Optimal Control

Prof. Lutz Hendricks

Econ720

September 23, 2015

Topics

Optimal control is a method for solving dynamic optimization problems in continuous time.

Generic Optimal control problem

Choose functions of time c(t) and k(t) so as to

$$\max \int_0^T v[k(t), c(t), t] dt \tag{1}$$

Constraints:

1. Law of motion of the **state** variable k(t):

$$\dot{k}(t) = g[k(t), c(t), t] \tag{2}$$

2. Feasible set for **control** variable c(t):

$$c(t) \in Y(t) \tag{3}$$

3. Boundary conditions, such as:

$$k(0) = k_0$$
, given (4)

$$k(T) \ge k_T \tag{5}$$

Generic Optimal control problem

- c and k can be vectors.
- ightharpoonup Y(t) is a compact, nonempty set.
- T could be infinite.
 - Then the boundary conditions change
- Important: the state cannot jump; the control can.

Example

A household chooses optimal consumption to

$$\max \int_0^T u[c(t)]dt \tag{6}$$

subject to

$$\dot{k}(t) = rk(t) - c(t) \tag{7}$$

$$c(t) \in [0, \overline{c}] \tag{8}$$

$$k(0) = k_0$$
, given (9)

$$k(T) \ge 0 \tag{10}$$

A Recipe for Solving Optimal Control Problems

1. Write down the *Hamiltonian*

$$H(t) = v(k, c, t) + \mu(t)g(k, c, t)$$
 (11)

μ is essentially a Lagrange multiplier (called a "co-state variable).

2. Derive the first order conditions which are necessary for an optimum:

$$\frac{\partial H}{\partial c} = 0 \tag{12}$$

$$\frac{\partial H}{\partial k} = -\dot{\mu} \tag{13}$$

$$\partial H/\partial k = -\dot{\mu}$$
 (13)

3. Impose the transversality condition:

for finite horizon:

$$\mu\left(T\right) = 0\tag{14}$$

for infinite horizon:

$$\lim_{t \to \infty} H(t) = 0 \tag{15}$$

▶ this depends on the terminal condition (see below).

- 4. A **solution** is the a set of functions $[c(t), k(t), \mu(t)]$ which satisfy
 - ▶ the FOCs
 - the law of motion for the state
 - the boundary / transversality conditions

Example: Growth Model

$$\max \int_0^\infty e^{-\rho t} u(c(t)) dt \tag{16}$$

subject to

$$\dot{k}(t) = f(k(t)) - c(t) - \delta k(t)$$

$$k(0) \text{ given}$$
(17)

Growth Model: Hamiltonian

$$H(k, c, \mu) = e^{-\rho t} u(c(t)) + \mu(t) [f(k(t)) - c(t) - \delta k(t)]$$
 (19)

Necessary conditions:

$$H_c = e^{-\rho t} u'(c) - \mu = 0$$

$$H_k = \mu \left[f'(k) - \delta \right] = -\dot{\mu}$$

Growth Model

Substitute out the co-state:

$$\dot{\mu} = e^{-\rho t} u''(c) \dot{c} - \rho \mu \tag{20}$$

$$\dot{c} = \frac{\dot{\mu} + \rho \mu}{e^{-\rho t} u''(c)} \tag{21}$$

$$= -\left(f'(k) - \delta - \rho\right) \frac{u'(c)}{u''(c)} \tag{22}$$

Solution: c_t, k_t that solve Euler equation and resource constraint, plus boundary conditions.

Details

- First order conditions are necessary, not sufficient.
- ▶ They are necessary only if we assume that
 - 1. a continuous, interior solution exists;
 - 2. the objective function v and the constraint function g are continuously differentiable.
- ► Acemoglu (2009), ch. 7, offers some insight into why the FOCs are necessary.

Details

▶ If there are multiple states and controls, simply write down one FOC for each separately:

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \delta H/\delta c_i & = & 0 \\ \partial H/\partial k_j & = & -\dot{\mu}_j \end{array}$$

- There is a large variety of cases depending on the length of the horizon (finite or infinite) and the kinds of boundary conditions.
 - Each has its transversality condition (see Leonard and Van Long 1992).

Next steps

Typical useful next things to do:

- 1. Eliminate μ from the system. Obtain two differential equations in (c,k).
- 2. Find the steady state by imposing $\dot{c} = \dot{k} = 0$.

