



University of Brasilia



Economics and Politics Research Group–EPRG
A *CNPq-Brazil Research Group*

<http://www.econpolrg.com/>

Research Center on Economics and Finance–CIEF
Research Center on Market Regulation–CERME
Research Laboratory on Political Behavior, Institutions and Public Policy–LAPCIPP
Master's Program in Public Economics–MESP
Graduate Program in Economics–Pós-ECO

There is Trouble with the Trees: How to Avoid Trade-Induced Deforestation?

Alan Leal (USP)
Maurício Bugarin (UnB)

Economics and Politics Working Paper 109/2024
August 1st, 2024

Economics and Politics Research Group
Working Paper Series

There is Trouble with the Trees: How to Avoid Trade-Induced Deforestation?

Alan Leal*
Maurício Bugarin†

Abstract

Trade and environment are intertwined subjects. The literature on the impact of trade opening on environmental outcomes are vast. Lacking however is the literature in how trade can be used politically to induce better environmental outcomes. To model this properly, we develop a game theoretic model in which two countries engage in trade and choose their respective levels of deforestation and trade tariffs. We consider the scenarios of market and central equilibria and derive some useful insights into their relationship of these two variables. As an extension, we also propose different model specifications and develop a numeric generalization of the model, which allows testing our models prediction for several countries. As a result, we find that there is an incentive for free-riding from the countries less concerned with deforestation on the countries that suffer the most disutility of its own deforestation.

Keywords: trade; deforestation; game theory

Resumo

O comércio internacional e meio ambiente são assuntos profundamente relacionados. O impacto da abertura comercial sobre variáveis ambientais é longamente documentado. Como usar o comércio internacional politicamente para induzir melhores resultados ambientais é um assunto que a literatura explora de modo incipiente. Visando modelar essa relação, o presente artigo desenvolve um modelo de teoria dos jogos, no qual dois países engajam em comércio internacional e escolhem seus respectivos níveis de desmatamento e tarifa de comércio exterior. Consideram-se os cenários de equilíbrio de mercado e central e derivam-se resultados relevantes para a relação entre essas duas variáveis. Como extensão, também propõem-se generalizações do modelo teórico e um modelo numérico que permite testar as previsões teóricas do modelo para vários países. Como resultado, encontra-se que há um incentivo de "carona" para os países que se importam menos com o desmatamento sobre aqueles países que se importam mais com o desmatamento.

Palavras-chaves: comércio; desmatamento; teoria dos jogos

*Ph.D. candidate in Economics at Universidade of São Paulo

†Full Professor of Economics at University of Brasília

1 Introduction

Trade and environment are deeply intertwined subjects. Given that international trade usually demands the production of goods intensive in factors related to the environment (e.g., land, water, among other materials), trade agreements can have an undesirable effect of increasing pollution, depletion of natural resources, and deforestation (Abman & Lundberg, 2019). However, recent studies have indicated that trade can be actually an inducer of environmental conservation, especially with regards to the deforestation, through common regulation on clean and green production (Balogh & Mizik, 2021). Trade agreements with a partner with stringent regulation can also decrease GHG emissions (Di Ubaldo, McGuire, & Shirodkar, 2022). In terms of this paper, although recent studies have been dedicated to understanding the relationship between trade and deforestation considering a game-theoretic approach (Harstad, 2022; Cunha, 2022), these studies focus on deriving a formal relationship among the levels of tariffs levied in the international trade and the deforestation. The rationale behind this approach consists of internalizing fully the cost of the deforestation by one country on its trade partner. On a regulatory note, trade agreements conditional on non-deforestation or green supply chains have been enabled recently explicitly in the trade agreements texts or by increasing of trade tariffs on non-compliers. Hence, trade agreements are one of the many instruments a country or bloc can use to enable non-deforestation on its trade partners (European-Union, 2023).

In physical terms, trade affect forests through several channels: (i) pressure for wood production by which forests are used as the main input and there may be or not any further used for this recently deforested land; (ii) forests cleared for the production of another good, as in international prices are attractive for a good produced in this recently deforested land and this motivates deforestation- this is called direct land use change, as land is cleared directly for some exports production; (iii) land used to produce non-tradable goods are now occupied by tradable goods and these non-tradable goods are then produced in recently deforested land- this is called indirect land use change. Hence, the interaction of domestic production, international demand, and land availability in terms of forests indicate how deforestation might occur in a country. These three channels might and probably do operate at the same time. They are also limited somehow or might be limited by foreign legislation such as EUDR and WTO new understandings regarding what is possible a country or trade bloc to do in applying their own non-deforestation laws (WTO (2022a) and WTO (2022b), regarding indirect land use change in Malasia and Indonesia in terms of palm oil production).

The questions regarding trade and deforestation are not easily modeled in terms of game theory, but there have been recent attempts to do so. Harstad (2022) analyze a multi-stage game, however finite, in which the Southern country (Brazil) choose its levels of deforestation, while the Northern country (EU, for concreteness) chooses its levels of trade tariffs. The author finds that conditioning free trade on non-deforestation effectively reduces deforestation, however not conditioning free trade to non-deforestation increases deforestation in the Southern country when it engages in a free trade agreement. On the other hand, Cunha (2022) builds upon Harstad (2022) by considering a dynamic game in which the Southern country produce agricultural goods for the Northern country, using

land as the only factor in this production. Agricultural production uses land, especially newly deforested land. The author finds different results from Harstad (2022), which is free trade always causes larger deforestation in the Southern country.

This paper moves in another direction, however. We want to characterize the equilibrium of deforestation levels and international trade tariffs based on how these two variables - deforestation and trade tariffs- affect the level of welfare of the representative individual of each country. In that way, we derive market and central-planner solutions in which country i does not and does internalize the externalities caused by the other country's trade tariffs and deforestation levels, respectively. We are then able to fully characterize the situations in which a trade arrangement is stable with regards to not getting higher tariffs given some preferences parametrization. Likewise, we are able to also explicitly declare when the equilibrium deforestation level will likely increase, in a analysis of heterogeneity of the representative individual of each country. We find as one of our results that countries more concerned with deforestation might suffer from free riding from less concerned countries. Moreover, deforestation seems to be increasing with leniency of a country with deforestation. On the other hand, trade tariffs tend to be small for countries less concerned with deforestation than for countries more concerned with deforestation.

More generally, international trade and deforestation displays several types of relationship. For instance, several studies indicates that higher international prices for trade goods affect deforestation positively (Robalino & Herrera, 2010; Assunção, Gandour, & Rocha, 2015; Lundberg & Abman, 2022; Berman, Couttenier, Leblois, & Soubeyran, 2023; Balboni, Berman, Burgess, & Olken, 2023). Other economic variables are also relevant in driving larger/smaller deforestation such as economic crises, with crises affecting negatively deforestation (Antonarakis, Pacca, & Antoniadis, 2022). Deforestation also seems to occur more frequently in small exporting farms than in large exporting farms (Silva, Moran, Millington, Viña, & Liu, 2023), which indicates possibly that the incentives for farmers to deforest is not neutral in the size of their farmers. Hence, the relationship of trade and deforestation is not fully characterized in a macro and micro aspect and we aim to further this discussion in terms of incentives and effectiveness of trade arrangements to induce lower deforestation.

The text is divided, besides this Introduction, into a section detailing our Model Primitives, their Solution, Stability Scenarios, some Extensions to our original model, and a numeric exercise for N countries, ending the paper with some Concluding Remarks.

