Simulation modeling for cost estimation

BY RICHARD WATERMAN Department of Statistics, University of Pennsylvania, and DONALD RUBIN Department of Statistics, Harvard University, and **NEAL THOMAS** Datametrics Research Inc. and ANDREW GELMAN Department of Statistics, Columbia University. June 23th 1999

Outline

- Context for the simulation model.
- Objectives.
- The types questions it answers.
- How it works, it's scope and requirements.
- Insights and benefits.

Context I, ABC.

- Ch.5, Cooper & Kaplan. The Design of Cost Management Systems.
- Introduce the idea of an *optimal cost system*.
- One that trades off between

(A) The cost of errors. (B) The cost of measurement.

- Error consequences include:
 - * Poor product related decisions.
 - * Poor product design decisions.
 - * Poor capital investment decisions.
 - * Inaccurate budgeting decisions.

Context II

- US Postal Service Data Quality Study (June 1997 April 1999).
- Part of the study mandate:

... provided sufficiently (1) complete and (2) accurate data for rate making, ...

- First level question: *what are costs?*
- Second level question: how well are costs estimated?
- Simulation model addresses the second question.

Simulation model objectives

- Examine how well costs are estimated.
- Establish the impact of measurement errors.
- Explore consequences of competing viewpoints.
- Prioritize information sources.
- Take a holistic view of the cost estimation process.

A flavor of the questions addressed

- What is the uncertainty in overall Marginal Cost estimates?
- How do cost elasticity assumptions impact MC estimates of products?
- What impact would halving data collection resources have on cost estimates?
- Which costpool contributes more **uncertainty** to overall MC estimates? Delivery or Transportation?
- Where are the strongest/weakest links in the chain of cost estimate components?

Why it's a hard problem

- Magnitude: multiple products (i), multiple cost drivers (j).
- **Complexity** of estimation equation.
- Multiple information sources.
- Inter-related data inputs.
- Spheres of influence. Accountants, Economists and Statisticians.

Schematic of the Marginal Cost estimation equation.



Simulation model description

- Take an established theoretical basis and combine this with best available data.
- Trade analytical complexity for computational intensity.
- Incorporate **uncertainty**, potential bias and dependencies in all input elements.
- Measure **uncertainty** in outputs (Marginal Cost estimates).
- Reflect system wide uncertainty, not just component level uncertainty.

Model Scope

- 8 mail subclasses.
- 29 Cost pools.
- Estimates Unit Volume Variable Cost/ Marginal Cost.
- Incorporates 4000 separate data inputs.
- Combines inputs from econometric studies, sample surveys and expert judgment – multiple data sources.
- Requires up to date data inputs to remain useful.

Cost estimation system evaluation

- How good a measuring stick do we have?
- Need to know "truth", to judge how far we are from truth.
- Generate *Hypothetical Worlds*, use these as testbeds.
- Benchmark *Hypothetical Worlds* against FY96 data to enhance credibility.
- Test measuring procedures (SEP's) against these Hypothetical Worlds.

How it works: an individual volume element





Uncertainty components

Summary of the sampling variability in the UVVC estimates for the 8 products used in the simulation model.

| | | | Subclass cv when a specific | | | | | |
|---------------|--------|-------|-----------------------------|-------|--------|-------|--------|-------|
| Subclass | UVVC | SEP | subsystem is "turned off" | | | | | |
| | mean | CV | RPW | IOCS | TRACS | CCS | ELAS | SS |
| First Class | 11.60 | 1.26 | 1.24 | 1.19 | 1.14 | *1.30 | 1.24 | 0.81 |
| Letters Flats | | | | | | | | |
| & IPPs | | | | | | | | |
| Periodicals | 3.38 | 10.09 | *10.23 | 1.30 | *10.14 | 10.06 | 10.07 | 10.02 |
| within County | | | | | | | | |
| Periodicals | 10.04 | 2.51 | 2.51 | 2.05 | 1.53 | 2.51 | 2.47 | *2.52 |
| Regular Rate | | | | | | | | |
| Standard A | 3.07 | 8.00 | 7.90 | *8.14 | *8.04 | 8.00 | 8.06 | 1.32 |
| Enhanced | | | | | | | | |
| Carrier Route | | | | | | | | |
| Standard A | 8.52 | 2.11 | 2.00 | 1.88 | 2.03 | 2.06 | 2.05 | 1.04 |
| Regular Rate | | | | | | | | |
| Standard A | 6.65 | 2.70 | 2.64 | 2.22 | 2.57 | *2.73 | 2.67 | 1.76 |
| Non-profit | | | | | | | | |
| Standard B | 146.17 | 4.59 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 3.75 | *4.71 | *4.64 | 3.85 |
| Parcel Post | | | | | | | | |
| Standard B | 96.33 | 13.48 | 8.79 | 11.46 | 12.49 | 13.26 | *13.49 | 13.24 |
| Library | | | | | | | | |

Summary and benefits

- It is feasible to assess cost uncertainty.
- A first step toward understanding the cost of errors.
- Model forces assumptions to be explicit.
- Provides a framework/language for discussion.
- Platform for investigating impacts of diverse viewpoints.
- By looking at the whole picture, it can pinpoint which errors have the most serious impact.