value under Profit Sharing Regulation</u>

IEM	81.2003	<i>Alessandro LANZA, Matteo MANERA and Massimo GIOVANNINI: <u>Oil and Product Dynamics in International Petroleum Markets</u></i>
CLIM	82.2003	<i>Y. Hossein FARZIN and Jinhua ZHAO: <u>Pollution Abatement Investment When Firms Lobby Against Environmental Regulation</u></i>
CLIM	83.2003	<i>Giuseppe DI VITA: <u>Is the Discount Rate Relevant in Explaining the Environmental Kuznets Curve?</u></i>
CLIM	84.2003	<i>Reyer GERLAGH and Wietze LISE: <u>Induced Technological Change Under Carbon Taxes</u></i>
NRM	85.2003	<i>Rinaldo BRAU, Alessandro LANZA and Francesco PIGLIARU: <u>How Fast are the Tourism Countries Growing? The cross-country evidence</u></i>
KNOW	86.2003	<i>Elena BELLINI, Gianmarco I.P. OTTAVIANO and Dino PINELLI: <u>The ICT Revolution: opportunities and risks for the Mezzogiorno</u></i>
SIEV	87.2003	<i>Lucas BRETSCGHER and Sjak SMULDERS: <u>Sustainability and Substitution of Exhaustible Natural Resources. How resource prices affect long-term R&D investments</u></i>
CLIM	88.2003	<i>Johan EYCKMANS and Michael FINUS: <u>New Roads to International Environmental Agreements: The Case of Global Warming</u></i>
CLIM	89.2003	<i>Marzio GALEOTTI: <u>Economic Development and Environmental Protection</u></i>
CLIM	90.2003	<i>Marzio GALEOTTI: <u>Environment and Economic Growth: Is Technical Change the Key to Decoupling?</u></i>
CLIM	91.2003	<i>Marzio GALEOTTI and Barbara BUCHNER: <u>Climate Policy and Economic Growth in Developing Countries</u></i>
IEM	92.2003	<i>A. MARKANDYA, A. GOLUB and E. STRUKOVA: <u>The Influence of Climate Change Considerations on Energy Policy: The Case of Russia</u></i>
ETA	93.2003	<i>Andrea BELTRATTI: <u>Socially Responsible Investment in General Equilibrium</u></i>
CTN	94.2003	<i>Parkash CHANDER: <u>The γ-Core and Coalition Formation</u></i>
IEM	95.2003	<i>Matteo MANERA and Angelo MARZULLO: <u>Modelling the Load Curve of Aggregate Electricity Consumption Using Principal Components</u></i>
IEM	96.2003	<i>Alessandro LANZA, Matteo MANERA, Margherita GRASSO and Massimo GIOVANNINI: <u>Long-run Models of Oil Stock Prices</u></i>
CTN	97.2003	<i>Steven J. BRAMS, Michael A. JONES, and D. Marc KILGOUR: <u>Forming Stable Coalitions: The Process Matters</u></i>
KNOW	98.2003	<i>John CROWLEY, Marie-Cecile NAVES (Ixiix): <u>Anti-Racist Policies in France. From Ideological and Historical Schemes to Socio-Political Realities</u></i>
KNOW	99.2003	<i>Richard THOMPSON FORD (Ixiii): <u>Cultural Rights and Civic Virtue</u></i>
KNOW	100.2003	<i>Alaknanda PATEL (Ixiii): <u>Cultural Diversity and Conflict in Multicultural Cities</u></i>
KNOW	101.2003	<i>David MAY (Ixiii): <u>The Struggle of Becoming Established in a Deprived Inner-City Neighbourhood</u></i>
KNOW	102.2003	<i>Sébastien ARCAND, Danielle JUTEAU, Sirma BILGE, and Francine LEMIRE (Ixiii) : <u>Municipal Reform on the Island of Montreal: Tensions Between Two Majority Groups in a Multicultural City</u></i>
CLIM	103.2003	<i>Barbara BUCHNER and Carlo CARRARO: <u>China and the Evolution of the Present Climate Regime</u></i>
CLIM	104.2003	<i>Barbara BUCHNER and Carlo CARRARO: <u>Emissions Trading Regimes and Incentives to Participate in International Climate Agreements</u></i>
CLIM	105.2003	<i>Anil MARKANDYA and Dirk T.G. RÜBBELKE: <u>Ancillary Benefits of Climate Policy</u></i>
NRM	106.2003	<i>Anne Sophie CRÉPIN (Ixiv): <u>Management Challenges for Multiple-Species Boreal Forests</u></i>
NRM	107.2003	<i>Anne Sophie CRÉPIN (Ixiv): <u>Threshold Effects in Coral Reef Fisheries</u></i>
SIEV	108.2003	<i>Sara ANIYAR (Ixiv): <u>Estimating the Value of Oil Capital in a Small Open Economy: The Venezuela's Example</u></i>
SIEV	109.2003	<i>Kenneth ARROW, Partha DASGUPTA and Karl-Göran MÄLER (Ixiv): <u>Evaluating Projects and Assessing Sustainable Development in Imperfect Economies</u></i>
NRM	110.2003	<i>Anastasios XEPAPADEAS and Catarina ROSETA-PALMA (Ixiv): <u>Instabilities and Robust Control in Fisheries</u></i>
NRM	111.2003	<i>Charles PERRINGS and Brian WALKER (Ixiv): <u>Conservation and Optimal Use of Rangelands</u></i>
ETA	112.2003	<i>Jack GOODY (Ixiv): <u>Globalisation, Population and Ecology</u></i>
CTN	113.2003	<i>Carlo CARRARO, Carmen MARCHIORI and Sonia OREFFICE: <u>Endogenous Minimum Participation in International Environmental Treaties</u></i>
CTN	114.2003	<i>Guillaume HAERINGER and Myrna WOODERS: <u>Decentralized Job Matching</u></i>
CTN	115.2003	<i>Hideo KONISHI and M. Utku UNVER: <u>Credible Group Stability in Multi-Partner Matching Problems</u></i>
CTN	116.2003	<i>Somdeb LAHIRI: <u>Stable Matchings for the Room-Mates Problem</u></i>
CTN	117.2003	<i>Somdeb LAHIRI: <u>Stable Matchings for a Generalized Marriage Problem</u></i>
CTN	118.2003	<i>Marita LAUKKANEN: <u>Transboundary Fisheries Management under Implementation Uncertainty</u></i>
CTN	119.2003	<i>Edward CARTWRIGHT and Myrna WOODERS: <u>Social Conformity and Bounded Rationality in Arbitrary Games with Incomplete Information: Some First Results</u></i>
CTN	120.2003	<i>Gianluigi VERNASCA: <u>Dynamic Price Competition with Price Adjustment Costs and Product Differentiation</u></i>
CTN	121.2003	<i>Myrna WOODERS, Edward CARTWRIGHT and Reinhard SELTEN: <u>Social Conformity in Games with Many Players</u></i>
CTN	122.2003	<i>Edward CARTWRIGHT and Myrna WOODERS: <u>On Equilibrium in Pure Strategies in Games with Many Players</u></i>
CTN	123.2003	<i>Edward CARTWRIGHT and Myrna WOODERS: <u>Conformity and Bounded Rationality in Games with Many Players</u></i>
1000		Carlo CARRARO, Alessandro LANZA and Valeria PAPPONETTI: <u>One Thousand Working Papers</u>

NOTE DI LAVORO PUBLISHED IN 2004

IEM	1.2004	<i>Anil MARKANDYA, Suzette PEDROSO and Alexander GOLUB: <u>Empirical Analysis of National Income and So2 Emissions in Selected European Countries</u></i>
ETA	2.2004	<i>Masahisa FUJITA and Shlomo WEBER: <u>Strategic Immigration Policies and Welfare in Heterogeneous Countries</u></i>
PRA	3.2004	<i>Adolfo DI CARLUCCIO, Giovanni FERRI, Cecilia FRALE and Ottavio RICCHI: <u>Do Privatizations Boost Household Shareholding? Evidence from Italy</u></i>
ETA	4.2004	<i>Victor GINSBURGH and Shlomo WEBER: <u>Languages Disenfranchisement in the European Union</u></i>
ETA	5.2004	<i>Romano PIRAS: <u>Growth, Congestion of Public Goods, and Second-Best Optimal Policy</u></i>
CCMP	6.2004	<i>Herman R.J. VOLLEBERGH: <u>Lessons from the Polder: Is Dutch CO2-Taxation Optimal</u></i>
PRA	7.2004	<i>Sandro BRUSCO, Giuseppe LOPOMO and S. VISWANATHAN (lxv): <u>Merger Mechanisms</u></i>
PRA	8.2004	<i>Wolfgang AUSSENEGG, Pegaret PICHLER and Alex STOMPER (lxv): <u>IPO Pricing with Bookbuilding, and a When-Issued Market</u></i>
PRA	9.2004	<i>Pegaret PICHLER and Alex STOMPER (lxv): <u>Primary Market Design: Direct Mechanisms and Markets</u></i>
PRA	10.2004	<i>Florian ENGLMAIER, Pablo GUILLEN, Loreto LLORENTE, Sander ONDERSTAL and Rupert SAUSGRUBER (lxv): <u>The Chopstick Auction: A Study of the Exposure Problem in Multi-Unit Auctions</u></i>
PRA	11.2004	<i>Bjarne BRENDSTRUP and Harry J. PAARSCH (lxv): <u>Nonparametric Identification and Estimation of Multi-Unit, Sequential, Oral, Ascending-Price Auctions With Asymmetric Bidders</u></i>
PRA	12.2004	<i>Ohad KADAN (lxv): <u>Equilibrium in the Two Player, k-Double Auction with Affiliated Private Values</u></i>
PRA	13.2004	<i>Maarten C.W. JANSSEN (lxv): <u>Auctions as Coordination Devices</u></i>
PRA	14.2004	<i>Gadi FIBICH, Arieh GAVIOUS and Aner SELA (lxv): <u>All-Pay Auctions with Weakly Risk-Averse Buyers</u></i>
PRA	15.2004	<i>Orly SADE, Charles SCHNITZLEIN and Jaime F. ZENDER (lxv): <u>Competition and Cooperation in Divisible Good Auctions: An Experimental Examination</u></i>
PRA	16.2004	<i>Marta STRYSZOWSKA (lxv): <u>Late and Multiple Bidding in Competing Second Price Internet Auctions</u></i>
CCMP	17.2004	<i>Slim Ben YOUSSEF: <u>R&D in Cleaner Technology and International Trade</u></i>
NRM	18.2004	<i>Angelo ANTOCI, Simone BORGHESI and Paolo RUSSU (lxvi): <u>Biodiversity and Economic Growth: Stabilization Versus Preservation of the Ecological Dynamics</u></i>
SIEV	19.2004	<i>Anna ALBERINI, Paolo ROSATO, Alberto LONGO and Valentina ZANATTA: <u>Information and Willingness to Pay in a Contingent Valuation Study: The Value of S. Erasmo in the Lagoon of Venice</u></i>
NRM	20.2004	<i>Guido CANDELA and Roberto CELLINI (lxvii): <u>Investment in Tourism Market: A Dynamic Model of Differentiated Oligopoly</u></i>
NRM	21.2004	<i>Jacqueline M. HAMILTON (lxvii): <u>Climate and the Destination Choice of German Tourists</u></i>
NRM	22.2004	<i>Javier Rey-MAQUIEIRA PALMER, Javier LOZANO IBÁÑEZ and Carlos Mario GÓMEZ GÓMEZ (lxvii): <u>Land, Environmental Externalities and Tourism Development</u></i>