2 Model Primitives

The original game contains two players, i and j , in this case countries, that chooses their respective levels of deforestation and trade tariffs levied on the other country (its trade partner). The utility of country i depends on all deforestation levels and trade tariffs, despite the fact that in a non-cooperative fashion, they all are not to be defined by country i . Hence, there might be some gain of coordination or central planning or playing cooperatively. This section aims to characterize analytically these possible gains.

Country i optimizes its utility for the representative individual, given by:

$$u_i = u_i(\tau_i, d_i, \tau_j, d_j) \tag{1}$$

Country i chooses τ_i and d_i , her levels of tariffs and deforestation, respectively. The problem is then given by maximizing u_i , considering τ_i and d_i .

Consider that:

$$u_i(\tau_i, \tau_j, d_i, d_j) = u_{i0} + \tau_i - b\tau_i^2 + d_i - cd_i^2 - (\tau_i\tau_j) - (d_i + d_j)^2 \quad (2)$$

Likewise, u_j will be given by:

$$u_j(\tau_i, \tau_j, d_i, d_j) = u_{j0} + \tau_j - d\tau_j^2 + d_j - ed_j^2 - (\tau_i\tau_j) - (d_i + d_j)^2 \quad (3)$$

u_{i0} and u_{j0} are autonomous levels of utility of country i and j , respectively, that is, they are the utility that country attains that do not depend on deforestation and tariffs¹. We also consider $b, c, d, e > 0$.

3 Solution

3.1 Market Solution

The First Order Conditions² of this problem for country i will be given by:

[τ_i]

$$1 - 2b\tau_i - \tau_j = 0$$

$$\tau_i = \frac{1 - \tau_j}{2b}$$

[d_i]

$$1 - 2cd_i - 2(d_i + d_j) = 0$$

$$d_i = \frac{1 - 2d_j}{2c + 2}$$

The Nash Equilibrium will be given by b, c, d, e that solves the system formed by the FOCs for country i and j . These solution will be given by:

$$\tau_i = \frac{1 - 2d}{1 - 4bd} \quad (4)$$

$$\tau_j = \frac{1 - 2b}{1 - 4bd} \quad (5)$$

$$d_i = \frac{e}{2(ec + e + c)} \quad (6)$$

¹Another interpretation is that this is level of utility when countries engage in a free trade arrangement and do not deforest.

²The proof that this solution characterizes a maximum is presented in the appendix.

$$d_j = \frac{c}{2(ec + e + c)} \quad (7)$$

3.2 Central Planner

The central planner finds the values τ_i , τ_j , d_i , and d_j that solve the optimization problem of $u_i + u_j$. Hence, he maximizes the following expression:

$$u_i + u_j = \tau_i - b\tau_i^2 + d_i - cd_i^2 + \tau_j - d\tau_j^2 + d_j - ed_j^2 - 2(\tau_i\tau_j) - 2(d_i + d_j)^2 \quad (8)$$

The FOCs³ of this optimization problem will be given by:

[τ_i]

$$1 - 2b\tau_i - 2\tau_j = 0$$

$$b\tau_i + \tau_j = 1/2$$

[τ_j]

$$1 - 2d\tau_j - 2\tau_i = 0$$

$$d\tau_j + \tau_i = 1/2$$

[d_i]

$$1 - 2cd_i - 4(d_i + d_j) = 0$$

$$(2 + c)d_i + 2d_j = 1/2$$

[d_j]

$$1 - 2ed_i - 4(d_i + d_j) = 0$$

$$(2 + e)d_j + 2d_i = 1/2$$

The equilibrium is given by the values of τ_i , τ_j , d_i , and d_j that solve the previous four equations simultaneously. Hence, the solution is given by:

$$\tau_i = \frac{d-1}{2bd-2} \quad (9)$$

$$\tau_j = \frac{b-1}{2bd-2} \quad (10)$$

$$d_i = \frac{e}{2(2+e)c+4e} \quad (11)$$

$$d_j = \frac{c}{2(2+e)c+4e} \quad (12)$$

³The proof that this solution characterizes a maximum is presented in the appendix.

3.3 Market and Central Planner Comparison

The Central Planner solution outlined above is socially optimizing in the sense that externalities caused by tariffs and deforestation choice by one country are fully internalized in the analysis. The next important question is how these socially optimal solutions compare to the non-cooperative case (that is, the market solution). Given the symmetry of the problem, we might look directly into a single country. In that way, let's see how tariffs and deforestation of country i compare in the case of cooperation and in the case of non-cooperation.

Proposition 1 *Consider the previously derived market and central planner solutions, then tariffs of country i are larger in cooperation than in the market solution, whenever $-1 \leq d(2b-3)$. Moreover, deforestation of country i is always larger in the market solution than in the central-planner solution.*

Proof: Appendix.

The previous Proposition 1 asserts that deforestation is always larger in the non-cooperative solution. Hence, if countries aim to decrease deforestation, cooperating is the most straightforward way achieve to it. In other words, this Proposition 1 asserts that deforestation will always be higher in non-cooperation than in cooperation. This is caused by the fact that in the cooperation, there is a proper internalization of costs of deforestation and trade tariffs by all countries. On the other hand, trade tariffs are larger in the non-cooperative case than in the cooperative case, given $-1 \leq d(2b-3)$.

4 Stability of the Solution

Stability can be characterized as the situation in which the current equilibrium does not change. In the two subsections below, we suppose there is parametric change such that the equilibrium has changed. We aim to characterize the direction of this change.

4.1 Reduction of Trade Tariffs

By stability, suppose that initially we have $(\tau_{it}, \tau_{jt}) = (\tau_{i0}, \tau_{j0})$. We want to find the situations for which a new tariffs situation would arise, (τ_{i1}, τ_{j1}) , such that $\tau_{i0} \leq \tau_{i1}$ and $\tau_{j0} \leq \tau_{j1}$, with a strict inequality for at least of one of these countries. We consider the scenario of a market economy, instead of cooperative solution.

Naturally, this change would occur with changes in the preferences, that is, parameters of our utility. So, if a country suffered more from a higher tariff or deforestation, this would affect the optimal level of tariffs in the non-cooperative case. We want to characterize this equilibrium properly.

How would the τ_i change in response to a change in the preference of country i for a higher level of deforestation. The following proposition explain this effect.

Proposition 2 *Whenever $b > 1/2$, tariffs are increasing in d ; likewise, whenever $d > 1/2$, tariffs are increasing in b .*

Proof. Appendix.

Hence, for larger values of the disutility from tariffs, tariffs are increasing in the parameters b and d . Whenever b and d are high, that is, whenever a country representative consumer dislikes more trade tariffs, then trade tariffs are positive and increasing in these two parameters, b and d . In practical terms, the higher the discomfort with trade tariffs, more increasing are trade tariffs in this discomfort.

4.2 Reduction of Deforestation Levels

What are the situations in terms of preferences changes, that is, parameters changes, for which the level of deforestation of country i changes? Deforestation on the market equilibrium depends on the values of the preference parameters e and c . Hence, we enunciate the following Proposition:

Proposition 3 *The level of deforestation of country i is decreasing in its own disutility from deforestation and increasing in the disutility of other country's deforestation.*

Proof. Appendix

Proposition 3 implies that there is an incentive for free-riding in terms of deforestation on the country with the highest disutility from deforestation. This is a sound result, given that oftentimes countries will commit to different levels of deforestation and an inequality among them might create some incentives of free-riding.

