

# **Use of Long-term Auctions for Network Investment**

Tanga McDaniel and Karsten Neuhoff

NOTA DI LAVORO 29.2003

**MARCH 2003**

PRIV – Privatisation, Regulation, Antitrust

Tanga McDaniel, *University of Cambridge, Department of Applied Economics*  
Karsten Neuhoff, *University of Cambridge, Department of Applied Economics*

This paper can be downloaded without charge at:

The Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei Note di Lavoro Series Index:  
[http://www.feem.it/web/attiv/\\_wp.html](http://www.feem.it/web/attiv/_wp.html)

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

# Use of Long-term Auctions for Network Investment

## Summary

Short-term auctions for access to entry terminals of the British gas-network appear to successfully allocate scarce resources and capture scarcity rent. Now long-term auctions are being introduced to guide future capacity expansion decisions. In our model the fraction of rights issued in the long-term auction turns out to be a crucial design parameter. Even a “hypothetically” optimal parameter choice can in general only satisfy one of three aims: unbiased provision of capacity, full revelation of private information and minimisation of distortions from network effects. The results suggest that long-term auctions for transmission capacity are not necessarily preferable to regulatory approved capacity expansion.

**Keywords:** Auctions, gas, investment, networks, regulation

**JEL:** D44, L95, L5, D92

*This paper has been 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 26-28, 2002.*

*The authors want to thank David Newbery for extensive and helpful discussions, Gert Brunekreeft, Paul Pezanis-Christou, Emanuele Giovannetti, Paul Joskow, Richard Steinburg and seminar participants at the Max-Planck Institute, Jena for their comments. Any remaining errors are the authors'. The authors thank Transco Plc., Gottlieb-Daimler Foundation and the Economic and Social Research Council (awards R42200034307 and R000238563) for research support.*

*Address for correspondence:*

Tanga McDaniel  
Department of Applied Economics  
University of Cambridge  
Sidgwick Avenue  
Cambridge CB3 9DE  
UK  
Phone: 44-(0) 1223-335272  
Fax: 44-(0) 1223-335272  
E-mail: tm23@econ.cam.ac.uk

# 1 Introduction

Auctions are a common method of rationing fixed and scarce resources. Their potential use as a means of determining and allocating future demands is a relatively new idea, however. In electricity and gas industries auctions are either already in operation or are being discussed as a means of allocating use of constrained network capacity among energy producers. In the UK auctions have been used since September 1999 to ration entry rights to the national gas transmission system; access to the electricity interconnectors between many European borders (e.g., Belgium-Netherlands, Germany-Netherlands, France-UK, UK-Ireland, and Denmark-Germany) is determined via an auction process, and auctions are often used to allocate access to gas networks in the US. In many cases, auctions are replacing regulated and negotiated charges for access to essential facilities in utility industries. On the surface this makes perfect sense, and indeed, auctions eliminated the overbooking of constrained entry terminals on the UK gas network and allowed the network owner to capture and redistribute scarcity rent which was previously retained by traders. This leads to the following question: just how much can auctions revolutionize the way essential facilities are used- in particular, can they reveal unbiased demands and willingness to pay for network investments (i.e., future capacity).

In both electricity and gas there is discussion of and planning towards the use of auctions for guiding capacity investments. We argue that widening the use of auctions to determine demand for investments is not the logical extension of current auctions of existing capacity, and using the UK gas industry as a reference we show that, in the presence of market power, unbiased revelation of willingness to pay for investments cannot be achieved. Although this paper is motivated by the UK gas auctions of network capacity and the proposal by the regulator to use auctions as a means of guiding future investment decisions (we subsequently refer to this use of auctions as "long-term" auctions), the results generalize to other network markets where there is some market power, network constraints and competition among bidders.

McDaniel and Neuhoff (2002) discuss changes in the access regime to the national gas transmission system (NTS) in the UK and the use of short-term auctions for entry capacity.<sup>1</sup> They conclude that the short-term auctions have so far been successful with respect to a number of metrics including: anticipation of spot prices, reduction of con-

---

<sup>1</sup>A good summary of the early evolution is given by Armstrong, Cowan and Vickers (1994) .

straint alleviation costs, and rent capture. In this paper our focus will be on the long run aspects of the auction approach. Investment decisions in vertically disintegrated network industries are based on imperfect decentralized information. An objective of the auction would be to aggregate the individual demands and private information of bidders so that the network owner (in this case, Transco) can make better predictions about the need for capacity upgrades to the network. At the same time, there remains the objective of ensuring sufficient competition in gas spot markets. Our results show that these objectives interact with the product being auctioned in such a way that both cannot simultaneously be achieved. The results can be directly transferred to questions of capacity expansion in electricity networks, which were previously performed by regulated monopolies, potentially based on market signals as suggested by Rivier (1991) or Leautier (2000). Specific to electricity networks is that some investments can reduce overall performance of the network, however, Bushnell and Stoft (1996) show that in the case of full transmission contract coverage such detrimental investment will not be profitable for any party. Our analysis suggests that for a non-meshed network market power can significantly distort capacity investment. This is empirically supported by Abdala and Chambouleyron (1999) and Anderson (1999), who show that in spite of the positive framework no significant investment in transmission networks had been performed in Argentina, to our knowledge the only country that had implemented private grid capacity expansion by 1999.

This remainder of this paper is organized as follows: section two provides a description of the UK gas network and entry terminals; in section three we outline the assumptions and challenges for the auction and for the model that follows in section four. Section five is the heart of the paper; here we derive the fraction of entry capacity rights which would be auctioned long-term to meet three different objectives: eliminating bias resulting from market power, revealing private information about upstream production or removing distortions from downstream production. Additionally, we show that these objectives cannot be met simultaneously. Section six concludes.

## 2 The gas pipeline network

Figure 1 illustrates the main gas pipeline network in Northern Europe. Most underwater pipelines start from gas fields and transport gas of different consistencies that has to be processed at the beach before it can be inserted to the National Transmission System

(NTS). The UK is responsible for approximately 55% percent of North Sea gas production that can be roughly classified as wet and dry gas fields. Wet-gas is produced in the Northern fields that are interconnected to St. Fergus, and is a by-product of crude oil production. Producers of wet-gas are thus reluctant to adjust their output to match gas demand. The other fields are dry-gas fields which only produce natural gas implying that output can be more easily adjusted to accommodate seasonal variations in gas demand.

The Frigg pipeline was initially constructed to allow gas from the UK-Norwegian Frigg field to be transported to the UK. The Frigg Treaty of 1997 allowed use of the pipeline to import gas into the UK from additional Norwegian gas fields by interconnecting it with other pipelines and using it for new gas exploration.

The UK-Belgium interconnector, opened in October 1998, was initially planned to allow for exports of UK gas to the continent, but is also used on so-called reverse flows for imports into the UK during winter peak demand. Upgrades of compression facilities are planned for 2002 to increase the reverse flow capacity. Two further interconnectors are used for exports to Ireland. Given the level of abstraction of the current study, we simply classify these as additional demand on the NTS.

There are six major beach terminals in Great Britain where gas is put into the NTS: St. Fergus, Teeside, Easington, Theddlethorpe and Bacton on the east-coast and Barrow on the west-coast. St. Fergus in Scotland and Bacton in the south-east are the most active entry terminals on the network. The high demand for entry rights at St. Fergus can be seen by observing the number of gas pipelines connecting it to fields in the North Sea. Bacton is likewise connected to a number of major pipelines, but more importantly, it is the closest terminal to the interconnector linking Great Britain to the continent via Zeebrugge in Belgium. The first auction of entry capacity rights included only these six beach terminals; subsequent auctions also included a number of onshore fields, storage and constrained LNG facilities.

The NTS in the UK connects the gas landing facilities and storage facilities to gas customers. Demand for transmission services is volatile over the year and capacity is capital intensive making it inefficient to provide for a network that can satisfy all transmission requests. Over the last years the St. Fergus terminal in Scotland was the most constrained, with currently binding constraints in Scotland at Aberdeen, Moffat & Woller and Kirriemiur.



Figure 1: Gas Pipelines Northern Europe (Copyright Platts, 2001)

### 3 Model assumptions

#### 3.1 Market power

As illustrated by Figure 2 the overall concentration of gas production for the UK market is not high, but several terminals on the network are only used by a small number of producers (the extreme case being at Barrow where there is essentially only one producer buying capacity rights). A consultation document by Transco, the network owner/operator, shows 5-firm concentration ratios between 65-100 percent from July 1998 to June 1999.<sup>2</sup>

The concern about the effect of market power in the upstream market is mirrored in a recent consultation document by the Department of Trade and Industry. The first issue to be addressed was whether "upstream mergers have resulted in over-concentration of gas ownership." (DTI 2001) Given these concerns, our model assumes that there is some market power in production.

<sup>2</sup>Transco Revised Consultation Report on PC48, Methodology for determining floor prices for auctions of monthly entry capacity, Transco Plc. September 1999.




Figure 2: Share of UK gas production (Source: Leading UK Gas Producers, Platts 1998)

### 3.2 Capacity allocated in long-term auction and market entry

We assume that a proportion of transmission capacity is to be withheld from the long-term auction and allocated in spot markets. The initial purpose of retaining capacity rights for the spot market is the creation of a liquid short-term market and to ensure that entrants can obtain access rights at the market clearing price. Entry requires spot markets because few entrants would have funds to endure the time between the long-term auctions and the date at which they can deliver the first gas. Analysis of competition in the electricity industry by Newbery (1998) showed that entry and the threat of entry are essential to prevent high prices. In the long-term auction this would imply that additional firms will register to participate if they anticipate that the value of the capacity contracts they obtain will be above the spot price. In a world with perfect information, no uncertainty and without transaction costs this process would mitigate market power and reduce the inefficiency of the auction signal.

