Oil and Product Price Dynamics in International Petroleum Markets

Alessandro Lanza, Matteo Manera and
Massimo Giovannini
NOTA DI LAVORO 81.2003

SEPTEMBER 2003

IEM – International Energy Markets

Alessandro Lanza**,** *Eni S.p.A., Roma, Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Milano
and CRENoS, Cagliari, Italy*
Matteo Manera**,** *Department of Statistics, University of Milano-Bicocca, Italy
and Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Milano, Italy*
Massimo Giovannini**,** *Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Milano, Italy*

Oil and Product Price Dynamics in International Petroleum Markets

Summary

In this paper we investigate crude oil and products price dynamics. We present a comparison among ten price series of crude oils and fourteen price series of petroleum products, considering four distinct market areas (Mediterranean, North Western Europe, Latin America and North America) over the period 1994-2002. We provide first a complete analysis of crude oil and product price dynamics using cointegration and error correction models. Subsequently we use the error correction specification to predict crude oil prices over the horizon January 2002-June 2002.The main findings of the paper can be summarized as follows: a) differences in quality are crucial to understand the behaviour of crudes; b) prices of crude oils whose physical characteristics are more similar to the marker show the following regularities: b1) they converge more rapidly to the long-run equilibrium; b2) there is an almost monotonic relation between Mean Absolute Percentage Error values and crude quality, measured by API° gravity and sulphur concentration; c) the price of the marker is the driving variable of the crude price also in the short-run, irrespective of the specific geographical area and the quality of the crude under analysis.

Address for correspondence:

Alessandro Lanza
Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei
Corso Magenta, 63
20123 Milano
Italy
Phone: +39-02-52036930
Fax: +39-02-52036946
E-mail: alessandro.lanza@feem.it

Oil and Product Price Dynamics in International Petroleum Markets

(Revised: 31 July 2003)

1. Introduction

Over the last 30 years, oil prices have been closely scrutinized by applied economic literature. Literally hundreds of applied research and policy studies have examined the role played by oil prices in determining economic growth or inflation rates, both in developed and developing countries.

Recently, several studies have contributed to this literature by examining the relation between the price of crude oil and refinery products. If we exclude the specialized literature, however, much less attention has been given to understanding the price dynamics for different crudes, even if the quality of crude oils available to refiners (and consequently their prices) is a critical factor in the strategies employed by refiners around the world.

Oil is not a homogenous commodity: as a number of experts have pointed out (see, The International Crude Oil Market Handbook, 2001) there are over 160 different internationally traded crude oils, all of which vary in terms of characteristics, quality, and market penetration.

Crude oils are classified by density and sulphur content. Lighter crudes generally have a higher share of light hydrocarbons – i.e. higher value products - that can be produced by simple distillation. Heavier crude oils give a greater share of lower-valued products through simple distillation and require additional processing to produce the

desired range of products. Some crude oils also have a higher sulphur content, an undesirable characteristic in terms of both processing and product quality.

The quality of the crude oil determines the level of processing and re-processing necessary to achieve the optimal mix of product output. As a result, price and price differentials between crude oils also reflect the relative ease of refining. For example, a premium crude oil like West Texas Intermediate (WTI), the U.S. benchmark, or Brent, the European benchmark, have a relatively high natural yield of desirable Gasoline. In contrast, almost half of the simple distillation yield from Urals is a heavy residue that must be reprocessed or sold at a discount as crude oil.

Refiners are in competition for an optimal mix of crudes for their refineries, in line with the technology of the particular refinery, the desired output mix and, more important, the relative price of available crudes. In recent years, refiners have been faced with two opposing forces: a combination of consumers' desires for lower prices and government regulations specifying increasingly lighter products of higher quality (the most difficult to produce) and supplies of crude oil that are increasingly heavier, i.e. with higher sulphur content (the most difficult to refine).

The importance of identifying the way in which a given crude is linked to a specific crude benchmark comes directly from market considerations: the pressure of falling margins in the oil products market, combined with some degree of flexibility in supply decisions, obliges refiners to seek opportunities in the free market to improve their profits. Crudes are expected to continue to become heavier with higher sulphur content, while environmental restrictions are expected to significantly reduce the demand for high-sulphur content fuels. As a consequence, light sweet crudes will continue to be available and in even greater demand than today. This is why an understanding of the

price dynamics, and the role played by different crudes, is crucial for the modern oil industry.

Because there are so many different varieties and grades of crude oil, buyers and sellers have found it easier to refer to a limited number of reference, or benchmark, crude oils. Other varieties are then priced at a discount or premium, according to their quality. For any given crude oil, the price is considered to be linked to another crude oil price (usually referred to as the marker). In this very simple scheme, to understand the behaviour of a given crude oil would be sufficient to explain the behaviour of its marker. However, the price difference between these two crudes is non-constant over time. To enrich the relations it is necessary to include variables other than the price marker to explain the oil price dynamics of the given crude.

In principle, several variables could affect this relation and could be used as explanatory variables. Considering data availability, the common assumption is that imbalances in the petroleum product price could reflect most of these missed variables. For example: if, due to extraordinary seasonal factors, Gasoline demand were higher than expected, this would be reflected into the relations between crudes according to various specific characteristics.

This approach has been examined in several different papers. However the specific economic literature on this issue is not very large. Adrangi, Chatrath, Raffiee and Ripple (2001) analyze the price dynamics of a specific crude (the Alaska North Slope) and its relation with US West coast diesel fuel price using a VAR methodology and a bivariate GARCH model to show the casual relationship between the two prices. Asche, Gjolberg and Volker (2003) make use of multivariate framework to test whether

there is a long-term relationship between crude oil and refined product prices in the North Western Europe market.

Gjølberg and Johnsen (1999) analyze co-movements between the prices of crude oil and major refined products during the period 1992-98. Specifically, they explore the existence of long-run equilibrium price relationships, and whether deviations from the estimated equilibrium can be utilized for predictions of short-term price changes and for risk management.

In this paper we present a comparison among crudes considering four distinct market areas (Mediterranean, North Western Europe, Latin America and North America) on ten prices series of crude oils and on fourteen price series of petroleum products.

We provide first a complete analysis of crude oil and product price dynamics using co-integration and error correction models over the period 1994-2002. Subsequently we use the error correction specification to predict crude oil prices over the horizon January 2002-June 2002.