5 Extensions

We propose some extensions to amplify the analytical power of our model. In a first moment, we consider that a country i will derive more utility in deforesting less. The second extension considers that the higher the deforestation of another country, the higher its own utility. We are particularly interested in analyzing the comparative statistics of the new parameters considered in the analysis.

5.1 Utility from preserving forests

Consider that the representative utility of country i is given by:

$$u_i(\tau_i, \tau_j, d_i, d_j) = u_{i0} + \tau_i - b\tau_i^2 + d_i - cd_i^2 - (\tau_i\tau_j) - (d_i + d_j)^2 + \phi_i(1 - d_i) \quad (13)$$

ϕ_i measures how much the representative individual of country i values keeping the forests of its own country intact. Likewise, the representative utility of country j will be given by:

$$u_j(\tau_i, \tau_j, d_i, d_j) = u_{j0} + \tau_j - d\tau_j^2 + d_j - ed_j^2 - (\tau_i\tau_j) - (d_i + d_j)^2 + \phi_j(1 - d_j) \quad (14)$$

The First Order Conditions of the market equilibrium will be given by:

[τ_i]

$$1 - 2b\tau_i - \tau_j = 0$$

[d_i]

$$1 - 2cd_i - 2(d_i + d_j) - \phi_i = 0$$

[τ_j]

$$1 - 2d\tau_j - \tau_i = 0$$

[d_j]

$$1 - 2ed_j - 2(d_i + d_j) - \phi_j = 0$$

The market solution of this extension will then be given by:

$$\tau_i = \frac{2d - 1}{4bd - 1} \quad (15)$$

$$\tau_j = \frac{2b - 1}{4bd - 1} \quad (16)$$

$$d_i = \frac{e - \phi_i + \phi_j - e\phi_i}{2(e + c + ec)} \quad (17)$$

$$d_j = \frac{c + \phi_i - \phi_j - c\phi_j}{2(e + c + ec)} \quad (18)$$

The trade tariffs does not change in this scenario in comparison to the standard model. However, the level of deforestation changes. Even more so, the deforestation changes in response to both parameters ϕ_i and ϕ_j . The following proposition can thus be enunciated.

Proposition 4 *The level of deforestation decreases how much the representative individual values keeping your own forests intact, however it increases with the importance given by country j 's representative individual values his own intact forests.*

Proof. Observe that $\frac{\partial d_i}{\partial \phi_i} = -\frac{1+e}{2(c+e+ec)} < 0$ and $\frac{\partial d_i}{\partial \phi_j} = \frac{1}{2(e+c+ec)} > 0$.

Proposition 4 asserts the public opinion on forests affect the level of deforestation that a country has. There is a positive relationship between a country's public opinion care for its own forests and non-deforestation, while there is a negative relationship between a country's public opinion care for its own forests and the non-deforestation of other countries. This selfish behavior is in line with our findings of free riding incentives displayed previously.

5.2 Forest-related tariffs on trade

Consider now the utility of a representative individual in country i is given by the following expression:

$$u_i = u_{i0} + \tau_i - b\tau_i^2 + d_i - cd_i^2 - (\tau_i\tau_j) - (d_i + d_j)^2 - \tau_i(d_j - d_{ji})I\{d_j > d_{ji}\}$$

Where $I\{\}$ is the indicator function. d_{ji} can be understood as the level of deforestation by country j that country i supports. Levels above this threshold imply a disutility for

country i . Assume that $d_j > d_{ji}$ also. Otherwise, this extension produces the same results as our standard model. Considering this scenario, we have that the FOCs for the country i market problem will be given by:

$$[\tau_i] \quad 1 - 2b\tau_i - \tau_j - d_j + d_{ji} = 0$$

$$[d_i] \quad 1 - 2cd_i - 2(di + dj) = 0$$

$$[\tau_j] \quad 1 - 2d\tau_j - \tau_i - d_i + d_{ij} = 0$$

$$[d_j] \quad 1 - 2ed_j - 2(d_i + d_j) = 0$$

The solutions to this system will be given by:

$$\tau_i = - \frac{2c + e - 2cd + 2cd_{ij} + 2ce - 4de + 2ed_{ij} - 4cdd_{ji}}{2(4bd - 1)(c + e + ec)} - \frac{4cde + 2ced_{ij} - 4ded_{ji} - 4cded_{ji}}{2(4bd - 1)(c + e + ec)} \quad (19)$$

$$\tau_j = - \frac{c + 2e - 4bc - 2be - 2cd_{ji} + 2ce_2ed_{ji} - 4bcd_i - 4bce}{2(4bd - 1)(c + e + ec)} - \frac{4bed_{ij} + 2ced_{ji} - 4bcd_{ij}}{2(4bd - 1)(c + e + ec)} \quad (20)$$

$$d_i = \frac{e}{2(c + e + ec)} \quad (21)$$

$$d_j = \frac{c}{2(c + e + ec)} \quad (22)$$

In this case, we might make the following assertion.

Proposition 5 *The higher the tolerance of a country with regards to other country's deforestation, the lower its tariffs, given that $4bd - 1 < 0$.*

Proof. Appendix.

Proposition 5 implies that, when conditions are met, a larger tolerance for deforestation by another country tends to lead to reduction of trade tariffs as understood in this paper. In other words, the highest the tolerance of country for deforestation of the other country, more unlikely is the use of trade tariffs as a deterrence to deforestation.

6 The case of finite number of countries: a numerical exercise

In this section, we expand this paper model in its simplest version to a case of a finite number of countries and/or regions. Given the complexity of the problem, we are able to derive the solutions of the model, but not in explicit form. Hence, this is a good case for using numerical methods to check whether these derivations are effective in predicting tariffs and deforestation based in different settings of the utility.

6.1 Set-up

The setup is not very different from the two countries scenario, however we opt to use matrix notation as a way to keep the model compact and easier to understand. In that way, define u_i as the utility of country i , u is a $n \times 1$ vector containing the utilities from countries $1, \dots, N$. Moreover, we define \otimes as the Kronecker product and \odot as the Hadamard product. Then, the utility of $1, \dots, N$ countries might be defined in the following fashion:

$$u = u_0 + \tau + d - W_1 \tau \otimes \tau' \mathbf{1}_N - W_2 d \otimes d' \mathbf{1}_N$$

u_0 is a $n \times 1$ vector and can be understood again as an autonomous level utility, that countries enjoy with free trade and zero deforestation. τ is a vector $n \times 1$ containing the tariffs levied by one country on all its trade partners. We assume for simplicity that there is only one trade tariff being levied by one country on all its partners⁴. d is a vector $n \times 1$ containing the level of deforestation of all countries. W_1 is a $n \times n$ matrix measuring the impact tariffs of other countries tariffs on one another. Likewise, W_2 measures the impact of each country's levels of deforestation on each other. All elements of W_1 and W_2 are strictly non-negative. These matrix are not null either. These two matrix are very generic and can be calibrated considering different variables and determinants, that is, we only impose non-negativity as a restriction on the values of these two matrix. $\mathbf{1}_N$ is a column vector of size N , filled with 1s.

We enunciate the following proposition:

Proposition 6 *The market solution for N countries is characterized by the following expressions:*
Tariffs

$$I_N = W_1 \tau \otimes \mathbf{1}'_N I_N + W_1 \odot \tau'$$

Deforestation

$$I_N = W_2 d \otimes \mathbf{1}'_N I_N + W_2 \odot d'$$

⁴This hypothesis might seem restrictive, however this is not the case. The argument for restriction is valid in the sense that we do not allow for different trade tariffs within the context of a free or preferential trade agreement, which postulates lower tariffs for members of this FTA or PTA. However, if we assume the world of this numeric exercise is one of no FTA or PTA, then the tariffs have the appropriate interpretation of the Most Favourable Nation (MFN) tariffs, that is, the tariffs that a country must apply to all its trade partners.

