ornl

OAK
RIDGE
NATIONAL
LABORATORY

UNION
CARBIDE

ORNL/TM-8178

Evaluation of the Mathematical and Economic Basis for Conversion Processes in the Leap Energy-Economy Model

E. M. Oblow

OAK RIDGE NATIONAL LABORATORY
CENTRAL RESEARCH LIBRARY
CIRCULATION SECTION
4500N ROOM 175
LIBRARY LOAN COPY
DO NOT TRANSFER TO ANOTHER PERSON
If you wish someone else to see this report, send in name with report and the library will arrange a loan.

OPERATED BY
UNION CARBIDE CORPORATION
FOR THE UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Printed in the United States of America. Available from
National Technical Information Service
U.S. Department of Commerce
5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, Virginia 22161
NTIS price codes—Printed Copy: A03; Microfiche A01

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.

Contract No. W-7405-eng-26
Engineering Physics Division

ORNL/TM-8178

EVALUATION OF THE MATHEMATICAL AND ECONOMIC BASIS FOR CONVERSION PROCESSES IN THE LEAP ENERGY-ECONOMY MODEL

E. M. OBLOW

Date Published - October 1982

This Work Sponsored by
Department of Energy
Office of Energy Information Administration

OAK RIDGE NATIONAL LABORATORY
Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37830
operated by
UNION CARBIDE CORPORATION
for the
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT v

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. ECONOMIC BASIS OF CONVERSION PROCESS EQUATIONS 3

A. Classical Theory of the Firm 3

B. LEAP Form of Classical Theory of Firm 10

III. IMPLEMENTATION OF CLASSICAL THEORY OF THE FIRM IN LEAP 15

IV. ECONOMIC IMPLICATIONS OF USE OF LEAP EQUATIONS 21

V. ECONOMIC CONSISTENCY WITHIN LEAP FRAMEWORK 25

A. Behavior of Exogenous Parameters 25

B. Alternate Formulation of Capacity Factor 26

VI. CONCLUSIONS 31

REFERENCES 33

DISTRIBUTION 35

ABSTRACT

An evaluation was made of the mathematical and economic basis for conversion processes in the LEAP energy-economy model. Conversion processes are the main modeling subunit in LEAP used to represent energy conversion industries and are supposedly based on the classical economic theory of the firm. The study arose out of questions about uniqueness and existence of LEAP solutions and their relation to classical equilibrium economic theory. An analysis of classical theory and LEAP model equations was made to determine their exact relationship. The conclusions drawn from this analysis were that LEAP theory is not consistent with the classical theory of the firm. Specifically, the capacity factor formalism used by LEAP does not support a classical interpretation in terms of a technological production function for energy conversion processes. The economic implications of this inconsistency are suboptimal process operation and short term negative profits in years where plant operation should be terminated. A new capacity factor formalism, which retains the behavioral features of the original model, is proposed to resolve these discrepancies.

I. INTRODUCTION

The present study grew out of an investigation of the uniqueness and existence of solutions to the underlying equations of the LEAP energy modelling system.[1-3] In the previous work, the investigation of uniqueness was based on the behavior of the supply curves arising in the generic LEAP processes for conversion and allocation of energy products. The particular proof of uniqueness for solutions to the conversion process equations required certain conditions to be met related to profitability in process plant operation. Although these conditions are usually met in the classical economic theory of the firm, the behavior of certain solutions to large LEAP modelling problems[4,5] sheds some doubt on the mathematical and economic basis of the LEAP conversion process equations. The present study was therefore undertaken to better understand the connection between LEAP conversion process modelling assumptions and the classical economic theory of the firm.

Although other theoretical discussions of the economic basis for the equations in LEAP have already been published by the authors of the model,[6,7] it is not at all clear that the actual modelling assumptions implemented in the GEMS[1] or LEAP-EMS[2] codes are consistent with this theory. This confusion makes it difficult to understand the results of some major LEAP results[4,5] and affects the proofs of existence and uniqueness of LEAP model solutions.[3] Since the conversion process is central to all large scale models, this problem clearly needs resolution.

