

Der Open-Access-Publikationsserver der ZBW – Leibniz-Informationzentrum Wirtschaft
The Open Access Publication Server of the ZBW – Leibniz Information Centre for Economics

Kratzsch, Uwe; Sieg, Gernot; Stegemann, Ulrike

Working Paper

A full participation agreement on global emission reduction through strategic investments in R&D

Economics Department Working Paper Series, No. 10

Provided in cooperation with:

Technische Universität Braunschweig

Suggested citation: Kratzsch, Uwe; Sieg, Gernot; Stegemann, Ulrike (2010) : A full participation agreement on global emission reduction through strategic investments in R&D, Economics Department Working Paper Series, No. 10, <http://hdl.handle.net/10419/51316>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die ZBW räumt Ihnen als Nutzerin/Nutzer das unentgeltliche, räumlich unbeschränkte und zeitlich auf die Dauer des Schutzrechts beschränkte einfache Recht ein, das ausgewählte Werk im Rahmen der unter

→ <http://www.econstor.eu/dspace/Nutzungsbedingungen> nachzulesenden vollständigen Nutzungsbedingungen zu vervielfältigen, mit denen die Nutzerin/der Nutzer sich durch die erste Nutzung einverstanden erklärt.

Terms of use:

The ZBW grants you, the user, the non-exclusive right to use the selected work free of charge, territorially unrestricted and within the time limit of the term of the property rights according to the terms specified at

→ <http://www.econstor.eu/dspace/Nutzungsbedingungen>
By the first use of the selected work the user agrees and declares to comply with these terms of use.



Technische
Universität
Braunschweig

Institut für
Volkswirtschaftslehre

A Full Participation Agreement On Global Emission Reduction Through Strategic Investments in R&D

by

Uwe Kratzsch, Gernot Sieg and Ulrike Stegemann

Economics Department Working Paper Series

No. 10

November 2010

**© Technische Universität Braunschweig,
Economics Department, 2010**

Address

Institut für Volkswirtschaftslehre
Spielmannstraße 9
D38106 Braunschweig, Germany

Telephone

+49 531 391 2578

Website

<http://www.tu-braunschweig.de/vwl>

Fax

+49 531 391 2593

All rights reserved.

Any reproduction, publication and reprint in the form of a different publication, whether printed or produced electronically, in whole or in part, is permitted only with the explicit written authorisation of the TU Braunschweig, Economics Department, or the author(s).

The views expressed in this paper do not necessarily reflect those of the Economics Department or the TU Braunschweig.

The Working Paper Series seeks to disseminate economic research work by the TU Braunschweig Economics Department's staff and visitors. Papers by researchers not affiliated with the TU Braunschweig Economics Department may also be considered for publication to the extent that they have been presented at research seminars/workshops organised by the Department.

The working papers published in the Series constitute work in progress circulated to stimulate discussion and critical comments. Views expressed represent exclusively the authors' own opinions.

The Series is managed by the Director of the Economics Department, and an Editorial Board oversees the process of publication.

A Full Participation Agreement On Global Emission Reduction Through Strategic Investments in R&D

Uwe Kratzsch*
Gernot Sieg*
Ulrike Stegemann*

Abstract

If an emission reduction agreement with participation of all players is not enforceable because politicians are too myopic or not able to commit themselves to sustainable policies or costs of reducing emissions are too high, strategic investments in research and development (R&D) of green technology, for example sustainable drive-trains, can pave the way for a future treaty. Although no player will rationally reduce emissions on its own, investments in R&D by at least one player can change the strategic situation of negotiations to control emissions: Emission abatement costs will decrease so that a treaty with full participation can be achieved in future periods through time consistent sustainable policies.

Keywords: emissions; discount factor; commitment; endogenous technical change; repeated prisoner's dilemma

JEL: Q54; F53; O30; H41

1 Introduction

International cooperation to reduce environmental external effects, for example cross border emissions, often fails. Because no country has to participate and all countries can renegotiate their treaties at any times, especially if governments change due to regular elections, institutions that

*TU Braunschweig, Institut für Volkswirtschaftslehre, Spielmannstr. 9, 38106 Braunschweig, Germany. This research project is partially funded by the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research (Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung, 01UN1006A) as part of the research project "STROM - Strategic options of the automobile industry for the migration towards sustainable drivetrains in established and emergent markets".

