

NOTA DI LAVORO

82.2014

Assessing Direct and Indirect Economic Impacts of a Flood Event Through the Integration of Spatial and Computable General Equilibrium Modelling

By **Lorenzo Carrera**, Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Ca' Foscari University of Venice and Euro-Mediterranean Centre on Climate Change

Gabriele Standardi, Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei and Euro-Mediterranean Centre on Climate Change

Francesco Bosello Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Euro-Mediterranean Centre Climate Change and University of Milan

Jaroslav Mysiak, Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei and Euro-Mediterranean Centre on Climate Change

Climate Change and Sustainable Development

Series Editor: Carlo Carraro

Assessing Direct and Indirect Economic Impacts of a Flood Event Through the Integration of Spatial and Computable General Equilibrium Modelling

By Lorenzo Carrera, Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Ca' Foscari University of Venice and Euro-Mediterranean Centre on Climate Change

Gabriele Standardi, Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei and Euro-Mediterranean Centre on Climate Change

Francesco Bosello Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Euro-Mediterranean Centre Climate Change and University of Milan

Jaroslav Mysiak, Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei and Euro-Mediterranean Centre on Climate Change

Summary

In this paper we developed and tested an integrated methodology for assessing direct and indirect economic impacts of flooding. The methodology combines a spatial analysis of damage to physical stocks with a general economic equilibrium approach using a regionally-calibrated (to Italy) version of a Computable General Equilibrium (CGE) global model. We applied the model to the 2000 Po river flood. To account for the uncertainty in the induced effects on regional economies, we explored three disruption and two recovery scenarios. The results prove that: i) indirect losses are a significant share of direct losses, and ii) the model is able to capture both positive and negative economic effects of a disaster in different areas of the same country. The assessment of indirect impacts is essential for a full understanding of the economic outcomes of natural disasters.

Keywords: Flood Risk, Indirect Impacts, Computable General Equilibrium, Natural Disasters

JEL Classification: Q5, Q54

Address for correspondence:

Lorenzo Carrera

Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei

Isola San Giorgio Maggiore 8

30124 Venice

Italy

Phone: +39 041 2700474

E-mail: lorenzo.carrera@feem.it

Assessing direct and indirect economic impacts of a flood event through the integration of spatial and computable general equilibrium modelling

Lorenzo Carrera^{a,b,c}, Gabriele Standardi^{a,c}, Francesco Bosello^{a,c}, Jaroslav Mysiak^{a,c}

^aFondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Isola San Giorgio Maggiore, 30124 Venice, Italy

^bCa' Foscari University of Venice, Dorsoduro 3246, 30123, Venice, Italy

^cEuro-Mediterranean Centre on Climate Change, Isola San Giorgio Maggiore, 30124 Venice, Italy

^dUniversity of Milan, Via Festa del Perdono 7, 20122 Milano

Corresponding author:

*Lorenzo Carrera - Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Isola San Giorgio Maggiore 8, 30124 Venice, Italy
(Tel.: +39-041.2700.474, Fax: +39-041.2700.412, Email: lorenzo.carrera@feem.it)*

Abstract

In this paper we developed and tested an integrated methodology for assessing direct and indirect economic impacts of flooding. The methodology combines a spatial analysis of damage to physical stocks with a general economic equilibrium approach using a regionally-calibrated (to Italy) version of a Computable General Equilibrium (CGE) global model. We applied the model to the 2000 Po river flood. To account for the uncertainty in the induced effects on regional economies, we explored three disruption and two recovery scenarios. The results prove that: i) indirect losses are a significant share of direct losses, and ii) the model is able to capture both positive and negative economic effects of a disaster in different areas of the same country. The assessment of indirect impacts is essential for a full understanding of the economic outcomes of natural disasters.

Keywords: flood risk, indirect impacts, computable general equilibrium, natural disasters

1. Introduction and background

Water-related extremes, such as floods and storms, account at the global level for the greatest share of natural disasters' inflicted economic damage and death toll (Jonkman and Kelman, 2005; Kunreuther and Michel-kerjan, 2007; United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction Secretariat, 2009). In Europe, according to NatCatService (MunichRE, 2010), 80 per cent of the economic losses caused by natural disasters that occurred during the period 1980-2009 were related to hydro-meteorological events (EEA, 2010). Hydrological events only (i.e. flood and wet mass movements) account for 25 per cent of the overall losses in the 32 European Environmental Agency (EEA) Member States, estimated as 414 billion Euro over the period 1980-2009 (in 2009 values) (EEA, 2010).

Growing population and capital density, unsustainable development, inappropriate land use and climate change, threaten to intensify natural hazards' risk with even more concerning consequences for the environment and societies (IPCC, 2012). Against this background the EEA warned that flood related losses will rise consistently in Europe (EEA, 2012). According to Feyen et al. (2012), which calculated the expected annual damage (EAD) from river flooding events in Europe, current EAD of 6.4 billion Euro may increase by 2100 to 14 - 21.5 billion Euro (constant 2006 prices) depending on climate scenarios (Feyen et al., 2012). Under the medium to high emission scenario A1B Rojas et al. (Rojas et al., 2013) calculated that EAD might raise by the end of this century to around 97 billion Euro (constant 2006 prices undiscounted, considering both climate and socio-economic changes).

However, economic impacts of natural hazards are still poorly understood, particularly their indirect, wider and macro-economic effects. Typically estimates from the European Environmental Agency (EEA) (EEA, 2012) and global disaster databases (i.e. the EM-DAT dataset managed by the Centre for Research on the Epidemiology of Disasters, the NatCatSERVICE dataset managed by Munich Reinsurance Company, and the Sigma dataset from Swiss Reinsurance Company) undervalue the full cost of disasters to societies and environment because most of the time they account for direct impacts only, with partial or incomplete consideration given to indirect, wider and macroeconomic effects.

Several efforts have been made to assess indirect impacts of disasters on national and regional economies (Cochrane, 2004; Green et al., 2011; Messner et al., 2007; Okuyama, 2007; Przulski and Hallegatte, 2011; Rose, 2004) using different methodologies. These include amongst others: post

event economic surveys (Kroll et al., 1991; Molinari et al., 2014; Pfurtscheller, 2014), econometric models (Albala-Bertrand, 1993; Cavallo et al., 2012; Noy and Nualsri, 2007; Strobl, 2010), input-output (I-O) models (Hallegatte, 2008; Hallegatte et al., 2011; Henriët et al., 2012; Okuyama, 2014; Okuyama et al., 2004; Ranger et al., 2011), computable general equilibrium (CGE) models (Berrittella et al., 2007; Haddad and Teixeira, 2013; Jonkhoff, 2009; Pauw, K. et al., 2011; Rose and Liao, 2005; Rose et al., 1997; Tsuchiya et al., 2007). Different methodologies have different advantages and disadvantages. Econometric models and post event surveys, if well specified and based upon data of a reasonable quality, can indeed quantify indirect effects on national/local GDP of extreme events with high levels of accuracy and scarce uncertainty in the assessment procedure (Przyluski and Hallegatte, 2011). However they cannot describe the systemic economic channels through which they propagates within and between the economies affected. I-O and CGE models can do so (Hallegatte, 2008; Okuyama, 2007; Rose, 2004). I-O models can reach a high analytical specificity, they can represent urban contexts as well as even smaller economic entities like natural parks or cities, but then they are usually missing the effect on the overall economy. Moreover I-O models cannot assess the impacts on the supply side, and do not allow for flexibility in the economic system which is indeed a characteristics of CGE models (Hallegatte, 2008). CGE models are able to capture the feedback effects from the macro-economic context on the “markets” initially concerned (Rose, 2004). Furthermore, in general equilibrium approaches the use of consistent accounting methodology for capturing economic flows overcome the problems of ‘double-counting’, often affecting the evaluation conducted through the application of partial equilibrium (Pauw, K. et al., 2011). CGE models also offer in principle the possibility to conduct simulated counterfactual analyses, comparison between what happened and what would have happened in the absence of the catastrophic event. Nonetheless, CGE models have several limitations. They assume perfect markets and they are not able to capture non-market values (Pauw, K. et al., 2011). Another important limitation of CGE models is their “coarse” investigation unit, usually the country. This may allow analysis of aggregated events or trends, but makes local analyses particularly challenging, especially for small to medium disasters.

Against this background, in this paper we propose the combination of a spatially based analysis with a CGE model, regionally calibrated to the Italian macro-regions North, Center and South (Standardi et al., 2014). Our sub-national version of the global CGE model allows to assess the

regional impacts (at sub-national level), whilst maintaining the global scale of the economic system (e.g. global trading, international exports and imports, etc.).

Our aim is to couple the high resolution of spatial analysis with the CGE models' systemic ability to capture economic interaction, without pushing the CGE aggregation need too far to lose completely local specificities. We then apply our methodology to estimate the economic impacts at the sub-national and national level of a flood event that occurred in Northern Italy in October 2000. At country level the outputs of the model provide an indirect-direct losses ratio of 0.19-0.22. The model is also able to unravel the wider impact of the flood into differentiated effects in sub-national economies. Thus the indirect losses in the North are partially compensated by (tiny) economic gains in non-affected areas (Centre and South) because of the interconnectivity of the economic system, the mobility of productivity factors and substitution of goods. The propagation of impacts beyond national border is negligible and the EU level GDP is in practice unaffected.

The paper unfolds as follows: Section 2 briefly reviews the case study area and the flood event; Section 3 provides a comprehensive discussion on the conceptual framework and methodology, a description of the sample data and the integrated model; Section 4 presents and discusses the results; Section 5 concludes the document providing a critical review of the outcomes, in the broader context of flood impact assessment and disaster risk management.

