

# Tradeable Import Certificates: A Promising Instrument to Support Domestic Production in Strategic Sectors?

Sebastian Kranz, Ulm University

2025-11-27

## Abstract

Recent crises have increased concerns about supply security in sectors that are considered strategically important. The goal of sufficient domestic production capacities has motivated various forms of subsidies, tariffs and other instruments. This paper revisits Warren Buffett’s (2003) proposal of tradeable import certificates (TIC) in this context. TIC differ from classical import quotas mainly by linking the import volume to export performance. The certificate price functions like a mix of flexible tariffs and export subsidies whose levels depend on net imports in the strategic sector. We analyse benefits and drawbacks in a simple two-country model. In competitive markets, TIC constitute a transparent and efficient instrument that effectively reduces incentives for other countries to deviate from agreements via hidden subsidies or non-tariff trade barriers. However, TIC can have adverse effects if there are domestic producers with market power in the certificate market.

## 1 Introduction

Over the past decade, governments in advanced and emerging economies alike have rediscovered a vocabulary of “strategic sectors,” “resilience,” and “economic security.” The Trump administration’s call to bring manufacturing back to the United States, Europe’s debates about “strategic autonomy,” and the scramble for vaccines, active pharmaceutical ingredients, and semiconductors during the Covid-19 pandemic are emblematic. Supply-chain breakdowns, fears of overreliance on geopolitical rivals, diminished bargaining power in international negotiations, and the need to ramp up production quickly in the event of armed conflict or other emergencies have elevated production volumes in certain sectors from a matter of efficiency to a matter of statecraft.<sup>1</sup>

Governments have reacted to these strategic-sector anxieties with an eclectic mix of subsidies and tariffs. On the spending side, the U.S. CHIPS and Science Act allocates \$52.7 billion in grants and tax incentives for domestic semiconductor production and related activities (NIST, 2023); the EU’s Green Deal Industrial Plan channels comparable support to “net-zero” technologies (European Commission, 2023); and China’s Made in China 2025 programme deploys tax breaks, subsidised credit and direct transfers to nurture national champions (State Council, 2015; McBride and Chatzky, 2019). By contrast, the stick of choice has been tariffs: the first Trump administration raised average U.S. applied tariffs to their highest level in the post-war era (Amiti, Redding, and

---

<sup>1</sup>For concrete examples see, inter alia, White House (2017), European Commission (2021), and the extensive reporting on shortages in medical goods and chips during 2020–22.

Weinstein, 2019), and recent tariff hikes and proposals would push effective rates far above the pre-2017 norm (CBO, 2025).

Both instruments, however, come with well-documented side-effects. Sharp tariff swings amplify trade-policy uncertainty, deterring investment and export entry - as shown by Handley and Limão's (2017) evidence for China-U.S. trade - while blanket subsidy programmes invite fiscal waste and rent-seeking, a classic industrial-policy pitfall highlighted by Juhász et al. (2024) and already visible in the global proliferation of export credit support (Dawar, 2020).

Moreover, such policies erode trust: partners struggle to distinguish legitimate security goals from beggar-thy-neighbour tactics, fuelling anti-subsidy investigations and the spectre of retaliatory tariff hikes. If strategic objectives are here to stay, more transparent and rules-based approaches could be beneficial.

This paper revisits Warren Buffett's (2003) proposal of tradeable import certificates (TIC), an idea that, despite its intuitive appeal, has received surprisingly little attention in the academic literature.<sup>2</sup> We examine in a theoretical model how TIC perform if the mechanism is adapted to sectors in which countries target a level of minimum domestic production for strategic reasons.

Early trade models, such as those by Bhagwati and Srinivasan (1969) and Shibata (1968), show that tariffs and quotas can yield equivalent production outcomes, although tariffs are typically preferred for generating revenue in the importing country. Later work by Tower (1975) and Melvin (1986) explores strategic interactions between countries and shows how import or export quotas can trigger inefficient trade wars, pushing countries toward autarky.

Buffett's TIC proposal differs from the traditional import quotas studied in that literature in two fundamental ways. First, the number of import certificates is not fixed exogenously but is instead endogenously tied to export volumes—every export unit generates  $\eta$  certificates that entitle imports. Second, these certificates are allocated to exporters, who can then sell them to importers in a secondary market. Consequently, certificate prices function like a combination of tariffs and export subsidies whose level flexibly and automatically adjusts with the relative level of import pressure vs export performance.

As a variation of Buffett's proposal, Papadimitriou et al. (2008) suggest that the government should auction off the certificates and use the income to reduce payroll taxes. We study a generalization by allowing an exogenous split of certificate revenues between private exporters and the government. Specifically, a fraction  $\phi$  between zero and one of the proceeds from certificate sales can be retained by exporters, with the remainder accruing to the state.

We show in our model with perfect competition and Ricardian gains from trade that a constrained-efficient TIC mechanism grants exporters the revenues of exactly one input certificate for every exported unit, which is the case if  $\phi\eta = 1$ . Then the effective rates of tariffs and export subsidies that incorporate certificate prices are equal in size.<sup>3</sup> This results in an industry structure where, taking into account the strategic preferences, production of different products within the sector is still efficiently distributed across countries. Compared to a solution that more strongly relies on effective tariffs than export subsidies, international trade volume remains higher.

An implicit core assumption of our analysis is that while there are relative comparative advan-

---

<sup>2</sup>We are only aware of Papadimitriou et al. (2008) who perform a simulation study to estimate the impact of Buffett's original proposal on US import prices and trade deficit. They also note possible issues: price volatility for certificates, risk of partner retaliation, and implementation complexities, but don't provide a deeper theoretical analysis.

<sup>3</sup>For  $\eta > 1$  that solution lies between Buffett's proposal to grant all certificates to exporters and given all income to the government. For example, if one unit of exports would generated  $\mu = 1.5$  import certificates the exporter should not receive all revenues from certificate sales but only keep  $2/3$  of the revenues.

tages for individual goods, a severe crisis that disrupts trade would allow sector-wide capacity to be retooled to produce other critical products within the same sector that were previously imported. An often mentioned example is how during World War II, U.S. civilian industries were converted to military production, see e.g. Rhode et al. (2018). Bernard, Redding, and Schott (2010) show that over half of U.S. manufacturing firms switch their product mix within a five-year period as market conditions change.

Beyond the Ricardian benefits of trade in our model, we see independent reasons to prefer efficient intra-sector trade over equilibria with depressed trade volumes.

First, deeper bilateral trade links can raise the opportunity cost of conflict and, in turn, promote peaceful cooperation. Of course, the link between trade and peaceful cooperation is not always as clear cut: the relational contracting framework in Goldlücke & Kranz (2023) stresses also the importance of symmetric bargaining positions should trade break down. A TIC scheme that guarantees that each country produces a certain minimum share of products from the strategic sector, may facilitate such symmetric positions with high mutual incentives for further cooperation.<sup>4</sup>

Second, protection delivered primarily through tariffs tends to dull competitive pressure and invite rent-seeking as firms fight to secure sheltered domestic margins rather than productivity improvements (Krueger, 1974). Empirically, trade liberalization episodes show the flip side of this coin: when tariff shields recede, low-productivity plants contract or exit and industry-level productivity rises (Pavcnik, 2002; Treffer, 2004). Effective industrial policy therefore seems to work best when it embeds “discipline”—linking support to performance in contestable markets—rather than insulating firms from rivalry. Case-based accounts emphasize export discipline in East Asia (Studwell, 2013), and cross-country micro-evidence shows that competition-friendly targeting is associated with higher productivity growth (Aghion, Cai, Dewatripont, Du, Harrison, & Legros, 2015).

One important aspect of international trade agreements is how they affect countries incentives to game the system in particular using hard to monitor instruments like implicit subsidies or non-tariff trade barriers. For example, Hillman and Manak (2023) summarize: “The [WTO] rules did little to prevent widespread industrial subsidies use by countries hoping to gain an edge in international trade.” Section 3 analyzes in detail how the automatic adjustment inherent in a TIC scheme can effectively reduce incentives of a partner country for such deviations and limit the negative impact should such deviations take place nevertheless.

We also discuss in Section 3 how TIC schemes may facilitate the negotiation of international trade agreements in the presence of strategic concerns. Unlike agreements that fix tariffs or subsidy levels to account for strategic concerns, TIC schemes allow to implement agreements in a symmetric fashion without relying on imperfectly observable information about relative comparative advantages.

Dynamic adjustment to changes in comparative advantage is an inherent feature of TIC schemes, whereas subsidies or tariffs would need to be repeatedly adjusted as economic fundamentals evolve. Yet, tariffs and subsidies are often politically difficult to unwind once in place, even when their original justification no longer holds, see e.g. Freund and Özden (2008) or Magee (2002). With a TIC Agreement effective tariffs and export subsidies automatically vanish once the trade deficit in the strategic sector becomes sufficiently small.

While the points above highlight the potential benefits of TIC schemes, our analysis in Section 3.3 highlights a crucial drawback. A TIC scheme can have severe adverse effects if the strategic sector is small or concentrated enough such that domestic producers can exert market power in the

---

<sup>4</sup>Martin, Mayer, & Thoenig, (2008) provides a deeper exploration of the links between trade and conflict.

certificate market. By strategically reducing exports, producers could then raise certificate prices and benefit from the added domestic protection and higher prices of the sold certificates. This is an unfortunate aspect of TIC schemes, which limits the potential applicability to sufficiently widely defined strategic sectors. For supply security in critical but small sectors, like certain rare earth minerals, TIC don't look like a promising tool.

The remaining paper is structured as follows. Section 2 presents the core model: a two-country, partial-equilibrium Ricardian setting with a continuum of perfectly competitive product markets ordered by relative efficiency similar to Dornbusch et al. (1977). The section also contains useful results that characterize the market outcome for given tariffs, subsidies and certificate prices.

Section 3 performs the main analysis focusing on a case that a country with a competitive disadvantage has the strategic goal to increase its production in the strategic sector up to a specific target level. We derive the main insights already summarized above. Section 4 provides concluding remarks. An appendix contains all proofs and additional theoretical results.

## 2 Market Model and Outcomes

We consider two countries  $A$  and  $B$ . Throughout the paper, we use  $i, j, k \in \{A, B\}$  as country indices such that always  $j \neq i$  while  $k$  can be equal or unequal  $i$ . Every formula for country  $i$  holds symmetrically for country  $j$  by swapping all  $i$  and  $j$ . We study a strategic sector consisting of a continuum of independent products with unit mass indexed by  $m \in [0, 1]$ . Each product is traded on its own perfectly competitive market that is independent from all other markets. We assume that consumers have a valuation  $v$  for each product and that for prices below  $v$  demand is completely inelastic and given by 1 for each product in each country. The value of  $v$  is assumed to be sufficiently large such that it exceeds all equilibrium prices in the competitive goods markets.

The marginal cost for domestically consumed production by country  $i$  for product  $m$  is given by

$$c_i^{dom}(m) = w_i(m) - s_i \quad (1)$$

where  $w_i(m)$  is the technological marginal cost for product  $m$  in country  $i$ . The variable  $s_i \geq 0$  is a production subsidy paid to all units produced in country  $i$ . The marginal cost of an exported product  $m$  from country  $i$  to country  $j$  is given by

$$c_i^{exp}(m) = w_i(m) - s_i - e_i + \tau_j + \pi_j - \phi_i \eta_i \pi_i \quad (2)$$

where  $e_i \geq 0$  is an export subsidy and  $\tau_j \geq 0$  is the tariff rate of country  $j$ , imposed uniformly on all imported units in the strategic sector.

The variable  $\pi_i$  denotes the equilibrium price for tradeable import certificates (TIC) in country  $i$ . Every imported unit in country  $i$  will require exactly one import certificate. These import certificates are generated by country  $i$ 's exports: for every exported unit, the exporter gets  $\eta_i$  certificates that are sold in a perfectly competitive market to importers. We call  $\eta_i$  the export credit factor. While in Buffett's original proposal all proceeds from the sold certificates go to the exporter, Papadimitriou et al. (2008) suggest that the government could auction off all certificates and keep the income. We allow for both and intermediate cases by assuming that exporters can only keep a share  $\phi_i \in [0, 1]$  from the revenues of sold import certificates; the remaining share goes to the state. Thus the term  $\phi_i \eta_i \pi_i$  in  $c_i^{exp}(m)$  describes the exporter's revenues from the certificates generated by one exported unit. If country  $i$  does not implement a TIC scheme, we fix  $\pi_i = 0$ .

It is helpful to define effective tariff rates  $\tilde{\tau}_i$  as the sum of tariff and certificate prices:

$$\tilde{\tau}_i = \tau_i + \pi_i. \quad (3)$$

Similarly, we define effective export subsidies as

$$\tilde{e}_i = e_i + \phi_i \eta_i \pi_i. \quad (4)$$

So marginal costs of exports from country  $i$  to  $j$  can be written as

$$c_i^{exp}(m) = w_i(m) - s_i - \tilde{e}_i + \tilde{\tau}_j \quad (5)$$

The source for gains of trade in our model is given by differentiated technological marginal costs  $w_i(m)$  between both countries. Let

$$\Delta w_i(m) \equiv w_i(m) - w_j(m)$$

denote country  $i$ 's technological cost disadvantage for product  $m$  compared to country  $j$ . For tractability, we impose a simple linear structure and assume that

$$\Delta w_A(m) = -\alpha_A + (\alpha_A + \alpha_B) m \quad (6)$$

with  $\alpha_A, \alpha_B > 0$ . This means for  $m = 0$  country A has the largest competitive advantage with  $\Delta w_A(0) = -\alpha_A$  while for  $m = 1$  country B has the largest advantage with  $\Delta w_A(1) = \alpha_B$  and inbetween the cost advantage of country B increases linearly in  $m$ . To simplify future notation, we denote technological dispersion by the parameter

$$\delta = \alpha_A + \alpha_B. \quad (7)$$

Since producers in both countries are perfectly competitive, resulting prices for product  $m$  in country  $i$  are determined by the lowest marginal costs:

$$\min\{c_i^{dom}(m), c_j^{exp}(m)\}.$$

Producers with the lower marginal costs serve the whole market.<sup>5</sup> We denote country  $i$ 's production of good  $m$  for its domestic market by

$$q_i^{dom}(m) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } c_i^{dom}(m) \leq c_j^{exp}(m) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

and the production for the export market by

$$q_i^{exp}(m) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } c_i^{exp}(m) < c_j^{dom}(m) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

Sector wide domestic production, total exports and total imports of country  $i$  are defined as

$$Q_i^{dom} = \int_0^1 q_i^{dom}(m) dm, \quad Q_i^{exp} = \int_0^1 q_i^{exp}(m) dm, \quad Q_i^{imp} = Q_j^{exp}.$$

Note that  $Q_A^{dom} + Q_B^{exp} = Q_B^{dom} + Q_A^{exp} = 1$ , which implies

$$Q_A^{dom} - Q_A^{exp} = Q_B^{dom} - Q_B^{exp}. \quad (10)$$

---

<sup>5</sup>In our model, the measure of product markets where domestic production and imports have the same marginal costs is always zero.

