

PLACEHOLDER THESIS TITLE
A VERY MEANINGFUL THESIS

by

LIM JIEW PENG

DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS
NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF SINGAPORE

2016/2017

ABSTRACT

Here is some filler text.

FOREWORD

(Place holder) acknowledgements

ABBREVIATIONS

BCA: Building and Construction Authority of Singapore

CONQUAS: Construction Quality Assessment System

DID: Difference-in-differences methodology

GM: Green Mark environmental certification in Singapore

HDB: Housing Development Board. Statutory board in Singapore in charge of public housing.

MRT: Mass Rapid Transit. Public rail system in Singapore.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Green Mark (GM) Certification in Singapore	2
1.2	Aim of Study	2
2	Literature Review	4
3	Data and Methodology	6
3.1	Data Sources	6
3.2	Descriptive Statistics	6
3.3	Methodology	9
4	Empirical Results	10
5	Conclusion	13

LIST OF FIGURES

LIST OF TABLES

3.1	Comparison of GM and non-GM Properties	7
4.1	Effects of GM Award on Price	10
4.2	Difference-in-difference Models	11
4.3	Placebo Difference-in-difference Tests	12

1 INTRODUCTION

In recent years, numerous green building certification schemes have been developed, “aimed at mitigating the impact of buildings on the natural environment through sustainable design” (Vierra 2016). The impact of buildings on the environment is huge; for instance, “US buildings alone are responsible for more CO₂ emissions than any other entire country in the world except China” (Kats 2003). Many of these certifications focus on rating the sustainability and energy efficiency of buildings.

This drive towards sustainable design started in the 1990s with the Building Research Establishment (BRE) Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM), and was followed in 2000 by the US Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) rating system (Vierra 2016). This drive for environmental sustainability in products and buildings has accelerated in recent years due to growing concerns about environmental issues.

Certifications encourage the construction of green buildings by reducing information asymmetries associated with green buildings, which cause potential buyers to not fully price in the benefits of green technology (Matisoff, Noonan, and Flowers 2016). While green features provide tangible and intangible benefits such as lower electricity bills and better environment, these features are unobservable at the demand side before purchase. Some of these features such as material sourcing might not even be observable after purchase. This problem is similar to the “market for lemons” problem (Akerlof 1970), where potential buyers cannot differentiate between the presence and absence of green features. As a result, there is a pooling equilibrium where potential buyers/tenants are not willing to fully price in the green features which landlords or developers claim to exist. Assuming green features require additional costs to build in, the lack of price premiums means that building in green features leads to lower profits. Developers and constructors will choose not to build in green features to their buildings because the additional costs are not covered by a corresponding price premium.

A credible certification can verify these unobservable green characteristics, increasing confidence in the validity of the environmental information provided, and hence act as a signal to potential buyers about the green features and quality of the building. This would justify a price premium for green features, which would in turn pay for the additional costs required to build in green features, increasing the construction of these environmentally sustainable buildings.

Some literature have shown that the costs of building green features are actually not that high, implying that developers should not require large incentives to build in green features. These studies have demonstrated that the average cost premium for green buildings are only about 1% to 2% (see Bartlett and Howard 2000; also Kats 2003). The Building and Construction Authority of Singapore (BCA) conducted a study in 2008

and found a cost premium of between 0.3% to 8% for their Green Mark certification, depending on the level of certification desired.

Regardless, even if the cost premiums are low, these cost premiums still need to be offset by a corresponding price premium. Buyers and tenants are unwilling to pay for green features not because they do not value green features, but because they cannot observe them before the purchase or rental agreement. A certification acts as a signal or assurance of quality, to allow potential tenants and buyers to fully price in the benefits from the green features.

1.1 Green Mark (GM) Certification in Singapore

The Green Mark scheme was launched in January 2005 by the BCA to encourage the construction of more environmentally friendly and energy efficient buildings. The GM scheme rates and certifies buildings according to five main criteria: energy efficiency, water efficiency, environmental protection, indoor environmental quality, and other green and innovative features (Building and Construction Authority 2017).

Buildings which apply for the GM certification would be assessed on the criteria listed above, and would be scored on a points basis. These scores would then be converted to an award type (Certified, Gold, Gold Plus, Platinum).

