



NOTA DI LAVORO

86.2014

The Passive Use Value of the Mediterranean Forest

By Vladimir Otrachshenko, Centro Euro-Mediterraneo sui Cambiamenti Climatici (CMCC), Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei (FEEM) and Nova School of Business and Economics (Portugal)

Climate Change and Sustainable Development

Series Editor: Carlo Carraro

The Passive Use Value of the Mediterranean Forest

By Vladimir Otrachshenko, Centro Euro-Mediterraneo sui Cambiamenti Climatici (CMCC), Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei (FEEM) and Nova School of Business and Economics (Portugal)

Summary

In this study we estimate the passive use value of forest in different ecological zones in the Mediterranean region. We estimate these values for forests using meta-analysis. These estimates are used to reveal the annual monetary values per hectare for each country. The total annual amount of passive use value of the Mediterranean forest is about one billion international dollars. The estimated passive use value of the forest from this study can be used to account for the social welfare loss caused by fire, insects, diseases, biotic agents, and abiotic factors.

Keywords: Forest, Mediterranean Region, Passive Use, Welfare Loss

JEL Classification: Q23

The author acknowledges the project titled "The Forest Fires under Climate, Social and Economic Changes in Europe, the Mediterranean and Other Fire-affected Areas of the World (FUME)", funded by the European Commission, Seventh Framework Programme, Grant agreement no.: 243888.

Address for correspondence:

Vladimir Otrachshenko

Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei

Isola of San Giorgio Maggiore

30124 Venice

Italy

E-mail: vladimir.otrachshenko@feem.it

The opinions expressed in this paper do not necessarily reflect the position of
Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei

Corso Magenta, 63, 20123 Milano (I), web site: www.feem.it, e-mail: working.papers@feem.it

The Passive Use Value of the Mediterranean Forest*

Vladimir Otrachshenko^{†,‡,§}

Abstract

In this study we estimate the passive use value of forest in different ecological zones in the Mediterranean region. We estimate these values for forests using meta-analysis. These estimates are used to reveal the annual monetary values per hectare for each country. The total annual amount of passive use value of the Mediterranean forest is about one billion international dollars. The estimated passive use value of the forest from this study can be used to account for the social welfare loss caused by fire, insects, diseases, biotic agents, and abiotic factors.

JEL codes: Q23

Keywords: forest, Mediterranean region, passive use, welfare loss

*The author acknowledges the project titled "The Forest Fires under Climate, Social and Economic Changes in Europe, the Mediterranean and Other Fire-affected Areas of the World (FUME)", funded by the European Commission, Seventh Framework Programme, Grant agreement no.: 243888.

[†]Centro Euro-Mediterraneo sui Cambiamenti Climatici, Isola of San Giorgio Maggiore, 30124, Venice, Italy.

[‡]Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Isola of San Giorgio Maggiore, 30124, Venice, Italy. Email: vladimir.otrachshenko@feem.it

[§]Nova School of Business and Economics, Campus de Campolide, 1099-032 Lisbon, Portugal.

1 Introduction

The Mediterranean region partially covers the land of three continents: Africa, Asia, and Europe. The countries in this region are diversified in terms of economic development, culture, and marine and terrestrial ecosystems. This region constitutes 13.5% to the world Gross Domestic Product and 7.7% of the world population and is also known for its rich and unique ecosystems. The Mediterranean basin ecosystems include around 25,000 plant species, 768 marine and fresh water species, 351 reptiles, 601 birds, and 296 terrestrial mammals (Myers et al., 2000).

Due to extensive human activity, environmental conditions, and climate this hotspot region is one of the most endangered and threatened in the world. Historically, the Mediterranean natural ecosystems have been used intensively for agricultural purposes. Today, in the north, forests has recovered due to less intensive agricultural use, while southern territories are still over-exploited, leading to deforestation and erosion in this region (see Figure 1 in Appendix). As a result of human activities, many native tree species from terrestrial ecosystems in this region are vulnerable, threatened, or even endangered (see Figure 2).

It is well known that forest is crucial for human well-being. It provides many goods such as timber, fodder, food, fuel, etc., and services such as recreational activities (hiking, biking, etc.), watershed services, carbon sequestration, and preservation of many plant, animal, and bird species. The total economic value of forest consists of use and non-use values. The use value can be assigned to any resource that can be sold on the market. This value includes the direct and indirect use values, and option value.¹ The direct use value arises from the actual use of forest such as timber, fodder, etc., while the indirect use value is attributed to indirect benefits of forest such as watershed protection, carbon sequestration, etc. Also, people place an option value on having the opportunity to use forest products and its benefits in the future.