Sufficient conditions

First-order conditions are sufficient, if the programming problem is **concave**.

This can be checked in various ways.

Sufficient Conditions I:

- ► The objective function and the constraints are concave functions of the controls and the states.
- ▶ The co-state must be positive.
- ▶ This condition is easy to check, but very stringent.

Sufficient Conditions II

First-order conditions are sufficient, if the Hamiltonian is concave in controls and states, where the co-state is evaluated at the optimal level.

► This, too is very stringent.

Sufficient Conditions III

Arrow and Kurz (1970)

First-order conditions are sufficient, if the *maximized* Hamiltonian is concave in the states.

Maximized Hamiltonian:

Substitute controls and co-states out, so that the Hamiltonian is only a function of the states.

This is less stringent and by far the most useful set of sufficient conditions.

Discounting: Current value Hamiltonian

Problems with discounting

Current utility depends on time only through an exponential discounting term $e^{-\rho t}$.

The generic discounted problem is

$$\max \int_0^T e^{-\rho t} v[k(t), c(t)] dt \tag{23}$$

subject to the same constraints as above.

Applying the Recipe

$$H(t) = e^{\rho t} v(k,c) + \hat{\mu} g(k,c)$$
 (24)

$$\frac{\partial H}{\partial c_t} = 0 \implies e^{-\rho t} v_c(k_t, c_t) = -\hat{\mu}_t g_c(k_t, c_t)$$
 (25)

$$\frac{\partial H}{\partial k_t} = e^{-\rho t} v_k(k_t, c_t) + \hat{\mu}_t g_k(k_t, c_t) = -\dot{\hat{\mu}}_t$$
 (26)

Applying the Recipe

Let

$$\mu_t = e^{\rho t} \hat{\mu}_t \tag{27}$$

and multiply through by $e^{\rho t}$:

$$v_c(t) = -\mu_t g_k(t)$$

This is the standard FOC, but with μ instead of $\hat{\mu}$.

Applying the Recipe

$$v_k(t) + e^{\rho t} \hat{\mu}_t g_k(t) = -e^{\rho t} \hat{\mu}_t \tag{28}$$

Substitute out $\hat{\mu}_t$ using

$$\dot{\mu}_t = rac{de^{
ho t}\hat{\mu}_t}{dt} =
ho \mu_t + e^{
ho t}\dot{\hat{\mu}}_t$$

we have

$$v_k(t) + \mu_t g_k(t) = -\dot{\mu}_t + \rho \,\mu_t$$

This is the standard condition with an additional $\rho\mu$ term.

Shortcut

We now have a shortcut for discounted problems.

Hamiltonian (drop the discounting term):

$$H = v(k,c) + \mu g(k,c) \tag{29}$$

FOCs:

$$\partial H/\partial c = 0 \tag{30}$$

$$\partial H/\partial k = \underbrace{\mu(t)\rho}_{\text{added}} - \dot{\mu}(t)$$
 (31)

and the TVC

$$\lim_{T \to \infty} e^{-\rho T} \mu(T) k(T) = 0 \tag{32}$$

Equality constraints

Equality constraints of the form

$$h[c(t), k(t), t] = 0$$
 (33)

are simply added to the Hamiltonian as in a Lagrangian problem:

$$H(t) = v(k, c, t) + \mu(t)g(k, c, t) + \lambda(t)h(k, c, t)$$
(34)

FOCs are unchanged:

$$\frac{\partial H}{\partial c} = 0$$
$$\frac{\partial H}{\partial k} = -\dot{\mu}$$

For inequality constraints:

$$h(c,k,t) \ge 0; \lambda h = 0 \tag{35}$$

Transversality Conditions

Finite horizon: Scrap value problems

- ► The horizon is T.
- ► The objective function assigns a scrap value to the terminal state variable: $e^{-\rho T}\phi(k(T))$:

$$\max \int_{0}^{T} e^{-\rho t} v[k(t), c(t), t] dt + e^{-\rho T} \phi(k(T))$$
 (36)

- Hamiltonian and FOCs: unchanged.
- Replace the TVC with

$$\mu(T) = \phi'(k(T)) \tag{37}$$

Intuition: μ is the marginal value of the state k.