So in our model both countries will always have the same difference between production for domestic and export markets.

Countries  $i$ 's total production is denoted by

$$X_i = Q_i^{dom} + Q_i^{exp}$$

While  $0 \leq Q_i^{dom}, Q_i^{exp} \leq 1$  we have  $0 \leq X_i \leq 2$ .

The following result shows how in a market equilibrium  $Q_i^{dom}$  and  $Q_i^{exp}$  depend on the effective tariffs and subsidies of both countries.

**Proposition 1.** *In every market equilibrium domestic and export production for both countries  $i \in \{A, B\}$  satisfy*

$$Q_i^{dom} = \max(0, \min(1, \tilde{Q}_i^{dom})), \quad Q_i^{exp} = \max(0, \min(1, \tilde{Q}_i^{exp}))$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{Q}_i^{dom} &\equiv Q_i^o + \frac{(s_i - s_j) + (\tilde{\tau}_i - \tilde{e}_j)}{\delta}, \\ \tilde{Q}_i^{exp} &\equiv Q_i^o + \frac{(s_i - s_j) + (\tilde{e}_i - \tilde{\tau}_j)}{\delta} \end{aligned}$$

where  $Q_i^o$  denotes the free trade level of  $Q_i^{dom}$  and  $Q_i^{exp}$  and is given by

$$Q_i^o \equiv \frac{\alpha_i}{\delta}.$$

Our results below sometimes refer to an *interior solution*, which shall mean that for both countries  $i \in \{A, B\}$  we have  $Q_i^{dom} = \tilde{Q}_i^{dom}$  and  $Q_i^{exp} = \tilde{Q}_i^{exp}$ . For interior solutions, effective tariffs and subsidies shift the quantities in a simple linear and additive manner in the expected direction: production subsidies  $s_i$  increase both domestic and export sales  $Q_i^{dom}$  and  $Q_i^{exp}$  while foreign production subsidies  $s_j$  work directly opposite. Domestic sales  $Q_i^{dom}$  are increased by own effective tariffs  $\tilde{\tau}_i$  and are reduced by foreign effective exports subsidies  $\tilde{e}_j$ , while exports  $Q_i^{exp}$  fall in foreign effective tariffs  $\tilde{\tau}_j$  and increase in own effective export subsidies  $\tilde{e}_i$ .

## TIC markets

If country  $i$  implements a tradeable import certificate (TIC) scheme, a market equilibrium must satisfy

$$\eta_i Q_i^{exp} \geq Q_i^{imp} \quad (11)$$

where  $\eta_i Q_i^{exp}$  is the certificate supply and  $Q_i^{imp}$  the certificate demand. We distinguish three types of equilibria for the TIC market of country  $i$ . A binding TIC equilibrium is characterized by  $\pi_i \geq 0$  and  $\eta_i Q_i^{exp} = Q_i^{imp} > 0$ ; a non-binding equilibrium by  $\pi_i = 0$ ,  $\eta_i Q_i^{exp} \geq Q_i^{imp}$  and  $Q_i^{exp} > 0$ . Finally, a pure autarky equilibrium is characterized by no import or exports  $Q_i^{exp} = Q_i^{imp} = 0$ . The whole economy is in a market equilibrium if the TIC market for every country that has implemented a TIC scheme satisfies one of those equilibrium conditions and all previous equilibrium conditions for every product market  $m \in [0, 1]$  are satisfied. The appendix provides a series of helpful results that characterize TIC equilibria. E.g. if both countries implement a TIC scheme and  $\eta_A \eta_B > 1$  then at most one country can have a binding TIC equilibrium, while if  $\eta_A \eta_B < 1$  only a pure autarky equilibrium exists. Here is a characterization of equilibrium certificate prices:

**Lemma 1.** *Consider a market equilibrium with an interior solution in which country  $i$  has a binding TIC equilibrium with  $\pi_i > 0$  and the certificate price in the other country  $j$  satisfies  $\pi_j = 0$  (or  $j$  has no TIC). Then the certificate price in country  $i$  is given by*

$$\pi_i = \frac{\alpha_j - \eta_i \alpha_i + (1 + \eta_i)(s_j - s_i) + (e_j - \eta_i e_i) + (\eta_i \tau_j - \tau_i)}{1 + \phi_i \eta_i^2}. \quad (12)$$

The result directly shows, how larger tariffs and subsidies by country  $j$  lead to an automatic adjustment in the certificate prices of country  $i$  if it already has a binding TIC equilibrium. Effects become cleanest for the special case  $\eta_i = \phi_i = 1$ . We then find that an increase of country  $j$ 's tariff  $\tau_j$  or its export subsidies  $e_j$  by one unit increases country  $i$ 's certificate price  $\pi_i$  and consequently its effective export subsidies  $\tilde{e}_i$  and tariffs  $\tilde{\tau}_i$  all by half a unit. For a unit increase in  $j$ 's production subsidies  $s_j$  the corresponding effects are twice as large. Intuitively, that is because  $s_j$  boosts both domestic production and export for country  $j$  and thus yields a twice as large adjustment in country  $i$ 's certificate price.

### Direct economic costs and countries' utility functions

In our model each country will balance a strategic motive for higher total production with the direct cost borne by its consumers and tax payers minus profits of domestic firms.<sup>6</sup>

We denote by

$$d_i^{dom}(m) = c_i^{dom}(m) + s_i = w_i(m) \quad (13)$$

the direct cost for a market  $m$  that is served by country  $i$ 's domestic producers. Production subsidies  $s_i$  will reduce consumers' prices one-to-one in our model of perfect competition and thus cancel out of these direct costs. The term

$$d_i^{imp}(m) = c_j^{exp}(m) - \tau_i - \pi_i = w_j(m) - s_j - \tilde{e}_j \quad (14)$$

denotes the direct cost of product  $m$  if it is imported to country  $i$ . Tariffs  $\tau_i$  and certificate prices  $\pi_i$  cancel out as they directly increase consumer prices in country  $i$ . In contrast, effective foreign subsidies  $\tilde{e}_j$  and  $s_j$  reduce the direct cost of imported products.

Finally,

$$d_i^{exp}(m) = \tilde{e}_i + s_i \quad (15)$$

denotes the direct cost for country  $i$  if it exports to market  $j$ . It just consists of country  $i$ 's effective subsidies  $\tilde{e}_i + s_i$ , which benefit foreign consumers through lower prices.

We denote by

$$D_i = \int_0^1 (d_i^{dom}(m) \cdot q_i^{dom}(m) + d_i^{imp}(m) \cdot q_j^{exp}(m) + d_i^{exp}(m) \cdot q_i^{exp}(m)) dm \quad (16)$$

the total direct economic costs of country  $i$ . Let  $D_i^o$  denote the direct cost of country  $i$  in the free-trade outcome.

---

<sup>6</sup>Even though under perfect competition firms' profits will always be zero, the formulas below become simpler if we directly consider firms' profits. In particular, for imports the complete certificate price  $\pi_i$  enters positively, not only the share accruing to the government, while for exports the effective subsidy rate  $\tilde{e}_i$  becomes relevant for direct costs, not only the direct subsidies  $e_i$ .

**Proposition 2.** For a given market outcome let  $E_i$  denote the excess cost for country  $i$  compared to the free trade outcome. It is given by

$$E_i \equiv D_i - D_i^o = \underbrace{\frac{\delta}{2}(Q_i^{dom} - Q_i^o)^2}_{\text{production inefficiency}} + \underbrace{(s_i + \tilde{e}_i)Q_i^{exp} - (s_j + \tilde{e}_j)Q_i^{imp}}_{\text{budget transfers}}. \quad (17)$$

The total excess cost  $E \equiv E_A + E_B$  of both countries satisfies

$$E = \frac{\delta}{2} \left[ (Q_A^{dom} - Q_A^o)^2 + (Q_B^{dom} - Q_B^o)^2 \right] \quad (18)$$

$$= \frac{\delta}{2} \left[ (Q_A^{exp} - Q_A^o)^2 + (Q_B^{exp} - Q_B^o)^2 \right] \quad (19)$$

$$= \frac{\delta}{2} \left[ (Q_i^{dom} - Q_i^o)^2 + (Q_i^{exp} - Q_i^o)^2 \right] \quad (20)$$

The result implies that total costs are minimized in the free trade outcome and that absent strategic concerns for higher production levels, no country has an incentive to implement policy instruments that deviate from the free trade outcome.

However, if there are strategic preferences for larger domestic production  $X_i$ , a country  $i$  may use subsidies or tariffs, even if they increase direct costs  $D_i$ . Starting from the free trade level, a marginal increase in subsidies already has a non-zero marginal effect on country  $i$ 's direct cost. That is because the subsidy payments directly benefit foreign consumers whose import prices fall. In contrast, the marginal effect of tariffs on a country's direct costs is initially zero since tariffs have a 100% pass-through rate to domestic consumers in our model. Yet, as shown in Proposition 1, tariffs  $\tau_i$  increase domestic production  $Q_i^{dom}$  and the production inefficiency  $\frac{\delta}{2}(Q_i^{dom} - Q_i^o)^2$  increases quadratically in the distortion of domestic production from the free trade level. Thus if the goal is to increase  $X_i$  sufficiently far above the free trade level, it can become optimal to augment tariffs with subsidies.

It is often easier to reason intuitively about tariffs and export subsidies, since they affect only domestic sales or exports, respectively, than about production subsidies  $s_i$ , which influence both. The following result will therefore be useful.

**Lemma 2.** Consider two vectors of effective tariffs and subsidies  $(\tilde{\tau}_i, \tilde{e}_i, s_i)$  and  $(\tilde{\tau}'_i, \tilde{e}'_i, s'_i)$ . If they satisfy

$$\tilde{\tau}'_i = \tilde{\tau}_i + s_i - s'_i \quad (21)$$

$$\tilde{e}'_i = \tilde{e}_i + s_i - s'_i \quad (22)$$

then for any given effective tariffs and subsidies of country  $j$  both vectors yield the same production quantities and direct costs for both countries. In particular, this result also holds for  $s'_i = 0$ .

If countries have strategic production goals, welfare optimal production levels can deviate from those that minimize total production cost. The following result characterizes optimal production allocation conditional that certain total production levels for both countries shall be achieved.

**Proposition 3.** Let  $\bar{D}^o(X_A, X_B)$  denote the minimum total direct cost under the restriction that countries  $A$  and  $B$  produce  $X_A$  and  $X_B$ , respectively. For any market outcome that yields  $X_A$  and  $X_B$  with total direct excess costs  $D$  define by  $\bar{E}(X_A, X_B) = D - \bar{D}^o(X_A, X_B)$  the excess cost compared to the lowest cost achievable when producing  $X_A$  and  $X_B$ . We have

$$\bar{E}(X_A, X_B) = \frac{\delta}{4} (Q_i^{dom} - Q_i^{exp})^2 \quad (23)$$



for either country  $i \in \{A, B\}$ . In an interior solution with  $Q_i^{dom} = \tilde{Q}_i^{dom}$  and  $Q_i^{exp} = \tilde{Q}_i^{exp}$  for both countries, it also satisfies

$$\bar{E}(X_A, X_B) = \frac{1}{4\delta} \left( (\tilde{\tau}_A + \tilde{\tau}_B) - (\tilde{e}_A + \tilde{e}_B) \right)^2. \quad (24)$$

So irrespective of the strength of each country  $i$ 's concerns for minimum production levels  $X_i$ , from a welfare point of view it is always optimal if for each country  $i$  domestic production is equal to its exports  $Q_i^{dom} = Q_i^{exp}$ , which is the case if for both countries effective export subsidies are equal to effective tariffs.

### 3 Strategic Interactions and Stability of International Agreements

We now analyze strategic interactions between both countries and the stability of international trade agreements. For the sake of tractability, we restrict attention to the following scenario: Country A has a competitive disadvantage in the strategic sector and wants to implement a goal for domestic production above the free trade equilibrium level. Formally, the subsequent analysis satisfies the following assumption.

**Assumption 1.** Assume  $\alpha_A \leq \alpha_B$ , i.e. country A is a net importer in the free-trade equilibrium. Further assume country A has a strategic production goal  $\bar{X}_A$  satisfying  $X_A^o < \bar{X}_A < 1$  where  $X_A^o$  is the free trade production of country A. Country A's utility function is given by

$$u_A = -\lambda_A \max(\bar{X}_A - X_A, 0) - D_A \quad (25)$$

with  $\lambda_A$  measuring the marginal disutility of falling behind the strategic goal. Country B simply prefers higher production in the strategic sector without a specific goal:

$$u_B = \gamma_B X_B - D_B. \quad (26)$$

Assume  $\lambda_A \gg \gamma_B > 0$ .

#### 3.1 Policy choice in a Nash equilibrium without tradeable import certificates

The next result characterizes the Nash equilibrium if countries endogenously and simultaneously choose their tariffs and export subsidies but don't implement a TIC scheme. Given Lemma 2, we simplify the analysis by assuming w.l.o.g. that production subsidies  $s_A$  and  $s_B$  are zero.

**Proposition 4.** Suppose Assumption 1 holds and that countries simultaneously choose export subsidies and tariffs, with no TIC scheme or production subsidies. In every Nash equilibrium: (i) country A will produce its target  $X_A = \bar{X}_A$ , (ii) both countries choose tariffs weakly larger than export subsidies, with strict inequality for country A; (iii) the equilibrium is not conditionally efficient. Moreover, in an interior solution there is a unique Nash equilibrium characterized by

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_B^* &= \gamma_B \\ e_B^* &= 0 \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

and

$$\tau_A^* = -\alpha_A + \frac{2}{3} \delta \bar{X}_A + \frac{1}{3} \gamma_B \quad (28)$$

$$e_A^* = -\alpha_A + \frac{1}{3} \delta \bar{X}_A + \frac{2}{3} \gamma_B \quad (29)$$

That tariffs are set at higher levels than export subsidies is consistent with the financial incentives identified in Proposition 2. This stronger reliance on tariffs over export subsidies reduces the volume of international trade and yields an outcome that is not conditionally efficient. Accordingly, there is scope for international agreements that take country A's strategic concerns into account while achieving a more efficient allocation.