To illustrate the theoretical problems encountered in the LEAP conversion process, the basis for this process module will first be developed along classical lines. This entails reviewing the classical economic theory of the firm in the context of generalized equilibrium modelling. The central conclusions concerning plant profitability and operation under classical assumptions will be analyzed in some detail. This theoretical foundation will be developed in Section II.a; the particular manner in which this theory is applied in the LEAP code will then be discussed in Section II.b. The possible weaknesses of this latter approach, compared with classical theory, will then be examined in Section III and the economic consequences of these deficiencies in solving the LEAP model equations will be explored in Section IV. A modified theory retaining both the essence of the practical LEAP approach and the conditions needed to meet classical constraints is then offered in Section V. Conclusions will be drawn about the usefulness of the current version of LEAP and the potential for its improvement with implementation of the proposed changes.

II. ECONOMIC BASIS OF CONVERSION PROCESS EQUATIONS

A. Classical Theory of the Firm

The basis for the LEAP conversion process equations has been discussed at great length by several authors and reviewers.[1,2,6,7,8] The model used is intended to repesent an optimized aggregate production unit consistent with the classical theory of the firm.[9] Since details of this theory can be found elsewhere,[6,7,9] it is only appropriate here to review this theory briefly to establish notation and understand the optimal conditions which must exist in the equilibrium market.

The LEAP code system consists of a series of generic processes linked together to form a network of interacting economic activities. The LEAP conversion process, as it might be imbedded in such a network appears in Fig. 1. This module takes a vector of input quantities $\overline{Q}_I$, at prices $\overline{w}$, per unit of input and builds plant capacity N_W, sufficient to convert the inputs into a vector quantity of final products $\overline{Q}$, at prices $\overline{p}$, per unit of output in order to meet a specified demand.



Fig. 1. LEAP Conversion Process Module

In the LEAP model the problem solved by the basic conversion process can be stated in terms of the following optimization problem for the behavior of the process firm. Given the unit input prices of the factors of production $\overline{w}$, the final product prices $\overline{p}$, and the unit cost of capital N_C, the conversion process in LEAP attempts to model an optimally operated firm which seeks to find the quantities of input factors $\overline{Q}_I$, and the plant capacity per unit final product N_W, which maximizes long-term profit π, over the life of the plant.

For the sake of notational simplicity, the discussion to follow will deal with the specific case of an energy conversion process plant with a two-year lifetime. The plant will be considered to have been built in year 1 and operated in years 1 and 2. The profitability of the plant can be written for this case as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \pi = {} & p_1Q_1 - w_1Q_{I,1} - \sum_j w_{1,j}Q_{I,1,j} - N_CN_W \\ & + p_2Q_2 - w_2Q_{I,2} - \sum_j w_{2,j}Q_{I,2,j} \cdot \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

In this notation the subscripts 1 and 2 refer to the year of plant operation and j denotes factors of production other than the primary energy source. The first four terms on the right-hand side of Eq. (1), represent the plant profit in the first year of operation and the next three terms represent the profit for the second year. The form of the equation is such that all capital investments are made in the initial year of operation and only the prices and quantities of energy input and output linked to other LEAP process modules are considered in the optimization process. Thus, the two summation terms over j represent the costs of

factors of production other than energy which are specified exogeneously to the process module. Also, π is considered to be the net present value of profit in LEAP with a discount factor for capital being specified exogeneously. For simplicity in this case, the discount factor was assumed to be unity (i.e., a zero discount rate) and therefore does not appear explicitly in the equation.

In order to formulate a classical profit optimization problem from the profit definition given in Eq. (1), the conversion process must obey a technology or production constraint. This constraint determines the maximum output which the conversion technology can produce from a given quantity of the factors of production fed into the process. It therefore represents a relationship between input and output for the particular technology of production. For all LEAP conversion processes, this technology production constraint is assumed to be one with constant returns-to-scale.[6] The definition of a constant returns-to-scale production function in the ith year is, for this case, is given by the following,

$$f_i(Q_i, Q_{I,i}, N_W) = f_i\left(\frac{Q_i}{N_W}, \frac{Q_{I,i}}{N_W}, 1\right) = 0 \qquad (2)$$

That is, the relationship between input and output in any given year is independent of plant size N_W; it depends solely on the technological constraints relating unit input to unit output.