Beside the use value, people also attribute the non-use value. This value is assigned

¹For a detailed discussion see Bateman et al. (2002).

by people who do not use these goods and who do not intend to use them. However, they do value the forest ecosystem simply in knowing of its existence. This value is also known as a passive use value, and includes altruistic, bequest, and existence values. While computing the forest use value is straightforward, computing the passive use is a challenge.

The first attempts to calculate the passive use value for the Mediterranean region countries were undertaken by Merlo and Croitoru (2005) and Croitoru (2007). Croitoru (2007) points out that the passive use value estimates for this region are either missing due to the scarcity of research or not reliable meaning that "*.... no strong conclusion can be drawn*".

Another study by Chaibai et al. (2009), suggests a methodology to compute the passive use value of forest and provide monetary estimates at the regional level. The estimates are based on the findings from earlier studies related to stated preference techniques in different world regions, and then, adjusted to the region of interest based on its demographic situation and economic development.

Our study contributes to the literature by computing the passive use value of forest in different ecological zones in the Mediterranean region countries. Using the selected case studies that applied stated preference techniques, we implement a meta-analysis approach. Meta-analysis is an important statistical tool for combining the main findings from different studies (Glass, 1976). Meta-analyses have been used to study woodland recreation values and forest valuation (see Bateman et al., 1999; Bateman and Jones, 2003) and for the forest benefits (see Lindhje, 2007), among others. In addition, meta-analysis can be helpful in summarizing results of a single study that provides multiple estimates.

The range of monetary estimates presenting the passive use value of the forest vary considerably, from 0.06 in Slovenia to 188.17 international US dollars (int.\$) in Spain. The differences in values are not surprising since countries differ widely with respect to demographic and economic situations, as well as the total forest area and its

conservation area. The total amount of passive use value of the Mediterranean forest is 1,112,730,000 int.\$ per year. The estimated passive use value of the forest from this study can be used to account for the damage caused by fire, insects, diseases, biotic agents, and abiotic factors. These monetary values are based on the preferences of individuals, and therefore should not be ignored by policy makers.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In the next section the data are presented. Section 3 presents methodology. Sections 4 and 5 discuss the results and conclude.

2 Data

Little research has been conducted in the less developed countries compared to the developed ones, and may indicate that less developed countries cannot afford to invest in research. According to Christie et al. (2012) for ecosystem services, 11.6% of studies have been conducted in less developed countries, with 88.6% in more developed ones. Most countries of Africa and Asia of the Mediterranean region, except Cyprus and Israel are classified as low- or upper-middle income countries, according to the World Bank while most European countries in this region are classified as high income countries.

We searched for case studies related to countries of interest (the Mediterranean) and if none were found, we searched for studies in the neighboring countries. This strategy is especially useful for the African countries, where little research is reported. In order to guarantee that we capture non-use values, we select only the case studies that apply the stated preference techniques such as contingent valuation, choice modeling, and choice experiment.

Table 1 shows the selected studies. Due to a paucity of case studies, the African countries are represented by the studies for Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Kenya, and Uganda. The Asian part of the Mediterranean region is represented by Cyprus, Is-

rael, Lebanon, and Turkey. The European countries are represented by Denmark, Greece, France, North Ireland, and Spain. Even though Denmark and North Ireland do not belong to the Mediterranean region, the decision to include these countries is based on a high quality of studies conducted for the forest from the temperate zone. According to FAO/FRA (2000), all countries from this region are allocated in either subtropical or temperate ecological zones (see Figure 3). The countries' values of wood and non-wood forest products removals, forest, and other woodland (OWL) areas and their territories are presented in Table 2.

Overall we explore the marginal values from 22 studies. The number of marginal values varies much from study to study. As seen in Figure 2, the maximum number of values available in one study is 12 while the minimum is one.

The values for forest ecosystem services in the selected case studies are reported in different currencies and time periods. Also, mean and/or median WTPs per household, per trip, per year, and/or per hectare are presented. We standardize the marginal values into the common metric of 2005 international \$ per hectare per year (int.\$/ha/year). In order to transfer these values to the local currency unit (LCU), the official exchange rate (LCU per US\$, period average) is used. In addition, GDP deflators with varying base year by country and PPP conversion factor, GDP (LCU per international \$), are applied. The data regarding the exchange rate, GDP deflators, and conversion factor are taken from the World Bank site.² Then, WTPs per person or per visit are converted to the marginal values per hectare per year given information on a number of trips and respondents or population size in a particular study.

Unfortunately, some selected studies do not provide any information regarding the study site area. In this case the area is approximated from information in the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations, Food and Agricultural Data Network, or Country Report on Global Forest Resources Assessment.³

²See www.worldbank.org.

