

Do numerical simulation and
optimization results improve
management? Experimental evidence.

by

Kjell Arne Brekke, Statistics Norway

Erling Moxnes, SNF

Corresponding author:

Breiviksveien 40, 5045 Bergen

+47 55959526 (fax -439)

Erling.Moxnes@snf.no

Do models improve management?

- Focus on
 - Decision quality
 - Simulation versus optimization
 - Numerical guidance
- Not focus on
 - Model quality (forecast/strategy)
 - Competition with other advises
 - Improved understanding
- Previous studies find positive effects
 - Expert/information systems
 - No studies of social planning

Experiment

- “Virtual reality” to be managed:
 - Two-species fishery model, age-classes, non-linearities, economics, unemployment, randomness and measurement error
- Simulation tool
 - “Correct” single-species models with uncertain initial stocks and no economics. Advice: 4-year stock predictions for two simple fishing strategies, $h(\text{own stock})$, for each species.
- Optimization tool
 - Stochastic Lotka-Volterra model estimated on data from “virtual reality” with correct economics, max: expected NPV. Advice: Fixed fishing strategies, $h(\text{both stocks})$.

Computer screen

Management of Cod and Capelin - Barents Sea			RESULT	
Decisions	Cod	Capelin	PV Cod	
Quota			PV Cap.	
INFORMATION	Cod	Capelin	-Unemp.	
Stock estimate	864	3840	Criterion	
Catch	238	2325	Payoff	
Income	1425	1163		
Cost	889	187		
Net Income	536	976		
Unemp., %	0	0		

Year 0

NEXT YEAR

Advice from economist		
	Cod	Capelin
Target esc.	1222	7000

Help from biological model: Cod

	15 %	30 %
Catch next year	130	259

Help from biological model: Cap.

	40 %	80 %
Catch next year	1536	3072

Experimental design

- 64 students with higher economic education, no practical experience
- 3 by 3 factorial design: The two tools and the initial conditions (high and low stocks)
- 16 realizations of random variable
- Financial incentives to perform well
- Pre questionnaire (check and data)
- Post questionnaire (strategy and value of tool)
- Benchmark score: Score using the exact optimization strategy

Results:

- ANOVA results: Score- Benchmark score

- Average benchmark score: 17200

Variable	Estimate	t-ratio
Intercept	1973*	4.87
Optimization	1014*	2.51
Simulation	1053*	2.61
Hight stock	-1171*	-2.90
Opt.*Sim.	-222	-0.55
Opt.*High	850*	2.11
Sim.*High	-342	-0.85
All	-256	-0.64

* Significant at 5 percent level

- Estimated subject strategies

- Only sensitive to “own resource”

- Less sensitive to stock than opt. strategy

- 3/4 year time delay

Conclusions

- Both tools have positive effects, 10% each
 - Complements rather than substitutes
 - High return on tool development, if not
 - smaller effects in real management?
- Optimization particularly important when initial stocks different from equilibrium
 - Only simulation tool: anchoring of goal on initial disequilibrium
- Subject strategies relative to opt. strategy:
 - correction in direction of more elaborate optimization (non-linearities and measurement error)
 - correction in direction of actual management
- Subjects overestimate the value of both tools (200-300 %)
 - Overselling to naive students?