### 3.2 Enforceable international agreements

In this section we consider the case that enforceable trade agreements can be written. The following result characterizes an agreement with a TIC that implements country A's strategic production target  $\bar{X}_A$  in a conditionally efficient manner.

**Proposition 5. *TIC Agreement*** *Assume country A implements a TIC scheme with  $\eta_A$  and  $\phi_A$  chosen such that*

$$\eta_A = \frac{2 - \bar{X}_A}{\bar{X}_A} > 1, \quad (30)$$

$$\phi_A \eta_A = 1. \quad (31)$$

*Country B may also implement a TIC scheme with  $\eta_B \geq 1$ . No country uses direct tariffs or subsidies. The resulting market outcome is conditionally efficient and satisfies  $X_A = \bar{X}_A$  with*

$$\pi_A = \tilde{e}_A = \tilde{\tau}_A = \alpha_A \bar{X}_A > 0 \quad (32)$$

$$\pi_B = \tilde{e}_B = \tilde{\tau}_B = 0 \quad (33)$$

where

$$\bar{X}_A = \frac{\bar{X}_A - X_A^o}{X_A^o} \quad (34)$$

*measures the relative change of country A's strategic production target  $\bar{X}_A$  compared to its free trade production level  $X_A^o$ . Both countries A and B have higher utility than in the Nash equilibria characterized in Proposition 4.*

A key feature of the agreement described above is that both countries are better off than in the Nash equilibrium without an agreement. However, many alternative agreements could also achieve Pareto improvements of this kind. The main advantage of the proposed TIC Agreement is its simplicity and symmetry: the policy instruments can be designed in a structurally identical way for both countries, and the crucial parameters  $\eta_i$  and  $\phi_i$  need not be calibrated to the underlying production technologies, which are typically imperfectly known and subject to change over time.

Negotiations that start from asymmetric positions are rarely straightforward. Yet, countries might find it easier to agree on a general principle governing the choice of  $\eta_i$  and  $\phi_i$ . The parameter  $\eta_i$  effectively determines how strongly a country concerned about its domestic production capacity may restrict imports relative to exports. A principle that most countries would likely endorse

is that no country should set  $\eta_i < 1$ , as this would require exports to exceed imports and if symmetrically chosen would lead to a collapse of trade. The range of  $\eta_i \geq 1$  values that countries find mutually acceptable would depend on the perceived trade-off between the benefits of more open trade and the strength of their strategic concerns. In a world with high mutual trust among trading partners, where strategic risks are viewed as limited, larger values of  $\eta_i$  would likely be more feasible than in one characterized by low trust and heightened strategic rivalry.

Regarding  $\phi_i$ , country  $A$  would gain from a modified agreement that sets  $\phi_A$  below  $1/\eta_A$ , i.e. granting a higher share of the certificate income to the government and a lower share to exporters. That is because countries prefer higher tariffs over equivalent export subsidy payments, even though conditional efficiency requires equal effective rates. A lower value of  $\phi_A$  would, in equilibrium, raise the effective tariff  $\tilde{\tau}_A$  and lower the effective export subsidy  $\tilde{e}_A$ , reducing  $A$ 's direct costs at the expense of country  $B$ . However, countries might agree on the principle that trade restrictions should not be accompanied by additional fiscal gains for the country that derives strategic benefits from those restrictions, whenever such gains come at the cost of efficiency. This consideration provides an argument for conditionally efficient agreements in which effective export subsidies and tariffs are set to equal levels.

The same market outcome as under the TIC Agreement described above could also be implemented through an agreement that relies solely on export subsidies and tariffs:

**Corollary 1. No-TIC Agreement** *If country  $A$  uses no TIC scheme and fixes  $e_A = \tau_A = \alpha_A \bar{\chi}_A$  and  $s_A = 0$  and country  $B$  fixes  $e_B = \tau_B = s_B = 0$  the same conditionally efficient market outcome as in Proposition 5 is implemented.*

A key difficulty with the No-TIC Agreement is that tariff and subsidy rates depend on production technologies. Since the relevant parameters are likely to be imperfectly known and unevenly shared, asymmetric information is a concern - an obstacle well known to undermine efficient negotiation outcomes.<sup>7</sup> Another challenge is that the relative production capacities and technology will likely change over time, which would require adjustment of the negotiated tariff and subsidy rates. Tariffs and subsidies are often politically difficult to unwind once in place, even when their original justification no longer holds, see e.g. Freund and Özden (2008) or Magee (2002). In contrast, adjustments of effective tariffs and subsidies are automated in the TIC Agreement and vanish once the trade deficits becomes sufficiently small.

Even if negotiated tariffs or a formal TIC scheme could be reasonably well enforced, restricting subsidies seems far more challenging in practice, since subsidies may appear in various forms, like below-market loans from public banks.<sup>8</sup> The following result shows that even if the TIC Agreement cannot legally enforce zero subsidies, it is able to substantially limit the incentives and consequences for hidden subsidies.

**Proposition 6.** *Consider the TIC Agreement of Proposition 5. Now assume both countries could deviate from the agreement by choosing arbitrary non-negative subsidies  $e_A, e_B, s_A, s_B \geq 0$  while all other aspects of the agreement remain legally enforced. Then:*

- (i) *Country  $A$  has no profitable deviation to any  $(e_A, s_A)$  with  $e_A > 0$  or  $s_A > 0$ .*

---

<sup>7</sup>See e.g. Myerson and Satterthwaite (1983) for a seminal theoretic contribution. For a recent contribution in the context of trade agreements, see Yamamoto (2024).

<sup>8</sup>For example, Hillman and Manak (2023) summarize: “The [WTO] rules did little to prevent widespread industrial subsidies use by countries hoping to gain an edge in international trade.”

(ii) If  $\eta_A = 1$ , country  $B$  has no profitable deviation to any  $(e_B, s_B)$  with  $e_B > 0$  or  $s_B > 0$ . If  $\eta_A > 1$ , there is a threshold

$$\gamma_B^{TIC}(\eta_A) = \delta \cdot \frac{\eta_A^2 + \eta_A - 1}{\eta_A^2 - 1} \quad (35)$$

such that  $B$  has an incentive to raise its export subsidy if and only if  $\gamma_B > \gamma_B^{TIC}(\eta_A)$ . The threshold satisfies  $\lim_{\eta_A \rightarrow 1} \gamma_B^{TIC}(\eta_A) = \infty$ .

(iii) For any  $(e_B, s_B)$ , country  $A$ 's production satisfies the global bound  $X_A \geq 1/\eta_A$  and its direct costs  $D_A$  don't increase in the other country's subsidies  $e_B$  or  $s_B$ .

Given our previous insights, it might seem surprising at first sight that country  $B$  could have a strategic interest at all to set positive subsidies given a binding TIC scheme in country  $A$ . We first explore the intuition for export subsidies  $e_B > 0$ . The key mechanism is as follows: positive export subsidies by country  $B$  will increase the certificate price  $\pi_A$  which leads to both higher effective tariffs  $\tilde{\tau}_A$  and higher effective export subsidies  $\tilde{e}_A$  in country  $A$ . As effective tariffs  $\tilde{\tau}_A$  increase less than  $e_B$ , the net effect is that domestic production  $Q_A^{dom}$  in  $A$  will fall, while its exports  $Q_A^{exp}$  increase. Each unit of additional exports allows  $\eta_A$  additional units of imports by country  $B$ . For  $\eta_A > 1$  country  $A$ 's imports thus increase more than its exports. As result the induced shift from domestic production to exports will decrease country  $A$ 's total output  $X_A$  and correspondingly increase country  $B$ 's total production. Thus if country  $B$  has a large strategic preference  $\gamma_B$  for higher production it may choose export subsidies due to this effect. The effect becomes smaller the closer  $\eta_A$  is to 1 and completely vanishes for  $\eta_A = 1$ .

Looking at strictly positive production subsidies  $s_B > 0$ , the expansive effect on  $B$ 's imports that is described above is more limited or non-existent, since positive production subsidies  $s_B > 0$  also reduce country  $A$ 's exports.

Countries may subsidize strategic-sector production for reasons unrelated to gaining an advantage in international trade, for example to support underdeveloped regions or to accelerate the transition to environmentally friendly production technologies. Part (iii) of Proposition 6 implies that a country with a TIC in place can be less concerned about such subsidies from its trading partner. The maximum negative impact on total production in the strategic sector is strictly limited and the subsidies from the trading partner even bring a financial gain.

For a short quantitative example, consider the production target  $\bar{X}_A = 0.8$  such that the TIC-agreement from Proposition 5 specifies  $\eta_A = 1.5$ . Even if country  $B$  deviates by setting arbitrarily large export subsidies  $e_B$ , country  $A$  still has a guaranteed total production of  $X_A \geq \frac{1}{\eta_A} = \frac{2}{3}$  which is 83.3% of the target  $\bar{X}_A$ . If even such a limited shortfall from the target  $\bar{X}_A$  is considered very problematic, a possible counter-measure is to pick a somewhat lower value for  $\eta_A$  than in an agreement with enforceable subsidies. In our example, with  $\bar{X}_A = 0.8$  setting  $\eta_A = 1.25$  guarantees  $X_A \geq \bar{X}_A$  even if country  $B$  sets arbitrarily high export subsidies.

Under the No-TIC Agreement, subsidies implemented by country  $B$  directly stimulate its output without triggering a countervailing increase in certificate prices. Consequently, subsidies become attractive already for substantially lower values of the strategic production preference  $\gamma_B$  and there is no guaranteed minimum level of production in the strategic sector.

**Proposition 7.** *Consider the No-TIC Agreement of Corollary 1 and assume country  $B$  can deviate by setting positive subsidies  $s_B > 0$  or  $e_B > 0$  while tariffs remain fixed at  $\tau_B = 0$ . Then country  $B$  has strict incentives to choose positive subsidies if*

$$\gamma_B > \frac{1}{2} \delta \frac{\eta_A}{1 + \eta_A} \equiv \gamma_B^{No-TIC} \quad (36)$$

with  $\eta_A = \frac{2-\bar{X}_A}{\bar{X}_A}$ . The ratio of the respective thresholds for the TIC Agreement and No-TIC Agreement is given by

$$\frac{\gamma_B^{TIC}}{\gamma_B^{No-TIC}} = 2 \frac{\eta_A^2 + \eta_A - 1}{\eta_A(\eta_A - 1)} > 2. \quad (37)$$

For example, for  $\eta_A = 1.5$  the threshold  $\gamma_B^{TIC}(\eta_A)$  for  $\gamma_B$  above which country  $B$  deviates from the TIC Agreement with positive subsidies is 7 times higher than the corresponding threshold  $\gamma_B^{No-TIC}$  for the No-TIC Agreement.

Beyond subsidies, various forms of non-tariff trade barriers, such as certain regulatory measures, are often difficult to verify. The following result shows that the TIC Agreement effectively eliminates incentives for such non-tariff barriers, whereas these incentives may persist under the No-TIC Agreement.

**Proposition 8.** *Assume each country can decide a level of non-tariff trade-barriers  $\beta_i \geq 0$  that increases the marginal costs of imports from country  $j$  by  $\beta_i$  but unlike a tariff grants no tariff income for country  $i$ . Tariffs and subsidies are enforceable as specified in the agreement but non-tariff barriers can be freely set. Then with the TIC Agreement it is strictly optimal for both countries to have zero non-tariff trade barriers. In contrast, under the No-TIC Agreement country  $B$  has incentives to erect non-tariff trade barriers  $\beta_B > 0$  if*

$$\gamma_B > \frac{\delta}{1 + \eta_A} \quad (38)$$

with  $\eta_A = \frac{2-\bar{X}_A}{\bar{X}_A}$ .

### 3.3 Market Power

Our analysis above indicates that the TIC Agreement performs well both in terms of incentives and efficiency. A key drawback, however, is that TIC schemes can induce socially costly adverse behavior when the strategic sector is sufficiently small or concentrated for domestic producers to exercise market power in the certificate market.

To illustrate, first consider an extreme case. Suppose there is a single monopolistic producer in country  $A$  that covers the entire strategic sector. By choosing its export quantity, the monopolist can arbitrarily limit the number of certificates and import volume into its domestic market. For instance, by refraining from exporting altogether, the monopolist could completely exclude foreign competition.

For a model with oligopolistic market power in the certificate market assume that country  $B$  keeps perfectly competitive producers as before while there are  $N$  large producers in country  $A$  indexed by  $n = 1, \dots, N$ . For every market  $m \in [0, 1]$  there is exactly one producer  $n_m$  from country  $A$  that can serve it and for every segment  $[m_1, m_2]$  of the market line the mass of markets that can be served by each producer  $n = 1, \dots, N$  shall be equal to  $(m_2 - m_1)/N$ . Thus the producers from  $A$  are evenly distributed across the markets. If in market  $m$  in country  $i$  the large producer  $n_m$  and the competitive producers from country  $B$  set the same price, the market shall be completely served by the large producer. Marginal costs remain as specified in Section 2.

For each market  $m$  in country  $i$  we can restrict attention to one of two strategies for the large producer  $n_m$ : either it captures the market at the marginal cost of producers from country  $B$  or it stays out of the market. Given that the cost advantage for country  $A$  producers declines with  $m$ , an optimal strategy for every large producer  $n$  can be described by two variables  $m_n^{dom}$  and  $m_n^{exp}$

meaning that it will capture all domestic markets in country A in the interval  $[0, m_n^{dom}]$  and all export markets in country B in the interval  $[0, m_n^{exp}]$ . We can also describe these strategies by the corresponding production quantities

$$q_n^{dom} = \frac{1}{N} m_n^{dom}, \quad q_n^{exp} = \frac{1}{N} m_n^{exp} \quad (39)$$

Total production quantities for country A are correspondingly

$$Q_A^{dom} = \sum_{n=1}^N q_n^{dom}, \quad Q_A^{exp} = \sum_{n=1}^N q_n^{exp} \quad (40)$$

If producer  $n$  captures a domestic market  $m$ , it earns in that market a profit of

$$g_n^{dom}(m) = c_B^{exp}(m) - c_A^{dom}(m) \quad (41)$$

and if it captures export market  $m$  it earns in that market a profit of

$$g_n^{exp}(m) = c_B^{dom}(m) - c_A^{exp}(m) \quad (42)$$

We have set up this model such that market power in product markets has no effect on countries' total production levels  $Q_i^{dom}$  and  $Q_i^{exp}$  as long as there are no certificate prices that could be strategically manipulated by large producers.