- ► The finite horizon TVC with the boundary condition $k(T) \ge k_T$ is $\mu(T) = 0$.
 - Intuition: capital has no value at the end of time.
- ▶ But the infinite horizon boundary condition is NOT $\lim_{t\to\infty} \mu(t) = 0$.
- ▶ The next example illustrates why.

Infinite horizon TVC: Example

$$\max \int_{0}^{\infty} \left[\ln (c(t)) - \ln (c^{*}) \right] dt$$

$$subject \ to$$

$$\dot{k}(t) = k(t)^{\alpha} - c(t) - \delta k(t)$$

$$k(0) = 1$$

$$\lim_{t \to \infty} k(t) \ge 0$$

- $ightharpoonup c^*$ is the max steady state (golden rule) consumption.
- ▶ No discounting subtracting c^* makes utility finite.

Hamiltonian

$$H(k,c,\lambda) = \ln c - \ln c^* + \lambda \left[k^{\alpha} - c - \delta k \right]$$
 (38)

► Necessary FOCs

$$H_c = 1/c - \lambda = 0$$

$$H_k = \lambda \left[\alpha k^{\alpha - 1} - \delta \right] = -\dot{\lambda}$$
(39)

- ▶ We show: $\lim_{t\to\infty} c(t) = c^*$ [why?]
- Limiting steady state solves

$$\dot{\lambda}/\lambda = \alpha k^{\alpha - 1} - \delta = 0$$
$$\dot{k} = k^{\alpha} - 1/\lambda - \delta k = 0$$

Solution is the golden rule:

$$k^* = (\alpha/\delta)^{1/(1-\alpha)} \tag{41}$$

Verify that this max's steady state consumption.

- ▶ Implications for the TVC...
- $\lambda(t) = 1/c(t)$ implies $\lim_{t\to\infty} \lambda(t) = 1/c^*$.
- ► Therefore, neither $\lambda(t)$ nor $\lambda(t)k(t)$ converge to 0.
- ▶ The correct TVC: $\lim_{t\to\infty} H(t) = 0$.
- ► The only reason why the standard TVC does not work: there is no discounting in the example.

Infinite horizon TVC: Discounting

- With discounting, the TVC is easier to check.
- Assume:
 - the objective function is $e^{-\rho t}v[k(t),c(t)]$
 - it only depends on t through the discount factor
 - \triangleright v and g are weakly monotone
- Then the TVC becomes

$$\lim_{t \to \infty} e^{-\rho t} \mu(t) k(t) = 0 \tag{42}$$

where μ is the costate of the current value Hamiltonian.

► This is exactly analogous to the discrete time version

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \beta^t u'(c_t) k_t = 0 \tag{43}$$

$$\max \int_{0}^{\infty} e^{-\rho t} u(y(t)) dt$$

$$subject \ to$$

$$\dot{x}(t) = -y(t)$$

$$x(0) = 1$$

$$x(t) \ge 0$$

$$(44)$$

$$(45)$$

$$(46)$$

$$(47)$$

$$(47)$$

Current value Hamiltonian Necessary FOCs

FOC

Therefore:

$$\mu(t) = \mu(0)e^{\rho t} \tag{49}$$

$$y(t) = u'^{-1} [\mu(0) e^{\rho t}]$$
 (50)

Solution

The optimal path has $\lim x(t) = 0$ or

$$\int_0^\infty y(t) dt = \int_0^\infty u'^{-1} \left[\mu(0) e^{\rho t} \right] dt = 1$$
 (51)

This solves for $\mu(0)$.

► TVC for infinite horizon case:

$$\lim e^{-\rho t} \mu(0) e^{\rho t} x(t) = 0 \tag{52}$$

► Equivalent to

$$\lim x(t) = 0 \tag{53}$$

Reading

- ► Acemoglu (2009), ch. 7. Proves the Theorems of Optimal Control.
- Barro and Martin (1995), appendix.
- ► Leonard and Van Long (1992): A fairly comprehensive treatment. Contains many variations on boundary conditions.

References I

- Acemoglu, D. (2009): *Introduction to modern economic growth*. MIT Press.
- Arrow, K. J., and M. Kurz (1970): "Optimal growth with irreversible investment in a Ramsey model," *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, pp. 331–344.
- Barro, R., and S.-i. Martin (1995): "X., 1995. Economic growth," Boston, MA.
- Leonard, D., and N. Van Long (1992): Optimal control theory and static optimization in economics. Cambridge University Press.