sustain international cooperation have to be both individually and collectively rational. Therefore, collective action through agreements to reduce cross border emissions has to be and has been analyzed by several game-theoretical contributions using dynamic models of international public goods provision (Carraro and Siniscalco 1993). Barrett (1999) uses a repeated N -player prisoner's dilemma game where each country can choose between participating on a global agreement, inducing the reduction of emissions, and rejecting the agreement. Because a deviating country is punished by all other countries, the number of participating countries has to be small if an agreement shall be enforced. However, if only a subset of countries participates in an agreement the environmental benefit of the agreement is at risk. Consider, for example, a single country reducing greenhouse gas emissions. If the world supply of fossil fuels remains fixed, a reduction in the demand for fossil fuels would merely lower the world price of carbon and provoke non-participating countries to consume what the participating countries have saved (Sinn 2008). The so-called "green paradox" sows seeds of doubt about the benefit of partial agreements.

Barrett (2002) demonstrates that many countries can participate in an agreement, but only if the abatement level of emission is lowered. To summarize, the approaches of Barrett (1999 and 2002) expose a trade-off between "narrow but deep" and "broad but shallow" treaties; however, society strives for "broad and deep".

Asheim et al. (2006) demonstrate that two treaties can encompass a larger number of parties than a single global treaty proposed by Barrett (1999), because under regional cooperation a deviator is punished by just a group of countries. Then the system with two agreements can Pareto dominate a regime based on one global treaty, meaning that the global reduction of emissions is greater under two agreements than under one single agreement. Nonetheless, even with two regional agreements, the number of participating countries is limited, leading again to the problem of the green paradox.

Froyn and Hovi (2008) offer a more optimistic view. They show that it may be possible to sustain full participation in one single agreement without watering down abatement levels. This can be achieved by limiting the number of countries that are permitted to punish a non-compliant country which has deviated from the agreement. Froyn and Hovi's (2008) findings can also be transferred to a model where countries can choose the level of abatement in every period, as Asheim and Holtmark (2009) demonstrate. They show that a "broad and deep" agreement with full participation and abatement at an efficient level can always be achieved if the countries' common discount factor is sufficiently high.

However, as the experiences from Copenhagen show, global agreements on emission reduction currently seem to be not available. One reason may be that politicians place a high weight on present payoffs but too less weight

on payoffs in future legislative periods. Furthermore, abatement of emissions may be too expensive. In this paper, we will demonstrate a solution for this dilemma. If negotiations about the provision of an international public good like emission reduction fail because politicians are too myopic or abatement costs are too high, then investments in research and development (R&D) of green technology can pave the way for a future treaty. We will show that just one country can do the pioneer work to invest in green technology so that emissions will effectively be slowed down. The investing country will not reduce emissions on its own, but it will remove the debilitating strategic situation of emission reduction negotiations by bringing forward green technology. The improved technology will lead to a decrease of abatement costs. As soon as abatement costs are sufficiently reduced, there will be a future agreement with full participation.

2 The model

We consider a world consisting of N identical countries. In every period of the infinitely repeated game, each country has to decide whether to cooperate, i.e., to reduce emissions at cost $c > 0$, or to defect, i.e., not to reduce emissions. The mitigation of emissions is not limited to national borders, but is a global public good from which all countries can equally benefit. Let $k \leq N$ be the number of countries that participate in an agreement. Then, the periodic payoff for each of the k participating countries playing cooperate is $dk - c$, where $d > 0$ is a constant. Each of the $N - k$ non-participating countries playing defect receives dk . Future payoffs are discounted with a common discount factor $0 < \delta < 1$.

In the stage game, the provision of the global public good results in a prisoner's dilemma. No country will sign the agreement, because defect is a dominant strategy, $d(k - 1) > dk - c \forall k$. This condition must also hold for the case of $k = 1$, therefore $c > d$ holds. It follows then that full participation cannot be a Nash equilibrium, because the assumption implies that $d(N - 1) > dN - c$ for $k = N$. Furthermore, the outcome of the stage game is not Pareto efficient: Full participation will Pareto dominate zero participation, $dN - c > 0$. It follows that the number of countries must be sufficiently large, i.e., $N > c/d > 1$. This condition is assumed to be fulfilled.