2. Background information on the Po river October 2000 flood event

The Po river is located in Northern Italy, which includes eight Italian regions: Piedmont, Aosta Valley, Liguria, Lombardy, Trentino Alto Adige, Veneto, Friuli-Venezia Giulia, Emilia-Romagna. The area produces around 77 percent of the national Gross Domestic Product (GDP), with Lombardy having by far the largest economy (21 percent of national GDP), followed by Emilia-Romagna with 9 percent, Piedmont with 8 percent and Aosta Valley with 0.3 percent. Because of the strategic importance of the area, this paper analyses the economic impacts of the Po river flood that occurred in October 2000 in Piedmont, Aosta Valley and other downstream regions in the Northern Italy. Between 13th and 16th October 2000, a series of extreme precipitations, up to 600 mm in 48 hours hit the Northwest of Italy leading to numerous inundations and landslides (Ratto et al., 2003; Regione Piemonte, 2000a, 2000b). The event is amongst the most significant that have occurred in Italy over the past decades. It caused 37 casualties and missing persons (27 in Italy and 10 in Switzerland) and economic damages of over 2.5 billion Euro, as reported by the Information

System on Hydrogeological Disasters (IRPI), 5.2 billion Euro as reported by Guzzetti and Tonelli (2004) or 8.6 billion Euro as reported by the EM-DAT International Disasters Database (Centre for Research on the Epidemiology of Disasters - CRED). More than 40,000 people were evacuated and at least 3,000 lost their houses (Guzzetti and Tonelli, 2004). The flood hit more than 700 municipalities and almost all main cities of Piedmont and Aosta Valley. All economic sectors were severely impacted, either directly through structural damage or indirectly through business interruptions. The flood caused significant damages to industries, transport infrastructures and urbanized areas. It led to lifelines interruptions, cutting-off major highways, regional and provincial roads. Milan-Turin and Turin-Aosta highways were severely damaged. Bridges were destroyed resulting in temporal isolation of small and medium sized towns (Tropeano and Turconi, 2001). In several areas electricity, telecommunication, and drinking water supply services were interrupted for days – up to a week in Turin and other towns in the area (Tropeano and Turconi, 2001). In addition to hitting the constructed areas, the flood caused serious damages to agriculture affecting livestock, crop production, farm structures, and farming facilities (Farinosi et al., 2012).

3. Methodology

3.1. Conceptual framework

Our work aims to estimate the economic impacts of the Po river 2000 flood event. Because of the knowledge gap in indirect impact assessment, this paper focus on developing and testing an integrated methodology for indirect impact assessment. Therefore the direct impact assessment shall be considered instrumental to the indirect, and meaningful for comparison and validation of the outputs provided by the integrated spatial-CGE model. Hereinafter, we define the terminology used in the paper and the general conceptual framework with reference to relevant literature.

Meyer et al. (2013) divides the economic impacts of disasters in direct, business interruption, and indirect costs. Direct are the losses affecting humans, assets, property and any other objects in the areas that had physical contact with the flood (Merz et al., 2010; Meyer et al., 2013). Business interruptions are those losses that occur to business directly affected by the hazard. They are often referred as primary indirect damages because they are induced by the interruption of business activities. Indirect losses occur inside and outside the flooded area (Merz et al., 2010; Messner et al., 2007) and are caused by direct costs and/or business interruption costs (Przyluski and Hallegatte, 2011). Indirect impacts are prompted by the physical stock of capital which is

damaged, transmitted through the inter-linkages of economic systems (Cochrane, 2004; Merz et al., 2010) and resulting in a disruption of economic flows (Rose and Liao, 2005; Rose, 2004). More in general at meso and macro scale, floods engender exogenous, internal or external (if international trade is affected) 'shocks' to economies, with far-reaching ripple effects. Beyond the direct structural damage caused by floods, the disaster-affected sectors are likely to curtail their activities and production, collect less revenues, lay-off staff, and postpone investments. These dynamics influence both the market and consumers' preferences. Direct losses set off a sequence of 'upstream' and 'downstream' reactions, which affect suppliers and customers. These ripple effects represent the indirect impacts of a disaster. Generally a flood event produces negative effects on the region directly affected but, on the larger scale, the event could produce positive and negative propagation effects in the economies of neighbouring and distant regions (Jonkhoff, 2009).

Summarizing, in this paper we consider direct impacts as the physical damage to the stock, which is a quantity at a single point time (Rose, 2004), and indirect impacts as the effect of a disaster to the flows, originated by the stock over time (Rose, 2004), or the aggregation of business interruption costs and indirect costs as defined in Meyer et al. (2013), which our model is not able to distinguish separately. Our analysis is a comparative static exercise adopting a one-year timeframe. In our setup the adjustment from the pre to the post-disaster economy is instantaneous. We acknowledge the fact that effects of disasters can extend over longer periods of time (Cavallo et al., 2012; Hallegatte, 2014) and that friction and inertia may affect the transition phases. Therefore our estimation of indirect impacts shall be considered as short-term effects only and may underestimate losses. Table 1 provides the description of our conceptual framework.

Table 1. Summary of our conceptual approach and expected output. IT is Italy, EU European Union, RoW Rest of the world.

Type of impact (our definition)	Main literature reference		Assessment tool	Expected output	Scale of analysis
	Meyer et al. 2013	Rose et al. 2004			
Direct	Direct cost	Stock of capital	Spatial analysis with depth-damage functions from Huizinga (2007)	Physical damage to the stock of capital represented by the full replacement cost (Euro)	250x250m
Indirect	Business interruption cost, indirect cost	Flows	Sub-national CGE model from Standardi et al. (2014)	Percent change in: i) production per economic sector, ii) sub-national (North, Centre, South), IT, EU, RoW GDP	Sub-national areas (North, Centre, South), IT, EU, RoW

3.2. Integration of the spatial and CGE models

The integrated model described in this paper (Figure 1) is conceptually divided into three parts: i) the spatial analysis of the flood event for the estimation of direct impacts and affected areas (km²) per land use class of Corine Land Cover 2000 (CLC2000); ii) the spatial-CGE integration part which produce the input (damage to the primary factors productivity per economic sector) to 'shock' the CGE model; iii) and the CGE model simulation which provides the indirect impacts.

Going backwards (right to left) in the methodological map (Figure 1) we proceed as follows:

- a) We estimate indirect impacts (production and GDP changes, monetary losses) by applying a 'shock' to the sub-national CGE model. The shock is provided by reducing (in percentage) the primary factors (capital, land and labour) productivity of the economic sectors in the flooded area (North), which are exogenous factors of the CGE model;
- b) We derive changes in factors' productivity are derived (in the second part of the model) from the relation between land use and economic activities (described in 3.5.2). Hence, the percentage of flooded area per land use class in the North is translated into a reduction of capital and land productivity. The percentage of workers affected is translated into a reduction of labour productivity. For instance, if 10 percent of industrial areas in the North are flooded, we assume that 10 percent of the capital of the heavy manufacturing capital sector is damaged for a certain period of time. Assuming this period to be three months, the reduction to the capital productivity will be: $0.1 \times (3/12)$.

Equation 1 and 2 describe how we estimate the impacts to capital, land and labour:

$$(1) \text{ impact to the capital (land)}_k [\%] = \frac{\text{flooded area}_i [\text{km}^2]}{\text{total area}_i [\text{km}^2]} \times \frac{\text{duration impact [days]}}{365 [\text{days}]}$$

$$(2) \text{ impact to the labour}_k [\%] = \frac{\text{affected workers}_k}{\text{total workers}_k} \times \frac{\text{duration impact [days]}}{365 [\text{days}]}$$

where:

i is the land use class (or the sum of land use classes) associated to the economic sector k (Table 5).

We estimate workers at the municipality level and apply the impact to the Northern Italy economy. If a sector is associated with more than one land use class, the areas are summed up.

c) We estimate the impact using equations (1) and (2) via the spatial analysis. Flood extension maps are intersected with CLC2000 to calculate the flooded surfaces per land use class (km²). CLC2000 is also used to calculate the total surface of each land use class in the North (km²). The percentage of flooded area per land use class is the ratio between the two. We derive the number of affected workers is derived from the National Census 2001 data at municipality level (from ISTAT). In order to consider the wider impacts of the flood, particularly on transport infrastructures and commuters, we assume that all workers belonging to a municipality intersecting the flooded area are fully affected. We use the same dataset is used to calculate the total workers in the North. As before, the ratio between affected and total is the percentage of affected workers. We estimate the direct economic impacts with depth-damage functions (Huizinga, 2007) on land use classes.




Figure 1: methodological map of the spatial-CGE integrated model.

3.3. Flood data sources

The flood extension data sources used in this paper are: the Piedmont Region, the Agency for Environmental Protection of Piedmont Region (ARPA Piedmont), the Aosta Valley Region, the Po River Basin Authority and ARPA Emilia Romagna. Piedmont and Aosta Valley were the most affected areas. Indeed, Piedmont produced and published a comprehensive impact assessment study (Regione Piemonte, 2000a, 2000b), and both regions provided flood extension maps produced through on-site assessments and aerial photo interpretation. In the remaining regions (i.e. Lombardy and Emilia-Romagna) ARPA Emilia Romagna and the Po River Basin Authority provided information about the flood extension based on on-site observations. In these regions the flood recorded a maximum extension of the water confined within the 200 years return period dykes along the Po river. Figure 2 shows the area of study (Northern Italy) and the flood extension (in blue). These digital maps provide high resolution flood extension but no information on water depth.




Figure 2. Po river 2000 flood extension (in blue) in Northern Italy, which is represented using Corine Land Cover map 2000. Red is mainly constructed area while yellow is agricultural land. Note: our analysis does not consider the delta of the Po river, which was not affected. Source: own elaboration on Corine Land Cover 2000, ISTAT, Regione Piemonte, ARPA Piedmont, Regione Aosta Valley, ARPA Emilia-Romagna and Po River Basin Authority.

3.4. Direct economic impact assessment

In recent years, an increasing number of studies have used land cover characteristics and water depth-damage functions for the assessment of the economic impacts of flood risk (Feyen et al.,

2012; Kreibich et al., 2010; Rojas et al., 2013; Thielen et al., 2008), which is the most common methodology for the estimation of damage (Green et al., 2011; Jongman et al., 2012; Merz et al., 2010; Meyer and Messner, 2005). A depth-damage function provide the relationship between water depth and monetary damage for a specific land use type. The intersection of flood extension maps (with water depth sometimes complemented by other parameters such as velocity, duration, etc.) with land use maps of the flooded area, enables the calculation of direct damages of a flood event (Merz et al., 2010; Meyer et al., 2013).

For consistency purposes in flood risk assessment amongst European River Basin Districts the European Commission's (EC) Joint Research Centre (JRC), Institute for Environment and Sustainability, developed a first Pan-European flood depth-damage function dataset for all EU27 Member States, including maximum damage values for each land use type (Huizinga, 2007). This dataset has been used in pan-European flood risk assessments (Feyen et al., 2012; Rojas et al., 2013). Flood depth-damage functions are affected by a large degree of uncertainty in curves construction and the value of the assets (De Moel and Aerts, 2011; Green et al., 2011; Jongman et al., 2012; Merz et al., 2010). Moreover they provide country-scale curves only, without consideration given to local or regional differences. However given the primary focus of our study on indirect impacts and the limitation of information available (digitally available flood extension maps did not reported water depth, which we did not computed for) we found JRC's damage functions particularly suitable for our purposes. As described in Huizinga (2007) these damage functions do not represent depreciated values but full replacement cost of the damaged asset or good. Hence this approach may overestimate the damage (Merz et al., 2010), because it does not capture the traditional definition of value of a capital good, which is the present value of income of flow it generates over the remaining of its life period (Georgescu-Roegen, 1993). However we believe that this method provides an acceptable estimation of the stock damaged by the flood event within the impacted area, i.e. the direct impact.