Ofgem's proposals have been that Transco provide sufficient capacity such that 20-25 percent of access rights will be auctioned in the spot market (2001a). We will refer to annual, monthly and daily auctions as spot markets in contrast to the long-term auction with a suggested five year horizon. When there is market power or private information about production decisions our model shows that the proportion of capacity reserved for the spot-market has substantial implications for the level of investment indicated by the long-term auction. Threat of entry might reduce inefficiencies resulting from such externalities, but entrants face two obstacles. First, entry is difficult if a five-year horizon is required before the first payback on investments can be expected. This difficulty will be

reflected in high capital costs or in difficulty ensuring the guarantees required when signing long-term contracts. Second, entrants have less information about the market situation than incumbents. They have less information about which capacity rights are profitable to obtain and which are not. We assume there is a fixed cost required for any participant to acquire information and maintain the trading capabilities to participate in long-term auctions. This effectively limits the number of shippers using the network and prevents only a theoretically feasible perfect arbitrage.<sup>3</sup>

The assumption of capacity allocation in the spot market makes possible a liquid spot market for transmission rights allowing any shipper to obtain transmission rights at the market-clearing price. All shippers will value the rights they purchased in the long-term market at the price they could obtain in the spot market. Figure 3 shows that prices in the monthly auctions (auctioned in 6-monthly tranches twice per year) are a good indicator for spot price differences between the beach price at St. Fergus- where gas is landed before entering the NTS in Scotland- and the National Balancing Point- a fictitious or notional point on the network where spot trading and balancing occur. Deviations can be explained by information revealed after the six months auction. Industry sources suggest that daily spot prices are in line with the other two indicators shown in the figure.

Shippers with long-term contracts are more detached from capacity spot prices; however, if significant trading volume is performed in the spot market, then all shippers will set prices in the downstream market corresponding to spot prices irrespective of their forward contracts. Hence all shippers will include transmission at the spot market clearing price into the resale price. A similar situation can be observed in the international oil market. "Transnationals" like BP-Amoco and Mobil (though not Exxon) are known to hedge prices of both their crude supplies and petroleum products. The system enables petroleum companies to predict and ensure refinery margins for the year ahead<sup>4</sup>. Irrespective of hedging strategies the firms will trade petroleum products corresponding to the spot market price.

---

<sup>3</sup>A shipper is anyone who has a license to put gas into the network; also, any producer who lands gas at one of the nodes on the network.

<sup>4</sup>Madhumita Chakraborty: "Expert group signals foray into oil futures", *Financial Express*, Tuesday, March 21, 2000, see also Phillips and Weiner (1994) .






Figure 3: Monthly averaged price differences between day-ahead spot market for gas at St. Fergus and National Balancing Point and weighted average prices paid in auction for monthly entry rights.

### 3.3 Capacity expansion

We assume the transmission operator and the regulator jointly determine the bidding procedure and that the regulator can use incentive schemes to motivate the regulated monopolist to implement any procedure. For the initial model the procedure is characterized by the parameter  $s$ — the fraction of total capacity allocated in the forward auction — and the reserve price  $r$  which is set to a fraction of the marginal cost of network expansion,  $0.8c$ . We assume that additional capacity is available at constant costs  $c$  per unit of capacity expansion; in reality scale effects usually imply that investment is only performed if a significant amount of extra capacity is required. The cost  $c$  can be thought of as the long run marginal cost (LRMC) of expanding the network to meet expected demand growth.<sup>5</sup>

One proposal by Ofgem for the long-term auction envisages selling bundled strips of

---

<sup>5</sup>Prior to the introduction of capacity auctions shippers paid NTS use of system charges consisting of commodity and capacity fees. The commodity fee was a flat unit rate; the capacity fees varied depending on the entry and offtake nodes on the network and were calculated by Transco on the basis of the LRMC of accommodating a sustained increase in demand between system nodes. (See Transco's *Ten year Statement 1998* for a description of the LRMC calculation: <http://www.transco.uk.com>)

5 year capacity or unbundled strips of 1 year series of capacity.<sup>6</sup> A short time horizon has the disadvantage that shippers can bid for high quantities so that excess capacity will exist and subsequent auction prices will be low. A longer time horizon as proposed by some respondents to the consultation process preferably corresponding to the life time of the investment, could prevent such behavior but would create rigidity in the system. If one producer anticipated high output during the initial years and a second producer only assumed higher production in subsequent years then their needs would not be matched in the long-term auction. One could imagine scenarios where both bid for capacity resulting in excessive investment or alternatively where neither bids resulting in under-investment.

### 3.4 Auction design challenge

Within the context of auction theory the right for network entry capacity is a multi-unit product for which bidders have multi-unit demands and multi-dimensional, affiliated values. In addition to these complexities, auctions for access to the gas network deviate from a standard single unit auction with affiliated values in five significant ways: first, multiple units of access rights are offered for each terminal. Second, access rights for several terminals are auctioned concurrently and the value attributed to the rights by a shipper at one terminal depends on the price to be paid at other terminals.<sup>7</sup> Third, the number of access rights issued for a terminal depends on the quantity required at other terminals because most capacity constraints are not at the terminal but in the network; therefore, the auctioneer (Transco in this case) has some flexibility as to which terminal to allocate the capacity. Fourth, it is proposed that long-term auction results will determine investment in capacity expansion— knowing there will be sufficient capacity would give a shipper the flexibility to expand future output beyond the level he contracted in the long-term market. Fifth, the auction designers (in this case Ofgem in conjunction with government) are not primarily interested in maximizing auction revenue (as the auctioneer is a regulated monopolist), but instead care about competition in production and supply,

---

<sup>6</sup>Ofgem, *Transco's National Transmission System System Operator incentives 2002-2007, Final Proposals*, December 2001

<sup>7</sup>In FCC auctions for radio spectrum companies value spectrum based on whether they obtain spectrum in neighboring regions or whether technology applied by provider in neighboring region is compatible with own technology. Entry terminals are not complementary in this way. Some are substitutes in the long run since entry prices influence where producers build pipelines.

security of supply and allocative efficiency.

Subsets of these deviations from a simple auction typically suffice to ensure that the auction will be inefficient. Regarding point two Jehiel and Moldovanu (2001) show that if signals for bidders are multi-dimensional (e.g., private information about expected production at different possibly multiple terminals) then full efficiency is unlikely to be achieved. Moreover, efficiency and revenue maximization do not often coincide in such complex environments. Dasgupta and Maskin (2000) derive strict conditions under which efficient allocations can occur in multi-unit common value auctions if one allows bids to be contingent on the bids of others. However, Jehiel and Moldovanu show that efficient multi-object auctions with common values in general do not exist.

McCabe et al. (1989) anticipate the notion that auctions might successfully allocate rights to future network access, but do not discuss the interaction of long-term and short-term auctions and the strategic effect of this interaction on bidders' incentives.

Our analysis of long-term auctions is simplified by the fact that a significant proportion of access rights are allocated in the short-term market and that rights are defined as use-it-or-lose-it (i.e., if the owner of the rights does not indicate an intention to use them by a pre-specified time, the rights can be re-auctioned). This makes a liquid spot market possible and prevents withholding of capacity to influence market outcomes in the spot market. All companies will therefore value their rights based on the spot market values and any difference between the spot market prices and the price of long-term contracts represent a sunk cost with little impact on the competition.<sup>8</sup>

Two open ended auction designs were initially proposed for the UK by the regulator Ofgem (2001a). The first design is a pay-as-bid auction where all bids are accepted which are either supported by existing capacity or for which the lowest bid is still high enough to pay for the corresponding capacity expansion. The second design is an iterative approach whereby Transco announces prices that are increased until the capacity, which shippers bid for at the announced price, coincides with the existing capacity. If more than the existing capacity is required at price  $c$  then it is assumed that Transco will expand the network to accommodate demand.

We do not explicitly replicate the suggested auction mechanism, but use the Cournot

---

<sup>8</sup>The 3G auctions in Europe show that auction fees which appear to be sunk costs nevertheless can influence subsequent decisions. We indirectly incorporate these effects by assuming a fixed cost  $c_i$  of participating in the long-term auction, which reduces competitiveness of the long-term market.

approximation. Fortunately, this approximation is exact in our setting because the expected auction price in a situation with network expansion will always be the marginal cost of network expansion  $c$ . Therefore it suffices for bidders to specify the quantity they want to obtain since the price is already given. Our model is simplified in that it does not capture the discrete nature of capacity expansion. In a situation with discrete capacity expansion the marginal bid can be above  $c$  if insufficient bids are available to allow for a further step of capacity expansion.

## 4 The Model

We will use the British gas market to describe the model underlying our results. Many of the issues involved in an auction for entry rights to the NTS in Britain can to our understanding be captured in a two-node setting. Node one represents the beachhead at St. Fergus where gas is landed before entering the network; node two represents the National Balancing Point (NBP). Entry rights correspond to transmission capacity between St. Fergus and the NBP.

The capacity available for inserting gas or electricity into a network is generally a function of the net-flows at the remaining nodes. However, gas-flow patterns in the UK are predictable and the current short-term capacity allocation mechanism rather successfully separated the allocation of entry rights from the allocation of exit rights. We follow this concept in the subsequent analysis which allows us to focus the model on entry rights and the role of producers.<sup>9</sup>

We focus on a scenario where constraints exist so that capacity expansion is required to fully accommodate demand. The results of the long-term auction determine the transmission capacity made available in five years time. We model the allocation and investment process in four steps. At step zero the regulator or transmission operator decides on the fraction of capacity to allocate in the long-term auction. In the first step access rights are auctioned in the long-auction. In the second step the transmission operator decides how much to invest in capacity expansion and in the third step the remaining capacity is allocated in the short term auctions. This approach appears to reflect the initial thinking of

---

<sup>9</sup>In a recent discussion of transmission rights in the electricity markets a similar separation of entry and exit rights were suggested (Ofgem 2001b). We believe that the volatility of electricity flow patterns makes such an approach infeasible.