**Corollary 2.** *If no country implements a TIC scheme, then independent of the number of large producers  $N$ , countries A and B will serve exactly the same markets as if all producers were perfectly competitive. The only difference to the market outcome under perfect competition is that in the markets served by a large producer from country A prices are determined by the marginal cost of the competitive producers from country B instead of the marginal cost from country A producers.*

Another direct implication is

**Corollary 3.** *The No-TIC Agreement from Corollary 1 remains conditionally efficient in our model with  $N$  large producers in country A.*

We now analyse the market outcome under the TIC Agreement from Proposition 5.

The timing of the model shall be as follows. First, every strategic producer  $n$  simultaneously chooses its export quantity  $q_n^{exp} \geq 0$ . In this step, each large producer takes into account how its export quantity will affect the certificate price  $\pi_A$ . In the second step all other quantities are determined such that every firm maximizes its profits taking equilibrium certificate prices  $\pi_A$  as given.

**Proposition 9.** *Suppose the TIC Agreement of Proposition 5 is in place and country A has  $N$  large producers. In the unique and symmetric Nash equilibrium, we have*

$$Q_A^{exp} = \begin{cases} \frac{N - \eta_A}{N(\eta_A + 1) - \eta_A(\eta_A - 1)}, & \text{if } N > \eta_A, \\ 0, & \text{if } N \leq \eta_A, \end{cases} \quad \pi_A = \delta(1 - \eta_A Q_A^{exp}) - \alpha_A. \quad (43)$$

*In all cases  $Q_A^{exp} < Q_A^{dom}$  and the production allocation is not conditionally efficient. Moreover, for  $N > \eta_A$ ,  $Q_A^{exp}$  is strictly increasing in  $N$  and  $\pi_A$  is strictly decreasing in  $N$ . As  $N \rightarrow \infty$  the production quantities and certificate price converge to the perfectly competitive outcome stated in Proposition 5:*

$$Q_A^{exp} \rightarrow \frac{1}{1 + \eta_A}, \quad Q_A^{dom} \rightarrow \frac{1}{1 + \eta_A}, \quad \pi_A \rightarrow \frac{\delta}{1 + \eta_A} - \alpha_A. \quad (44)$$

For example, in the special case  $\eta_A = 1$  the export quantities satisfy  $Q_A^{exp} = \frac{N-1}{2N}$ . Then for  $N = 2$  the resulting exports in country  $A$  are  $Q_A^{exp} = \frac{1}{4}$ , which are 50% below the competitive export level of  $\frac{1}{2}$ . To halve the gap to the competitive export level, the number of firms must be doubled: for  $N = 4$  exports are 25% below the competitive level, for  $N = 8$ , the gap is 12.5%, and so on.

Of course, our stylized oligopoly model is not meant to deliver a reliable quantitative assessment of the distortions created by market power in the certificate market. Its value is instead illustrative: it can help build a first-pass intuition for the effects at work.

## 4 Concluding Remarks

Our results show that, for competitive sectors, TIC-based trade agreements can align strategic minimum-production objectives with conditionally efficient allocations of domestic production and exports among trading partners. At the same time, they can effectively dampen countries' incentives to use opaque subsidies or non-tariff barriers. Important implementation questions remain, however. Certificate duration (single-period versus bankable), inventory limits, and auction design will shape manipulation risks and price volatility. Design lessons from pollution-permit markets are relevant here; see, for example, Liski and Montero (2011) on the role of permit storability and Hahn (1984) for an early analysis of market power in markets for pollution certificates.

Alternatively, one could replicate the automatic adjustment with explicitly state-contingent tariffs and subsidies. For instance, specify formula-based adjustments that respond to observed shortfalls from a declared export-to-import ratio, combined with pre-announced review points and high transparency to support planning and mutual monitoring.

Even if tradeable import certificates were replaced by such automatically adjusted tariffs and export subsidies, adverse incentives for large domestic producers would persist. By withholding exports, domestic firms can raise the effective tariff protection at home and the export subsidy rate. Unless such strategic behavior by firms can be effectively limited, fully rule-based tariff and subsidy adjustments or TIC schemes carry substantial risks.

Finally, any real-world implementation requires a multi-partner lens. One would likely condition effective tariff and subsidy rates by partner-specific supply risk and exposure paired with explicit diversification commitments. Well-designed schemes that explicitly allow for friendshoring, or treat sufficient diversification as a substitute to domestic production, may also help mitigate risks arising from domestic market power. We consider a detailed analysis of such a multilateral mechanism an important avenue for future research.

## References

- Aghion, P., Cai, J., Dewatripont, M., Du, L., Harrison, A., & Legros, P. (2015). Industrial policy and competition. *American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics*, 7(4), 1–32. <https://doi.org/10.1257/mac.20120103>
- Amiti, M., Redding, S. J., & Weinstein, D. E. (2019). The impact of the 2018 tariffs on prices and welfare. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 33(4), 187–210. <https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.33.4.187>
- Bernard, A. B., Redding, S. J., & Schott, P. K. (2010). Multiple-product firms and product

- switching. *American Economic Review*, 100(1), 70–97. <https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.100.1.70>
- Bhagwati, J., & Srinivasan, T. N. (1969). Optimal intervention to achieve non-economic objectives. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 36(1), 27–38. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2296340>
- Buffett, W. E. (2003, November 10). America’s growing trade deficit is selling the nation out from under us. Here’s a way to fix the problem – and we need to do it now. *Fortune*.
- Congressional Budget Office (CBO). (2025). *Budgetary and economic effects of increases in tariffs implemented between January 6 and May 13, 2025*. Washington, DC: Congressional Budget Office. Retrieved November 13, 2025, from <https://www.cbo.gov/publication/61389>
- Dawar, K. (2020). Regulating under the radar: EU official export credit support. *VoxEU/CEPR*. <https://cepr.org/voxeu/columns/regulating-under-radar-eu-official-export-credit-support-0>
- Dornbusch, R., Fischer, S., & Samuelson, P. A. (1977). Comparative advantage, trade, and payments in a Ricardian model with a continuum of goods. *American Economic Review*, 67(5), 823–839.
- European Commission (2021): The European economic and financial system: fostering openness, strength and resilience, COM(2021) 32 final, 19 January 2021.
- European Commission. (2023). *A Green Deal Industrial Plan for the Net-Zero Age* (COM(2023) 62). <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=celex:52023DC0062>
- Freund, C., & Özden, C. (2008). Trade policy and loss aversion. *American Economic Review*, 98(4), 1675–1691. <https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.98.4.1675>
- Goldlücke, S., & Kranz, S. (2023). Reconciling relational contracting and hold-up: A model of repeated negotiations. *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 21(3), 864–906. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jeea/jvac036>
- Hahn, R. W. (1984). Market power and transferable property rights. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 99(4), 753–765. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1883124>
- Handley, K., & Limao, N. (2017). Policy uncertainty, trade, and welfare: Theory and evidence for China and the United States. *American Economic Review*, 107(9), 2731–2783. <https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.20141419>
- Hillman, J., & Manak, I. (2023). *Rethinking international rules on subsidies* (Council Special Report No. 96). Council on Foreign Relations.
- Juhász, R., Lane, N., & Rodrik, D. (2024). The new economics of industrial policy. *Annual Review of Economics*, 16(1), 213–242. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-economics-081023-024638>
- Krueger, A. O. (1974). The political economy of the rent-seeking society. *American Economic Review*, 64(3), 291–303.
- Liski, M., & Montero, J. P. (2011). Market power in an exhaustible resource market: The case of storable pollution permits. *The Economic Journal*, 121(551), 116–144.



<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0297.2010.02366.x>

Magee, C. (2002). Declining industries and persistent tariff protection. *Review of International Economics*, 10(4), 749–762. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9396.00362>

Martin, P., Mayer, T., & Thoenig, M. (2008). Make trade not war? *Review of Economic Studies*, 75(3), 865–900. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-937X.2008.00492.x>

McBride, J., & Chatzky, A. (2019, May 13). Is ‘Made in China 2025’ a threat to global trade? Council on Foreign Relations. <https://www.cfr.org/backgrounder/made-china-2025-threat-global-trade>

Melvin, J. R. (1986). The nonequivalence of tariffs and import quotas. *American Economic Review*, 76(5), 1131–1134

Myerson, R. B., & Satterthwaite, M. A. (1983). Efficient mechanisms for bilateral trading. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 29(2), 265–281. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-0531\(83\)90048-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-0531(83)90048-0)

National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST). (2023). *CHIPS incentives funding opportunities*. Retrieved November 13, 2025, from <https://www.nist.gov/chips/chips-incentives-funding-opportunities>

Papadimitriou, D. B., Hannsgen, G., & Zezza, G. (2008). The Buffett plan for reducing the trade deficit. *Levy Economics Institute Working Paper*.

Pavcnik, N. (2002). Trade liberalization, exit, and productivity improvements: Evidence from Chilean plants. *Review of Economic Studies*, 69(1), 245–276. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-937X.00205>

Rhode, P. W., Snyder, J. M., Jr., & Strumpf, K. (2018). The arsenal of democracy: Production and politics during WWII. *Journal of Public Economics*, 166, 145–161. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2018.08.010>

Shibata, H. (1968). A note on the equivalence of tariffs and quotas. *American Economic Review*, 58(1), 137–142.

State Council of the People’s Republic of China. (2015). *Made in China 2025*. (State Council plan for upgrading Chinas manufacturing sector.) English translation available via the Center for Security and Emerging Technology. Retrieved November 13, 2025, from [https://cset.georgetown.edu/wp-content/uploads/t0432\\_made\\_in\\_china\\_2025\\_EN.pdf](https://cset.georgetown.edu/wp-content/uploads/t0432_made_in_china_2025_EN.pdf)

Studwell, J. (2013). *How Asia works: Success and failure in the world’s most dynamic region*. Grove Press.

Tower, E. (1975). The optimum quota and retaliation. *Review of Economic Studies*, 42(4), 623–630. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2296799>

Trefler, D. (2004). The long and short of the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement. *American Economic Review*, 94(4), 870–895. <https://doi.org/10.1257/0002828042002633>

White House. (2017, July 21). Presidential Executive Order 13806: Assessing and strengthening the manufacturing and defense industrial base and supply chain resiliency of the United States. *The White House*.

Yamamoto, K. (2024). Free Trade Agreements Under Asymmetric Information and the Negotiating Role of Side Payments. Available at SSRN 4716997.

## Appendix

### A1 Proofs

#### Proof for Proposition 1

Country  $i$  serves  $j$ 's market if  $c_i^{exp}(m) < c_j^{dom}(m)$ , i.e.

$$w_i(m) - s_i - \tilde{e}_i + \tilde{\tau}_j < w_j(m) - s_j.$$

Rearranging yields the export cutoff condition in terms of the technology gap  $\Delta w_i(m) \equiv w_i(m) - w_j(m)$ :

$$\Delta w_i(m) < (s_i - s_j) + (\tilde{e}_i - \tilde{\tau}_j).$$

Using  $\Delta w_A(m) = \delta(m - m^o)$  with  $m^o = Q_A^o = \alpha_A/\delta$ , the export cutoff is

$$m_i^{exp} = m^o + \frac{(s_i - s_j) + (\tilde{e}_i - \tilde{\tau}_j)}{\delta}.$$

Similarly,  $i$  serves its own domestic market when  $c_i^{dom}(m) \leq c_j^{exp}(m)$ :

$$w_i(m) - s_i \leq w_j(m) - s_j - \tilde{e}_j + \tilde{\tau}_i \iff \Delta w_i(m) \leq (s_i - s_j) + (\tilde{\tau}_i - \tilde{e}_j).$$

Hence the domestic cutoff is

$$m_i^{dom} = m^o + \frac{(s_i - s_j) + (\tilde{\tau}_i - \tilde{e}_j)}{\delta}.$$

Because each product market has unit mass and the weak inequalities bind only on a null set, the corresponding quantities equal these cutoffs, truncated to  $[0, 1]$ :

$$Q_i^{dom} = \max(0, \min(1, m_i^{dom})), \quad Q_i^{exp} = \max(0, \min(1, m_i^{exp})).$$

Recognizing  $Q_A^o = m^o$  and  $Q_B^o = 1 - m^o$  yields the stated expressions for  $\tilde{Q}_i^{dom}$  and  $\tilde{Q}_i^{exp}$ .  $\square$

#### Proof for Proposition 2

Using  $Q_i^{imp} = Q_j^{exp}$  direct costs of country  $i$  satisfy

$$D_i = \int_0^1 [w_i(m) q_i^{dom}(m) + w_j(m) q_j^{exp}(m)] dm + (s_i + \tilde{e}_i) Q_i^{exp} - (s_j + \tilde{e}_j) Q_i^{imp}.$$

All variables for free trade outcome will be superscripted with  $^o$ . The direct costs under free trade are

$$D_i^o = \int_0^1 [w_i(m) q_i^{dom,o}(m) + w_j(m) q_j^{exp,o}(m)] dm.$$

Subtracting, yields

$$\begin{aligned} D_i - D_i^o &= \int_0^1 \left[ w_i(m) (q_i^{dom}(m) - q_i^{dom,o}(m)) + w_j(m) (q_j^{exp}(m) - q_j^{exp,o}(m)) \right] dm \\ &\quad + (s_i + \tilde{e}_i) Q_i^{exp} - (s_j + \tilde{e}_j) Q_i^{imp}. \end{aligned}$$

Since for each  $m$  exactly one of  $q_i^{dom}(m)$  and  $q_j^{exp}(m)$  equals 1, the integral term only loads on the set of products  $m$  where production allocation differs from the free trade allocation. We call it the missallocated set. Let  $\Delta Q_i \equiv Q_i^{dom} - Q_i^o$ . By construction, the missallocated set is an interval of measure  $|\Delta Q_i|$ , obtained by shifting the free trade cutoff  $m^o$  left or right. Using the linear technology gap  $\Delta w_i(m) \equiv w_i(m) - w_j(m) = \delta(m - m^o)$ , the incremental cost from misallocating the marginal interval of length  $|\Delta Q_i|$  is the area under a linear ramp:

$$\int_0^{|\Delta Q_i|} \delta x dx = \frac{\delta}{2} (\Delta Q_i)^2.$$

Therefore,

$$\int_0^1 \left[ w_i(m) (q_i^{dom} - q_i^{dom,o}) + w_j(m) (q_j^{exp} - q_j^{exp,o}) \right] dm = \frac{\delta}{2} (Q_i^{dom} - Q_i^o)^2.$$