Our methodology proceeds as follows: we overlay CLC2000 map with the recorded flood extent, provided by the aggregation of the spatial layers available. The result is the flooded land, characterised by a specific use. Flooded areas are divided into five categories: urban continuous (CLC2000 code 1.1.1), urban discontinuous (1.1.2.), transport infrastructures (1.2.2, 1.2.3, 1.2.4.), industry and commercial (1.2.1.), agriculture (2.all).

The direct economic impact is a function of the type of land use (damage value per each land use), the level of the damage (damage factor, based on water depth), and the extension of the flooded area by land use type.

$$(3) \text{ Direct economic impact} = \sum_{i=1}^4 \text{damage value}_i \times \text{damage factor}_i \times \text{extension of flooded area}_i$$

where i = land use type: residential buildings (1), commercial and industrial (2), agriculture (3), transport infrastructure (4)

Table 2 shows the maximum damage values for some EU Member States and the damage factor range of values (from a minimum of 1 m water depth to a maximum of 6 m and over). In Huizinga's functions (2007), the maximum damage values were elaborated from existing studies across some EU countries and the average damage value per land use class was applied to other EU Member State scaled to GDP per capita (Jongman, 2012). The functions were built on observations from nine countries. In countries without prior damage function data (such as Italy), the average functions were used per for each land use class (Huizinga, 2007). The damage functions and maximum damage values are nationally homogenous, they do not account for regional differences.

Table 2. Maximum damage values (Euro/m²) and damage factor range (from a minimum of 1m to a maximum of 6m and over) per land use class for selected EU countries. Source: own elaboration on Huizinga, 2007.

Max damage value - Area	Residential building	Commerce	Industry	Road	Agriculture
EU27	575	476	409	18	0.59
Italy	618	511	440	20	0.63
Luxembourg	1443	1195	1028	46	1.28
Germany	666	551	474	21	0.68
Netherlands	747	619	532	24	0.77
France	646	535	460	21	0.66
Damage factor (range)	0.4-1	0.3-1	0.3-1	0.42-1	0.55-1

As already mentioned, water depth is not provided in the digital version of our flood maps. Therefore, we consider the extreme values of the damage factor, i.e. the one corresponding to 1 and 6m (and above) average water depth. Because of this assumption the direct impact assessment provides a range of losses instead of a single value estimation.

Based on the aggregation of land classes, the following assumptions are considered: (1) since CLC2000 does not distinguish between industry and commercial, the average of the two is applied

(i.e. 475.5 Euro/m²); (2) because of their lower density, discontinuous urban area value is considered half of continuous (i.e. 309 Euro/m²); (3) in the plain area of the valley roads are normally elevated from the average ground level. For this reason only a portion of road's damage value is considered for transport infrastructure surfaces (14 Euro/m²). The same value was also extended to airports and railways.

3.5. *Indirect economic impact assessment using the CGE model*

Indirect economic impacts are assessed through the use of a CGE model. The family of models have been increasingly applied by national and international institutions to a wide range of issues, such as tax reforms, trade liberalization, energy policy, and recently, the economic effects of climate change impacts (Standardi et al., 2014).

A CGE model is a system of equations which describes the behaviour of the economic agents (representative household and firm), the structure of the markets and the institutions, and the links between them. In the model mechanisms consumers maximize utility subject to an individual budget constrain. Firms maximize profit choosing the amount of inputs. Primary factors, such as land, capital, labour and natural resources, are owned by the household and are fixed in supply. The equilibrium in the market system is achieved when the demands of buyers match the supplies of sellers at prevailing prices in every market simultaneously. Global CGE trade models, such as the one used for our work, which is based on GTAP7 (Global Trade Analysis Project, reference year 2004) (Narayanan and Walmsley, 2008) have a Walrasian structures. Money is neutral, factors are fully employed, and the markets are perfectly competitive. In addition, macro-economic closure is neoclassical as investments are driven by savings. Trade balance is determined endogenously. CGE model parameterization derives from a calibration procedure. That is, key behavioural parameters replicate the observed demand and supply relations in a given reference year. We followed the same procedure for the specification of sub-national relations in the CGE (see Appendix for the description of CES (*constant elasticity of substitution*) and CET (*Constant Elasticity of Transformation*) functions).

As anticipated the time scale of our indirect impact analysis is one year and our CGE model is static. Each single 'shock' to the economic system (in our case to the productivity of primary factors of production such as capital, land, labour) translates into an impact on flows, i.e. an yearly disruption of regional/sectorial output and GDP. Within the year, we assume that the reduction in factors productivity is recovered within a selected timeframe depending on the economic sector

(from 1 week of non-agriculture sectors to a maximum duration of 3 months for the agriculture sector). The uncertainty in production loss duration is dealt with considering three different duration scenarios based on authors' judgement and literature (Kajitani and Tatano, 2014; Pfurtscheller, 2014). We acknowledge the fact that more extensive sensitivity analysis could better represent this type of uncertainty. The shock is enforced to the one year point of the disaster occurrence and does not influence precedent or subsequent years. No subsidies and post-disaster reconstruction are accounted for in the economic model, aside from the indirect effects on the duration of the recovery period. Inventories are also not considered.

3.5.1. *The sub-national CGE model for Italy*

Most global CGE models are limited in terms of the scale of analysis. They normally use of national panel data, with no detail at the sub-national level, which can be particularly important to capture highly spatially-heterogeneous flood impacts (Hallegatte, 2012). Few CGE models report a sub-national detail at the same time keeping track of international relations¹. Building such a tool requires a not negligible effort both in the database construction and in the modelling of the theoretical structure. We start from the GTAP model (Hertel, 1997), which presents the country as the highest geographical detail.

In order to derive a consistent sub-national economic description we used three datasets: (1) the GTAP 7 database (Narayanan and Walmsley, 2008) which reports economic flows in the reference year 2004 for 57 sectors and 113 countries or groups of countries worldwide; (2) the sub-national dataset of ISTAT (*Italian National Statistical Institute*) from the same year, which provides information on value added, labour and land for the 20 Italian regions and 40 economic sectors; (3) ISTAT bilateral flows of carried goods (in tons) by mode of transportation (truck, rail, water and air) for the 20 Italian regions. We followed a three steps procedure: (a) we matched the 40 ISTAT sectors with the 10 GTAP sectors chosen in our aggregation and reported in Table 3. We distributed the Italian value added and primary factors in GTAP across the three Italian macro-regions (North, Centre and South) () using the shares of ISTAT for value added, labour and land. Capital was computed as a difference between value added and labour. For the sectors that use natural resources we took the sub-national share of value added in those sector as a proxy; (b) we

¹ For a survey of the literature on sub-national CGE models see section 2 in Perali et al. (2012) and Rodriguez (2007).

used the shares obtained from ISTAT transport data to split the sectorial GTAP Italian production between domestic sub-national demand and bilateral trade flows across Italian regions; (c) we adjusted the bilateral trade flows across Italian regions to make them consistent with the ISTAT data on the economic production by using the RAS statistical method (for more details see Standardi et al., 2014).

The modification of the model also requires some adjustments of the theoretical structure to incorporate the possibility of an increasing spatial mobility in both factors and goods market at the sub-country level, because both goods and factors usually move easier within the country than between countries (more details, including the main equations are described in the Appendix). In GTAP primary factors cannot move outside the country they belong to. This is partially justified in an international context, but it is not realistic within the same country, where for instance workers and capital can quite easily reallocate in other regions following push or pull economic factors. Moreover in a standard CGE model, the Armington assumption (Armington, 1969) applies. It postulates that homologous domestic and imported goods are not perfectly substitutable in consumer preferences. This prevents unrealistic specialization phenomena and trade overflows. The values of the Armington elasticity are set by econometric estimations, which are carried out at the national level. Within national borders, the Armington assumption, that needs to be kept in order to avoid unrealistic specialization and trade between regions, needs to be realistically weakened (McCallum, 1995). Armington elasticities were thus recalibrated at the sub-national level and the demand structure modified accounting for the higher product substitution inside than outside the Italian borders (for more details see Appendix and Standardi et al. 2014).

To account for the effects of these different assumptions we considered two recovery scenarios. The first scenario is represented by a rigid model that has the same theoretical structure and parameterization of GTAP. This means sub-national regions behave exactly like countries. As a result, factor endowments cannot move outside the sub-national region they belong and the trade in the sub-national region has the same Armington elasticity as in the standard GTAP model. The second model is a more flexible one. We introduced capital and labour mobility within Italy (endogenous factor supply at the sub-country level) through a CET function (see Appendix). As a result labour and capital can move across the Italian sub-national region after a shock in the economic system. We also modified the values of the Armington elasticity for the sub-national

regions to take into account the fact that products are closer substitutes within the country than across countries².

The sectorial and geographical aggregations of the sub-national CGE model are shown in Tables 3 and 4.

Table 3: CGE model sectors

CGE sectors
Grains and crops
Livestock meat products
Mining and extraction
Processed food
Textiles and clothing
Light manufacturing
Heavy manufacturing
Utilities and construction
Trade and communication
Other services

Table 4: regions of the CGE model

CGE regions	Description
North	Aosta Valley, Emilia-Romagna, Friuli-Venezia Giulia, Liguria, Lombardy, Piedmont, Trentino-Alto Adige, Veneto
Centre	Lazio, Marche, Toscana, Umbria
South	Abruzzo, Apulia, Basilicata, Campania, Calabria, Molise, Sardegna, Sicilia
EU	Rest of the European Union
ROW	All remaining countries in the world

3.5.2. Measuring indirect impacts

Table 5 provides an overview on the relation between the CGE sectors and the other datasets: land use (CLC2000), national and regional datasets on value added, land, labour, flows of transported goods (from ISTAT), and GTAP sectors.

² For further details about the calibration of the sub-national parameters refer to the Appendix.

Table 5: Construction of spatial-CGE model: CGE model sectors (left part of the table); GTAP sectors (global) and ISTAT databases (regional) (centre); CLC2000 and ISTAT database on labour (right).