The main findings of the paper can be summarized as follows.

Differences in quality are crucial to understand the behaviour of crudes.

Prices of crude oils whose physical characteristics are more similar to the marker show the following regularities:

a) they converge more rapidly to the long-run equilibrium.

b) there is an almost monotonic relation between Mean Absolute Percentage Error values and crude quality, measured by API° gravity and sulphur concentration. This evidence can be motivated by considering the presence of the marker as an

explanatory variable: the closer the crude to the marker, the higher the contribution of the latter in explaining and predicting the former.

The price of the marker is the driving variable of the crude price also in the short-run, irrespective of the specific geographical area and the quality of the crude under analysis.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 provides a description of the analyzed data. Section 3 discusses the econometric methods and models. In Section 4 the empirical results are reported and commented. The forecasting performance of the estimated models is illustrated in Section 5. Concluding remarks close the paper.

2. Data description

Our analysis is based on ten prices series of crude oils and on fourteen price series of petroleum products. These data cover four distinct market areas: Mediterranean (MED), North Western Europe (NWE), Latin America (LA) and North America (NA). In the first two areas the reference price for crude oil (marker) is represented by Brent, while for the remaining two areas the benchmark crude is WTI. The petroleum products we are considering belong to three different quality categories: unleaded Gasoline, Gasoil and Fuel oil. Within the last class we distinguish between high sulphur Fuel oil (HSFO) and low sulphur Fuel Oil (LSFO). The data frequency is weekly with the exception of the LA market, where only monthly data are available, while the sample covers the period 1994-2002. All crude oil prices are expressed in US$ per barrel, whilst product prices are in US$ per metric ton. More details on the dataset are provided in Table 1.

Table 2 and Table 3 report, for both crude oils and petroleum products, the coefficients of variation of price levels and the annualized standard deviation of price

changes. On average, the coefficients of variation for crude prices are the double of the coefficients of variation of product prices, suggesting that the behaviour of crude prices is very close to that of financial assets. Moreover, if we look at the two groups separately, we find an inverse relation between quality (measured by API° gravity) and the coefficient of variation. A possible interpretation is the subsidiary role played by heavy crudes when light crudes become too expensive, while the lower-quality products are more volatile since their price is intimately linked to the price of some specific substitutes (e.g. natural gas).

Table 4 shows the percentage price correlations within crudes and between crudes and products. Higher correlations occur when crudes and products similar in terms of API° gravity are analyzed. The evidence from Tables 3 and 4 should suggest that prices characterized by more similar coefficients of variation (i.e. light crudes and heavy products) are more correlated. However, the coefficient of variation is a measure of long-run volatility, whereas price change correlation captures short-run movements in price variations. Moreover, an increase in the demand of light products has the effect of increasing the supply of both high-quality and low-quality products (see Gjolberg and Johnsen, 1999). Such considerations justify the presence of higher correlation between light (heavy) crudes and the top (bottom) of the barrel.

3. Model specification

Crude oil and product prices dynamics can be modelled with an Autoregressive-Distributed Lag (ADL) specification:

$$\alpha(L) p_t^c = \mu + \gamma(L) p_t^m + \vartheta(L) p_t^{y_1} + \xi(L) p_t^{y_2} + u_t \qquad (1)$$

where L is the lag operator, $\alpha(L) = 1 - \alpha_1 L - \ldots - \alpha_P L^P$, $\gamma(L) = \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 L + \ldots + \gamma_Q L^Q$, $\vartheta(L) = \vartheta_0 + \vartheta_1 L + \ldots + \vartheta_R L^R$ and $\xi(L) = \xi_0 + \xi_1 L + \ldots + \xi_S L^S$. Capital letters P, Q, R and S represent the optimal number of lags of the polynomials $\alpha(L)$, $\gamma(L)$, $\theta(L)$ and $\xi(L)$, respectively. With p_t^c we indicate the price of the selected crude, whereas p_t^m is the price of the marker associated with p_t^c, and $p_t^{y_i}$, $i=1,2$, are the prices of two products; u_t is a white noise process. All variables are log-transformed.

Recent developments in time series econometrics suggest that the first step towards the estimation of model (1) is to check whether or not the different price series are stationary. Augmented Dickey-Fuller (ADF) tests for unit roots have been used and all variables have been found to be integrated of order one, or I(1), with intercept but no trend.[1]

Though non-stationary, the oil and product price series may form a linear combination which is stationary, or I(0). If this is the case, the relevant price series are said to be cointegrated. The basic model used to test for the presence of cointegration is given by the static regression

$$p_t^c = \beta_0 + \beta_1 p_t^m + \beta_2 p_t^{y_1} + \beta_3 p_t^{y_2} + \varepsilon_t \tag{2}$$

If the residuals $\hat{\varepsilon}_t$ are I(0), then equation (2) provides the long-run or equilibrium relationship between the relevant price series. When two or more variables are

---

[1] The complete set of results is reported in Tables A1-A3 of the Appendix.

cointegrated, we know from the Engle-Granger representation theorem that they admit
an error correction (ECM) formulation of the type:

$$\Delta p_t^c = \sum_{p=1}^{P-1} \delta_{0p} \Delta p_{t-p}^c + \sum_{q=0}^{Q-1} \delta_{1q} \Delta p_{t-q}^m + \sum_{r=0}^{R-1} \delta_{2r} \Delta p_{t-r}^{y_1} + \sum_{s=0}^{S-1} \delta_{3s} \Delta p_{t-s}^{y_2} + \lambda \hat{\varepsilon}_{t-1} + \eta_t \qquad (3)$$

where $\qquad \hat{\varepsilon}_t = p_t^c - \left(\hat{\beta}_0 + \hat{\beta}_1 p_t^m + \hat{\beta}_2 p_t^{y_1} + \hat{\beta}_3 p_t^{y_2} \right), \qquad \hat{\beta}_0 = \hat{\mu} \Big/ \left(1 - \sum_{p=1}^{P} \hat{\alpha}_p \right),$

$\hat{\beta}_1 = \sum_{q=0}^{Q} \hat{\gamma}_q \Big/ \left(1 - \sum_{p=1}^{P} \hat{\alpha}_p \right), \qquad \hat{\beta}_2 = \sum_{r=0}^{R} \hat{\vartheta}_r \Big/ \left(1 - \sum_{p=1}^{P} \hat{\alpha}_p \right), \qquad$ and

$\hat{\beta}_3 = \sum_{s=0}^{S} \hat{\xi}_s \Big/ \left(1 - \sum_{p=1}^{P} \hat{\alpha}_p \right).$

The coefficients β_i in equation (2) can be interpreted as long-run elasticities of the
crude price to the marker price and petroleum products prices. In other terms, each β_i
measures the percentage variation of crude oil price due to a unit percentage variation of
each explanatory variable.

