

PIK Report

No. 111

FINDING A PARETO-OPTIMAL SOLUTION
FOR MULTI-REGION MODELS SUBJECT
TO CAPITAL TRADE AND SPILLOVER
EXTERNALITIES

Marian Leimbach, Klaus Eisenack



POTSDAM INSTITUTE
FOR
CLIMATE IMPACT RESEARCH (PIK)

Authors:

Dr. Marian Leimbach*
Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research
P.O. Box 60 12 03, D-14412 Potsdam, Germany
Phone: +49-331-288-2556
Fax: +49-331-288-2600
E-mail: leimbach@pik-potsdam.de

Dr. Klaus Eisenack
Department of Economics and Statistics
Carl von Ossietzky University Oldenburg
26111 Oldenburg

*(corresponding author)

Herausgeber:
Prof. Dr. F.-W. Gerstengarbe

Technische Ausführung:
U. Werner

POTSDAM-INSTITUT
FÜR KLIMAFOLGENFORSCHUNG
Telegrafenberg
Postfach 60 12 03, 14412 Potsdam
GERMANY
Tel.: +49 (331) 288-2500
Fax: +49 (331) 288-2600
E-mail-Adresse: pik@pik-potsdam.de

Abstract

In this paper we present an algorithm that deals with trade interactions within a multi-region model. In contrast to traditional approaches this algorithm is able to handle spillover externalities. Technological spillovers are expected to foster the diffusion of new technologies, which helps to lower the cost of climate change mitigation. We focus on technological spillovers which are due to capital trade. The algorithm of finding a pareto-optimal solution in an intertemporal framework is embedded in a decomposed optimization process. The paper analyzes convergence and equilibrium properties of this algorithm. In the final part of the paper, we apply the algorithm to investigate possible impacts of technological spillovers. While benefits of technological spillovers are significant for the capital-importing region, benefits for the capital-exporting region depend on the type of regional disparities and the resulting specialization and terms-of-trade effects.

1 Introduction

Climate policies and the integrated assessment of climate change are supported by a rising number of tools, starting with such diverse models as DICE (Nordhaus, 1992) and IMAGE (Alcamo et al., 1994) more than 15 years ago. Over the last decade, climate policy models were improved in different directions, e.g. multi-region analyses and multi-gas analyses, integration of energy system models, and integration of endogenous and induced technological change (cf. Löschel, 2002).

However, most climate policy modeling fails to take essential interregional effects into account, in particular foreign investments and technological spillovers. This, on the one hand, reflects general deficiencies of the economic theory in dealing with regional interactions in a dynamic framework, but is odd, on the other hand, in view of the role foreign investments play in a globalized world and may play in dealing with the climate change problem. International experts expect investments in energy systems worldwide to amount to around 20 trillion dollars over the next 30 years (IEA, 2006). 11 trillion dollars alone will be invested into the electricity sector, mainly in China, India, and Africa. In the case of Africa, these investments would consume half of the domestic savings. Hence, enormous foreign capital will be needed. Restructuring the global energy system in a climate-friendly way results in scenarios that are dominated by investments into carbon-free energy technologies. This implies huge foreign investments, because those regions that host the innovators of, for instance, new solar energy technologies, don't correspond with those regions where the solar power plants should be built up.

In a multi-region setting, investment and trade decisions of each region depend on decisions of each other region. In classical economics and trade theory, prices are the major tool for coordinating regional interactions (cf. Samuelson, 1952; Negishi, 1972). Price-based adjustment algorithms like the standard Walrasian excess demand algorithm can be used for finding equilibrium prices. Early work on algorithms that help to find equilibrium prices numerically was summarized by Scarf (1984). More recently, e.g. Kumar and Shubik (2004) and Luenberger and Maxfield (1995) presented advanced algorithms for the computation of competitive equilibria.

Additional challenges arise from the existence of externalities (Farmer and Lahiri, 2005; Greiner and Semmler, 2002) and the fact that international trade is an

inherent dynamic process (Oniki and Uzawa, 1965; Stiglitz, 1970). Our motivation in developing and applying a new method of multi-region modeling is due to the deficits of traditional approaches in dealing with externalities, in particular with technological spillovers. Within the discussion about promising climate protection strategies, technological spillovers come to the fore. Spillovers are expected to foster the diffusion of new technologies and make the difference that helps investors in new energy technologies to break even (Barreto and Klaassen, 2004).

Within this study, the reference point is the Negishi approach - a well-known solution technique for multi-region modeling (Manne and Rutherford, 1994; Leimbach and Toth, 2003). Technically, the Negishi approach merges the regions' optimization problems under a global welfare function. It therefore differs from approaches based on decentralized decision-making. Essentially, it internalizes the coordination function which in decentralized models is played by the market or a virtual auctioneer.

Some well-known models in climate economics, e.g. MERGE (Manne et al., 1995; Manne and Richels, 1995) and RICE (Nordhaus and Yang, 1996), applied the traditional Negishi algorithm in order to find a general equilibrium in an intertemporal optimizing framework. The Negishi approach is numerically quite efficient and in cases without externalities, where the social optimum corresponds to the competitive market equilibrium, often superior to the open loop Nash approach in finding a market solution. However, as Leimbach and Edenhofer (2007) have shown, the Negishi approach is limited in capturing the external effects induced by technological spillovers.

Following the basic idea of Leimbach and Edenhofer (2007), we present an alternative trade algorithm that is able to internalize external spillover effects. We focus on embodied technological spillovers that are induced by capital trade. The presence of physical capital, produced abroad, affects efficiency or productivity levels of domestic firms in a host economy. A host region can boost its productivity by importing capital equipment embodying foreign knowledge. From a theoretical point of view, this paper relates to the theory of endogenous growth (e.g. Romer, 1990; Grossman and Helpman, 1991). In explaining technological change, this theory emphasizes the role of knowledge externalities, of investments into R&D, and of innovations that increase the quality or quantity of goods. The concept of embodied spillovers applied here gives rise to a type of technological change which

resembles the expansion of product variety. While we not account for separated capital stocks, the increase of productivity of the aggregated capital stock assumes that old capital equipment does not become obsolete.

Embodied spillovers represent an external effect. Yet, they have certainly an impact on the investment decisions of the regional agents. This feedback is widely neglected in existing models. This is due to the increasing returns to scale effect which defies control of classical general equilibrium theory. But if empirical studies suggest a link between positive productivity gains and capital trade (e.g. Lee, 1995; Coe et al., 1997; Eaton and Kortum, 2001), why should agents not take this into account in decision-making and why should foresighted agents not be more proactive in attracting capital exports? In contrast to the majority of literature, which deals with spillovers as a purely external effect, we present an approach where technological spillovers are anticipated by the regional actors, hence, influencing the dynamics of the control variables.

The paper is structured as follows: The trade algorithm is elaborated in combination with a stylized multi-region model, the structure of which is presented in section 2. In order to make this model computable, we carry out a decomposition. The decomposed model and the iterative algorithm that searches for a pareto-optimal solution are presented in section 3. We discuss the equilibrium properties of its solution in section 4. Results from numerical experiments on potential welfare and terms-of-trade implications of technological spillovers are presented in section 5. It turns out that at least for the capital-exporting region benefits from spillovers are sensitive to the type of specialisation and that taking technological spillovers into account could substantially change the optimal trade pattern. We end with some conclusions in section 6.

2 The multi-region model

In this section, we present the multi-region model. It represents a dynamic model of international trade. The decomposition that makes the model computable is given in the next section. We decided against a presentation of a more general model that differs from the computational model in order to avoid redundancy later on. The algorithm that solves the model, however, can be applied to other specifications (in particular of the production functions) as well. Analytical elaboration, provided

in the Appendix A, is based on a more compact and general exposition of the model. The model can be classified as an optimal economic growth model. A representative agent is assumed to summarize households' consumption decisions and firms' investment and trade decisions.

The following indices are used throughout the presentation:

| | | |
|-----------|-----------|---------------|
| t | 1,2,...,T | time periods, |
| i, k, l | 1,2,...,n | regions, |
| j | | goods, |
| r | 1,2,...,m | iterations. |

With $J = \{G, F\}$ and $j \in J$, the following types of traded goods are distinguished:

| | |
|-----|-------------------|
| G | consumption good, |
| F | investment good. |

Each good is produced in a different sector. Hence, j also represents a sectoral index denoted by a superscript throughout the presentation. Although the model and the equations are implemented in a time-discrete framework, we use the continuous formulation throughout the paper for simplicity. Time derivatives are represented as usual. Each variable actually bears the time and iteration index. For transparency reasons, they are suppressed as often as possible.

The objective of the multi-region model is to maximize the welfare U of n regions:

$$\max \{U\} \quad U = (U_1, U_2, \dots, U_i, \dots, U_n), \quad (1)$$

with

$$U_i = \int_{t=1}^T f[C_i(t)] \cdot e^{-\rho t} dt. \quad (2)$$

These welfare functions measure the utility of each regions' representative household. Utility is expressed as a function f of the consumption path C subject to discounting by the pure rate of time preference ρ . As an instance of the function f , we apply a common logarithmic or Bernoullian utility function

$$f(C_i) = L_i \cdot \ln \frac{C_i}{L_i}, \quad (3)$$

where L represents the regions' population which provides the exogenously given production factor labor. The production function Y^G for the consumption goods sector is specified as a Cobb-Douglas function :

$$Y_i^G = A_i \cdot [(1 - \theta_i) \cdot K_i]^{\alpha_i} \cdot L_i^{1-\alpha_i}, \quad (4)$$

with

$$0 < \theta_i < 1. \quad (5)$$

Variable A denotes the productivity level and variable θ denotes the share of total capital stock which is allocated to the investment goods sector. K and L represent the capital and labor production factors; α is the capital-output elasticity parameter. We assume that labor is used only in the consumption goods sector. This means that there is a fixed endowment of this production factor which, furthermore, is internationally immobile. This prevents the model from coming up with exaggerated specialization.