CGE model Sector	Regional calibration of the CGE model		Estimation of the flood impact		
	GTAP model Sector	ISTAT databases Sector	CLC2000 name	CLC2000 code	ISTAT database on labour Sector
Grains and crops	Cereal grains; Crops nec; Oil seeds; Paddy rice; Plant-based fibers; Processed rice; Sugar cane; sugar beet; Vegetables; fruit; nuts; Wheat	Cereals; Citrus fruits; Flowers and potted plants; Fruits; Industrial vegetables;; Legumes; Olives; Other woody products; Pastures; Potatoes and vegetables; Wine	Agriculture	2.all subsets	Agriculture
Heavy manufacturing	Chemical, rubber, plastic prods; Electronic equipment; Ferrous metals; Machinery and equipment nec; Metals nec; Mineral products nec; Petroleum, coal products	Coke, refineries, chemical and pharmaceutical; Manufacturing of nonferrous minerals; Metal and metallic goods production; Wood, rubber, plastic factories and other manufacturing	Industry and commercial	1.2.1	Manufacture
Light manufacturing	Leather products; Manufactures nec; Metal products; Motor vehicles and parts; Paper products, publishing; Transport equipment nec; Wood products	Machinery and mechanical manufacturing, electric and optical equipment, transportation; Paper, printing and publishing; Tannery and leather	Industry and commercial	1.2.1	Manufacture
Livestock meat products	Animal products nec; Cattle, sheep, goats ,horses; Meat products nec; Meat: cattle, sheep, goats, horse; Raw milk; Wool, silk-worm cocoons	Eggs; Honey; Livestock; Meat; Milk	Agriculture	2.all subsets	Agriculture
Mining and extraction	Coal; Fishing; Forestry; Gas; Minerals nec; Oil	Fishing; Forestry; Minerals	none	none	Extraction
Other services	Business services nec; Dwellings; Financial services nec; Insurance; PubAdmin/Defence/Health/Educat; Recreation and other services	Brokering; Domestic assistance; Education; Healthcare and other social services; Other public, social and personal services; Public administration and defence; mandatory social insurances; Real estate, rentals, informatics, research and development, other professional and entrepreneurial activities	Urban	1.1.1, 1.1.2	Services
Processed food	Beverages and tobacco products; Dairy products; Food products nec; Sugar; Vegetable oils and fats	Food, beverages and tobacco	Industry and commercial	1.2.1.	Manufacture
Textiles and clothing	Textiles; Wearing apparel	Textile and wearing apparel	Industry and commercial	1.2.1	Manufacture
Trade and communication	Air transport; Communication; Sea transport; Trade; Transport nec	Hotels and restaurants; Logistics, storage and communications; Wholesale and trading; vehicle, motorbike and household appliance repairing	Urban	1.1.1, 1.1.2	Transportation
Utilities and construction	Construction; Electricity; Gas manufacture, distribution; Water	Construction; Production and distribution of electric energy, gas, steam and water	Transport infrastructures	1.2.2, 1.2.3, 1.2.4	Construction

We aggregate CLC2000 classes into four categories: agricultural, industrial/commercial, infrastructural, and urban. For the estimation of capital and land losses we associate the following land use class and economic sectors (Table 5): agriculture land is associated with grains and crops and livestock meat products; industrial/commercial land with processed food, textiles and clothing, light manufacturing and heavy manufacturing; infrastructure land with utilities and construction, which includes electricity, gas and water distribution; urban land with trade and communication and other services.

For the estimation of labour productivity losses we associate the six categories of workers defined by ISTAT (Italian National Statistics Institute) (agriculture, extraction, manufacture, construction, transport and services) to our CGE sectors (Table 5). We associate agriculture workers are associated with grains and crops and livestock meat products; extraction workers with mining and extraction; manufacture workers with processed food, textiles and clothing, light manufacturing and heavy manufacturing; construction workers with utilities and construction; transportation workers with trade and communication (in GTAP this sector includes also transport activities); services workers with other services.

Summarizing, we design the following inputs for the CGE model simulations:

- a) As described in 3.2, we use the result of equation (1) as a proxy to quantify the land productivity loss in the sectors: grains and crops, and livestock meat products. We assume that the impact lasted for one, two, and three months³;
- b) By the same token and following equation (2), we compute labour productivity losses in agriculture are computed for a period of one, two, and three months of interrupted activity;
- c) In all the other sector capital and labour follow equation (1) and (2), but assuming a shorter duration of impact: one, two, three weeks, as these sectors are less dependent upon land.

We compute the impact of the flood event for each sub-national region (North, Centre and South), Italy as a whole, the European Union (EU) and the rest of the world. Our outputs are: percentage change in real GDP and production in each sector. Absolute values have been computed using the

³ We are aware that these periods may not be accurate and need to be refined by additional studies. For our modelling purposes, this uncertainty was included considering three reasonable scenarios based on the specific characteristics of the livestock sector and seasonal farming (autumn-winter crops).

Italian sub-national real GDP database (ISTAT) and scaled to Euro 2000 value using the World Development Indicator database (The World Bank).

4. Results and discussion

4.1. Direct economic impacts

Table 6 shows the flood affected areas by land use class.

Table 6: Flooded areas by land use classes and the share of the total flood extent.

Description	Area [km ²]	% flood extent
Agriculture land	646.65	54.68
Urban	22.70	1.92
<i>Urban continuous</i>	614.21	0.05
<i>Urban discontinuous</i>	22.09	1.87
Industrial-commercial	5.71	0.48
Infrastructure	0.38	0.03
Other classes	507.19	42.89
Total	1,182.66	100.00

We calculate the damage to the physical stock as in equation (3) using Huizinga's (2007) damage functions (Table 7). We estimate the range of the damage for water depths of 1 and 6 meters and above, which correspond to the minimum and the maximum damage factors in Huizinga (2007).

Table 7. Direct economic impacts (2007 Euro values). DF is damage factor. Source: own elaboration on CLC2000, flood extension maps and Huizinga's (2007) damage functions.

Description	Area [km ²]	Damage [Euro/m ²]	DF (1m)	DF (6m)	Total damage (1m) [Euro]	Total damage (6m) [Euro]
Agriculture land	646.65	0.63	0.55	1	224,064,638	407,390,251
Urban	22.70					
<i>Urban continuos</i>	0.61	618.00	0.40	1	151,832,959	379,582,398
<i>Urban discontinuos</i>	22.09	309.00	0.40	1	2,730,736,453	6,826,841,133
Industrial-commercial	5.71	475.50	0.30	1	815,348,313	2,717,827,713
Infrastructure	0.38	14.00	0.42	1	2,279,658	5,427,758
Other classes	507.19	0.00	-	-	0	0
Total	1,182.66				3,924,262,023	10,337,069,253

Our results show that the analysed flood event causes significant economic damages to all productive sectors and capital assets. We find that the largest share of losses occurs in the urban discontinuous and industrial/commercial areas, rather than in the urban continuous areas, as in other studies (Feyen et al., 2012; Rojas et al., 2013). We also register high level of losses in industrial/commercial areas. This is probably due to the fact that our flood extension map is based on real post-event observations rather than simulation results obtained from hydrological models. The former captures the real-world heterogeneity of protection levels across different land uses. For instance urban centres in the Northern Italy may be effectively protected, while industrial

activities are often located in flood risk areas (Regione Piemonte, 2000a, 2000b). Following the most conservative assumptions our estimation calculates that the total damage amounts to almost 4 billion Euro in 2007 prices. Instead, with the highest damage factor, we estimate a total direct loss which exceeds 10,3 billion Euro (in 2007 values).

4.2. Indirect economic impacts

Tables 5 and 6 describe the results of our spatial damage assessment feeding into the CGE model for indirect impact assessment.

Table 8: land affected by the flood in the Northern Italy.

DESCRIPTION	Total Area [km ²]	Flooded Area [km ²]	As % of Northern IT
All	119,521.15	673.24	0.56
Agriculture land	54,214.89	646.65	1.19
Urban	5,451.89	20.48	0.38
Industrial-commercial	1,196.13	5.71	0.48
Infrastructure	184.20	0.38	0.21

Table 9: number of workers affected by the flood. Note that if a municipality is entirely or partially affected by the flood, we consider the whole employed population as concerned. Sectors: agricultural (AGR), extraction (EXT), manufactures (MANIF), construction (CONS), transport (TRAN), services (SER), total workers (TOT). (Nr. Mun) is the number of municipalities affected. Source: own elaboration on ISTAT Census 2001.

DESCRIPTION	Nr. Mun	AGR	EXT	MANIF	CONS	TRAN	SERV	TOT
CGE sectors		1, 2	3	4, 5, 6, 7	8	9	10	
North total	4,541	435,290	116,047	3,259,352	867,645	497,706	5,817,653	10,993,693
North Flooded	367	33,377	13,928	307,878	79,221	51,378	601,462	1,087,244
North Flooded (%)	8	8	12	9	9	10	10	10

The two table are the input data of the CGE simulations. Six simulations are run in total, using three disruption duration scenarios on two post-disaster recovery scenarios (the rigid and the flexible model). Results are shown in Figure 3. The North is the most affected area in both models, with the flexible one leading to higher losses. The flood has small to no impact on the Centre and the South in the rigid model due to the low market integration assumed (for this reason they are not reported in Figure 3).




Figure 3: range of sub-national and national GDP variations (in percentage of real GDP) for different type of models: rigid = rig, flexible = flex, depending on the different duration of the impact. Centre and South Rig are not reported because the change is null.

In the flexible specification the Northern consumer and firm can more easily shift their purchases toward the Centre and the South. The consequence is a redistribution of the GDP from the North to the South and the Centre, which experience positive economic effects. Interestingly, results for Italy as a whole are similar both in the rigid and the flexible model. On the one hand this points out a comfortable robustness in the aggregated results. Introducing regional specificities does not transform entirely the economic pattern of the Italian supply and demands systems nor their response to shocks. On the other hand, it highlights the importance of introducing the regional analysis to capture relevant distributional effects. As expected, given the scale of the initial shock and the size of the economies involved, the impacts on the EU and the rest of the world are negligible (see further on this (Merz et al., 2010), though not reported).

It is worth noting that the Centre and the South do not compensate completely the GDP and production loss in the North in the flexible model. This is due to two factors. The first is an imperfect relocation effect. The Centre and the South are not able to perfectly replace North production, simply because their economic structure (i.e. sectorial composition of the economy) is different. Secondly, there is an aggregated effect. Negative GDP in the North also implies a lower demand and thus a net depressing effect on the overall economy even though, at the regional level, the Centre and the South can benefit.