In order to further encourage developers to incorporate Green Building Technologies (GBTs) into their developments, the BCA set aside \$20 million on the Green Mark Incentive Scheme (GMIS) in 2006. This was a scheme aimed at accelerating the adoption of green technologies, by providing cash incentives to developers, building owners, architects and mechanical and electrical (M&E) engineers who “[made] efforts to achieve at least a BCA Green Mark Gold rating or higher”. The cash incentives would be split into two stages: half of which would be disbursed upon successful certification during the design or construction stage, and the remaining would be disbursed after validation, one year after the Temporary Occupation Permit (TOP) date. (Building and Construction Authority 2015)

1.2 Aim of Study

The aim of this paper is to explore the signalling effects of an environmental certification or award, using data from housing transactions in Singapore.

The signalling effects of environmental certifications are important because these certifications are meant to incentivise certain behaviour, in this case, constructing energy efficient buildings. In order for certifications

to incentivise private companies to adopt certain practices, they need to act as credible signals, i.e. provide a price premium to offset the cost premium associated with “good behaviour”.

This study uses a difference-in-differences (DID) approach to study the signalling effects of the GM award through its effect on housing transaction prices.

2 LITERATURE REVIEW

- Relationship between energy efficiency and price (early stuff, 1980s): Johnson and Kaserman (1983), Quigley (1984), Laquatra (1986), Dinan and Miranowski (1989)

Even before the proliferation of green certification schemes, some early papers in the 1980s have already demonstrated the relationship between energy efficiency and residential property prices (see Johnson and Kaserman 1983; Laquatra 1986; Dinan and Miranowski 1989). These papers demonstrate that improvements in energy efficiency, which lead to cost savings, are capitalised in the housing market. Cost savings from energy efficient investments are translated into increased housing prices.

- studies on certification schemes: Bond and Devine (2016), Deng, Li, and Quigley (2012), Jayantha and Man (2013), Fuerst et al. (2016), Matisoff, Noonan, and Flowers (2016), Kahn and Kok (2014)

More recently, the growing concern about climate change (and the proliferation of green certifications) has sparked more research on the effect of green certifications on housing prices. These studies show that green labelling or certification has a positive effect on residential property prices.

Using a hedonic pricing model, Jayantha and Man (2013) studied two green certifications in Hong Kong, namely the Hong Kong Building Environmental Assessment Method (HK-BEAM) and the Hong Kong Green Building Council (HK-GBC) award. Using data from 1 July 2003 to 1 September 2008 (to avoid the SARS outbreak in 2003 and the global financial crisis in 2008), the study found that people were willing to pay between 3.4 and 6.4 percent more for green certified buildings.

Several studies also used hedonic price models to analyse the LEED programme in the US. For instance, Bond and Devine (2016) used a hedonic model with property-level characteristics such as presence of gym or swimming pool, as well as unit-level characteristics like the size of a dwelling unit, to model housing prices. The study also used coarsened exact matching (CEM) to balance the control (non-certified) and treatment (certified) groups. The motivation behind this is similar to propensity score matching; that is to find suitable controls for each treatment observation. The results from this study indicate that non-certified properties which are marketed as having green features do command a price premium over other non-certified properties, and certification adds a 4 percent premium on top of this, demonstrating the effect of the certification signal.

Another study by Kahn and Kok (2014) analysed various certifications like Energy Star, LEED and GreenPoint in the California housing market. The study used transactions of all single-family home sales in California from 2007 to 2012 and found a small premium of about 5% for certified homes. The study also found variations in the premium based on environmental ideology and local climatic conditions (e.g. hotter areas

demand more cooling and hence higher importance of energy efficiency).

Although many studies focus on the US market, there are a few studies that have attempted to examine if the same price premium holds in other markets around the world. Fuerst and Shimizu (2016) analysed the Japanese housing market and found a 5% higher asking price for Tokyo Green Label certified condominiums compared to uncertified condominiums. The study also specifically tested if sellers overestimate the value of the green label by testing if transaction prices of green labelled buildings differed from their average asking prices, and found no evidence of such phenomena. This provides some evidence that the price premium is not unique to the US market, and can be generalised to other countries.

Deng, Li, and Quigley (2012) studied the GM program in Singapore

Heinzle, Yip and Xing (2013) also studied the GM program using a stated preference study and found a price premium between 3.78 and 7.98 percent, depending on the level of certification (e.g. Gold, Platinum). This study also looked at the importance of various housing attributes in determining the purchase decisions of a potential buyer. The study found that price, size, location (Core Central Region/Rest of Central Region/Outside Central Region), the direction or facing of the living room and distance to MRT are the most important attributes (in that order). Apart from price which is the dependent variable in the hedonic model and facing of the living room which is unavailable, the rest of these variables are included in some form or other (e.g. location is absorbed by the 4 digit postal code fixed effects in the hedonic model).

