Spatial Evolution of Social Norms
in a Common-Pool Resource Game

Joëlle Noailly, Cees A. Withagen
and Jeroen C.J.M. van den Bergh

NOTA DI LAVORO 79.2005

MAY 2005

ETA – Economic Theory and Applications

Joëlle Noailly, *CPB Netherlands Bureau for Economic Policy Analysis*
Cees A. Withagen, *Department of Spatial Economics, Faculty of Economics and Business Administration, Free University, and Faculty of Economics and Business Administration, Tilburg University*
Jeroen C.J.M. van den Bergh, *Department of Spatial Economics, Faculty of Economics and Business Administration, Free University and Institute for Environmental Studies, Free University*

Spatial evolution of social norms in a common-pool resource game

Summary

We study the conditions for the emergence of cooperation in a spatial common-pool resource game. We consider three types of agents: cooperators, defectors and enforcers. The role of enforcers is to punish defectors for overharvesting the resource. Agents are located around a circle and they only observe the actions of their two nearest neighbors. Their payoffs are determined by both local and global interactions and they modify their actions by imitating the strategy in their neighborhood with the highest payoffs on average. Using theoretical and numerical analysis, we find that a large diversity of equilibria exists in this game. In particular, we derive conditions for the occurrence of equilibria in which the three strategies coexist. We also discuss the stability of these equilibria. Finally, we show that introducing resource dynamics favors the occurrence of cooperative equilibria.

Address for correspondence:

Joëlle Noailly
CPB Netherlands Bureau for Economic Policy Analysis
Centraal Planbureau
P.O. Box 80510
2508 GM
The Hague
The Netherlands
Phone: +31 070 338 3498
E-mail: noailly@cpb.nl

1 Introduction

The common-pool resource (CPR) game is an excellent vehicle to study social dilemmas. A social dilemma is a situation in which the pursuit of individual interest comes at the expense of the collective goals. In the context of the management of common-pool resources, such a social dilemma results in overexploitation and inefficiency compared to the Pareto optimum.

Are people's actions always governed by selfish behavior? Recent evidence has led economists to reconsider their assumptions on behavior. In practice, a certain proportion of the population often exhibits cooperative behavior that seems in contradiction with a rational, selfish agent perspective. Such behavior is especially common when social norms prevail. These can operate in a decentralized way through a system of mutual trust, reward or punishment.

Ostrom (1990) collected a large range of case studies of rural communities in which the presence of social norms led to sustainable management of common-pool resources. An example that has received much attention is the lobster industry in Maine. In this community, fishermen were assigned a spatial territory to spread their traps. In order to increase their catch, free-riders tried to expand their territory. Every fisherman, however, was allowed to defend his territory using different degrees of sanctions ranging from reprimands to opening or destroying the traps of the free-riders (Acheson, 1988). In other settings, ceasing cooperation with rather than punishment of free-riders has also proved effective. For example, Japanese villagers, Irish fishermen and inhabitants of the Solomon islands chose to cut contact with other members of the community who were overfishing (McKean, 1992; Taylor, 1987; Hviding and Baines, 1994). In this way, free-riders are deprived from the benefits provided by cooperation in other economic activities.

Next to case studies, there is also a large variety of experimental evidence that supports the persistence of cooperation. This literature is too large to be reviewed here. Seminal work has been done by Ostrom et al. (1994) and Fehr and Gächter (2001). The latter study shows that often a small proportion of 'altruistic punishers' in the population is sufficient to enforce cooperation in the group. Van Soest and Vyrastekova (2004) provide an application in the field of renewable resources.

A key question is: Why does cooperative behavior emerge in the first place? Compared to the real world evidence there is not so much theory on this subject. Fehr and Schmidt (1999) develop a theoretical model of inequity aversion. They assume that a small proportion of people is willing to sacrifice material payoffs if this leads to more 'fair' and equitable outcomes. Sethi and Somanathan (1996) discuss the view expressed by Dasgupta (1993), who offers three possible explanations.

1. Small communities can be considered as mini states with the capacity to force members of the community to accept rules of behavior. Sethi and Somanathan (1996) do not find this a strong argument, because it cannot explain the fact that sanctioning by private individuals can be spontaneous and entail destructive actions that are often prohibited at the state level.

2. Rationality in a repeated game can be reconciled with cooperation. This is the well-known Folk theorem. But the problem here is of course that the set of potential equilibrium outcomes is very large and that alternating periods of cooperation and defection can arise, contradicting observed persistence of strategies.

3. Social norms are internalized. They can then thus motivate agents to do what they do.

To address the problem associated with explanation 2 and analyse the solution offered under 3, adopting an evolutionary game setting is a promising option. By tracing the evolution of cooperation (and defection) it can help to determine which hypothetical equilibria with or without cooperation are actually feasible from a dynamic population perspective.

Theoretical models to explain or analyse the role of social norms to sustain cooperation in a resource setting are rare. Sethi and Somanathan (1996) aim to analyse which norms, as mentioned under point 3 above, can be internalized, using an evolutionary game theoretic framework. In their model, agents can choose between three strategies: defection, cooperation or enforcement. Agents who choose to be enforcer punish defectors, even though they incur a cost for doing so. The sanction level and the cost of sanctioning borne by defectors and enforcers depends on the number of defectors and enforcers in the population. Payoffs are related to the size of the resource stock and, for defectors (and enforcers), to the level of sanction (punishing) cost level. The agents can modify their strategy over time through a process of social learning. They learn by imitating the strategy that yields above average profits in the population. This is modeled by a replicator dynamics that mimics the evolution of social norms in the population. Sethi and Somanathan identify two main equilibria: namely a population composed of only defectors and a population composed of only cooperators and enforcers.

Another theoretical study of the role of social norms in solving social dilemmas is Eshel et al. (1998), who consider a model of local interactions between altruistic and egoistic agents. Although they do not deal with a resource, they nevertheless suggest relevant elements for our approach. In the first place, they assume that agents imitate the strategy in their The neighborhood with the highest average profit. Second, they are able to derive analytical results for a setting in which agents are spatially distributed aroundon a circle and interact only with their two nearest neighbors.

In the present paper, we consider a spatial evolutionary CPR game that combines both local and global interactions. Agents can be cooperators, defectors or enforcers, and imitate the strategy yielding above average payoffs in their neighborhood. We model space just like in Eshel et al. (1998) by assuming a circle with agents that only observe their two nearest neighbors. This is a logical conceptual-analytical starting point, and it also provides a quite accurate picture of how interactions occur in a large range of CPR issues, notably irrigation problems. Indeed, in many rural communities experiencing water conflicts, the monitoring of water quotas is exerted by the farmer located upstream or downstream of the water flow (see Ostrom, 1990; Smith, 2000), suggesting a linear or circular (to avoid edge problems) model. In line with this, we assume in our model that enforcers can only punish defectors located in their immediate neighborhood, which implies local interaction. Payoffs further depend on the aggregate harvesting effort and on the evolution of the stock of the resource, which means global interactions. We derive theoretical and numerical results on the type of equilibria that emerge in such a system. We find two main innovative results compared to previous work. First, equilibria in which the three types of strategies coexist survive in the long-run. Second, the emergence of such equilibria, and of cooperative equilibria in general, is facilitated when resource dynamics are introduced.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents the standard CPR game and its evolutionary version. Section 3 sets out the main results obtained with our model for the case without resource dynamics. We discuss stability of equilibria in Section 4. Section 5 presents the results with resource dynamics. Section 6 concludes.

2 The CPR game

We consider the performance of three types of agents: cooperators, defectors and enforcers. They play a game that involves the exploitation of a common pool of a renewable natural resource. Cooperators and enforcers are supposed to display social behavior, meaning that they restrict the level of harvesting effort exercised. Defectors, however, are only interested in their own profits, and harvest with a relatively high effort level, thereby possibly harming the other players. In order to be more precise with regard to these concepts we introduce here briefly the standard CPR game as a benchmark (see e.g., Dasgupta and Heal, 1979; Chichilnisky, 1994; or Ostrom et al.,1994). We consider first the case of no resource dynamics. Subsequently we discuss the case where the natural resource changes over time. Then we introduce the evolutionary CPR game.

2.1 The standard CPR game

A fixed population of n $(n > 1)$ agents has access to a common pool of resources. Initially, we assume that the size of the pool is constant over time. The exploitation of the resource leads to harvest. The individual effort level of agent i is denoted by x_i $(i = 1, \ldots, n)$. The individual cost of effort is denoted by w. Total effort is:

$$X = \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i. \tag{1}$$

Harvest depends on individual as well as aggregate effort. When aggregate effort is X total harvest is equal to $F(X)$. It is assumed that F is strictly concave and increasing, $F(0) = 0$, $F'(0) > w$, and $F'(\infty) < w$. The harvested commodity is taken as the numeraire. Each agent i receives a share of total revenues equal to his share in aggregate effort. Individual profits are then given by:

$$\pi_i(x_i, X) = \frac{x_i}{X} F(X) - w x_i. \tag{2}$$

Aggregate profits are:

$$\Pi = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \pi_i(x_i, X) = F(X) - wX. \tag{3}$$

The Pareto efficient, aggregate profit maximizing level of effort is defined by $F'(X_P) = w$. The zero profit level of efforts is defined by $F(X_O) = w X_O$. The symmetric Nash equilibrium aggregate effort follows from

$$\frac{n-1}{n} \frac{F(X_C)}{X_C} + \frac{1}{n} F'(X_C) = w \tag{4}$$

Clearly $X_0 > X_C > X_P$. So, the Nash equilibrium is suboptimal, but yields positive rents.

In the case of resource dynamics the social optimum can be described in several ways. One option (in continuous time) is to consider the maximization of the present value of total profits

$$max \int_0^\infty e^{-rt} [F(X(t), N(t)) - wX(t)] dt$$

subject to

$$\dot{N}(t) = G(N(t)) - F(X(t), N(t)), N(0) = N_0$$

Here r is the social discount rate, $N(t)$ denotes the resource stock at time t, G is the natural growth function, and F is the harvest function, increasing in aggregate effort as well as in the existing stock. Social behavior can then be defined as consistent with a dynamic extraction

path that follows from present value maximization. The Nash equilibrium is the solution to the differential game where each agent takes the time path of efforts of all other players as given and maximizes his own total discounted profits.

2.2 The evolutionary CPR game

In the evolutionary CPR game a distinction is made between cooperators, defectors and enforcers. Defectors do not behave according to the social norm, and may be punished by enforcers. We first introduce the set of strategies. Next, we discuss the payoffs. Then, we go into the spatial structure of the game. Finally, we introduce replicator dynamics.

2.2.1 Strategies

In our evolutionary framework agents have a fixed strategy that may not be based on perfect rationality, but that we assume to be in line with our common understanding of the agents' characteristics. The individual effort by cooperators and enforcers is denoted by x_L and the effort by individual defectors is x_H.

For the case of no resource dynamics it is assumed that these effort rates are constant and satisfy

$$X_P \leq nx_L < nx_H. \tag{5}$$

Hence, if all players (n) are cooperators or enforcers they end up more closely to the Pareto efficient outcome than when all players are defectors. [1]

For the case of resource dynamics there are several plausible ways of modeling effort by individual agents. As suggested above, cooperation can be modeled by assuming that if all agents were cooperators, they would mimic the present value maximizing extraction path. A feature common to evolutionary approaches, however, is that agents use rules of thumb rather than adopt individually or socially optimal strategies. One way to capture this is to assume that effort rates of agents are constants, that may, however, differ across types of agents. For example, the individual effort of cooperators and enforcers is x_L with nx_L close to X^{pv}, defined as the steady state effort of the present value maximizing program, whereas effort by defectors is larger: $x_H > x_L$. If $nx_L = X^{pv}$ and all agents are cooperators, convergence to the present value optimal steady state ocurs. An alternative approach allows for the strategy to depend on the existing stock, in line with the work of Sethi and Somanathan (1996). There it is assumed that all players can observe the existing resource stock, or are informed about the stock by an agency. Then one can define $x_L(t) = \alpha_L N(t)$ and $x_H(t) = \alpha_H N(t)$ with α_L and α_H positive

---

[1]One could be more specific by assuming for example that $X_P = nx_L < X_C \leq nx_H \leq X_0$. But for our purposes this simple representation suffices.

constants with $\alpha_H > \alpha_L$. In particular, α_L can be chosen such that convergence occurs to N^{pv}, the present value maximizing steady state resource stock. It need not be the case that the socially optimal steady state coincides with the steady state arising from present value maximization. Other objectives than present value maximization can be pursued as well.