The choice of explaining oil prices in terms of petroleum product prices relies on the
theory of derived demand, which states that the price of an input should be determined
by its contribution to the market value of the output reflected in its market price (see
Adrangi, Chatrath, Raffiee and Ripple, 2001, for a test of the causal relationship flowing
from product prices to crude oil price).

Equation (3) incorporates short-run and long-run effects, captured by coefficients
δ_{ij} and λ, respectively. In particular, λ is the so-called long-run adjustment coefficient
which measures how fast p_t^c converges towards the long-run equilibrium represented
by equation (2).

4. Empirical results

For each of the eight selected crudes we should estimate, at least in principle, as many specifications for equation (3) as the number of combinations of products (i.e. six models for MED and NWE, three models for LA and NA).

Given the large number of resulting models, we use a simple criterion to select the best specification for each crude. Following Stock and Watson (1993), we estimate an augmented version of equation (2), formed by adding one lead and one lag to all the independent variables (DOLS estimation). In this way we obtain corrected t-statistics for each estimated coefficient, which allow us to select the specifications of the long-run equation with the largest number of statistically significant parameters. If two or more long-run specifications have the same number of significant coefficients, we select the one whose associated ECM yields the largest number of statistically significant parameters. The final product selection for each crude is reported in the third column of Table 5.

As it is shown in Table 5, the sum of the estimated coefficients β in equation (2) (ignoring the intercept term) is approximately equal to one. Moreover, the null hypothesis that this sum is equal to one is not rejected by the data in 5 cases out of 8.[2] These coefficients can be interpreted as the contribution (weight) given by each independent variable to the determination of crude oil price. The price of the marker dominates relation (2), while product prices play a sort of compensation role, in order to preserve the one-to-one relation between the crude and the marker. If we exclude Maya

---

[2] A corrected Wald test, based on the DOLS coefficient estimates, rejects the null hypothesis at 1% significance level for Kern River and Thums, and at 5% for Iranian.

in the LA area, the β coefficients of the corresponding selected pair of product prices have opposite signs. The contribution of each product to the market value of a particular crude oil is such that a constant balance between price of the crude and price of the marker is maintained in the long-run.

Specifically, $\hat{\beta}_1$ is always larger than one, and its magnitude increases as heavier crudes are considered. These features show that when the price of the marker increases the demand of heavy crude oils increases, which, in turn, forces their price to rise more than proportionally.

Furthermore, when the MED and NWE areas are considered, the long-run coefficients $\hat{\beta}_2$ and $\hat{\beta}_3$ have positive and negative signs, respectively. The converse is true when we concentrate on NA. A possible interpretation of this empirical evidence is that, while Europe is characterized by two highly demanded light products (i.e. Gasoline and Gasoil), only Gasoline has a primary role in North America. As a consequence, an increase in the demand for Gasoline in Europe is met using very light crudes in the production process of Gasoline, while medium-quality crudes are employed to produce Gasoil. On the contrary, the North American refinery system is mainly oriented towards the production of Gasoline, which explains the positive long-run correlation between crude and Gasoline prices.

In all areas each crude price is cointegrated with the price of the marker and the prices of the selected pair of products, according to the ADF tests on the residuals of the long-run equation (2) reported in Table 6.

The best ECM specification is attained with the product pair LSFO-Gasoline for seven crudes out of eight (the only exception is HSFO-Gasoline for Urals NWE). The short-run coefficient of Gasoline in the ECM equation (3) is significant, in all markets

and for all crudes, with the exception of Forcados. The more volatile product in the short-run (Gasoline) is responsible of the short-run dynamics of the crude oil price. It is well known that the refined barrel can be ideally divided in two classes of products: high-quality (light) and low-quality (heavy) products. Hence, the best explanation of both short-run and long-run behaviour of a crude oil price is obtained when we include in the ECM specification the pair formed by the most representative products in each class, that is LSFO-Gasoline (Table 7).

If we combine the information included in Table 1 with Table 7, it is easy to see that the magnitude of the estimated long-run adjustment coefficients is sensitive to the gravity of the specific crude, that is, with the exception of Forcados, a sort of monotonic relation between speed of adjustment and API° emerges. Prices of crude oils whose physical characteristics are more similar to the marker are likely to converge more rapidly to the long-run equilibrium.

Furthermore, the price of the marker is the driving variable of the crude price also in the short-run, irrespective of the specific geographical area and the quality of the crude under analysis (see Table 5)[3].

5. Forecasting crude oil prices

We assess the ability of the ECM specification to predict crude oil prices over the horizon January 2002-June 2002 by computing three different sets of forecasts: static, dynamic and simulated. With the exception of LA area, where only monthly data are available, we split the forecasting horizon (24 weeks) into six windows of four weeks, with the purpose of partially neutralizing potential contingent factors that could affect

---

[3] The estimated short-run coefficients of the ECM are reported in Table A4 of the Appendix.

the forecasting evaluation (e.g. changes in OPEC policy). Moreover, in order to make the calculated forecasts comparable, instead of estimating the ECM just once and using the same estimated parameters to calculate forecast values of the dependent variable for each of the six windows, we re-estimate the ECM six times with a rolling-sample technique: in this way, the forecast values in each window depend on updated coefficients estimates from samples of the same size.