I_N is the identity matrix of size N .

Proof. Appendix.

The Central Planner solution, on the other hand, will be given by the following proposition.

Proposition 7 *The central planner solution for N countries is characterized by the following expressions:*
Tariffs

$$\mathbf{1}_N = 2(\mathbf{1}_N \otimes (\mathbf{1}'_N \tau))(\mathbf{1}'_N W_1)'$$

Deforestation

$$\mathbf{1}_N = 2(\mathbf{1}_N \otimes (\mathbf{1}'_N d))(\mathbf{1}'_N W_2)'$$

Proof. Appendix.

6.2 Calibration

We simulate two scenarios for W_1 , with W_2 being the same for both scenarios. W_2 is defined as $W_2[,j] = forests_j / \sum_{i=1}^N forests_i$, in which $forests_j$ is the forest cover of country j in km^2 . We use the forest cover as in 2021, provided by the World Bank Development Indicators. W_1 , on the other hand, considers either GDP per capita in 2021 (constant 2015 US\$) or Trade (% GDP) in 2021, both provided by the World Bank Development Indicators. In that way, we have that $W_1[i,j] = inv_dist[i,j] * gdp_percapita[i] * gdp_percapita[j]'$ or $W_1[i,j] = inv_dist_{i,j} * trade_gdp[i] * trade_gdp[j]'$, in which $inv_dist[i,j] = 1/dist[i,j]$, with $dist[i,j]$ being the distance between countries i and j . The inverse of distance among the countries is used to weight W_1 , as a way to account for gravity relations in the trade among them. In Table 1 below, we present the results in the case of market and central planner for both variables in our model and considering different specifications for the Top 5 countries in terms of absolute forest cover.

Table 1: Results for N countries game of trade and deforestations (N=218) for selected countries

	GDP per capita				Trade (% of GDP)			
	τ_M	τ_C	d_M	d_C	τ_M	τ_C	d_M	d_C
Russia	0.79	0.91	0.79	0.73	0.58	0.98	0.82	0.36
Brazil	0.84	1.42	0.85	0.43	0.17	0.35	0.66	0.11
Canada	0.60	0.85	0.20	0.20	0.30	0.55	0.06	0.06
United States of America	0.56	1.01	0.70	0.70	0.14	0.64	0.53	0.14
China	0.64	0.76	0.18	0.03	0.80	1.67	0.99	0.30

Source: Authors' elaboration.

The previous Table 1 indicates that our predictions in the two-country model is transposed to the solution of the model for the five countries with the largest forest cover - we display only five of 218 countries due to space constraints. These conclusions are that trade tariffs in the central planner solution are larger than their market solution. On the other hand,

deforestation in the market economy is larger than the central planned economy for all five economies considered in this analysis. This solution pattern is consistent across different specifications for W_1 , whether this matrix is built using GDP per capita or trade (% of GDP).

7 Concluding Remarks

This paper provides some relevant insights into the preferences of the public for tariffs and deforestation and impacts on the stability of trade arrangements and deforestation levels.

The market solution for deforestation levels is always worse than the cooperative solution. This is an expected result of a good model and it informs that deforestation levels seem to decrease with higher cooperation amongst the parties.

On the other hand, the relationship between the optimal level of tariffs in the market and central planner solutions is not easily predicted. There are some preferences by a country that might direct the inequality of the Nash and the cooperative equilibria toward a different relationship. This adds realism to the model considered here in which countries can change their preferences over tariffs and deforestation and this changes the levels of tariffs that are found to be the highest.

The model also indicates there is an incentive for free-riding from the countries less concerned with deforestation on the countries that suffer the most disutility of its own deforestation. This is an interesting dynamic that relates to how the countries will define their own level of disutility and how that might compromise the countries in reaching a lower and more interesting levels of deforestation.

Finally, a global campaign for the change of public perception on deforestation seems to be the more sounding way to reduce deforestation in all countries and avert the phenomenon of free riding of unconcerned countries with those more committed with deforestation reduction.

References

- Abman, R., & Lundberg, C. (2019). Does free trade increase deforestation? the effects of regional trade agreements.
- Antonarakis, A. S., Pacca, L., & Antoniadis, A. (2022, 5). The effect of financial crises on deforestation: a global and regional panel data analysis. *Sustainability Science*, *17*, 1037–1057. doi: 10.1007/s11625-021-01086-8
- Assunção, J., Gandour, C., & Rocha, R. (2015, 12). Deforestation slowdown in the brazilian amazon: prices or policies? *Environment and Development Economics*, *20*, 697–722. doi: 10.1017/S1355770X15000078

- Balboni, C., Berman, A., Burgess, R., & Olken, B. A. (2023, 9). The economics of tropical deforestation. *Annual Review of Economics*, *15*, 723–754. doi: 10.1146/annurev-economics-090622-024705
- Balogh, J. M., & Mizik, T. (2021, June). Trade–Climate nexus: A systematic review of the literature. *Econ. Soc.*, *9*(3), 99.
- Berman, N., Couttenier, M., Leblois, A., & Soubeyran, R. (2023, 5). Crop prices and deforestation in the tropics. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, *119*, 102819. doi: 10.1016/j.jeem.2023.102819
- Cunha, J. V. (2022). *A strategic analysis of trade and public environmental goods* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation).
- Di Ubaldo, M., McGuire, S., & Shirodkar, V. (2022, December). Voluntary programs and emissions revisited: What is the effect of EU trade agreements with environmental provisions? *Journal of International Business Policy*, *5*(4), 467–489.
- European-Union. (2023). Regulation (eu) 2023/1115 of the european parliament and of the council of 31 may 2023 on the making available on the union market and the export from the union of certain commodities and products associated with deforestation and forest degradation and repealing regulation (eu) no 995/2010.
- Harstad, B. (2022). Trade, trees, and contingent trade agreements.
- Lundberg, C., & Abman, R. (2022, 3). Maize price volatility and deforestation. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, *104*, 693–716. doi: 10.1111/ajae.12246
- Robalino, J., & Herrera, L. D. (2010). *Staff working paper ersd-2010-04 trade and deforestation: A literature review trade and deforestation: A literature review **. doi: <https://doi.org/10.30875/a6679776-en>
- Silva, R. F. B. d., Moran, E. F., Millington, J. D. A., Viña, A., & Liu, J. (2023, 7). Complex relationships between soybean trade destination and tropical deforestation. *Scientific Reports*, *13*, 11254. doi: 10.1038/s41598-023-38405-1
- WTO. (2022a). *Ds593: European union — certain measures concerning palm oil and oil palm crop-based biofuels*. https://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/dispu_e/cases_e/ds593_e.htm. (Accessed: 2024-06-20)
- WTO. (2022b). *European union and certain member states — certain measures concerning palm oil and oil palm crop-based biofuels*. https://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/dispu_e/cases_e/ds600_e.htm. (Accessed: 2024-06-20)

A Maximum of the Market Solution: Characterization

In order for our solution to characterize properly a maximum, it is necessary that the objective function to be quasi-concave. A formal test to see whether the function is quasi-concave consists of testing whether the Hessian of the maximization problem is negative definite. Consider that the Hessian in this problem is given by:

$$H_1 = \begin{bmatrix} -2b & 0 \\ 0 & -2(c+1) \end{bmatrix}$$

Given that this square matrix is a diagonal one, then its eigenvalues are its non-null elements in the main diagonal. Moreover, as $-2b < 0$ and $-2(c+1) < 0$, given $b, c > 0$. Then, we have that our problem is fully characterized for country i . Given the symmetry of the utilities of country i and country j , then we can affirm that FOCs characterize fully a maximum, hence the utility is majored in the points we have found.