Ofgem regarding the auction’s implementation (Ofgem 2001a). Later documents (Ofgem 2002) discuss auctioning a fixed fraction of existing capacity and reserving a fixed amount of this same capacity for short-term auctions. The difference in designs produces a subtle change in our results but the qualitative message remains the same. The alternative design is discussed in the Appendix.

As is common in models with a number of stages we use backward induction to find the solution. We begin by finding a solution for step 3, use this solution to determine optimal actions for step 2, and finally, by knowing agents’ preferred actions in subsequent rounds, we can determine the solution for step 1.

## 4.1 Period three

Changes of available transmission capacity in five years time have a twofold effect. Additional capacity permits additional gas to flow into the network and therefore reduces prices at the NBP. At the same time additional capacity from St. Fergus to the NBP results in higher demand for gas at St. Fergus and will thereby increase spot prices at the beachhead. We identify three categories of shippers which are identified with different strategies. The first category are local gas producers,  $l$ , who land all their gas for the UK at St. Fergus. Second are national gas producers,  $n$ , landing at St. Fergus and other UK terminals. As we assume that other terminals are unconstrained in our model all non-St. Fergus gas is delivered to the NBP. The third category consists of trading companies,  $t$ , owning shares of transmission capacity. This setup is illustrated in Figure 4.

We assume a competitive short-term market for gas. This assumption is supported by the observation that scarcity prices of entry capacity rights at St. Fergus are continuously high. In a non-competitive market producers landing at St. Fergus would reduce their output in order to capture the scarcity rent. High scarcity prices would then only be observed at times when Transco has to buy back entry capacity rights, but not in the monthly auctions.

Total expected production  $Q_u$  at St. Fergus (upstream) equals the total production of  $n_l$  symmetric local producers ( $q_l$ ) and  $n_n$  symmetric national producers ( $q_n$ ). Higher prices upstream,  $p_u$ , (i.e., prices on the beach before the gas enters the network) motivate producers to increase their production by the factor  $\frac{\alpha}{Q}$ . Aggregate production is a function




Figure 4: We model local producers, national producers and traders in a two node network.

of aggregate intercept  $Q = n_l q_l + n_n q_n$  and aggregate slope  $\theta$ , with  $\theta = (n_l + n_n) \alpha$

$$Q_u = n_l (q_l + \alpha p_u) + n_n (q_n + \alpha p_u) = Q + \theta p_u. \quad (1)$$

Each national producer is furthermore assumed to land  $q_o$  units of gas at the NBP. For simplicity we assume that this quantity does not change with the price level at the NBP. We solve for the upstream spot price using (1) and our assumption that the supply of transmission capacity  $K$  is scarce:

$$p_u = \frac{K - Q}{\theta}. \quad (2)$$

The downstream price at the NBP,  $p_d$ , results from market clearing of net demand  $D - \frac{\theta}{\gamma} p_d$  (total demand at NBP minus landing at terminals other than St. Fergus) with gas delivered from St. Fergus:

$$p_d = \frac{D - K}{\frac{\theta}{\gamma}}, \quad (3)$$

where  $\frac{\theta}{\gamma}$  is the slop of downstream demand curve and satisfies  $0 < \gamma \leq 1$ ,  $\frac{\theta}{\gamma} \geq \theta$ .

## 4.2 Period two

Transmission capacity is expanded such that the total auctioned capacity  $Y$  equals the announced fraction of total capacity,  $sK$ . The total auctioned capacity is the sum of bids

at or above long term marginal cost of expansion  $c$  of all shippers  $Y = \sum_{i \in \{l, n, t\}} n_i y_i$ .<sup>10</sup>

$$K = \frac{Y}{s} = \frac{\sum_{i \in \{l, n, t\}} n_i y_i}{s}. \quad (4)$$

For example, if the sum of bids is 80 and 80 percent of capacity was auctioned long-term then total capacity must be expanded to  $\frac{80}{0.8} = 100$  so that  $(1-s)$  is available for the short-term auction.

In the discussion we address the question whether the auctioneer or the regulator can adapt  $s$  to adjust for distortions due to market power. In the appendix we present a second design option: Instead of requiring Transco to offer a fixed proportion of total installed capacity in the short term market we assess the impact of requiring Transco to offer a fixed amount  $K_s$  of capacity in the short term market. The results are qualitatively similar but provide for less flexibility for the regulator to balance the goals of revelation of private information and mitigating market power based on public information.

### 4.3 Period one

In the auction all shippers choose the quantity of long term rights  $y_i$  in order to maximize expected profit.<sup>11</sup> The profit function for a national producer equals the number of rights obtained  $y_n$  in the long term auction times their value in the spot market. This value equals the price difference in the spot markets  $p_d - p_u$  minus the price  $c$  to be paid for the rights. The national producer furthermore sells  $q_n$  in the upstream market and  $q_0$  in the downstream market.

$$\pi_n = y_n (p_d - p_u - c) + (q_n + \alpha p_u) p_u + q_0 p_d. \quad (5)$$

---

<sup>10</sup>The currently proposed auction design sets a reserve price of 0.8 times long term marginal cost  $c$ . This creates an additional incentive to understate capacity requirements. If in 'reality' a small expansion would be required and therefore the market clearing price in the auction would be  $c$ , then bidders with market power will reduce their bidding volume to push the long-term auction price to  $0.8c$  and retain profits of  $0.2c$  when the real scarcity value realises in period three. However, the current analysis is restricted to a situation where capacity expansion occurs.

<sup>11</sup>When modelling markets with a homogeneous good like the access rights, the basic approaches are either Bertrand or Cournot models. In a Bertrand model firms are believed to set a price for the good they are selling and subsequently customers buy the cheapest good while a Cournot approach assumes that price evolves until supply matches demand. When there are transmission constraints shippers will jointly increase prices (through their quantity choices) until demand for transmission has reduced to the available capacity. The choice variable of companies is therefore the capacity  $y_i$  to provide for shipping.

The FOC with respect to  $y$  gives the optimal quantity to be obtained in the auction. Note that  $Y$  is the sum of all  $y_i$ . We keep  $Y$  at the right hand side to simplify the subsequent calculation.

$$y_n = \frac{(s - \frac{2\alpha}{\theta})Q + \gamma sD - s\theta c - \gamma q_0 + q_n}{1 + \gamma} + \left( \frac{2\alpha}{s\theta(1 + \gamma)} - 1 \right) Y. \quad (6)$$

A local producer does not sell gas at the NBP, therefore we set  $q_0 = 0$  and obtain from (6)

$$y_l = \frac{(s - \frac{2\alpha}{\theta})Q + \gamma sD - s\theta c + q_l}{1 + \gamma} + \left( \frac{2\alpha}{s\theta(1 + \gamma)} - 1 \right) Y \quad (7)$$

Finally we assess trading companies that do not produce any gas. Setting  $q_n = q_0 = \alpha = 0$  in (6) gives the quantity traders bid for in the auction:

$$y_t = \frac{sQ + \gamma sD - s\theta c}{1 + \gamma} - Y. \quad (8)$$

#### 4.4 Total capacity provided

We can now calculate total capacity requested in the auction. We use the definition of total auctioned capacity  $Y = \sum_{i \in \{n, l, t\}} n_i y_i$  and substitute  $y_i$ 's from equations (6), (7) and (8). Then we use  $Q = n_n q_n + n_l q_l$  according to (1) and set  $n_n + n_l + n_t = N$  to obtain

$$Y_{\text{auction}} = \frac{1}{1 + N - \frac{2}{s(1+\gamma)}} \frac{N(sQ + \gamma sD - s\theta c) - \gamma n_n q_0 - Q}{1 + \gamma}. \quad (9)$$

The boundary conditions require that all shippers submit positive bids. A rough approximation of the values of  $s$  which satisfy this requirement can be obtained by calculating the  $s$  for which aggregate bidding volume (9) is positive,  $s > \frac{2}{(1+N)(1+\gamma)}$ . The exact calculation for national producers gives a slightly higher value of  $s$ . Either way the value is far below what is being considered and thus not restrictive for our purpose.

To allow for comparison we need to know the quantity of transmission capacity provided for by a social welfare planner. He provides for sufficient capacity such that the marginal value of additional transmission capacity  $p_d - p_u$  equals unit expansion costs  $c$ . This gives

$$Y_{\text{opt}} = \frac{sQ + s\gamma D - s\theta c}{1 + \gamma}. \quad (10)$$

Comparing  $Y_{\text{auction}}$  and  $Y_{\text{opt}}$  we obtain

$$Y_{\text{auction}} - Y_{\text{opt}} = \frac{Y_{\text{opt}} \left( \frac{2}{s} - (1 + \gamma) \right) - \gamma n_n q_0 - Q}{(1 + N)(1 + \gamma) - \frac{2}{s}}. \quad (11)$$



It follows that insufficient capacity is provided for ( $Y_{\text{auction}} - Y_{\text{opt}} < 0$ ) if national gas producers' output at the national balancing point (or other unconstrained terminals) relative to total output at the constrained terminal (St. Fergus) is bigger than the following value:

$$\frac{n_n q_o}{Q} > \frac{1}{\gamma} \left[ \frac{Y_{\text{opt}}}{Q} \left( \frac{2}{s} - (1 + \gamma) \right) - 1 \right] \quad (12)$$

If  $\frac{Y_{\text{opt}}}{Q} \leq \frac{1}{\frac{2}{s} - (1 + \gamma)}$  then we obtain insufficient investment ( $Y_{\text{auction}} < Y_{\text{opt}}$ ) even for  $q_0 = 0$ , which implies that we do not even need national producers for underinvestment to occur. Local producers under-contract in the long term auction in order to reduce available capacity towards NBP and increase NBP prices and therefore the value of their remaining long-term access rights.