While static and dynamic forecasts are self-explanatory, the procedure we use to generate the simulated forecasts needs some explanation. The aim of this exercise is to produce "true" out-of-sample, multistep-ahead forecasts for the crude oil price, given the presence of marker and product prices as exogenous variables in model (3). Let's indicate with T the last in-sample observation for each window. Then:

i) For each variable $\Delta p_t^m, \Delta p_t^{y_1}, \Delta p_t^{y_2}$ and $\hat{\varepsilon}_t$, we estimated an ARMA(1,1) model of the type $x_t = \phi_1 x_{t-1} + u_t + \vartheta_1 u_{t-1}$, $t=2,..,T$. Since all estimated ARMA(1,1) models are found to be statistically adequate to capture the behaviour of these series, for each model we calculated the residuals $\hat{u}_t$.

ii) Each ARMA residual vector $\hat{u}_t$, $t=2,..,T$, is bootstrapped R=1000 times, to obtain bootstrapped residuals $\hat{u}_t^{b(r)}$, where $r=1,..,R=1000$ indicates the r-th replication and superscript b denotes a bootstrapped series.

iii) Each series $\Delta p_t^m, \Delta p_t^{y_1}, \Delta p_t^{y_2}$ and $\hat{\varepsilon}_t$ is simulated R times out-of-sample ($t=T+1,...,T+h$) using the estimated ARMA models of stage (i) and the bootstrapped

residuals of stage (2). That is: $\hat{x}_t^{*(r)} = \hat{\phi}_1 \hat{x}_{t-1}^{*(r)} + \hat{u}_t^{b(r)} + \hat{\vartheta}_1 \hat{u}_{t-1}^{b(r)}$, $t=T+1,..,T+h$, where the superscript * denotes a simulated series, and $h=4$ ($h=6$ for the crudes of the LA area, since only monthly data are available).

iv) for each series $\Delta p_t^m, \Delta p_t^{y_1}, \Delta p_t^{y_2}$ and $\hat{\varepsilon}_t$, we select, among the R simulated series, that series whose standard deviation is closest to the standard deviation of the actual series (this last calculated using in-sample observations).

Formally: $\tilde{x}_t = \min_r \left(\left\| Std.Dev.\left(\hat{x}_t^{*(r)} \right) - Std.Dev.\left(x_t \right) \right\| \right)$, where $\tilde{x}_t$ denotes the selected simulated series.

v) we re-estimate the ECM specification (3) over the sample $t=k,..,T$, where $k = \max(P,Q,R,S)$, and we calculate the residuals $\hat{\eta}_t$.

vi) Residuals $\hat{\eta}_t$ are bootstrapped R times, thus obtaining $\hat{\eta}_t^{b(r)}$.

vii) The dependent variable p_t^c is simulated R times, using the bootstrapped residuals of the ECM model (stage vi) and the simulated exogenous series (stage iv):

$$\hat{p}_t^{*c(r)} = \hat{p}_{t-1}^{*c(r)} + \sum_{p=1}^{P-1} \hat{\delta}_{0p} \Delta \tilde{p}_{t-p}^c + \sum_{q=0}^{Q-1} \hat{\delta}_{1q} \Delta \tilde{p}_{t-q}^m + \sum_{r=0}^{R-1} \hat{\delta}_{2r} \Delta \tilde{p}_{t-r}^{y_1} + \sum_{s=0}^{S-1} \hat{\delta}_{3s} \Delta \tilde{p}_{t-s}^{y_2} + \hat{\lambda} \tilde{\varepsilon}_{t-1} + \hat{\eta}_{i,t+j}^{b(r)}$$

$t=T+1,..,T+h$.

For crudes belonging to the MED, NWE and NA markets, we repeat this procedure for all the 6 windows using the rolling-sample technique illustrated above.

After completion of the three forecasting exercises, we obtain, for the MED, NWE, and NA areas, 24 one-step-ahead (static) forecasts, 24 (dynamic) h-steps-ahead forecasts (h=1,..,4) and 24 (simulated) forecast distributions, each formed by R=1000 simulated forecasts. All forecasts are collected in six windows of size 4. For the LA area we produce 6 (static) one-step-ahead forecasts, 6 (dynamic) h-steps-ahead forecasts (h=1,..,4) and 6 (simulated) forecast distributions.

In order to evaluate the predictive ability of each ECM specifications, we calculate the mean absolute percentage error (MAPE), the Theil's inequality coefficient (decomposed in bias, variance and covariance proportions) and the SR (success ratio), which indicates the percentage number of times the forecasted series has the same sign of the corresponding actual series. Moreover, for the simulated forecasts only, we calculate a range of dispersion measures associated to each forecast distribution, as follows. First, we compute the standard deviations of the distribution of forecasts in each window and in each forecasting period (24 standard deviations). Second, we calculate the mean of the 24 standard deviations. Third, for each window, we calculate the mean of the standard deviations relative to the h-th forecasting point, h=1,…,4 (mean of 6 standard deviations).

Results from static and dynamic forecast are reported in Table 9. The following comments apply.

First, due to the different data frequencies, a direct comparison between the LA market and the remaining areas is not possible, although comments that hold for the weekly series can be directly extended to the monthly data.

Second, if we rank the different crudes according to the forecasting performance of the corresponding ECM specifications using the MAPE, the same ranking holds irrespective of whether the forecasts are static or dynamic. The only exception is Iranian heavy, whose dynamic forecasts seem to be relatively better than the static predictions.

Third, there is an almost monotonic relation between MAPE values and crude quality, measured by API° gravity and sulphur concentration. Actually, among the crudes with similar gravity, crudes with less sulphur are characterized by lower MAPE. This evidence can be motivated by considering the presence of the marker as an explanatory variable: the closer the crude to the marker, the higher the contribution of the latter in explaining and predicting the former.

Fourth, from inspection of the Theil's statistic, we experience an increase of the bias proportion and a correspondent reduction of variance and covariance proportions when moving from static to dynamic forecasts. Nonetheless, the values of the Theil's coefficient are generally quite small, indicating a good predictive fit.

Fifth, the low value of the variance proportion in the dynamic forecasts is perfectly consistent with the values of SR.

Results from the simulated forecasts are reported in Table 10. MAPE, Theil's coefficient and SR are calculated on the mean of each forecasted distribution. As expected, the forecasting performance for each model is slightly worse than in the static and dynamic cases. Nevertheless, taking into account the crudes from the LA area, we find that this kind of forecasts performs relatively better for heavier crudes. Actually, MAPE values are almost five times larger than those obtained from the dynamic forecasts in NWE, and almost twice than in NA. Conversely, the heaviest crude in LA

(i.e. Boscan) has MAPE values which are less than twice those of the dynamic forecast, while Maya, the lightest crude in that area, has a MAPE value which is four times larger.