B Maximum of the Central Planner Solution: Characterization

In the case of the central planner, we must also guarantee that function is quasi-concave. As a way to assess this is to test the Hessian of this problem, which will be given by the following 4x4 square matrix $(\tau_i, \tau_j, d_i, d_j)$:

$$H_2 = \begin{bmatrix} -2b & -2 & 0 & 0 \\ -2 & -2d & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -2(c+2) & -4 \\ 0 & 0 & -4 & -2(e+2) \end{bmatrix}$$

Its characteristic equation will be given by:

$$(-2b - \lambda)[(-2d - \lambda)(-2(c+2) - \lambda)(-2(e+2) - \lambda) + 16(2d + \lambda)] + 2[-2(2(c+2) + \lambda)(2(e+2) + \lambda) + 32] = 0$$

The roots of this system will be given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_1 &= -b - d - \sqrt{4 + b^2 - 2bd + d^2} \\ \lambda_2 &= -e - c - 4 - \sqrt{c^2 + e^2 - 2ec + 16} \\ \lambda_3 &= -b - d + \sqrt{4 + b^2 - 2bd + d^2} \\ \lambda_4 &= -e - c - 4 + \sqrt{c^2 + e^2 - 2ec + 16}. \end{aligned}$$

We must have that $\lambda_k < 0, \forall k = 1, 2, 3, 4$. Given that we previously assumed that $b, c, d, e > 0$, then $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 < 0$ always. For $\lambda_3 < 0$, we must have $\sqrt{4 + b^2 - 2bd + d^2} < b + d$. Likewise, for $\lambda_4 < 0$, we must have $\sqrt{c^2 + e^2 - 2ec + 16} < e + c + 4$, which happens whenever $c > -1.15223$ ⁵.

⁵We have assumed that $c > 0$, hence this condition is always met.

Whenever these conditions are met, our FOCs characterizes a maximum.

C Comparative Statics

This section aims to analyze how the Nash Equilibrium in the market equilibrium changes with parameter variation. It is a simple comparative statistics analysis.

Looking more directly at country i , we have the τ_i changes with the parameter b in the following manner:

$$\frac{\partial \tau_i}{\partial b} = \frac{4d(1-2d)}{(1-4bd)^2} \geq 0, d \leq 1/2$$

$$\frac{\partial \tau_i}{\partial b} < 0, d > 1/2$$

Now, looking at comparative statistics of the level of deforestation of country i , with regards to the parameter c :

$$\frac{\partial d_i}{\partial c} = \frac{-2e(e+1)}{(2(ec+e+c))^2} < 0, e > 0$$

Hence, the impact of c on the deforestation of country i is always negative.

D Proofs

D.1 Market and Central Planner Comparison

1. Tariffs (τ_i)

$$\tau_i^{NASH} \leq \tau_i^{COOP}$$

$$\frac{1-2d}{1-4bd} \leq \frac{d-1}{2bd-2}$$

$$(1-2d)(2bd-2) \leq (1-4bd)(d-1)$$

$$-1 \leq 2bd-3d$$

$$-1 \leq d(2b-3)$$

Hence, whenever $-1 \leq d(2b-3)$, tariffs in the cooperative case will be higher than in the non-cooperative case.

2. Deforestation (d_i)

$$d_i^{NASH} \geq d_i^{COOP}$$

$$\frac{e}{2(ec+c+e)} \geq \frac{e}{2(2+e)c+4e}$$

$$2(ec+c+e) \leq 2(2+e)c+4e$$

$$0 < 2c+2e$$

$$0 < 2(c + e)$$

This always happens, given that $c, e > 0$. Hence, the market equilibrium levels for deforestation is always higher than the cooperative equilibrium levels of these variables.

D.2 Stability of Trade Arrangements

Tariffs of country i change with regard to d in the following manner:

$$\frac{\partial \tau_i}{\partial d} = \frac{-2(1 - 4bd) + 4b(1 - 2d)}{(1 - 4bd)^2}$$

When will $\frac{\partial \tau_i}{\partial d}$ be positive? Whenever we have:

$$-2(1 - 4bd) + 4b(1 - 2d) > 0$$

$$-2 + 8bd + 4b - 8bd > 0$$

$$4b > 2$$

$$b > 1/2$$

Whenever $b > 1/2$, increasing d leads to an increase of the tariffs of country i on goods of country j . Likewise, whenever $d > 1/2$, the impact of b on the tariffs for country i is positive.

D.3 Reduction of Deforestation Levels

In the case of e , we have the following partial effect:

$$\frac{\partial d_i}{\partial e} = \frac{2(ec + e + c) - e(c + 1)}{[2(ec + e + c)]^2}$$

This implies that a positive change in the parameter e will increase deforestation levels in the equilibrium for country i .

The impact of the parameter c on the deforestation levels of country i will be given by the following expression:

$$\frac{\partial d_i}{\partial c} = \frac{-e(e + 1)}{2(ec + c + e)^2}$$

Which is negative whenever $e > 0$.

D.4 Forest-tariffs on trade

We need to prove that tariffs will move in a different direction than a preference by country i with regards to the deforestation of country j . Consider the τ_i in this scenario. Then, $\frac{\partial \tau_i}{\partial d_{ji}}$ will be given by:

$$\frac{\partial \tau_i}{\partial d_{ji}} = -\frac{-4cd - 4de - 4cde}{2(4bd - 1)(c + e + ec)}$$

$\frac{\partial \tau_i}{\partial d_{ji}} < 0$ whenever $4bd - 1 < 0$.

D.5 Market equilibrium for N countries

The derivation for the case of deforestation is identical to the case of tariffs. Hence, we only present the derivation for the case of tariffs. Consider that W_1 is $n \times n$ square matrix, with generic element given by w_{ij} , with $i = 1, \dots, N$ and $j = 1, \dots, N$. Hence, the first order conditions will be given by:

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial \tau} = \underbrace{\frac{\partial \tau}{\partial \tau}}_A - \underbrace{\frac{\partial W_1 \tau \otimes \tau' \mathbf{1}_N}{\partial \tau}}_B$$

A is given by the following expression:

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial \tau_1}{\partial \tau_1} & \frac{\partial \tau_1}{\partial \tau_2} & \cdots & \frac{\partial \tau_1}{\partial \tau_N} \\ \frac{\partial \tau_2}{\partial \tau_1} & \frac{\partial \tau_2}{\partial \tau_2} & \cdots & \frac{\partial \tau_2}{\partial \tau_N} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \cdots & \vdots \\ \frac{\partial \tau_n}{\partial \tau_1} & \frac{\partial \tau_n}{\partial \tau_2} & \cdots & \frac{\partial \tau_n}{\partial \tau_N} \end{bmatrix}$$

Which can be simplified into: $A = I_N$. B , on the other hand, will be given by the following expression:

$$B = \begin{bmatrix} w_{11}2\tau_1 + \cdots + w_{1n}\tau_n & \cdots & w_{1n}\tau_n \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ w_{n1}\tau_1 & \cdots & w_{n1}\tau_1 + w_{n2}\tau_2 + \cdots + 2w_{nn}\tau_n \end{bmatrix}$$