Now define the following parameters and variables

$$x_i = Q_i/N_w \tag{3a}$$

$$y_i = Q_{I,i}/N_w \equiv g_i(x_i) \tag{3b}$$

$$\phi_i = \sum_j w_{i,j}\, Q_{I,i,j}/Q_i \tag{3c}$$

where x_i is the output per unit plant size, y_i is the input per unit plant size, $g_i(x_i)$ is the functional form relating input to maximum output (i.e., in this form it is the inverse production function) and ϕ_i is the constant operating cost per unit output for the input factors of production other than energy, all in the ith year. In terms of these new variables, the classical profit maximization problem for a firm with a constant returns-to-scale production function can be written as follows:

$$\underset{\overline{Q},\overline{Q}_I,N_w}{\text{Maximize}} \quad \pi = N_w[(p_1-\phi_1)x_1-w_1y_1-N_c + (p_2-\phi_2)x_2-w_2y_2] \tag{4}$$

subject to the constraints

$$f_1(x_1,y_1) = 0 = y_1-g_1(x_1) \tag{5a}$$

$$f_2(x_2,y_2) = 0 = y_2-g_2(x_2). \tag{5b}$$

Eliminating $\overline{Q}_I$ from consideration by using the constraint relationships (5a) and (5b) directly, Eq. (4) can be written in terms of $\overline{x}$ and

N_w in its simplest form as,

$$\underset{\bar{x},N_w}{\text{Maximize}} \quad \pi = N_w[(p_1-\phi_1)x_1-w_1g_1(x_1)-N_c + (p_2-\phi_2)x_2-w_2g_2(x_2)] \tag{6}$$

The conditions under which a local extrenum exists for Eq. (6) are the following

$$\frac{\partial\pi}{\partial x_1} = 0 \qquad \frac{\partial\pi}{\partial x_2} = 0 \qquad \frac{\partial\pi}{\partial N_w} = 0 \tag{7}$$

The equations for extremum solutions can therefore be derived by differentiating Eq. (6) with respect to the independent variables x_1, x_2, and N_w. This results in the following equations for the extremum solutions x_1^*, x_2^*, and N_w^*:

$$\frac{\partial\pi}{\partial x_1} = 0 = (p_1-\phi_1)-w_1g_1'(x_1^*) \tag{8}$$

$$\frac{\partial\pi}{\partial x_2} = 0 = (p_2-\phi_2)-w_2g_2'(x_2^*) \tag{9}$$

$$\frac{\partial\pi}{\partial N_w} = 0 = (p_1-\phi_1)x_1^*-w_1g_1(x_1^*)-N_c + (p_2-\phi_2)x_2^*-w_2g_2(x_2^*) \tag{10}$$

where $g_i'(x_i) \equiv dg_i/dx_i$.

Rewriting these equations substituting the relationships given in Eqs. (8) and (9) in Eq. (10), the final conditions for optimal production can be written as follows,

$$g_1'(x_1^*) = \frac{p_1 - \phi_1}{w_1} \tag{11}$$

$$g'(x^*) = \frac{p_2 - \phi_2}{w_2} \tag{12}$$

$$w_1[g_1'(x_1^*)x_1^* - g_1(x_1^*)] + w_2[g_2'(x_2^*)x_2^* - g_2(x_2^*)] = N_c \tag{13}$$

The three equations here are similar to the classic Kuhn-Tucker conditions[10] for operation of the firm at maximal profit. The first two conditions [i.e., Eqs. (11) and (12)] are the short run optimal profit conditions of prices being equal to the marginal cost of production. The third condition [i.e., Eq. (13)] represents the long-range profit optimum of zero profit in firms with production functions displaying constant returns-to-scale.