2.2.2 Payoffs

The numbers of cooperators, defectors and enforcers are denoted by n^C, n^D and n^E, respectively. Cooperators and enforcers all exercise an effort level of $x_L(N)$ (obviously the argument N can be suppressed when resource dynamics is not taken into account) each. Enforcers punish defectors, at a cost γ per detected defector. Defectors exercise an effort $x_H(N)$ and pay a sanction δ per enforcer that detects them. Define $Z(X, N) = F(X, N)/X - w$, which can be interpreted as aggregate profit per unit of effort. Individual profits, payoff, can be written as follows.

$$
\begin{align}
\pi^C(X, N) &= x_L(N)Z(X, N) \tag{6} \\
\pi_k^D(X, N) &= x_H(N)Z(X, N) - \delta k \tag{7} \\
\pi_m^E(X, N) &= x_L(N)Z(X, N) - \gamma m \tag{8}
\end{align}
$$

Here $\pi_k^D(X, N)$ denotes the profits of a defector punished k times and $\pi_m^E(X, N)$ is the payoff of an enforcer punishing m times.

2.2.3 Spatial structure

Sethi and Somanathan (1996) assume that all enforcers in the population can detect all defectors and punish them. Formally, that means that $k = n^E$ and $m = n^D$. Obviously, the spatial structure is irrelevant then. In contrast, we assume that an enforcer can only detect and punish a defector in his immediate neighborhood. This calls for a definition of neighborhood. There are several straightforward ways to do so. Eshel et al. (1998) describe players as located on a circle, implying that every agent has exactly two direct neighbors. Hence k and m take the values $0, 1$, or 2. One could extend the notion of neighborhood to two positions on the circle at each side. Then k and m run from 0 to 4. Another convenient way of defining neighborhood is on a torus. A torus is a two dimensional lattice whose corners are pasted together to ensure that all cells are connected, so that there are no edge effects. Then an agent's neighbors are, for example, those to the west, east, north and south. In that case k and m run from 0 to 4. One could include also those to the north-east etc., at the cost of higher complexity. In the present paper we focus on the circle with each agent having two neighbors, because this allows us to derive interesting theoretical results that are much more difficult to obtain for the torus.

For an extensive numerical analysis on the two-dimensional torus, using a different learning rule as well, we refer to Noailly et al. (2004). The sanctioning cost falling upon an enforcer is proportional to the number of defectors detected and punished, which expresses the efforts made by the enforcer. Similarly, in our setup it matters by how many enforcers a defector is detected. In the case of two enforcers, the cost to the defector is twice as high as in the case of only one enforcer. This can be regarded either as reflecting the sum of the damages inflicted upon the defector by individual enforcers or as the level of punishment being dependent on the amount of evidence provided by all enforcers together.

2.2.4 Replicator dynamics.

A common element of evolutionary game theory is replicator dynamics, describing when, how and why agents switch strategies. In Sethi and Somanathan (1996) agents are assumed to be able to observe their own profits and the average profits in the population. The decision to change strategy is based on the comparison of these profits. In particular the replicator dynamics is described by:

$$\dot{n}^j = n^j(\pi^j - \overline{\pi}) \qquad j = C, D, E \tag{9}$$

where $\overline{\pi} = (n^C \pi^C + n^D \pi^D + n^E \pi^E)/n$, the average payoff in the entire population at time t. Therefore, agents do not necessarily switch to the most profitable strategy instantaneously. It follows that an equilibrium with all three strategies, a so-called $CDE-$equilibrium (with Co-operators, Defectors and Enforcers) will never prevail, because in such an equilibrium enforcers would do strictly worse than cooperators. In contrast to Sethi and Somanathan we explicitly take into account that agents do not observe the payoffs of the entire population. We make the more realistic assumption that agents only observe the payoffs of all agents in their neigh-borhood, including themselves. The aggregate replicator dynamics formulation then has to be dropped. Several alternative imitation or selection mechanisms can be adopted. One is that an agent imitates the strategy in his neighborhood with the highest payoff. The advantage of this rule is its simplicity. But it can lead to outcomes that might be considered implausible. Take for example the case where a cooperator is surrounded by two defectors, one not being punished (and better off than the cooperator) and the other one severely punished, paying a very high sanction. In such a case it might not be considered very plausible for the cooperator to switch to defection. On the torus, with a cooperator surrounded by three defectors, one of which is not punished and the other three severely punished, the example might even be more appealing. However, there are no fundamental objections against modeling the imitation dynamics this

way. An alternative approach is to switch to the strategy that is doing best on average in the neighborhood. This implies a certain degree of rationality on behalf of the agent. Applying this rule to the previous example, the cooperator becomes a defector if on average the defectors in the cooperator's neighborhood do better than the cooperator. This is the rule employed by Eshel et al. (1998) and we will use it the present paper too.

3   No resource dynamics

This section deals with the case where resource dynamics is not taken into account. Consequently, the variable N, denoting the resource stock, is suppressed throughout this section. At any instant of time τ the system is characterized by the number of agents of each type, $n^C(\tau), n^D(\tau)$ and $n^E(\tau)$, summing up to the given number n and by the location of each agent on the circle. For convenience, we fix one position on the circle and call it position 1.Then a state of the system can be represented by a vector of length n consisting of ordered $C's$, $D's$ and $E's$. So, with $n = 5$, the notation $CDEDE$ means that there is a cooperating agent at position 1, there are defectors at positions 2 and 4, and enforcers at positions 3 and 5 (note, however, that this state is essentially the same as $DEDEC$). Time is considered discrete. At time $\tau + 1$ the system finds itself in a new state, as a consequence of agents switching from one strategy to another. In first instance strategy changes occur only on the basis of replicator dynamics. Mutation is studied in section 4. The questions we address in the present concern the limiting behavior of the system, as τ goes to infinity.

We have been able to identify a rich set of limit states. First of all there are equilibria. A state is called an equilibrium if no agents want to change strategy. Second, there are blinkers. A state is called a blinker if there are agents that change strategy, but the new resulting state is a rotation of the original state. For example: the state characterized by $CDEED$ is a blinker, if, after all agents have made their choice of strategy, the new state is $DCDEE$. So, essentially neither the numbers of cooperators, defectors and enforcers, nor their relative positions on the circle have changed. We also found cycling with period 1, where composition of the population of strategies as well as locations change over time, but where after one period the system reproduces.

As shown by the profit equations given in the previous section, payoffs are affected by both local and global factors, namely sanctioning among neighbors and aggregate efforts, respectively. The combination of these two types of factors is an innovative feature of the present paper. However, it entails the inconvenience to render the model much more complex to analyse. Under some assumptions with regard to the ranking of profits, general theoretical results can

be derived for equilibria and blinking. With regard to cycling we restrict ourselves to providing an example to show that it can actually occur.

3.1 Equilibria and blinkers

We aim to derive conditions for the existence of certain types of equilibria and blinkers. Profit rankings are not unambiguous: $\pi_1^E(X) < \pi_1^D(X)$ for some values of X and $\pi_1^E(X) > \pi_1^D(X)$ for other values. This complicates a theoretical analysis and makes it difficult to obtain clear-cut results. Therefore, we concentrate on unambiguous profit rankings here. We also want to neglect the case of negative profits. This rules out the possibility that defectors do worse than cooperators even if they are not punished. To avoid clutter we omit the argument X when there is no danger of confusion. For example, $\pi_0^D > \pi^C$ means $\pi_0^D(X) > \pi^C(X)$ for all relevant X (i.e., $nx_L \leq X \leq nx_H$).

Profits from harvesting are nonnegative if $Z(nx_H) \geq 0$, because Z is decreasing and $X \leq nx_H$. An immediate consequence is that $\pi_0^D > \pi^C = \pi_0^E$. It also holds that $\pi_0^E > \pi_1^E > \pi_2^E$ and $\pi_0^D > \pi_1^D > \pi_2^D$. Still many rankings are possible. One could choose the sanction rate δ very low relative to the cost of sanctioning γ. That would imply that $\pi_2^D > \pi_0^E$. An immediate consequence of this inequality holding is that only defectors survive. Such an extreme case is not particularly interesting neither from an analytical nor from a practical point of view. Therefore, we assume that $\pi^C > \pi_1^D$, which is achieved if and only if $x_H Z - \delta < x_L Z$. A sufficient condition for this to hold is that $(x_H - x_L)Z(nx_H) < \delta$. Moreover, we want sanctions and costs of sanctions to be such that $\pi_1^D > \pi_1^E$ implies $\pi_1^E > \pi_2^D > \pi_2^E$ and such that $\pi_1^E > \pi_1^D$ implies $\pi_1^D > \pi_2^E > \pi_2^D$. Therefore, if being punished once is better than punishing once, then being punished twice is worse than punishing twice, and vice versa. Hence, in the former case, being a defector is not too advantageous. These assumptions allow for a theoretical approach. The simulations that follow in the next section suggest that the results we obtain analytically also hold for a much broader class of parameter values.

Since the imitation rule that we employ is based on comparison of average payoffs, an additional distinction can be made. A defector punished once is doing better than an enforcer punishing once, and having a non-punishing enforcer in his neighborhood, or this ranking is the other way around. To illustrate the intuition, consider the following complete string $EEEDD$, so with the second defector next to the first enforcer. The first and the third enforcers, both next to a defector punished once, change to defection when the sanction rate is sufficiently low. However, with a moderately low sanction rate both defectors become enforcers.

Quite naturally, these considerations lead to the following three orderings.

Definition 1

10

i. The sanction rate is relatively low if: $\pi_0^D > \pi^C = \pi_0^E > \pi_1^D > \pi_1^E > \pi_2^D > \pi_2^E$

ii. The sanction rate is relatively very low if: $\pi_0^D > \pi^C = \pi_0^E > \pi_1^D > \pi_1^E > \pi_2^D > \pi_2^E$ and $\pi_1^D > \frac{1}{2}(\pi_0^E + \pi_1^E)$

iii. The sanction rate is relatively moderately low if : $\pi_0^D > \pi^C = \pi_0^E > \pi_1^D > \pi_1^E > \pi_2^D > \pi_2^E$ and $\pi_1^D < \frac{1}{2}(\pi_0^E + \pi_1^E)$

iv. The sanction rate is relatively high if: $\pi_0^D > \pi^C = \pi_0^E > \pi_1^E > \pi_1^D > \pi_2^E > \pi_2^D$

So, the sanction rate is relatively low if $\pi_k^D > \pi_k^E$ for $k = 1, 2$. It is relatively high if $\pi_k^D < \pi_k^E$ for $k = 1, 2$. It should be noted that the wording, including 'relatively', is chosen on purpose. For example, the sanction rate could be called absolutely low if $\pi_2^D > \pi_1^E$, or even $\pi_2^D > \pi_0^E$. We will consider such cases later on in this paper when performing simulations.

Below we derive a set of sufficient conditions for each of the two rankings to hold, thereby showing that the definitions are not void.

Lemma 1

i. Suppose $\gamma > \delta$ and $(x_H - x_L)Z(nx_L) < 2\delta - \gamma$. Then the sanction rate is relatively low.

ii. Suppose $\gamma > \delta$, and $\delta - \frac{1}{2}\gamma < (x_H - x_L)Z(nx_H) < (x_H - x_L)Z(nx_L) < 2\delta - \gamma$. Then the sanction rate is relatively very low.

iii. Suppose $\gamma > \delta$ and $(x_H - x_L)Z(nx_L) < \delta - \frac{1}{2}\gamma$. Then the sanction rate is relatively moderately low.

iv. Suppose $(x_H - x_L)Z(nx_L) < \delta - \gamma$ and $(x_H - x_L)Z(nx_H) > \delta - 2\gamma$. Then the sanction rate is relatively high.

Proof

The proof the lemma is given in the appendix.

The proof of the lemma is rather technical, but the idea behind it is easily explained, for example, for part i. If the cost of sanctioning γ is higher than the sanction δ, then a defector being punished k times is better off than an enforcer punishing k times for all k, because profits from harvesting are higher for a defector, and the defector incurs a lower sanction than the cost the enforcer has to make to punish. Moreover, if $(x_H - x_L)Z(nx_L) < 2\delta - \gamma$, then $x_H Z(X) - 2\delta < x_L Z(X) - \gamma < 0$ for all $X \leq nx_H$ and hence $\pi_1^E > \pi_2^D$. All the other proofs follow the same approach.