The model also offers disaggregated sectorial results (Figure 4). In the North the most affected sectors are grains and crops, and livestock meat products, both in the rigid and flexible model. The same sectors in the Centre and the South increase their production both in the rigid and flexible model, with larger gains in the flexible model.




Figure 4: inter-sectorial distribution of the impacts: percentage of production variation in the North, Centre and South of Italy.

We estimate the indirect losses in the North to range from 644 million to 2,537 million Euro (in 2000 values), depending on the type of the model (rigid-flexible) and the duration of the disruption (Figure 5). Using the flexible model, due to the mobility factors a slightly positive effect is recorded in the Centre and the South. The indirect losses on Italy as a whole ranges from 647 to 1,955 million Euro (in 2000 values).




Figure 5: indirect economic impacts (2000 Euro value). Rig is the rigid model, while Flex is the flexible model. Numbers define the duration of the impact. (1) 1 months for agriculture and 1 week for other sectors; (2) 2 months for agriculture and 2 week for other sectors; (3) 3 months for agriculture and 3 weeks for other sectors. Economic losses are expresses in million Euro 2000 value. In the rigid model the impacts in the Centre and South are negligible, hence not reported.

4.3. Discussion of results

Indirect losses at country level represent a significant share of direct losses, which according to our estimation range from 3.3 to 8.8 billion Euro (in 2000 value). At country level both the rigid and the flexible models provide similar results of indirect losses. In the flexible model, the larger negative impact to the Northern economy is partially compensated by a positive effect in the other regions (Centre and South). It is a good signal that the flexible model is better designed to capture also positive effects of disasters, keeping constant the total indirect economic loss at country level.

Figure 6 shows the range of the results in terms of absolute losses. Direct impacts depend on the assumptions made with respect to the flood water depth. Indirect impacts are influenced by the duration of the impact on the productivity. Monetary values are actualized to Euro 2000 values, assuming the economic system of 2000 being similar to the economic system in 2004 (the CGE model base year).




Figure 6: range of direct and indirect losses (in the North and Italy as a whole) using the flexible model. Values are given in million Euro 2000 value.

Because of the objective impossibility to work with a non-disaster counterfactual, the validation of our results is extremely difficult. Empirical evidence of changes in the regional and national economy and production are not available. We thus report some comparison with the literature conducting similar experiments. In our estimations, the ratio between indirect (at country level) and direct losses is around 0.19-0.22. Compared to the EM-DAT loss data for the same event (8.6 billion Euro) our indirect loss at country level ranges from 7 to 22 percent. The EMDAT dataset is reported to be a (not always transparent) combination of direct and indirect impacts. Other studies on indirect impact assessment of natural disasters provide figures in the same order of magnitude. For example, indirect economic losses in Louisiana after Katrina were estimated as 42 billion US\$ compared to 107 billion US\$ direct losses, that is a ratios of 0.39 (Hallegatte, 2008). The assessment of the indirect losses caused by sea level rise and storm surge in Copenhagen associated to a potential direct loss of 9,300 million Euro, provided an indirect loss of 747 million Euro, which is a ratio of 0.08 (Hallegatte et al., 2011). These studies also highlight a clear nonlinear increasing relation between indirect and direct losses (Przyluski and Hallegatte, 2011) which are also highly site- and hazard-specific. We acknowledge that additional research could corroborate our results, e.g. post-event econometric analysis to avoid noise and other perturbations existing in the annual production datasets (ISTAT).

5. Conclusion and policy implications

The economic analysis of natural hazard (notably flood) impacts focuses far too often on the direct damage to physical assets only, neglecting the wider indirect losses set off by the former. The global disaster databases such as EM-DAT do little to disentangle the direct from the higher order losses. Hence, the full social cost of natural hazards remains poorly understood. In a world of growing interdependency of national economies, an improved acquaintance of indirect economic losses is an essential prerequisite for a full appreciation of hazard risk.

In this paper, we examined a combination of spatially explicit damage assessment with macroeconomic loss propagation using a regionally calibrated version of a global CGE model. We applied the model on example of the destructive Po river flood that occurred in October 2000 in Piedmont, Aosta Valley, and other downstream regions in the Northern Italy. Paying due attention to the uncertainty regarding the length of disruption and the aftermath recovery, we analysed three scenarios of productivity falloff and two scenarios of inter-sectorial recovery. The direct flood damage was estimated by spatially explicit flood depth-damage functions over aggregated land use classes. The result of the spatial analysis were used to ‘shock’ the regional economy in the Northern Italy by weakening the primary factors’ productivity (capital, land and labour) that are exogenous parameters of the CGE model. To account for the regional effects of the revisited event, we disaggregated a global CGE model with a country resolution to sub-national units, i.e. groups of regions almost equivalent the NUTS1 level. We also modified factors’ mobility and substitutability of goods in consumers’ preferences accordingly. The flood impacts were estimated in terms of the real GDP and the production changes for each economic sector in the North, Centre and South of Italy, Italy as a whole, the rest of Europe, and the rest of the world.

The results are considerable both in absolute and relative terms. We estimated direct impacts to range between 3.3 to 8.8 billion Euro (in 2000 values) depending on water depth assumptions. The indirect impacts were estimated as falling between 0.64 and 1.95 billion Euro (in 2000 values), depending on the controlled flexibility of substitution and mobility (rigid-flexible) and the length of productivity falloff. The approximated indirect losses amount to around a fifth (19 to 22 percent) of the direct losses, depending on the assumptions made. Considering the limitation of existing empirical information on 2000 Piedmont flood, our estimations match remarkably the results of other studies. The regionally disaggregated CGE model is instrumental to tracing down the transfer of disaster’s effects across regions. The flexible version of the model is able to unravel the

impact of a disaster into differentiated effects in sub-national economies, positive or negative as they may be depending on the location of the event.

Our analysis suggests that indirect losses play an important role in the full social costs of floods. The methodology detailed in this paper is applicable to other natural hazards (e.g. storm surges, forest fires, earthquakes, volcanic eruptions, avalanches, etc.) and/or countries and regions.

Although data intensive and time consuming, the construction of a Pan-European CGE model disaggregated to NUTS2 level would make the indirect assessment more precise and sensitive to the regional differences of the hardship suffered. As a result, the EU disaster risk reduction policies would be better informed by empirical evidence, as highlighted in the EC (EC, 2009), EEA (EEA, 2013) and De Groeve (De Groeve et al., 2013). The policies benefiting from a more comprehensive risk analysis include the EU Flood Directive (2007/60/EC), the EU Solidarity and Structural Funds (De Groeve et al., 2013), and the Climate Change Adaptation (EC, 2013).

Acknowledgements

The research underlying this paper has received funding from the Italian Ministry of Education, University and Research and the Ministry for Environment, Land and Sea (the GEMINA project) and the EU's Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013) under grant agreement n° 265213 (EPI-WATER – Evaluating Economic Policy Instruments for Sustainable Water Management in Europe).

The four authors designed jointly the research exercise. L.C. and G.S. performed the empirical analysis to which F.B. and J.M. contributed with expert judgement and guidance. The authors are grateful to Fabio Eboli for supervising the CGE analysis and valuable advices, and the four anonymous reviewers for appreciated comments and suggestions which without doubts led to sizeable improvements of the paper.

6. Appendix: the Italian sub-national CGE model

6.1. Supply

The value added in the standard GTAP model originates from five primary factors: land, natural resources, unskilled labour, skilled labour and capital. All the sectors use labour and capital while only some use land and natural resources (agriculture and mining-related sectors, respectively). Land and natural resources supply is sluggish across sectors while labour and capital are perfectly mobile. All the primary factors are spatially immobile. For our sub-national context, we assume the following:

- 1) Primary factors sectorial mobility does not change.
- 2) Land and natural resources remain spatially immobile at the sub-national level.
- 3) Sub-national unskilled labour, skilled labour and capital supply is geographically sluggish within Italy and still immobile with respect to the rest of Europe and the rest of the world.

The third assumption is new with respect to the standard GTAP model. It is implemented through a CET (*Constant Elasticity of Transformation*) function: as a result, workers and capital can move outside the Italian region they belong to in response to economic shocks.

First order conditions of the CET supply function and the formula to determine the national price of the endowment (shadow price) are given in the equations 1-6, where Q_L , Q_H , Q_K , P_L , P_H , and P_K represent, respectively, the quantity of supplied unskilled labour, skilled labour, capital and the associated prices in the sub-national region. ITA and r are, respectively, the unique Italian aggregate index and the sub-national index. The parameters σ_L , σ_H and σ_K are the elasticity of substitution of the endowment supply, they are a measure of geographical mobility. Increasing the absolute value of these parameters means increasing the factors mobility within Italy. At this stage, we make the hypothesis that $\sigma_L = \sigma_H = \sigma_K$.

$$QL_r = QL_{ITA} \left(\frac{PL_{ITA}}{PL_r} \right)^{\sigma_L} \quad \text{with } \sigma_L < 0 \quad (1)$$

$$\sum_r QL_r PL_r = QL_{ITA} PL_{ITA} \quad (2)$$

$$QH_r = QH_{ITA} \left(\frac{PH_{ITA}}{PH_r} \right)^{\sigma_H} \quad \text{with } \sigma_H < 0 \quad (3)$$

$$\sum_r QH_r PH_r = QH_{ITA} PH_{ITA} \quad (4)$$

$$QK_r = QK_{ITA} \left(\frac{PK_{ITA}}{PK_r} \right)^{\sigma_K} \quad \text{with } \sigma_K < 0 \quad (5)$$

$$\sum_r QK_r PK_r = QK_{ITA} PK_{ITA} \quad (6)$$

The value of σ_K , σ_L and σ_H ranges from 0 to -1. No doubt arises for the case of perfect factor immobility ($\sigma_K = \sigma_L = \sigma_H$) as the value immediately derives from the economic theory. In the case of imperfect factor mobility we base our guess on the sensitivity analysis carried out in Standardi et al. (2014), which has shown as results are more sensitive for values included between 0 and -5. For this reason and given the fact that we are not considering long run effects but only effects which take place within a year, the value is set to be equal to -1. This is to avoid unrealistic changes in the labor and capital supply. However we are aware that an econometric estimation would be worthy to get more robust guess.

