· Welfare and Missing Markets

- Externality
- Public goods

Example: Externalities

* Action that impaces negotively the utility of other agents.

* Consumers : I=2

- i=1: has an action that impacts utility of i=2

- Denote that action: h GIR

- each agent i=1,2 has preferences over Xix 1R

consumption action If i=1, then I does not pick this.

- U: X: × IR → IR replesents Zi

. $(N_2i, N_Li, h) = \frac{\chi_{Li}}{\uparrow} + \frac{\chi_{Li}}{\uparrow} + \frac{\chi_{Li}}{\downarrow} +$

but not how i substitutes between two commodities.

- · \$ (.) is twice differentiable and concave
- · \$2(.) <0 negative externality
- · no assumptions on \$2(.)
- "Choice of h" is costless to 1
- One firm with $T_J = \{(0, ..., 0)\}$
- Change i= 1's maximization phoblem is

- · 1's optimal choice of h is h* with \$2'(h*) = 0
- " Utilitarium efficient choice of h solves mox [$\beta_1(h) + \beta_2(h)$]

 or he solves $\beta_1'(h) + \beta_2'(h) = 0$.

Since $\emptyset_{i}'(.)$ < o for all h, \Rightarrow $\emptyset'_{i}(h^{e})$ > $0 = \emptyset'_{i}(h^{*})$ Since \emptyset_{i} is concave \Rightarrow h^{*} > h^{e}

=> Thus, 1 is consuming more than is utilitation efficient.

Potential Fix: Property Rights

- i=2 has the right to om "externaling free environment"
- i=1 must buy sufficient rights to be able to consume h.
- Market cleaning: agent + has to want to sell the right to agent 1.

* Endowment of h

- Whi = 0 and Whz = Wh
- Ph : price of h
- amount of right consumed by it is hi
- hith= wn by market cleaning
- define \$2(.) function of ha

\$2(h2) = \$2(Wh-h2) = \$2(h1)

$$\hat{\varphi}'(ht) = Pt$$
) $\Rightarrow \hat{\varphi}'(ht) = -\hat{\varphi}'(w_2 - ht) = \hat{\varphi}'(ht)$

(Remark)

- can think of the inefficiency as related to a missing market.

- property rights allowed to trade on h, then we return to efficiency.

(In a missing market, trading on h makes the market efficient i.e., eliminates negative externality by trading on h)

- Endowment of h was irrelavant: Win could have taken any value & Win could have been distributed any way between i=1.2

Example) Take away

An implicit assumption in the First Welfale Theorem is

"universal price quoting of the commodities" or "complete methods"

Example: Public goods

* good that you cannot prevent other agents from having access to it.

* jorgon: non-rivalrous & non-excludable

* Under provision of public good relative to efficient.

- Commodities : l=1,2 (l=1: numeraire

let: public good

- firm J=1:

· turn numeraise into public good

· f: IR+ > IR+ Strictly increasing, concave, differentiable, invertible inverse differentiable, f(0)=0.

· 1 = {1-2,9): 2,9=0 and f(2)=9 f(0=9 in equilibrium.

 $Z = f^{+}(g) := C(g)$ Cost function.

differentiable = so rigg is differentiable

- Consumers i=1,..., I:

· Consumer i : (XII, Ki)

> boys Nei

profile of consumption bumdles is $(X_1,...,X_{I})$

=> Consumes: Xxi + Z Xxk

· Wi =0, for all i.

· Z represents by 11;

Mi (Kin , Kix) = Kin + & (S(Xx1, ..., Xxx))

where $\mathscr{G}_{1}:\mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{R}$ is strictly incheasing, strictly amove and twice differentiable $\mathscr{K}:S(\mathcal{X}_{21},...,\mathcal{X}_{2E})=\sum_{k=1}^{E}\mathcal{X}_{2k}$

(- depond on how much the opposite guys buy)

Amond the definition of a competitive equilibrium to have all consumers having correct beliefs about what others amount: $((N^*, ..., N^*_{-}, -Z^*, 2^*), (P^*, P^*_{-}))$ solves

 $max \left[\chi_{ii} + \phi_{i} \left(\chi_{2i} + \sum_{k} \chi_{2k} \right) \right]$ S.t. $p_{i}^{*} \chi_{i}^{*} + p_{i}^{*} \chi_{2i}^{*} \leq p_{i}^{*} \omega_{1i}$

· Normalize Pt=1

* Conditions or competitive equilibrium

1 Firm max profit

2 = f(2*) and max [P* f(2) - 2]

=> F.O.C P.*+(Z) ≤ 1 With =1 if Z*>0

=> z*=f'(g*) = c(g*). Thus P* = c'(g)

@ Consumer max:

\$ (16 + = 1 xin) = P with = if xi >0.

$$(x_{i}^{*} + \sum_{\alpha \neq i} x_{i}^{*} = g^{*} \rightarrow \text{fir each}:$$

$$g'(g^{*}) \leq g^{*} \leq C'(g^{*})$$

$$i^{*} (x_{i}^{*} > 0 \Rightarrow g'(g^{*}) = C'(g^{*})$$

* Implication for provision of public goods.

· Order i=1,..., I s.t at g

 $\phi'(g^*) \leq \phi'(g^*) \leq \ldots \leq \phi'_{\perp}(g^*)$ (For anvisionce, we can order $\phi'(g)$, $\forall i$)

case 1): gt=0. No public good

case 2) : 3 >0 P= = c'(3") and

ヨ some M s.t. め((g*) = Pま for i=M,..., I め(()) < Pま for i<M

1

$$\sum_{i=M}^{T} \phi_i'(g^*) = (I-M+1) \cdot C'(g^*). \tag{A}$$

• efficient $g: \max_{g} \sum_{i=1}^{J} \varphi_{i}(g) - c(g)$ (B)

*Check => ge > g+ < compare (A) to solution (B)

(Remember assumption of \$1; s(num, nox) = Insa)

=> Complete the market: film choose consumer specific 8: