



Dipartimento di Scienze Economiche, Matematiche e Statistiche

Università degli Studi di Foggia

**Largest Consistent Set in International
Environmental Agreements**

Marta Biancardi e Giovanni Villani

Quaderno n. 04/2011

“Esemplare fuori commercio per il deposito legale agli effetti della legge 15 aprile 2004 n. 106”
Quaderno riprodotto dal Dipartimento di Scienze Economiche, Matematiche e Statistiche
nel mese di aprile 2011 e depositato ai sensi di legge.

Authors only are responsible for the content of this reprint.

Dipartimento di Scienze Economiche, Matematiche e Statistiche, Largo Papa Giovanni Paolo II, 1,
71121 Foggia (Italy), Phone +39 0881-75.37.30, Fax +39 0881-77.56.16

Largest Consistent Set in International Environmental Agreements

Marta Biancardi, Giovanni Villani

Department of Economics, Mathematics and Statistics, University of Foggia,

Largo Papa Giovanni Paolo II,1, 71100 - Foggia, Italy;

m.biancardi@unifg.it, g.villani@unifg.it

Abstract

In this paper we study the formation and the stability of International Environmental Agreements (IEAs) in a pollution abatement model with a quadratic cost function. Countries play a two-stage game: in the first stage each country decides to join or not the coalition while, in the second stage, the quantity of pollution abatement is chosen. To analyze the stability of coalition structures in a multiple coalition game, we use the notion of the Largest Consistent Set (LCS) which allows players to be farsighted.

In an abstract context, Chwe (1994) developed the concept of farsighted stability: an outcome is stable and it is in the LCS if and only if deviations from it or potential further deviations are not unanimously preferred to the original outcome by the coalition considering the deviations. Applying this notion of stability in the IEA context we assume that, when a country or a sub-coalition contemplate exiting or joining an agreement, it takes into account the reactions of other countries ignited by its own actions.

We identify what would be the resulting stable structures and the LCS, examining the indicator of countries' environmental awareness proposed by the model. A particular analysis is proposed about the Grand Coalition. Moreover, we present a handy Maple algorithm to compare the cost functions and to determine direct dominance.

Keywords: IEA; Farsightedness; Implementation.

JEL Codes: F50; C60.

References

- [Barrett (1994)] Barrett, S. (1994). *Self-enforcing International Environmental Agreements*. Oxford Economic Paper, 46, 878-894.
- [Biancardi and Di Liddo (2010)] Biancardi, M. and A. Di Liddo, (2010). *The size of farsighted stable coalitions in a game of pollution abatement*. Natural Resource Modeling, Vol. 23, Issue 4, pp. 467-493.

- [Biancardi and Villani (2010)] Biancardi, M. and G. Villani, (2010), *International environmental agreements with asymmetric countries*. Computational Economics, Vol. 36, 69-92.
- [Carraro and Siniscalco (1993)] Carraro, C. and Siniscalco, D. (1993). *Strategies for the international protection of the environment*. Journal of Public Economics, 52, 309-328.
- [Chwe (1994)] Chwe, M. (1994). *Farsighted coalitional stability*. Journal of Economic Theory, 63, 299-325.
- [D'Aspremont et al. (1983)] D'Aspremont, C., Jacquemin, J., Gadszewicz, J. and Weymark, J. (1983). *On the stability of collusive price leadership*. Canadian Journal of Economics, 16, 17-25.
- [Diamantoudi and Sartzetakis (2002)] Diamantoudi, E. and Sartzetakis, E. (2002). *International Environmental Agreements: the role of foresight*. Economics working papers 2002-10, School of economics and management University of Aarhus.
- [Diamantoudi and Sartzetakis (2006)] Diamantoudi, E. and Sartzetakis, E. (2006). *Stable International Environmental Agreements: An analytical approach*. Journal of public economic theory, 8 (2), 247-263.
- [Eyckmans (2001)] Eyckmans, J. (2001). *On the farsighted stability of the Kyoto Protocol*. Energy, transport and environment working papers series, etc 0103.
- [Hoel (1992)] Hoel, M. (1992). *International environmental conventions: the case of uniform reductions of emissions*. Environmental and Resource Economics, 2, 141-159.
- [Mauleon and Vannetelbosch (2004)] Mauleon, A. and V. Vannetelbosch (2004). *Farsightedness and cautiousness in coalition formation games with positive spillover*. Theory and Decision, 56, 291-324.
- [Osmani and Tol (2010)] Osmani, D and R.S.J. Tol, (2010). *The case of two self-enforcing international agreement for environmental protection with asymmetric countries*. Computational Economics, 36, 93-119.
- [Ray and Vohra (1997)] Ray, D. and R. Vohra (1997). *Equilibrium binding agreement*. Journal of Economic Theory, 73, 30-78.
- [Rubio and Ulph (2006)] Rubio, S.J. and Ulph, A. (2006). *Self-enforcing international environmental agreements revisited*. Oxford economic papers 58, 233-263.
- [Sáiz et al. (2006)] Sáiz, M.E., Hendrix, E.M.T. and Olieman, N.J. (2006). *On the Computation of Stability in Multiple Coalition Formation Games*. Computational Economics, 28, 251-275.

- [de Zeeuw (2008)] Zeeuw, A. de (2008). *Dynamic effects on the stability of international environmental agreements*. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, 55, 163-174.
- [Xue (1998)] Xue, L. (1998). *Coalition stability under perfect foresight*. *Economic Theory*, 11, 603-627.