- lower implicit prices for rental compared to owner-occupiers: Fuerst et al. (2016), Michelsen, Mense, and Kholodilin (2015)

A few studies pointed out the heterogeneous incentives to invest in energy efficiency between owner-occupiers and landlords. Michelsen, Mense, and Kholodilin (Michelsen, Mense, and Kholodilin 2015) studied the Berlin apartment housing market and found that the implicit price of energy efficiency in a tenant-occupied dwelling is less than that of an owner-occupied one, by a factor of 2.5. They also explain that this is due to tenants not having enough technical understanding to evaluate the true quality of a dwelling, and that they also apply larger discount rates to future energy savings or energy price increases.

3 DATA AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 Data Sources

About eighty percent of the Singapore population lives in public housing (Department of Statistics Singapore 2017). Property characteristics are heterogeneous across different submarkets (Sing, Tsai, and Chen 2006), so this paper studies only new sales in the condominium and apartment market, of which 134,183 transactions were collected. Public housing by the Housing Development Board (HDB) as well as executive condominiums (ECs) are subsidised and have eligibility criteria (see Housing and Development Board 2015b; also Housing and Development Board 2015a), hence they might function differently from the private housing market. In the private property market, I use only residential properties, because commercial and office buildings do undergo asset enhancement initiatives (AEIs) every once in a while. If the timing of the GM award coincides with these AEIs, the DID cannot isolate the effect of the GM award from the other relevant improvements in the property as a result of the AEI.

Housing transactions ranging from Jan 2003 to Mar 2016 was obtained from the Real Estate Information System (REALIS) of Singapore. A total of 331,405 private residential housing transactions were collected.

Information about the GM awards was obtained by scraping the Building Construction Authority of Singapore (BCA) Green Mark Buildings Directory,¹ searching for Residential and Mixed Developments. Since the GM Buildings Directory only contained the year of award, I obtained the exact dates of the award by searching for “BCA Awards” the Straits Times archive from LexisNexis. Green Mark winners are announced on the BCA awards night, so I searched for the dates of the BCA awards night for each year (2005 till 2015).

Information about condominium facilities was obtained from (??). Construction Quality Assessment System (CONQUAS) scores for projects were obtained from the BCA’s Information on Construction Quality (IQUAS) database.²

3.2 Descriptive Statistics

¹The BCA Green Mark Buildings Directory contains a list of buildings which are awarded with the Green Mark award. Information about the award such as the award year is provided. Website can be found here: https://www.bca.gov.sg/green_mark/KnowledgeResources/BuildingDirectory.aspx

²The IQUAS database contains information about projects, such as the CONQUAS score and Quality Mark certification. Website can be found here: <https://www.bca.gov.sg/Professionals/IQUAS/IQUAS/default.aspx?menuID=4>

Table 3.1: Comparison of GM and non-GM Properties

	Overall (N = 134,183)	Non-GM (N = 83,367)	GM (N = 50,816)
Property Type			
Apartment	44,594 (33%)	36,170 (43%)	8,424 (17%)
Condominium	89,589 (67%)	47,197 (57%)	42,392 (83%)
Unit Price (S\$/sqm)			
Min	3253.686	3253.686	4231.134
Mean (SD)	14,068.65 (6,043.71)	13,854.19 (6,088.18)	14,420.48 (5,953.39)
Max	78067.94	78067.94	66968.64
Unit Size (sqm)			
Min	24	24	34
Mean (SD)	100.98 (51.51)	96.38 (49.75)	108.52 (53.43)
Max	1289	879	1289
Distance to MRT (km)			
Min	0.04728256	0.04728256	0.05318607
Mean (SD)	0.94 (0.73)	1.03 (0.71)	0.80 (0.72)
Max	5.745097	5.745097	3.355272
Lease Type			
Leasehold	76,686 (57%)	37,913 (45%)	38,773 (76%)
Freehold	57,497 (43%)	45,454 (55%)	12,043 (24%)
Floor			
Mean (SD)	9.64 (8.04)	8.62 (7.11)	11.31 (9.13)
Max	70	52	70
Green Mark Award			
Certified	4,997 (4%)	0 (0%)	4,997 (10%)
Gold	21,345 (16%)	0 (0%)	21,345 (42%)
Gold Plus	20,128 (15%)	0 (0%)	20,128 (40%)
Platinum	4,346 (3%)	0 (0%)	4,346 (9%)
No Award	83,367 (62%)	83,367 (100%)	0 (0%)
CONQUAS Score			
61-70	638 (0%)	548 (1%)	90 (0%)