NRM	23.2004	<i>Pius ODUNGA and Henk FOLMER (lxvii): <u>Profiling Tourists for Balanced Utilization of Tourism-Based Resources in Kenya</u></i>
NRM	24.2004	<i>Jean-Jacques NOWAK, Mondher SAHLI and Pasquale M. SGRO (lxvii): <u>Tourism, Trade and Domestic Welfare</u></i>
NRM	25.2004	<i>Riaz SHAREEF (lxvii): <u>Country Risk Ratings of Small Island Tourism Economies</u></i>
NRM	26.2004	<i>Juan Luis EUGENIO-MARTÍN, Noelia MARTÍN MORALES and Riccardo SCARPA (lxvii): <u>Tourism and Economic Growth in Latin American Countries: A Panel Data Approach</u></i>
NRM	27.2004	<i>Raúl Hernández MARTÍN (lxvii): <u>Impact of Tourism Consumption on GDP. The Role of Imports</u></i>
CSRM	28.2004	<i>Nicoletta FERRO: <u>Cross-Country Ethical Dilemmas in Business: A Descriptive Framework</u></i>
NRM	29.2004	<i>Marian WEBER (lxvi): <u>Assessing the Effectiveness of Tradable Landuse Rights for Biodiversity Conservation: an Application to Canada's Boreal Mixedwood Forest</u></i>
NRM	30.2004	<i>Trond BJORN DAL, Phoebe KOUNDOURI and Sean PASCOE (lxvi): <u>Output Substitution in Multi-Species Trawl Fisheries: Implications for Quota Setting</u></i>
CCMP	31.2004	<i>Marzio GALEOTTI, Alessandra GORIA, Paolo MOMBRINI and Evi SPANTIDAKI: <u>Weather Impacts on Natural, Social and Economic Systems (WISE) Part I: Sectoral Analysis of Climate Impacts in Italy</u></i>
CCMP	32.2004	<i>Marzio GALEOTTI, Alessandra GORIA, Paolo MOMBRINI and Evi SPANTIDAKI: <u>Weather Impacts on Natural, Social and Economic Systems (WISE) Part II: Individual Perception of Climate Extremes in Italy</u></i>
CTN	33.2004	<i>Wilson PEREZ: <u>Divide and Conquer: Noisy Communication in Networks, Power, and Wealth Distribution</u></i>
KTHC	34.2004	<i>Gianmarco I.P. OTTAVIANO and Giovanni PERI (lxviii): <u>The Economic Value of Cultural Diversity: Evidence from US Cities</u></i>
KTHC	35.2004	<i>Linda CHAIB (lxviii): <u>Immigration and Local Urban Participatory Democracy: A Boston-Paris Comparison</u></i>
KTHC	36.2004	<i>Franca ECKERT COEN and Claudio ROSSI (lxviii): <u>Foreigners, Immigrants, Host Cities: The Policies of Multi-Ethnicity in Rome. Reading Governance in a Local Context</u></i>
KTHC	37.2004	<i>Kristine CRANE (lxviii): <u>Governing Migration: Immigrant Groups' Strategies in Three Italian Cities – Rome, Naples and Bari</u></i>
KTHC	38.2004	<i>Kiflemariam HAMDE (lxviii): <u>Mind in Africa, Body in Europe: The Struggle for Maintaining and Transforming Cultural Identity - A Note from the Experience of Eritrean Immigrants in Stockholm</u></i>
ETA	39.2004	<i>Alberto CAVALIERE: <u>Price Competition with Information Disparities in a Vertically Differentiated Duopoly</u></i>
PRA	40.2004	<i>Andrea BIGANO and Stef PROOST: <u>The Opening of the European Electricity Market and Environmental Policy: Does the Degree of Competition Matter?</u></i>
CCMP	41.2004	<i>Micheal FINUS (lxix): <u>International Cooperation to Resolve International Pollution Problems</u></i>