The number of traders  $n_t$  does not change the qualitative result. However, in equation (11) more traders reduces the difference between  $Y_{\text{auction}} - Y_{\text{opt}}$  and thereby increase the match between the auction result and social planner's decision.

## 4.5 Entry cost for traders

An increase in the number of traders reduces the profit to be made by each trader in two ways. First, it reduces the difference between auctioned capacity and optimal capacity, thereby reducing the profits to be made on each unit of capacity. Second, it reduces the market share of each trader. For a given number of traders we can calculate the profit each trader obtains: from (5) set  $q_0 = q_n = 0$ ; substitute  $y_t$  from (8); substitute  $p_d$  and  $p_u$  from (3) and (2); substitute  $K$  from (4), and set  $Y = Y_{\text{auction}}$  from (9):

$$\pi_t(n_t) = \frac{s}{\theta(1 + \gamma)} \left( \frac{\left(1 - \frac{2}{s(1 + \gamma)}\right) (sQ + \gamma sD - s\theta c) + \gamma n_n \frac{q_o}{s} + \frac{Q}{s}}{1 + N - \frac{2}{s(1 + \gamma)}} \right)^2 \quad (13)$$

The equilibrium number of traders  $n_t$  is achieved if all traders make positive profit while any additional trader would not be able to cover fixed entry costs  $c_i$ :

$$\pi_t(n_t + 1) < c_i \leq \pi_t(n_t). \quad (14)$$

From equation (13) it follows for  $n_t$  that  $\pi_t(n_t)$  grow with  $\left(\frac{1}{1 + n_n + n_t + n_t}\right)^2$  and using (14) gives for the equilibrium number of traders  $1 + n_n + n_t + n_t$  which is proportional to  $\sqrt{\frac{1}{c_i}}$ . The total number of market participants increases only with the root of the reduction in costs. Looking at equation (11) this shows that for a reduction of factor two of the

mismatch between auctioned capacity and optimal capacity to be auctioned,  $c_i$  has to be reduced by the factor of four. As  $c_i$  does never approach 0, unless traders are subsidized, traders will not provide for perfect arbitrage.

## 5 Discussion

In the previous section we developed a model to illustrate the effect of strategic behavior of bidders if the auction results are used to decide on transmission capacity expansion. The only parameter to be chosen by the regulator or transmission operator was the fraction  $s$  of capacity rights to be allocated in the long-term auction. In the next three sections we will assume that the transmission operator uses all publicly available information to choose the optimal  $s$  in step zero in order to achieve the best match between transmission capacity provided and transmission capacity required.

We show that a unique unbiased  $s$  that is plausible for the industry does not exist because of the competing objectives of the auction: A different  $s$  must be chosen to satisfy each of three desirable criteria. In section 5.1 we show that with full information  $s_{full}$  will provide for the correct amount of investment. That is, setting  $s = s_{full}$  removes the distortion in the auction outcome resulting from market power. However, shippers may also have private information about their upstream production decisions. In this case, as shown in section 5.2,  $s_{pri}$  which in general differs from  $s_{full}$  should be chosen to reveal private information. Section 5.3 shows that a third value,  $s_{net}$ , should be chosen if the goal is to minimize network interactions due to private information of national producers about their production in other parts of the country.

In section 5.4 we show that all three objectives cannot be simultaneously achieved and discuss the merits of an approach to change  $s$  during the procedure. This would allow the auctioneer to achieve two out of the three previous goals, but changing  $s$  will destroy the reputation of the auctioneer and therefore interfere with future auctions. Finally, in section 5.5 we analyze whether deviations of Cournot equilibrium are feasible.

## 5.1 Avoiding biased capacity provision, full information $s_{full}$

Equation (11) suggests that we can choose  $s$  in order to match  $Y_{auction}$  and  $Y_{opt}$ . This would involve setting

$$s_{full} = \frac{1}{1 + \gamma} \left( 2 - \frac{Q + \gamma n_n q_0}{K_{opt}} \right). \quad (15)$$

In order to make comparisons between our three values for  $s$  we first find numerical approximations under plausible assumptions. We then make analytical comparisons under the assumption that, in the long run equilibrium  $K_{opt} \sim Q$  (i.e., the optimal amount of capacity between St. Fergus and the NBP is equal to upstream production). For numerical approximations we assume that the output of national producers at the NBP equals total production at St. Fergus  $n_n q_0 = Q$ , and the price elasticity at St. Fergus is one-third of the price elasticity at the NBP (i.e.,  $\gamma = 1/3$ ). We thus obtain  $s_{full} \sim \frac{1}{2}$ . Only if half the fraction of total capacity is offered in the long-term auction then the distortions of individual bidders cancel each other and in the presence of full information the appropriate amount of capacity is provided by the long-term auction.

## 5.2 Revelation of private information, $s_{pri}$

In the previous section we analyzed the effect of  $s$  on the future investment assuming that all information was publicly shared. Now we incorporate the effect that producers have additionally with their private information. The purpose of the auction is to reveal such information in order to provide for the optimal amount of capacity. However, producers only focus on their individual profit. The calculation shows that the result is that they usually do not perfectly reveal their private information. Rewriting (6) to ensure that  $y_n$  only appears on the left hand side we obtain:

$$y_n = \frac{\left( s - \frac{2}{n_i + n_n} \right) Q + \gamma s D - s \theta c - \gamma q_0 + q_n}{2(1 + \gamma) - \frac{2}{s(n_i + n_n)}} + \frac{\frac{2}{s(n_i + n_n)} - (1 + \gamma)}{2(1 + \gamma) - \frac{2}{s(n_i + n_n)}} (Y - y_n) \quad (16)$$

Please note, that  $Y$  is the sum over all  $y_i$  and therefore  $Y - y_n$  does not contain the  $y_n$  we are calculating.

We want to know by how much a national producer changes her bid in the long term auction, if her private signal changes while all other players retain their signal. Differentiating (16) with respect to  $q_n$  we obtain

$$\frac{\partial y_n}{\partial q_n} = \frac{s - \frac{2}{n_i + n_n} + 1}{2(1 + \gamma) - \frac{2}{s(n_i + n_n)}} \quad (17)$$

The auctioneer anticipates how shippers change their bids based on their private information  $q_n$  and intends to choose the optimal  $s_{pri}$  such that the provided capacity matches the additional/reduced requirements. Using the investment condition in equation (4) we calculate the expected effect of private information on the final allocation:

$$\frac{\partial K}{\partial q_n} = \frac{1}{s} \frac{\partial y_n}{\partial q_n} = \frac{s - \frac{2}{n_l + n_n} + 1}{2s(1 + \gamma) - \frac{2}{n_l + n_n}} \quad (18)$$

In the optimal scenario the system operator wants to ensure that shippers bidding according to their private information results in the same capacity expansion as would have been suggested by the optimal planning condition (10).  $\frac{\partial K}{\partial q_n} = \frac{1}{1 + \gamma}$  and choose

$$s_{pri} = 1 - \frac{2\gamma}{(n_n + n_l)(1 + \gamma)}$$

If we assume that two national and two local producers dominate production at St. Fergus then we obtain the optimal  $s_{pri} = 0.875$  as illustrated in Figure (5).




Figure 5: The proportion of rights allocated long-term  $s$  is optimal dependent on whether expected bias is to be eliminated  $s_{full}$ , truthful revelation of additional information is to be achieved  $s_{pri}$  or interference due to the network is to be minimised  $s_{net}$ .

### 5.3 Minimizing distortions through network effects, $s_{net}$

The auction result is furthermore distorted by changes in expected output of national producers  $q_0$  at terminals other than the terminal we are concerned about. According to (16) we obtain

$$\frac{\partial K}{\partial q_0} = \frac{1}{s} \frac{\partial y_n}{\partial q_0} = \frac{-\gamma}{2s(1+\gamma) - \frac{2}{(n_n+n_i)}} \quad (19)$$

Once again we require that the capacity change in the auction equals the capacity change implemented by a informed regulator, and obtain according to (10):

$$\frac{\partial K}{\partial q_0} \equiv \frac{\partial K_{opt}}{\partial q_0} = -\frac{\partial K_{opt}}{\partial D} = -\frac{\gamma}{1+\gamma} \quad (20)$$

Combining (19) and (20) we obtain an the equation for the optimal  $s_{net}$ :

$$s_{net} = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{(1+\gamma)(n_n+n_i)} \quad (21)$$

Using the previous parameter values gives  $s_{net} = 0.69$ . The higher the output of national producers is upstream, the higher can  $s$  be. If  $s < s_{net}$  then national producers' private information about changes of their future downstream output results in excessive capacity expansion, and  $s > s_{net}$  implies too little revelation of private information (i.e., too little capacity relative to the social planner's decision).

### 5.4 Can all objectives be achieved using one $s$ ?

In this section we first ask if a unique  $s$  exists to meet our three objectives simultaneously; then we discuss why  $s$  cannot be strategically changed by the auctioneer in step in step 2 of the auction procedure.

