

# Sustainability, Modelling and Regional Transition (in Queensland)

Patrick O'Callaghan, John Mangan, Tina Rampino

AIBE, The University of Queensland

April 26, 2022

# Table of Contents

John Mangan

Patrick O'Callaghan

“Global” solution methods

Value functions

# Why are we here?

Brief discussion of the history of the project and why we are here.

- ▶ why the project is important to AIBE
- ▶ background of regional/sectoral economics at UQ
- ▶ Input-Output modelling
- ▶ the state of CGE modelling in Australia
  - ▶ CoPS, U Victoria (no uncertainty at all or proper dynamics)

# Table of Contents

John Mangan

Patrick O'Callaghan

“Global” solution methods

Value functions

## How we arrived at Maiwar: methodology

Recent literature on macroeconomic production networks:

Baqaei–Farhi, . . .

- ▶ embeds network modelling in macro models (IO renaissance)
- ▶ main finding: nonlinear (beyond Cobb-Douglas) effects matter

Atalay has some good econometric estimates of elasticities

- ▶ elasticity of substitution for flows between sectors is about 0.1
- ▶ previously most assumed Cobb-Douglas elasticity of 1.0

Conclusion: nonlinear effects matter

- ▶ does not bode well for multi-sectoral steady-state approx.
- ▶ this includes Baqaei–Farhi, Atalay, CoPS, McKibben

## How we arrived at Maiwar: methodology

How about “global” approximation e.g. Value Function Iteration?

Building on Scheidegger’s machine-learning approaches, we found

- ▶ for 1-sector model, grid approach is (at least) 1 order of magnitude more accurate than steady/ergodic-state approach

But, after a lot of hard work:

- ▶ trouble with grid approach:  $10^{12}$  points for 12 dimensions
- ▶ approximation is poor outside of grid
- ▶ VFI is also unstable (poorly suited to multi-sectoral flows)

## A bit more detail on the current state of CGE modelling

- ▶ McKibbin 1990s GCube (steady-state, no uncertainty either)
- ▶ Malakellis 1990s CoPS (Hamiltonian no uncertainty)
- ▶ Ha-Kompas 2017 Hamiltoniann, no uncertainty, impressive.
- ▶ Wende 2019, Treasury Intersectoral Model (TIM)  
steady-state, no uncertainty

## How we arrived at Maiwar . . . the research question

My old supervisor (Herakles Polemarchakis) once told me that building a model without a question is *the kiss of death*.

Reading group: Aarushi, Marian, Patrick Duenow and I, late 2020.

- ▶ Economy-wide implications of mental health: with Patrick D
- ▶ COVID impact
- ▶ In 2022, settled on 2050 net-zero carbon emission targets.
  - ▶ Most economists think Australia will be better off, but
  - ▶ Adams 2021, CoPS: Qld -6% GSP and -100k jobs *rel. to base*.
  - ▶ What about Qld targets over and above those of Australia?



# MAIWAR (Modelling Australian Industry With AMPL Regions)

1. Flexible yet Fast: without steady-state approx
2. Look-forward property: flow of state-action dependent rewards

$$V_{t_0}(\omega_{t_0}) = r_{t_0}(\omega_{t_0}, \mathbf{a}_{t_0}) + \cdots + r_{t_9}(\omega_{t_9}, \mathbf{a}_{t_9}) + V_{t_{10}}(\omega_{t_{10}})$$

3. Uncertainty: easy way to improve on CoPS
4. Investment/saving behaviour: Euler equations: CGE Dixon–Rimmer 2020
5. Data: BLADE, calibration, econometrics
6. Robust/Reliable: works with a variety of set-ups
7. Accurate/Accessible: John as end-user, as open source as possible
8. Modern yet Trustworthy: best-in-class knowledge, 2+ solvers
9. Scalable: at least to 8 regions and 20 sectors

## Cai–Judd's SCEQ: Simple (yet Powerful) Certainty Equivalent Method

E.g. Irreversible risk: one-off, permanent 5% productivity shock.

Loosely resembles tipping points: each year, chance of ice-shelf ...

In this simple example there are 28 paths to 2050:

- ▶ path where shock never happens
- ▶ path where shock happens in 2023;
- ▶ path where shock happens in 2024;
- ▶ ...

Each path has 28 periods (PathTimes).

Agents make 10-year plans (LookForward) at each time and path.

Goal: Balance consumption today vs uncertain consumption tomorrow.

On path  $p$ : once plan  $t_0$  is made, time reveals state  $\omega_{t_1} \rightarrow$  new plan.

## What do we (the modeller) do with all this info?

- ▶ For each path  $p$  and step  $s$  along the path, take the plan that starts at time  $s$  and store the values for time  $s$ .
  - ▶ For consumption store in a matrix  $C_{s,p}$ . The values of this matrix are the solutions for each  $r$  in Regions and  $i$  in Sectors.
  - ▶ similarly for investment  $INV_{s,p}$ , labour  $L_{s,p}$ , kapital  $K_{s,p}$ , etc.
- ▶ *We have generated an empirical distribution of solutions.*
- ▶ Can now derive the sample means (paths), variances, etc.
- ▶ Check that the Euler equation holds for the sample mean.