	Overall (N = 134,183)	Non-GM (N = 83,367)	GM (N = 50,816)
71-80	4,259 (3%)	3,584 (4%)	675 (1%)
81-90	25,202 (19%)	15,663 (19%)	9,539 (19%)
> 90	37,741 (28%)	15,044 (18%)	22,697 (45%)
Missing	66,343 (49%)	48,528 (58%)	17,815 (35%)
Facilities (%)			
BBQ Pit	0.66 (0.47)	0.64 (0.48)	0.69 (0.46)
Swimming Pool	0.67 (0.47)	0.71 (0.45)	0.62 (0.49)
Tennis Court	0.51 (0.50)	0.42 (0.49)	0.66 (0.47)
Basketball Court	0.06 (0.24)	0.07 (0.25)	0.05 (0.23)
Gym	0.75 (0.43)	0.76 (0.43)	0.73 (0.45)
Function Room	0.31 (0.46)	0.26 (0.44)	0.38 (0.48)
Jacuzzi	0.44 (0.50)	0.46 (0.50)	0.40 (0.49)
Sauna	0.12 (0.32)	0.09 (0.29)	0.15 (0.36)
Transaction Year			
2003	4,179 (3%)	3,953 (5%)	226 (0%)
2004	4,867 (4%)	3,945 (5%)	922 (2%)
2005	6,964 (5%)	4,878 (6%)	2,086 (4%)
2006	8,815 (7%)	6,663 (8%)	2,152 (4%)
2007	11,920 (9%)	7,304 (9%)	4,616 (9%)
2008	3,767 (3%)	2,771 (3%)	996 (2%)
2009	12,729 (9%)	6,677 (8%)	6,052 (12%)
2010	14,379 (11%)	8,704 (10%)	5,675 (11%)
2011	14,927 (11%)	9,207 (11%)	5,720 (11%)
2012	19,603 (15%)	10,979 (13%)	8,624 (17%)
2013	14,591 (11%)	7,719 (9%)	6,872 (14%)
2014	6,833 (5%)	3,395 (4%)	3,438 (7%)
2015	7,083 (5%)	4,547 (5%)	2,536 (5%)
2016	3,526 (3%)	2,625 (3%)	901 (2%)

3.3 Methodology

Certified buildings can have a price premium due to two reasons: either the signalling effect provided by the certification, or that good features tend to cluster together such that green buildings are also higher quality buildings in other aspects. Fuerst (2016) also pointed out that energy efficient features present in green buildings may also affect building performance in non-environmental aspects, and hence also generate a price premium that is unrelated to environmental friendliness.

This study uses a difference-in-differences (DID) approach to isolate the signalling effect from any other factors associated with the GM certification that might contribute to a price premium.

Housing prices are modelled using the hedonic price model introduced by Rosen (1974). In this model, housing price is a function of structural, environmental and locational attributes. These attributes carry implicit prices, which are revealed from observed prices of different properties with different combinations of attributes. These implicit prices are estimated with regression analysis.

This paper uses a feature of the GM program in Singapore to isolate the signalling effects of an environmental certification. Because certification takes time, developments sometimes get the award only after their launch. This makes it possible to use a DID framework to isolate the effect of the award as a signal from other unobserved characteristics. The idea is that the award is an “unexpected shock” to buyers, and hence the price premium attributed to the property after the award will be independent of other unobserved characteristics, which may cluster together with green features. In essence, because nothing about the property has changed after it is awarded with the GM award, any price premium that is generated after the award should be independent of unobserved characteristics.

This study uses only new sales of private residential properties, excluding ECs.

4 EMPIRICAL RESULTS

Table 4.1: Effects of GM Award on Price

	<i>Dependent variable:</i>		
	Natural log of Price psm		
	(1)	(2)	(3)
GM Award	0.045*** (0.002)	0.083*** (0.003)	0.025*** (0.002)
Property Type: Condominium		0.084*** (0.004)	0.054*** (0.003)
ln(Area (sqm))		-0.178*** (0.002)	-0.129*** (0.002)
Freehold		0.150*** (0.005)	0.148*** (0.004)
Floor		0.008*** (0.0003)	0.008*** (0.0002)
Floor ²		-0.00002** (0.00001)	-0.0001*** (0.00001)
First Floor		-0.037*** (0.002)	-0.044*** (0.002)
Top Floor		-0.059*** (0.003)	-0.083*** (0.002)
Distance to MRT (km)		-0.082*** (0.003)	-0.024*** (0.002)
Years to Completion		-0.027*** (0.001)	-0.027*** (0.001)
4-digit Postal Code Fixed Effects	No	Yes	Yes
Year-Month Dummies	No	No	Yes
Condo Facilities Dummies	No	Yes	Yes
Observations	134,183	103,123	103,123
R ²	0.003	0.825	0.927
Adjusted R ²	0.003	0.824	0.926
Residual Std. Error	0.375 (df = 134181)	0.163 (df = 102612)	0.106 (df = 102451)