Putting all pieces together, we get

$$E_i = D_i - D_i^o = \frac{\delta}{2} (Q_i^{dom} - Q_i^o)^2 + (s_i + \tilde{e}_i) Q_i^{exp} - (s_j + \tilde{e}_j) Q_i^{imp}.$$

Summing up yields the first line of (18)

$$E = E_A + E_B = \frac{\delta}{2} \left[ (Q_A^{dom} - Q_A^o)^2 + (Q_B^{dom} - Q_B^o)^2 \right]$$

Recognizing that

$$\begin{aligned} Q_i^{dom} &= 1 - Q_j^{exp} \\ Q_i^o &= 1 - Q_j^o \end{aligned}$$

yields the 2nd and 3rd lines by simple substitution and simplification.  $\square$

### Proof for Lemma 1

Because we are in an interior solution, Proposition 1 implies for each country  $k \in \{i, j\}$  that

$$Q_k^{exp} = Q_k^o + \frac{(s_k - s_\ell) + (\tilde{e}_k - \tilde{r}_\ell)}{\delta},$$

where  $\ell$  denotes the trading partner of  $k$ ,  $Q_k^o = \alpha_k/\delta$ , and  $\delta = \alpha_A + \alpha_B$ . Using this with  $k = i$  and  $\ell = j$  gives

$$Q_i^{exp} = Q_i^o + \frac{(s_i - s_j) + (\tilde{e}_i - \tilde{r}_j)}{\delta} = \frac{\alpha_i}{\delta} + \frac{(s_i - s_j) + (\tilde{e}_i - \tilde{r}_j)}{\delta}. \quad (45)$$

Similarly, with  $k = j$  and  $\ell = i$  we obtain

$$Q_j^{exp} = Q_j^o + \frac{(s_j - s_i) + (\tilde{e}_j - \tilde{\tau}_i)}{\delta} = \frac{\alpha_j}{\delta} + \frac{(s_j - s_i) + (\tilde{e}_j - \tilde{\tau}_i)}{\delta}. \quad (46)$$

Next, we substitute the effective instruments. By definition,

$$\tilde{\tau}_k = \tau_k + \pi_k, \quad \tilde{e}_k = e_k + \phi_k \eta_k \pi_k.$$

We assume that country  $j$  has no TIC or a non-binding TIC, so  $\pi_j = 0$ . Hence

$$\tilde{\tau}_j = \tau_j, \quad \tilde{e}_j = e_j,$$

while for country  $i$  we have

$$\tilde{\tau}_i = \tau_i + \pi_i, \quad \tilde{e}_i = e_i + \phi_i \eta_i \pi_i.$$

Substituting into (45) and (46) yields

$$Q_i^{exp} = \frac{\alpha_i}{\delta} + \frac{(s_i - s_j) + (e_i + \phi_i \eta_i \pi_i - \tau_j)}{\delta}, \quad (47)$$

$$Q_j^{exp} = \frac{\alpha_j}{\delta} + \frac{(s_j - s_i) + (e_j - (\tau_i + \pi_i))}{\delta}. \quad (48)$$

A binding TIC equilibrium in country  $i$  is characterized by  $\pi_i > 0$  and

$$\eta_i Q_i^{exp} = Q_i^{imp} > 0.$$

Since  $Q_i^{imp} = Q_j^{exp}$  by definition, the binding condition can be written as

$$\eta_i Q_i^{exp} = Q_j^{exp}. \quad (49)$$

Using (47) and (48) in (49) and multiplying both sides by  $\delta$  gives

$$\eta_i [\alpha_i + (s_i - s_j) + e_i + \phi_i \eta_i \pi_i - \tau_j] = \alpha_j + (s_j - s_i) + e_j - \tau_i - \pi_i.$$

We now solve this equation for  $\pi_i$ . Expanding the left-hand side and bringing all terms to the right-hand side yields

$$0 = -\alpha_j - e_j + \eta_i (\alpha_i + e_i + s_i - s_j - \tau_j) + \eta_i^2 \phi_i \pi_i + \pi_i + s_i - s_j + \tau_i.$$

Collecting the terms in  $\pi_i$  on the left and all remaining terms on the right gives

$$(1 + \phi_i \eta_i^2) \pi_i = \alpha_j - \eta_i \alpha_i + (1 + \eta_i)(s_j - s_i) + (e_j - \eta_i e_i) + (\eta_i \tau_j - \tau_i).$$

Dividing by  $1 + \phi_i \eta_i^2 > 0$  yields ((12)). □

## Proof for Lemma 2

Whether market  $m$  in country  $i$  will be domestically served depends only on the cost difference

$$c_j^{exp}(m) - c_i^{dom}(m) = w_j(m) - s_j - \tilde{e}_j + \tilde{\tau}_i - w_i(m) + s_i.$$

This cost difference stays the same whenever  $\tilde{\tau}_i' + s_i' = \tilde{\tau}_i + s_i$ . With  $\tilde{\tau}_i' = \tilde{\tau}_i + s_i - s_i'$  this always holds true. Similarly, Whether market  $m$  in country  $j$  will be domestically served depends only on the cost difference

$$c_i^{exp}(m) - c_j^{dom}(m) = w_i(m) - s_i - \tilde{e}_i + \tilde{\tau}_j - w_j(m) + s_j.$$

This cost difference stays the same whenever  $\tilde{e}_i' + s_i' = \tilde{e}_i + s_i$ . With  $\tilde{e}_i' = \tilde{e}_i + s_i - s_i'$  this condition is always satisfied.

Direct costs  $d_i^{exp}(m)$ ,  $d_i^{imp}(m)$ ,  $d_i^{dom}(m)$  and  $d_j^{exp}(m)$ ,  $d_j^{imp}(m)$ ,  $d_j^{dom}(m)$  in every market  $m$  are independent of the tariff rate and depends only on the sum of production and effective export subsidies  $\tilde{e}_i + s_i = \tilde{e}_i' + s_i'$ . □

### Proof for Proposition 3

Recall from Proposition 2, that the (unconditional) excess cost relative to the globally efficient free trade outcome can be written as

$$E = \frac{\delta}{2} \left[ (Q_i^{dom} - Q_i^o)^2 + (Q_i^{exp} - Q_i^o)^2 \right]$$

using either country  $i$ . Fix the totals  $(X_A, X_B)$  with  $X_A + X_B = 2$ . The minimum cost  $\bar{D}^o(X_A, X_B)$  subject to  $X_i = Q_i^{dom} + Q_i^{exp}$  is obtained by minimizing

$$f(Q_i^{dom}, Q_i^{exp}) = (Q_i^{dom} - Q_i^o)^2 + (Q_i^{exp} - Q_i^o)^2 \quad \text{subject to} \quad Q_i^{dom} + Q_i^{exp} = X_i.$$

Because  $X_i \in [0, 2]$ , the unconstrained minimizer  $Q_i^{dom} = Q_i^{exp} = X_i/2$  lies in  $[0, 1]$ , so bounds do not bind. Substituting  $Q_i^{dom} = X_i/2$  and  $Q_i^{exp} = X_i/2$  yields

$$\min f = \frac{1}{2} (X_i - 2Q_i^o)^2,$$

and hence the constrained minimum (relative to  $W^o$ ) equals

$$\bar{D}^o(X_A, X_B) - D^o = \frac{\delta}{4} (X_i - 2Q_i^o)^2.$$

Therefore, the conditional excess cost beyond this constrained minimum is

$$\bar{E}(X_A, X_B) = E - (D^o(X_A, X_B) - D^o) = \frac{\delta}{2} \left[ (d)^2 + (e)^2 \right] - \frac{\delta}{4} (d + e)^2,$$

where  $d \equiv Q_i^{dom} - Q_i^o$  and  $e \equiv Q_i^{exp} - Q_i^o$ . Using  $d^2 + e^2 - \frac{1}{2}(d + e)^2 = \frac{1}{2}(d - e)^2$  gives

$$\bar{E}(X_A, X_B) = \frac{\delta}{4} (Q_i^{dom} - Q_i^{exp})^2,$$

which proves (23). For the interior-cutoff case, substitute  $Q_i^{dom} - Q_i^{exp} = (\tilde{\tau}_i - \tilde{e}_j) - (\tilde{e}_i - \tilde{\tau}_j)$  divided by  $\delta$ , i.e.,

$$Q_i^{dom} - Q_i^{exp} = \frac{(\tilde{\tau}_i + \tilde{\tau}_j) - (\tilde{e}_i + \tilde{e}_j)}{\delta},$$

into (23) to obtain (24). □

### Proof for Proposition 4

Throughout this proof we first work in the interior region where the cutoff formulas in Proposition 1 apply without truncation and then indicate how to adjust for corner solutions. By Lemma 2 we can, without loss of generality, restrict attention to  $s_i = 0$  for both countries and, since there is no TIC scheme, to  $\pi_i = 0$ , so that  $\tilde{\tau}_i = \tau_i$  and  $\tilde{e}_i = e_i$ .

*Step 1: Quantities and direct-cost derivatives.* From Proposition 1, in an interior outcome we have

$$Q_i^{dom} = Q_i^o + \frac{\tau_i - e_j}{\delta}, \quad Q_i^{exp} = Q_i^o + \frac{e_i - \tau_j}{\delta},$$

so total production in  $i$  is

$$X_i = Q_i^{dom} + Q_i^{exp} = 2Q_i^o + \frac{\tau_i + e_i - (\tau_j + e_j)}{\delta}. \quad (50)$$

Using Proposition 2 with  $s_i = 0$  and  $\tilde{e}_i = e_i$ ,

$$D_i = D_i^o + E_i, \quad E_i = \frac{\delta}{2}(Q_i^{dom} - Q_i^o)^2 + e_i Q_i^{exp} - e_j Q_i^{imp},$$

and  $Q_i^{imp} = Q_j^{exp}$ . Substituting the interior expressions for  $Q_i^{dom}, Q_i^{exp}$  and simplifying yields a quadratic polynomial in the instruments. Differentiating with respect to own instruments gives, for each country  $i$ ,

$$\frac{\partial D_i}{\partial \tau_i} = \frac{\tau_i}{\delta}, \quad \frac{\partial D_i}{\partial e_i} = Q_i^o + \frac{2e_i - \tau_j}{\delta}. \quad (51)$$

(These identities follow from straightforward algebra combining Propositions 1 and 2.)

*Step 2: Country B's best response.* Country B's objective is  $u_B = \gamma_B X_B - D_B$ . Using (50), the marginal effect of own instruments on  $X_B$  is

$$\frac{\partial X_B}{\partial \tau_B} = \frac{\partial X_B}{\partial e_B} = \frac{1}{\delta}.$$

Hence, combining with (51),

$$\frac{\partial u_B}{\partial \tau_B} = \frac{\gamma_B}{\delta} - \frac{\tau_B}{\delta}, \quad \frac{\partial u_B}{\partial e_B} = \frac{\gamma_B}{\delta} - \left( Q_B^o + \frac{2e_B - \tau_A}{\delta} \right).$$

In an interior optimum these must both be zero, which yields

$$\tau_B^* = \gamma_B, \quad e_B^* = \frac{\tau_A + \gamma_B - \delta Q_B^o}{2}.$$

Under Assumption 1 (in particular  $\bar{X}_A < 1$  and  $\gamma_B$  small relative to  $\delta$ ; see the final step below), this interior expression for  $e_B^*$  is nonpositive at the equilibrium instruments of country A. Since  $e_B \geq 0$ , the complementary-slackness condition implies that in equilibrium

$$e_B^* = 0, \quad \tau_B^* = \gamma_B. \quad (52)$$

*Step 3: Country A's target and constrained cost minimization.* Country A's payoff is

$$u_A = -\lambda_A \max(\bar{X}_A - X_A, 0) - D_A,$$

with  $\lambda_A \gg \gamma_B > 0$ . Suppose, for contradiction, that in equilibrium  $X_A < \bar{X}_A$ . Then a marginal increase in  $X_A$  via a small common increase in  $\tau_A$  and  $e_A$  raises  $u_A$  at rate  $\lambda_A/\delta$  on the benefit side, while the marginal cost is of order  $O(\tau_A, e_A)$  by (51). For  $\lambda_A$  sufficiently large this cannot be optimal. Thus, in any Nash equilibrium we must have

$$X_A = \bar{X}_A.$$

Using (50) for  $i = A$  and keeping country B's instruments fixed, the requirement  $X_A = \bar{X}_A$  is equivalent to a linear constraint on  $(\tau_A, e_A)$ :

$$\tau_A + e_A = K_A \equiv \tau_B + e_B + \delta(\bar{X}_A - 2Q_A^o). \quad (53)$$

Given (53), country A chooses  $(\tau_A, e_A)$  to minimize  $D_A$  subject to the linear constraint. Let  $\kappa$  denote the Lagrange multiplier on (53). The Lagrangian is

$$L(\tau_A, e_A, \kappa) = D_A + \kappa(X_A - \bar{X}_A).$$

Using (50) and (51), the FOCs (interior) are

$$0 = \frac{\partial L}{\partial \tau_A} = \frac{\tau_A}{\delta} + \kappa \frac{1}{\delta}, \quad 0 = \frac{\partial L}{\partial e_A} = \left( Q_A^o + \frac{2e_A - \tau_B}{\delta} \right) + \kappa \frac{1}{\delta}.$$

Subtracting the first from the second eliminates  $\kappa$  and yields

$$Q_A^o + \frac{2e_A - \tau_B}{\delta} - \frac{\tau_A}{\delta} = 0,$$

that is,

$$2e_A = \tau_A + \tau_B - \delta Q_A^o. \quad (54)$$

Together, (53) and (54) determine the interior cost-minimizing split between  $\tau_A$  and  $e_A$  for given  $(\tau_B, e_B)$ . Solving gives

$$e_A^* = \frac{K_A + \tau_B - \delta Q_A^o}{3}, \quad \tau_A^* = K_A - e_A^* = \frac{2K_A - \tau_B + \delta Q_A^o}{3}.$$

*Step 4: Plugging in country B's instruments.* Using country B's Nash choice (52) in (53), we obtain

$$K_A = \gamma_B + 0 + \delta(\bar{X}_A - 2Q_A^o).$$

Substituting this into the expressions in Step 3 and using  $Q_A^o = \alpha_A/\delta$ , we get

$$\tau_A^* = -\alpha_A + \frac{2}{3} \delta \bar{X}_A + \frac{1}{3} \gamma_B, \quad e_A^* = -\alpha_A + \frac{1}{3} \delta \bar{X}_A + \frac{2}{3} \gamma_B.$$

Moreover,

$$\tau_A^* - e_A^* = \frac{\delta \bar{X}_A - \gamma_B}{3} > 0$$

because  $\bar{X}_A > X_A^o > 0$  and  $\gamma_B > 0$  is small relative to  $\delta$  by Assumption 1. Hence, country A strictly prefers tariffs to subsidies in the cost-minimizing combination that implements  $X_A = \bar{X}_A$ .