The SR, though lower than in both static and dynamic cases, has values which are higher than 0.50, meaning that the simulated series produce reasonable predictions of the turning points of crude prices.

The second section of Table 10 reports several dispersion measures of the forecasted distributions. The mean of all the standard deviations (SD) indicates that lower predicting variability is associated with higher quality crudes. The overall coherence of the simulation exercise is guaranteed by the values of each standard deviation, which increase as the forecasting horizon increases.

6. Conclusions

This paper presents two different exercises that need to be commented in a separate way even if there are some common interesting features.

The first conclusion is related to the different relation between a given crude, its area-specific market and the related petroleum products. In this paper we investigate crude oil and products price dynamics using cointegration and ECM. Empirical evidence shows that product price are statistically relevant in explaining short- and long-run adjustment in petroleum markets. The relevant product mix also depend on the specific market area and on the characteristics of the selected crude. It is also worth to underline that the long-run adjustment coefficients are sensitive to the gravity of the specific crude. Prices of crude oils whose physical characteristics are more similar to

the marker are likely to converge more rapidly to the long-run equilibrium. Furthermore, the price of the marker is the driving variable of the crude price also in the short-run, irrespective of the specific geographical area and the quality of the crude under analysis.

The second conclusion is related to the part of the paper aimed at assessing the ability of the ECM specification to predict crude oil prices over the horizon January 2002-June 2002. We computed three different sets of forecasts, namely static, dynamic and simulated, and in general the lower predicting variability is associated with higher quality crudes. Also in this case there is almost monotonic relation between MAPE values and crude quality, measured by API° gravity and sulphur concentration. Actually, among the crudes with similar gravity, crudes with less sulphur are characterized by lower MAPE. This evidence can be motivated by considering the presence of the marker as an explanatory variable: the closer the crude to the marker, the higher the contribution of the latter in explaining and predicting the former.

References

Adrangi, B., A. Chatrath, K. Raffiee and R.D.Ripple (2001), "Alaska North Slope crude oil price and the behaviour of diesel prices in California", *Energy Economics*, **23**, 29-42.

Asche, F., O. Gjolberg and T. Völker (2003), "Price relationships in the petroleum market. An analysis of crude oil and refined product prices", *Energy Economics*, **25**, 289-301.

Engle, R.F., and C.W.J. Granger (1987), "Co-integration and error correction: representation, estimation and testing", *Econometrica*, **55**, 251-276.

Gjolberg, O., and T. Johnsen (1999), "Risk management in the oil industry: can information on long-run equilibrium prices be utilized?", *Energy Economics*, **21** 517-527.

The International Crude Oil Market Handbook (2001), Energy Intelligence Group, Fourth Edition.

MacKinnon, J.G. (1991), "Critical values for co-integration tests", in R.F. Engle and C.W.J. Granger (eds.), *Long-run Economic Relationships*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Stock, J. and M. Watson (1993), "A simple estimator of cointegrating vectors in higher order integreted systems", *Econometrica*, **61**, 783-820.

Table 1. Dataset

Area:	Mediterranean (MED)	North Western Europe (NWE)	Latin America (LA)	North America (NA)
Marker:	Brent (38.3°, 0.37%)	Brent	WTI (39.6°, 0.24%)	WTI
Crudes:	- Urals MED (32°, 1.3%) - Iranian heavy (30.2°, 1.77%)	- Urals NWE (32°, 1.3%) - Foracdos (31°, 0.19%)	- Maya (21.8°, 3.33%) - Boscan (10.1°, 5.4%)	- Kern River (13.4°, 1.1%) - Thums (17°, 1.50%)
Products:	- Premium Gasoline - Gasoil - Low Sulphur Fuel Oil (LSFO) - High Sulphur Fuel Oil (HSFO)	- Premium Gasoline - Gasoil - Low Sulphur Fuel Oil (LSFO) - High Sulphur Fuel Oil (HSFO)	- Super Unleaded - Gasoil N°2 - Low Sulphur Fuel Oil (LSFO)	- Super Unleaded - Gasoil N°2 - Low Sulphur Fuel Oil (LSFO)
Sample:	10/7/1994-06/28/2002	10/7/1994-06/28/2002	01/1994-06/2002	10/7/1994-06/28/2002
Frequency:	weekly	weekly	monthly	weekly

Note to Table 1. Sources Platt's and Petroleum Intelligence Weekly (2000); API° gravity and sulphur content (%) are reported in parentheses; HSFO is not traded in LA and NA.

Table 2. Descriptive statistics: crude oil prices

		Coefficient of variation (CV) Percent price level	Annualized standard deviation (ASD) Percent price variation
	Brent	9.40	33.53
MED	Urals MED	9.62	37.37
	Iranian	10.47	39.23
NWE	Urals NWE	9.52	36.50
	Forcados	9.42	34.70
	WTI	8.40	26.82
LA	Maya	11.49	38.28
	Boscan	12.67	35.48
NA	Kern River	12.96	35.67
	Thums	11.76	31.87

Note to Table 2. All prices are expressed in logs. $CV = 100\left(\hat{\sigma}_p / \hat{\mu}_p\right)$ where $\hat{\mu}_p = \sum_{t=1}^{T} p_t \big/ T$ and $\hat{\sigma}_p^2 = \sum_{t=1}^{T}\left(p_t - \hat{\mu}_p\right)^2 \big/ (T-1)$ and $ASD = 100\left(\sqrt{n}\,\hat{\sigma}_{\Delta p}\right)$, where n is the number of observations per year, $\hat{\sigma}_{\Delta p}^2 = \sum_{t=1}^{T}\left(\Delta p_t - \hat{\mu}_{\Delta p}\right)^2 \big/ (T-1)$ and $\hat{\mu}_{\Delta p} = \sum_{t=1}^{T} \Delta p_t \big/ T$.