6.2. Demand

In the standard GTAP model the demand side is composed by private consumption, government spending and intermediate goods. The demand tree follows a double nest. The first nest links domestic demand and aggregate foreign imports of a specific commodity (irrespective of origin country) for each agent (households, government, firms). The second nest differentiates foreign imports according to the geographical origin. The second model improvement thus consists in modifying the demand tree in order to make sub-national products closer substitutes among them than the foreign products.

To achieve this goal we insert four additional parameters σ_{ARM1} , σ_{IMP1} , σ_{ARM2} and σ_{IMP2} . The parameters σ_{ARM} and σ_{IMP} are the Armington elasticities in the standard GTAP model representing in the country or group of countries the substitution between the national product and the aggregate foreign product and the substitution across foreign products which have different geographical origin; σ_{ARM1} and σ_{IMP1} are the Armington elasticities representing in the sub-national

region the substitution between the national product and the aggregate foreign product and the substitution across foreign products which have different geographical origin; σ_{ARM2} and σ_{IMP2} are the Armington elasticities representing in the sub-national region the substitution between the sub-national product and the aggregate product coming from the other sub-national regions and the substitution across products coming from the other sub-national regions.

We use CES (*constant elasticity of substitution*) functions to model the inter-national and intra-national demands. As the following equations apply to all sectors in the same manner, for sake of algebraic simplicity we do not consider a sector index in the rest of this appendix.

Q , QD and QM , represent, respectively, the quantity of total, domestic and imported good demanded by households, government or firms in the country or group of countries, represented by index c . QU , QDU and QMU are, respectively, total, national and international imported good by households, government or firms in the sub-national region r (the suffix U stands for upper level). QDL and QML represent the domestic and intra-national imported good in the sub-national region (the suffix L stands for lower level). P , PCD , PM , PU , PDU , PMU , PDL and PML are the associated prices.

The equations (7) and (8) show the mathematics behind the standard GTAP trade structure (still valid for rest of Europe and rest of the world in our model), the equations (9), (10), (11) and (12) describe the new structure for the sub-national regions (North, Centre and South of Italy):

$$QD_c = Q_c \left(\frac{P_c}{PD_c} \right)^{\sigma_{ARM}} \quad \text{with } \sigma_{ARM} > 0 \quad (7)$$

$$QM_c = Q_c \left(\frac{P_c}{PM_c} \right)^{\sigma_{ARM}} \quad \text{with } \sigma_{ARM} > 0 \quad (8)$$

$$QDU_r = QU_r \left(\frac{PU_r}{PDU_r} \right)^{\sigma_{ARM1}} \quad \text{with } \sigma_{ARM1} > 0 \quad (9)$$

$$QMU_r = QU_r \left(\frac{PU_r}{PMU_r} \right)^{\sigma_{ARM1}} \quad \text{with } \sigma_{ARM1} > 0 \quad (10)$$

$$QDL_r = QDU_r \left(\frac{PDU_r}{PDL_r} \right)^{\sigma_{ARM2}} \quad \text{with } \sigma_{ARM2} > 0 \quad (11)$$

$$QML_r = QDU_r \left(\frac{PDU_r}{PML_r} \right)^{\sigma_{ARM2}} \quad \text{with } \sigma_{ARM2} > 0 \quad (12)$$

The value of σ_{ARM} and σ_{IMP} stems from GTAP, which, in turn, derive them by econometric estimation (Hertel, 1997).

In the rigid model two relations characterise the four parameters:

$$\sigma_{ARM} = \sigma_{ARM1} = \sigma_{ARM2}$$

$$\sigma_{IMP} = \sigma_{IMP1} = \sigma_{IMP2}$$

In the rigid model the relations are following:

$$\sigma_{ARM} = \sigma_{ARM1} = 2/3 * \sigma_{ARM2}$$

$$\sigma_{IMP} = \sigma_{IMP1} = 2/3 * \sigma_{IMP2}$$

These relations take into account the increased product substitutability at the sub-national level.

The factor 2/3 is somewhat arbitrary. However for values smaller than 2/3 the algorithm has troubles to converge to the optimal solution. As a consequence we can interpret it as a threshold to model substitution across sub-national goods.

As in the case of factor market, econometric estimation would be more appropriate to assess the new Armington elasticities. Unfortunately, to the best of our knowledge they are not available for this kind of problem and we are forced to do some simplification.

7. References

- Albala-Bertrand, J.M., 1993. Natural disaster situations and growth: A macroeconomic model for sudden disaster impacts. *World Dev.* 21, 1417–1434.
- Armington, P.S., 1969. A Theory of Demand for Products Distinguished by Place of Production. Staff Pap. Monet. Fund 159–178.
- Berrittella, M., Hoekstra, A.Y., Rehdanz, K., Roson, R., Tol, R.S.J., 2007. The economic impact of restricted water supply: a computable general equilibrium analysis. *Water Res.* 41, 1799–813.
- Cavallo, E., Bank, I.D., Galiani, S., Pantano, J., 2012. Catastrophic Natural Disasters and Economic Growth 1–35.
- Centre for Research on the Epidemiology of Disasters - CRED, n.d. EM-DAT The international disaster database [WWW Document]. URL www.emdat.be
- Cochrane, H.C., 2004. Chapter 3. Indirect Losses from Natural Disasters: Measurement and Myth, in: Yasuhide Okuyama and Stephanie E. Chang Eds. *Modeling the Spatial and Economic Effects of Disasters*, New York, NY; Springer.
- De Groeve, T., Poljansek, K., Ehlich, D., 2013. Recording Disaster Losses Recommendations for a European approach. Ispra, Italy.
- De Moel, H., Aerts, J.C.J.H., 2011. Effect of uncertainty in land use, damage models and inundation depth on flood risk estimates. *Nat. Hazards* 58, 407–425.
- EC, 2009. A Community approach on the prevention of natural and man-made disasters COM(2009) 82 final. Brussels.
- EC, 2013. An EU Strategy on adaptation to climate change COM (2013) 216. Brussels.
- EEA, 2010. Mapping the impacts of natural hazards and technological accidents in Europe An overview of the last decade. European Environmental Agency. Copenhagen.
- EEA, 2012. Climate change, impacts and vulnerability in Europe 2012. European Environmental Agency. Copenhagen.
- EEA, 2013. Towards a potential European flood impact database. European Environmental Agency. Copenhagen.
- Farinosi, F., Carrera, L., Maziotis, A., Mysiak, J., Eboli, F., Standardi, G., 2012. Policy-relevant assessment method of socio-economic impacts of floods: an italian case study - FEEM Working Paper (No. 87-2012). Venice.
- Feyen, L., Dankers, R., Bódis, K., Salamon, P., Barredo, J., 2012. Fluvial flood risk in Europe in present and future climates. *Clim. Change* 112, 47–62.

- Georgescu-Roegen, N., 1993. The entropy law and the economic problem. *Valuing Earth Econ. Ecol. ethics*. Massachusetts MIT Press Cambridge 75–88.
- Green, C., Viavattene, C., Thompson, P., 2011. Guidance for assessing flood losses - CONHAZ Report 1–86.
- Guzzetti, F., Tonelli, G., 2004. Information system on hydrological and geomorphological catastrophes in Italy (SICI): a tool for managing landslide and flood hazards 213–232.
- Haddad, E.A., Teixeira, E., 2013. Economic impacts of natural disasters in megacities: the case of floods in São Paulo, Brazil.
- Hallegatte, S., 2008. An adaptive regional input-output model and its application to the assessment of the economic cost of Katrina. *Risk Anal.* 28, 779–99.
- Hallegatte, S., 2012. Modeling the roles of heterogeneity, substitution, and inventories in the assessment of natural disaster economic costs. World Bank, Washington, DC.
- Hallegatte, S., 2014. An Exploration of the Link between Development , Economic Growth , and Natural Risk.
- Hallegatte, S., Ranger, N., Mestre, O., Corfee-morlot, P.D.J., Herweijer, C., Muir, R., 2011. Assessing climate change impacts , sea level rise and storm surge risk in port cities : a case study on Copenhagen 113–137.
- Henriet, F., Hallegatte, S., Tabourier, L., 2012. Firm-network characteristics and economic robustness to natural disasters. *J. Econ. Dyn. Control* 36, 150–167.
- Huizinga, H.J., 2007. Flood damage functions for EU member states - HKV Consultants, Implemented in the framework of contract #382442-F1SC awarded by the European Commission - Joint Research Centre.
- IPCC, 2012. *Managing the Risks of Extreme Events and Disasters to Advance Climate Change Adaptation*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- IRPI, n.d. Sistema Informativo sulle Catastrofi Idrogeologiche [WWW Document]. URL <http://sici.irpi.cnr.it/>
- Jongman, B., Kreibich, H., Apel, H., Barredo, J.I., Bates, P.D., Feyen, L., Gericke, a., Neal, J., Aerts, J.C.J.H., Ward, P.J., 2012. Comparative flood damage model assessment: towards a European approach. *Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci.* 12, 3733–3752.
- Jonkhoff, W., 2009. Flood risk assessment and policy in the Netherlands, in: OECD (Ed.), *Green Cities: New Approaches to Confronting Climate Change*. OECD, Las Palmas de Gran Canaria, pp. 220–240.
- Jonkman, S.N., Kelman, I., 2005. An analysis of the causes and circumstances of flood disaster deaths. *Disasters* 29, 75–97.