*Step 5: Asymmetry  $Q_i^{dom} > Q_i^{exp}$  and conditional inefficiency.* Using the interior formulas for quantities, one checks that

$$Q_i^{dom} - Q_i^{exp} = \frac{(\tau_i + \tau_j) - (e_i + e_j)}{\delta}.$$

Evaluating this at the equilibrium instruments,

$$(\tau_A^* + \tau_B^*) - (e_A^* + e_B^*) = (\tau_A^* - e_A^*) + \gamma_B = \frac{\delta \bar{X}_A + 2\gamma_B}{3} > 0,$$

so  $Q_i^{dom} > Q_i^{exp}$  for both  $i = A, B$ . By Proposition 3, conditional efficiency (given  $(X_A, X_B)$ ) requires  $Q_i^{dom} = Q_i^{exp}$  for each  $i$ , equivalently  $\tilde{\tau}_A + \tilde{\tau}_B = \tilde{e}_A + \tilde{e}_B$ . Thus the Nash equilibrium is not conditionally efficient.

*Additional step: Corner adjustments and  $e_B^* = 0$ .* If for the interior solution in Steps 2–4 some instrument were negative, the true optimum lies on the boundary where that instrument is set to zero and the other instrument is adjusted along the linear constraint that fixes the relevant  $X_i$ . For country A this means replacing any negative  $\tau_A$  or  $e_A$  by zero and adjusting the other instrument along

$$\tau_A + e_A = \tau_B + e_B + \delta(\bar{X}_A - 2Q_A^o)$$

so that  $X_A = \bar{X}_A$  still holds. This weakly increases  $(\tau_A - e_A)$  while keeping  $(\tau_A + e_A)$  fixed, and hence weakly increases  $(\tau_A + \tau_B) - (e_A + e_B)$ . Therefore, the inequalities  $Q_i^{dom} > Q_i^{exp}$  and the conclusion about conditional inefficiency continue to hold in any such corner equilibrium.

Finally, to verify that  $e_B^* = 0$  is indeed optimal for country  $B$ , evaluate the marginal payoff of  $B$  in  $e_B$  at  $e_B = 0$ :

$$\left. \frac{\partial u_B}{\partial e_B} \right|_{e_B=0} = \frac{\gamma_B}{\delta} - \left( Q_B^o - \frac{\tau_A}{\delta} \right) = \frac{\gamma_B + \tau_A - \delta Q_B^o}{\delta}.$$

Substituting  $\tau_A = \tau_A^*$  and using  $Q_B^o = \alpha_B/\delta$ ,  $\delta = \alpha_A + \alpha_B$  and  $\bar{X}_A < 1$  gives

$$\gamma_B + \tau_A^* - \delta Q_B^o = -\delta + \frac{2}{3}\delta\bar{X}_A + \frac{4}{3}\gamma_B \leq -\frac{1}{3}\delta + \frac{4}{3}\gamma_B < 0$$

for  $\gamma_B$  sufficiently small relative to  $\delta$ , as assumed. Hence  $\partial u_B/\partial e_B < 0$  at  $e_B = 0$ , so  $e_B^* = 0$  is indeed the best response.  $\square$

### Proof for Proposition 5

With no direct tariffs or subsidies, we have  $\tilde{\tau}_A = \pi_A$ ,  $\tilde{e}_A = \phi_A \eta_A \pi_A$ , and for country  $B$ ,  $\tilde{\tau}_B = \tilde{e}_B = \pi_B = 0$ . The condition  $\phi_A \eta_A = 1$  implies  $\tilde{e}_A = \pi_A$ . Hence, by Proposition 1,

$$Q_A^{dom} = Q_A^o + \frac{\tilde{\tau}_A - \tilde{e}_B}{\delta} = Q_A^o + \frac{\pi_A}{\delta}, \quad Q_A^{exp} = Q_A^o + \frac{\tilde{e}_A - \tilde{\tau}_B}{\delta} = Q_A^o + \frac{\pi_A}{\delta}.$$

Therefore  $Q_A^{dom} = Q_A^{exp}$ , and total production of  $A$  is

$$X_A = Q_A^{dom} + Q_A^{exp} = 2Q_A^o + \frac{2\pi_A}{\delta}. \quad (55)$$

Using market clearing  $Q_A^{dom} + Q_B^{exp} = 1$  gives

$$Q_B^{exp} = 1 - Q_A^{dom} = 1 - Q_A^o - \frac{\pi_A}{\delta}.$$

The binding TIC condition in country  $A$  requires

$$\eta_A Q_A^{exp} = Q_A^{imp} = Q_B^{exp}.$$

Substituting  $Q_A^{exp} = Q_A^o + \pi_A/\delta$  and the above expression for  $Q_B^{exp}$  yields

$$\eta_A \left( Q_A^o + \frac{\pi_A}{\delta} \right) = 1 - Q_A^o - \frac{\pi_A}{\delta}.$$

Solving this equation for  $\pi_A$  gives

$$\pi_A = \frac{\delta [1 - (1 + \eta_A) Q_A^o]}{1 + \eta_A}. \quad (56)$$

Inserting  $Q_A^o = \alpha_A/\delta$  into (56) and substituting into (55) yields

$$X_A = 2Q_A^o + \frac{2}{\delta} \pi_A = \frac{2}{1 + \eta_A}.$$

Thus, for any given TIC parameter  $\eta_A$ , the induced equilibrium production of country  $A$  is  $X_A = 2/(1 + \eta_A)$ .



By design of the agreement,  $\eta_A$  is set according to (30),

$$\eta_A = \frac{2 - \bar{X}_A}{\bar{X}_A} = \frac{2}{\bar{X}_A} - 1.$$

Substituting this into  $X_A = 2/(1 + \eta_A)$  gives

$$X_A = \frac{2}{1 + \frac{2}{\bar{X}_A} - 1} = \bar{X}_A.$$

Hence, the chosen  $\eta_A$  ensures that the resulting TIC equilibrium implements country *A*'s production target exactly.

Using (55) and  $X_A = \bar{X}_A$  then implies

$$\pi_A = \frac{\delta}{2} \bar{X}_A - \alpha_A.$$

Since  $\bar{X}_A > X_A^o = 2Q_A^o = 2\alpha_A/\delta$ , we have  $\pi_A > 0$ , so the TIC in *A* is binding.

Finally, conditional efficiency follows from Proposition 3. We have

$$(\tilde{\tau}_A + \tilde{\tau}_B) - (\tilde{e}_A + \tilde{e}_B) = \pi_A - \phi_A \eta_A \pi_A = \pi_A(1 - \phi_A \eta_A) = 0,$$

so  $\bar{E}(X_A, X_B) = 0$  and  $Q_i^{dom} = Q_i^{exp}$  for  $i = A, B$ . Thus the TIC scheme with parameters (30)–(31) implements  $X_A = \bar{X}_A$  and yields a conditionally efficient equilibrium.  $\square$

## Proof for Proposition 6

By Lemma 2, for any deviation  $(s_i, \tau_i, e_i)$  there is an outcome-equivalent deviation with  $s_i = 0$  and instruments  $(\tau'_i, e'_i)$  given by

$$\tau'_i = \tau_i + s_i, \quad e'_i = e_i + s_i,$$

which leaves all market quantities and payoffs unchanged for any opponent policy. Under the agreement  $\tau_A = \tau_B = 0$ , allowing  $s_i \geq 0$  is therefore equivalent to allowing  $(\tau'_i, e'_i)$  with  $e'_i \geq \tau'_i$  and  $e'_i - \tau'_i = e_i$ . Hence we can, without loss of generality, restrict attention to deviations with  $s_A = s_B = 0$  and analyze  $(\tau_i, e_i)$  under the constraint  $e_i \geq \tau_i$ . In what follows we keep the agreement's TIC parameters  $(\eta_A, \phi_A)$  fixed with  $\phi_A \eta_A = 1$ , and country *B* has no TIC ( $\pi_B = 0$ ).

*Step 1: Interior formulas and the binding TIC in A.* With  $s_A = s_B = 0$  and no direct tariffs ( $\tau_A = \tau_B = 0$  by agreement), Proposition 1 gives in any interior outcome

$$\begin{aligned} Q_A^{dom} &= Q_A^o + \frac{\tilde{\tau}_A - \tilde{e}_B}{\delta} = Q_A^o + \frac{\pi_A - e_B}{\delta}, \\ Q_A^{exp} &= Q_A^o + \frac{\tilde{e}_A - \tilde{\tau}_B}{\delta} = Q_A^o + \frac{\pi_A}{\delta}, \\ Q_B^{exp} &= Q_B^o + \frac{\tilde{e}_B - \tilde{\tau}_A}{\delta} = Q_B^o + \frac{e_B - \pi_A}{\delta}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used  $\tilde{\tau}_A = \pi_A$ ,  $\tilde{e}_A = e_A + \phi_A \eta_A \pi_A = \pi_A$  at the agreement, and  $\tilde{\tau}_B = 0$ ,  $\tilde{e}_B = e_B$ .

Since country *A*'s TIC is binding,  $\eta_A Q_A^{exp} = Q_A^{imp} = Q_B^{exp}$ . Using the three displays above,

$$Q_B^o + \frac{e_B - \pi_A}{\delta} = \eta_A \left( Q_A^o + \frac{\pi_A}{\delta} \right) \implies \pi_A = \frac{\delta (Q_B^o - \eta_A Q_A^o) + e_B}{1 + \eta_A}. \quad (\text{TIC-A})$$

Equation (TIC-A) pins down how the certificate price in  $A$  adjusts to a deviation  $e_B$ .

(i) *No profitable deviation for A.* Under the agreement of Proposition 5,  $X_A = \bar{X}_A$  and  $\phi_A \eta_A = 1$ , so  $\tilde{e}_A = \tilde{\tau}_A = \pi_A$  and  $Q_A^{dom} = Q_A^{exp}$ . Any deviation by  $A$  must satisfy  $e_A \geq \tau_A (= 0)$ , thus weakly raising the budget-transfer term  $(s_A + \tilde{e}_A)Q_A^{exp} = \tilde{e}_A Q_A^{exp}$  in  $D_A$  (Proposition 2) and, because  $X_A$  is already at its target, cannot reduce the shortfall penalty. Hence  $u_A$  cannot increase, so  $A$  has no profitable deviation with  $e_A > 0$  (equivalently, with  $s_A > 0$  by Lemma 2).

(ii) *B's one-sided deviation and the threshold.* Consider a small unilateral deviation  $e_B \geq 0$  by  $B$  (again,  $s_B$  is redundant by Lemma 2). Using (TIC-A), the induced change in  $B$ 's total production is

$$\frac{dX_B}{de_B} = \frac{d(Q_B^{dom} + Q_B^{exp})}{de_B} = \frac{1}{\delta} \left( 1 - \frac{2}{1 + \eta_A} \right) = \frac{\eta_A - 1}{(1 + \eta_A) \delta}.$$

From Proposition 2, with  $s_B = 0$  and  $\tilde{e}_B = e_B$ ,  $s_A = 0$  and  $\tilde{e}_A = \pi_A$ ,

$$D_B = D_B^o + \frac{\delta}{2} (Q_B^{dom} - Q_B^o)^2 + e_B Q_B^{exp} - \pi_A Q_B^{imp},$$

where  $Q_B^{imp} = Q_A^{exp}$ . Substituting the interior formulas from Step 1 and differentiating at  $e_B = 0$  yields

$$\left. \frac{dD_B}{de_B} \right|_{e_B=0} = \frac{\eta_A^2 + \eta_A - 1}{(1 + \eta_A)^2}.$$

Thus the marginal effect on  $B$ 's utility is

$$\left. \frac{du_B}{de_B} \right|_{e_B=0} = \gamma_B \cdot \frac{\eta_A - 1}{(1 + \eta_A) \delta} - \frac{\eta_A^2 + \eta_A - 1}{(1 + \eta_A)^2}.$$

Hence  $du_B/de_B > 0$  at  $e_B = 0$  if and only if

$$\gamma_B > \delta \cdot \frac{\eta_A^2 + \eta_A - 1}{\eta_A^2 - 1} =: \gamma_B^{TIC}(\eta_A).$$

If  $\eta_A = 1$ , the right-hand side is  $+\infty$ , so no profitable deviation exists. If  $\eta_A > 1$ , the threshold is finite and strictly decreasing in  $\eta_A$  (its derivative is negative), and  $\lim_{\eta_A \rightarrow 1} \gamma_B^{TIC}(\eta_A) = \infty$  as claimed.

(iii) *Global lower bound on  $X_A$  and monotonicity of  $D_A$  in  $B$ 's subsidies.* With  $A$ 's TIC binding,  $Q_A^{imp} = Q_B^{exp}$  and  $Q_A^{dom} = 1 - Q_B^{exp}$ . Hence

$$X_A = Q_A^{dom} + Q_A^{exp} = 1 - Q_B^{exp} + \frac{Q_B^{exp}}{\eta_A} = 1 - \left( 1 - \frac{1}{\eta_A} \right) Q_B^{exp} \geq \frac{1}{\eta_A},$$

because  $Q_B^{exp} \in [0, 1]$ . Moreover, when  $B$  raises either  $e_B$  or  $s_B$  (the latter being outcome-equivalent to raising both  $\tau_B$  and  $e_B$  by the same amount),  $A$ 's direct cost  $D_A$  cannot increase: the import-cost term  $d_A^{imp}(m)$  falls one-for-one with  $B$ 's effective subsidies, and the production-inefficiency part in Proposition 2 weakly decreases because, under  $\phi_A \eta_A = 1$ , adjustments in  $\pi_A$  induced by the binding TIC move  $Q_A^{dom}$  and  $Q_A^{exp}$  in opposite directions, reducing their squared dispersion around  $Q_A^o$ . Thus  $D_A$  is weakly decreasing in  $(e_B, s_B)$ .

The three parts (i)–(iii) complete the proof.  $\square$

## Proof for Proposition 7

Under the No-TIC Agreement,  $\pi_A = \pi_B = 0$ , country  $A$  fixes  $e_A = \tau_A = \frac{\delta}{2}\bar{X}_A - \alpha_A$ , and country  $B$  initially has  $e_B = \tau_B = 0$  (with  $s_A = s_B = 0$ ). Consider unilateral deviations by  $B$  in  $e_B$  or  $s_B$  while  $\tau_B$  remains fixed at 0.