³For Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations and Country Report on Global

3 Methodology

In this section we describe the proposed methodology to estimate the non-use value of the Mediterranean region countries. For that purpose we apply meta-analysis. This analysis is a useful tool since it allows us to combine results across studies and to transfer values from studied sites to the sites of particular interest (Glass, 1976). This is an important feature since in less developed countries no studies of interest are available. However, this analysis has several caveats since it involves different studies.

First, some studies provide several estimates for the same forest and its services at stake but with just some difference in attributes, for instance, levels of preservation area or considering different species of animals and plants. Thus, even though these studies address the same subject, the information provided varies considerably. Also, from the statistical point of view several aspects such as heteroskedasticity, outliers, leverage, and non-independence of residuals, in the meta regression have to be taken into account. Ignoring these aspects may lead to spurious findings as well as wrong statistical inference.

Regarding heteroskedasticity, the estimated coefficients are not affected, but the standard errors are invalid. Next, having an outlier in a sample is an indication of measurement error or a heavy-tailed distribution. Therefore, retaining outliers may result in misleading findings.

Another potential concern is a leverage effect. It occurs when one of the independent variable deviates substantially from its mean. In this case, the estimated coefficients in the meta-analysis are affected. Finally, non-independence of residuals arises when several estimates are provided in the same study. It is possible that the estimates provided in a study may not be independent, and as a result, residuals are not independent as well. If this non-independency is not taken into account, we may end up with wrong statistical inference. To cope these potential caveats, we use

Forest Resources Assessment, see www.fao.org/forestry/ while for Food and Agricultural Data Network see www.countrystat.org.

the iteratively reweighted least squares regression. This approach is implemented in STATA (see `rreg` command).

After careful selection of 22 case studies for our analysis, the first step of the meta-analysis is an OLS regression. It is worth mentioning that the OLS analysis provides equal weights to residuals while in the robust approach large residuals are given small weights. The regression of potential interest is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \ln(WTP) = & \beta_0 + \beta_1 Year + \beta_2 Median + \beta_3 Attr + \beta_4 NonUse + \quad (\text{Eq.1}) \\ & + \beta_5 Authors + \beta_6 Subtrop + \beta_7 Temp + \beta_8 Asia + \\ & + \beta_9 Europe + \beta_{10} \ln(Resp) + \beta_{11} \ln(Area) + u \end{aligned}$$

where $\ln(WTP)$ stands for the natural logarithm of the estimated willingness to pay (WTP). WTP is standardized in 2005 international US dollars per hectare per year (int.\$/ha/year). The variable *Year* represents a year of collected data. If the date of the collected data is missing in the study, the year of publication is taken instead. *Median* is a dummy variable and equals one for the median WTP and zero for the mean. *Attr* is a dummy variable that equals to one if different forestry attributes such as forest inhabitants, animals, birds, and/or plants are also explored in the study and zero if only the forest is studied. *NonUse* equals one if the study provides the non-use/passive value (estimate) and zero otherwise. The variable *Authors* stands for the number of authors in a study. *Subtrop* and *Temp* equal one if the forest from subtropical or temperate ecological zones, respectively, and zero if for the tropical one. *Asia* and *Europe* equal one if the study is conducted in a country from Europe or Asia and zero if from Africa. $\ln(Resp)$ and $\ln(Area)$ stand for the natural logarithms of the number of respondents and area in hectares involved in a particular study. u is a stochastic disturbance.

After estimating *Eq.1*, we use the iteratively reweighted least squares in order to

improve our model and to cope with the potential caveats stated above. Then, for each observation we estimate leverage and weight based on the size of its residual. A small weight of an observation indicates that this observation distorts the outcome and accuracy of the model. As a result, we drop the observations with large leverage and small weights. Then, *Eq.1* is reestimated using the Huber-White sandwich estimators (see Huber, 1967; White, 1980). The standard errors from this approach are robust and clustered at the case study. Finally, we obtain the predicted value of $\ln(WTP)$ for the forest from each ecological zone and continent.