It is important to note here that the present value of profit [i.e., π in Eq. (6)] is a linear function of plant size N_w as a result of the production function having constant returns-to-scale. In this case, therefore, no real extremum condition represented by the partial derivative $\partial\pi/\partial N_w$ exists. Equation (13) simply represents a relationship which must exist between the prices $\overline{p}$ and $\overline{w}$, so that any plant size yields an optimum. Prices are therefore constant with respect to plant size and N_w can be eliminated when considering optimal plant operation.

If all the prices are given (i.e., $\overline{p}$ and $\overline{w}$ are known), then Eqs. (11) - (13) represent three equations in the two unknowns x_1^* and x_2^*. All the prices $\overline{p}$ and $\overline{w}$ cannot therefore be independent. The optimality conditions allow only three of the four prices p_1, p_2, w_1, or w_2 to be specified independently in order to solve for the fourth price and x_1^* and x_2^*. Note also that the unknowns y_1^* and y_2^* can be obtained directly from x_1^* and x_2^* once the functional form of the inverse production functions $g_1(x)$ and $g_2(x)$ are given.

A closer look at Eqs. (11) - (13) reveals that these are very general conditions for an extremum in the profit function. In order for a profit maximum (as opposed to a minimum) to exist and be unique and for profits to be positive to offset the plant capitalization N_c, certain additional constraints must be placed on the behavior of the inverse production function $g(x)$. It is clear from Eq. (13) that the profits in each individual year are governed by the terms $g'(x^*)x^*-g(x^*)$ and for yearly positive profits to exist under all circumstances it is clear that:

$$g'(x^*)x^* > g(x^*) \qquad \text{for all } x^* > 0 \tag{14}$$

In addition, Eqs. (11) and (12) require $g'(x^*) > 0$ for yearly positive profits to exist. For a profit maximum to occur the second derivatives of the production function must be such that

$$g_1'(x_1^*) > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad g_2'(x_2^*) > 0 \qquad \text{for all } x^* > 0 \tag{15}$$

The inverse production function must therefore be a monotically increasing function of x and $g'(x)$ must take on all values from 0 to ∞ in

the region of optimum output x^* in order for a positive profit maximum to occur. If these conditions are not satisfied, the possibilities exist for multiple extrema, negative profits, and profit minimization.

When all three extremal conditions are satisfied [i.e., Eqs. (11) - (13)], together with the yearly positive profit maximization conditions given by Eqs. (14) and (15), the resulting maximization problem can be displayed graphically as shown in Fig. 2. The solution to this set of equations is unique and requires only that the input prices w_1 and w_2 together with one additional variable (either p_1 or p_2 or p_1/p_2) be specified to solve for the remaining price and x_1^*, x_2^*, y_1^*, and y_2^*. The case displayed also exhibits the desirable property of decreasing returns-to-scale for output as a function of input. That is, it takes increasingly more units of input to produce a unit of output as the quantity of output increases.

B. LEAP Form of Classical Theory of Firm

To put the optimality conditions of the classical theory of the firm into the framework of the LEAP code, Eqs. (11) - (15) must first be expressed as a single first year equation for plant operation. Since all future years are assumed to satisfy a positive profit constraint and a short run optimization condition of price equals marginal cost, the first year equations equivalent to Eqs. (11) - (13) are the following (dropping first year subscripts),



Fig. 2. Generic Behavior of equilibrium solutions to conversion process equations for classical inverse production function, g(x)

$$(p-\phi)x^* - wg(x^*) = k \tag{16}$$

$$g'(x^*) = \frac{p-\phi}{w} \tag{17}$$

where

$$k \equiv N_c - [(p_2-\phi_2)x_2^* - w_2 g_2(x_2^*)] \tag{18}$$

In LEAP the above equations are simplified even further by defining the following variables,

$$\hat{\phi} \equiv \phi + \frac{wg(x^*)}{x^*} \quad \text{average operating cost} \tag{19}$$

$$C_f \equiv \frac{Q}{N_w} = x^* \quad \text{average capacity factor} \tag{20}$$

where ϕ is the average constant operating cost for non-energy factors of production (i.e., labor, materials, etc.) and C_f is the plant capacity factor. The final form of the LEAP equations for the first year of operation are, therefore,

$$(p-\hat{\phi})C_f = k \tag{21}$$

$$g'(x^*) = \frac{p-\phi}{w} \tag{22}$$

where

$$x^* = C_f \qquad y^* = g(x^*) \tag{23}$$

These equations are now in the form in which the authors of LEAP interpreted the classical theory of the firm for use in conversion process modelling.[1,11]