Which can be simplified in the following expression:

$$B = W_1 \tau \otimes \mathbf{1}'_N I_N + W_1 \odot \tau'$$

Hence, the First Order Conditions imply that in the maximum:

$$I_N = W_1 \tau \otimes \mathbf{1}'_N I_N + W_1 \odot \tau'$$

D.6 Central Planner equilibrium for N countries

Considering that if u is the $n \times 1$ vector with each country's representative individual, then $\mathbf{1}'_N u$ is the utility the central planner optimizes with regards to τ or d . Solving for τ , given its similarity with the problem with d , we must calculate the following expression:

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{1}'_N u}{\partial \tau} = \underbrace{\frac{\partial \mathbf{1}'_N \tau}{\partial \tau}}_A - \underbrace{\frac{\partial \mathbf{1}'_N (W_1 \tau \otimes \tau' \mathbf{1}_N)}{\partial \tau}}_B$$

\mathbf{A} is given by the following expression:

$$A = \frac{\partial \mathbf{1}'_N \tau}{\partial \tau} = \mathbf{1}_N$$

Before displaying the value of \mathbf{B} , let's explore the expression: $\mathbf{1}'_N (W_1 \tau \otimes \tau' \mathbf{1}_N)$. This expression can be written as:

$$\sum_{k=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \tau_j \tau_k \sum_{i=1}^N w_{ij}$$

The derivative \mathbf{B} will create a $n \times 1$ vector, with the following terms: $\mathbf{B} = 2 \begin{bmatrix} \sum_{j=1}^N \tau_j \sum_{i=1}^N w_{i1} \\ \sum_{j=1}^N \tau_j \sum_{i=1}^N w_{i2} \\ \vdots \\ \sum_{j=1}^N \tau_j \sum_{i=1}^N w_{in} \end{bmatrix}$

Which can be simplified into the following matrix:

$$B = 2(\mathbf{1}_N \otimes (\mathbf{1}'_N \tau))(\mathbf{1}'_N W_1)'$$

The **Economics and Politics (CNPq) Research Group** started publishing its members' working papers on June 12, 2013. Please check the list below and click at <http://econpolrg.com/working-papers/> to access all publications.

Number	Date	Publication
109/2024	08-01-2024	There is Trouble with the Trees: How to Avoid Trade-Induced Deforestation?, Alan Leal and Maurício Bugarin
108/2024	05-15-2024	DPVAT Focalizado: Um Novo Modelo do Seguro Obrigatório, Frederico Viana de Araújo and Vander Mendes Lucas
107/2022	08-29-2022	Políticas de Custeio Extra Tarifário do Transporte Público Brasileiro: Internalizar Externalidades é Preciso, Carlos Henrique Ribeiro de Carvalho and Vander Mendes Lucas
106/2022	08-19-2022	Avaliação da Eficácia da Política de Garantia de Preços mínimos para o Milho em Grãos, Gabriel Pinto Nogueira de Moura and Vander Mendes Lucas
105/2021	10-18-2021	Licitações com preço de reserva secreto e negociação: Uma análise de teoria dos leilões para o caso de valores privados, Adriana C. Portugal and Maurício S. Bugarin
104/2021	04-12-2021	Planos de Saúde Coletivos: Análise Econômica do Reajuste por Faixa Etária, Fernando B. Meneguim, Maurício Soares Bugarin, and Tomás T. S. Bugarin
103/2020	10-20-2020	Teoria dos Leilões e Aplicações: A Teoria dos Jogos volta roubar a cena no Prêmio Nobel de Economia de 2020, Maurício Bugarin
102/2020	09-10-2020	Ex-ante Moral Hazard of Unemployment Insurance, Artur Henrique da Silva Santos, Maurício Soares Bugarin and Paulo Roberto Amorim Loureiro
101/2020	01-30-2020	Motivação Partidária nas Transferências Voluntárias da União: O papel do Legislativo Federal, Fernanda L. Marciniuk, Maurício S. Bugarin and Débora C. Ferreira
100/2020	01-28-2020	The Paradox of Concessions in Developing Countries: A game-theoretic investigation of airport concessions in Brazil, Mauricio Bugarin and Frederico Ribeiro
99/2019	06-05-2019	Crime and political effects of a concealed carry ban in Brazil, Rodrigo Schneider
98/2019	05-08-2019	Polo Industrial de Manaus e Desempenho Socioeconômico: Uma Análise de Componentes Principais no Período de 2002 – 2015, Rogério da Cruz Gonçalves and Philipp Ehrl
97/2019	05-01-2019	Efeitos Econômicos da Zona Franca de Manaus, Rogério da Cruz Gonçalves and Philipp Ehrl
96/2019	04-25-2019	Closed Season e Seguro-Defeso: Análise de Incentivos e Avaliação de Impacto, Artur Henrique da Silva Santos, Maurício Soares Bugarin and Paulo Roberto Amorim Loureiro
95/2019	04-18-2019	Rules versus Standards in Developing Countries The Case for Clear and Precise Legal Norms on Eminent Domain Power, Hans-Bernd Schäfer
94/2019	02-20-2019	A influência da reeleição nas políticas fiscais subnacionais, Fernanda L. Marciniuk and Mauricio S. Bugarin
93/2018	12-10-2018	Electronic voting and Public Spending: The impact of enfranchisement on federal budget amendments in Brazil, Rodrigo Schneider, Diloá Athias and Maurício Bugarin
92/2018	12-04-2018	Aplicação da Lei de Benford na Detecção de Jogo de Planilha: O Caso do Estádio Nacional de Brasília, Carlos Alberto Cascão Júnior, Adriana Cuoco Portugal, Mauricio Soares Bugarin and Flávia Ceccato Cunha
91/2018	11-21-2018	Where'd You Get that Idea? Determinants of Creativity and Impact in Popular Music, Bernardo Mueller
90/2018	11-12-2018	A Previdência Complementar é, de fato, Complementar?, Marcos Nihari and Vander Lucas
89/2018	11-05-2018	Sobre Falácias de Moro, Nelson Gonçalves Gomes
88/2018	10-29-2018	Eficiência financeira das concessões de aeroportos no Brasil no período de 2015 a 2016, João Paulo de Castro Carisio Ribeiro, Marcelo Driemeyer Wilbert and Samuel de Resende Salgado
87/2018	10-19-2018	Leilões para conversão de dívida em investimento: Uma proposta da teoria de leilões para implantação dos Termos de Ajuste de Conduta (TAC) da ANATEL, Hélio Maurício Miranda da Fonseca and Maurício Soares Bugarin
86/2018	10-08-2018	Redistribution in Contemporary Japan: A Political Economy Analysis of Ide, Furuichi and Miyazaki (2016)'s "All for All" Fiscal Reform Proposal, Maurício Bugarin