Investment goods production is assumed to be a function of capital only. Region i 's production function of investment good F is given by

$$Y_i^F = \kappa_i \cdot (\theta_i \cdot K_i)^\phi. \quad (6)$$

When the elasticity parameter ϕ is equal to 1, this equation becomes a Leontief-type production function and parameter κ can be interpreted as a technological coefficient (investment goods output per unit capital stock).¹

Capital is allocated from a common pool. Thus, perfect cross-sectoral mobility of capital is implicitly assumed (we neglect the vintage and putty-clay structure of the capital stock). Capital accumulation follows the standard equation of capital stock formation:

¹Following the neoclassical assumption of diminishing marginal productivity, we chose a value for ϕ that is slightly lower than 1. With $\phi < 1$, this production function exhibits decreasing returns to scale and the conventional remuneration of production factors in accordance with its marginal productivities is incomplete. Implicitly, there is a kind of monopoly rent that restricts further entry of firms. However, this does not limit the model's capability in finding an interregional competitive equilibrium, which is the focus here.

$$\dot{K}_i = I_i + \sum_{k=1}^n X_{k,i}^F - \delta_i \cdot K_i, \quad (7)$$

where I represents domestic investments, while X^F accounts for investment goods imports. The parameter δ represents the depreciation rate of capital. For simplicity reasons, we assume perfect substitutability between domestic and imported capital goods. The same assumption applies to consumption goods. The output of the consumption goods sector represents the regional gross product net of investments. It is used to meet demands on consumption and exports, while being incremented by imports:

$$Y_i^G = C_i + \sum_{k=1}^n (X_{i,k}^G - X_{k,i}^G). \quad (8)$$

Variable $X_{i,k}$ denotes the export from region i to region k . It simultaneously denotes the import of region k from region i . Note that the trade variables represent net export and net import values. The use of separate export and import variables is due to the subsequent modeling of technological spillovers, which imply a price differential between capital exports and imports.

The investment goods sector provides domestic investments and meets foreign demands on investment goods by

$$Y_i^F = I_i + \sum_{k=1}^n X_{i,k}^F. \quad (9)$$

The range of regional interactions usually modeled is extended by technological spillovers. Technological spillovers increase the host country's productivity through capital goods imports. Within the model, an additional change of the total factor productivity A in a region i is a function of capital goods exports X^F from region k to region i and of productivity differences between both regions:

$$\dot{A}_i = \sum_{k=1}^n \left[\left(\frac{X_{k,i}^F}{K_i} \right)^\zeta \cdot \beta \cdot \max(0, A_k - A_i) \right]. \quad (10)$$

Parameter β represents the spillover intensity, i.e. the actual impact of technological spillovers in the host region, while ζ ($0 < \zeta < 1$) depicts the elasticity of productivity changes on capital goods imports. The capital import variable is divided by the capital stock in order to avoid scaling effects. By choosing the

control variable X^F , regions influence the extent of technological spillovers, i.e. technological spillovers are subject of rational expectations.

An intertemporal budget constraint D based on world market prices p^j has to be met by each region. It is given by

$$D_i(T) = \int_{t=1}^T B_i(t) dt = 0, \quad (11)$$

where the budget balance B is defined as

$$B_i = \sum_{j \in J} \left(p^j \cdot \sum_{k=1}^n [X_{i,k}^j - X_{k,i}^j] \right). \quad (12)$$

This equation serves to level off the trade deficits of each region in the long run. The model is completed by initial conditions:

$$K_i(0) = k_i \quad (13)$$

$$A_i(0) = a_i \quad (14)$$

and non-negativity conditions:

$$C_i, A_i, I_i, K_i, Y_i^j, X_{i,k}^j, X_{k,i}^j \geq 0. \quad (15)$$

3 Decomposed model

Because each region is represented by a distinct and separate utility function, the multi-region model is not operable offhand. Forming a global welfare function is a possible next step towards a solution. The Negishi model represents such a global welfare maximization problem. Negishi (1972) proved the correspondence between the international competitive equilibrium and a welfare optimum ²

$$\max W(U(C_i)) = \sum_{i=1}^n \omega_i \cdot U_i(C_i) \quad (16)$$

²Negishi (1972) characterized the solution as a maximum point of a social welfare function which is a linear combination of utility functions of individual consumers, with the weights in the combination in inverse proportion to the marginal utilities of income.

for a particular set of strictly positive welfare weights ω_i with $\sum \omega_i = 1$ under usual convexity assumptions. Negishi presented a mapping to derive ω_i . This mapping has a fixed point.

However, the Negishi model fails when technological spillovers have to be considered. Leimbach and Edenhofer (2007) have shown that the Negishi algorithm can not consider spillover effects because it is not able to distinguish between export and import prices and quantities. To overcome this problem, we developed an alternative approach to multi-region modeling based on a decomposition of the original optimization problem into single regional optimization modules and a trade module. While the present decomposition resembles that of Leimbach and Edenhofer (2007), the resulting trade module is a completely different one.

3.1 Region module

In each region module, welfare of the considered region only is maximized:

$$\max_{\theta_i} U_i. \quad (17)$$

This decentralized optimization problem is subject to the constraints (2)-(10) and (13)-(15) from the multi-region model in the previous section. Note that the intertemporal budget constraint is no longer part of the optimization problem. Instead, each region is restricted by import and export bounds \bar{X} . These bounds are primarily algorithmic devices generated by the trade module (see below). However, they can be conceived as the net import demand and export offer from other regions that the optimizing region expects to face. Each region can only import what the other regions offer to export to this region:

$$X_{k,i,r}^j = \bar{X}_{k,i,r-1}^j. \quad (18)$$

Analogously, each region has to meet imports that the other regions demand, yielding the export constraint

$$X_{i,k,r}^j = \bar{X}_{i,k,r-1}^j. \quad (19)$$

Despite the fact that \bar{X} represents the right hand side of an equation, we keep to refer to it as a bound.

3.2 Trade module

The purpose of the trade module is to determine the trade flow boundaries \bar{X} . To this end, the trade module is formulated as a single multi-region model. Equally to the Negishi approach, a global objective function combines the welfare functions of all regions by means of welfare weights:

$$\max_{\theta_i, \bar{X}_{i,k}^j} W = \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \cdot U_i. \quad (20)$$

The welfare function is optimized with respect to the factor allocation θ and the export/import quantities \bar{X} . The optimization problem includes constraints (2)-(10) and (13)-(15) for each region with the only difference that the trade flow variables X are replaced by \bar{X} . In order to avoid artificial investment goods exports in anticipation of spillover gains from re-exports, an additional constraint states that each region can only be a net exporter or importer of investment goods:

$$\int_{t=1}^T \sum_{k=1}^n \bar{X}_{i,k}^F(t) dt \cdot \int_{t=1}^T \sum_{k=1}^n \bar{X}_{k,i}^F(t) dt = 0. \quad (21)$$

Indeterminacy could cause simultaneous goods export and import in a single region. This is prevented by the constraint

$$\sum_{k=1}^n \bar{X}_{i,k}^G(t) \cdot \sum_{k=1}^n \bar{X}_{k,i}^G(t) = 0. \quad (22)$$

The trade module represents the problem as a Social Planner problem, generating a solution that assumes the decentralized actors to behave socially optimal.

3.3 Iterative trade algorithm

The decomposed model is solved iteratively by the following steps:

1. Fixing the trade structure.
2. Solve region modules (decentralized model).
3. Extract prices for intertemporal budget constraints.
4. Adjust welfare weights.
5. Solve trade module (Social Planner model) and derive export/import bounds.

In each iteration, the welfare weights of the objective function (20) are updated based on the deviations of the intertemporal trade balances (intertemporal budget constraints) by

$$w_{i,r+1} = w_{i,r} \cdot (1 + h(D_{i,r})). \quad (23)$$

The particular implementation of the function

$$h(D_{i,r}) = \gamma \left[\frac{(\ln(r) + 2)}{\sum_{k=1}^n V_k + V_i} \right] \cdot D_{i,r}(T) \quad (24)$$

follows Leimbach and Toth (2003, p.163), where

$$V_i = \int_{t=1}^T \left[p^G(t) \cdot C_i(t) + \sum_{k=1}^n p^j(t) \cdot (X_{i,k}^j(t) - X_{k,i}^j(t)) \right] dt. \quad (25)$$

Weighting factor V can be interpreted as the economic power of each region; γ is a parameter that facilitates the convergence process. The iterative procedure of adjusting the welfare weights assures that the intertemporal budget constraints are met when the algorithm converges.