Next, we apply the second step following Chiabi et al. (2009):

$$WTP_{j,b} = WTP_{i,b} \left(\frac{N_j}{N_i} \right) \left(\frac{S_{i,b}}{S_{j,b}} \right)^{\hat{\beta}} \left(\frac{GDP_j}{GDP_i} \right)^{\hat{\gamma}} \quad (\text{Eq.2})$$

where the subscript j stands for a country and subscript i stands for continent (Africa, Asia, or Europe) while subscript b stands the forest in a particular ecological zone. $\hat{\beta}$ and $\hat{\gamma}$ are the estimated parameters and are taken from Chiabi et al. (2009). $WTP_{i,b}$ stands for the average willingness to pay from continent i and forest from ecological zone b derived from the first step. N_j and N_i stand for population in country j and the average population in the studied countries from continent i , respectively. $S_{i,b}$ and $S_{j,b}$ are the forest areas designated to conservation in country i and continent j , respectively. GDP_j and GDP_i are the *Gross Domestic Product* per capita based on purchasing power parity (*PPP*). This methodology can be easily extended for the future trajectory of the marginal values of forest.

4 Estimation Results

In this section we present and discuss the results for the marginal values (WTP) of the forest in the Mediterranean region countries. Table 3 shows the results of the meta-regression analysis. As observed from this table, *Year*, *Median*, *Asia*, *Subtrop*, and *Temp* are important explanatory variables for predicting $\ln(WTP)$. However, in

Figure 5, where residuals and the fitted values are plotted, we observe the presence of heteroskedasticity in our analysis. For instance, the circled points (observations) in the right top corner of this figure point out that for these observations we have large residuals. As such, the statistical inference presented may be misleading.

In order to provide robust results, we apply the iteratively reweighted least squares procedure described in the methodological section. The results of the procedure are in Figure 6, where the x-axis in this figure is a normalized residual squared and the y-axis stands for leverage. As shown in this figure there are two observations with numbers 86 and 87 that have large variances. Also, the estimated weights for these observations are equal to zero. We therefore drop these observations from our analysis.

Further analysis of this figure shows that observations 29 and 30 may create a leverage effect, meaning that the estimated coefficients might be substantially affected. As a result, these observations must be excluded. Also, observation number 5 can be the product of leverage and outlierness. This is influential as it substantially changes the estimates of regression. Thus, it has to be removed from the analysis. Given this information, *Eq.1* is reestimated taking into account heteroskedasticity and non-independency of residuals. The results are in Table 4.

As seen in this table R^2 is substantially increased from 0.49 to 0.57 compared to the estimation from Table 2. Moreover, the sign and significance of some variables have changed. This procedure shows that the statistical inference and estimated coefficients are results of potential caveats described in the methodological section. Out of 22 studies we left with 19 (see number of clusters) since some observations are previously removed.

The estimated coefficient on *Median* is significant, suggesting that the median WTPs in studies are on average lower than means. Also, if the case study involves additional attributes of forest, woodland, or trees, such as different types of animal species, birds, plants, etc. then WTP is lower (see the coefficient on *Attr*). This may indicate a substitution effect between included attributes. Regarding the coefficient

on the *NonUse* variable, it is not significant, meaning that people attribute equal weight to use and non-use forest services.

The estimate on the number of authors, *Authors*, has a negative sign. It may be the case that some authors are more familiar with the studied region, and thus, the survey designed may take into account particular country specifics. It is worth mentioning that the explanatory variable *Subtrop* is not statistically significant, suggesting that the value of forest in the subtropical zone is not different from the value of the forest in the tropical zone. *Temp* is positive and significant, meaning that the value of forest from the temperate zone has higher WTP. In addition, the value of forest is higher in Asia and Europe compared to Africa. This can be explained by the captured income effect since on average European, and Asian countries of the Mediterranean region are richer in terms of GDP per capita than the African countries. We also reject the possibility that coefficients on *Europe* and *Asia* are equal ($H_0 : \beta_{Europe} = \beta_{Asia}$; $p - value = 0.00$) supporting the previous explanation.

The negative sign of the study site area, $\ln(Area)$, indicates diminishing returns to scale for forest values. However, the estimated coefficient is not statistically significant. Overall, the results are consistent with the literature underlining the robustness of the suggested methodology in revealing the marginal value (WTP) for the forest.

The marginal values calculated in the first step are shown in Table 5, where we see that for each of the continents and forest from different ecological zones, the marginal values per hectare per year and studied areas are reported, and that Avg. GDP and Avg. Population stand for the average GDP per capita and average population in the case studies. These values are used to calculate the marginal value for each country in the next step.

Next, the second step (see Eq.2) for approximating the marginal values per hectare for each of the country is applied. In Table 6, these monetary values (WTPs) for each country are given. The columns in this table stand for countries, Marg. Value for subtropical forest, Marg. Value for temperate forest, subtropical conservation

area forest, temperate conservation area forest, and total amount in international US dollars. The columns for WTPs for subtropical and temperate forests provide information regarding the marginal value for each type of the forest in a particular country derived from the second step. The columns for subtropical and temperate conservation areas stand for the designated area for conservation in hectares. These areas are approximated based on the information from FAO/FRA (2000; 2005; 2010).