Number	Date	Publication
85/2018	08-08-2018	Gestão Fiscal e Despesa de Pessoal: Análise dos Gastos Públicos Estaduais entre 2008 e 2016, Marcos Lima Bandeira, Paulo Augusto P. de Britto and André Luiz Marques Serrano
84/2018	07-11-2018	Atuação do poder legislativo estadual: análise dos incentivos dos deputados estaduais na atividade legislativa, Débora Costa Ferreira, Fernando B. Meneguim and Maurício Soares Bugarin
83/2018	07-04-2018	Eficiência, atratividade e dissuasão de acordos de leniência e combate à corrupção: o caso da Operação Lava-Jato, Rafael M. Gomes, Roberto H. de Aragão Neto, Maurício S. Bugarin and André L. Gama
82/2018	06-28-2018	Ciclos Políticos e Eleitorais na Execução do Programa Bolsa Família em Nível Municipal, Tiago Sousa Pereira, Moisés A. Resende Filho and Vander Mendes Lucas
81/2018	06-20-2018	Análise do IBS como Proposta de Reforma Tributária. Um Estudo Aplicado de Equilíbrio Geral Computável, Nathanael Pereira Costa and Vander Mendes Lucas
80/2017	09-27-2017	Impacto do Programa Ensino Médio Inovador em indicadores educacionais, Luís Felipe Batista de Oliveira and Rafael Terra
79/2017	09-14-2017	Uma Avaliação da Política de Privatização de Aeroportos Brasileira: Uma Abordagem por Controle Sintético, Caio Cordeiro de Resende
78/2017	08-30-2017	Tecnologia e Desempenho Escolar: Uma Avaliação de Impacto do Programa Um Computador por Aluno, Caio Cordeiro de Resende and Ana Carolina Zoghbi
77/2017	08-23-2017	Desregulamentação da franquia de bagagem despachada no Brasil: Uma Análise de Impacto Regulatório, Débora Alves Pereira Bastos, Rodrigo César Bessoni e Silva and Vander Mendes Lucas
76/2017	08-16-2017	Análise de Eficiência das IFES no Uso de Recursos Financeiros 2010-2015, Antonio Marcos Correia Melonio and Vander Mendes Lucas
75/2017	08-09-2017	Royalties do petróleo, reeleição e ciclos políticos: um estudo econométrico para as eleições, Eduardo Dornelas Munhoz e Moisés de Andrade Resende Filho
74/2017	08-02-2017	Responsabilidade fiscal, a atuação do Poder Judiciário e o comportamento estratégico dos governantes, Débora Costa Ferreira, Fernando B. Meneguim and Maurício Soares Bugarin
73/2017	07-26-2017	Sustentabilidade da Dívida dos Estados Brasileiros: 2005-2015, Hiromi Cristina Santos Doi and Vander Mendes Lucas
72/2017	07-19-2017	Hotelling's product differentiation: an infinite-dimensional linear programming approach, Rodrigo Peñaloza
71/2017	06-16-2017	Escola japonesa ou escola brasileira? A inserção dos estudantes brasileiros na escola no Japão, Maurício Soares Bugarin
70/2017	04-17-2017	How the East was Lost: Coevolution of Institutions and Culture in the 16th Century Portuguese Empire, Bernardo Mueller
69/2017	04-10-2017	A reforma política sob o ponto de vista da análise econômica do direito, Pedro Fernando Nery and Fernando B. Meneguim
68/2016	07-14-2016	O dilema entre a eficiência de curto e de longo prazo no ordenamento jurídico e o impacto no crescimento econômico, Fernando B. Meneguim and Tomás T. S. Bugarin
67/2016	05-04-2016	A estrutura de capital de empresas brasileiras de capital aberto: uma análise de seus determinantes, João Pedro Bertani Catrib, Paulo Augusto P. de Britto and André Luiz Marques Serrano
66/2016	04-20-2016	Tests for history dependence in mixed-Poisson growth: Brazil, 1822-2000, and USA, 1869-1996, with an estimate of the world mixing distribution at start-up, Steve De Castro and Flávio Gonçalves
65/2016	04-13-2016	Piketty's Prediction meets technical progress in Harrod-Domar's Dynamics and Solow Swan's Surrogate, Steve De Castro
64/2016	04-06-2016	Análise do impacto da alteração normativa na aposentadoria por invalidez no Brasil, Helvio Antonio Pereira Marinho, Moises de Andrade Resende Filho and Vander Mendes Lucas
63/2016	03-30-2016	Black movement: Estimating the effects of affirmative action in college admissions on education and labor market outcomes, Andrew Francis-Tan and Maria Tannuri-Pianto
62/2016	01-13-2016	Electronic voting and Social Spending: The impact of enfranchisement on municipal public spending in Brazil, Rodrigo Schneider, Diloá Athias and Maurício Bugarin

Number	Date	Publication
61/2015	12-02-2015	Alunos de inclusão prejudicam seus colegas? Uma avaliação com dados em painel de alunos da rede municipal de São Paulo, Bruna Guidetti, Ana Carolina Zoghbi and Rafael Terra
60/2015	12-02-2015	Impacto de programa Mais Educação em indicadores educacionais, Luís Felipe Batista de Oliveira and Rafael Terra
59/2015	10-21-2015	Eficiência de custos operacionais das companhias de distribuição de energia elétrica (CDEEs) no Brasil: Uma aplicação (DEA & TOBIT) em dois estágios, Daniel de Pina Fernandes and Moisés de Andrade Resende Filho
58/2015	10-14-2015	Determinantes do risco de crédito rural no Brasil: uma crítica às renegociações da dívida rural, Lucas Braga de Melo and Moisés de Andrade Resende Filho
57/2015	10-07-2015	Distribuição da riqueza no Brasil: Limitações a uma estimativa precisa a partir dos dados tabulados do IRPF disponíveis, Marcelo Medeiros
56/2015	10-01-2015	A composição da desigualdade no Brasil. Conciliando o Censo 2010 e os dados do Imposto de Renda, Marcelo Medeiros, Juliana de Castro Galvão and Luísa Nazareno
55/2015	09-24-2015	A estabilidade da desigualdade no Brasil entre 2006 e 2012: resultados adicionais, Marcelo Medeiros and Pedro H. G. F. Souza
54/2015	09-24-2015	Reciclagem de plataformas de petróleo: ônus ou bônus?, Roberto N. P. di Cillo
53/2015	09-09-2015	A Progressividade do Imposto de Renda Pessoa Física no Brasil, Fábio Castro and Mauricio S. Bugarin
52/2015	07-03-2015	Measuring Parliaments: Construction of Indicators of Legislative Oversight, Bento Rodrigo Pereira Monteiro and Denílson Banderia Coêlho
51/2015	06-29-2015	A didactic note on the use of Benford's Law in public works auditing, with an application to the construction of Brazilian Amazon Arena 2014 World Cup soccer stadium, Mauricio S. Bugarin and Flavia Ceccato Rodrigues da Cunha
50/2015	04-29-2015	Accountability and yardstick competition in the public provision of education, Rafael Terra and Erlinson Mattos
49/2015	04-15-2015	Understanding Robert Lucas (1967-1981), Alexandre F. S. Andrada
48/2015	04-08-2015	Common Labor Market, Attachment and Spillovers in a Large Federation, Emilson Caputo Delfino Silva and Vander Mendes Lucas
47/2015	03-27-2015	Tópicos da Reforma Política sob a Perspectiva da Análise Econômica do Direito, Pedro Fernando Nery and Fernando B. Meneguín
46/2014	12-17-2014	The Effects of Wage and Unemployment on Crime Incentives - An Empirical Analysis of Total, Property and Violent Crimes, Paulo Augusto P. de Britto and Tatiana Alessio de Britto
45/2014	12-10-2014	Políticas Públicas de Saúde Influenciam o Eleitor?, Hellen Chrytine Zanetti Matarazzo
44/2014	12-04-2014	Regulação Ótima e a Atuação do Judiciário: Uma Aplicação de Teoria dos Jogos, Maurício S. Bugarin and Fernando B. Meneguín
43/2014	11-12-2014	De Facto Property Rights Recognition, Labor Supply and Investment of the Poor in Brazil, Rafael Santos Dantas and Maria Tannuri-Pianto
42/2014	11-05-2014	On the Institutional Incentives Faced by Brazilian Civil Servants, Mauricio S. Bugarin and Fernando B. Meneguín
41/2014	10-13-2014	Uma Introdução à Teoria Econômica da Corrupção: Definição, Taxonomia e Ensaio Seleccionados, Paulo Augusto P. de Britto
40/2014	10-06-2014	Um modelo de jogo cooperativo sobre efeitos da corrupção no gasto público, Rogério Pereira and Tatiane Almeida de Menezes
39/2014	10-02-2014	Uma análise dos efeitos da fusão ALL-Brasil Ferrovias no preço do frete ferroviário de soja no Brasil, Bruno Ribeiro Alvarenga and Paulo Augusto P. de Britto
38/2014	08-27-2014	Comportamentos estratégicos entre municípios no Brasil, Vitor Lima Carneiro & Vander Mendes Lucas
37/2014	08-20-2014	Modelos Microeconômicos de Análise da Litigância, Fábio Avila de Castro
36/2014	06-23-2014	Uma Investigação sobre a Focalização do Programa Bolsa Família e seus Determinantes Imediatos. André P. Souza, Plínio P. de Oliveira, Janete Duarte, Sérgio R. Gadelha & José de Anchieta Neves
35/2014	06-22-2014	Terminais de Contêineres no Brasil: Eficiência Intertemporal. Leopoldo Kirchner and Vander Lucas
34/2014	06-06-2014	Lei 12.846/13: atrai ou afugenta investimentos? Roberto Neves Pedrosa di Cillo