A value for  $s$  which removes distortions from market power and privately held upstream and downstream information would have to satisfy  $s_{full} = s_{pri} = s_{net}$ . We now show that not even any two pairs of the equality are generally satisfied (the entire equality is never satisfied). Maintaining the assumption that in a long run equilibrium,  $K_{opt} = Q$  (i.e., the amount of capacity that a social planner would choose equals total upstream production) the solutions to equations (22) and (23) depends on the magnitude of downstream production,  $n_n q_0$ , relative to upstream production,  $Q$ . Letting  $n_n q_0 = xQ$ , then  $s_{full} = s_{pri}$  gives:

$$\frac{1}{1+\gamma} \left( 2 - \frac{Q + \gamma x Q}{Q} \right) = 1 - \frac{2\gamma}{N(1+\gamma)} \quad (22)$$

This has one solution at  $\gamma = -\frac{N}{N-2}$  which is infeasible for  $N > 1$ . Second, if  $s_{full} = s_{net}$  then:

$$\frac{1}{1+\gamma} \left( 2 - \frac{Q + \gamma x Q}{Q} \right) = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{(1+\gamma)N} \quad (23)$$

which is solved when  $\gamma = \frac{N-2}{N(2x+1)}$ . In the UK total supply at non-St. Fergus terminals is approximately 1.8 times the supply from St. Fergus,<sup>12</sup> thus  $s_{full} = s_{net}$  when  $\gamma \sim \frac{N-2}{3.6(N+1)}$ .

Finally,  $s_{pri} = s_{net}$  when:

$$1 - \frac{2\gamma}{N(1+\gamma)} = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{(1+\gamma)N} \quad (24)$$

This occurs when  $\gamma = -\frac{N-2}{N-4}$  and is only feasible for  $N = 3$ .

Instead of choosing one optimal  $s$  to satisfy all criteria it would be tempting for the auctioneer to change the  $s$  throughout the process. That is, he might initially sell a fraction  $s_1 = s_{pri}$  of total access rights to ensure full revelation of private information and correct the market power distortions in step two by applying an  $s_2$  that differs from the  $s_1$ . Alternatively high  $s_1 = s_{net}$  could be initially chosen to fully capture private information from national producers about changes in output downstream and systematic bias from market power corrected for at step 2.

However, the change of  $s_1$  towards  $s_2$  in step two would not be welcomed by the market, and would not be feasible in any repeated game as shown by experience from inflation targeting of central banks. Central Banks like to increase the amount of money circulating in the economy in order to stimulate the economy: More money allows agents to buy more services, which results in more production etc. But if agents anticipate additional money to be circulated in the economy then they will increase prices and wages. In equilibrium the additional money issued by the Central Bank is matched by higher prices such that the amount of services and products bought stays constant. The only result of the economic ambitions of the Central Bank is inflation. Therefore most Central Banks that are headed by conservative bankers are believed to have little interest in stimulating the economy but significant interest in maintaining low inflation. Such Central Bankers will only increase the volume of money issued as a result of events that are unanticipated by all players. If a Central Banker will increase the money volume more than previously announced in order to stimulate the economy he and the bank loses the credibility as a conservative banker. In the future markets will anticipate similar behavior and future inflation will be higher.

---

<sup>12</sup>National Grid Company, *Seven Year Statement*

This experience corresponds to the auctioneer’s decision process. Transco announces the factor  $s_1$  to inform shippers about the link between auction results and capacity expansion. Shippers bid in the auction based on their beliefs about subsequently capacity investments. The auctioneer can deviate once from the announced  $s_1$  but in all subsequent years shippers will anticipate such behavior and include it in the bidding strategy.

## 5.5 Danger of foreclosure

Can shippers reserve excessive capacity in the long-term market such that competitors cannot obtain sufficient capacity in the spot market? Faced with a shortage of transmission capacity in the spot market competitors would lack growth potential or even have to default on existing contracts. If such a scenario were realistic it would imply that all shippers amply contract in the long-term auction to ensure sufficient capacity will be available for their own needs or to foreclose competitors. We believe that such a scenario is unlikely for the following three reasons.

First, withholding transmission capacity is difficult. For a producer such as a generator withholding output is feasible because competition authorities have problems attributing such behavior to intentional market manipulation.<sup>13</sup> However, for the owner of a transmission network withholding output (i.e., capacity rights) is more difficult since this behavior can be observed and verified by the competition authorities.

Second, we mentioned at the beginning that we assume that the transmission operator will make a significant fraction  $(1 - s)$  of transmission capacity available in the short-term time frame of a year or less - the main motivation being the support of potential entrants, but furthermore as a means of preventing foreclosure. This additional capacity makes foreclosure in the long-term market counter-productive since over contracting signals the need for more investment which makes more (not less) capacity available in short term markets.

A third argument is related to our previous model. We analyzed shippers’ strategies with a Cournot model to ensure that small unilateral deviations are not profitable. But would a large deviation by shipper, requesting a large quantity in the forward market, be profitable? This shipper could then try to foreclose competitors in the spot market.

---

<sup>13</sup>Experience in the California electricity market indicates that it is hard to differentiate between electricity generators withholding capacity and planned outages for revision or breakdowns (Joskow and Kahn 2001).

Such a deviation seems unlikely. We mentioned above the difficulties of foreclosure in an easily controllable market; in addition to this competitors would observe the behavior of the deviating shipper for example by analyzing the aggregate capacity bids in the long-term auction. If competitors were worried about being a victim of such a foreclosure in the future they would reveal their information to the auctioneer, the regulator or the competition authority. Based on this information the auctioneer could re-evaluate and re-decide on the investment and allocation strategy.

## 6 Conclusion

Short-term auctions for access to terminals of the British gas-network have been used since September 1999 and appear to successfully allocate scarce resources and capture scarcity rent. Now long-term auctions are being introduced to guide future capacity expansion decisions.

It is important for competition that some access rights be made available in spot markets. In our model the fraction of total rights issued in the long-term auction turns out to be a crucial design parameter. Even a ‘hypothetically’ optimal parameter choice can in general only satisfy one of three competing aims: unbiased provision of capacity, full revelation of private information, and minimization of distortions from network effects. Gas industries are characterized by asymmetric agents who produce and sell at different points on the network. In this setting, private information about production can give incentives for over or under investment depending on the proportion of capacity reserved for spot markets.

One alternative to long-term auctions is a regulatory approved decision about capacity expansion by the transmission owner. This decision would be based on the same publicly available information as the decision about the optimal  $s$ , but would not be influenced by privately held information and would consequently be less prone to error caused by information about production at other entry terminals. Producers would be more willing to reveal private information about expected output growth because additional capacity would increase the value of their output and they would not face the ‘artificial’ incentive to push up the value of their long-term entry rights by withholding information. However, shippers might overstate capacity requirements to reduce risk of congestion, in order to increase the expected value of their gas.



Our simple model does not allow for a comprehensive analysis of the trade-off between regulatory approved capacity expansion and expansion based on auction results. However, it suggests that investment bias and withholding of private information can be significant drawbacks of long-term auctions.

## References

- Abdala, M. A. and A. Chambouleyron (1999). Transmission investment in competitive power systems. Privatesector - Worldbank.
- Anderson, K. P. and A. McCarthy (1999). Transmission pricing and expansion methodology: lessons from argentina. *Utilities Policy* 8, 199–211.
- Armstrong, M., S. Cowan, and J. Vickers (1994). *Regulatory Reform, Economic Analysis and British Experience*. Cambridge Massachusetts.
- Bushnell, J. B. and S. Stoft (1996). Electric grid investment under a contract regime. *Journal of Regulatory Economics* 10, 61–79.
- Dasgupta, P. and E. S. Maskin (2000). Efficient auctions. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 341–88.
- DTI (2001). Gas: A consultation on concerns about gas prices and possible improvements to market efficiency.
- Jehiel, P. and B. Moldovanu (2001). Efficient design with interdependent valuations. *Econometrica* 69(5), 1237–59.
- Joskow, P. and E. Kahn (2001). A quantitative analysis of pricing behavior in california’s wholesale electricity market during summer 2000. *Working paper*.
- Leautier, T.-O. (2000). Regulation of an electricity power transmission company. *The Energy Journal* Vol. 23, No. 4, 61–91.
- McCabe, K., S. Rassenti, and V. Smith (1989). Designing smart computer assisted markets. *European Journal of Political Economy* 5.
- McDaniel, T. and K. Neuhoff (2002). Auctions to gas transmission access: The british experience. *Working Paper*.
- Newbery, D. M. (1998). Competition, contracts, and entry in the electricity spot market. *RAND Journal of Economics* 29 (4), 726–749.

Ofgem (2001a). Long term signals and incentives for investment in transmission capacity on transco's national transmission system. *March*.

Ofgem (2001b). Ngc system operator incentive scheme from april 2002 initial proposals. *December*.

Ofgem (2002). Transco price control and nts so incentives 2002-2007: Explanatory notes to accompany the section 23 notice of proposed modifications to transco's transporter licence. *April*.

Phillips, G. M. and R. J. Weiner (1994). Information and normal backwardation as determinants of trading performance: Evidence from north sea oil forward market. *The Economic Journal* 104, 76-95.

Rivier, M. and I. J. Perez-Arriaga (1991). Cost allocation of transmission services. *Power Industry Computer Applications Conference Baltimore*.