An further distinction suggests itself: a relatively very high versus a moderately high sanction rate, according to $\frac{1}{2}(\pi_0^D + \pi_1^D)$ being smaller or larger than π_1^E, respectively. However, this distinction is not meaningful, as can be seen as follows. The inequality $\frac{1}{2}(\pi_0^D + \pi_1^D) < \pi_1^E$, requires $(x_H - x_L)Z(X) < \frac{1}{2}\delta - \gamma$ for all $X \leq nx_H$, so that it is necessary that $\frac{1}{2}\delta - \gamma > 0$. But the inequality $\pi_1^D > \pi_2^E$ requires $(x_H - x_L)Z(X) > \delta - 2\gamma = 2(\frac{1}{2}\delta - \gamma)$. This is a contradiction.

Also, note that the relatively high sanction rate implicitly assumes that $\delta > \gamma$, since $(x_H - x_L)Z(nx_L) > 0$.

Next we establish several propositions regarding the existence and the characteristics of equilibria and blinkers, assuming that the profit ranking satisfies one of the definitions given above. States with only cooperators ('all$C$'), only defectors ('all$D$'), only enforcers ('all$E$'), and only cooperators and enforcers ('CE'), are always an equilibrium. A state with only defectors and cooperators ('CD') cannot be an equilibrium, because then a cooperator next to a defector will change to defection. Therefore, we concentrate on the DE and CDE equilibria. A cluster in an equilibrium is a string of adjacent agents playing identical strategies. To start with we prove a lemma that turns out to be rather helpful.

Lemma 2.

Suppose $n \geq 3$.

i. A string composed as CED cannot occur in an equilibrium.

ii. A string composed as CD cannot occur in an equilibrium.

iii. A string composed as DED cannot occur in an equilibrium.

iv. A string composed as EDE cannot occur in an equilibrium.

Proof

i. With CED, the punishing enforcer switches to cooperation, if not to defection.

ii. With CD the defector switches to cooperation or the other way around.

iii. and iv. Obviously, DED cannot occur under a relatively low sanction rate, and EDE is ruled out in the case of a relatively high sanction rate. If DED would occur in an equilibrium with a relatively high sanction rate, the defectors surrounding the enforcer would not be punished twice, since EDE is ruled out. But then the enforcer switches to defection. To exclude EDE in the relatively low sanction case, the same type of argument holds.

Proposition 1

Suppose the sanction rate is relatively very low.

i. There exists neither a DE nor a CDE equilibrium.

ii. There exists neither a DE nor a CDE blinker.

Proof

i. Suppose there exists an equilibrium with $n^E > 0$ and $n^D > 0$. There must be at least one enforcer next to a defector, because the equilibrium does not consist of defectors only, and if a defector is not punished, he cannot be a neighbor of a cooperator, because then the cooperator switches to defection. If a defector next to an enforcer is punished only once the enforcer will

12

switch to defection, because $\pi_1^D > \frac{1}{2}(\pi_0^E + \pi_1^E)$, a contradiction. Hence every defector is punished twice, contradicting lemma 3iv.

ii. Suppose there is a blinker with $n^E > 0$ and $n^D > 0$. At least one agent switches to enforcement. This is not a cooperator. So, a defector should switch to enforcement. He will only do so if he is punished twice: so we have EDE. In order for the first enforcer in this string to switch to defection, we need $DEDE$, because with $EEDE$ he will stay an enforcer. But now the first defector in the row will never switch to enforcement. This proves part ii of the proposition.

Proposition 2

Suppose the sanction rate is relatively moderately low.

i. For a DE-equilibrium to obtain it is necessary that $n \geq 5$. If $n = 5$ the equilibrium configuration is given by $EEEDD$. In any DE-equilibrium enforcers occur in clusters of minimal length 3.

ii. For a CDE-equilibrium to obtain it is necessary that $n \geq 9$. If $n = 9$ the equilibrium configuration is given by $CEEEDDEEE$. In any CDE equilibrium any enforcer adjacent to a defector is part of a cluster of at least 3 enforcers.

iii. There exists neither a DE nor a CDE blinker.

Proof

The proof of the proposition is given in the appendix.

The intuition behind the proposition is straightforward. Since, by definition, $\pi_1^E < \pi_1^D < \frac{1}{2}(\pi_0^E + \pi_1^E)$, punishing enforcers need to be 'protected' by non-punishing enforcers. This leads to clusters of three enforcers. Protection by cooperators does not work, because, in an equilibrium, a punishing enforcer can never be located next to a cooperator. This is also an informal explanation of the minimal number of players needed. This minimal number is an absolute one. Obviously, it might be the case that that in a CDE-equilibrium the majority of agents is defecting.

Proposition 3.

Suppose the sanction rate is relatively high.

i. For a DE-equilibrium to obtain it is necessary that $n \geq 5$. If $n = 5$ the equilibrium configuration is given by $EEDDD$. In any DE-equilibrium defectors occur in clusters of minimal length 3.

ii. For a CDE-equilibrium to obtain it is necessary that $n \geq 8$. If $n = 8$, the equilibrium configuration is given by $CEEDDDEE$. In any CDE equilibrium any defector adjacent to an enforcer is part of a cluster of at least 3 defectors.

iii. There exist no DE blinkers. There do exist CDE blinkers. A necessary condition is $n \geq 4$. If $n = 4$, the blinker is $CDDE$.

Proof

i. and ii. The proof of parts i. and ii follows the lines of the proof of the previous proposition. It will not be given here.

iii. Non-existence of DE blinkers is obvious. Suppose $n = 3$ and there is a CDE blinker. Then the cooperator remains a cooperator. Both the enforcer and the defector turn into cooperators. Hence there is no blinking in this case. Suppose $n = 4$. In a CDE blinker a cooperator never becomes an enforcer. Hence, at least one cooperator should turn into a defector. This can only be the case if he is next to a defector who is not punished. In the present case we cannot have $CDCE$ because both cooperators will become defectors. Hence the only equilibrium candidate is $CDDE$. It is easily verified that this is a blinking equilibrium.

3.2 Cycling

To illustrate the phenomenon of cycling in the present setting, consider the following initial state: $DDDDEE$. The defectors in positions 2 and 3 will not change strategy. The first and fourth defector change strategy if the average payoff of the defectors in their neighborhood is smaller than the payoff of an enforcer punishing once:

$$\frac{1}{2}[\pi_0^D(X) + \pi_1^D(X)] < \pi_1^E(X) \tag{10}$$

If this inequality holds, for $X = 2x_L + 4x_H$, the enforcers stick to enforcement since then also

$$\pi_1^D(X) < \pi_1^E(X) \tag{11}$$

Therefore, if (11) holds, the new state becomes $EDDEEE$. The enforcers at positions 1 and 6 in the new state switch to defection if

$$\frac{1}{2}[\pi_0^E(X) + \pi_1^E(X)] < \pi_1^D(X) \tag{12}$$

for $X = 4x_L + 2x_H$. When this condition holds, the defectors stay defectors. Now take $x_L = 100$, $x_H = 120$, $F(X) = 13.25X^{1/2}$, $w = 0.5$, $\gamma = 0.1$, $\delta = 0.5428$. Then all conditions are satisfied. Therefore, cycling between the two states indicated above occurs with a period of one. It may be noticed that the range of the sanction δ, given the other parameter values, is rather small. This small range is also found in various other numerical examples with different parameter values for x_L, x_H and the parameters of F, to the extent that initially it turned out to be quite difficult even to find an example of cycling. It suggests that cycling does not

occur for a wide range of parameter values. Obviously, that does not matter, since the aim was just to provide an example. Moreover, it would be relatively easy to induce cycling if we allow profits from harvesting to be negative: $Z(X) < 0$. In that case the incentive to change strategy is much larger for defectors , because they earn less from harvesting than enforcers (they incur greater losses). In our example we took care that profits, even including sanctions and the cost of sanctioning, are positive. The importance of the example is that it shows that the system is not only steered through local interaction, but that global interaction through aggregate efforts plays a role too.

Comparing the results in this section with those obtained by Sethi and Somanathan, we observe that we not only have more types of limit states (cycling, blinking and equilibria), but within the class of equilibria, we have equilibria with cooperation surviving next to defection, which is novel as well. This phenomenon occurs for sanction levels that can be deemed realistic. So, it turns out that the spatial structure of the game is pivotal in the characterization of potential equilibria.

4 Stability

In the previous section we have established the existence of equilibria where cooperators survive in groups with many defectors. This is a result that is due to the spatial structure of our model. It would less interesting as a result if the occurrence of these equilibria would merely be a coincidence, namely for very specific spatial constellations, or if the equilibria would easily be disrupted by players making mistakes in choosing their strategies. In the present section we investigate this issue. We first go into the possibilities offered by evolutionary game theory. Then we discuss and explore an alternative route, relying on numerical simulations with stochastic features.

In evolutionary game theory stability of equilibria is tied to mutation, meaning that players may make mistakes in deciding on their strategy. This then leads to the notion of stochastic stability. Before dealing with stochastic stability in detail we illustrate the concept by means of an example. Suppose we start in a configuration of only cooperators. This configuration will persist if all players follow the imitation rule. However, suppose that each player has a given small probability of making a mistake. At some instant of time this probability materializes and a player becomes a defector. Then defection will infect a large part of the population within finite time: many cooperators will be eradicated. And it is highly unlikely that the stochastic process of mutation will restore the 'all$C$' equilibrium. This is essentially why this equilibrium is not stochastically stable.

One way to assess the stochastic stability or instability of equilibria is outlined in Young (1998) and in Eshel et al. (1998). We briefly sketch the procedure, merely to illustrate the difficulties encountered in its application. As was stated before, at any instant of time τ the state of the system is characterized by the number of agents of each type, $n^C(\tau), n^D(\tau)$ and $n^E(\tau)$, summing up to the given number of agents n, and by the location of each agent on the circle. Such a representation may be misleading, however. If two states are identical up to rotation or taking the mirror image, they should be considered as identical states. For example: the state $CCDDEEE$ is the same as $CDDEEEC$ (each player is moved one position) and as $EEEDDCC$ (we 'read' the circle in the opposite direction). So, in the sequel, we restrict ourselves to unique states. The state space is the finite set of all possible states. The matrix P of transition probabilities p_{ij} from state i to state j, is completely determined by the imitation dynamics. To keep things simple, we assume that a situation where a player has two equivalent strategies to choose from does not occur. Then the transition matrix consists of zeros and ones only. Next, we introduce mutation. After the transition to a new state a player has a probability $\frac{1}{2}\alpha$ of not adopting the strategy that is optimal according to the imitation rule, but, instead, going to pursue either of the two alternative strategies. So, a player who just became a cooperator, according to the imitation rule, will actually act as a defector or an enforcer, each with probability $\frac{1}{2}\alpha$. This yields another matrix of probabilities denoted by Q with a typical element q_{ij} denoting the probability of transition from state i to state j, as a consequence of the mutations that happen to take place in state i. The overall transition matrix is then Γ with $\gamma_{ij} = \sum_k p_{ik} q_{kj}$. Let μ be the solution of the following system $\mu\Gamma = \mu$, where μ is on the unit simplex: $\mu \geq 0$ and $\sum_i \mu_i = 1$. The vector μ is the unique stationary distribution of the process for a given mutation rate. Element μ_i indicates that as time gets large, state i will occur during a proportion μ_i of time. Finally, one considers the limit of μ for the mutation rate approaching zero.

It is clear from the exposition given above that in the case at hand it is almost unsurmountable to derive general results on the stochastic stability of CDE equilibria in our model. Already for the minimal number of agents in the low sanction case the set of possible states amounts to hundreds. Eshel et al. (1998) were able to derive results on stochastic stability, thanks to the fact that their analysis only involves two strategies. And Sethi and Somanathan (1996) do not inquire into stochastic stability, arguing that: "Given the timescales relevant for this paper, the introduction of stochastic perturbations is therefore unlikely to affect our main inferences". Like in the case of Sethi and Somanathan, one can consider our model as applying to fisheries. The timescales can be interpreted as referring to seasons, while updating occurs once per season. If an equilibrium would not persist after, say, 1000 seasons, then this

should not be considered as a sign of instability because it concerns an extremely long time horizon for the system considered. In other words, if it takes thousands of seasons and thus years before a certain type of equilibrium (e.g., CDE) has completely vanished, then from a practical perspective this should not be regarded as a serious case of instability. Indeed, many other, directed factors will then have ample time to exercise their influence on the system and its stability, negating the relevance of the stochastic factors.