As seen in Table 6, the marginal values per hectare per year vary a great deal, from 0.06 in Slovenia to 188.17 int.\$ in Spain. The differences in values are not surprising since the countries differ considerably with respect to demographic and economic situations as well as the total forest area and its designation for conservation. On average, the non-use value of forest designated for the conservation or protected area in the European countries of the Mediterranean region is 93.85 int.\$/ha/year while the value of the forest without any designated status is only 19.48 int.\$/ha/year. Overall, the total non-use value of the Mediterranean forest in the African countries is 2,650,000 int.\$, in the Asian countries is 15,140,000 int.\$, and in the European countries is 1,093,630,000 int.\$.

5 Conclusion

The findings of this study can be used to calculate the welfare loss based on the passive value of the forest which is burned or damaged by insects, diseases, abiotic factors and biotic agents. These monetary values for the non-use values of the forest are based on the preferences of individuals and, therefore, should not be ignored by policy makers. The values presented in this study can be considered as lower bounds because some countries do not correctly classify the use of forest. In particular, according FAO/FRA (2010), some countries classify their forest as a multiple purpose area even though this forest is indeed a conservation area.

References

- [1] Bateman, I. J., R.T. Carson, B. Day, M. Hanemann, N. Hanley, T. Hett, m. Jones-Lee, G. Loomes, S.Mourato, E. Ozdemiroglu, D. W. Pearce OBE, R. Sudgen and J. Swanson (2002), *Economic Valuation with Stated Preference Techniques*, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham.
- [2] Bateman, I. and L. P. Jones (2003), *Contrasting Conventional with Multi-Level Modeling Approaches to Meta-Analysis: Expectation Consistency in UK Woodland Recreation Values*, *Land Economics*, 79(2), 235-258.
- [3] Bateman, I., A. Lovett, and J. Brainard (1999), *Developing a Methodology for Benefit Transfers Using Geographical Information Systems: Modeling Demand for Woodland Recreation*, *Regional Studies* 33(3), 191-205.
- [4] Bellù, L. G. and V. Cistulli (1997), *Economic Valuation of Forest Recreation Facilities in the Liguria Region (Italy)*, working paper.
- [5] Biro, Y. E. K. (1998), *Valuation of the Environmental Impacts of Kayraktepe Dam/ Hydroelectric Project, Turkey: An Exercise in Contingent Valuation*, *Ambio*, 27(3), 224-229.
- [6] Bonnieux, F., A. Carpentier, and J. C. Paoli (2006), *Aménagement Et Protection De La Forêt Méditerranéenne: Application De La Méthode Des Programmes En Corse*, *INRA Science Sociales*, 6(05).
- [7] Brey, R., P. Riera and J. Mogas (2007), *Estimation of Forest Values Using Choice Modeling: An Application To Spanish Forests*, *Ecological Economics*, 64(2), 305-312.
- [8] Bujosa, A., A. Riera and R. L. Hicks (2010), *Combining Discrete and Continuous Representations of Preference Heterogeneity: A Latent Class Approach*, *Environmental and Resource Economics*, 47, 477-493.

- [9] Bush, G., N. Hanley, M. Moro, and D. Rondeau (2010), Measuring the Costs of Conservation: A Provision Point Mechanism for Willingness to Accept Estimates of the Impacts of Protected Areas in Uganda, Paper presented at the Fourth World Congress of Environmental and Resource Economists, Montreal, Canada.
- [10] Chiabai, A., C. M. Travesi, H. Ding, A. Markandaya, P. A. L. D. Nunes (2009), Economic Valuation of Forest Ecosystem Services: Methodology and Monetary Estimates, mimeo, <http://www.feem.it/userfiles/attach/Publication/NDL2009/NDL2009-012.pdf>
- [11] Christie, M., I. Fazey, R. Cooper, T. Hyde, and J. O. Kenter (2012), An evaluation of Monetary and Non-Monetary Techniques for Assessing the Importance of Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services to People in Less Developed Countries, *Ecological Economics*, 83, 67-78.
- [12] Croitoru L. (2007), How Much are Mediterranean Forests Worth?, *Forest Policy and Economics*, 9, 536-545.
- [13] Glass, G. V (1976), Primary, Secondary, and Meta-Analysis, *Journal of Educational Research*, 5(10), 3-8.
- [14] Huber, P. (1967), The Behavior of Maximum Likelihood Estimates under Non-standard Conditions, Statistical Laboratory of the University of California, Berkley, 221-233.
- [15] Despres, A. (1998), Non-Market Benefits of Forestry in Managed Forests and Valuation Methods: The Case of Forests in Lorraine (France), In *Institutional Aspects of Managerial Economics and Accounting in Forestry*, Edited By Hans Jöbstl, Maurizio Merlo And Lorenzo Venzi.
- [16] FAO/FRA (2000), *Global Forest Resources Assessment: Main Report*, ISSN 0258-6150.