KTHC	42.2004	<i>Francesco CRESPI</i> : <u>Notes on the Determinants of Innovation: A Multi-Perspective Analysis</u>
CTN	43.2004	<i>Sergio CURRARINI and Marco MARINI</i> : <u>Coalition Formation in Games without Synergies</u>
CTN	44.2004	<i>Marc ESCRIHUELA-VILLAR</i> : <u>Cartel Sustainability and Cartel Stability</u>
NRM	45.2004	<i>Sebastian BERVOETS and Nicolas GRAVEL</i> (lxvi): <u>Appraising Diversity with an Ordinal Notion of Similarity: An Axiomatic Approach</u>
NRM	46.2004	<i>Signe ANTHON and Bo JELLESMARK THORSEN</i> (lxvi): <u>Optimal Afforestation Contracts with Asymmetric Information on Private Environmental Benefits</u>
NRM	47.2004	<i>John MBURU</i> (lxvi): <u>Wildlife Conservation and Management in Kenya: Towards a Co-management Approach</u>
NRM	48.2004	<i>Ekin BIROL, Ágnes GYOVAI and Melinda SMALE</i> (lxvi): <u>Using a Choice Experiment to Value Agricultural Biodiversity on Hungarian Small Farms: Agri-Environmental Policies in a Transitional Economy</u>
CCMP	49.2004	<i>Gernot KLEPPER and Sonja PETERSON</i> : <u>The EU Emissions Trading Scheme. Allowance Prices, Trade Flows, Competitiveness Effects</u>
GG	50.2004	<i>Scott BARRETT and Michael HOEL</i> : <u>Optimal Disease Eradication</u>
CTN	51.2004	<i>Dinko DIMITROV, Peter BORM, Ruud HENDRICKX and Shao CHIN SUNG</i> : <u>Simple Priorities and Core Stability in Hedonic Games</u>
SIEV	52.2004	<i>Francesco RICCI</i> : <u>Channels of Transmission of Environmental Policy to Economic Growth: A Survey of the Theory</u>
SIEV	53.2004	<i>Anna ALBERINI, Maureen CROPPER, Alan KRUPNICK and Nathalie B. SIMON</i> : <u>Willingness to Pay for Mortality Risk Reductions: Does Latency Matter?</u>
NRM	54.2004	<i>Ingo BRÄUER and Rainer MARGGRAF</i> (lxvi): <u>Valuation of Ecosystem Services Provided by Biodiversity Conservation: An Integrated Hydrological and Economic Model to Value the Enhanced Nitrogen Retention in Renaturated Streams</u>
NRM	55.2004	<i>Timo GOESCHL and Tun LIN</i> (lxvi): <u>Biodiversity Conservation on Private Lands: Information Problems and Regulatory Choices</u>
NRM	56.2004	<i>Tom DEDEURWAERDERE</i> (lxvi): <u>Bioprospection: From the Economics of Contracts to Reflexive Governance</u>
CCMP	57.2004	<i>Katrin REHDANZ and David MADDISON</i> : <u>The Amenity Value of Climate to German Households</u>
CCMP	58.2004	<i>Koen SMEKENS and Bob VAN DER ZWAAN</i> : <u>Environmental Externalities of Geological Carbon Sequestration Effects on Energy Scenarios</u>
NRM	59.2004	<i>Valentina BOSETTI, Mariaester CASSINELLI and Alessandro LANZA</i> (lxvii): <u>Using Data Envelopment Analysis to Evaluate Environmentally Conscious Tourism Management</u>
NRM	60.2004	<i>Timo GOESCHL and Danilo CAMARGO IGLIORI</i> (lxvi): <u>Property Rights Conservation and Development: An Analysis of Extractive Reserves in the Brazilian Amazon</u>
CCMP	61.2004	<i>Barbara BUCHNER and Carlo CARRARO</i> : <u>Economic and Environmental Effectiveness of a Technology-based Climate Protocol</u>
NRM	62.2004	<i>Elissaios POPYRAKIS and Reyer GERLAGH</i> : <u>Resource-Abundance and Economic Growth in the U.S.</u>
NRM	63.2004	<i>Györgyi BELA, György PATAKI, Melinda SMALE and Mariann HAJDÚ</i> (lxvi): <u>Conserving Crop Genetic Resources on Smallholder Farms in Hungary: Institutional Analysis</u>
NRM	64.2004	<i>E.C.M. RUIJGROK and E.E.M. NILLESEN</i> (lxvi): <u>The Socio-Economic Value of Natural Riverbanks in the Netherlands</u>