Table 3. Descriptive statistics: prices of products

	Coefficient of variation (CV)				Annualized standard deviation (ASD)			
	MED	NWE	LA	NA	MED	NWE	LA	NA
Gasoline	5.08	4.99	4.48	4.56	30.24	31.18	36.56	35.77
Gasoil	5.58	5.14	4.86	4.90	30.64	26.53	25.10	29.38
LSFO	5.46	5.05	5.80	5.85	29.38	25.33	33.01	31.12
HSFO	6.07	5.66	-	-	32.41	33.74	-	-

Notes to Table 3. See Table 2

Table 4. Price change correlations

	Brent	Urals MED	Iranian	Urals NWE	Forcad.	WTI	Maya	Boscan	Kern River	Thums
Brent	1.00									
Urals MED	0.96	1.00								
Iranian	0.96	0.99	1.00							
Urals NWE	0.98	-	-	1.00						
Forcados	0.99	-	-	0.97	1.00					
WTI						1.00				
Maya						0.91	1.00			
Boscan						0.76	0.84	1.00		
Kern River						0.68	-	-	1.00	
Thums						0.70	-	-	0.96	1.00
Gasoline	0.63	0.59	0.59	0.62	0.62	0.74^m 0.57^w	0.70	0.53	0.44	0.45
Gasoil	0.66	0.63	0.63	0.66	0.66	0.83^m 0.65^w	0.78	0.64	0.48	0.49
LSFO	0.45	0.41	0.42	0.40	0.44	0.71^m 0.43^w	0.81	0.67	0.44	0.48
HSFO	0.37	0.33	0.33	0.49	0.52	-	-	-	-	-

Notes to Table 4. m= monthly; w= weekly.

Table 5. Estimation of the long-run relationship

	Crudes	Products (y_1, y_2)	R^2	$\hat{\beta}_1$	$\hat{\beta}_2$	$\hat{\beta}_3$
MED	Urals MED	LSFO, Gasoline	0.99	1.04*** (11.69)	0.12* (1.72)	-0.16** (-2.58)
	Iranian	LSFO, Gasoline	0.99	1.13*** (11.00)	0.18** (2.34)	-0.24*** (-3.34)
NWE	Urals NWE	HSFO, Gasoline	0.99	1.01*** (11.54)	0.11* (1.83)	-0.13** (-2.14)
	Forcados	LSFO, Gasoline	0.99	1.06*** (16.23)	0.01 (0.43)	-0.08 (-1.51)
LA	Maya	LSFO, Gasoline	0.95	1.85*** (4.69)	-0.52* (-1.63)	-0.20 (-0.58)
	Boscan	LSFO, Gasoline	0.91	2.04*** (3.53)	-0.87* (-1.85)	0.03 (0.06)
NA	Kern River	LSFO, Gasoline	0.94	1.35*** (3.77)	-0.07 (-0.24)	0.04 (0.13)
	Thums	LSFO, Gasoline	0.95	1.32*** (4.70)	-0.10 (-0.42)	0.03 (0.11)

Notes to Table 5. $\hat{\beta}_i$ i=1,..,3, are the DOLS estimates of the augmented dynamic regression

$$p_t^c = \beta_0 + \beta_1 p_t^m + \beta_2 p_t^{y_1} + \beta_3 p_t^{y_2} + \sum_{i=-r}^{r} \theta_i \Delta p_{t-i}^m + \sum_{i=-r}^{r} \phi_i \Delta p_{t-i}^{y_1} + \sum_{i=-r}^{r} \gamma_i \Delta p_{t-i}^{y_2} + \varepsilon_t,$$ with r=1

(see Stock and Watson, 1993), in parentheses the rescaled *t*-statistics; * (**)[***] indicates significance at 10% (5%) [1%]

Table 6. Cointegration tests

	Crudes	Products (y_1, y_2)	a	b	p	ADF
MED	Urals MED	LSFO, Gasoline	no	no	2	-5.98[***]
	Iranian	LSFO, Gasoline	no	no	2	-5.98[***]
NWE	Urals NWE	HSFO, Gasoline	no	no	2	-5.33[***]
	Forcados	LSFO, Gasoline	no	no	1	-4.88[***]
LA	Maya	LSFO, Gasoline	no	no	0	-3.82 (57.96[***])
	Boscan	LSFO, Gasoline	no	no	0	-3.79 (53.72[***])
NA	Kern River	LSFO, Gasoline	no	no	2	-5.09[***]
	Thums	LSFO, Gasoline	no	no	0	-5.55[***]

Notes to Table 6. *ADF* is the calculated *t* test for the null hypothesis of no cointegration (i.e. $\gamma=0$) in the Augmented Dickey-Fuller regression on $\hat{\varepsilon}_t$: $\Delta\hat{\varepsilon}_t = a + bt + \gamma\hat{\varepsilon}_{t-1} + \sum_{i=1}^{p}\gamma_i\Delta\hat{\varepsilon}_{t-i} + v_t$, where $\hat{\varepsilon}_t$ are the estimated residuals of the DOLS regression; *p* is the order of the augmentation needed to eliminate any autocorrelation in the residuals of the ADF regression; * (**)[***] indicates significance at 10% (5%) [1%] on the basis of the critical values by MacKinnon, (1991); for crudes in the LA area the Johansen's (1991) trace test is reported in parentheses.

Table 7. Selected products and long-run adjustment coefficients

	MED	NWE	LA	NA
Selected products	LSFO-Gasoline (Urals, Iranian)	HSFO-Gasoline (Urals) LSFO-Gasoline (Forcados)	LSFO-Gasoline (Maya, Boscan)	LSFO-Gasoline (Kern River, Thums)
Long-run products	LSFO-Gasoline (Urals, Iranian)	HSFO-Gasoline (Urals) - (Forcados)	LSFO (Maya, Boscan)	-
Short-run products	Gasoline (Urals, Iranian)	Gasoline (Forcados)	LSFO-Gasoline (Maya, Boscan)	LSFO-Gasoline (Kern River, Thums)
Long-run adjustment coefficients ($\hat{\lambda}$)	-0.12 (Urals, Iranian)	-0.11 (Urals) -0.06 (Forcados)	-0.15 (Maya) -0.09 (Boscan)	-0.07 (Kern River, Thums)

Notes to Table 7. Selected products = pair of products corresponding to the best model specifications (1) and (2); long-run products = products whose coefficients are statistically significant in the long-run relation (1); short-run products = products whose short-run coefficients are statistically significant in model (2); crudes associated with selected products, long-run products, short-run products and long-run adjustment coefficients (see equation (2)) are reported in parentheses.