- Kajitani, Y., Tatano, H., 2014. ESTIMATION OF PRODUCTION CAPACITY LOSS RATE AFTER THE GREAT EAST. *Econ. Syst. Res.* 26:1, 13–38.
- Kreibich, H., Seifert, I., Merz, B., Thielen, A.H., 2010. Development of FLEMOcs—a new model for the estimation of flood losses in the commercial sector. *Hydrol. Sci. Journal—Journal des Sci. Hydrol.* 55, 1302–1314.
- Kroll, C.A., Landis, J.D., Shen, Q., Stryker, S., 1991. Economic impacts of the Loma Prieta earthquake: A focus on small businesses.
- Kunreuther, H.C., Michel-kerjan, E.O., 2007. Climate Change, Insurability of Large-scale Disasters and the Emerging Liability Challenge - NBER working paper series.
- McCallum, R.A., 1995. Instance-based utility distinctions for reinforcement learning with hidden state, in: *ICML*. pp. 387–395.
- Merz, B., Kreibich, H., Schwarze, R., Thielen, A., 2010. Review article “Assessment of economic flood damage”. *Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci.* 10, 1697–1724.
- Messner, F., Penning-Rowsell, E., Green, C., Meyer, V., Tunstall, S., van der Veen, A., 2007. Evaluating flood damages: guidance and recommendations on principles and methods, *FLOODsite-Report T09-06-01*.
- Meyer, V., Becker, N., Markantonis, V., Schwarze, R., van den Bergh, J.C.J.M., Bouwer, L.M., Bubeck, P., Ciavola, P., Genovese, E., Green, C., Hallegatte, S., Kreibich, H., Lequeux, Q., Logar, I., Papyrakis, E., Pfuerscheller, C., Poussin, J., Przylyski, V., Thielen, a. H., Viavattene, C., 2013. Review article: Assessing the costs of natural hazards – state of the art and knowledge gaps. *Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci.* 13, 1351–1373.
- Meyer, V., Messner, F., 2005. National flood damage evaluation methods. A review of applied methods in England, the Netherlands, the Czech Republic and Germany - *UFZ Discussion Papers*.
- Molinari, D., Menoni, S., Aronica, G.T., Ballio, F., Berni, N., Pandolfo, C., Stelluti, M., Minucci, G., 2014. Ex post damage assessment: an Italian experience. *Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci.* 14, 901–916.
- MunichRE, 2010. *NatCatSERVICE* [WWW Document]. URL www.munichre.com
- Narayanan, G.B., Walmsley, T., 2008. The GTAP 7 Data Base. *Cent. Glob. Trade*.
- Noy, I., Nualsri, A., 2007. What do exogenous shocks tell us about growth theories? *Santa Cruz Inst. for International Economics, Santa Cruz*.
- Okuyama, Y., 2007. Economic modeling for disaster impact analysis: past, present, and future. *Econ. Syst. Res.* 19, 115–124.

- Okuyama, Y., 2014. Disaster and economic structural change: case study on the 1995 Kobe earthquake. *Econ. Syst. Res.* 37–41.
- Okuyama, Y., Hewings, G.D., Sonis, M., 2004. Measuring Economic Impacts of Disasters: Interregional Input-Output Analysis Using Sequential Interindustry Model, in: Okuyama, Y., Chang, S. (Eds.), *Modeling Spatial and Economic Impacts of Disasters SE - 5*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, pp. 77–101.
- Pauw, K., J., T., Bachu, M., Van Seventer, D.E., 2011. The economic costs of extreme weather events: A hydro-meteorological CGE analysis for Malawi. *Environ. Dev. Econ.* 16 (2), 177–198.
- Pfurtscheller, C., 2014. Regional economic impacts of natural hazards – the case of the 2005 Alpine flood event in Tyrol (Austria). *Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci.* 359–378.
- Przyluski, V., Hallegatte, S., 2011. Indirect Costs of Natural Hazards - CONHAZ Report.
- Ranger, N., Hallegatte, S., Bhattacharya, S., Bachu, M., Priya, S., Dhore, K., Corfee-Morlot, J., 2011. An assessment of the potential impact of climate change on flood risk in Mumbai. *Clim. Change* 104.1, 139–167.
- Ratto, S., Bonetto, F., Comoglio, F., 2003. The October 2000 flooding in Valle d’Aosta (Italy) : Event description and land planning measures for the risk mitigation. *Int. J. River Basin Manag.* 1, 105–116.
- Regione Piemonte, 2000a. Rapporto sull’evento alluvionale del 13-16 Ottobre 2000 Parte I. Turin.
- Regione Piemonte, 2000b. Rapporto sull’evento alluvionale del 13-16 Ottobre 2000 Parte II. Turin.
- Rojas, R., Feyen, L., Watkiss, P., 2013. Climate change and river floods in the European Union : Socio-economic consequences and the costs and benefits of adaptation. *Glob. Environ. Chang.* - Press.
- Rose, A., 2004. Economic Principles, Issues and Research Priorities in Hazard Loss Estimation, in: In Okuyama, Y. and S.E. Chang (eds.) *Modeling the Spatial and Economic Effects of Disasters*. New York: Springer.
- Rose, A., Benavides, J., Chang, S.E., Szczesniak, P., Lim, D., 1997. The Regional Economic Impact of an Earthquake: Direct and Indirect Effects of Electricity Lifeline Disruptions. *J. Reg. Sci.* 37, 437–458.
- Rose, A., Liao, S.-Y., 2005. Modeling Regional Economic Resilience to Disasters: A Computable General Equilibrium Analysis of Water Service Disruptions*. *J. Reg. Sci.* 45, 75–112.
- Standardi, G., Bosello, F., Eboli, F., 2014. A sub-national version of the GTAP model for Italy. *Work. Pap. Fond. Eni Enrico Mattei* 2014.04, 1–20.
- Strobl, E., 2010. The Economic Growth Impact of Hurricanes: Evidence from U.S. Coastal Counties. *Rev. Econ. Stat.* 93, 575–589.

The World Bank, n.d. World Development Indicators [WWW Document]. URL <http://data.worldbank.org/>

Thieken, A.H., Olschewski, A., Kreibich, H., Kobsch, S., Merz, B., Proverbs, D., Brebbia, C.A., Penning-Roswell, E., 2008. Development and evaluation of FLEMOps-a new Flood Loss Estimation MOdel for the private sector., in: 1st International Conference on Flood Recovery, Innovation and Response (FRIAR), London, UK, 2-3 July 2008. WIT Press, pp. 315–324.

Tropeano, D., Turconi, L., 2001. Alluviuone del 14-16 ottobre 2000 nell'Italia nord-ovest: cronaca di sintesi e commenti. NIMBUS.

Tsuchiya, S., Tatano, H., Okada, N., 2007. Economic loss assessment due to railroad and highway disruptions. *Econ. Syst. Res.* 19.2, 147–162.

United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction Secretariat, 2009. Global assessment report on disaster risk reduction (2009). Geneva.

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:

<http://www.feem.it/getpage.aspx?id=73&sez=Publications&padre=20&tab=1>
http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/JELJOUR_Results.cfm?form_name=journalbrowse&journal_id=266659
<http://ideas.repec.org/s/fem/femwpa.html>
<http://www.econis.eu/LNG=EN/FAM?PPN=505954494>
<http://ageconsearch.umn.edu/handle/35978>
<http://www.bepress.com/feem/>

NOTE DI LAVORO PUBLISHED IN 2014

CCSD	1.2014	Erin Baker, Valentina Bosetti, Karen E. Jenni and Elena Claire Ricci: Facing the Experts: Survey Mode and Expert Elicitation
ERM	2.2014	Simone Tagliapietra: Turkey as a Regional Natural Gas Hub: Myth or Reality? An Analysis of the Regional Gas Market Outlook, beyond the Mainstream Rhetoric
ERM	3.2014	Eva Schmid and Brigitte Knopf: Quantifying the Long-Term Economic Benefits of European Electricity System Integration
CCSD	4.2014	Gabriele Standardi, Francesco Bosello and Fabio Eboli: A Sub-national CGE Model for Italy
CCSD	5.2014	Kai Lessmann, Ulrike Kornek, Valentina Bosetti, Rob Dellink, Johannes Emmerling, Johan Eyckmans, Miyuki Nagashima, Hans-Peter Weikard and Zili Yang: The Stability and Effectiveness of Climate Coalitions: A Comparative Analysis of Multiple Integrated Assessment Models
CCSD	6.2014	Sergio Currarini, Carmen Marchiori and Alessandro Tavoni: Network Economics and the Environment: Insights and Perspectives
CCSD	7.2014	Matthew Ranson and Robert N. Stavins: Linkage of Greenhouse Gas Emissions Trading Systems: Learning from Experience
CCSD	8.2013	Efthymia Kyriakopoulou and Anastasios Xepapadeas: Spatial Policies and Land Use Patterns: Optimal and Market Allocations
CCSD	9.2013	Can Wang, Jie Lin, Wenjia Cai and ZhongXiang Zhang: Policies and Practices of Low Carbon City Development in China
ES	10.2014	Nicola Genovese and Maria Grazia La Spada: Trust as a Key Variable of Sustainable Development and Public Happiness: A Historical and Theoretical Example Regarding the Creation of Money
ERM	11.2014	Ujjayant Chakravorty, Martino Pelli and Beyza Ural Marchand: Does the Quality of Electricity Matter? Evidence from Rural India
ES	12.2014	Roberto Antonietti: From Outsourcing to Productivity, Passing Through Training: Microeconomic Evidence from Italy
CCSD	13.2014	Jussi Lintunen and Jussi Uusivuori: On The Economics of Forest Carbon: Renewable and Carbon Neutral But Not Emission Free
CCSD	14.2014	Brigitte Knopf, Bjørn Bakken, Samuel Carrara, Amit Kanudia, Ilkka Keppo, Tiina Koljonen, Silvana Mima, Eva Schmid and Detlef van Vuuren: Transforming the European Energy System: Member States' Prospects Within the EU Framework
CCSD	15.2014	Brigitte Knopf, Yen-Heng Henry Chen, Enrica De Cian, Hannah Förster, Amit Kanudia, Ioanna Karkatsouli, Ilkka Keppo, Tiina Koljonen, Katja Schumacher and Detlef van Vuuren: Beyond 2020 - Strategies and Costs for Transforming the European Energy System
CCSD	16.2014	Anna Alberini, Markus Bareit and Massimo Filippini: Does the Swiss Car Market Reward Fuel Efficient Cars? Evidence from Hedonic Pricing Regressions, a Regression Discontinuity Design, and Matching
ES	17.2014	Cristina Bernini and Maria Francesca Cracolici: Is Participation in Tourism Market an Opportunity for Everyone? Some Evidence from Italy
ERM	18.2014	Wei Jin and ZhongXiang Zhang: Explaining the Slow Pace of Energy Technological Innovation: Why Market Conditions Matter?
CCSD	19.2014	Salvador Barrios and J. Nicolás Ibañez: Time is of the Essence: Adaptation of Tourism Demand to Climate Change in Europe
CCSD	20.2014	Salvador Barrios and J. Nicolás Ibañez Rivas: Climate Amenities and Adaptation to Climate Change: A Hedonic-Travel Cost Approach for Europe
ERM	21.2014	Andrea Bastianin, Marzio Galeotti and Matteo Manera: Forecasting the Oil-gasoline Price Relationship: Should We Care about the Rockets and the Feathers?
ES	22.2014	Marco Di Cintio and Emanuele Grassi: Wage Incentive Profiles in Dual Labor Markets
CCSD	23.2014	Luca Di Corato and Sebastian Hess: Farmland Investments in Africa: What's the Deal?
CCSD	24.2014	Olivier Beaumais, Anne Briand, Katrin Millock and Céline Nauges: What are Households Willing to Pay for Better Tap Water Quality? A Cross-Country Valuation Study
CCSD	25.2014	Gabriele Standardi, Federico Perali and Luca Pieroni: World Tariff Liberalization in Agriculture: An Assessment Following a Global CGE Trade Model for EU15 Regions
ERM	26.2014	Marie-Laure Nauleau: Free-Riding on Tax Credits for Home Insulation in France: an Econometric Assessment Using Panel Data