## A Short term capacity independent of investment

The previous analysis assumed a constant fraction  $1 - s$  of total installed capacity is made available in the short term market. Alternatively a fixed amount of pre-auction, existing capacity  $K_S$  which is independent of the total post-auction installed capacity could be made available in the short term market. The expansion rules for transmission capacity (4) change to:

$$K = K_S + \sum_{i \in \{l, n, t\}} n_i y_i. \quad (25)$$

This changes prices in the profit function for national producers (5) and the subsequent FOC (6) for the determine the bid volume:

$$y_n = \frac{(1 - \frac{2\alpha}{\theta})Q + \gamma D - \theta c - \gamma q_0 + q_n}{\gamma + 1} + \left( \frac{2\alpha}{\theta(\gamma + 1)} - 1 \right) (K_S + Y). \quad (26)$$

The bid function for local producers, previously (7), now follows from setting  $q_0 = 0$  in (26) and the previous bid function for traders (8) is replaced by (26) with  $\alpha = 0$  and  $q_n = 0$ . Aggregating these individual bid functions total capacity requested in the auction is

$$Y_{auct} = \frac{1}{1 + N - \frac{2}{1+\gamma}} \frac{N(Q + \gamma D - \theta c) - \gamma n_n q_0 - Q + (\gamma + 1) K_S}{1 + \gamma} - K_S, \quad (27)$$

while the socially optimal bid volume, previously (10), now becomes:

$$Y_{opt} = \frac{Q + \gamma D - c\theta}{1 + \gamma} - K_S. \quad (28)$$

Comparing (27) and (28) it follows that insufficient investment is provided iff:

$$\frac{n_n q_o}{Q} > \frac{1}{\gamma} \left[ \frac{Y_{opt}}{Q} (1 - \gamma) + 2 \frac{K_S}{Q} - 1 \right]. \quad (29)$$

If  $\frac{Y_{opt}}{Q} < \frac{1 - 2 \frac{K_S}{Q}}{1 - \gamma}$  then investment is insufficient ( $Y_{auction} < Y_{opt}$ ) even for  $q_0 = 0$ .

Moving on to the policy implications we can calculate the optimal  $K_S$ , instead of previously  $s_{full}$ , to avoid biased capacity provision due to market power for the case of complete and symmetric information:

$$K_S = \frac{2\gamma Q - (1 - \gamma)\gamma D + (1 - \gamma)c\theta}{(1 + \gamma)^2} \quad (30)$$

To calculate the effect of private information about future up- and downstream production quantities we rearrange (26) to ensure  $y_n$  only appears on the left hand side.

Differentiating this re-arranged equation with respect to  $q_n$  gives the change of national producers' bid as a function of their private information on upstream production quantities

$$\frac{\partial K}{\partial q_n} = \frac{\partial y_n}{\partial q_n} = \frac{1 - \frac{1}{n_n + n_l}}{1 - \frac{1}{n_n + n_l} + \gamma} \quad (31)$$

To evaluate (31) we compare it to how much optimal capacity (30) changes when the amount of upstream production  $q_n$  changes:  $\frac{\partial K_{opt}}{\partial q_n} = \frac{1}{1 + \gamma}$ . The auction (31) with a finite number of shippers  $n_n + n_l \leq N < \infty$  only provides for complete revelation of private information on upstream production if downstream price is independent of imports ( $\gamma \rightarrow 0$ ).

The effect of private information of future downstream production quantities  $q_0$  of national producers on their bid follows from differentiating the re-arranged (26) with respect to :

$$\frac{\partial K}{\partial q_0} = \frac{\partial y_n}{\partial q_0} = -\frac{1}{2} \frac{\gamma}{1 + \gamma - \frac{1}{n_l + n_n}} \quad (32)$$

Comparing the result to the capacity change implemented by a well informed regulator (20)  $\frac{\partial K}{\partial q_0} = -\frac{\gamma}{1 + \gamma}$  shows that both results will only coincide if  $\gamma = \frac{2}{n_n + n_l} - 1$ . The market with a finite number of shippers only provides the appropriate capacity if either downstream price slope equals upstream price slope and only one strategic producer exists that is national or if two strategic producers exist and downstream price is price independent ( $\gamma=0$ ).

Choosing the 'right' quantity of transmission capacity  $K_s$  to be allocated short term can remove biased bids based on public information. However, any private information is only revealed incompletely. Deciding on the absolute amount  $K_s$  rather than on the fraction of total installed capacity  $1 - s$  to be allocated short term eliminates the option for regulators to choose between unbiased provision of public information and revelation of different types of private information. Apart from this difference neither design can simultaneously provide for unbiased use of public information in the presence of market power and unbiased revelation of private information on up- and downstream production quantities.

## NOTE DI LAVORO DELLA FONDAZIONE ENI ENRICO MATTEI

### Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei Working Paper Series

Our working papers are available on the Internet at the following addresses:

[http://www.feem.it/web/attiv/\\_wp.html](http://www.feem.it/web/attiv/_wp.html)

<http://papers.ssrn.com>

SUST	1.2002	<i>K. TANO, M.D. FAMINOW, M. KAMUANGA and B. SWALLOW: <u>Using Conjoint Analysis to Estimate Farmers' Preferences for Cattle Traits in West Africa</u></i>
ETA	2.2002	<i>Efrem CASTELNUOVO and Paolo SURICO: <u>What Does Monetary Policy Reveal about Central Bank's Preferences?</u></i>
WAT	3.2002	<i>Duncan KNOWLER and Edward BARBIER: <u>The Economics of a "Mixed Blessing" Effect: A Case Study of the Black Sea</u></i>
CLIM	4.2002	<i>Andreas LÖSCHEL: <u>Technological Change in Economic Models of Environmental Policy: A Survey</u></i>
VOL	5.2002	<i>Carlo CARRARO and Carmen MARCHIORI: <u>Stable Coalitions</u></i>
CLIM	6.2002	<i>Marzio GALEOTTI, Alessandro LANZA and Matteo MANERA: <u>Rockets and Feathers Revisited: An International Comparison on European Gasoline Markets</u></i>
ETA	7.2002	<i>Effrosyni DIAMANTOUDI and Eftichios S. SARTZETAKIS: <u>Stable International Environmental Agreements: An Analytical Approach</u></i>
KNOW	8.2002	<i>Alain DESDOIGTS: <u>Neoclassical Convergence Versus Technological Catch-up: A Contribution for Reaching a Consensus</u></i>
NRM	9.2002	<i>Giuseppe DI VITA: <u>Renewable Resources and Waste Recycling</u></i>
KNOW	10.2002	<i>Giorgio BRUNELLO: <u>Is Training More Frequent when Wage Compression is Higher? Evidence from 11 European Countries</u></i>
ETA	11.2002	<i>Mordecai KURZ, Hehui JIN and Maurizio MOTOLESE: <u>Endogenous Fluctuations and the Role of Monetary Policy</u></i>
KNOW	12.2002	<i>Reyer GERLAGH and Marjan W. HOFKES: <u>Escaping Lock-in: The Scope for a Transition towards Sustainable Growth?</u></i>
NRM	13.2002	<i>Michele MORETTO and Paolo ROSATO: <u>The Use of Common Property Resources: A Dynamic Model</u></i>
CLIM	14.2002	<i>Philippe QUIRION: <u>Macroeconomic Effects of an Energy Saving Policy in the Public Sector</u></i>
CLIM	15.2002	<i>Roberto ROSON: <u>Dynamic and Distributional Effects of Environmental Revenue Recycling Schemes: Simulations with a General Equilibrium Model of the Italian Economy</u></i>
CLIM	16.2002	<i>Francesco RICCI (I): <u>Environmental Policy Growth when Inputs are Differentiated in Pollution Intensity</u></i>
ETA	17.2002	<i>Alberto PETRUCCI: <u>Devaluation (Levels versus Rates) and Balance of Payments in a Cash-in-Advance Economy</u></i>
Coalition Theory Network	18.2002	<i>László Á. KÓCZY (IIV): <u>The Core in the Presence of Externalities</u></i>
Coalition Theory Network	19.2002	<i>Steven J. BRAMS, Michael A. JONES and D. Marc KILGOUR (IIV): <u>Single-Peakedness and Disconnected Coalitions</u></i>
Coalition Theory Network	20.2002	<i>Guillaume HAERINGER (IIV): <u>On the Stability of Cooperation Structures</u></i>
NRM	21.2002	<i>Fausto CAVALLARO and Luigi CIRAOLO: <u>Economic and Environmental Sustainability: A Dynamic Approach in Insular Systems</u></i>
CLIM	22.2002	<i>Barbara BUCHNER, Carlo CARRARO, Igor CERSOSIMO and Carmen MARCHIORI: <u>Back to Kyoto? US Participation and the Linkage between R&amp;D and Climate Cooperation</u></i>
CLIM	23.2002	<i>Andreas LÖSCHEL and ZhongXIANG ZHANG: <u>The Economic and Environmental Implications of the US Repudiation of the Kyoto Protocol and the Subsequent Deals in Bonn and Marrakech</u></i>
ETA	24.2002	<i>Marzio GALEOTTI, Louis J. MACCINI and Fabio SCHIANTARELLI: <u>Inventories, Employment and Hours</u></i>
CLIM	25.2002	<i>Hannes EGLI: <u>Are Cross-Country Studies of the Environmental Kuznets Curve Misleading? New Evidence from Time Series Data for Germany</u></i>
ETA	26.2002	<i>Adam B. JAFFE, Richard G. NEWELL and Robert N. STAVINS: <u>Environmental Policy and Technological Change</u></i>
SUST	27.2002	<i>Joseph C. COOPER and Giovanni SIGNORELLO: <u>Farmer Premiums for the Voluntary Adoption of Conservation Plans</u></i>
SUST	28.2002	<i><u>The ANSEA Network: Towards An Analytical Strategic Environmental Assessment</u></i>
KNOW	29.2002	<i>Paolo SURICO: <u>Geographic Concentration and Increasing Returns: a Survey of Evidence</u></i>
ETA	30.2002	<i>Robert N. STAVINS: <u>Lessons from the American Experiment with Market-Based Environmental Policies</u></i>