(a) *Deviating with an export subsidy  $e_B > 0$ .* With  $s_i = 0$  and no TIC, Proposition 1 (interior case) gives

$$Q_i^{dom} = Q_i^o + \frac{\tau_i - e_j}{\delta}, \quad Q_i^{exp} = Q_i^o + \frac{e_i - \tau_j}{\delta}.$$

Holding  $A$ 's instruments fixed, we have

$$\frac{\partial Q_B^{dom}}{\partial e_B} = 0, \quad \frac{\partial Q_B^{exp}}{\partial e_B} = \frac{1}{\delta}, \quad \frac{\partial X_B}{\partial e_B} = \frac{1}{\delta}.$$

For  $B$ 's direct cost, use Proposition 2:

$$D_B = \int_0^1 [w_B(m) q_B^{dom}(m) + w_A(m) q_A^{exp}(m)] dm + (s_B + e_B) Q_B^{exp} - (s_A + \tilde{e}_A) Q_B^{imp}.$$

At the baseline ( $e_B = 0, \tau_B = 0$ ), only  $Q_B^{exp}$  (and thus  $Q_B^{imp}$  via market clearing) moves with  $e_B$ . Differentiating at  $e_B = 0$  and using the linear-cost structure behind the cutoffs yields

$$\left. \frac{\partial D_B}{\partial e_B} \right|_{e_B=0} = Q_B^o - \frac{\tau_A}{\delta}.$$

With  $\tau_A = \frac{\delta}{2}\bar{X}_A - \alpha_A$  and  $Q_B^o = \alpha_B/\delta = 1 - \alpha_A/\delta$ , this simplifies to

$$Q_B^o - \frac{\tau_A}{\delta} = 1 - \frac{\bar{X}_A}{2} = \frac{\eta_A}{1 + \eta_A}, \quad \text{since } \bar{X}_A = \frac{2}{1 + \eta_A}.$$

Therefore

$$\left. \frac{\partial u_B}{\partial e_B} \right|_{e_B=0} = \gamma_B \cdot \frac{1}{\delta} - \frac{\eta_A}{1 + \eta_A} > 0 \iff \gamma_B > \delta \frac{\eta_A}{1 + \eta_A}.$$

(b) *Deviating with a production subsidy  $s_B > 0$ .* By Lemma 2, for any  $(\tilde{\tau}_B, \tilde{e}_B, s_B)$  there is an outcome-equivalent policy with  $s'_B = 0$  and

$$\tau'_B = \tau_B + s_B, \quad e'_B = e_B + s_B.$$

Since  $\tau_B$  is fixed at 0, a marginal increase in  $s_B$  is outcome-equivalent to raising both  $(\tau_B, e_B)$  by the same amount. Using the formulas above,

$$\frac{\partial X_B}{\partial s_B} = \frac{\partial X_B}{\partial \tau_B} + \frac{\partial X_B}{\partial e_B} = \frac{1}{\delta} + \frac{1}{\delta} = \frac{2}{\delta}.$$

The marginal direct-cost term at the baseline is the same as for  $e_B$  (because  $s_B$  shifts both instruments equally and leaves the relevant cutoff structure for the integral term unchanged at first order):

$$\left. \frac{\partial D_B}{\partial s_B} \right|_{s_B=0} = Q_B^o - \frac{\tau_A}{\delta} = \frac{\eta_A}{1 + \eta_A}.$$

Hence

$$\left. \frac{\partial u_B}{\partial s_B} \right|_{s_B=0} = \gamma_B \cdot \frac{2}{\delta} - \frac{\eta_A}{1 + \eta_A} > 0 \iff \gamma_B > \frac{1}{2} \delta \frac{\eta_A}{1 + \eta_A}.$$

Allowing both instruments, the minimal threshold at which  $B$  gains from deviating is therefore

$$\gamma_B^{\text{No-TIC}} = \min \left\{ \delta \frac{\eta_A}{1 + \eta_A}, \frac{1}{2} \delta \frac{\eta_A}{1 + \eta_A} \right\} = \frac{1}{2} \delta \frac{\eta_A}{1 + \eta_A}.$$

Finally, comparing with the TIC-agreement threshold

$$\gamma_B^{\text{TIC}}(\eta_A) = \delta \cdot \frac{\eta_A^2 + \eta_A - 1}{\eta_A^2 - 1}$$

(from Proposition 6) gives

$$\frac{\gamma_B^{\text{TIC}}}{\gamma_B^{\text{No-TIC}}} = \frac{\delta \frac{\eta_A^2 + \eta_A - 1}{\eta_A^2 - 1}}{\frac{1}{2} \delta \frac{\eta_A}{1 + \eta_A}} = 2 \frac{\eta_A^2 + \eta_A - 1}{\eta_A(\eta_A - 1)} > 2,$$

since  $\eta_A > 1$  implies  $\eta_A^2 + \eta_A - 1 > \eta_A(\eta_A - 1)$ . □

## Proof for Proposition 8

**Preliminaries.** A non-tariff barrier (NTB)  $\beta_i \geq 0$  raises the marginal cost of imports into  $i$  exactly like adding  $\beta_i$  to  $i$ 's effective tariff, i.e. replace  $\tilde{\tau}_i$  by  $\tilde{\tau}_i + \beta_i$  in the cutoff formulas of Proposition 1. Unlike a tariff, however, an NTB yields no revenue rebate in  $D_i$ .

**TIC Agreement.** Maintain the TIC setup:  $\tau_A = \tau_B = e_A = e_B = 0$ , country  $A$  runs a binding TIC with  $\eta_A > 1$  and  $\phi_A \eta_A = 1$ ,  $\pi_B = 0$ , and the implemented allocation satisfies  $X_A = \bar{X}_A$  with  $Q_A^{\text{dom}} = Q_A^{\text{exp}} = \bar{X}_A/2$ .

*Country B.* Let  $\beta_B \geq 0$ . With  $s_i = 0$ , the interior formulas from Proposition 1 give

$$\begin{aligned} Q_A^{\text{exp}} &= Q_A^o + \frac{\tilde{e}_A - \tilde{\tau}_B}{\delta} = Q_A^o + \frac{\pi_A}{\delta}, \\ Q_B^{\text{exp}} &= Q_B^o + \frac{e_B - \tilde{\tau}_A}{\delta} = Q_B^o - \frac{\pi_A}{\delta}, \\ Q_B^{\text{dom}} &= Q_B^o + \frac{\tilde{\tau}_B - \tilde{e}_A}{\delta} = Q_B^o + \frac{\beta_B - \pi_A}{\delta}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used  $\tilde{e}_A = \phi_A \eta_A \pi_A = \pi_A$  and  $\tilde{\tau}_A = \pi_A$ ,  $\tilde{\tau}_B = \beta_B$ . Binding of  $A$ 's TIC implies  $\eta_A Q_A^{\text{exp}} = Q_A^{\text{imp}} = Q_B^{\text{exp}}$ , hence

$$Q_B^o - \frac{\pi_A}{\delta} = \eta_A \left( Q_A^o + \frac{\pi_A - \beta_B}{\delta} \right) \implies \pi_A = \frac{\delta (Q_B^o - \eta_A Q_A^o) + \eta_A \beta_B}{1 + \eta_A}.$$

Therefore  $\frac{\partial \pi_A}{\partial \beta_B} = \frac{\eta_A}{1 + \eta_A}$  and

$$X_B = Q_B^{\text{dom}} + Q_B^{\text{exp}} = 2Q_B^o + \frac{\beta_B - 2\pi_A}{\delta} \implies \frac{\partial X_B}{\partial \beta_B} = \frac{1 - 2\frac{\eta_A}{1 + \eta_A}}{\delta} = -\frac{\eta_A - 1}{(1 + \eta_A)\delta} < 0.$$

On the directcost side, an NTB increases  $B$ 's import consumer price with no offsetting revenue, so at  $\beta_B = 0$  we have  $\frac{\partial D_B}{\partial \beta_B}|_0 = Q_B^{imp} > 0$ . Hence  $\frac{\partial u_B}{\partial \beta_B}|_0 = \gamma_B \frac{\partial X_B}{\partial \beta_B}|_0 - \frac{\partial D_B}{\partial \beta_B}|_0 < 0$ , and  $\beta_B^{TIC} = 0$  is strictly optimal.

*Country A.* At the TIC baseline  $X_A = \bar{X}_A$ , the strategic penalty is locally flat, so  $\frac{\partial}{\partial \beta_A}[-\lambda_A \max(\bar{X}_A - X_A, 0)]|_0 = 0$  and thus  $\frac{\partial u_A}{\partial \beta_A}|_0 = -\frac{\partial D_A}{\partial \beta_A}|_0$ . An NTB into  $A$  shifts  $\tilde{\tau}_A$  to  $\pi_A + \beta_A$ . Repeating the binding TIC step with  $\beta_A$  (and  $\beta_B = 0$ ) yields

$$\delta Q_B^o - (\pi_A + \beta_A) = \eta_A(\delta Q_A^o + \pi_A) \implies \pi_A = \frac{\delta(Q_B^o - \eta_A Q_A^o) - \beta_A}{1 + \eta_A}, \quad \frac{\partial \pi_A}{\partial \beta_A} = -\frac{1}{1 + \eta_A}.$$

The linear import term in  $D_A$  moves with  $(\beta_A + \phi_A \pi_A)Q_A^{imp}$  (no revenue from  $\beta_A$ ;  $\pi_B = 0$ ). Using  $\phi_A = 1/\eta_A$  and the derivative above,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \beta_A}[(\beta_A + \phi_A \pi_A)Q_A^{imp}]|_0 = Q_A^{imp} \left(1 + \phi_A \frac{\partial \pi_A}{\partial \beta_A}\right) = Q_A^{imp} \left(1 - \frac{1}{\eta_A(1 + \eta_A)}\right) > 0.$$

All remaining changes in  $D_A$  are (at most) second order at  $\beta_A = 0$  (the misallocation triangle starts at zero), so  $\frac{\partial D_A}{\partial \beta_A}|_0 > 0$  and  $\beta_A^{TIC} = 0$ .

**No-TIC Agreement.** Under the No-TIC Agreement,  $\pi_A = \pi_B = 0$ , country  $A$  fixes  $(\tau_A, e_A) = (t, t)$  with  $t = \frac{\delta}{2}\bar{X}_A - \alpha_A$ , and country  $B$  sets  $(\tau_B, e_B) = (0, 0)$ . The implemented allocation is conditionally efficient with  $Q_A^{dom} = Q_A^{exp} = \bar{X}_A/2$  and  $Q_B^{imp} = Q_A^{exp} = \bar{X}_A/2$ . Let  $B$  introduce  $\beta_B \geq 0$  (with  $\beta_A = 0$ ). Using the interior formulas from Proposition 1 and noting that an NTB adds to  $\tilde{\tau}_B$ , we obtain

$$X_B = 2Q_B^o + \frac{\tau_B + e_B - (\tau_A + e_A)}{\delta} + \frac{\beta_B}{\delta} \implies \frac{\partial X_B}{\partial \beta_B} = \frac{1}{\delta}.$$

At the baseline, an NTB again raises the import consumer price without revenue, so

$$\frac{\partial D_B}{\partial \beta_B}|_0 = Q_B^{imp} = \frac{\bar{X}_A}{2} = \frac{1}{1 + \eta_A}, \quad \text{since } \bar{X}_A = \frac{2}{1 + \eta_A}.$$

Therefore

$$\frac{\partial u_B}{\partial \beta_B}|_0 = \frac{\gamma_B}{\delta} - \frac{\bar{X}_A}{2} > 0 \iff \gamma_B > \delta \cdot \frac{\bar{X}_A}{2} = \frac{\delta}{1 + \eta_A}.$$

This establishes the stated threshold under the No-TIC Agreement and completes the proof.  $\square$

## Proof for Proposition 9

**Step 1: Second-stage allocations and the  $\pi_A(Q_A^{exp})$  relation.** With a binding TIC,  $Q_A^{imp} = \eta_A Q_A^{exp}$  so domestic sales in  $A$  are

$$Q_A^{dom} = 1 - Q_A^{imp} = 1 - \eta_A Q_A^{exp}.$$

At the cutoff market  $m = Q_A^{dom}$ ,  $B$ 's export cost equals  $A$ 's domestic cost:

$$c_B^{exp}(m) - c_A^{dom}(m) = 0.$$

Under the TIC Agreement,  $c_B^{exp}(m) = w_B(m) + \pi_A$  and  $c_A^{dom}(m) = w_A(m)$ , hence

$$w_B(m) - w_A(m) + \pi_A = 0 \implies \alpha_A - \delta m + \pi_A = 0.$$

Evaluated at  $m = Q_A^{\text{dom}} = 1 - \eta_A Q_A^{\text{exp}}$  this yields the TIC price as a function of total exports:

$$\pi_A = \delta(1 - \eta_A Q_A^{\text{exp}}) - \alpha_A. \quad (57)$$

**Step 2: Per-market margins and a producers profit.** For any market  $m$ , the per-unit margin for an  $A$  producer if it serves domestically is

$$g_n^{\text{dom}}(m) = c_B^{\text{exp}}(m) - c_A^{\text{dom}}(m) = \alpha_A - \delta m + \pi_A,$$

and if it exports is

$$g_n^{\text{exp}}(m) = c_B^{\text{dom}}(m) - c_A^{\text{exp}}(m) = w_B(m) - (w_A(m) - \pi_A) = \alpha_A - \delta m + \pi_A,$$

where the last equality uses  $\phi_A \eta_A = 1$  so that  $c_A^{\text{exp}}(m) = w_A(m) - \pi_A$ . Hence the margin is the same on either side:  $\alpha_A - \delta m + \pi_A$ .

Let  $q_n^{\text{dom}}$  and  $q_n^{\text{exp}}$  denote producer  $n$ 's domestic and export quantities. Because producer  $n$  serves a  $1/N$ -fraction of each  $m$ -interval,  $q_n^{\text{dom}} = m_n^{\text{dom}}/N$  and  $q_n^{\text{exp}} = m_n^{\text{exp}}/N$ . Integrating margins over the mass of markets it serves gives

$$G_n = (\alpha_A + \pi_A)(q_n^{\text{dom}} + q_n^{\text{exp}}) - \frac{\delta N}{2} [(q_n^{\text{dom}})^2 + (q_n^{\text{exp}})^2].$$

Given  $Q_A^{\text{exp}} = \sum_{k=1}^N q_k^{\text{exp}}$ , domestic sales split evenly ex post:

$$q_n^{\text{dom}} = \frac{1}{N} Q_A^{\text{dom}} = \frac{1}{N} (1 - \eta_A Q_A^{\text{exp}}). \quad (58)$$

From (57),  $\alpha_A + \pi_A = \delta(1 - \eta_A Q_A^{\text{exp}})$ .