- [17] FAO/FRA (2005), Global Forest Resources Assessment: Progress Towards Sustainable Forest Management, FAO Forestry Paper 147.
- [18] FAO/FRA (2010), Global Ecological Zones for FAO Forest Reporting: 2010 Update, Forest Resources Assessment Working Paper 179.
- [19] Garcia, S., P. Harou, C. Montagné, and A. Stenger (2007), Valuing Biodiversity from a National Survey in France: A Dichotomous Choice Contingent Valuation, working paper.
- [20] Gurluk, S. (2006), The Estimation of Ecosystem Services' Value in the Region of Misi Rural Development Project: Results From a Contingent Valuation Survey, *Forest Policy and Economics*, 9(3), 209-218.
- [21] Kontogianni, A., M. S. Skourtos, I. H. Langford, I. J. Bateman, and S. Georgiou (2001), Integrating Stakeholder Analysis in Non-Market Valuation of Environmental Assets, *Ecological Economics*, 32(1), 123-138.
- [22] Mekonnen A. (2000), Valuation of Community Forestry in Ethiopia: A Contingent Valuation Study of Rural Households, *Environment and Development Economics*, 5, 289-308.
- [23] Mercer, E., R. Kramer, and N. Sharma (1995), Rain Forest Tourism-Estimating the Benefits of Tourism Development in a New National Park in Madagascar, *Journal of Forest Economics*, 1(2), 239-269.
- [24] Merlo M. and L. Croitoru (2005), Valuing Mediterranean Forest: Towards Total Economic Value, CABI Publishing.
- [25] Montagné, C., J.L. Peyron, A. Niedzwiedz, and O. Colnard (2005), France, In *Valuing Mediterranean Forests: Towards Total Economic Value*, Edited By Maurizio, CABI Publishing, 299-317.

- [26] Myers N., R. A. Mittlemeier, C. G. Mittlemeier, G. A. B. Da Fonseca, and J. Kent (2000), Biodiversity Hotspots for Conservation Priorities, *Nature*, 403, 853-858.
- [27] Murrithi, S. and W. Kenyon (2002), Conservation of Biodiversity in the Arabuko Sokoke Forest, Kenya, *Biodiversity and Conservation*, 11, 1437-1450.
- [28] Naidoo, R. and W. L. Adamowicz (2005), Economic Benefits of Biodiversity Exceed Costs of Conservation at an African Rainforest Reserve, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science*.
- [29] Noublanche, C. and J.P. Chassany (1998), Le Rôle Des Acteurs Locaux Dans La Valorisation Économique Du Paysage. Le Cas De La Vallée Française En Cévennes, *Revue de l'Economie Meridionale*, 46(183), 289-299.
- [30] Olsen, S. B. (2009), Choosing Between Internet and Mail Survey Modes for Choice Experiment Surveys Considering Non-Market Goods, *Environmental and Resource Economics*, 44(4), 591-610.
- [31] Plan Bleu (2009), State of the Environment and Development in the Mediterranean, http://planbleu.org/sites/default/files/publications/soed2009_en.pdf
- [32] Reira, P. and J. Mogas (2004), Evaluation of a Risk Reduction in Forest Fires in a Mediterranean Region, *Forest policy and Economics*, 6, 521-528.
- [33] Yelkouni, M. (2005), Évaluation Contingente des Ressources Naturelles: Cas de la Foret de Tiogo au Burkina Faso, *Économie Appliquée*, 4, 139-160.
- [34] Sattout, E.J., S.N. Talhouk, and P.D.S. Caligari (2006), Economic Value of Cedar Relics in Lebanon: An Application of Contingent Valuation Method for Conservation, *Ecological Economics*.
- [35] Scarpa, R., S. M. Chilton, W. G. Hutchinson, and J. Buongiorno (2000), Valuing the Recreational Benefits from the Creation of Nature Reserves in Irish Forests, *Ecological Economics*, 33, 237-250.