3 A global agreement with immediate abatement

Following Froyen and Hovi (2008), a global agreement with full participation, i.e., $k = N$, can be accomplished by a strategy called Penance-m. Penance-m is characterized by three actions. First, each participating country plays cooperate as long as all other participating countries play cooperate as well.

Second, if one country plays defect, m countries will punish the deviator by playing defect in the following period while the other $k - m$ countries will play cooperate. Third, if one of the m punishing countries deviates from playing defect in a period of punishment, it will be punished as well by m punishing countries playing defect in the following period. Countries are quick to forgive, therefore, the punishment lasts for one period only.

Penance- m must fulfill two conditions to be a weakly renegotiation-proof equilibrium (in the sense of Farrell and Maskin 1989 for 2-person games and Bergin and MacLeod 1993 for N -person games): subgame perfection and renegotiation-proofness. In the following, these two conditions are briefly introduced. However, see Froyn and Hovi (2008) for a more detailed discussion. Subgame perfection at time t is satisfied if no country has an incentive to deviate from Penance- m given any history, i.e., if every country abides by Penance- m after the previous periods $\tau = \dots, t-2, t-1$. In such a case, there is also no incentive for a country to deviate for more than one period (Abreu 1988). For a country playing cooperate, Penance- m is subgame perfect if

$$\delta^t(dN - c) + \delta^{t+1}(dN - c) \geq \delta^t d(N - 1) + \delta^{t+1}(d(N - m) - c) \quad (1)$$

holds. For one of the m punishing countries playing defect, the condition of subgame perfection applies if

$$\delta^t d(N - m) + \delta^{t+1}(dN - c) \geq \delta^t(d(N - m + 1) - c) + \delta^{t+1}(d(N - m) - c). \quad (2)$$

This condition holds for all k and for all δ because $d(N - m) > d(N - m + 1) - c$ and $dN - c > d(N - m) - c$. Furthermore, subgame perfection requires that in a period of punishment all $N - m$ non-punishing countries play cooperate,

$$\delta^t(d(N - m) - c) + \delta^{t+1}(dN - c) \geq \delta^t d(N - m - 1) + \delta^{t+1}(d(N - m) - c). \quad (3)$$

If condition (3) holds, (1) is satisfied as well. Solving (3) for the number of punishing countries results in a lower bound for m ,

$$m \geq \underline{m} = \frac{c - d}{\delta d}. \quad (4)$$

The second requirement is that the strategy profile must be renegotiation-proof. Froyn and Hovi (2008) adopt the concept of weakly renegotiation-proofness, which implies that the m punishing countries gain at least the same payoff with punishment as with renegotiation,

$$\delta^t(dN - c) + \delta^{t+1}(dN - c) \leq \delta^t d(N - m) + \delta^{t+1}(dN - c). \quad (5)$$

Renegotiation-proofness yields an upper bound for the number of punishing countries,

$$m \leq \bar{m} = \frac{c}{d}. \quad (6)$$

However, these conditions are not sufficient for an equilibrium. According to the Folk Theorem, all participating countries must attach sufficiently great importance to future payoffs.

Proposition 1. *Penance- m leads to a subgame perfect and weakly renegotiation-proof equilibrium if*

$$\frac{c-d}{\delta d} \leq m \leq \frac{c}{d} \quad (7)$$

and if the weight that countries place on future payoffs is sufficiently high:

$$\delta \geq \tilde{\delta} = 1 - \frac{d}{c}. \quad (8)$$

Proof. The lower bound \underline{m} for the number of punishing countries follows from the subgame perfection requirement. There always exists a lower bound $\underline{m} > 0$ because, according to our assumption, $c > d$ holds. The upper bound \bar{m} for the number of punishing countries results from the weak renegotiation-proofness requirement and is always lower than the number of participating countries N because, by assumption, $dN - c > 0$, and hence $N > c/d$.

For an equilibrium $\underline{m} \leq \bar{m}$ must hold. The upper bound \bar{m} is independent of the discount factor. By contrast, the lower bound \underline{m} decreases with an increasing discount factor δ . Therefore, the condition $\underline{m} \leq \bar{m}$ will only hold for discount factors that are high enough, i.e.,

$$\delta \geq \tilde{\delta} = 1 - \frac{d}{c}. \quad (9)$$

Because $c > d > 0$, it follows that $0 < d/c < 1$, and therefore $0 < \tilde{\delta} < 1$. \square

Obviously, a global agreement with participation of all countries can only be achieved if abatement costs are not too high or/and the weight placed on future payoffs by the countries is not too low.