We investigate stability of the different equilibria, and in particular of CDE-equilibria, using numerical simulations. We employ the harvest function given by $F(N, X) = N^{1/2}X^{1/2}$ and consider a population of $n = 100$ agents. The other parameter values are

$$w = 5, \qquad N_0 = 10^6 \tag{13}$$

$$x_H = 120, \qquad x_L = 100 \tag{14}$$

$$\delta = 280, \qquad \gamma = 300 \tag{15}$$

These parameters are chosen such that $nx_L = X_P$, implying that when all agents harvest low the social optimum is reached. Further, we have $Z(nx_H) > 0$, so that in the absence of sanctioning all players enjoy positive profits.

In a first step, we illustrate the above statement of Sethi and Somanathan (1996) by studying the timescales on which cooperative equilibria cease to occur. We start from a fixed spatial configuration, namely a CDE initial state with $n^C = 25$, $n^D = 25$ and $n^E = 50$. The agents are positioned in the following order: 25 cooperators, 25 enforcers, 25 defectors and 25 enforcers. In the absence of mutation and with $\delta = 280$, this initial state leads to a CDE equilibrium.How does the frequency of CDE equilibria evolve when we introduce mutations? We assume that in every round each agent has a probability of making a mistake of $\alpha = 5/1000$, meaning that, at the beginning of every round, the agent has a chance of α to deviate from the decision rule. We record the population configuration at the end of every round. We conduct 100 simulation runs for different time horizons and compute the average time spent in each possible population configuration. The results are reported in Table 1

[Insert table 1 about here]

After 10000 rounds, the system spent on average 24% of the time in a CDE configuration. As expected, as the time horizon increases, i.e., as the number of mutations rises, the frequency of CDE equilibria decreases. Eventually, as $\tau \to \infty$, the frequency will be close to zero. Nevertheless, this frequency decreases by only 1% per additional 10000 rounds. After 30000 rounds, the system spends still 22% of the time in a CDE equilibrium. This suggests that the timescales over which CDE disappears are very long and irrelevant for applications with

17

seasonal updating. Note also that the mutation rate is kept constant in this experiment, whereas it should converge in a proper test for stochastic stability.

Our approach with spatial interaction lends itself to examine stability of equilibria in an alternative manner, namely to look at the emergence of equilibria and the frequency of the different types of equilibria when we randomize over the initial shares of strategies as well as their distribution over the circle. For a given sanction rate δ, we vary:

1. the initial shares of each strategy in the population. To reduce the number of runs necessary to cover all the possible combinations of initial shares, only strategy shares that are multiples of 0.05 are considered. The set of initial coordinates $Z = ((1; 0; 0), (0.95; 0.05; 0) \ldots (0; 0; 1))$ is composed of coordinates $z_0 = (n^C/n, n^D/n, n^E/n)$. Further, we eliminate initial strategy shares composed of only cooperators and defectors, and of only cooperators and enforcers, as the outcomes can be easily predicted in these cases.[2] This leaves us with 190 potential initial shares

2. the initial spatial distribution of strategies. For every z_0, we perform 100 so-called runs of 200 time-steps[3]. Each run starts with a draw from a uniform random spatial distribution, such that the probability of a position on the circle being occupied by a player of type j equals n^j/n $(j = C, D, E)$. This means that for each z_0, we consider 100 random spatial arrangements and registered the resulting equilibrium.

We find that on average 32% of the runs (out of 19000) converge to a D-equilibrium, 4% converge to a CE-equilibrium, 33% to a DE-equibrium and 29% to a CDE-equilibrium. Cycling occurred in the CDE-configuration in 2% of the cases. We found no occurrence of blinker states. This is in line with our theoretical results since the sanction level $\delta = 280$ corresponds to a relatively moderately low sanction rate. What can we conclude from the fact that in almost 30% of the cases convergence to a CDE-equilibrium occurs? Formally, it does not prove the stochastic stability of this type of equilibrium. But the procedure followed does suggest that CDE-equilibria are not a mere coincidence. In an environment that is stochastic with respect to initial shares and initial locations, cooperation will survive in a large number of cases.

Additionally, these simulations provide two other types of insights on how the system works. First, we gain insights on how the initial distribution affects equilibria. Figure 1 shows the frequency of convergence to each equilibrium for the different initial shares combinations. In

---

[2]When there are no enforcers in the population, defectors always earn more than cooperators and will spread quickly through the population. When there are no defectors in the population, cooperators and enforcers earn the same payoffs and stick to their strategies so that there is no further evolution of strategies.

[3]Convergence to equilibria always occurred within 200 time steps

each graph, each z_0 is represented by a dot. The grey-black scale indicates the result of 100 random spatial distributions after 200 time steps. A black colored coordinate indicates that, starting with the respective z_0, all runs converge to the given type of equilibrium.[4]

[Insert figure 1 about here]

As expected, D-equilibria are more easily achieved for initial populations with few enforcers and, inversely, CE-equilibria are more likely to be reached for initial populations composed of many enforcers. CDE-equilibria are most frequently achieved for middle-range initial shares with a slight majority of enforcers.

Second, we gain insights on the effects of the initial location of strategies over space. Figure 2 shows the evolution of strategy shares over time starting from three identical share vectors $z_0 = (0.30; 0.30; 0.40)$ but with different initial spatial arrangements. The evolution of strategy shares is governed by two forces. First, enforcers who punish a lot imitate defectors in their neighborhood. In some sense, enforcers are eliminated by defectors. Second, enforcers who punish at least one defector switch to cooperation when cooperators are located in their neighborhood. So, we see that enforcers have a hard life. On the other hand, they eliminate defectors if they punish hard enough. In all of the approach paths we see the number of enforcers decreases; the number of defectors increases in the final steps.

[Insert figure 2 about here]

Finally, to complete our analysis of stability and to confirm further that the occurrence of CDE-equilibria is not a mere coincidence, we run simulations for various sanction levels. Given our parameter values, the definition of a relatively very low sanction is satisfied for $200 < \delta < 232$. The sanction rate is relatively moderately low if $232 < \delta < 341$. It is relatively high if $400 < \delta < 680$. We also performed simulations for sanction rates outside the ranges that imply an unambiguous ordering of profits. For each sanction level, we performed 19000 simulation runs and computed the average frequence of occurrence of each equilibrium. The results are displayed in Figure 3. The exact frequencies for each type of equilibrium can be found in Table 3 in Appendix B.

[Insert figure 3 about here]

As expected, the frequency of D-equilibria decreases as the sanction rises. Inversely, the frequency of CE-equilibria increases with the sanction level. The largest frequency of CDE-equilibria is found for $\delta = 700$. Beyond $\delta = 800$, the frequency of CE-equilibria rises sharply

---

[4]For illustration purposes, we added the frequencies in all the extreme cases in which the intitial population is composed of two strategies only.

and it becomes almost impossible for defectors to survive in the population, as shown by the fall in the frequency of CDE- and D-equilibria. As expected from proposition 3, we also find blinkers in the range of relatively high sanction rates, even if the occurrence of this phenomenon is relatively rare (see Table 3 in Appendix). Recall that for a CDE-blinker to occur, the sanction level should be high and a single enforcer should be located between a cooperator and a defector. In large populations this is unlikely to happen. We also find relatively rare occurrence of cycling CDE-equilibria. The main conclusion we can draw from these exercises is that equilibria with cooperation have a high probability of survival.

5 Resource dynamics

The role of resource dynamics on harvesting behavior is often neglected in the literature on common-pool issues. Experiments and games developed by Ostrom et al. (1994) do not pay any attention to resource dynamics. In real-world situations, however, harvesters are likely to reconsider and actually modify their strategies on the basis of observed changes in the resource stock. Feedback effects are present from harvesting activities to the natural resource and vice versa. Resource dynamics raises the issue of the dynamic development of the resource itself and the impact of varying resource stock level on harvest. In addition, a new dynamic issue is relevant in the present context, namely how resource dynamics affects the occurrence of cooperation.

We start the analysis by postulating a logistic natural growth function :

$$G(N) = \rho N (1 - \frac{N}{K}) \tag{16}$$

with ρ the intrinsic growth rate and K the carrying capacity. Harvest is oftentimes represented by the Shaefer function where the harvest rate is effort multiplied by the resource stock. Alternatively, it can be assumed that

$$F(X, N) = X^\beta N^{1-\beta} \tag{17}$$

with $0 < \beta < 1$. Updating of the resource stock after each round follows the usual pattern

$$N_{t+1} = N_t + G(N_t) - F(X_t, N_t)$$

The steady state of the system is then the solution of

$$\rho N (1 - \frac{N}{K}) = X^\beta N^{1-\beta}$$

We follow Sethi and Somanathan (1996) and assume that individual effort is proportional to the existing resource stock, although there are other ways to model it, for instance with a fixed rate of harvest. We have

$$x_H = a_H N \tag{18}$$

$$x_L = a_L N \tag{19}$$

What is the effect of the introduction of resource dynamics on the limiting states? It is to be expected that the qualitative nature of the limit states will not change: blinkers, cycling and equilibria can still occur. Given that an additional global interaction mechanism is operative, cycling is likely to become more frequent. We further expect that the likelihood of the occurrence of CDE-equilibria will not decrease. Overharvesting as a consequence of higher effort levels in defection does not only reduce harvesting profits per unit of effort but also through the resulting smaller resource stock itself. Therefore, with a given effort rate of defectors, being a defector becomes relatively less rewarding when there are many defectors. Still, the effect does not need to be important. Actually, this is what we find for a set of parameters that closely resemble those used in the simulations in the absence of resource dynamics.

In the case of resource dynamics we can write:

$$\pi^C = a_L N \{ (\frac{1}{n^D(a_H - a_L) + na_L})^\beta - w \}$$

$$\pi^D_k = a_H N \{ (\frac{1}{n^D(a_H - a_L) + na_L})^\beta - w \} - k\delta$$

$$\pi^E_m = a_L N \{ (\frac{1}{n^D(a_H - a_L) + na_L})^\beta - w \} - m\gamma$$

Consider π^D_k. We see that if n^D increases, two things happen. First, aggregate profits from harvesting,

$$(\frac{1}{n^D(a_H - a_L) + na_L})^\beta - w$$

decrease. This is similar to the no resource dynamics case: it is a consequence of higher efforts, given the stock. Second, the stock decreases (after some time). This also gives smaller profits as an additional effect. The stock effect can be captured precisely by realizing that the steady state with n^D enforcers equals:

$$N(n^D) = K(1 - \frac{(n^D(a_H - a_L) + na_L)^\beta}{\rho})$$

21

So, the stock effect comes in in addition to the effort effect.

We run simulations with a_H and a_L fixed such that we can compare the average frequency of occurrence of equilibria with the no resource dynamics case. We fix $a_L = 0.0001$ and take $\delta = 300$, $K = 2 * 10^6$ and $\rho = 0.2$. For the rest we employ the same parameters as before. This yields a steady state stock of 10^6 if all players were cooperators or enforcers. The parameter value $a_L = 0.0001$ corresponds with $x_L = 100$ in the case of no resource dynamics. Analogously, we say that $a_H = 0.0002$ corresponds with $x_H = 200$ in the case without resource dynamics. We calculate the frequency of equilibria for these parameter values for the case of resource dynamics as well as for the case of no resource dynamics. In both cases $D-$equilibria occur with probability one. Similarly we performed the simulations for higher values of a_H. The results are given in Table 2.

[Insert table 2 about here]

We find that for identical x_H, resource dynamics leads to increasing occurrence of CDE-equilibria, as expected.[5]

Finally, we can show that in the case of fixed effort rates, the same type of results is to be expected. With fixed effort rates x_L and x_H we get

$$\pi^C = x_L\{(\frac{N}{n^D(x_H - x_L) + nx_L})^\beta - w\}$$

$$\pi_k^D = x_H\{(\frac{N}{n^D(x_H - x_L) + nx_L})^\beta - w\} - k\delta$$

$$\pi_m^E = x_L\{(\frac{N}{n^D(x_H - x_L) + nx_L})^\beta - w\} - m\gamma$$

Now the steady state stock is a bit less straightforward to calculate. It satisfies

$$\rho N(1 - \frac{N}{K}) = N^\beta(n^D(x_H - x_L) + nx_L)^\beta$$

It is not clear beforehand that this N is increasing in n^D. In fact it is increasing if and only if $\frac{N}{K} < \frac{1}{3}$. For this reason the case at hand is slightly more complicated. But, under this condition, essentially we see the same mechanism at work. Higher n^D decreases aggregate profits directly through the effort effect, and, in addition, decreases aggregate profits through its effect on the stock. All this implies that the difference $\pi_k^D - \pi_m^E$ decreases when n^D increases, and more than in the absence of resource dynamics.