Most crucially, computing B and V in Eq. (24) demands for world market prices p^j . These prices are computed as weighted averages of the regional import prices pi and export prices pe :

$$p^j = \left[\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^n (pi_{i,k}^j \cdot X_{i,k}^j + pe_{i,k}^j \cdot X_{i,k}^j)}{\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^n X_{i,k}^j} \right] / 2, \quad i \neq k. \quad (26)$$

Both prices pi and pe represent shadow prices of constraints (18) and (19), which can be described in the form of partial derivatives

$$pi_{k,i}^j = \frac{\partial U_i^*}{\partial \bar{X}_{k,i}^j}, \quad (27)$$

$$pe_{i,k}^j = -\frac{\partial U_i^*}{\partial \bar{X}_{i,k}^j}, \quad (28)$$

with U^* as maximum welfare in iteration r . Import and export prices are specific for each time period and possibly differ from each other. The following relations hold:

- in the non-spillover case (in general)

$$pe_{i,k}^j \neq pi_{i,k}^j, \quad i \neq k$$

$$pe_{i,k}^j \neq pe_{k,i}^j, \quad i \neq k$$

$$pi_{i,k}^j \neq pi_{k,i}^j, \quad i \neq k$$

$$pe_{i,k}^j = pi_{k,i}^j, \quad i \neq k$$

$$\forall i: \quad pe_{i,l}^j = pe_{i,k}^j, \quad l \neq k$$

$$\forall i: \quad pi_{l,i}^j = pi_{k,i}^j, \quad l \neq k$$

- in deviation from above for the spillover case (in general)

$$\exists i, k: \quad pe_{i,k}^F \neq pi_{k,i}^F, \quad i \neq k$$

$$\exists i: \quad pi_{l,i}^F \neq pi_{k,i}^F, \quad l \neq k.$$

In the presence of spillovers, export prices of investment goods do not, in general, correspond to import prices, and the latter may also differ depending on the region from which the capital good is imported. While regional prices are not necessarily expected to converge, convergence, however, can be monitored for the willingness to pay and the willingness to accept (see next section for a detailed justification).

The algorithm proposed in this paper couples the trade module and the regional modules to compute a pareto-optimal solution. The trade module can be conceived as a virtual coordinator that has to compute an optimal allocation of all traded goods. Whereas the Walrasian auctioneer monitors excess of demand over supply (or vice versa) and adjusts prices based on this information, here the coordinator knows the willingness of the trading partners to pay for another unit of import or to accept another unit of export. Based on this, the allocation of exports and imports is adjusted. For the single region, this allocation appears as the foreign demand for and supply of trading goods.

Capturing interactions between the regions by means of the virtual coordinator is an iterative process. Within each iteration, first the region modules, confronted with new export/import bounds, are solved. The region modules provide shadow prices for export and import goods from each region, which are used by the trade




Figure 1: Data flow between modules

module to update welfare weights and export/import bounds. Figure 1 shows the data flow between the modules. This iterative adjustment process ends when it converges, implying that the trade structure does not change anymore, i.e. for all export quantities and prices it holds that

$$\forall j : |\bar{X}_r^j - \bar{X}_{r-1}^j| \leq \epsilon, |p_r^j - p_{r-1}^j| \leq \epsilon. \quad (29)$$

Furthermore, convergence is given by

$$\forall i : |w_{i,r} - w_{i,r-1}| \leq \epsilon \quad (30)$$

and

$$\forall i : |\bar{C}_i - C_i| \leq \epsilon, |\bar{\theta}_i - \theta_i| \leq \epsilon, \quad (31)$$

where $\bar{C}, \bar{\theta}$ denote consumption and capital allocation computed by the trade module, while the analogue quantities C, θ are computed in the regional modules.

It should be noted that the present algorithm operates in an intertemporal model setting which may include transitional dynamics. Figure 2 demonstrates the convergence process for the time trajectory of the consumption good export variable. It results from a two-region setting as analyzed within the model experiments presented in section 5.




Figure 2: Convergence of consumption good export bound

4 Equilibrium solution

Does the solution of the decomposed model and the trade algorithm, respectively, represent an international competitive equilibrium? Based on Ginsburgh and Waelbroeck (1981, p.10), we define an international competitive equilibrium as allocation paths $\theta_i, C_i, X_{i,k}^j$ and $X_{k,i}^j$ supported by non-negative price vectors p^j , such that the following conditions hold:

- (a) equality of exports and imports for traded goods on the international market,
- (b) utility maximization by each region: θ_i, C_i , and X_i^j maximize U_i subject to the following constraints:
 - (b1) feasibility of produced quantities ($Y_i^j \leq Y_i^j(\theta_i)$),
 - (b2) intertemporal budget constraint ($D_i(T) = 0$),
 - (b3) availability of quantities on the domestic market ($I_i \geq 0, C_i \geq 0$).

The introduction of the export and import bounds (Eq. 18 and Eq. 19) in the regional module of the decomposed model is in contrast to the maximization problem as described in the definition of the competitive equilibrium where imports and

exports can be freely chosen to optimize utility. Therefore, verifying that the trade algorithm computes an equilibrium solution requests for mathematically proving that the export/import quantities and prices determined by the trade module indeed respect conditions (a) and (b).

Please note that this is not a corollary of Negishi's theorems due to the following reasons. Negishi considers trade in consumption goods only, does not take bilateral trade into account and does not distinguish import and export prices. Capital goods trade and distinct export and import prices are, however, necessary to consider technological spillovers.

We now demonstrate the required properties for the case without spillover externalities (Appendix A provides a concise analytical deduction).

Condition (a) is obviously met by definition of the import/export variables.

Condition (b) requires to show that for the prices p^F, p^G entailed by the result of the iterative algorithm (which is a fixed point of the decomposed model), the regions in the decentralized basic model, which is not restricted by trade bounds, choose exactly the same imports and exports as in the fixed point to obtain maximal welfare. By the basic model we mean optimization problem Eq. (17) s.t. (3-15), (21), (22). In this model, the budget balance has to be considered explicitly by introducing new costate variables π_i which appear to evolve according to $\pi_i(t) = \pi_i(0)e^{\rho t}$.

From the first order conditions of the trade module it can be derived that

$$\forall i, k = 1, \dots, n : \frac{C_i}{C_k} = \frac{w_i}{w_k} \quad (32)$$

and

$$\forall i, k = 1, \dots, n : \frac{\bar{\lambda}_k}{\lambda_i} = \frac{w_i}{w_k}, \quad (33)$$

where $\bar{\lambda}$ represents the shadow price of capital. If the algorithm converges, the intertemporal budget constraint is met and θ_i and C_i are identical in the regional and the trade module.

It remains to show that these results indeed meet the first order conditions of the optimization problem of the basic model. In the basic model, capital and consumption trade is chosen such that

$$\pi_i p^G = \frac{1}{C_i} \quad (34)$$

and

$$\pi_i p^F = \hat{\lambda}_i, \quad (35)$$

where $\hat{\lambda}_i$ denotes the shadow prices of capital in the basic model. This means that prices equal marginal utility, corrected by a factor representing the budget constraint. When selecting $\pi_i(0) = w_i^{-1}$, it can be shown (see Appendix A) that this implies the same values for the control variables of the basic model as the trade algorithm computes. The last equality is an intertemporal analogue to the Negishi approach, where the inverse of Negishi weights is equal to the marginal utilities of income.

We have thus shown that the trade algorithm computes an international competitive equilibrium in the non-spillover case, if it converges. A proof of convergence is beyond the scope of this paper. We instead provide numerical evidence.

Alternatively, to verify whether the numerically approximated fixed point indeed represents an international competitive equilibrium, a numerical test can be performed for each experiment. After the trade algorithm has finished, for each region the basic model is solved numerically with the prices p^j in the intertemporal budget constraint as given by the trade algorithm. Similar to the analytical approach above, it is compared whether the optimal import and export quantities reproduce the bounds of the trade algorithm. All experiments without the externality pass this test.

Calling $\pi_i p_i^j$ the importers' i willingness to pay (WTP), and $\pi_k p_k^j$ the exporters' k willingness to accept (WTA) good j , the above results imply that WTP and WTA converge during iteration (if the whole algorithm converges), giving the notion of world market prices a clear meaning. Figure 3 shows an example for convergence of both. Results are based on numerical experiments with a two-region setting as analyzed in the next section.

However, the above conclusion on achieving an equilibrium solution is only reliable for the non-spillover case. Spillover externalities (Eq. 10) of the analyzed type generate increasing returns to scale associated with non-convexities and thus causing multiple local optima. In particular, the asymmetry of spillover effects, which occurs if a region imports investment goods from a region with higher level of productivity, prevents convergence of the willingness to accept and the willingness to pay.




Figure 3: Convergence of the willingness to pay (WTP) and the willingness to accept (WTA) for a selected time period (COG: consumption good, CAG: capital good)

To represent this formally, spillover effects lead to an additional shadow price μ_i , which sums future utility gains of improved productivity due to imported capital goods. Then, the resulting prices are

$$pe_{i,k}^F = \lambda_i \quad (36)$$

and

$$pi_{k,i}^F = \lambda_i + \mu_i \frac{\partial \dot{A}_i}{\partial X_{k,i}^F}, \quad (37)$$

where $\mu_i > 0$ if region i imports from region k with a higher productivity level. \dot{A}_i represents the productivity change (cf. Eq. 10). As long as the productivity gradient remains and $\mu_i > 0$, the utility gains from import (and therefore the WTP) are always higher than from exports (and therefore the WTA). If the world market price is between the WTA and the WTP, we come up with a paradox situation where the region has to pay less than it is willing to pay for demands, but gets more than wanted for sales. It would thus aim at selling all capital it has, and at the same time imports all capital that is available on the market. If there is a second region in this situation, it is unclear how a market mechanism can resolve the conflict of allocating all available capital. It is, moreover, impossible to speak of an equilibrium price if regions want to sell and buy for different prices. In our model, this problem is avoided by constraint (21) that requires each region to

choose between being an exporter or an importer.