Aiming for re-election, politicians prefer local or national policy measures that cause immediate benefits to their voters, formalized through a low δ . To summarize condition (8), high emission abatement costs or myopia of politicians may foreclose a global agreement.

We offer a solution for this dilemma. In the next section, we show that a global agreement with full participation can be concluded if technical change lowers abatement costs over time. Hence, such an agreement may be achieved at a later date – as soon as the costs of reducing emissions have sufficiently declined.

4 A global agreement with future abatement

As from now, abatement costs c_t shall depend on the level of green technology y_t . The available technology is related to technical knowledge. The

technology can be improved by investments in R&D, which will lead to a reduction in abatement costs. For example, the internal combustion engine, that creates large polluting emissions, is the drive-train used in almost all cars. As an alternative there are green technologies available, for example electric powered mobility. However, the user costs of sustainable drive-trains are still higher than the costs of the traditional internal combustion technology. Investments in R&D of sustainable drive-train technology can improve the cost efficiency of low-emission drive-trains and therefore reduce abatement costs of automobile traffic.

We consider the case in which no emission reduction agreement would be signed today, i.e., in which condition (8) is not satisfied. Abatement of emissions may either be too expensive in period $t = 0$, or politicians may be too myopic. In either case, the crucial discount factor concerning the emission reduction contract exceeds the common discount factor of all countries,

$$\delta < \tilde{\delta}(t = 0) = 1 - d/c_0. \quad (10)$$

However, a global emission reduction agreement can be achieved in future periods if one country does the pioneer work and invests in R&D. It is assumed that the investing country provides funds in the amount of I_t for R&D in period t . For the purpose of simplification, the level of technology increases by a constant fraction $0 < \alpha < 1$ of investments I_t , where α reflects the efficiency of R&D with which the technology is improved. Since research is a timely process, the technological progress is bounded by $\hat{y} > 0$, which is the maximum technological progress obtainable in one period of time. Then, $\hat{I} = \hat{y}/\alpha$ is the level up to which investments in R&D are efficient. The increase in the level of technology is thus given by

$$\Delta y_t = y_{t+1} - y_t = \min\{\alpha I_t, \hat{y}\}. \quad (11)$$

Provided that investment is efficient, i.e., $I_t \leq \hat{I}$ for all t , the level of technology in period t equals

$$y_t = y_0 + \alpha \sum_{\tau=0}^{t-1} I_\tau \quad \text{with} \quad y_0 = 1. \quad (12)$$

It follows that a country has to invest \hat{I} in each period to improve the technology as fast as possible. The improved technology leads to a decrease in abatement costs that amount to

$$c_t = \frac{c_0 - d}{y_t} + d \quad (13)$$

in period t . It is impossible to remove the prisoners dilemma of the stages by investment in technology because $c_t > d$ applies in each future period. Defection, i.e., not participating in the emission reduction agreement, remains

the dominant strategy in each of the stages. But even though investments in R&D are not a strategy to change the stage game, they may induce the countries to join the agreement in future periods. However, this requires one single country that leads the way.

Proposition 2. *Define*

$$\hat{t} = \ln \left[\frac{\hat{y}}{\alpha(dN - d/(1 - \delta)) + \hat{y}} \right] / \ln[\delta]. \quad (14)$$

If the initial level of abatement costs is not too high, i.e.,

$$c_0 \leq \frac{\delta d}{1 - \delta} (1 + \hat{t}\hat{y}) + d, \quad (15)$$

and if the number of countries N is sufficiently large, i.e.,

$$N \geq \frac{(\hat{y}/\alpha)(1 - \delta)^2 + \delta}{d(1 - \delta)\delta}, \quad (16)$$

then the strategies that exactly one country invests

$$I_0 = \frac{(1 - \delta)c_0 - d}{\alpha\delta d} - (\tilde{t} - 1)\hat{I} \quad (17)$$

in period $t = 0$ and $I_t = \hat{I}$ from period $t = 1$ to $t = \tilde{t} - 1$, and all countries sign a global emission reduction treaty in \tilde{t} that is based on Penance- m , are a subgame perfect and weakly renegotiation-proof equilibrium.