---

[5]With the given parameters, CE-equilibria do not occur.

6 Conclusions

This paper has studied the emergence of cooperation in a particular spatial CPR game, namely with space modelled as a circle. The combination of evolution, space and resource leads to a complex model system that easily defies analytical solutions. Nevertheless, various analytical results have been derived, while some insights have been supported by a large number of numerical simulations.

The major contribution of the present paper is that in the CPR game a cooperative strategy can survive, even when the majority of agents is defecting. This result runs counter to some of those by Sethi and Somanathan (1996). Our finding is due to the assumption that agents base their actions on the observations of the profitability of strategies employed by neigboring agents. In such a setting cooperators and enforcers can in some sense protect each other. By means of several types of simulations we were able to establish support that cooperative equilibria are likely to persist, even in stochastically changing ernvironments. Introducing resource dynamics reenforces our results.

From a conceptual perspective, the approach adopted here can be understood as combining local and global interactions. Virtually all related, analytical work in the literature has focused solely on local interactions, which evidently renders much simpler model systems. The global interactions in this case are due to two factors. First, profits are affected by aggregate harvest, to which they all contribute. Second, profits depend on the resource stock, which changes due to the composition of harvesting strategies in the population of agents. The presence of global feedback means that profit rankings of strategies are not necessarily fixed over time. Indeed, due to changes in the composition of the population of strategies the aggregate harvest and resource stock change, which in turn may alter the conditions under which the agents interact. As a result, cycling can occur. Comparison of the cases without and with resource dynamics shows that in the latter case cycling equilibria are more frequent, which can be understood as the logical consequence of additional global feedback. The results obtained show that the cycles, in this case repeatedly moving back and forth between on the one hand a high aggregate effort and low resource state and on the other hand a low aggregate effort and high resource states implies an increase in the frequency of cycling equilibria. The important implication is that resource dynamics combined with spatial evolution increases the frequency of stable equilibria in which resource use is sustainable.

The analytical results apply mainly to the case of no global interactions. The alternative case was illustrated by a combination of analytical results, illustrative examples and systematic numerical simulations. Evidently, future work might concentrate of extending the boundary of analytical findings.

References

Acheson, J. (1988) *The lobster gangs of Maine.* Hanover: University Press of New England.

Dasgupta, P. (1993) *An inquiry into the well-being and destitution.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dasgupta, P. and Heal, G. (1979) *Economic theory and exhaustible resources.* Cambridge, NY, Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.

Eshel, I., Samuelson, L. and Shaked, A. (1998) Altruists, egoists and hooligans in a local interaction model. *American Economic Review*, Vol. 88, pp. 157–179.

Fehr, E. and Gächter, S. (2002) Altruistic punishment in humans. *Nature*, Vol. 415, pp. 137–140.

Fehr, E. and Schmidt, K. (1999) A theory of fairness, competition, and cooperation. *Quarterly Journal of Economics,* Vol. 114, pp. 817-868.

Hviding, E. and Baines, G. (1994) Community-based fisheries management, tradition and challenges of development in Marovo, Solomon Islands*, Development and Change,* Vol. 25, pp. 13-39.

McKean, M. (1992) Management of traditional common lands (Iriaichi) in Japan, in D. Bromley and D. Feeny (eds.), *Making the commons work,* San Francisco: ICS Press, pp. 66-98.

Noailly, J., Van den Bergh, J. and Withagen, C. (2004) Local and global interactions in an evolutionary CPR game on a torus, Department of Spatial Economics, Free University Amsterdam.

Ostrom, E. (1990) *Governing the commons: The evolution of institutions for collective action.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ostrom, E., Gardner, R. and Walker, J. (1994) *Rules, games and common-pool resources.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Sethi, R. and Somanathan, E. (1996) The evolution of social norms in common property resource use. *American Economic Review*, Vol. 86(4), pp. 766–789.

Smith, R. (2000) *Institutional innovations among the Mormons: Collective action in irrigation.* Working paper, Department of Political Science, Indiana University.

van Soest, D. and Vyrastekova, J.(2004) *Peer enforcement by selective exclusion,* Working Paper, Department of Economics: Tilburg University.

Taylor, L. (1987) The river would run red with blood: Community and common property in Irish fishing settlement, in B. McCay and J. Acheson (eds.), *The question of the commons: The culture and ecology of communal resources,* Tuscon: University of Arizona Press, pp. 290-307.

APPENDIX A. Proofs

Proof Lemma 1

i. Since $Z(nx_H) > 0$, it follows that $\gamma > \delta$ implies $x_H Z(X) - \delta > x_L Z(X) - \gamma$ for all $X \leq nx_H$. Hence $\pi_1^D > \pi_1^E$ and, a forteriori, $\pi_2^D > \pi_2^E$.

If $(x_H - x_L)Z(nx_L) < 2\delta - \gamma$ then $x_H Z(X) - 2\delta < x_L Z(X) - \gamma < 0$ for all $X \leq nx_H$ and hence $\pi_1^E > \pi_2^D$.

If $\gamma > \delta$ and $(x_H - x_L)Z(nx_L) < 2\delta - \gamma$ then $x_H Z(X) - \delta < x_L Z(X)$ for all $X \leq nx_H$ and hence $\pi_0^E > \pi_1^D$.

ii. If $(x_H - x_L)Z(nx_L) > \delta - \frac{1}{2}\gamma$ then $x_H Z(X) - \delta > x_L Z(X) - \frac{1}{2}\gamma < 0$ for all $X \leq nx_H$ implying $\pi_1^D > \frac{1}{2}(\pi_0^E + \pi_1^E)$. Moreover, the sanction rate is relatively low.

iii. If $(x_H - x_L)Z(nx_L) < \delta - \frac{1}{2}\gamma$ then $x_H Z(X) - \delta < x_L Z(X) - \frac{1}{2}\gamma < 0$ for all $X \leq nx_H$ implying $\pi_1^D < \frac{1}{2}(\pi_0^E + \pi_1^E)$. A forteriori $(x_H - x_L)Z(X) < 2\delta - \gamma$ for all $X \leq nx_H$, so that the sanction rate is relatively low.

iv. If $(x_H - x_L)Z(nx_L) < \delta - \gamma$ then $x_H Z(X) - \delta < x_L Z(X) - \gamma$ for all $X \leq nx_H$, implying $\pi_1^E > \pi_1^D$. Then also $\pi_2^E > \pi_2^D$ because $\delta > \gamma$.

If $\delta - 2\gamma < (x_H - x_L)Z(nx_H)$ then $0 < x_H Z(X) - \delta > x_L Z(X) - 2\gamma$ for all $X \leq nx_H$, implying $\pi_1^D > \pi_2^E$

Proof Proposition 2.

i. Number the positions on the circle clockwise. Put an enforcer on position 1 and, without loss of generality, a defector on position 2.

Suppose $n = 2$. This is not an equilibrium because $\pi_1^D > \pi_1^E$

Suppose $n = 3$. This case is ruled out by lemma 3iii or lemma 3iv.

Suppose $n = 4$. At number 3 there is a defector in view of lemma 3iv. At number 4 there is an enforcer in view of lemma 3iii. But this cannot be an equilibrium because $\pi_1^D > \pi_1^E$.

Suppose $n = 5$. At number 3 there is a defector in view of lemma 3iv. At number 4 there is an enforcer in view of lemma 3iii. At number 5 there is an enforcer because of lemma 3iv. So the equilibrium candidate looks like: $EDDEE$. This is indeed an equilibrium. The defectors will remain defectors since $\pi_1^D > \pi_1^E$ and the enforcers will remain enforcers since $\pi_1^D < \frac{1}{2}(\pi_0^E + \pi_1^E)$.

Next we show that the minimal length of an E-cluster is equal to three. Suppose there exists a DE equilibrium (with $n \geq 5$) with only two adjacent enforcers, surrounded by defectors: $DEED$. Then, because of lemma 3 we must also have $DEEDD$. This cannot be (part of) an equilibrium because $\pi_1^D > \pi_1^E$.

ii. Consider a CDE configuration. Put the cooperator closest to a defector on position 1.

Suppose the first defector is at number 2. This contradicts lemma 3ii.

Suppose the first defector is at number 3. There is an enforcer at number 2 by construction. This cannot be an equilibrium in view of lemma 3i.

Suppose the first defector is at number 4. There are enforcers at numbers 2 and 3 by construction. This cannot be an equilibrium because the enforcer at number 2 will turn into a cooperator since $\pi^C > \frac{1}{2}(\pi_0^E + \pi_1^E)$.

Suppose the first defector is at number 5. At numbers 2, 3 and 4 there are enforcers by construction. There cannot be an enforcer at number 6 because of lemma 3iv. There cannot be a cooperator at number 6 by construction. Hence is a defector at number 6. Because of symmetry there are enforcers at numbers 7, 8, and 9. It is easily verified that this is an equilibrium. Therefore the minimal number of players necessary for a CDE equilibrium is 9.

Suppose there is a CDE equilibrium with a string ED. We cannot have CED in view of lemma 3i, nor DED (lemma 3iii). So, we have a string EED. We cannot have $DEED$ by the following reasoning. If the further extension could be written as $DEEDD$ then this cannot be an equilibrium because $\pi_1^D > \pi_1^E$, implying that the second enforcer in the row turns into a defector. Lemma 3ii rules out the further extension $DEEDC$. And the extension $DEEDE$ is not allowed in view of lemma 3iv. Therefore, $DEED$ cannot be part of an equilibrium. Consider, therefore, $CEED$. Again the further extension cannot be $CEEDD$, $CEEDC$ or $CEEDE$. Hence we should have $EEED$. Therefore, the minimal string of enforcers is 3 if an enforcer is adjacent to a defector.

iii. In a blinker an enforcer will never switch to defection, for the following reason. An enforcer next to a defector will switch to defection only if it punishes twice: with CED the enforcer switches to cooperation, and with EED the (second) enforcer stays an enforcer since $\pi_2^D < \pi_1^D < \frac{1}{2}(\pi_0^E + \pi_1^E)$. Therefore, we must have DED. But the first defector will not switch to enforcement since $\pi_2^D > \pi_2^E$. It follows that DE blinkers do not exist. In a CDE blinker a cooperator will never switch to enforcement. Therefore, there should be a defector switching to enforcement. A necessary condition is that we have EDE. But the first enforcer will not switch to defection.

