Main points I’ve learnt:

* When land\_ownership=FALSE then all users act like hunters, and will try to cull as much as possible, regardless of the damage that the trees do to yield
* The algorithm takes a step or two to find the optimal harvesting solution, and so there is often a lot of variation in the actions of users at the start. If I want I can tweak the GA to make “learning” faster
* The manager’s budget and the users budget are not equivalent – i.e. just because the manager’s budget exceeds the users’ budget, does not mean that the manager is able to stop all culling.
* If the manager’s budget is increasing dynamically, and the increase is not sufficient to increase the cost of culling beyond a certain threshold, then the number of cull actions will stay the same (i.e. not decrease) despite the manager budget increase. Then once the manager’s budget increases again, if it takes the cost of culling above the threshold for the users’ budget, then the cull count will decrease. This is what causes the steps in the plot of manager’s budget against cull count. Using `usr\_budget\_rng’ and setting it to a non-zero value will introduce some variation in user budgets and should smooth out the steps.
* When the manager budget is higher, fewer trees are lost per time step
* When the manager budget increases are larger, the number of trees lost per time step decreases more quickly than when the increases are smaller
* In the scenario I have created in the first 7 simulations, when the manager’s budget reaches about 300% of the user budget then the decreases in trees lost per time step become neglible. This suggests that further manager budget increases will not make much difference to the number of trees lost. This also suggests that there isn’t a manager budget that can completely eradicate culling of trees.