Proof. First, we determine the cost minimizing investment strategy to induce an agreement. The pioneer aims to obtain the payoffs arising from the emission reduction agreement as soon as possible. Therefore, it will invest the maximum level \hat{I} of investments but stops investing as soon as the “breakthrough” technology level is reached, i.e., when condition (8) is satisfied. The “breakthrough” level shall be reached in $t = \tilde{t}$ so that an emission reduction agreement will come into effect in the same period. If the “breakthrough” technology would be exceeded in \tilde{t} , the pioneer would only invest the residual investment in one period. Due to discounting, the residual investment is made in period $t = 0$. Hence, the resulting technology at $t = \tilde{t}$ equals

$$y_{\tilde{t}} = 1 + \alpha(I_0 + (\tilde{t} - 1)\hat{I}). \quad (18)$$

According to condition (8), there will be a global emission reduction agreement at $t = \tilde{t}$ if abatement costs fulfill

$$c_{\tilde{t}} = \frac{c_0 - d}{1 + \alpha(I_0 + (\tilde{t} - 1)\hat{I})} + d \leq \frac{d}{1 - \delta}. \quad (19)$$

The residual investment I_0 thus equals

$$I_0 = \frac{(1 - \delta)c_0 - d}{\alpha\delta d} - (\tilde{t} - 1)\hat{I}. \quad (20)$$

The “breakthrough” technology is reached at

$$\tilde{t} = \left\lceil \frac{(1 - \delta)c_0 - d}{\alpha\delta d\hat{I}} \right\rceil \geq 1, \quad (21)$$

where the brackets symbolize the ceiling function, which refers to the next largest natural number. At this point of time, condition (8) will be fulfilled so that every country would sign a global emission reduction agreement based on Penance-m.

Second, the pioneer must have an incentive to invest. That means the agreement has to be achievable with a profitable investment. Let the initial level of abatement costs be

$$c_0 \leq \frac{\delta d}{1 - \delta}(1 + t\hat{y}) + d.$$

Then

$$c_t^{min} = \frac{c_0 - d}{1 + t\hat{y}} + d \leq \frac{d}{1 - \delta},$$

i.e., the minimal costs c_t^{min} that are feasible in period t if the pioneer invests the maximum amount of \hat{I} all the time are low enough to induce a global agreement. Without the pioneer’s investment there is no agreement, now and forever. Therefore, the investment in R&D induces additional payoffs because the countries agree to reduce emissions at \tilde{t} . The investment strategy is profitable if

$$\sum_{\tau=0}^{\tilde{t}-1} \delta^\tau I_\tau \leq \sum_{\tau=\tilde{t}}^{\infty} \delta^\tau \left(dN - \frac{d}{1 - \delta} \right), \quad (22)$$

i.e., if the present value of investments does not exceed the present value of payoffs that result from the induced global emission reduction agreement. Because $\sum_{\tau=0}^{\tilde{t}-1} \delta^\tau I_\tau \leq \sum_{\tau=0}^{\tilde{t}-1} \delta^\tau \hat{I}$, condition (22) applies as well if

$$\sum_{\tau=0}^{\tilde{t}-1} \delta^\tau \hat{I} \leq \sum_{\tau=\tilde{t}}^{\infty} \delta^\tau \left(dN - \frac{d}{1 - \delta} \right) \quad (23)$$

holds. Hence, the pionier invests if it doesn’t receive the payoffs of an agreement too late,

$$\tilde{t} \leq \ln \left[\frac{\hat{y}}{\alpha(dN - d/(1 - \delta)) + \hat{y}} \right] / \ln[\delta] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \hat{t}. \quad (24)$$

Furthermore, $\hat{t} \geq 1$ applies if the number of countries is sufficiently large,

$$N \geq \frac{\hat{I}(1-\delta)^2 + \delta}{d(1-\delta)\delta}. \quad (25)$$

Otherwise, there is no profitable investment strategy for one country. To summarize, if

$$c_0 \leq \frac{\delta d}{1-\delta}(1 + \hat{t}\hat{y}) + d \quad (26)$$

and $\tilde{t} \leq \hat{t}$, then the agreement will be feasible following a strategy that is profitable.