However, it remains open whether under this constraint the trade algorithm with positive spillover externalities produces a competitive equilibrium. We again performed the before mentioned numerical test. The test fails in a first instance. When the externality is internalized within the decision-making process of the decomposed model (Social Planner mode), the equivalence between the solution of the decentralized basic model and the Social Planner solution disappears. The decentralized agents do not behave socially optimal. A region which imports capital and receives the technological spillover under the trade algorithm, may use the high price for capital goods to export capital goods by its own and forgoing the technological spillovers in the basic model solution. This could increase its welfare, but it implies a trade structure that is certainly not optimal from the other regions' point of view. As suggested by economic theory, a tax or subsidy is needed to achieve the social pareto-optimum in a decentralized model. We do this by defining a market price \tilde{p}^F as the weighted average of the export prices pe^F only (compare Eq. 26):

$$\tilde{p}^F = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^n pe_{i,k}^F \cdot X_{i,k}^F}{\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^n X_{i,k}^F}, \quad i \neq k. \quad (38)$$

In addition, we define a subsidy $\sigma_{i,k}$ that represents a mark-up on the price of capital goods exported by the technologically advanced regions. For the importing regions, this represents a tax. The intertemporal budget constraint that the decentralized agents have to meet changes to

$$\int_{t=1}^T \left[p^G \cdot \sum_{k=1}^n (X_{i,k}^G - X_{k,i}^G) + (\tilde{p}^F + \sigma_{i,k}) \cdot \sum_{k=1}^n (X_{i,k}^F - X_{k,i}^F) \right] dt = 0. \quad (39)$$

It is beyond the scope of this paper to find a general closed form expression for the optimal subsidy. For a two-region setting (for which we made numerical experiments), however, we can provide

$$\sigma_{i,k} = \begin{cases} p^F - \tilde{p}^F & : A_i < A_k \\ 0 & : A_i \geq A_k. \end{cases} \quad (40)$$

as an optimal subsidy. With this approach, the spillover experiments pass the above numerical optimality test. This supports the extended scope of application of the trade algorithm.

5 Model experiments

In this section, we apply the model introduced in section 3 and the developed trade algorithm in order to analyze the impact of technological spillovers on economic growth and the trade structure. We run the model within a stylized conventional 2 goods x 2 factors x 2 regions setting³. All results can be interpreted in a qualitative sense only.

Technological spillovers are subject of rational expectations. The focus is on spillovers that increase the productivity in the consumption goods sector. First, we analyze a setting where both regions differ in their productivity level A only.




Figure 4: Impact of technological spillovers (SP: spillover case; NSP: non-spillover case; COG: consumption goods; CAG: capital goods; IR,DR: regions)

From an economic point of view, the question arises whether there are wel-

³All modules are programmed in GAMS (www.gams.com) and numerically solved with the non-linear programming solver CONOPT3. The programs are available from the authors upon request. For the default parameters and initial values see Appendix B.

fare gains for both regions and what changes result in the trade structure. Figure 4 illustrates some of the impacts⁴. For presentation reasons, the two regions are labeled by IR and DR in the Figures. Under a traditional free trade scenario, region IR, which has higher productivity in the production of the consumption good ($a_{IR} = 2.0$, $a_{DR} = 1.2$), will export the consumption good and extend its production by capital good imports. This picture changes when technological spillovers are taken into account. According to the optimal trade structure, region IR exports the investment good and region DR exports the consumption good. The dynamics of the current account is also reversed. Whereas DR starts with a trade surplus in the non-spillover case, a trade balance deficit comes with the optimal solution within the spillover scenario. The consumption path in Figure 4 indicates gains in consumption for both regions.

Consumption gains in both regions increase with time. There are yet significant differences in the patterns of gains. DR gains in all periods. IR, in contrast, loses in initial periods. Consumption and welfare gains of DR are directly linked to productivity increases caused by technological spillovers. Positive feedbacks to IR, while on a moderate level only, are mainly due to higher prices of investment goods. Figure 5 demonstrates the price differences between the spillover case and the non-spillover case. Differences exist for the investment goods only. Higher prices of investment goods occur due to the anticipation of the spillover effect and the willingness of DR to pay a higher price. In order to meet the intertemporal trade balance, DR compensates the expansion of investment goods imports (compared to the non-spillover case) increasingly by consumption goods exports.

Due to the discounting effect, consumption gains of region IR do not manifest in an equal increase in welfare. While IR increases its welfare in the spillover case compared to the autarky case by 0.5%, it loses compared to the non-spillover case by 0.6% (DR increases welfare by 17.0%). IR faces weakened terms of trade. As IR is exporter of consumption goods in the non-spillover case (see Figure 4), it first suffers from a decrease of relative prices of consumption goods. Becoming an exporter of investment goods and benefiting from the price increase can not completely compensate this terms-of-trade effect.

However, the level of positive feedbacks from the spillover effects on the capital-

⁴The current account is defined as intertemporal trade balance $D_i(t)$ based on Eq. (11).




Figure 5: Price levels of tradeable goods (SP: spillover case, NSP: non-spillover case, COG: consumption goods, CAG: capital goods).

exporting region heavily depends on the existing trade structure and diversity of regional characteristics. Within a scenario where IR is not only distinguished by higher productivity in the consumption goods sector but also by

- higher productivity in the investment good sector ,
- higher capital intensity,
- and pure rate of time preference,

IR increases its welfare compared to the non-spillover scenario (e.g. in the scenario with higher capital intensity by 0.7%). Higher capital intensity is implemented as a reduction of exogenous labor supply to 60%. Higher productivity is implemented by increasing parameter κ_{IR} from 0.16 to 0.18. For these scenarios, the change of consumption gains is demonstrated in Figure 6. In general, benefits occur for all cases where IR is an exporter of investment goods already in the non-spillover scenario. While this is accompanied by a higher growth rate of percentage consumption gains, it does not change the impact pattern of technological spillovers on consumption.

Besides the regional differences, the level of gains mainly depends on the specification of parameter β (spillover intensity). There is no empirical foundation for




Figure 6: Per capita consumption gains from technological spillovers (ref - Spillover reference scenario, hp - higher productivity of IR in investment goods sector , hki - higher capital intensity in IR)

β so far. We carried out sensitivity analyses with respect to the external effect. The spillover coefficient β was varied within the interval $[0, 1.6]$. Smooth changes of welfare and per capita consumption over a wide range (see Figure 7 and Figure 8) demonstrate robustness of the approach again .

6 Conclusions

We presented an alternative approach to multi-region modeling based on a novel trade algorithm. This approach is applicable in an intertemporal optimization framework. On the one hand, it shares some basic features with the approach of Leimbach and Edenhofer (2007), on the other hand, it includes a completely different trade module. Due to its similarity with the Negishi approach, this new approach is more transparent and convincing in the way it derives a pareto-optimal solution. This is further supported by an in-depth analysis of the analytical properties of the trade algorithm.

The algorithm presented in this paper is distinguished by its ability to deal with spillover externalities numerically. It is applicable to other types of externalities as well. First experiences exist in analyzing external effects from greenhouse gas emissions. Non-convexities induced by the external effects may prevent the algo-




Figure 7: Per capita consumption sensitivity on spillover intensity in DR




Figure 8: Per capita consumption sensitivity on spillover intensity in IR

rithm from finding the global optimum. Nevertheless, the convergence process in finding the local optimum was demonstrated to be quite robust. Further research is needed to proof general validity of the algorithm for cases with externalities.

Numerical experiments show that in the presence of technological spillovers, the optimal trade structure may reverse. The most significant spillover effect is the primary productivity-increasing effect for the capital importing region. Secondary price and terms of trade effects will affect the capital-exporting region as well. Benefits for that region are the higher the more it would export investment goods already in the absence of technological spillovers. This would guarantee that this region benefits completely from higher prices of the investment goods that occur in the presence of technological spillovers. Higher capital stock per capita, higher productivity in the investment goods sector and a lower pure rate of time preference increase the benefits of the spillover effect for the capital-exporting region.

Acknowledgement

We would like to thank Ottmar Edenhofer, Sylvie Marchand, Kai Lessmann, Robert Marschinski and Tom Rutherford for fruitful discussions and valuable aid.

A Analytical properties of the trade algorithm

It is shown in this appendix that the trade algorithm produces a competitive equilibrium if it converges. The strategy is as follows. At first we derive some analytical features of the regional module (for given import- and export bounds) and of the trade module (for given welfare weights), assuming an interior solution. When the algorithm converges, both modules compute coherent results. We show that these results respect the usual necessary conditions for an optimal solution of the basic model. For clarity, all variables of the trade module are indicated by a bar $\bar{\cdot}$, those of the basic model by a hat $\hat{\cdot}$, while variables of the regional module have no particular accents.