Number	Date	Publication
33/2013	11-27-2013	Vale a pena ser um bom gestor? Comportamento Eleitoral e Reeleição no Brasil, Pedro Cavalcante
32/2013	11-13-2013	A pressa é inimiga da participação (e do controle)? Uma análise comparativa da implementação de programas estratégicos do governo federal, Roberto Rocha C. Pires and Alexandre de Avila Gomide
31/2013	10-30-2013	Crises de segurança do alimento e a demanda por carnes no Brasil, Moisés de Andrade Resende Filho, Karina Junqueira de Souza and Luís Cristóvão Ferreira Lima
30/2013	10-16-2013	Ética & Incentivos: O que diz a Teoria Econômica sobre recompensar quem denuncia a corrupção? Maurício Bugarin
29/2013	10-02-2013	Intra-Village Expansion of Welfare Programs, M. Christian Lehmann
28/2013	09-25-2013	Interações verticais e horizontais entre governos e seus efeitos sobre as decisões de descentralização educacional no Brasil, Ana Carolina Zoghbi, Enlison Mattos and Rafael Terra
27/2013	09-18-2013	Partidos, facções e a ocupação dos cargos de confiança no executivo federal (1999-2011), Felix Lopez, Mauricio Bugarin and Karina Bugarin
26/2013	09-11-2013	Metodologias de Análise da Concorrência no Setor Portuário, Pedro H. Albuquerque, Paulo P. de Britto, Paulo C. Coutinho, Adelaida Fonseca, Vander M. Lucas, Paulo R. Lustosa, Alexandre Y. Carvalho and André R. de Oliveira
25/2013	09-04-2013	Balancing the Power to Appoint officers, Salvador Barberà and Danilo Coelho
24/2013	08-28-2013	Modelos de Estrutura do Setor Portuário para Análise da Concorrência, Paulo C. Coutinho, Paulo P. de Britto, Vander M. Lucas, Paulo R. Lustosa, Pedro H. Albuquerque, Alexandre Y. Carvalho, Adelaida Fonseca and André Rossi de Oliveira
23/2013	08-21-2013	Hyperopic Strict Topologies, Jaime Orillo and Rudy José Rosas Bazán
22/2013	08-14-2013	Há Incompatibilidade entre Eficiência e Legalidade? Fernando B. Meneguín and Pedro Felipe de Oliveira Santos
21/2013	08-07-2013	A Note on Equivalent Comparisons of Information Channels, Luís Fernando Brands Barbosa and Gil Riella
20/2013	07-31-2013	Vertical Integration on Health Care Markets: Evidence from Brazil, Tainá Leandro and José Guilherme de Lara Resende
19/2013	07-24-2013	A Simple Method of Elicitation of Preferences under Risk, Patrícia Langasch Tecles and José Guilherme de Lara Resende
18/2013	07-17-2013	Algunas Nociones sobre el Sistema de Control Público en Argentina con Mención al Caso de los Hospitales Públicos de la Provincia de Mendoza, Luis Federico Giménez
17/2013	07-10-2013	Mensuração do Risco de Crédito em Carteiras de Financiamentos Comerciais e suas Implicações para o Spread Bancário, Paulo de Britto and Rogério Cerri
16/2013	07-03-2013	Previdências dos Trabalhadores dos Setores Público e Privado e Desigualdade no Brasil, Pedro H. G. F. de Souza and Marcelo Medeiros
15/2013	06-26-2013	Incentivos à Corrupção e à Inação no Serviço Público: Uma análise de desenho de mecanismos, Maurício Bugarin and Fernando Meneguín
14/2013	06-26-2013	The Decline in inequality in Brazil, 2003–2009: The Role of the State, Pedro H. G. F. de Souza and Marcelo Medeiros
13/2013	06-26-2013	Productivity Growth and Product Choice in Fisheries: the Case of the Alaskan pollock Fishery Revisited, Marcelo de O. Torres and Ronald G. Felthoven
12/2013	06-19-2003	The State and income inequality in Brazil, Marcelo Medeiros and Pedro H. G. F. de Souza
11/2013	06-19-2013	Uma alternativa para o cálculo do fator X no setor de distribuição de energia elétrica no Brasil, Paulo Cesar Coutinho and Ângelo Henrique Lopes da Silva
10/2013	06-12-2013	Mecanismos de difusão de Políticas Sociais no Brasil: uma análise do Programa Saúde da Família, Denilson Bandeira Coêlho, Pedro Cavalcante and Mathieu Turgeon
09/2013	06-12-2103	A Brief Analysis of Aggregate Measures as an Alternative to the Median at Central Bank of Brazil's Survey of Professional Forecasts, Fabia A. Carvalho
08/2013	06-12-2013	On the Optimality of Exclusion in Multidimensional Screening, Paulo Barelli, Suren Basov, Mauricio Bugarin and Ian King
07/2013	06-12-2013	Desenvolvimentos institucionais recentes no setor de telecomunicações no Brasil, Rodrigo A. F. de Sousa, Nathalia A. de Souza and Luis C. Kubota
06/2013	06-12-2013	Preference for Flexibility and Dynamic Consistency, Gil Riella

Number	Date	Publication
05/2013	06-12-2013	Partisan Voluntary Transfers in a Fiscal Federation: New evidence from Brazil, Mauricio Bugarin and Ricardo Ubrig
04/2013	06-12-2013	How Judges Think in the Brazilian Supreme Court: Estimating Ideal Points and Identifying Dimensions, Pedro F. A. Nery Ferreira and Bernardo Mueller
03/2013	06-12-2013	Democracy, Accountability, and Poverty Alleviation in Mexico: Self-Restraining Reform and the Depoliticization of Social Spending, Yuriko Takahashi
02/2013	06-12-2013	Yardstick Competition in Education Spending: a Spatial Analysis based on Different Educational and Electoral Accountability Regimes, Rafael Terra
01/2013	06-12-2013	On the Representation of Incomplete Preferences under Uncertainty with Indecisiveness in Tastes, Gil Riella