- (lix) This paper was presented at the ENGIME Workshop on “Mapping Diversity”, Leuven, May 16-17, 2002
- (lx) This paper was presented at the EuroConference on “Auctions and Market Design: Theory, Evidence and Applications”, organised by the Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Milan, September 26-28, 2002
- (lxi) This paper was presented at the Eighth Meeting of the Coalition Theory Network organised by the GREQAM, Aix-en-Provence, France, January 24-25, 2003
- (lxii) This paper was presented at the ENGIME Workshop on “Communication across Cultures in Multicultural Cities”, The Hague, November 7-8, 2002
- (lxiii) This paper was presented at the ENGIME Workshop on “Social dynamics and conflicts in multicultural cities”, Milan, March 20-21, 2003
- (lxiv) This paper was presented at the International Conference on “Theoretical Topics in Ecological Economics”, organised by the Abdus Salam International Centre for Theoretical Physics - ICTP, the Beijer International Institute of Ecological Economics, and Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei – FEEM Trieste, February 10-21, 2003
- (lxv) This paper was presented at the EuroConference on “Auctions and Market Design: Theory, Evidence and Applications” organised by Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei and sponsored by the EU, Milan, September 25-27, 2003
- (lxvi) This paper has been presented at the 4th BioEcon Workshop on “Economic Analysis of Policies for Biodiversity Conservation” organised on behalf of the BIOECON Network by Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Venice International University (VIU) and University College London (UCL), Venice, August 28-29, 2003
- (lxvii) This paper has been presented at the international conference on “Tourism and Sustainable Economic Development – Macro and Micro Economic Issues” jointly organised by CRENoS (Università di Cagliari e Sassari, Italy) and Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, and supported by the World Bank, Sardinia, September 19-20, 2003
- (lxviii) This paper was presented at the ENGIME Workshop on “Governance and Policies in Multicultural Cities”, Rome, June 5-6, 2003
- (lxix) This paper was presented at the Fourth EEP Plenary Workshop and EEP Conference “The Future of Climate Policy”, Cagliari, Italy, 27-28 March 2003

2003 SERIES

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

2004 SERIES

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