NRM	31.2002	<i>Carlo GIUPPONI and Paolo ROSATO: <u>Multi-Criteria Analysis and Decision-Support for Water Management at the Catchment Scale: An Application to Diffuse Pollution Control in the Venice Lagoon</u></i>
NRM	32.2002	<i>Robert N. STAVINS: <u>National Environmental Policy During the Clinton Years</u></i>
KNOW	33.2002	<i>A. SOUBEYRAN and H. STAHN : <u>Do Investments in Specialized Knowledge Lead to Composite Good Industries?</u></i>
KNOW	34.2002	<i>G. BRUNELLO, M.L. PARISI and Daniela SONEDDA: <u>Labor Taxes, Wage Setting and the Relative Wage Effect</u></i>
CLIM	35.2002	<i>C. BOEMARE and P. QUIRION (lv): <u>Implementing Greenhouse Gas Trading in Europe: Lessons from Economic Theory and International Experiences</u></i>
CLIM	36.2002	<i>T.TIETENBERG (lv): <u>The Tradable Permits Approach to Protecting the Commons: What Have We Learned?</u></i>
CLIM	37.2002	<i>K. REHDANZ and R.J.S. TOL (lv): <u>On National and International Trade in Greenhouse Gas Emission Permits</u></i>
CLIM	38.2002	<i>C. FISCHER (lv): <u>Multinational Taxation and International Emissions Trading</u></i>
SUST	39.2002	<i>G. SIGNORELLO and G. PAPPALARDO: <u>Farm Animal Biodiversity Conservation Activities in Europe under the Framework of Agenda 2000</u></i>
NRM	40.2002	<i>S.M. CAVANAGH, W. M. HANEMANN and R. N. STAVINS: <u>Muffled Price Signals: Household Water Demand under Increasing-Block Prices</u></i>
NRM	41.2002	<i>A. J. PLANTINGA, R. N. LUBOWSKI and R. N. STAVINS: <u>The Effects of Potential Land Development on Agricultural Land Prices</u></i>
CLIM	42.2002	<i>C. OHL (lvi): <u>Inducing Environmental Co-operation by the Design of Emission Permits</u></i>
CLIM	43.2002	<i>J. EYCKMANS, D. VAN REGEMORTER and V. VAN STEENBERGHE (lvi): <u>Is Kyoto Fatally Flawed? An Analysis with MacGEM</u></i>
CLIM	44.2002	<i>A. ANTOCI and S. BORGHESI (lvi): <u>Working Too Much in a Polluted World: A North-South Evolutionary Model</u></i>
ETA	45.2002	<i>P. G. FREDRIKSSON, Johan A. LIST and Daniel MILLIMET (lvi): <u>Chasing the Smokestack: Strategic Policymaking with Multiple Instruments</u></i>
ETA	46.2002	<i>Z. YU (lvi): <u>A Theory of Strategic Vertical DFI and the Missing Pollution-Haven Effect</u></i>
SUST	47.2002	<i>Y. H. FARZIN: <u>Can an Exhaustible Resource Economy Be Sustainable?</u></i>
SUST	48.2002	<i>Y. H. FARZIN: <u>Sustainability and Hamiltonian Value</u></i>
KNOW	49.2002	<i>C. PIGA and M. VIVARELLI: <u>Cooperation in R&amp;D and Sample Selection</u></i>
Coalition Theory Network Coalition Theory Network	50.2002	<i>M. SERTEL and A. SLINKO (liv): <u>Ranking Committees, Words or Multisets</u></i>
ETA	51.2002	<i>Sergio CURRARINI (liv): <u>Stable Organizations with Externalities</u></i>
ETA	52.2002	<i>Robert N. STAVINS: <u>Experience with Market-Based Policy Instruments</u></i>
ETA	53.2002	<i>C.C. JAEGER, M. LEIMBACH, C. CARRARO, K. HASSELMANN, J.C. HOURCADE, A. KEELER and R. KLEIN (liii): <u>Integrated Assessment Modeling: Modules for Cooperation</u></i>
CLIM	54.2002	<i>Scott BARRETT (liii): <u>Towards a Better Climate Treaty</u></i>
ETA	55.2002	<i>Richard G. NEWELL and Robert N. STAVINS: <u>Cost Heterogeneity and the Potential Savings from Market-Based Policies</u></i>
SUST	56.2002	<i>Paolo ROSATO and Edi DEFRANCESCO: <u>Individual Travel Cost Method and Flow Fixed Costs</u></i>
SUST	57.2002	<i>Vladimir KOTOV and Elena NIKITINA (lvii): <u>Reorganisation of Environmental Policy in Russia: The Decade of Success and Failures in Implementation of Perspective Quests</u></i>
SUST	58.2002	<i>Vladimir KOTOV (lvii): <u>Policy in Transition: New Framework for Russia's Climate Policy</u></i>
SUST	59.2002	<i>Fanny MISSFELDT and Arturo VILLAVICENCO (lvii): <u>How Can Economies in Transition Pursue Emissions Trading or Joint Implementation?</u></i>
VOL	60.2002	<i>Giovanni DI BARTOLOMEO, Jacob ENGWERDA, Joseph PLASMANS and Bas VAN AARLE: <u>Staying Together or Breaking Apart: Policy-Makers' Endogenous Coalitions Formation in the European Economic and Monetary Union</u></i>
ETA	61.2002	<i>Robert N. STAVINS, Alexander F. WAGNER and Gernot WAGNER: <u>Interpreting Sustainability in Economic Terms: Dynamic Efficiency Plus Intergenerational Equity</u></i>
PRIV	62.2002	<i>Carlo CAPUANO: <u>Demand Growth, Entry and Collusion Sustainability</u></i>
PRIV	63.2002	<i>Federico MUNARI and Raffaele ORIANI: <u>Privatization and R&amp;D Performance: An Empirical Analysis Based on Tobin's Q</u></i>
PRIV	64.2002	<i>Federico MUNARI and Maurizio SOBRERO: <u>The Effects of Privatization on R&amp;D Investments and Patent Productivity</u></i>
SUST	65.2002	<i>Orley ASHENFELTER and Michael GREENSTONE: <u>Using Mandated Speed Limits to Measure the Value of a Statistical Life</u></i>
ETA	66.2002	<i>Paolo SURICO: <u>US Monetary Policy Rules: the Case for Asymmetric Preferences</u></i>
PRIV	67.2002	<i>Rinaldo BRAU and Massimo FLORIO: <u>Privatisations as Price Reforms: Evaluating Consumers' Welfare Changes in the U.K.</u></i>
CLIM	68.2002	<i>Barbara K. BUCHNER and Roberto ROSON: <u>Conflicting Perspectives in Trade and Environmental Negotiations</u></i>
CLIM	69.2002	<i>Philippe QUIRION: <u>Complying with the Kyoto Protocol under Uncertainty: Taxes or Tradable Permits?</u></i>
SUST	70.2002	<i>Anna ALBERINI, Patrizia RIGANTI and Alberto LONGO: <u>Can People Value the Aesthetic and Use Services of Urban Sites? Evidence from a Survey of Belfast Residents</u></i>
SUST	71.2002	<i>Marco PERCOCO: <u>Discounting Environmental Effects in Project Appraisal</u></i>