Finally, we show that the assumptions on the initial level of abatement costs c_0 are not contradicting. Since $\hat{t} \geq 1$ and $\hat{y} > 0$, it holds that

$$\frac{d}{1-\delta} \leq \frac{\delta d}{1-\delta}(1 + \hat{t}\hat{y}) + d. \quad (27)$$

There are technologies with c_0 such that a global emission reduction agreement is not an equilibrium in period $t = 0$ but achievable at a later date with an investing pioneer. \square

5 Concluding Remarks

This paper offers a road map to limit cross border emissions effectively. Our analysis shows that strategic investments in R&D of green technology can pave the way for a future global agreement with the participation of all countries. These investments are no solution to the common good problem of emission reduction but might change the strategic situation of environmental agreements. Although no country will rationally lead the way by reducing emissions on its own, one single country can rationally lead the way by strategically investing in R&D, thereby enabling a global agreement with full participation.

While our model supports public investments in R&D, it does not support the popular claim that such a policy results in future jobs or monopoly rents based on patents. For the conclusion of a global agreement with full participation, the newly developed green technology must be made available to all countries free of cost, at least during the agreement. Therefore, the pioneer, that has developed the technology, cannot earn monopoly rents after \hat{t} . New jobs may merely be created in R&D, but not necessarily in the production and distribution of the “breakthrough” technology afterwards.

A thorough analysis of the investment strategy shows that the investment in R&D is a chicken game between all countries. While it is optimal to invest if no other country invests, the payoffs are higher if another country bears the investment costs for the technology. However, one can imagine

strategies where some countries share the burden. For example, in order to improve research efficiency and reduce development costs, the development of the new green technology could be accomplished by a cooperation of governments sharing the vision of a mankind of homo sustinens and/or of the countries who share green preferences and prefer sustainable economic activities.

References

- Abreu, D., 1988, On the theory of infinitely repeated games with discounting, *Econometrica* 56(2), 383-396.
- Asheim, G.B., C.B. Froyn, J. Hovi and F.C. Menz, 2006, Regional versus global cooperation on climate control, *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 51(1), 93-109.
- Asheim, G.B. and B. Holtsmark, 2009, Renegotiation-Proof Climate Agreements with Full Participation: Conditions for Pareto-Efficiency, *Environmental and Resource Economics* 43(4), 519-533.
- Barrett, S., 1999, A Theory of Full International Cooperation, *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 11(4), 519-541.
- Barrett, S., 2002, Consensus Treaties, *Journal of Institutional and Theoretical Economics* 158(4), 529-547.
- Bergin, J. and B. MacLeod, 1993, Efficiency and renegotiation in repeated games, *Journal of Economic Theory* 61(1), 42-73.
- Carraro, C. and D. Siniscalco, 1993. Strategies for the international protection of the environment. *Journal of Public Economics* 52(3), 309-328.
- Farrell, J. and E. Maskin, 1989, Renegotiation in Repeated Games, *Games and Economic Behavior* 1(4), 327-360.
- Froyn, C.B. and J. Hovi, 2008, A climate agreement with full participation, *Economics Letters* 99(2), 317-319.
- Sinn, H.-W., 2008, Public policies against global warming: a supply side approach, *International Tax and Public Finance* 15(4), 360-394.

- 03 „Bread, peace and the attrition of power: Economic events and German election results“
by Irem Batool and Gernot Sieg, October 2008
- 04 „Grandfather rights in the market for airport slots“
by Gernot Sieg, November 2008
- 05 „Strategic Debt Management within the Stability and Growth Pact“
by Gernot Sieg and Ulrike Stegemann, April 2009
- 06 „When to Regulate Airports: A Simple Rule“
by Uwe Kratzsch and Gernot Sieg, May 2009
- 07 „Pakistan, Politics and Political Business Cycles“
by Irem Batool and Gernot Sieg, November 2009
- 08 „Quality standards for passenger trains: Political majorities and environmental costs“
by Julia Rothbauer and Gernot Sieg, March 2010
- 09 „Public Service Broadcasting of Sport, Shows and News as Economic Solution to the Voter’s Paradox of Rational Ignorance“
by Julia Rothbauer and Gernot Sieg, October 2010
- 10 „A Full Participation Agreement On Global Emission Reduction Through Strategic Investments in R&D“
by Uwe Kratzsch, Gernot Sieg and Ulrike Stegemann, November 2010



© Technische Universität Braunschweig
Institut für Volkswirtschaftslehre
Telefon +49 531 391-2578
Telefax +49 531 391-2593
vwl@tu-braunschweig.de
www.tu-braunschweig.de/vwl