Note:

*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

Table 4.2: Difference-in-difference Models

	<i>Dependent variable:</i>		
	Natural log of Price psm		
	(1)	(2)	(3)
GM Award	0.015*** (0.002)	0.023*** (0.003)	0.017*** (0.002)
GM x After GM	0.016*** (0.002)	0.029*** (0.002)	0.012*** (0.002)
Property Type: Condominium	0.054*** (0.003)	0.052*** (0.005)	0.049*** (0.003)
ln(Area (sqm))	-0.129*** (0.002)	-0.110*** (0.002)	-0.129*** (0.002)
Freehold	0.147*** (0.004)	0.095*** (0.005)	0.145*** (0.004)
Floor	0.008*** (0.0002)	0.008*** (0.0002)	0.008*** (0.0002)
Floor ²	-0.0001*** (0.00001)	-0.0001*** (0.00001)	-0.0001*** (0.00001)
First Floor	-0.044*** (0.002)	-0.052*** (0.002)	-0.044*** (0.002)
Top Floor	-0.083*** (0.002)	-0.075*** (0.002)	-0.083*** (0.002)
Distance to MRT (km)	-0.024*** (0.002)	-0.004 (0.003)	-0.025*** (0.002)
Years to Completion	-0.028*** (0.001)	-0.030*** (0.001)	-0.027*** (0.001)
CONQUAS Score		0.004*** (0.0002)	
CONQUAS Score: 71-80			0.218*** (0.010)
CONQUAS Score: 81-90			0.179*** (0.009)
CONQUAS Score: > 90			0.209*** (0.009)
CONQUAS Score: Missing			0.193*** (0.009)
4-digit Postal Code Fixed Effects	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year-Month Dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes
Condo Facilities Dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	103,123	65,403	103,123
R ²	0.927	0.940	0.927
Adjusted R ²	0.926	0.939	0.927
Residual Std. Error	0.106 (df = 102450)	0.100 (df = 64951)	0.106 (df = 102446)

Note:

*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

Table 4.3: Placebo Difference-in-difference Tests

	<i>Dependent variable:</i>
	Natural log of Price psm
GM Award	0.071*** (0.005)
GM x After	0.005 (0.005)
Property Type: Condominium	0.052*** (0.003)
ln(Area (sqm))	-0.141*** (0.002)
Freehold	0.179*** (0.003)
Floor	0.007*** (0.0002)
Floor ²	-0.00005*** (0.00001)
First Floor	-0.032*** (0.002)
Top Floor	-0.078*** (0.002)
Distance to MRT (km)	-0.003 (0.002)
Years to Completion	-0.009*** (0.0002)
CONQUAS Score: 61-70	0.045* (0.025)
CONQUAS Score: 71-80	0.099*** (0.025)
CONQUAS Score: 81-90	0.117*** (0.025)
CONQUAS Score: > 90	0.122*** (0.025)
CONQUAS Score: Missing	0.100*** (0.025)
4-digit Postal Code Fixed Effects	Yes
Year-Month Dummies	Yes
Condo Facilities Dummies	Yes
Observations	97,005
R ²	0.905
Adjusted R ²	0.904
Residual Std. Error	0.127 (df = 96189)
<i>Note:</i>	*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