A.1 Regional module for the case without spillovers

We first derive properties of the optimal paths of the regional modules where import and export bounds \bar{X}_i^j are prescribed by the trade module. Therefore, the bounds are parameters in the optimization problems of the regional modules. The derivative of optimal utility with respect to these parameters is used by the trade module for the next iteration (cf. Eqs. 27,28). Since we concentrate on interior solutions in the sense that $I_i > 0$, the current-value Hamiltonian L_i for the regional module reads

$$L_i = \ln(C_i) + \lambda_i(Y_i^F - \Delta \bar{X}_i^F - \delta_i K_i), \quad (41)$$

where, for convenience, net exports of region i are denoted by

$$\Delta \bar{X}_i^j = \sum_k (\bar{X}_{i,k}^j - \bar{X}_{k,i}^j). \quad (42)$$

Note that for the condition $C_i \geq 0$ no Kuhn-Tucker parameter is needed due to the logarithmic form of the utility function. The costate variable λ_i represents the shadow price for capital. The associated equation of motion for the shadow price is

$$\dot{\lambda}_i = \lambda_i \left(\rho + \delta_i - \frac{\partial Y_i^F}{\partial K_i} \right) - \frac{1}{C_i} \frac{\partial Y_i^G}{\partial K_i}, \quad (43)$$

together with the transversality condition $\lambda(T) = 0$.

By the envelope theorem, the optimal utility U_i^* resulting from an optimal allocation path θ_i depends on the parameters $\bar{X}_{i,k}$ by $\partial U_i^* / \partial \bar{X}_{i,k} = \partial L_i^* / \partial \bar{X}_{i,k}$, if

the latter is evaluated on the optimal production path. Therefore,

$$pe_{i,k}^G = -\frac{\partial U_i^*}{\partial \bar{X}_{i,k}^G} = -\frac{1}{C_i}, \quad (44)$$

$$pe_{i,k}^F = -\frac{\partial U_i^*}{\partial \bar{X}_{i,k}^F} = -\lambda_i. \quad (45)$$

A.2 Trade module

For the trade module, the Hamiltonian is expanded to

$$L = \sum_i w_i \ln(\bar{C}_i) + \sum_i \bar{\lambda}_i (Y_i^F - \Delta \bar{X}_i^F - \delta_i \bar{K}_i). \quad (46)$$

Based on the costate equation

$$\dot{\bar{\lambda}}_i = \bar{\lambda}_i (\rho + \delta_i - \frac{\partial Y_i^F}{\partial \bar{K}_i}) - \frac{w_i}{\bar{C}_i} \frac{\partial Y_i^G}{\partial \bar{K}_i}, \quad (47)$$

with the transversality condition $\bar{\lambda}_i(T) = 0$, the trade bounds are computed from $\max_{\bar{X}_{k,i}^j, \bar{X}_{i,k}^j, \bar{\theta}_i} L$. Hence, the optimal allocation $\bar{\theta}_i$ is determined from

$$-\frac{\partial Y_i^G}{\partial \bar{\theta}_i} \frac{w_i}{\bar{C}_i} = \bar{\lambda}_i \frac{\partial Y_i^F}{\partial \bar{\theta}_i}. \quad (48)$$

The derivatives of the Hamiltonian with respect to export and import bounds are

$$\frac{\partial L}{\partial \bar{X}_{i,k}^G} = -\frac{\partial L}{\partial \bar{X}_{k,i}^G} = \frac{w_k}{\bar{C}_k} - \frac{w_i}{\bar{C}_i}, \quad (49)$$

and

$$\frac{\partial L}{\partial \bar{X}_{i,k}^F} = -\frac{\partial L}{\partial \bar{X}_{k,i}^F} = \bar{\lambda}_k - \bar{\lambda}_i. \quad (50)$$

Setting Eq. (49) to zero describes an equation system for all net exports of the consumption good since $\bar{C}_i = Y_i^G - \Delta \bar{X}_i^G$ by definition. From its solution, import and export quantities are uniquely determined by the constraint (22). We can also derive the equation

$$\forall i, k = 1, \dots, n : \frac{\bar{C}_i}{\bar{C}_k} = \frac{w_i}{w_k}. \quad (51)$$

For the trade of investment goods the situation is more complicated, since Eq. (50) does not depend directly on $\bar{X}_{i,k}^F$. In the steady-state solution capital changes $\dot{\bar{K}}_i$ are chosen such that

$$\forall i, k = 1, \dots, n : \bar{\lambda}_i \equiv \bar{\lambda}_k. \quad (52)$$

In the following, we concentrate on that case, justifying to introduce the variable $\bar{\lambda} = \bar{\lambda}_i = \bar{\lambda}_k$ for the solution of the costate equation.

We now put together the results for the regional and trade module in the fixed point of the algorithm. There, $\theta_i = \bar{\theta}_i$, $C_i = \bar{C}_i$, and the intertemporal budget is balanced. We now prove the important equation

$$\forall i = 1, \dots, n : \bar{\lambda} \equiv w_i \lambda_i. \quad (53)$$

Define $\bar{\lambda} = w_i \lambda_i$. Then, by Eq. (43)

$$\dot{\bar{\lambda}}_i = w_i \dot{\lambda}_i = w_i \lambda_i (\rho + \delta_i - \frac{\partial Y_i^F}{\partial K_i}) - \frac{w_i}{C_i} \frac{\partial Y_i^G}{\partial K_i}, \quad (54)$$

which in the fixed point equals (by definition of $\bar{\lambda}$)

$$\bar{\lambda} (\rho + \delta_i - \frac{\partial Y_i^F}{\partial K_i}) - \frac{w_i}{C_i} \frac{\partial Y_i^G}{\partial K_i}, \quad (55)$$

which obviously solves Eq. (47). Trivially, $\bar{\lambda}(T) = w_i \lambda_i(T) = 0$. Therefore, $\bar{\lambda}$ is indeed the shadow price computed by the trade module. This shows that the shadow prices for capital in the regions only differ by a constant coefficient which is equivalent to its welfare weight.

A.3 Basic model

We will now show that the trade algorithm computes an international competitive equilibrium if it converges. This is the case when the optimal trade flows of the basic model reproduce the results of the trade algorithm. We demonstrate this by validating that the dynamics induced by the solution of the algorithm, namely

$$\hat{\theta}_i = \theta_i, \quad \hat{X}_i^j = \bar{X}_i^j, \quad (56)$$

and consequently $\hat{C}_i = C_i$, is consistent with the necessary optimality conditions of the basic model. Note that the Pontryagin maximum principle states that the evolution of state and costate variables, brought about by an optimal control path, defines an optimization problem for every time step, which is solved by the control variables. We verify this for the control variables computed by the trade module. Again, we concentrate on interior solutions.

The Hamiltonian of the basic model is

$$L_i = \ln(\hat{C}_i) + \hat{\lambda}_i (Y_i^F - \Delta \hat{X}_i^F - \delta \hat{K}_i) + \hat{\pi}_i (p^F \Delta \hat{X}_i^F + p^G \Delta \hat{X}_i^G). \quad (57)$$

The new costate variable $\hat{\pi}_i$ corresponds to the budget balance equation (cf. Eq. 11)

$$\dot{\hat{D}}_i = p^F(t)\Delta\hat{X}_i^F(t) + p^G(t)\Delta\hat{X}_k^G(t), \quad (58)$$

and $\hat{D}_i(T) = 0$. Note that the latter is always satisfied if quantities and prices are determined from the convergent trade module. We assume that world market prices are determined by $p^F(t) = e^{-\rho t} \frac{1}{n} \sum_k w_k \lambda_k(t)$ and $p^G(t) = e^{-\rho t} \frac{1}{n} \sum_k \frac{w_k}{C_k}$ in the fixed point of the trade algorithm. The associated costate equation is solved by

$$\hat{\pi}_i(t) = \hat{\pi}_i(0)e^{\rho t}, \quad (59)$$

where $\hat{\pi}_i(0)$ has to be chosen appropriately. The costate equation for $\hat{\lambda}_i$ evolves according to

$$\dot{\hat{\lambda}}_i = \hat{\lambda}_i(\rho + \delta_i - \frac{\partial Y_i^F}{\partial K_i}) - \frac{1}{\hat{C}_i} \frac{\partial Y_i^G}{\partial K_i}, \quad (60)$$

and $\hat{\lambda}_i(T) = 0$, which is identical to the costate equation for the regional module (see Eq. 43). Note that, due to convergence, also $\hat{C}_i = C_i$, $\hat{\theta}_i = \theta_i$ (cf. Eq. 31) and $\hat{K}_i = K_i$, such that we conclude

$$\hat{\lambda}_i \equiv \lambda_i. \quad (61)$$

So far we have only determined how the state and costate equations of the basic model evolve if the control variables are chosen as in the result of the trade algorithm. Now it has to be verified that the control variables also maximize the Hamiltonian of the basic model. We claim that choosing

$$\hat{\pi}_i(0) = w_i^{-1} \quad (62)$$

is appropriate. This is an intertemporal analogue to the Negishi approach, where the inverse of Negishi weights is equal to the marginal utilities of income.