APPENDIX B. Average frequencies of equilibria for different sanction levels

[Insert table 3 about here]

Figure 1: Frequency of equilibrium for initial shares multiple of 0.05, $\delta = 280$

Figure 2: Evolution of strategy shares over time, for $z_0 = (0.30; 0.30; 0.40)$, $\delta = 280$

Figure 3: Average frequency of D-, CE- and CDE-equilibria for different sanction levels

τ	D-equil.	DE-equil.	CE-equil.	CDE-equil.
100	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.99
500	0.13	0.27	0.00	0.60
10000	0.58	0.18	0.00	0.24
20000	0.59	0.18	0.00	0.23
30000	0.56	0.22	0.00	0.22

Table 1: Percentage of time spent in each equilibrium in the presence of mutations

	With resource dynamics		
$x_H = a_H N$	D-equil.	DE-equil.	CDE-equil.
200	1.00	0.00	0.00
300	0.77	0.19	0.03
350	0.60	0.34	0.07
400	0.51	0.40	0.09
	No resource dynamics		
x_H	D-equil.	DE-equil.	CDE-equil.
200	1.00	0.00	0.00
300	1.00	0.00	0.00
350	0.65	0.32	0.03
400	0.55	0.39	0.07

Table 2: Average frequency of convergence with and without resource dynamics, $\delta = 300$

sanction	D-equil.	DE-equil.	CE-equil.	CDE-equil.	CDE-equil. (blinking)	CDE-equil. (cycling)	E- equil.
140	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
160	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
180	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
200	0.99	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
220	0.99	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
225	0.99	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
230	0.99	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
235	0.60	0.34	0.01	0.05	0.00	0.00	0.00
240	0.40	0.39	0.01	0.20	0.00	0.00	0.00
245	0.34	0.36	0.01	0.29	0.00	0.01	0.00
250	0.32	0.34	0.03	0.28	0.00	0.03	0.00
260	0.32	0.34	0.03	0.28	0.00	0.03	0.00
270	0.32	0.35	0.03	0.28	0.00	0.03	0.00
280	0.32	0.33	0.04	0.29	0.00	0.02	0.01
290	0.32	0.33	0.04	0.29	0.00	0.02	0.01
300	0.32	0.33	0.04	0.29	0.00	0.02	0.01
310	0.31	0.33	0.04	0.29	0.00	0.02	0.01
320	0.32	0.33	0.04	0.29	0.00	0.02	0.01
350	0.30	0.34	0.04	0.29	0.00	0.02	0.01
360	0.30	0.33	0.04	0.30	0.00	0.02	0.01
370	0.30	0.34	0.04	0.30	0.00	0.02	0.01
500	0.12	0.34	0.06	0.45	0.01	0.01	0.01
700	0.10	0.44	0.07	0.33	0.02	0.01	0.02
750	0.09	0.45	0.07	0.33	0.03	0.01	0.02
800	0.00	0.01	0.78	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.20
900	0.00	0.00	0.78	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.21

Table 3: Average frequency of convergence for different sanction levels

NOTE DI LAVORO DELLA FONDAZIONE ENI ENRICO MATTEI

Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei Working Paper Series

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

NOTE DI LAVORO PUBLISHED IN 2004

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

KTHC	36.2004	*Franca ECKERT COEN and Claudio ROSSI* (lxviii): Foreigners, Immigrants, Host Cities: The Policies of Multi-Ethnicity in Rome. Reading Governance in a Local Context
KTHC	37.2004	*Kristine CRANE* (lxviii): Governing Migration: Immigrant Groups' Strategies in Three Italian Cities – Rome, Naples and Bari
KTHC	38.2004	*Kiflemariam HAMDE* (lxviii): Mind in Africa, Body in Europe: The Struggle for Maintaining and Transforming Cultural Identity - A Note from the Experience of Eritrean Immigrants in Stockholm
ETA	39.2004	*Alberto CAVALIERE:* Price Competition with Information Disparities in a Vertically Differentiated Duopoly
PRA	40.2004	*Andrea BIGANO and Stef PROOST:* The Opening of the European Electricity Market and Environmental Policy: Does the Degree of Competition Matter?
CCMP	41.2004	*Micheal FINUS* (lxix): International Cooperation to Resolve International Pollution Problems
KTHC	42.2004	*Francesco CRESPI:* Notes on the Determinants of Innovation: A Multi-Perspective Analysis
CTN	43.2004	*Sergio CURRARINI and Marco MARINI:* Coalition Formation in Games without Synergies
CTN	44.2004	*Marc ESCRIHUELA-VILLAR:* Cartel Sustainability and Cartel Stability
NRM	45.2004	*Sebastian BERVOETS and Nicolas GRAVEL* (lxvi): Appraising Diversity with an Ordinal Notion of Similarity: An Axiomatic Approach
NRM	46.2004	*Signe ANTHON and Bo JELLESMARK THORSEN* (lxvi): Optimal Afforestation Contracts with Asymmetric Information on Private Environmental Benefits
NRM	47.2004	*John MBURU* (lxvi)*:* Wildlife Conservation and Management in Kenya: Towards a Co-management Approach
NRM	48.2004	*Ekin BIROL, Ágnes GYOVAI and Melinda SMALE* (lxvi)*:* Using a Choice Experiment to Value Agricultural Biodiversity on Hungarian Small Farms: Agri-Environmental Policies in a Transition al Economy
CCMP	49.2004	*Gernot KLEPPER and Sonja PETERSON:* The EU Emissions Trading Scheme. Allowance Prices, Trade Flows, Competitiveness Effects
GG	50.2004	*Scott BARRETT and Michael HOEL:* Optimal Disease Eradication
CTN	51.2004	*Dinko DIMITROV, Peter BORM, Ruud HENDRICKX and Shao CHIN SUNG:* Simple Priorities and Core Stability in Hedonic Games
SIEV	52.2004	*Francesco RICCI*: Channels of Transmission of Environmental Policy to Economic Growth: A Survey of the Theory
SIEV	53.2004	*Anna ALBERINI, Maureen CROPPER, Alan KRUPNICK and Nathalie B. SIMON:* Willingness to Pay for Mortality Risk Reductions: Does Latency Matter?
NRM	54.2004	*Ingo BRÄUER and Rainer MARGGRAF* (lxvi): Valuation of Ecosystem Services Provided by Biodiversity Conservation: An Integrated Hydrological and Economic Model to Value the Enhanced Nitrogen Retention in Renaturated Streams
NRM	55.2004	*Timo GOESCHL and Tun LIN* (lxvi): Biodiversity Conservation on Private Lands: Information Problems and Regulatory Choices
NRM	56.2004	*Tom DEDEURWAERDERE* (lxvi): Bioprospection: From the Economics of Contracts to Reflexive Governance
CCMP	57.2004	*Katrin REHDANZ and David MADDISON:* The Amenity Value of Climate to German Households
CCMP	58.2004	*Koen SMEKENS and Bob VAN DER ZWAAN:* Environmental Externalities of Geological Carbon Sequestration Effects on Energy Scenarios
NRM	59.2004	*Valentina BOSETTI, Mariaester CASSINELLI and Alessandro LANZA* (lxvii): Using Data Envelopment Analysis to Evaluate Environmentally Conscious Tourism Management
NRM	60.2004	*Timo GOESCHL and Danilo CAMARGO IGLIORI* (lxvi):Property Rights Conservation and Development: An Analysis of Extractive Reserves in the Brazilian Amazon
CCMP	61.2004	*Barbara BUCHNER and Carlo CARRARO*: Economic and Environmental Effectiveness of a Technology-based Climate Protocol
NRM	62.2004	*Elissaios PAPYRAKIS and Reyer GERLAGH*: Resource-Abundance and Economic Growth in the U.S.
NRM	63.2004	*Györgyi BELA, György PATAKI, Melinda SMALE and Mariann HAJDÚ* (lxvi): Conserving Crop Genetic Resources on Smallholder Farms in Hungary: Institutional Analysis
NRM	64.2004	*E.C.M. RUIJGROK and E.E.M. NILLESEN* (lxvi): The Socio-Economic Value of Natural Riverbanks in the Netherlands
NRM	65.2004	*E.C.M. RUIJGROK* (lxvi): Reducing Acidification: The Benefits of Increased Nature Quality. Investigating the Possibilities of the Contingent Valuation Method
ETA	66.2004	*Giannis VARDAS and Anastasios XEPAPADEAS*: Uncertainty Aversion, Robust Control and Asset Holdings
GG	67.2004	*Anastasios XEPAPADEAS and Constadina PASSA*: Participation in and Compliance with Public Voluntary Environmental Programs: An Evolutionary Approach
GG	68.2004	*Michael FINUS*: Modesty Pays: Sometimes!
NRM	69.2004	*Trond BJØRNDAL and Ana BRASÃO*: The Northern Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries: Management and Policy Implications
CTN	70.2004	*Alejandro CAPARRÓS, Abdelhakim HAMMOUDI and Tarik TAZDAÏT*: On Coalition Formation with Heterogeneous Agents
IEM	71.2004	*Massimo GIOVANNINI, Margherita GRASSO, Alessandro LANZA and Matteo MANERA*: Conditional Correlations in the Returns on Oil Companies Stock Prices and Their Determinants
IEM	72.2004	*Alessandro LANZA, Matteo MANERA and Michael MCALEER*: Modelling Dynamic Conditional Correlations in WTI Oil Forward and Futures Returns
SIEV	73.2004	*Margarita GENIUS and Elisabetta STRAZZERA*: The Copula Approach to Sample Selection Modelling: An Application to the Recreational Value of Forests

CCMP	74.2004	*Rob DELLINK and Ekko van IERLAND*: Pollution Abatement in the Netherlands: A Dynamic Applied General Equilibrium Assessment
ETA	75.2004	*Rosella LEVAGGI and Michele MORETTO*: Investment in Hospital Care Technology under Different Purchasing Rules: A Real Option Approach
CTN	76.2004	*Salvador BARBERÀ and Matthew O. JACKSON* (lxx): On the Weights of Nations: Assigning Voting Weights in a Heterogeneous Union
CTN	77.2004	*Àlex ARENAS, Antonio CABRALES, Albert DÍAZ-GUILERA, Roger GUIMERÀ and Fernando VEGA-REDONDO* (lxx): Optimal Information Transmission in Organizations: Search and Congestion
CTN	78.2004	*Francis BLOCH and Armando GOMES* (lxx): Contracting with Externalities and Outside Options
CTN	79.2004	*Rabah AMIR, Effrosyni DIAMANTOUDI and Licun XUE* (lxx): Merger Performance under Uncertain Efficiency Gains
CTN	80.2004	*Francis BLOCH and Matthew O. JACKSON* (lxx): The Formation of Networks with Transfers among Players
CTN	81.2004	*Daniel DIERMEIER, Hülya ERASLAN and Antonio MERLO* (lxx): Bicameralism and Government Formation
CTN	82.2004	*Rod GARRATT, James E. PARCO, Cheng-ZHONG QIN and Amnon RAPOPORT* (lxx): Potential Maximization and Coalition Government Formation
CTN	83.2004	*Kfir ELIAZ, Debraj RAY and Ronny RAZIN* (lxx): Group Decision-Making in the Shadow of Disagreement
CTN	84.2004	*Sanjeev GOYAL, Marco van der LEIJ and José Luis MORAGA-GONZÁLEZ* (lxx): Economics: An Emerging Small World?
CTN	85.2004	*Edward CARTWRIGHT* (lxx): Learning to Play Approximate Nash Equilibria in Games with Many Players
IEM	86.2004	*Finn R. FØRSUND and Michael HOEL*: Properties of a Non-Competitive Electricity Market Dominated by Hydroelectric Power
KTHC	87.2004	*Elissaios PAPYRAKIS and Reyer GERLAGH*: Natural Resources, Investment and Long-Term Income
CCMP	88.2004	*Marzio GALEOTTI and Claudia KEMFERT*: Interactions between Climate and Trade Policies: A Survey
IEM	89.2004	*A. MARKANDYA, S. PEDROSO and D. STREIMIKIENE*: Energy Efficiency in Transition Economies: Is There Convergence Towards the EU Average?
GG	90.2004	*Rolf GOLOMBEK and Michael HOEL* : Climate Agreements and Technology Policy
PRA	91.2004	*Sergei IZMALKOV* (lxv): Multi-Unit Open Ascending Price Efficient Auction
KTHC	92.2004	*Gianmarco I.P. OTTAVIANO and Giovanni PERI*: Cities and Cultures
KTHC	93.2004	*Massimo DEL GATTO*: Agglomeration, Integration, and Territorial Authority Scale in a System of Trading Cities. Centralisation versus devolution
CCMP	94.2004	*Pierre-André JOUVET, Philippe MICHEL and Gilles ROTILLON*: Equilibrium with a Market of Permits
CCMP	95.2004	*Bob van der ZWAAN and Reyer GERLAGH*: Climate Uncertainty and the Necessity to Transform Global Energy Supply
CCMP	96.2004	*Francesco BOSELLO, Marco LAZZARIN, Roberto ROSON and Richard S.J. TOL*: Economy-Wide Estimates of the Implications of Climate Change: Sea Level Rise
CTN	97.2004	*Gustavo BERGANTIÑOS and Juan J. VIDAL-PUGA*: Defining Rules in Cost Spanning Tree Problems Through the Canonical Form
CTN	98.2004	*Siddhartha BANDYOPADHYAY and Mandar OAK*: Party Formation and Coalitional Bargaining in a Model of Proportional Representation
GG	99.2004	*Hans-Peter WEIKARD, Michael FINUS and Juan-Carlos ALTAMIRANO-CABRERA*: The Impact of Surplus Sharing on the Stability of International Climate Agreements
SIEV	100.2004	*Chiara M. TRAVISI and Peter NIJKAMP*: Willingness to Pay for Agricultural Environmental Safety: Evidence from a Survey of Milan, Italy, Residents
SIEV	101.2004	*Chiara M. TRAVISI, Raymond J. G. M. FLORAX and Peter NIJKAMP*: A Meta-Analysis of the Willingness to Pay for Reductions in Pesticide Risk Exposure
NRM	102.2004	*Valentina BOSETTI and David TOMBERLIN*: Real Options Analysis of Fishing Fleet Dynamics: A Test
CCMP	103.2004	*Alessandra GORIA e Gretel GAMBARELLI*: Economic Evaluation of Climate Change Impacts and Adaptability in Italy
PRA	104.2004	*Massimo FLORIO and Mara GRASSENI*: The Missing Shock: The Macroeconomic Impact of British Privatisation
PRA	105.2004	*John BENNETT, Saul ESTRIN, James MAW and Giovanni URGA*: Privatisation Methods and Economic Growth in Transition Economies
PRA	106.2004	*Kira BÖRNER*: The Political Economy of Privatization: Why Do Governments Want Reforms?
PRA	107.2004	*Pehr-Johan NORBÄCK and Lars PERSSON*: Privatization and Restructuring in Concentrated Markets
SIEV	108.2004	*Angela GRANZOTTO, Fabio PRANOVI, Simone LIBRALATO, Patrizia TORRICELLI and Danilo MAINARDI*: Comparison between Artisanal Fishery and Manila Clam Harvesting in the Venice Lagoon by Using Ecosystem Indicators: An Ecological Economics Perspective
CTN	109.2004	*Somdeb LAHIRI*: The Cooperative Theory of Two Sided Matching Problems: A Re-examination of Some Results
NRM	110.2004	*Giuseppe DI VITA*: Natural Resources Dynamics: Another Look
SIEV	111.2004	*Anna ALBERINI, Alistair HUNT and Anil MARKANDYA*: Willingness to Pay to Reduce Mortality Risks: Evidence from a Three-Country Contingent Valuation Study
KTHC	112.2004	*Valeria PAPPONETTI and Dino PINELLI*: Scientific Advice to Public Policy-Making
SIEV	113.2004	*Paulo A.L.D. NUNES and Laura ONOFRI*: The Economics of Warm Glow: A Note on Consumer's Behavior and Public Policy Implications
IEM	114.2004	*Patrick CAYRADE*: Investments in Gas Pipelines and Liquefied Natural Gas Infrastructure What is the Impact on the Security of Supply?
IEM	115.2004	*Valeria COSTANTINI and Francesco GRACCEVA*: Oil Security. Short- and Long-Term Policies