## Our contribution: multi-sectoral flows

For each Region  $r$ , Sector  $j$  and LookForward time  $t$ :

$$k_{r,j,t+1} = (1 - \delta)k_{r,j,t} + s_{r,j,t}$$

where  $s_{r,j,t}$  is a CES function of intermediate Long–Plosser flows.

$$s_{r,j,t} = \left( \sum_i \sigma_{ij} S_{r,ij,t}^\rho \right)^{\frac{1}{\rho}}$$

From Atalay's model:  $\rho = \frac{0.1-1}{0.1} = -9$ .

But: 20 Sectors implies 400 flows:  $8 \times 400 \times 10 = 32,000$  in total.

Jacobi Equations, for  $\mathbf{S}_{r,ij,t} = S_{r,ij,t} / \sigma_{r,ij}$ :

$$\mathbf{S}_{r,ij,t} = \mathbf{S}_{r,ik,t} \times \mathbf{S}_{r,kj,t}^{-1} \times \mathbf{S}_{r,kj,t}.$$

Use main diagonal and one column of  $S$ : 39 flows with total 3,120.

The solution for each path for Investment, Kapital and Labour

Cai–Judd: under the bonnet

# Why CGE modelling?

- ▶ "Old-fashioned", "black-box", "intractable", ...
- ▶ Yet industry demands "CGE" modelling and uses it as a basis for key decisions.
- ▶ A guide to quantifying the broader repercussions of sector-specific shocks.
- ▶ A guide to analysing the implications of

# Macroeconomics with networks



## Why the focus on uncertainty?

There is pretty strong evidence that the rise in uncertainty is a significant factor holding back the pace of recovery now. [...] research shows that heightened uncertainty slows economic growth, raises unemployment, and reduces inflationary pressures. [...] There is no question that slow growth, high unemployment, and significant uncertainty are challenges for monetary policy.

# Why not use a CoPS CGE model?

- ▶ Cost of software and of data for the model.
- ▶ CoPS already have a recent paper on 2050 targets

Moreover:

- ▶ no proper savings/investment: intertemporal behaviour
  - ▶ leads to strange “macro-closure conditions”
- ▶ no model of risk/uncertainty and associated behaviour

CoPS assume current economy is in *Deterministic Steady-State*.

# Treasury Intersectoral Model (TIM, 2017)

Part of a new generation of Australian models

J. Miranda-Pinto of UQ had a hand in TIM (and in our choices)

TIM has a sister called EMMA (Macro-econometric forecasting)

- ▶ TIM has proper savings
- ▶ 114-sector model of Australia
- ▶ but no risk
- ▶ Deterministic steady state & we can't access

# Adapting the Atalay model

Atalay assumes economy in (non-deterministic) steady state

- ▶ pretty complete and quite good empirical foundations
- ▶ we have full access via Matlab & Stata

Our adaptation of Atalay is the first model in our suite.

- ▶ less than 1 second to solve a 20-sector model
- ▶ regionalise using LGA-level income data via Table Builder
- ▶ capital flows matrix by adapting a US flows table from 1997 🤖
- ▶ Social Accounting Matrix using Current and Capital Accounts

# Table of Contents

John Mangan

Patrick O'Callaghan

“Global” solution methods

Value functions

## Quote from Cai and Judd (Feb, 2021)

Macroeconomists [and CoPS] are often interested in obtaining solutions around the non-stochastic steady state.

However in reality, the initial state could be far away from the steady state, and a policymaker may be more interested in the solutions for the initial periods in the forward-looking model than the far future states that could be around the steady state.

For example, in environmental and climate change economics . . .

## The current value function $V_0$

$$\begin{aligned} V_0(\omega_0) = \max_{a.} \quad & \mathbb{E} \left\{ \sum_{t=0}^{27} \beta^t r_t(\omega_t, a_t) + \beta^{28} V_{28}(\omega_{28}) \right\} \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \omega_{t+1} = g_t(\omega_t, a_t, \varepsilon_t), \quad t = 0, \dots, 27 \\ & f_t(\omega_t, a_t) \geq 0, \quad t = 0, \dots, 27. \end{aligned}$$

With current state  $\omega_t$ , action  $a_t$ , expectation  $\mathbb{E}$ , reward  $r_t$ , discount factor  $0 < \beta < 1$ , terminal value function  $V_{28}$ , transition law  $g_t$ , error  $\varepsilon_t$  and feasibility constraints  $f_t$  on actions.

- *Once approximated*, iterate over  $t$  to get *optimal policy*  $a^*(\omega.)$

# Thanks for listening!

Many thanks to the absent members of the team:

- ▶ Josh Aberdeen
- ▶ Patrick Duenow
- ▶ Cameron Gordon