CCSD	27.2014	Hannah Förster, Katja Schumacher, Enrica De Cian, Michael Hübler, Ilkka Keppo, Silvana Mima and Ronald D. Sands: European Energy Efficiency and Decarbonization Strategies Beyond 2030 – A Sectoral Multi-model Decomposition
CCSD	28.2014	Katherine Calvin, Shonali Pachauri, Enrica De Cian and Ioanna Mouratiadou: The Effect of African Growth on Future Global Energy, Emissions, and Regional Development
CCSD	29.2014	Aleh Cherp, Jessica Jewell, Vadim Vinichenko, Nico Bauer and Enrica De Cian: Global Energy Security under Different Climate Policies, GDP Growth Rates and Fossil Resource Availabilities
CCSD	30.2014	Enrica De Cian, Ilkka Keppo, Johannes Bollen, Samuel Carrara, Hannah Förster, Michael Hübler, Amit Kanudia, Sergey Paltsev, Ronald Sands and Katja Schumacher: European-Led Climate Policy Versus Global Mitigation Action. Implications on Trade, Technology, and Energy
ERM	31.2014	Simone Tagliapietra: Iran after the (Potential) Nuclear Deal: What's Next for the Country's Natural Gas Market?
CCSD	32.2014	Mads Greker, Michael Hoel and Knut Einar Rosendahl: Does a Renewable Fuel Standard for Biofuels Reduce Climate Costs?
CCSD	33.2014	Edilio Valentini and Paolo Vitale: Optimal Climate Policy for a Pessimistic Social Planner
ES	34.2014	Cristina Cattaneo: Which Factors Explain the Rising Ethnic Heterogeneity in Italy? An Empirical Analysis at Province Level
CCSD	35.2014	Yasunori Ouchida and Daisaku Goto: Environmental Research Joint Ventures and Time-Consistent Emission Tax
CCSD	36.2014	Jaime de Melo and Mariana Vijil: Barriers to Trade in Environmental Goods and Environmental Services: How Important Are They? How Much Progress at Reducing Them?
CCSD	37.2014	Ryo Horii and Masako Ikefuji: Environment and Growth
CCSD	38.2014	Francesco Bosello, Lorenza Campagnolo, Fabio Eboli and Ramiro Parrado: Energy from Waste: Generation Potential and Mitigation Opportunity
ERM	39.2014	Lion Hirth, Falko Ueckerdt and Ottmar Edenhofer: Why Wind Is Not Coal: On the Economics of Electricity
CCSD	40.2014	Wei Jin and ZhongXiang Zhang: On the Mechanism of International Technology Diffusion for Energy Productivity Growth
CCSD	41.2014	Abeer El-Sayed and Santiago J. Rubio: Sharing R&D Investments in Cleaner Technologies to Mitigate Climate Change
CCSD	42.2014	Davide Antonioli, Simone Borghesi and Massimiliano Mazzanti: Are Regional Systems Greening the Economy? the Role of Environmental Innovations and Agglomeration Forces
ERM	43.2014	Donatella Baiardi, Matteo Manera and Mario Menegatti: The Effects of Environmental Risk on Consumption: an Empirical Analysis on the Mediterranean Countries
CCSD	44.2014	Elena Claire Ricci, Valentina Bosetti, Erin Baker and Karen E. Jenni: From Expert Elicitations to Integrated Assessment: Future Prospects of Carbon Capture Technologies
CCSD	45.2014	Kenan Huremovic: Rent Seeking and Power Hierarchies: A Noncooperative Model of Network Formation with Antagonistic Links
CCSD	46.2014	Matthew O. Jackson and Stephen Nei: Networks of Military Alliances, Wars, and International Trade
CCSD	47.2014	Péter Csóka and P. Jean-Jacques Herings: Risk Allocation under Liquidity Constraints
CCSD	48.2014	Ahmet Alkan and Alparslan Tuncay: Pairing Games and Markets
CCSD	49.2014	Sanjeev Goyal, Stephanie Rosenkranz, Utz Weitzel and Vincent Buskens: Individual Search and Social Networks
CCSD	50.2014	Manuel Förster, Ana Mauleon and Vincent J. Vannetelbosch: Trust and Manipulation in Social Networks
CCSD	51.2014	Berno Buechel, Tim Hellmann and Stefan Köllner: Opinion Dynamics and Wisdom under Conformity
CCSD	52.2014	Sofia Priazhkina and Frank Page: Formation of Bargaining Networks Via Link Sharing
ES	53.2014	Thomas Longden and Greg Kannard: Rugby League in Australia between 2001 and 2012: an Analysis of Home Advantage and Salary Cap Violations
ES	54.2014	Cristina Cattaneo, Carlo V. Fiorio and Giovanni Peri: What Happens to the Careers of European Workers when Immigrants "Take their Jobs"?
CCSD	55.2014	Francesca Sanna-Randaccio, Roberta Sestini and Ornella Tarola: Unilateral Climate Policy and Foreign Direct Investment with Firm and Country Heterogeneity
ES	56.2014	Cristina Cattaneo, Carlo V. Fiorio and Giovanni Peri: Immigration and Careers of European Workers: Effects and the Role of Policies
CCSD	57.2014	Carlos Dionisio Pérez Blanco and Carlos Mario Gómez Gómez: Drought Management Plans and Water Availability in Agriculture. A Risk Assessment Model for a Southern European Basin
CCSD	58.2014	Baptiste Perrissin Fabert, Etienne Espagne, Antonin Pottier and Patrice Dumas: The Comparative Impact of Integrated Assessment Models' Structures on Optimal Mitigation Policies
CCSD	59.2014	Stuart McDonald and Joanna Poyago-Theotoky: Green Technology and Optimal Emissions Taxation
CCSD	60.2014	ZhongXiang Zhang: Programs, Prices and Policies Towards Energy Conservation and Environmental Quality in China
CCSD	61.2014	Carlo Drago, Livia Amidani Aliberti and Davide Carbonai: Measuring Gender Differences in Information Sharing Using Network Analysis: the Case of the Austrian Interlocking Directorship Network in 2009
CCSD	62.2014	Carlos Dionisio Pérez Blanco and Carlos Mario Gómez Gómez: An Integrated Risk Assessment Model for the Implementation of Drought Insurance Markets in Spain
CCSD	63.2014	Y. Hossein Farzin and Ronald Wendner: The Time Path of the Saving Rate: Hyperbolic Discounting and Short-Term Planning
CCSD	64.2014	Francesco Bosello and Ramiro Parrado: Climate Change Impacts and Market Driven Adaptation: the Costs of Inaction Including Market Rigidities
CCSD	65.2014	Luca Di Corato, Cesare Dosi and Michele Moretto: Bidding for Conservation Contracts

CCSD	66.2014	Achim Voß and Jörg Lingers: What's the Damage? Environmental Regulation with Policy-Motivated Bureaucrats
CCSD	67.2014	Carolyn Fischer, Richard G. Newell and Louis Preonas: Environmental and Technology Policy Options in the Electricity Sector: Interactions and Outcomes
CCSD	68.2014	Carlos M. Gómez, C. Dionisio Pérez-Blanco and Ramon J. Batalla: The Flushing Flow Cost: A Prohibitive River Restoration Alternative? The Case of the Lower Ebro River
ES	69.2014	Roberta Distante, Ivan Petrella and Emiliano Santoro: Size, Age and the Growth of Firms: New Evidence from Quantile Regressions
CCSD	70.2014	Jaime de Melo and Mariana Vijil: The Critical Mass Approach to Achieve a Deal on Green Goods and Services: What is on the Table? How Much to Expect?
ERM	71.2014	Gauthier de Maere d'Aertrycke, Olivier Durand-Lasserve and Marco Schudel: Integration of Power Generation Capacity Expansion in an Applied General Equilibrium Model
ERM	72.2014	ZhongXiang Zhang: Energy Prices, Subsidies and Resource Tax Reform in China
CCSD	73.2014	James A. Lennox and Jan Witajewski: Directed Technical Change With Capital-Embodied Technologies: Implications For Climate Policy
CCSD	74.2014	Thomas Longden: Going Forward by Looking Backwards on the Environmental Kuznets Curve: an Analysis of CFCs, CO2 and the Montreal and Kyoto Protocols
ERM	75.2014	Simone Tagliapietra: The EU-Turkey Energy Relations After the 2014 Ukraine Crisis. Enhancing The Partnership in a Rapidly Changing Environment
CCSD	76.2014	J. Farlin, L. Drouet, T. Gallé, D. Pittois, M. Bayerle, C. Braun, P. Maloszewski, J. Vanderborght, M. Elsner and A. Kies: Delineating Spring Recharge Areas in a Fractured Sandstone Aquifer (Luxembourg) Based on Pesticide Mass Balance
CCSD	77.2014	F. Branger and P. Quirion: Reaping the Carbon Rent: Abatement and Overallocation Profits in the European Cement Industry. Insights from an LMDI Decomposition Analysis
CCSD	78.2014	Johannes Emmerling : Sharing of Climate Risks across World Regions
CCSD	79.2014	Brigitte Knopf, Nicolas Koch, Godefroy Grosjean, Sabine Fuss, Christian Flachsland, Michael Pahle, Michael Jakob and Ottmar Edenhofer: The European Emissions Trading System (EU ETS): Ex-Post Analysis, the Market Stability Reserve and Options for a Comprehensive Reform
CCSD	80.2014	Yana Rubashkina, Marzio Galeotti and Elena Verdolini: Environmental Regulation and Competitiveness: Empirical Evidence on the Porter Hypothesis from European Manufacturing Sectors
ES	81.2014	Fabio Sabatini and Francesco Sarracino: E-participation: Social Capital and the Internet
CCSD	82.2014	Lorenzo Carrera, Gabriele Standardi, Francesco Bosello and Jaroslav Mysiak: Assessing Direct and Indirect Economic Impacts of a Flood Event Through the Integration of Spatial and Computable General Equilibrium Modelling