IEM	116.2004	*Valeria COSTANTINI and Francesco GRACCEVA*: Social Costs of Energy Disruptions
IEM	117.2004	*Christian EGENHOFER, Kyriakos GIALOGLOU, Giacomo LUCIANI, Maroeska BOOTS, Martin SCHEEPERS, Valeria COSTANTINI, Francesco GRACCEVA, Anil MARKANDYA and Giorgio VICINI*: Market-Based Options for Security of Energy Supply
IEM	118.2004	*David FISK*: Transport Energy Security. The Unseen Risk?
IEM	119.2004	*Giacomo LUCIANI*: Security of Supply for Natural Gas Markets. What is it and What is it not?
IEM	120.2004	*L.J. de VRIES and R.A. HAKVOORT*: The Question of Generation Adequacy in Liberalised Electricity Markets
KTHC	121.2004	*Alberto PETRUCCI*: Asset Accumulation, Fertility Choice and Nondegenerate Dynamics in a Small Open Economy
NRM	122.2004	*Carlo GIUPPONI, Jaroslaw MYSIAK and Anita FASSIO*: An Integrated Assessment Framework for Water Resources Management: A DSS Tool and a Pilot Study Application
NRM	123.2004	*Margaretha BREIL, Anita FASSIO, Carlo GIUPPONI and Paolo ROSATO*: Evaluation of Urban Improvement on the Islands of the Venice Lagoon: A Spatially-Distributed Hedonic-Hierarchical Approach
ETA	124.2004	*Paul MENSINK*: Instant Efficient Pollution Abatement Under Non-Linear Taxation and Asymmetric Information: The Differential Tax Revisited
NRM	125.2004	*Mauro FABIANO, Gabriella CAMARSA, Rosanna DURSI, Roberta IVALDI, Valentina MARIN and Francesca PALMISANI*: Integrated Environmental Study for Beach Management:A Methodological Approach
PRA	126.2004	*Irena GROSFELD and Iraj HASHI*: The Emergence of Large Shareholders in Mass Privatized Firms: Evidence from Poland and the Czech Republic
CCMP	127.2004	*Maria BERRITTELLA, Andrea BIGANO, Roberto ROSON and Richard S.J. TOL*: A General Equilibrium Analysis of Climate Change Impacts on Tourism
CCMP	128.2004	*Reyer GERLAGH*: A Climate-Change Policy Induced Shift from Innovations in Energy Production to Energy Savings
NRM	129.2004	*Elissaios PAPYRAKIS and Reyer GERLAGH*: Natural Resources, Innovation, and Growth
PRA	130.2004	*Bernardo BORTOLOTTI and Mara FACCIO*: Reluctant Privatization
SIEV	131.2004	*Riccardo SCARPA and Mara THIENE*: Destination Choice Models for Rock Climbing in the Northeast Alps: A Latent-Class Approach Based on Intensity of Participation
SIEV	132.2004	*Riccardo SCARPA Kenneth G. WILLIS and Melinda ACUTT*: Comparing Individual-Specific Benefit Estimates for Public Goods: Finite Versus Continuous Mixing in Logit Models
IEM	133.2004	*Santiago J. RUBIO*: On Capturing Oil Rents with a National Excise Tax Revisited
ETA	134.2004	*Ascensión ANDINA DÍAZ*: Political Competition when Media Create Candidates' Charisma
SIEV	135.2004	*Anna ALBERINI*: Robustness of VSL Values from Contingent Valuation Surveys
CCMP	136.2004	*Gernot KLEPPER and Sonja PETERSON*: Marginal Abatement Cost Curves in General Equilibrium: The Influence of World Energy Prices
ETA	137.2004	*Herbert DAWID, Christophe DEISSENBERG and Pavel ŠEVČIK*: Cheap Talk, Gullibility, and Welfare in an Environmental Taxation Game
CCMP	138.2004	*ZhongXiang ZHANG*: The World Bank's Prototype Carbon Fund and China
CCMP	139.2004	*Reyer GERLAGH and Marjan W. HOFKES*: Time Profile of Climate Change Stabilization Policy
NRM	140.2004	*Chiara D'ALPAOS and Michele MORETTO*: The Value of Flexibility in the Italian Water Service Sector: A Real Option Analysis
PRA	141.2004	*Patrick BAJARI, Stephanie HOUGHTON and Steven TADELIS* (lxxi): Bidding for Incompete Contracts
PRA	142.2004	*Susan ATHEY, Jonathan LEVIN and Enrique SEIRA* (lxxi): Comparing Open and Sealed Bid Auctions: Theory and Evidence from Timber Auctions
PRA	143.2004	*David GOLDREICH* (lxxi): Behavioral Biases of Dealers in U.S. Treasury Auctions
PRA	144.2004	*Roberto BURGUET* (lxxi): Optimal Procurement Auction for a Buyer with Downward Sloping Demand: More Simple Economics
PRA	145.2004	*Ali HORTACSU and Samita SAREEN* (lxxi): Order Flow and the Formation of Dealer Bids: An Analysis of Information and Strategic Behavior in the Government of Canada Securities Auctions
PRA	146.2004	*Victor GINSBURGH, Patrick LEGROS and Nicolas SAHUGUET* (lxxi): How to Win Twice at an Auction. On the Incidence of Commissions in Auction Markets
PRA	147.2004	*Claudio MEZZETTI, Aleksandar PEKEČ and Ilia TSETLIN* (lxxi): Sequential vs. Single-Round Uniform-Price Auctions
PRA	148.2004	*John ASKER and Estelle CANTILLON* (lxxi): Equilibrium of Scoring Auctions
PRA	149.2004	*Philip A. HAILE, Han HONG and Matthew SHUM* (lxxi): Nonparametric Tests for Common Values in First-Price Sealed-Bid Auctions
PRA	150.2004	*François DEGEORGE, François DERRIEN and Kent L. WOMACK* (lxxi): Quid Pro Quo in IPOs: Why Bookbuilding is Dominating Auctions
CCMP	151.2004	*Barbara BUCHNER and Silvia DALL'OLIO*: Russia: The Long Road to Ratification. Internal Institution and Pressure Groups in the Kyoto Protocol's Adoption Process
CCMP	152.2004	*Carlo CARRARO and Marzio GALEOTTI*: Does Endogenous Technical Change Make a Difference in Climate Policy Analysis? A Robustness Exercise with the FEEM-RICE Model
PRA	153.2004	*Alejandro M. MANELLI and Daniel R. VINCENT* (lxxi): Multidimensional Mechanism Design: Revenue Maximization and the Multiple-Good Monopoly
ETA	154.2004	*Nicola ACOCELLA, Giovanni Di BARTOLOMEO and Wilfried PAUWELS*: Is there any Scope for Corporatism in Stabilization Policies?
CTN	155.2004	*Johan EYCKMANS and Michael FINUS*: An Almost Ideal Sharing Scheme for Coalition Games with Externalities
CCMP	156.2004	*Cesare DOSI and Michele MORETTO*: Environmental Innovation, War of Attrition and Investment Grants

CCMP	157.2004	*Valentina BOSETTI, Marzio GALEOTTI and Alessandro LANZA*: How Consistent are Alternative Short-Term Climate Policies with Long-Term Goals?
ETA	158.2004	*Y. Hossein FARZIN and Ken-Ichi AKAO*: Non-pecuniary Value of Employment and Individual Labor Supply
ETA	159.2004	*William BROCK and Anastasios XEPAPADEAS*: Spatial Analysis: Development of Descriptive and Normative Methods with Applications to Economic-Ecological Modelling
KTHC	160.2004	*Alberto PETRUCCI*: On the Incidence of a Tax on PureRent with Infinite Horizons
IEM	161.2004	*Xavier LABANDEIRA, José M. LABEAGA and Miguel RODRÍGUEZ*: Microsimulating the Effects of Household Energy Price Changes in Spain