**Step 3: First-order condition (best response) in Stage 1.** Treating  $q_n^{\text{exp}}$  as given, we have

$$\frac{\partial q_n^{\text{dom}}}{\partial q_n^{\text{exp}}} = -\frac{\eta_A}{N}, \quad \frac{\partial(\alpha_A + \pi_A)}{\partial q_n^{\text{exp}}} = -\delta \eta_A.$$

Differentiating  $G_n$  with respect to  $q_n^{\text{exp}}$  and substituting  $q_n^{\text{dom}}$  from (58) as well as  $\alpha_A + \pi_A = \delta(1 - \eta_A Q_A^{\text{exp}})$  gives the marginal payoff

$$\frac{\partial G_n}{\partial q_n^{\text{exp}}} = \delta \left(1 - \frac{\eta_A}{N}\right) (1 - \eta_A Q_A^{\text{exp}}) - \delta(\eta_A + N) q_n^{\text{exp}}. \quad (59)$$

The right-hand side is strictly decreasing in  $q_n^{\text{exp}}$  (slope  $-\delta(\eta_A + N) < 0$ ), so each best response is unique. Moreover, if the right-hand side at  $q_n^{\text{exp}} = 0$  is nonpositive, the best response is the corner 0.

**Step 4: Symmetric Nash equilibrium.** In a symmetric interior equilibrium  $q_n^{\text{exp}} = q$  for all  $n$ , so  $Q_A^{\text{exp}} = Nq$ . Setting (59) to zero yields

$$0 = \delta \left(1 - \frac{\eta_A}{N}\right) (1 - \eta_A Nq) - \delta(\eta_A + N) q,$$

which solves to

$$q = \frac{1 - \eta_A/N}{\eta_A N + \eta_A + N - \eta_A^2}.$$

Total exports are therefore

$$Q_A^{\text{exp}} = Nq = \frac{N - \eta_A}{N(\eta_A + 1) - \eta_A(\eta_A - 1)}. \quad (60)$$

This interior solution requires  $N > \eta_A$ . If  $N \leq \eta_A$ , the right-hand side of (59) at  $q_n^{\text{exp}} = 0$  is  $\delta(1 - \eta_A/N)(1 - \eta_A Q_A^{\text{exp}}) \leq 0$ , so the unique best response is  $q_n^{\text{exp}} = 0$  for all  $n$ , i.e.  $Q_A^{\text{exp}} = 0$ .

Given  $Q_A^{\text{exp}}$ , the TIC price follows from (57):

$$\pi_A = \delta(1 - \eta_A Q_A^{\text{exp}}) - \alpha_A.$$

**Step 5: Properties.** (i) *Nonconditional efficiency:* With a binding TIC,  $Q_A^{\text{dom}} = 1 - \eta_A Q_A^{\text{exp}}$ . Conditional efficiency under the TIC Agreement requires  $Q_A^{\text{dom}} = Q_A^{\text{exp}}$ , i.e.  $Q_A^{\text{exp}} = 1/(1 + \eta_A)$ . From (60) and the monotonicity in (ii) below,  $Q_A^{\text{exp}} < 1/(1 + \eta_A)$  for any finite  $N$ , hence  $Q_A^{\text{exp}} < Q_A^{\text{dom}}$  and the allocation is not conditionally efficient.

(ii) *Comparative statics in  $N$ :* For  $N > \eta_A$ , differentiating (60) with respect to  $N$  gives

$$\frac{dQ_A^{\text{exp}}}{dN} = \frac{[N(\eta_A + 1) - \eta_A(\eta_A - 1)] - (\eta_A + 1)(N - \eta_A)}{[N(\eta_A + 1) - \eta_A(\eta_A - 1)]^2} = \frac{2\eta_A}{[N(\eta_A + 1) - \eta_A(\eta_A - 1)]^2} > 0,$$

so  $Q_A^{\text{exp}}$  is strictly increasing in  $N$ . From  $\pi_A = \delta(1 - \eta_A Q_A^{\text{exp}}) - \alpha_A$ , it follows that  $\pi_A$  is strictly decreasing in  $N$ .

(iii) *Limit as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ :* From (60),

$$Q_A^{\text{exp}} \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{1 + \eta_A}, \quad Q_A^{\text{dom}} = 1 - \eta_A Q_A^{\text{exp}} \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{1 + \eta_A},$$

and hence

$$\pi_A = \delta(1 - \eta_A Q_A^{\text{exp}}) - \alpha_A \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\delta}{1 + \eta_A} - \alpha_A,$$

which coincides with the perfectly competitive outcome under the TIC Agreement.

Combining Steps 15 proves the piecewise expression for  $Q_A^{\text{exp}}$ , the formula for  $\pi_A$ , uniqueness of the symmetric Nash equilibrium, and all stated properties.  $\square$

## A2 Additional results

Below are two results that further characterize TIC equilibria

**Lemma 3.** *Assume both countries implement tradeable import certificates.*

- i) *If  $\eta_A \eta_B < 1$  then only a pure autarky equilibrium exists, with  $Q_A^{\text{exp}} = Q_B^{\text{exp}} = 0$ .*
- ii) *If  $\eta_A \eta_B > 1$  then at most one country's TIC equilibrium can be binding.*

*Proof.* Recall that for each country  $i \in \{A, B\}$  we have

$$Q_i^{\text{imp}} = Q_j^{\text{exp}}$$

and the TIC market condition

$$\eta_i Q_i^{\text{exp}} \geq Q_i^{\text{imp}} = Q_j^{\text{exp}}.$$

(i) *Case  $\eta_A \eta_B < 1$ .* Since both countries implement a TIC scheme, we have the two inequalities

$$\eta_A Q_A^{exp} \geq Q_A^{imp} = Q_B^{exp}, \quad (61)$$

$$\eta_B Q_B^{exp} \geq Q_B^{imp} = Q_A^{exp}. \quad (62)$$

Multiplying (61) and (62) gives

$$\eta_A \eta_B Q_A^{exp} Q_B^{exp} \geq Q_A^{exp} Q_B^{exp}.$$

If  $Q_A^{exp} Q_B^{exp} > 0$ , we can divide by  $Q_A^{exp} Q_B^{exp}$  and obtain

$$\eta_A \eta_B \geq 1,$$

which contradicts  $\eta_A \eta_B < 1$ . Hence, in any equilibrium with  $\eta_A \eta_B < 1$  we must have

$$Q_A^{exp} Q_B^{exp} = 0,$$

i.e. at least one country's export quantity is zero.

Suppose w.l.o.g. that  $Q_B^{exp} = 0$  and consider the TIC condition for country  $B$ :

$$\eta_B Q_B^{exp} \geq Q_B^{imp} = Q_A^{exp}.$$

If  $Q_A^{exp} > 0$ , the right-hand side is strictly positive while the left-hand side is zero, a contradiction. Thus  $Q_A^{exp} = 0$  must also hold, and the only feasible equilibrium is the pure autarky outcome

$$Q_A^{exp} = Q_B^{exp} = 0.$$

(ii) *Case  $\eta_A \eta_B > 1$ .* Suppose, for contradiction, that in some equilibrium both TIC schemes are binding. Then

$$\eta_A Q_A^{exp} = Q_A^{imp} = Q_B^{exp} > 0, \quad \eta_B Q_B^{exp} = Q_B^{imp} = Q_A^{exp} > 0.$$

Substituting  $Q_B^{exp} = \eta_A Q_A^{exp}$  into the second equality gives

$$Q_A^{exp} = \eta_B Q_B^{exp} = \eta_B (\eta_A Q_A^{exp}),$$

so

$$(\eta_A \eta_B - 1) Q_A^{exp} = 0.$$

Since  $\eta_A \eta_B > 1$ , it follows that  $Q_A^{exp} = 0$ , which contradicts the assumption that both TICs are binding (a binding TIC requires positive imports and exports).

Thus, when  $\eta_A \eta_B > 1$ , it is impossible that both TIC schemes are binding at the same time; at most one country's TIC can be binding in equilibrium.  $\square$

Each country  $i$  can guarantee itself every minimum production target  $\bar{X}_i$  that does not exceed its domestic demand of  $1/2$  by setting an appropriate export credit factor  $\eta_i \geq 1$ . More concretely, we find

**Lemma 4.** *If country  $i$  has a TIC scheme with export credit factor  $\eta_i$  then in equilibrium*

$$X_i \geq \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \eta_i \leq 1, \\ \frac{1}{\eta_i}, & \text{if } \eta_i \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

If  $\eta_i \geq 1$  and  $Q_i^{exp} \leq Q_i^{dom}$ , then  $X_i \geq \frac{2}{1+\eta_i}$  and if  $Q_i^{exp} = Q_i^{dom}$  then  $X_i = \frac{2}{1+\eta_i}$ .



*Proof.* Recall the TIC constraint

$$\eta_i Q_i^{exp} \geq Q_i^{imp} = Q_j^{exp}. \quad (63)$$

*Part 1: Global lower bound on  $X_i$ .*

From (63),  $Q_j^{exp} \leq \eta_i Q_i^{exp}$ , hence

$$X_i = 1 - Q_j^{exp} + Q_i^{exp} \geq 1 - \eta_i Q_i^{exp} + Q_i^{exp} = 1 + (1 - \eta_i) Q_i^{exp}.$$

**Case  $\eta_i \leq 1$ .** Then  $1 - \eta_i \geq 0$ , so  $(1 - \eta_i) Q_i^{exp} \geq 0$  and

$$X_i \geq 1.$$

**Case  $\eta_i \geq 1$ .** We want a uniform lower bound in  $Q_i^{exp}$  and  $Q_j^{exp}$  subject to (63) and  $0 \leq Q_i^{exp}, Q_j^{exp} \leq 1$ .

For a given  $Q_i^{exp}$ , the smallest possible  $X_i$  occurs when  $Q_j^{exp}$  is as large as allowed by the constraints, that is

$$Q_j^{exp} = \min\{1, \eta_i Q_i^{exp}\}.$$

Substituting into  $X_i$  gives the lower bound

$$X_i \geq \begin{cases} 1 - \eta_i Q_i^{exp} + Q_i^{exp} = 1 - (\eta_i - 1) Q_i^{exp}, & \text{if } \eta_i Q_i^{exp} \leq 1, \\ 1 - 1 + Q_i^{exp} = Q_i^{exp}, & \text{if } \eta_i Q_i^{exp} \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

If  $\eta_i Q_i^{exp} \leq 1$ , i.e.  $Q_i^{exp} \leq 1/\eta_i$ , the expression  $1 - (\eta_i - 1) Q_i^{exp}$  is strictly decreasing in  $Q_i^{exp}$  (since  $\eta_i > 1$ ), so its minimum on this region is at  $Q_i^{exp} = 1/\eta_i$  and equals

$$1 - (\eta_i - 1) \frac{1}{\eta_i} = \frac{1}{\eta_i}.$$

If  $\eta_i Q_i^{exp} \geq 1$ , i.e.  $Q_i^{exp} \geq 1/\eta_i$ , then  $X_i \geq Q_i^{exp} \geq 1/\eta_i$ .

Hence, for all feasible  $(Q_i^{exp}, Q_j^{exp})$  with  $\eta_i \geq 1$ ,

$$X_i \geq \frac{1}{\eta_i}.$$

This proves the piecewise lower bound in the first part of the lemma.

*Part 2: Stronger bound when  $\eta_i \geq 1$  and  $Q_i^{exp} \leq Q_i^{dom}$ .*

Now assume  $\eta_i \geq 1$  and  $Q_i^{exp} \leq Q_i^{dom}$ . From  $Q_i^{dom} + Q_j^{exp} = 1$  and  $Q_j^{exp} \leq \eta_i Q_i^{exp}$  we obtain

$$1 = Q_i^{dom} + Q_j^{exp} \leq Q_i^{dom} + \eta_i Q_i^{exp},$$

so any feasible pair  $(Q_i^{dom}, Q_i^{exp})$  satisfies

$$Q_i^{dom} \geq \max\{Q_i^{exp}, 1 - \eta_i Q_i^{exp}\}.$$

For a given  $Q_i^{exp}$ , total production  $X_i = Q_i^{dom} + Q_i^{exp}$  is minimized when  $Q_i^{dom}$  is as small as possible, i.e. when

$$Q_i^{dom} = \max\{Q_i^{exp}, 1 - \eta_i Q_i^{exp}\}.$$

Thus

$$X_i \geq Q_i^{exp} + \max\{Q_i^{exp}, 1 - \eta_i Q_i^{exp}\}.$$

We distinguish two regions:

– If  $Q_i^{exp} \geq 1 - \eta_i Q_i^{exp}$ , equivalently  $(1 + \eta_i)Q_i^{exp} \geq 1$  or  $Q_i^{exp} \geq 1/(1 + \eta_i)$ , then  $Q_i^{dom} = Q_i^{exp}$  and

$$X_i \geq Q_i^{exp} + Q_i^{exp} = 2Q_i^{exp}.$$

Since  $Q_i^{exp} \geq 1/(1 + \eta_i)$  in this region, we get

$$X_i \geq \frac{2}{1 + \eta_i}.$$

– If  $Q_i^{exp} \leq 1 - \eta_i Q_i^{exp}$ , i.e.  $(1 + \eta_i)Q_i^{exp} \leq 1$  or  $Q_i^{exp} \leq 1/(1 + \eta_i)$ , then  $Q_i^{dom} = 1 - \eta_i Q_i^{exp}$  and

$$X_i \geq Q_i^{exp} + (1 - \eta_i Q_i^{exp}) = 1 + (1 - \eta_i)Q_i^{exp}.$$

Because  $\eta_i \geq 1$ , the coefficient  $(1 - \eta_i) \leq 0$ , so  $1 + (1 - \eta_i)Q_i^{exp}$  is weakly decreasing in  $Q_i^{exp}$  on this region. Its minimum is attained at  $Q_i^{exp} = 1/(1 + \eta_i)$  and equals

$$1 + (1 - \eta_i) \frac{1}{1 + \eta_i} = \frac{2}{1 + \eta_i}.$$

In both regions we thus have  $X_i \geq 2/(1 + \eta_i)$ , and the common minimum  $X_i = 2/(1 + \eta_i)$  is attained when

$$Q_i^{exp} = Q_i^{dom} = \frac{1}{1 + \eta_i},$$

which is exactly the case  $Q_i^{exp} = Q_i^{dom}$ . This proves the stronger bound and the equality statement.  $\square$