Table 8. Static and dynamic forecast evaluation of selected ECM models

		MED		NWE		LA		NA	
		Urals med	Iranian	Urals NWE	Forcad.	Maya	Boscan	Kern River	Thums
Static Forecasts	MAPE	0.26	0.37	0.24	0.08	0.96	1.95	0.74	0.86
	Theil	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.001	0.01	0.01	0.004	0.005
	BP	0.29	0.06	0.31	0.54	0.29	0.49	0.26	0.28
	VP	0.29	0.35	0.29	0.14	0.003	0.03	0.44	0.35
	CP	0.42	0.59	0.41	0.32	0.71	0.49	0.30	0.37
Dynamic Forecasts	MAPE	0.55	0.52	0.52	0.19	2.08	5.32	1.48	1.39
	Theil	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.001	0.01	0.03	0.01	0.01
	BP	0.62	0.63	0.71	0.74	0.82	0.68	0.79	0.65
	VP	0.14	0.18	0.21	0.11	0.07	0.27	0.17	0.29
	CP	0.25	0.19	0.08	0.15	0.11	0.05	0.04	0.06
	SR	0.875	0.958	1.00	0.958	1.00	1.00	0.958	0.958

Notes to Table 8. Static forecasts indicate one-step-ahead forecasts, dynamic forecasts indicate 4-step-ahead forecasts (6 steps for LA area); MAPE is the mean absolute percentage error, Theil is the Theil's Inequality Coefficient and BP, VP, CP are the bias, variance, and covariance proportions. SR is the mean of the success ratio calculated as the percentage number of times the sign of the forecasted series is the same as the sign of the actual series. All the reported values, with the exception of those referring to LA, are mean values calculated over the 6 forecast windows.

Table 9. Simulated forecast evaluation of selected ECM models

		MED		NEW		LA		NA	
		Urals med	Iranian	Urals NWE	Forcad.	Maya	Boscan	Kern River	Thums
Mean	MAPE	2.42	2.26	2.40	2.09	9.83	9.56	3.54	3.22
	Theil	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.06	0.06	0.02	0.02
	BP	0.69	0.51	0.61	0.67	0.75	0.67	0.66	0.59
	VP	0.29	0.45	0.37	0.30	0.25	0.33	0.19	0.26
	CP	0.02	0.04	0.02	0.03	0.004	0.005	0.16	0.14
	SR	0.58	0.5	0.71	0.54	0.67	0.66	0.625	0.54
Dispersion	SD	0.50	0.53	0.38	0.16	0.86	1.44	0.91	0.68
	SD1	0.25	0.27	0.19	0.09	-	-	0.55	0.47
	SD2	0.45	0.48	0.35	0.15	-	-	0.80	0.62
	SD3	0.58	0.62	0.45	0.19	-	-	1.03	0.73
	SD4	0.70	0.73	0.51	0.22	-	-	1.26	0.88

Notes to Table 9. Simulated forecast stands for 'true' out of sample 4 (6) step-ahead forecast. In order to calculate the reported measures of dispersion we proceeded as follows: i) we calculated the standard deviations of the distribution of forecasts in each window and in each forecasting period (24 standard deviations); ii) in order to obtain SD we calculated the mean of all the standard deviations of point i. (mean of 24 standard deviations); iii) in order to obtain SDk k=1,..,4 we calculated the mean by window of the standard deviations referring to k-th forecasting point (mean of 6 standard deviations).

Appendix

Table A1. Unit root tests: Crudes

	a	b	P	ADF
Brent	yes	no	1	-2.06
Δ Brent	no	no	0	-15.94**
Urals med	yes	no	1	-2.31
Δ Urals med	no	no	0	-15.81**
Iranian	yes	no	1	-2.24
Δ Iranian	no	no	0	-15.90**
Urals NWE	yes	no	1	-2.24
Δ Urals NWE	no	no	0	-16.07**
Forcados	yes	no	1	-2.18
Δ Forcados	no	no	0	-15.60**
WTI	yes	no	0	-1.69
Δ WTI	no	no	0	-8.70**
Maya	yes	no	0	-1.82
Δ Maya	no	no	0	-8.33**
Boscan	yes	no	1	-2.24
Δ Boscan	no	no	0	-6.95**
Kern River	yes	no	1	-2.26
Δ Kern River	no	no	0	-15.52**
Thums	yes	no	1	-2.11
Δ Thums	no	no	0	-16.00**

Notes to Table A1. ADF is the calculated t test for the null hypothesis of a unit root (i.e. γ=0) in the series x_t from the Augmented Dickey-Fuller regression: $\Delta x_t = a + bt + \gamma x_{t-1} + \sum_{i=1}^{p} \lambda_i \Delta x_{t-1} + \eta_t$; p is the order of the augmentation needed to eliminate any autocorrelation in the residuals of the ADF regression; * (**)[***] indicates significance at 10% (5%) [1%] on the basis of the critical values by MacKinnon, J.G. (1991) "Critical Values for Co-Integration Tests", in R.F. Engle and C.W.J. Granger (eds.), *Long-run Economic Relationships*, Oxford, Oxford University Press..

Table A2. Unit root tests: Products, Europe

	MED				NWE			
	a	b	p	ADF	a	b	p	ADF
Gasoline	yes	no	1	-2.18	yes	no	1	-2.15
Δ Gasoline	no	no	0	-14.17**	no	no	0	-15.02**
Gasoil	yes	no	1	-2.03	yes	no	1	-1.84
Δ Gasoil	no	no	0	-14.63**	no	no	0	-15.12**
LSFO	yes	no	1	-2.50	yes	no	1	-2.16
Δ LSFO	no	no	0	-12.51**	no	no	0	-13.45**
HSFO	yes	no	2	-2.44	yes	no	1	-2.19
Δ HSFO	no	no	1	-11.26**	no	no	0	-15.59**

Notes to Table A2. see Table A1

Table A3. Unit root tests: Products, America

	LA				NA			
	a	b	p	ADF	a	b	p	ADF
Gasoline	yes	no	0	-2.27	yes	no	1	-2.73
Δ Gasoline	no	no	0	-9.51**	no	no	0	-16.34**
Gasoil	yes	no	1	-1.88	No	no	1	-1.73
Δ Gasoil	no	no	0	-7.68**	no	no	0	-19.25**
LSFO	yes	no	0	-1.73	yes	no	1	-2.37
Δ LSFO	no	no	0	-8.92**	no	no	0	-14.54**