NRM	72.2002	<i>Philippe BONTEMS and Pascal FAVARD: <u>Input Use and Capacity Constraint under Uncertainty: The Case of Irrigation</u></i>
PRIV	73.2002	<i>Mohammed OMRAN: <u>The Performance of State-Owned Enterprises and Newly Privatized Firms: Empirical Evidence from Egypt</u></i>
PRIV	74.2002	<i>Mike BURKART, Fausto PANUNZI and Andrei SHLEIFER: <u>Family Firms</u></i>
PRIV	75.2002	<i>Emmanuelle AURIOL, Pierre M. PICARD: <u>Privatizations in Developing Countries and the Government Budget Constraint</u></i>
PRIV	76.2002	<i>Nichole M. CASTATER: <u>Privatization as a Means to Societal Transformation: An Empirical Study of Privatization in Central and Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union</u></i>
PRIV	77.2002	<i>Christoph LÜLSFESMANN: <u>Benevolent Government, Managerial Incentives, and the Virtues of Privatization</u></i>
PRIV	78.2002	<i>Kate BISHOP, Igor FILATOTCHEV and Tomasz MICKIEWICZ: <u>Endogenous Ownership Structure: Factors Affecting the Post-Privatisation Equity in Largest Hungarian Firms</u></i>
PRIV	79.2002	<i>Theodora WELCH and Rick MOLZ: <u>How Does Trade Sale Privatization Work? Evidence from the Fixed-Line Telecommunications Sector in Developing Economies</u></i>
PRIV	80.2002	<i>Alberto R. PETRUCCI: <u>Government Debt, Agent Heterogeneity and Wealth Displacement in a Small Open Economy</u></i>
CLIM	81.2002	<i>Timothy SWANSON and Robin MASON (Ivi): <u>The Impact of International Environmental Agreements: The Case of the Montreal Protocol</u></i>
PRIV	82.2002	<i>George R.G. CLARKE and Lixin Colin XU: <u>Privatization, Competition and Corruption: How Characteristics of Bribe Takers and Payers Affect Bribe Payments to Utilities</u></i>
PRIV	83.2002	<i>Massimo FLORIO and Katuscia MANZONI: <u>The Abnormal Returns of UK Privatisations: From Underpricing to Outperformance</u></i>
NRM	84.2002	<i>Nelson LOURENÇO, Carlos RUSSO MACHADO, Maria do ROSÁRIO JORGE and Luis RODRIGUES: <u>An Integrated Approach to Understand Territory Dynamics. The Coastal Alentejo (Portugal)</u></i>
CLIM	85.2002	<i>Peter ZAPFEL and Matti VAINIO (Iv): <u>Pathways to European Greenhouse Gas Emissions Trading History and Misconceptions</u></i>
CLIM	86.2002	<i>Pierre COURTOIS: <u>Influence Processes in Climate Change Negotiations: Modelling the Rounds</u></i>
ETA	87.2002	<i>Vito FRAGNELLI and Maria Erminia MARINA (Iviii): <u>Environmental Pollution Risk and Insurance</u></i>
ETA	88.2002	<i>Laurent FRANCKX (Iviii): <u>Environmental Enforcement with Endogenous Ambient Monitoring</u></i>
ETA	89.2002	<i>Timo GOESCHL and Timothy M. SWANSON (Iviii): <u>Lost Horizons. The noncooperative management of an evolutionary biological system.</u></i>
ETA	90.2002	<i>Hans KEIDING (Iviii): <u>Environmental Effects of Consumption: An Approach Using DEA and Cost Sharing</u></i>
ETA	91.2002	<i>Wietze LISE (Iviii): <u>A Game Model of People's Participation in Forest Management in Northern India</u></i>
CLIM	92.2002	<i>Jens HORBACH: <u>Structural Change and Environmental Kuznets Curves</u></i>
ETA	93.2002	<i>Martin P. GROSSKOPF: <u>Towards a More Appropriate Method for Determining the Optimal Scale of Production Units</u></i>
VOL	94.2002	<i>Scott BARRETT and Robert STAVINS: <u>Increasing Participation and Compliance in International Climate Change Agreements</u></i>
CLIM	95.2002	<i>Banu BAYRAMOGLU LISE and Wietze LISE: <u>Climate Change, Environmental NGOs and Public Awareness in the Netherlands: Perceptions and Reality</u></i>
CLIM	96.2002	<i>Matthieu GLACHANT: <u>The Political Economy of Emission Tax Design in Environmental Policy</u></i>
KNOW	97.2002	<i>Kenn ARIGA and Giorgio BRUNELLO: <u>Are the More Educated Receiving More Training? Evidence from Thailand</u></i>
ETA	98.2002	<i>Gianfranco FORTE and Matteo MANERA: <u>Forecasting Volatility in European Stock Markets with Non-linear GARCH Models</u></i>
ETA	99.2002	<i>Geoffrey HEAL: <u>Bundling Biodiversity</u></i>
ETA	100.2002	<i>Geoffrey HEAL, Brian WALKER, Simon LEVIN, Kenneth ARROW, Partha DASGUPTA, Gretchen DAILY, Paul EHRlich, Karl-Goran MALER, Nils KAUTSKY, Jane LUBCHENCO, Steve SCHNEIDER and David STARRETT: <u>Genetic Diversity and Interdependent Crop Choices in Agriculture</u></i>
ETA	101.2002	<i>Geoffrey HEAL: <u>Biodiversity and Globalization</u></i>
VOL	102.2002	<i>Andreas LANGE: <u>Heterogeneous International Agreements – If per capita emission levels matter</u></i>
ETA	103.2002	<i>Pierre-André JOUVET and Walid OUESLATI: <u>Tax Reform and Public Spending Trade-offs in an Endogenous Growth Model with Environmental Externality</u></i>
ETA	104.2002	<i>Anna BOTTASSO and Alessandro SEMBENELLI: <u>Does Ownership Affect Firms' Efficiency? Panel Data Evidence on Italy</u></i>
PRIV	105.2002	<i>Bernardo BORTOLOTTI, Frank DE JONG, Giovanna NICODANO and Ibolya SCHINDELE: <u>Privatization and Stock Market Liquidity</u></i>
ETA	106.2002	<i>Haruo IMAI and Mayumi HORIE (Iviii): <u>Pre-Negotiation for an International Emission Reduction Game</u></i>
PRIV	107.2002	<i>Sudeshna GHOSH BANERJEE and Michael C. MUNGER: <u>Move to Markets? An Empirical Analysis of Privatisation in Developing Countries</u></i>
PRIV	108.2002	<i>Guillaume GIRMENS and Michel GUILLARD: <u>Privatization and Investment: Crowding-Out Effect vs Financial Diversification</u></i>
PRIV	109.2002	<i>Alberto CHONG and Florencio LÓPEZ-DE-SILANES: <u>Privatization and Labor Force Restructuring Around the World</u></i>
PRIV	110.2002	<i>Nandini GUPTA: <u>Partial Privatization and Firm Performance</u></i>
PRIV	111.2002	<i>François DEGEORGE, Dirk JENTER, Alberto MOEL and Peter TUFANO: <u>Selling Company Shares to Reluctant Employees: France Telecom's Experience</u></i>

PRIV	112.2002	<i>Isaac OTCHERE</i> : <u>Intra-Industry Effects of Privatization Announcements: Evidence from Developed and Developing Countries</u>
PRIV	113.2002	<i>Yannis KATSOULAKOS and Elissavet LIKOYANNI</i> : <u>Fiscal and Other Macroeconomic Effects of Privatization</u>
PRIV	114.2002	<i>Guillaume GIRMENS</i> : <u>Privatization, International Asset Trade and Financial Markets</u>
PRIV	115.2002	<i>D. Teja FLOTTO</i> : <u>A Note on Consumption Correlations and European Financial Integration</u>
PRIV	116.2002	<i>Ibolya SCHINDELE and Enrico C. PEROTTI</i> : <u>Pricing Initial Public Offerings in Premature Capital Markets: The Case of Hungary</u>
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 Reyer 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 (Ivix)</i> : <u>Bio-Ecological Diversity vs. Socio-Economic Diversity. A Comparison of Existing Measures</u>
KNOW	14.2003	<i>Maddy JANSSENS and Chris STEYAERT (Ivix)</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 (Ivix)</i> : <u>Diversity in Entrepreneurship: Ethnic and Female Roles in Urban Economic Life</u>
KNOW	16.2003	<i>Alexandra BITUSIKOVA (Ivix)</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 (Ivix)</i> : <u>A Stage Model of Developing an Inclusive Community</u>
KNOW	18.2003	<i>Selma van LONDEN and Arie de RUIJTER (Ivix)</i> : <u>Managing Diversity in a Globalizing World</u>
Coalition Theory Network	19.2003	<i>Sergio CURRARINI</i> : <u>On the Stability of Hierarchies in Games with Externalities</u>
PRIV	20.2003	<i>Giacomo CALZOLARI and Alessandro PAVAN (Ivx)</i> : <u>Monopoly with Resale</u>
PRIV	21.2003	<i>Claudio MEZZETTI (Ivx)</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 (Ivx)</i> : <u>Tilting the Supply Schedule to Enhance Competition in Uniform-Price Auctions</u>
PRIV	23.2003	<i>David ETTINGER (Ivx)</i> : <u>Bidding among Friends and Enemies</u>
PRIV	24.2003	<i>Hannu VARTAINEN (Ivx)</i> : <u>Auction Design without Commitment</u>
PRIV	25.2003	<i>Matti KELOHARJU, Kjell G. NYBORG and Kristian RYDQVIST (Ivx)</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 (Ivx)</i> : <u>Rationing in IPOs</u>
PRIV	27.2003	<i>Kjell G. NYBORG and Ilya A. STREBULAEV (Ivx)</i> : <u>Multiple Unit Auctions and Short Squeezes</u>
PRIV	28.2003	<i>Anders LUNANDER and Jan-Eric NILSSON (Ivx)</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 (Ivx)</i> : <u>Use of Long-term Auctions for Network Investment</u>



- (l) This paper was presented at the Workshop “Growth, Environmental Policies and Sustainability” organised by the Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Venice, June 1, 2001
- (li) This paper was presented at the Fourth Toulouse Conference on Environment and Resource Economics on “Property Rights, Institutions and Management of Environmental and Natural Resources”, organised by Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, IDEI and INRA and sponsored by MATE, Toulouse, May 3-4, 2001
- (lii) This paper was presented at the International Conference on “Economic Valuation of Environmental Goods”, organised by Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei in cooperation with CORILA, Venice, May 11, 2001
- (liii) This paper was circulated at the International Conference on “Climate Policy – Do We Need a New Approach?”, jointly organised by Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Stanford University and Venice International University, Isola di San Servolo, Venice, September 6-8, 2001
- (liv) This paper was presented at the Seventh Meeting of the Coalition Theory Network organised by the Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei and the CORE, Université Catholique de Louvain, Venice, Italy, January 11-12, 2002
- (lv) This paper was presented at the First Workshop of the Concerted Action on Tradable Emission Permits (CATEP) organised by the Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Venice, Italy, December 3-4, 2001
- (lvi) This paper was presented at the ESF EURESCO Conference on Environmental Policy in a Global Economy “The International Dimension of Environmental Policy”, organised with the collaboration of the Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Acquafredda di Maratea, October 6-11, 2001
- (lvii) This paper was presented at the First Workshop of “CFEWE – Carbon Flows between Eastern and Western Europe”, organised by the Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei and Zentrum für Europäische Integrationsforschung (ZEI), Milan, July 5-6, 2001
- (lviii) This paper was presented at the Workshop on “Game Practice and the Environment”, jointly organised by Università del Piemonte Orientale and Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Alessandria, April 12-13, 2002
- (lvix) This paper was presented at the ENGIME Workshop on “Mapping Diversity”, Leuven, May 16-17, 2002
- (lvx) 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

## 2002 SERIES

<b>CLIM</b>	<i>Climate Change Modelling and Policy</i> (Editor: Marzio Galeotti )
<b>VOL</b>	<i>Voluntary and International Agreements</i> (Editor: Carlo Carraro)
<b>SUST</b>	<i>Sustainability Indicators and Environmental Valuation</i> (Editor: Carlo Carraro)
<b>NRM</b>	<i>Natural Resources Management</i> (Editor: Carlo Giupponi)
<b>KNOW</b>	<i>Knowledge, Technology, Human Capital</i> (Editor: Dino Pinelli)
<b>MGMT</b>	<i>Corporate Sustainable Management</i> (Editor: Andrea Marsanich)
<b>PRIV</b>	<i>Privatisation, Regulation, Antitrust</i> (Editor: Bernardo Bortolotti)
<b>ETA</b>	<i>Economic Theory and Applications</i> (Editor: Carlo Carraro)

## 2003 SERIES

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