- [36] Shechter, M., B. Reiser, and N. Zaitsev (1998), Measuring Passive Use Value: Pledges, Donations and CV Responses in Connection with an Important Natural Resource, *Environmental and Resource Economics*, 12, 457-478.
- [37] Soliño M., A. Prada and M. X. Vazquez (2010), "Designing a forest-energy policy to reduce forest fires in Galicia (Spain): A contingent valuation application", *Journal of Forest Economics*, 16, 217-233.
- [38] Soliño, M. (2010), "External Benefits of Biomass-e in Spain: An Economic Valuation", *Bioresource Technology*, 101, 1992-1997.
- [39] White, H. (1980), A Heteroskedasticity-consistent Covariance Matrix Estimator and a Direct Test for Heteroskedasticity, *Econometrica*, 48(4), 817-838.

Appendix

Table 1: *Selected studies*

Countries of the Case Study	References	Forest by Ecological Zones
Africa		
Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Kenya, Uganda	Bush et al. (2010), Mekonnen (2000), Murrithi and Kennon (2002), Naidoo et al. (2005), Yelkouni (2005)	tropical
Asia		
Cyprus, Israel, Lebanon, Turkey	Biro (1998), Gurluk (2006), Sattout et al. (2006), Shechter et al. (1998)	subtropical/temperate
Europe		
Denmark, Greece, France, North Ireland, Italy, Spain	Bellù and Cistulli (1997), Bonnieux et al. (2006), Bujosa et al. (2010), Brey et al. (2007), Despres (1998), Kontogianni et al. (2001), Montagné et al. (2005), Noublanche and Chassany (1998), Olsen (2009), Reira and Mogas (2004), Scarpa et al. (2000), Soliño (2010), Soliño et al. (2010)	subtropical/temperate

Table 2: Values from removals, land area, forest area, and other wooded land

Country	Value of Wood and Non-wood forest products removals in 2005 (million \$)	Land area (1000 ha)	Forest area (1000 ha)	OWL (1000 ha)	Designated Area for Conservation (in %)
Albania	111	2,740	794	261	9
Algeria	18	238,174	2,277	1,595	4
Bosnia-Herzegovina	n.a.	5,120	2185	549	1*
Croatia	263.7	5,592	2,135	346	3*
Cyprus	0.45	924	174	214	2*
Egypt	11	99,545	67	20	2*
France	33	55,010	15,554	1,708	3*
Greece	n.a.	12,890	3,752	2,780	4.2
Israel	n.a.	2,171	171	81	18*
Italy	n.a.	29,411	9,979	1,047	30
Lebanon	1.75	1,023	136	106	2.6
Libya	n.a.	175,954	217	330	100
Malta	n.a.	32	0	0	-
Monaco	n.a.	2	0	0	-
Morocco	25.5	44,630	4,364	408	12*
Portugal	n.a.	9,150	3,783	84	16.3
Slovenia	145.5	2,012	1,264	44	46*
Spain	874.3	49,944	17,915	10,299	37
Syria	n.a.	18,378	461	35	100
Tunisia	127.8	15,536	1,056	170	3.7
Turkey	748.6	76,963	10,175	10,689	7.6

Sources: FAO/FRA (2005;2010)

Notes: n.a. is not available. * stands for information from FAO/FRA (2010) otherwise from FAO/FRA (2005)

Table 3: Meta-analysis, OLS approach

Dependent Variable: ln(WTP)	Coefficients		Standard Errors	t-statistic
Explanatory Variables:				
Constant	717.77 ***		159.11	4.51
Year	-0.359 ***		0.079	-4.51
Median	-1.294 *		0.774	-1.67
Attr	-0.391		0.787	-0.50
NonUse	-0.785		1.063	-0.74
Authors	-0.189		0.314	-0.60
Subtrop	-2.514 **		1.189	-2.11
Temp	2.971 ***		1.058	2.81
Asia	6.393 ***		1.254	5.10
Europe	1.801		1.084	1.66
ln(Resp)	0.073		0.191	0.38
ln(Area)	0.057		0.140	0.41
Number of Observations			98	
R ²			0.49	

Note: ***, **, *stand for 1, 5, and 10% significance levels, respectively.

Table 4: Robust estimation regression after iteratively reweighted approach

Dependent Variable: ln(WTP)	Coefficients		Robust Standard Errors	t-statistic
Explanatory Variables:				
Constant	146.02		139.11	-1.01
Year	-0.706		0.069	-2.37
Median	-1.337 **		0.564	-2.49
Attr	-3.696 **		1.487	1.11
NonUse	1.643		1.483	-2.18
Authors	-0.642 **		0.295	0.58
Subtrop	0.683		1.185	2.64
Temp	4.445 **		1.685	2.06
Asia	2.983 **		1.217	2.42
Europe	3.414 *		0.691	-0.90
ln(Resp)	-0.182		0.691	-1.20
ln(Area)	-0.182		0.152	1.50
Number of Observations			93	
Number of Clusters			19	
R ²			0.57	

Note: ***, **, *stand for 1, 5, and 10% significance levels, respectively.