5 CONCLUSION

REFERENCES

- Akerlof, George A. 1970. "The Market for 'Lemons': Quality Uncertainty and the Market Mechanism." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 84 (3): 488. doi:10.2307/1879431.
- Bartlett, Ed, and Nigel Howard. 2000. "Informing the decision makers on the cost and value of green building." *Building Research & Information* 28 (5-6): 315–24. doi:10.1080/096132100418474.
- Bond, Shaun A., and Avis Devine. 2016. "Certification Matters: Is Green Talk Cheap Talk?" *Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics* 52 (2): 117–40. doi:10.1007/s11146-015-9499-y.
- Building and Construction Authority. 2015. <https://www.bca.gov.sg/GreenMark/gmis.html>.
- . 2017. "BCA Green Mark Assessment Criteria." https://www.bca.gov.sg/GreenMark/green_mark_criteria.html.
- Deng, Yongheng, Zhiliang Li, and John M. Quigley. 2012. "Economic returns to energy-efficient investments in the housing market: Evidence from Singapore." *Regional Science and Urban Economics* 42 (3). Elsevier B.V.: 506–15. doi:10.1016/j.regsciurbeco.2011.04.004.
- Department of Statistics Singapore. 2017. "Infographic - Singapore Population." <http://www.singstat.gov.sg/statistics/visualising-data/infographics/population>.
- Dinan, Terry M., and John A. Miranowski. 1989. "Estimating the implicit price of energy efficiency improvements in the residential housing market: A hedonic approach." *Journal of Urban Economics* 25 (1): 52–67. doi:10.1016/0094-1190(89)90043-0.
- Fuerst, Franz, and Chihiro Shimizu. 2016. "Green luxury goods? The economics of eco-labels in the Japanese housing market." *Journal of the Japanese and International Economies* 39. Elsevier Inc.: 108–22. doi:10.1016/j.jjie.2016.01.003.
- Fuerst, Franz, Pat McAllister, Anupam Nanda, and Pete Wyatt. 2016. "Energy performance ratings and house prices in Wales: An empirical study." *Energy Policy* 92. Elsevier: 20–33. doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2016.01.024.
- Heinzle, S L, A B Y Yip, and M L Y Xing. 2013. "The Influence of Green Building Certification Schemes on Real Estate Investor Behaviour: Evidence from Singapore." *Urban Studies* 50 (10): 1970–87. doi:10.1177/0042098013477693.
- Housing and Development Board. 2015a. "Buying a New Executive Condominium." <http://www.hdb.gov.sg/>

cs/infoweb/residential/buying-a-flat/new/eligibility/executive-condominiums.

———. 2015b. “Buying a New Flat.” <http://www.hdb.gov.sg/cs/infoweb/residential/buying-a-flat/new>.

Jayantha, Wadu Mesthrige, and Wan Sze Man. 2013. “Effect of green labelling on residential property price: a case study in Hong Kong.” *Journal of Facilities Management* 11 (1): 31–51. doi:10.1108/14725961311301457.

Johnson, Ruth C., and David L. Kaserman. 1983. “Housing Market Capitalization of Energy-Saving Durable Good Investments.” *Economic Inquiry* 21 (3): 374–86. doi:10.1111/j.1465-7295.1983.tb00639.x.

Kahn, Matthew E., and Nils Kok. 2014. “The capitalization of green labels in the California housing market.” *Regional Science and Urban Economics* 47 (1). Elsevier B.V.: 25–34. doi:10.1016/j.regsciurbeco.2013.07.001.

Kats, Gregory H. 2003. “Green Building Costs and Financial Benefits.” *Massachusetts Technology Collaborative*, 2–5. doi:10.1089/jop.2006.22.291.

Laquatra, Joseph. 1986. “Housing market capitalization of thermal integrity.” *Energy Economics* 8 (3): 134–38. doi:10.1016/0140-9883(86)90011-3.

Matisoff, Daniel C., Douglas S. Noonan, and Mallory E. Flowers. 2016. “Green Buildings: Economics and Policies.” *Review of Environmental Economics and Policy* 10 (2): rew009. doi:10.1093/reep/rew009.

Michelsen, Claus, Andreas Mense, and Konstantin A Kholodilin. 2015. “The market value of energy efficiency in buildings and the mode of tenure.” *Urban Studies*, no. August 2015. doi:10.1007/s10273-011-1262-2.

Quigley, John M. 1984. “The production of housing services and the derived demand for residential energy.” doi:10.2307/2555526.

Rosen, Sherwin. 1974. “Hedonic Prices and Implicit Markets : Product Differentiation in Pure Competition.” *Journal of Political Economy* 82 (1): 34–55.

Sing, Tien Foo, I. Chun Tsai, and Ming Chi Chen. 2006. “Price dynamics in public and private housing markets in Singapore.” *Journal of Housing Economics* 15 (4): 305–20. doi:10.1016/j.jhe.2006.09.006.

Vierra, Stephanie. 2016. “Green Building Standards and Certification Systems.” <https://www.wbdg.org/resources/green-building-standards-and-certification-systems>.