By differentiating the Hamiltonian with respect to the control variable $\hat{\theta}_i$, we obtain the first order condition

$$0 = \hat{\lambda}_i \frac{\partial Y_i^F}{\partial \theta_i} - \frac{\partial Y_i^G}{\partial \theta_i} \frac{1}{\hat{C}_i} = \lambda_i \frac{\partial Y_i^F}{\partial \theta_i} - \frac{\partial Y_i^G}{\partial \theta_i} \frac{1}{C_i}, \quad (63)$$

where the second equation is due to Eq. (61) and $\hat{C}_i = C_i$. This equation is obviously the same as Eq. (48), such that $\hat{\theta}_i$ indeed maximizes L_i . For import and export quantities, the first order conditions are

$$\frac{\partial L}{\partial \hat{X}_{i,k}^G} = -\frac{\partial L}{\partial \hat{X}_{k,i}^G} = \hat{\pi}_i p^G - \frac{1}{\hat{C}_i} = 0, \quad (64)$$

and

$$\frac{\partial L}{\partial \hat{X}_{i,k}^F} = -\frac{\partial L}{\partial \hat{X}_{k,i}^F} = \hat{\pi}_i p^F - \hat{\lambda}_i = 0. \quad (65)$$

Due to Eq. (51),

$$\hat{\pi}_i p^F - \hat{\lambda}_i = \hat{\pi}_i e^{-\rho t} \frac{1}{n} \sum_k \frac{w_k}{C_k} - \frac{1}{C_i} = \hat{\pi}_i(0) \frac{w_i}{C_i} - \frac{1}{C_i}. \quad (66)$$

Since $\hat{\pi}_i(0)w_i = 1$, the first order condition for trade with the consumption good is satisfied. By using Eq. (61) we also obtain

$$\hat{\pi}_i p^F - \hat{\lambda}_i = \hat{\pi}_i e^{-\rho t} \frac{1}{n} \sum_j w_j \lambda_j - \lambda_i \quad (67)$$

for the capital good. This is, by Eq. (53), equivalent to

$$\hat{\pi}_i(0) \frac{1}{n} \sum_j w_j \frac{\bar{\lambda}}{w_j} - \frac{\bar{\lambda}}{w_i} = \hat{\pi}_i(0) \bar{\lambda} - \frac{\bar{\lambda}}{w_i}, \quad (68)$$

and vanishes again due to $\hat{\pi}_i(0) = w_i^{-1}$. We can thus conclude that the dynamics of the basic model induced by the trade structure of the trade algorithm is consistent with an optimal selection of control variables in the decentralized case.

As a by-product we have derived an interpretation for the welfare weights. It is one corollary that the regional shadow prices for capital λ_i differ from the world market price only by the ratio $\hat{\pi}_i$, which is proportional to w_i^{-1} .

B Default parameters and initial values

| | | |
|------------------|---|----------------|
| ρ | : | 0.03 |
| δ | : | 0.08 |
| β | : | 0.4 |
| ζ | : | 0.4 |
| α_{IR} | : | 0.33 |
| α_{DR} | : | 0.33 |
| κ_{IR} | : | 0.16 |
| κ_{DR} | : | 0.16 |
| ϕ | : | 0.9 |
| k_{IR} | : | 4 |
| k_{DR} | : | 4 |
| a_{IR} | : | 2.0 |
| a_{DR} | : | 1.2 |
| $L_{IR}(0)$ | : | 1.0 (constant) |
| $L_{DR}(0)$ | : | 1.0 (constant) |
| First iteration: | | |
| \bar{X}_{IR}^j | : | 0.0 |
| \bar{X}_{DR}^j | : | 0.0 |
| w_{IR} | : | 1.0 |
| w_{DR} | : | 1.0 |

References

- [1] Alcamo, J. (1994). IMAGE 2.0 - Integrated Modeling of Global Climate Change, Kluwer, Dordrecht.
- [2] Barretto, L., Klaassen, G. (2004). Emissions Trading and the Role of Learning-by-doing in the "Bottom-up" Energy-Systems ERIS Model. International Journal of Energy Technology and Policy 2, 70-95.
- [3] Coe, D.T., Helpman, E., Hoffmaister, A.W. (1997). North-South R&D spillovers. Economic Journal, 107, 134-149.
- [4] Farmer, R., Lahiri, A. (2005). A two-country model of endogenous growth. Review of Economic Dynamics, 8, 68-88.
- [5] Ginsburgh, V.A., Waelbroeck, J.L. (1981). Activity Analysis and General Equilibrium Modelling. North-Holland, Amsterdam.
- [6] Greiner, A., Semmler, W. (2002). Externalities of investment, education and economic growth. Economic Modelling, 19, 709-724.
- [7] Grossman, G.M., Helpman E. (1991). Innovation and Growth in the Global Economy. Cambridge, MA, MIT Press.
- [8] IEA (2006). World Energy Outlook. International Energy Agency, Paris.
- [9] Kumar, A., Shubik, M. (2004). Variations on the Theme of Scarf's Counter-Example. Computational Economics, 24, 1-19.
- [10] Lee, J.-W. (1995). Capital goods import and long-run growth. Journal of Development Economics, 48, 91-110.
- [11] Leimbach, M., Toth, F.L. (2003). Economic Development and Emission Control over the Long Term: The ICLIPS Aggregated Economic Model. Climatic Change, 56, 139-165.
- [12] Leimbach, M., Edenhofer, O. (2007). Technological spillovers within multi-region models: Intertemporal optimization beyond the Negishi approach. Economic Modelling, 24, 272-294.

- [13] Löschel, A. (2002). Technological change in economic models of environmental policy: a survey. *Ecological Economics* 43, 105-126.
- [14] Luenberger, D.G., Maxfield, R.R. (1995). Computing Economic Equilibria Using Benefit and Surplus Functions. *Computational Economics*, 8, 47-64.
- [15] Manne, A.S., Mendelsohn, M., Richels, R. (1995). MERGE - A Model for Evaluating Regional and Global Effects of GHG Reduction Policies. *Energy Policy*, 23, 17-34.
- [16] Manne, A.S., Richels, R. (1995). The Greenhouse Debate: Economic Efficiency, Burden Sharing and Hedging Strategies. *The Energy Journal*, 16, 1-37.
- [17] Manne, A.S., Rutherford, T.F. (1994). International Trade, Capital Flows and Sectoral Analysis: Formulation and Solution of Intertemporal Equilibrium Models, in: Cooper, W.W., Whinston, A.B. (Eds.), *New Directions in Computational Economics*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, pp. 191-205.
- [18] Oniki, H., Uzawa, H. (1965). Patterns of Trade and Investment in a Dynamic Model of International Trade. *Review of Economic Studies*, 32, 15-38.
- [19] Negishi, T. (1972). *General Equilibrium Theory and International Trade*. North-Holland, Amsterdam.
- [20] Nordhaus, W.D. (1992). An Optimal Transition Path for Controlling Greenhouse Gases. *Science* 28, 1315-1319.
- [21] Nordhaus, W.D., Yang, Z. (1996). A Regional Dynamic General-Equilibrium Model of Alternative Climate-Change Strategies. *American Economic Review*, 86, 741-765.
- [22] Romer, P.M. (2006). Endogenous technological change. *Journal of Political Economy*, 98, S71-S102.
- [23] Samuelson, P.A. (1952). Spatial Price Equilibrium and Linear Programming. *American Economic Review*, 42, 283-303.

- [24] Scarf, H. (1984). The Computation of Equilibrium Prices, in: Scarf, H., Shoven, J. (Eds.), *Applied General Equilibrium Analysis*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- [25] Stiglitz, J.E. (1970). Factor Price Equalization in a Dynamic Economy. *The Journal of Political Economy*, 78, 456-488.

PIK Report-Reference:

- No. 1 3. Deutsche Klimatagung, Potsdam 11.-14. April 1994
Tagungsband der Vorträge und Poster (April 1994)
- No. 2 Extremer Nordsommer '92
Meteorologische Ausprägung, Wirkungen auf naturnahe und vom Menschen beeinflusste Ökosysteme, gesellschaftliche Perzeption und situationsbezogene politisch-administrative bzw. individuelle Maßnahmen (Vol. 1 - Vol. 4)
H.-J. Schellnhuber, W. Enke, M. Flechsig (Mai 1994)
- No. 3 Using Plant Functional Types in a Global Vegetation Model
W. Cramer (September 1994)
- No. 4 Interannual variability of Central European climate parameters and their relation to the large-scale circulation
P. C. Werner (Oktober 1994)
- No. 5 Coupling Global Models of Vegetation Structure and Ecosystem Processes - An Example from Arctic and Boreal Ecosystems
M. Plöchl, W. Cramer (Oktober 1994)
- No. 6 The use of a European forest model in North America: A study of ecosystem response to climate gradients
H. Bugmann, A. Solomon (Mai 1995)
- No. 7 A comparison of forest gap models: Model structure and behaviour
H. Bugmann, Y. Xiaodong, M. T. Sykes, Ph. Martin, M. Lindner, P. V. Desanker, S. G. Cumming (Mai 1995)
- No. 8 Simulating forest dynamics in complex topography using gridded climatic data
H. Bugmann, A. Fischlin (Mai 1995)
- No. 9 Application of two forest succession models at sites in Northeast Germany
P. Lasch, M. Lindner (Juni 1995)
- No. 10 Application of a forest succession model to a continentality gradient through Central Europe
M. Lindner, P. Lasch, W. Cramer (Juni 1995)
- No. 11 Possible Impacts of global warming on tundra and boreal forest ecosystems - Comparison of some biogeochemical models
M. Plöchl, W. Cramer (Juni 1995)
- No. 12 Wirkung von Klimaveränderungen auf Waldökosysteme
P. Lasch, M. Lindner (August 1995)
- No. 13 MOSES - Modellierung und Simulation ökologischer Systeme - Eine Sprachbeschreibung mit Anwendungsbeispielen
V. Wenzel, M. Kücken, M. Flechsig (Dezember 1995)
- No. 14 TOYS - Materials to the Brandenburg biosphere model / GAIA
Part 1 - Simple models of the "Climate + Biosphere" system
Yu. Svirezhev (ed.), A. Block, W. v. Bloh, V. Brovkin, A. Ganopolski, V. Petoukhov, V. Razzhevaikin (Januar 1996)
- No. 15 Änderung von Hochwassercharakteristiken im Zusammenhang mit Klimaänderungen - Stand der Forschung
A. Bronstert (April 1996)
- No. 16 Entwicklung eines Instruments zur Unterstützung der klimapolitischen Entscheidungsfindung
M. Leimbach (Mai 1996)
- No. 17 Hochwasser in Deutschland unter Aspekten globaler Veränderungen - Bericht über das DFG-Rundgespräch am 9. Oktober 1995 in Potsdam
A. Bronstert (ed.) (Juni 1996)
- No. 18 Integrated modelling of hydrology and water quality in mesoscale watersheds
V. Krysanova, D.-I. Müller-Wohlfeil, A. Becker (Juli 1996)
- No. 19 Identification of vulnerable subregions in the Elbe drainage basin under global change impact
V. Krysanova, D.-I. Müller-Wohlfeil, W. Cramer, A. Becker (Juli 1996)
- No. 20 Simulation of soil moisture patterns using a topography-based model at different scales
D.-I. Müller-Wohlfeil, W. Lahmer, W. Cramer, V. Krysanova (Juli 1996)
- No. 21 International relations and global climate change
D. Sprinz, U. Luterbacher (1st ed. July, 2nd ed. December 1996)
- No. 22 Modelling the possible impact of climate change on broad-scale vegetation structure - examples from Northern Europe
W. Cramer (August 1996)

- No. 23 A method to estimate the statistical security for cluster separation
F.-W. Gerstengarbe, P.C. Werner (Oktober 1996)
- No. 24 Improving the behaviour of forest gap models along drought gradients
H. Bugmann, W. Cramer (Januar 1997)
- No. 25 The development of climate scenarios
P.C. Werner, F.-W. Gerstengarbe (Januar 1997)
- No. 26 On the Influence of Southern Hemisphere Winds on North Atlantic Deep Water Flow
S. Rahmstorf, M. H. England (Januar 1977)
- No. 27 Integrated systems analysis at PIK: A brief epistemology
A. Bronstert, V. Brovkin, M. Krol, M. Lüdeke, G. Petschel-Held, Yu. Svirezhev, V. Wenzel (März 1997)
- No. 28 Implementing carbon mitigation measures in the forestry sector - A review
M. Lindner (Mai 1997)
- No. 29 Implementation of a Parallel Version of a Regional Climate Model
M. Kücken, U. Schättler (Oktober 1997)
- No. 30 Comparing global models of terrestrial net primary productivity (NPP): Overview and key results
W. Cramer, D. W. Kicklighter, A. Bondeau, B. Moore III, G. Churkina, A. Ruimy, A. Schloss, participants of "Potsdam '95" (Oktober 1997)
- No. 31 Comparing global models of terrestrial net primary productivity (NPP): Analysis of the seasonal behaviour of NPP, LAI, FPAR along climatic gradients across ecotones
A. Bondeau, J. Kaduk, D. W. Kicklighter, participants of "Potsdam '95" (Oktober 1997)
- No. 32 Evaluation of the physiologically-based forest growth model FORSANA
R. Grote, M. Erhard, F. Suckow (November 1997)
- No. 33 Modelling the Global Carbon Cycle for the Past and Future Evolution of the Earth System
S. Franck, K. Kossacki, Ch. Bounama (Dezember 1997)
- No. 34 Simulation of the global bio-geophysical interactions during the Last Glacial Maximum
C. Kubatzki, M. Claussen (Januar 1998)
- No. 35 CLIMBER-2: A climate system model of intermediate complexity. Part I: Model description and performance for present climate
V. Petoukhov, A. Ganopolski, V. Brovkin, M. Claussen, A. Eliseev, C. Kubatzki, S. Rahmstorf (Februar 1998)
- No. 36 Geocybernetics: Controlling a rather complex dynamical system under uncertainty
H.-J. Schellnhuber, J. Kropp (Februar 1998)
- No. 37 Untersuchung der Auswirkungen erhöhter atmosphärischer CO₂-Konzentrationen auf Weizenbestände des Free-Air Carbondioxid Enrichment (FACE) - Experimentes Maricopa (USA)
T. Kartschall, S. Grossman, P. Michaelis, F. Wechsung, J. Gräfe, K. Waloszczyk, G. Wechsung, E. Blum, M. Blum (Februar 1998)
- No. 38 Die Berücksichtigung natürlicher Störungen in der Vegetationsdynamik verschiedener Klimagebiete
K. Thonicke (Februar 1998)
- No. 39 Decadal Variability of the Thermohaline Ocean Circulation
S. Rahmstorf (März 1998)
- No. 40 SANA-Project results and PIK contributions
K. Bellmann, M. Erhard, M. Flechsig, R. Grote, F. Suckow (März 1998)
- No. 41 Umwelt und Sicherheit: Die Rolle von Umweltschwellenwerten in der empirisch-quantitativen Modellierung
D. F. Sprinz (März 1998)
- No. 42 Reversing Course: Germany's Response to the Challenge of Transboundary Air Pollution
D. F. Sprinz, A. Wahl (März 1998)
- No. 43 Modellierung des Wasser- und Stofftransportes in großen Einzugsgebieten. Zusammenstellung der Beiträge des Workshops am 15. Dezember 1997 in Potsdam
A. Bronstert, V. Krysanova, A. Schröder, A. Becker, H.-R. Bork (eds.) (April 1998)
- No. 44 Capabilities and Limitations of Physically Based Hydrological Modelling on the Hillslope Scale
A. Bronstert (April 1998)
- No. 45 Sensitivity Analysis of a Forest Gap Model Concerning Current and Future Climate Variability
P. Lasch, F. Suckow, G. Bürger, M. Lindner (Juli 1998)
- No. 46 Wirkung von Klimaveränderungen in mitteleuropäischen Wirtschaftswäldern
M. Lindner (Juli 1998)
- No. 47 SPRINT-S: A Parallelization Tool for Experiments with Simulation Models
M. Flechsig (Juli 1998)

- No. 48 The Odra/Oder Flood in Summer 1997: Proceedings of the European Expert Meeting in Potsdam, 18 May 1998
A. Bronstert, A. Ghazi, J. Hladny, Z. Kundzewicz, L. Menzel (eds.) (September 1998)
- No. 49 Struktur, Aufbau und statistische Programmbibliothek der meteorologischen Datenbank am Potsdam-Institut für Klimafolgenforschung
H. Österle, J. Glauer, M. Denhard (Januar 1999)
- No. 50 The complete non-hierarchical cluster analysis
F.-W. Gerstengarbe, P. C. Werner (Januar 1999)
- No. 51 Struktur der Amplitudengleichung des Klimas
A. Hauschild (April 1999)
- No. 52 Measuring the Effectiveness of International Environmental Regimes
C. Helm, D. F. Sprinz (Mai 1999)
- No. 53 Untersuchung der Auswirkungen erhöhter atmosphärischer CO₂-Konzentrationen innerhalb des Free-Air Carbon Dioxide Enrichment-Experimentes: Ableitung allgemeiner Modelllösungen
T. Kartschall, J. Gräfe, P. Michaelis, K. Waloszczyk, S. Grossman-Clarke (Juni 1999)
- No. 54 Flächenhafte Modellierung der Evapotranspiration mit TRAIN
L. Menzel (August 1999)
- No. 55 Dry atmosphere asymptotics
N. Botta, R. Klein, A. Almgren (September 1999)
- No. 56 Wachstum von Kiefern-Ökosystemen in Abhängigkeit von Klima und Stoffeintrag - Eine regionale Fallstudie auf Landschaftsebene
M. Erhard (Dezember 1999)
- No. 57 Response of a River Catchment to Climatic Change: Application of Expanded Downscaling to Northern Germany
D.-I. Müller-Wohlfel, G. Bürger, W. Lahmer (Januar 2000)
- No. 58 Der "Index of Sustainable Economic Welfare" und die Neuen Bundesländer in der Übergangsphase
V. Wenzel, N. Herrmann (Februar 2000)
- No. 59 Weather Impacts on Natural, Social and Economic Systems (WISE, ENV4-CT97-0448)
German report
M. Flechsig, K. Gerlinger, N. Herrmann, R. J. T. Klein, M. Schneider, H. Sterr, H.-J. Schellnhuber (Mai 2000)
- No. 60 The Need for De-Aliasing in a Chebyshev Pseudo-Spectral Method
M. Uhlmann (Juni 2000)
- No. 61 National and Regional Climate Change Impact Assessments in the Forestry Sector - Workshop Summary and Abstracts of Oral and Poster Presentations
M. Lindner (ed.) (Juli 2000)
- No. 62 Bewertung ausgewählter Waldfunktionen unter Klimaänderung in Brandenburg
A. Wenzel (August 2000)
- No. 63 Eine Methode zur Validierung von Klimamodellen für die Klimawirkungsforschung hinsichtlich der Wiedergabe extremer Ereignisse
U. Böhm (September 2000)
- No. 64 Die Wirkung von erhöhten atmosphärischen CO₂-Konzentrationen auf die Transpiration eines Weizenbestandes unter Berücksichtigung von Wasser- und Stickstofflimitierung
S. Grossman-Clarke (September 2000)
- No. 65 European Conference on Advances in Flood Research, Proceedings, (Vol. 1 - Vol. 2)
A. Bronstert, Ch. Bismuth, L. Menzel (eds.) (November 2000)
- No. 66 The Rising Tide of Green Unilateralism in World Trade Law - Options for Reconciling the Emerging North-South Conflict
F. Biermann (Dezember 2000)
- No. 67 Coupling Distributed Fortran Applications Using C++ Wrappers and the CORBA Sequence Type
T. Slawig (Dezember 2000)
- No. 68 A Parallel Algorithm for the Discrete Orthogonal Wavelet Transform
M. Uhlmann (Dezember 2000)
- No. 69 SWIM (Soil and Water Integrated Model), User Manual
V. Krysanova, F. Wechsung, J. Arnold, R. Srinivasan, J. Williams (Dezember 2000)
- No. 70 Stakeholder Successes in Global Environmental Management, Report of Workshop, Potsdam, 8 December 2000
M. Welp (ed.) (April 2001)