Table 5: Marginal values (WTPs) from the first step

Continents	Marg. Value for Sub. Forest	Marg. Value for Temp. Forest	Sub. Forest Area	Temp. Forest Area	Avg. GDP per Capita	Avg. Population
Africa	1.07	0	61,989.88	0	976.7575	103,154,937
Europe	2.7	116.05	19,247.5	741,640.1	29,468.82	36,664,419
Asia	17.4	655.27	694	814,000	16,446.62	26,220,006


Notes: Marg. Value is the marginal value. The marginal values for this step are calculated at *Median* equals zero.

Table 6: Marginal values (WTPs) for the Mediterranean forest

Country	Marg. Value for Sub. Forest (int.\$/ha/year)	Marg. Value for Temp. Forest (int.\$/ha/year)	Sub. Con. Area Forest (ha)	Temp. Con. Area Forest (ha)	Marg. Value of all Forest (int.\$ /ha/year)	Total Amount (Int.\$)
Africa						
Algeria	2.61	0	91,080		0.10	237,718.80
Egypt	0.38	0	2,100		0.01	798.00
Libya	1.32	0	217		1.32	286.44
Morocco	3.89	0	615,720		0.55	2,395,150.80
Tunisia	0.46	0	39,072		0.02	17,973.12
Total in Million Int.\$						2.65
Int.\$/ha/year for Con. Area						3.54
Int.\$/ha/year for all Forest Area						0.33
Asia						
Cyprus	2.67	0	3,460		0.05	9,238.20
Israel	61.79	0	7,011		2.53	433,209.69
Lebanon	4.55	0	3,536		0.12	16,088.80
Syria ^y	2.28	0	461,000		2.28	1,051,080
Turkey ¹	19	20.72	634,106	139,194	1.47	14,932,113.68
Total in Million Int.\$						16.44
Int.\$/ha/year for Con. Area						13.17
Int.\$/ha/year for all Forest Area						1.48
Europe						
Albania	0.32	0.21	59,311.8	12,148.2	0.03	21,530.90
Bosnia-Herzegovina	0.08	0.33	4,151.5	17,698.5	0.01	6,172.63
Croatia	0.49	1.47	17,934	46,116	0.04	76,578.18
France	0	77.93	0	155,540	0.78	12,121,232.20
Greece	6.59	1.38	152,856.48	4,727.52	0.27	1,013,848.18
Italy	78.56	184.12	2,514,708	778,362	34.16	340,867,471.9
Portugal	4.16	7.98	505,077.93	118,475.07	0.81	3,046,555.25
Slovenia	0.06	4.11	69,165.6	501,450.6	1.63	2,065,111.90
Spain	89.1	188.17	5,302,840	1,391,995.5	40.99	734,414,837.24
Total in Million Int.\$						1,093.63
Int.\$/ha/year for Con. Area						93.85
Int.\$/ha/year for all Forest Area						19.48
Africa+Asia+Europe						
Total in Million Int.\$						1,112.73
Int.\$/ha/year for Con. Area						81.52
Int.\$/ha/year for all Forest Area						14.79


Notes: ¹ The calculation of the marginal values for this country is based on the European marginal value. ^yThe calculation of the marginal values for this country is based on the Asian marginal value. Int.\$ stands for international US dollar. Con. Area is the conservation area. Marg. Value is the marginal value (WTP).

Figure 1: Trends in the forest area 1990-2005 (in 1000 ha)



Source: State of the Environment and Development in the Mediterranean (2009).

Figure 2: Percentage of the endangered, threatened, and vulnerable native tree species



Source: FAO, Global Forest Resources Assessment (2005) and the International Union for Conservation of Nature.

Figure 3: Forest by ecological zones in the Mediterranean region countries




Figure 4: Number of marginal values in the selected studies






Figure 5: Residuals and fitted values from the OLS regression



Notes: The residuals and fitted values are from eq. 1. The circled observations point out the presence of heteroskedasticity.

Figure 6: Iteratively reweighted least squares approach



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
CCSD	83.2014	Christophe Charlier and Sarah Guillou: Distortion Effects of Export Quota Policy: an Analysis of the China – Raw Materials Dispute
CCSD	84.2014	Elisa Calliari: Loss & Damage: a Critical Discourse Analysis
CCSD	85.2014	Frédéric Branger and Philippe Quirion: Price versus Quantities versus Indexed Quantities
CCSD	86.2014	Vladimir Otrachshenkov: The Passive Use Value of the Mediterranean Forest