NOTE DI LAVORO PUBLISHED IN 2005

CCMP	1.2005	*Stéphane HALLEGATTE*: Accounting for Extreme Events in the Economic Assessment of Climate Change
CCMP	2.2005	*Qiang WU and Paulo Augusto NUNES*: Application of Technological Control Measures on Vehicle Pollution: A Cost-Benefit Analysis in China
CCMP	3.2005	*Andrea BIGANO, Jacqueline M. HAMILTON, Maren LAU, Richard S.J. TOL and Yuan ZHOU*: A Global Database of Domestic and International Tourist Numbers at National and Subnational Level
CCMP	4.2005	*Andrea BIGANO, Jacqueline M. HAMILTON and Richard S.J. TOL*: The Impact of Climate on Holiday Destination Choice
ETA	5.2005	*Hubert KEMPF*: Is Inequality Harmful for the Environment in a Growing Economy?
CCMP	6.2005	*Valentina BOSETTI, Carlo CARRARO and Marzio GALEOTTI*: The Dynamics of Carbon and Energy Intensity in a Model of Endogenous Technical Change
IEM	7.2005	*David CALEF and Robert GOBLE*: The Allure of Technology: How France and California Promoted Electric Vehicles to Reduce Urban Air Pollution
ETA	8.2005	*Lorenzo PELLEGRINI and Reyer GERLAGH*: An Empirical Contribution to the Debate on Corruption Democracy and Environmental Policy
CCMP	9.2005	*Angelo ANTOCI*: Environmental Resources Depletion and Interplay Between Negative and Positive Externalities in a Growth Model
CTN	10.2005	*Frédéric DEROIAN*: Cost-Reducing Alliances and Local Spillovers
NRM	11.2005	*Francesco SINDICO*: The GMO Dispute before the WTO: Legal Implications for the Trade and Environment Debate
KTHC	12.2005	*Carla MASSIDDA*: Estimating the New Keynesian Phillips Curve for Italian Manufacturing Sectors
KTHC	13.2005	*Michele MORETTO and Gianpaolo ROSSINI*: Start-up Entry Strategies: Employer vs. Nonemployer firms
PRCG	14.2005	*Clara GRAZIANO and Annalisa LUPORINI*: Ownership Concentration, Monitoring and Optimal Board Structure
CSRM	15.2005	*Parashar KULKARNI*: Use of Ecolabels in Promoting Exports from Developing Countries to Developed Countries: Lessons from the Indian LeatherFootwear Industry
KTHC	16.2005	*Adriana DI LIBERTO, Roberto MURA and Francesco PIGLIARU*: How to Measure the Unobservable: A Panel Technique for the Analysis of TFP Convergence
KTHC	17.2005	*Alireza NAGHAVI*: Asymmetric Labor Markets, Southern Wages, and the Location of Firms
KTHC	18.2005	*Alireza NAGHAVI*: Strategic Intellectual Property Rights Policy and North-South Technology Transfer
KTHC	19.2005	*Mombert HOPPE*: Technology Transfer Through Trade
PRCG	20.2005	*Roberto ROSON*: Platform Competition with Endogenous Multihoming
CCMP	21.2005	*Barbara BUCHNER and Carlo CARRARO*: Regional and Sub-Global Climate Blocs. A Game Theoretic Perspective on Bottom-up Climate Regimes
IEM	22.2005	*Fausto CAVALLARO*: An Integrated Multi-Criteria System to Assess Sustainable Energy Options: An Application of the Promethee Method
CTN	23.2005	*Michael FINUS, Pierre v. MOUCHE and Bianca RUNDSHAGEN*: Uniqueness of Coalitional Equilibria
IEM	24.2005	*Wietze LISE***: Decomposition of CO2 Emissions over 1980–2003 in Turkey
CTN	25.2005	*Somdeb LAHIRI*: The Core of Directed Network Problems with Quotas
SIEV	26.2005	*Susanne MENZEL and Riccardo SCARPA*: Protection Motivation Theory and Contingent Valuation: Perceived Realism, Threat and WTP Estimates for Biodiversity Protection
NRM	27.2005	*Massimiliano MAZZANTI and Anna MONTINI*: The Determinants of Residential Water Demand Empirical Evidence for a Panel of Italian Municipalities
CCMP	28.2005	*Laurent GILOTTE and Michel de LARA*: Precautionary Effect and Variations of the Value of Information
NRM	29.2005	*Paul SARFO-MENSAH*: Exportation of Timber in Ghana: The Menace of Illegal Logging Operations
CCMP	30.2005	*Andrea BIGANO, Alessandra GORIA, Jacqueline HAMILTON and Richard S.J. TOL*: The Effect of Climate Change and Extreme Weather Events on Tourism
NRM	31.2005	*Maria Angeles GARCIA-VALIÑAS*: Decentralization and Environment: An Application to Water Policies
NRM	32.2005	*Chiara D'ALPAOS, Cesare DOSI and Michele MORETTO*: Concession Length and Investment Timing Flexibility
CCMP	33.2005	*Joseph HUBER*: Key Environmental Innovations
CTN	34.2005	*Antoni CALVÓ-ARMENGOL and Rahmi İLKILIÇ* (lxxii): Pairwise-Stability and Nash Equilibria in Network Formation
CTN	35.2005	*Francesco FERI* (lxxii): Network Formation with Endogenous Decay
CTN	36.2005	*Frank H. PAGE, Jr. and Myrna H. WOODERS* (lxxii): Strategic Basins of Attraction, the Farsighted Core, and Network Formation Games

CTN	37.2005	*Alessandra CASELLA and Nobuyuki HANAKI* (lxxii): <u>Information Channels in Labor Markets. On the Resilience of Referral Hiring</u>
CTN	38.2005	*Matthew O. JACKSON and Alison WATTS* (lxxii): <u>Social Games: Matching and the Play of Finitely Repeated Games</u>
CTN	39.2005	*Anna BOGOMOLNAIA, Michel LE BRETON, Alexei SAVVATEEV and Shlomo WEBER* (lxxii): <u>The Egalitarian Sharing Rule in Provision of Public Projects</u>
CTN	40.2005	*Francesco FERI*: <u>Stochastic Stability in Network with Decay</u>
CTN	41.2005	*Aart de ZEEUW* (lxxii): <u>Dynamic Effects on the Stability of International Environmental Agreements</u>
NRM	42.2005	*C. Martijn van der HEIDE, Jeroen C.J.M. van den BERGH, Ekko C. van IERLAND and Paulo A.L.D. NUNES*: <u>Measuring the Economic Value of Two Habitat Defragmentation Policy Scenarios for the Veluwe, The Netherlands</u>
PRCG	43.2005	*Carla VIEIRA and Ana Paula SERRA*: <u>Abnormal Returns in Privatization Public Offerings: The Case of Portuguese Firms</u>
SIEV	44.2005	*Anna ALBERINI, Valentina ZANATTA and Paolo ROSATO*: <u>Combining Actual and Contingent Behavior to Estimate the Value of Sports Fishing in the Lagoon of Venice</u>
CTN	45.2005	*Michael FINUS and Bianca RUNDSHAGEN:* <u>Participation in International Environmental Agreements: The Role of Timing and Regulation</u>
CCMP	46.2005	*Lorenzo PELLEGRINI and Reyer GERLAGH*: <u>Are EU Environmental Policies Too Demanding for New Members States?</u>
IEM	47.2005	*Matteo MANERA*: <u>Modeling Factor Demands with SEM and VAR: An Empirical Comparison</u>
CTN	48.2005	*Olivier TERCIEUX and Vincent VANNETELBOSCH* (lxx): <u>A Characterization of Stochastically Stable Networks</u>
CTN	49.2005	*Ana MAULEON, José SEMPERE-MONERRIS and Vincent J. VANNETELBOSCH* (lxxii): <u>R&D Networks Among Unionized Firms</u>
CTN	50.2005	*Carlo CARRARO, Johan EYCKMANS and Michael FINUS*: <u>Optimal Transfers and Participation Decisions in International Environmental Agreements</u>
KTHC	51.2005	*Valeria GATTAI*: <u>From the Theory of the Firm to FDI and Internalisation:A Survey</u>
CCMP	52.2005	*Alireza NAGHAVI*: <u>Multilateral Environmental Agreements and Trade Obligations: A Theoretical Analysis of the Doha Proposal</u>
SIEV	53.2005	*Margaretha BREIL, Gretel GAMBARELLI and Paulo A.L.D. NUNES*: <u>Economic Valuation of On Site Material Damages of High Water on Economic Activities based in the City of Venice: Results from a Dose-Response-Expert-Based Valuation Approach</u>
ETA	54.2005	*Alessandra del BOCA, Marzio GALEOTTI, Charles P. HIMMELBERG and Paola ROTA*: <u>Investment and Time to Plan: A Comparison of Structures vs. Equipment in a Panel of Italian Firms</u>
CCMP	55.2005	*Gernot KLEPPER and Sonja PETERSON*: <u>Emissions Trading, CDM, JI, and More – The Climate Strategy of the EU</u>
ETA	56.2005	*Maia DAVID and Bernard SINCLAIR-DESGAGNÉ*: <u>Environmental Regulation and the Eco-Industry</u>
ETA	57.2005	*Alain-Désiré NIMUBONA and Bernard SINCLAIR-DESGAGNÉ*: <u>The Pigouvian Tax Rule in the Presence of an Eco-Industry</u>
NRM	58.2005	*Helmut KARL, Antje MÖLLER, Ximena MATUS, Edgar GRANDE and Robert KAISER*: <u>Environmental Innovations: Institutional Impacts on Co-operations for Sustainable Development</u>
SIEV	59.2005	*Dimitra VOUVAKI and Anastasios XEPAPADEAS* (lxxiii): <u>Criteria for Assessing Sustainable Development: Theoretical Issues and Empirical Evidence for the Case of Greece</u>
CCMP	60.2005	*Andreas LÖSCHEL and Dirk T.G. RÜBBELKE*: <u>Impure Public Goods and Technological Interdependencies</u>
PRCG	61.2005	*Christoph A. SCHALTEGGER and Benno TORGLER*: <u>Trust and Fiscal Performance: A Panel Analysis with Swiss Data</u>
ETA	62.2005	*Irene VALSECCHI*: <u>A Role for Instructions</u>
NRM	63.2005	*Valentina BOSETTI and Gianni LOCATELLI*: <u>A Data Envelopment Analysis Approach to the Assessment of Natural Parks' Economic Efficiency and Sustainability. The Case of Italian National Parks</u>
SIEV	64.2005	*Arianne T. de BLAEIJ, Paulo A.L.D. NUNES and Jeroen C.J.M. van den BERGH*: <u>Modeling 'No-choice' Responses in Attribute Based Valuation Surveys</u>
CTN	65.2005	*Carlo CARRARO, Carmen MARCHIORI and Alessandra SGOBBI*: <u>Applications of Negotiation Theory to Water Issues</u>
CTN	66.2005	*Carlo CARRARO, Carmen MARCHIORI and Alessandra SGOBBI*: <u>Advances in Negotiation Theory: Bargaining, Coalitions and Fairness</u>
KTHC	67.2005	*Sandra WALLMAN* (lxxiv**)**: <u>Network Capital and Social Trust: Pre-Conditions for 'Good' Diversity?</u>
KTHC	68.2005	*Asimina CHRISTOFOROU* (lxxiv): <u>On the Determinants of Social Capital in Greece Compared to Countries of the European Union</u>
KTHC	69.2005	*Eric M. USLANER* (lxxiv): <u>Varieties of Trust</u>
KTHC	70.2005	*Thomas P. LYON* (lxxiv): <u>Making Capitalism Work: Social Capital and Economic Growth in Italy, 1970-1995</u>
KTHC	71.2005	*Graziella BERTOCCHI and Chiara STROZZI* (lxxv): <u>Citizenship Laws and International Migration in Historical Perspective</u>
KTHC	72.2005	*Elsbeth van HYLCKAMA VLIEG* (lxxv): <u>Accommodating Differences</u>
KTHC	73.2005	*Renato SANSA and Ercole SORI* (lxxv): <u>Governance of Diversity Between Social Dynamics and Conflicts in Multicultural Cities. A Selected Survey on Historical Bibliography</u>
IEM	74.2005	*Alberto LONGO and Anil MARKANDYA*: <u>Identification of Options and Policy Instruments for the Internalisation of External Costs of Electricity Generation. Dissemination of External Costs of Electricity Supply Making Electricity External Costs Known to Policy-Makers MAXIMA</u>

(lxv) This paper was presented at the EuroConference on "Auctions and Market Design: Theory, Evidence and Applications" organised by Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei and sponsored by the EU, Milan, September 25-27, 2003

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

(lxvii) This paper has been presented at the international conference on "Tourism and Sustainable Economic Development – Macro and Micro Economic Issues" jointly organised by CRENoS (Università di Cagliari e Sassari, Italy) and Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, and supported by the World Bank, Sardinia, September 19-20, 2003

(lxviii) This paper was presented at the ENGIME Workshop on "Governance and Policies in Multicultural Cities", Rome, June 5-6, 2003

(lxix) This paper was presented at the Fourth EEP Plenary Workshop and EEP Conference "The Future of Climate Policy", Cagliari, Italy, 27-28 March 2003

(lxx) This paper was presented at the 9th Coalition Theory Workshop on "Collective Decisions and Institutional Design" organised by the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona and held in Barcelona, Spain, January 30-31, 2004

(lxxi) This paper was presented at the EuroConference on "Auctions and Market Design: Theory, Evidence and Applications", organised by Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei and Consip and sponsored by the EU, Rome, September 23-25, 2004

(lxxii) This paper was presented at the 10th Coalition Theory Network Workshop held in Paris, France on 28-29 January 2005 and organised by EUREQua.

(lxxiii) This paper was presented at the 2nd Workshop on "Inclusive Wealth and Accounting Prices" held in Trieste, Italy on 13-15 April 2005 and organised by the Ecological and Environmental Economics - EEE Programme, a joint three-year programme of ICTP - The Abdus Salam International Centre for Theoretical Physics, FEEM - Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, and The Beijer International Institute of Ecological Economics

(lxxiv) This paper was presented at the ENGIME Workshop on "Trust and social capital in multicultural cities" Athens, January 19-20, 2004

(lxxv) This paper was presented at the ENGIME Workshop on "Diversity as a source of growth" Rome November 18-19, 2004

(lxxvl) This paper was presented at the 3rd Workshop on Spatial-Dynamic Models of Economics and Ecosystems held in Trieste on 11-13 April 2005 and organised by the Ecological and Environmental Economics - EEE Programme, a joint three-year programme of ICTP - The Abdus Salam International Centre for Theoretical Physics, FEEM - Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, and The Beijer International Institute of Ecological Economics