- No. 71 GIS-gestützte Analyse globaler Muster anthropogener Waldschädigung - Eine sektorale Anwendung des Syndromkonzepts
M. Cassel-Gintz (Juni 2001)
- No. 72 Wavelets Based on Legendre Polynomials
J. Fröhlich, M. Uhlmann (Juli 2001)
- No. 73 Der Einfluß der Landnutzung auf Verdunstung und Grundwasserneubildung - Modellierungen und Folgerungen für das Einzugsgebiet des Glan
D. Reichert (Juli 2001)
- No. 74 Weltumweltpolitik - Global Change als Herausforderung für die deutsche Politikwissenschaft
F. Biermann, K. Dingwerth (Dezember 2001)
- No. 75 Angewandte Statistik - PIK-Weiterbildungsseminar 2000/2001
F.-W. Gerstengarbe (Hrsg.) (März 2002)
- No. 76 Zur Klimatologie der Station Jena
B. Orłowsky (September 2002)
- No. 77 Large-Scale Hydrological Modelling in the Semi-Arid North-East of Brazil
A. Güntner (September 2002)
- No. 78 Phenology in Germany in the 20th Century: Methods, Analyses and Models
J. Schaber (November 2002)
- No. 79 Modelling of Global Vegetation Diversity Pattern
I. Venevskaia, S. Venevsky (Dezember 2002)
- No. 80 Proceedings of the 2001 Berlin Conference on the Human Dimensions of Global Environmental Change "Global Environmental Change and the Nation State"
F. Biermann, R. Brohm, K. Dingwerth (eds.) (Dezember 2002)
- No. 81 POTSDAM - A Set of Atmosphere Statistical-Dynamical Models: Theoretical Background
V. Petoukhov, A. Ganopolski, M. Claussen (März 2003)
- No. 82 Simulation der Siedlungsflächenentwicklung als Teil des Globalen Wandels und ihr Einfluß auf den Wasserhaushalt im Großraum Berlin
B. Ströbl, V. Wenzel, B. Pfützner (April 2003)
- No. 83 Studie zur klimatischen Entwicklung im Land Brandenburg bis 2055 und deren Auswirkungen auf den Wasserhaushalt, die Forst- und Landwirtschaft sowie die Ableitung erster Perspektiven
F.-W. Gerstengarbe, F. Badeck, F. Hattermann, V. Krysanova, W. Lahmer, P. Lasch, M. Stock, F. Suckow, F. Wechsung, P. C. Werner (Juni 2003)
- No. 84 Well Balanced Finite Volume Methods for Nearly Hydrostatic Flows
N. Botta, R. Klein, S. Langenberg, S. Lützenkirchen (August 2003)
- No. 85 Orts- und zeitdiskrete Ermittlung der Sickerwassermenge im Land Brandenburg auf der Basis flächendeckender Wasserhaushaltsberechnungen
W. Lahmer, B. Pfützner (September 2003)
- No. 86 A Note on Domains of Discourse - Logical Know-How for Integrated Environmental Modelling, Version of October 15, 2003
C. C. Jaeger (Oktober 2003)
- No. 87 Hochwasserrisiko im mittleren Neckarraum - Charakterisierung unter Berücksichtigung regionaler Klimaszenarien sowie dessen Wahrnehmung durch befragte Anwohner
M. Wolff (Dezember 2003)
- No. 88 Abflußentwicklung in Teileinzugsgebieten des Rheins - Simulationen für den Ist-Zustand und für Klimaszenarien
D. Schwandt (April 2004)
- No. 89 Regionale Integrierte Modellierung der Auswirkungen von Klimaänderungen am Beispiel des semi-ariden Nordostens von Brasilien
A. Jaeger (April 2004)
- No. 90 Lebensstile und globaler Energieverbrauch - Analyse und Strategieansätze zu einer nachhaltigen Energiestruktur
F. Reusswig, K. Gerlinger, O. Edenhofer (Juli 2004)
- No. 91 Conceptual Frameworks of Adaptation to Climate Change and their Applicability to Human Health
H.-M. Füssel, R. J. T. Klein (August 2004)
- No. 92 Double Impact - The Climate Blockbuster 'The Day After Tomorrow' and its Impact on the German Cinema Public
F. Reusswig, J. Schwarzkopf, P. Polenz (Oktober 2004)
- No. 93 How Much Warming are we Committed to and How Much Can be Avoided?
B. Hare, M. Meinshausen (Oktober 2004)

- No. 94 Urbanised Territories as a Specific Component of the Global Carbon Cycle
A. Svirejeva-Hopkins, H.-J. Schellnhuber (Januar 2005)
- No. 95 GLOWA-Elbe I - Integrierte Analyse der Auswirkungen des globalen Wandels auf Wasser, Umwelt und Gesellschaft im Elbegebiet
F. Wechsung, A. Becker, P. Gräfe (Hrsg.) (April 2005)
- No. 96 The Time Scales of the Climate-Economy Feedback and the Climatic Cost of Growth
S. Hallegatte (April 2005)
- No. 97 A New Projection Method for the Zero Froude Number Shallow Water Equations
S. Vater (Juni 2005)
- No. 98 Table of EMICs - Earth System Models of Intermediate Complexity
M. Claussen (ed.) (Juli 2005)
- No. 99 KLARA - Klimawandel - Auswirkungen, Risiken, Anpassung
M. Stock (Hrsg.) (Juli 2005)
- No. 100 Katalog der Großwetterlagen Europas (1881-2004) nach Paul Hess und Helmut Brezowsky
6., verbesserte und ergänzte Auflage
F.-W. Gerstengarbe, P. C. Werner (September 2005)
- No. 101 An Asymptotic, Nonlinear Model for Anisotropic, Large-Scale Flows in the Tropics
S. Dolaptchiev (September 2005)
- No. 102 A Long-Term Model of the German Economy: $lagom^{d_sim}$
C. C. Jaeger (Oktober 2005)
- No. 103 Structuring Distributed Relation-Based Computations with SCDRC
N. Botta, C. Ionescu, C. Linstead, R. Klein (Oktober 2006)
- No. 104 Development of Functional Irrigation Types for Improved Global Crop Modelling
J. Rohwer, D. Gerten, W. Lucht (März 2007)
- No. 105 Intra-Regional Migration in Formerly Industrialised Regions: Qualitative Modelling of Household Location Decisions as an Input to Policy and Plan Making in Leipzig/Germany and Wirral/Liverpool/UK
D. Reckien (April 2007)
- No. 106 Perspektiven der Klimaänderung bis 2050 für den Weinbau in Deutschland (Klima 2050) -
Schlußbericht zum FDW-Vorhaben: Klima 2050
M. Stock, F. Badeck, F.-W. Gerstengarbe, D. Hoppmann, T. Kartschall, H. Österle, P. C. Werner,
M. Wodinski (Juni 2007)
- No. 107 Climate Policy in the Coming Phases of the Kyoto Process: Targets, Instruments, and the Role
of Cap and Trade Schemes - Proceedings of the International Symposium, February 20-21,
2006, Brussels
M. Welp, L. Wicke, C. C. Jaeger (eds.) (Juli 2007)
- No. 108 Correlation Analysis of Climate Variables and Wheat Yield Data on Various Aggregation Levels
in Germany and the EU-15 Using GIS and Statistical Methods, with a Focus on Heat Wave
Years
T. Sterzel (Juli 2007)
- No. 109 MOLOCH - Ein Strömungsverfahren für inkompressible Strömungen - Technische Referenz 1.0
M. Münch (Januar 2008)
- No. 110 Rationing & Bayesian Expectations with Application to the Labour Market
H. Förster (Februar 2008)
- No. 111 Finding a Pareto-Optimal Solution for Multi-Region Models Subject to Capital Trade and
Spillover Externalities
M. Leimbach, K. Eisenack (November 2008)