Notes to Table A3. see Table A1

Table A4. ECM model estimates

	Urals MED	Iranian	Urals NWE	Forcados	Maya	Boscan	Kern River	Thums
Products (y_1, y_2)	LSFO, Gasoline	LSFO, Gasoline	HSFO, Gasoline	LSFO, Gasoline	LSFO, Gasoline	LSFO, Gasoline	LSFO, Gasoline	LSFO, Gasoline
$\hat{\delta}_{01}$	0.51*** (11.15)	0.42*** (8.89)	0.48* (10.56)	0.30*** (6.04)	-	-	0.02 (0.37)	-0.05 (-1.13)
$\hat{\delta}_{02}$	-0.22*** (-4.46)	-0.15*** (-2.95)	-0.28*** (-5.88)	-0.001 (-0.03)	-	-	0.03 (0.57)	-0.02 (-0.54)
$\hat{\delta}_{03}$	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.13 (3.19***)	0.15 (3.53***)
$\hat{\delta}_{10}$	1.11*** (64.9)	1.15*** (59.53)	1.09*** (74.96)	1.04*** (167.06)	1.11*** (13.39)	0.98*** (6.74)	0.73*** (16.51)	0.66*** (17.67)
$\hat{\delta}_{11}$	-0.57*** (-10.8)	-0.49*** (-8.49)	-0.52*** (-10.2)	-0.29*** (-5.58)	-	-	0.33*** (5.84)	0.34*** (6.91)
$\hat{\delta}_{12}$	0.23*** (4.27)	0.16*** (2.77)	0.30*** (5.65)	-0.01 (-0.15)	-	-	0.10* (1.76)	0.12** (2.30)
$\hat{\delta}_{13}$	-	-	-	-	-	-	-0.02 (-0.29)	0.002 (0.05)
$\hat{\delta}_{20}$	-0.02 (-0.98)	0.003 (0.17)	-0.02 (-1.44)	-0.01 (-1.19)	0.34*** (6.19)	0.27*** (2.70)	0.07* (1.70)	0.11*** (2.96)
$\hat{\delta}_{21}$	-0.01 (-0.29)	-0.02 (-0.87)	0.01 (0.96)	-0.01 (-0.77)	-	-	-0.10** (-2.26)	-0.08** (-2.03)
$\hat{\delta}_{22}$	0.01 (0.79)	0.02 (0.82)	-0.01 (-0.36)	0.01 (1.24)	-	-	0.02 (0.36)	0.03 (0.70)
$\hat{\delta}_{23}$	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.01 (0.18)	0.02 (-0.91)
$\hat{\delta}_{30}$	-0.04** (-2.01)	-0.04* (-1.84)	0.01 (0.29)	-0.02** (-2.51)	-0.08 (-1.47)	-0.17* (-1.83)	-0.01 (-0.38)	-0.03 (-0.91)
$\hat{\delta}_{31}$	0.07*** (3.26)	0.04* (1.81)	0.001 (0.05)	0.01 (1.54)	-	-	0.09** (2.29)	0.05* (1.64)
$\hat{\delta}_{32}$	-0.04** (-2.04)	-0.02 (-0.75)	-0.02 (-1.45)	0.01** (2.08)	-	-	0.01 (0.22)	0.03 (0.77)
$\hat{\delta}_{33}$	-	-	-	-	-	-	-0.05 (-1.37)	-0.04 (-1.31)
$\hat{\lambda}$	-0.12*** (-5.56)	-0.12*** (-5.55)	-0.11*** (-5.45)	-0.06*** (-4.32)	-0.15*** (-3.75)	-0.10** (-1.96)	-0.07** (-4.18)	-0.07*** (-3.71)
BG-stat	0.01	0.63	0.71	2.07	0.61	6.21*	0.36	0.94
R2	0.95	0.94	0.97	0.99	0.90	0.64	0.64	0.67

Notes to Table A4. The ECM specification is

$$\Delta p_t^c = \sum_{p=1}^{P-1} \delta_{0p} \Delta p_{t-p}^c + \sum_{q=0}^{Q-1} \delta_{1q} \Delta p_{t-q}^m + \sum_{r=0}^{R-1} \delta_{2r} \Delta p_{t-r}^{y_1} + \sum_{s=0}^{S-1} \delta_{3s} \Delta p_{t-s}^{y_2} + \lambda \hat{\varepsilon}_{t-1} + \eta_t \text{ , where}$$

$P=Q=R=S$; BG- stat is the LM version of the Breusch-Godfrey test for absence of first order residual autocorrelation in the regression; * (**)[***] indicates significance at 10% (5%) [1%]

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/Feem/Pub/Publications/WPapers/default.html
http://papers.ssrn.com

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

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

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

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

KNOW	77.2003	*Richard PEARCE* (lxii): <u>A Biologist's View of Individual Cultural Identity for the Study of Cities</u>
KNOW	78.2003	*Vincent MERK* (lxii): <u>Communication Across Cultures: from Cultural Awareness to Reconciliation of the Dilemmas</u>
KNOW	79.2003	*Giorgio BELLETTINI, Carlotta BERTI CERONI and Gianmarco I.P.OTTAVIANO*: <u>Child Labor and Resistance to Change</u>
ETA	80.2003	*Michele MORETTO, Paolo M. PANTEGHINI and Carlo SCARPA*: <u>Investment Size and Firm's Value under Profit Sharing Regulation</u>
IEM	81.2003	*Alessandro LANZA, Matteo MANERA and Massimo GIOVANNINI:* <u>Oil and Product Dynamics in International Petroleum Markets</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 fur Europaische 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

(lix) This paper was presented at the ENGIME Workshop on "Mapping Diversity", Leuven, May 16-17, 2002

(lx) This paper was presented at the EuroConference on "Auctions and Market Design: Theory, Evidence and Applications", organised by the Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Milan, September 26-28, 2002

(lxi) This paper was presented at the Eighth Meeting of the Coalition Theory Network organised by the GREQAM, Aix-en-Provence, France, January 24-25, 2003

(lxii) This paper was presented at the ENGIME Workshop on "Communication across Cultures in Multicultural Cities", The Hague, November 7-8, 2002