For the sake of further discussions, it should be noted here that Eqs. (21) and (22) constitute two equations in two unknowns (i.e., χ^* and p) which can be solved once w, k and ϕ are known. Given such a solution, Eq. (23) can then be used to calculate y*, while N_w can be obtained from the condition of constant price with respect to plant size in meeting final demand Q. The procedure for determining k given w_2 is the only complication in this approach. This, however, is handled by a separate model for future year prices beyond the range of years with which the LEAP model deals directly, called the terminal value model.[1,11]

Although considerable documentation on the relationship between the classical theory of the firm and LEAP conversion process equations existed before the current study began, the theoretical foundation of the actual code equations was never made specifically clear. The major reason for the difficulty in making this connection lies in the manner in which LEAP defines and uses the capacity factor C_f. In most classical theory applications, the basis for any particular model has traditionally been the choice of the functional form for the conversion process production function. Several familiar classical forms used in modelling production are, for instance, the Cobb-Douglas, CES, or Leontief models.[9] Given such functional forms, the defining equations for either marginal or average capacity factors can easily be derived. This approach however was not taken in the case of LEAP. What was done instead was to define a functional form for the capacity factor itself, thereby implying an underlying functional form for the basic production function. This choice has profound affects on the results produced by this model. The rationale for this choice together with its economic and mathematical implications for LEAP are discussed more fully in the next section.

III. IMPLEMENTATION OF CLASSICAL THEORY OF THE FIRM IN LEAP

The major divergence of LEAP modelling from other classical approaches is the choice of a functional form for the capacity factor C_f. In LEAP, the authors attempted to build a model which had a certain behavioral relationship not present in other models. In particular, a capacity factor was sought which was bounded by some maximum operation level and one which varied as a function of prices and operating costs so as to increase capacity when profitablity was high and decrease capacity when profitability was low. To this end a behavioral relationship for the capacity factor of the following form was chosen,[11]

$$C_f \equiv \frac{\beta}{1+\left(\frac{\alpha\hat{\phi}}{p}\right)^{\delta}} \tag{24}$$

where β is the maximum fraction of plant capacity which can be used under optimum conditions (usually $0 \leq \beta \leq 1$), p and $\hat{\phi}$ are the price of final product and average constant operating cost for the plant, and α and δ are behavioral parameters which determine how sensitive the capacity factor is to the ratio $\hat{\phi}/p$.

As can be seen from Eq. (24), the capacity factor is a fractional quantity (a fraction of the plant total capacity) which is strictly positive and has an upper bound of β (i.e., $0 \leq C_f \leq \beta$). When prices are much higher than average operating costs and plant profitability is high (i.e., $p \gg \hat{\phi}$), then $C_f \to \beta$ and the plant operates at maximum capacity. Likewise when $p \ll \hat{\phi}$, the plant shuts down as $C_f \to 0$. This model also has the flexibility, through the δ parameter, to approach a pure Leontief

input-output model[9] in the limit as $\delta \to \infty$. This feature is an important one for comparing LEAP results to those derived from the more traditional approach of choosing a production function to model the conversion process.

Looking more closely at the form of C_f given in Eq. (24), it becomes clear that a conventional analysis of the LEAP conversion process is possible if the capacity factor form chosen implies a conventional underlying production function [i.e., if the inverse production function $g(\chi)$ can be derived from Eq. (24)]. The procedure for uncovering the inverse production function is to couple Eq. (24) to the short run optimality condition for $g'(\chi^*)$ [i.e., Eq. (22)] to form a differential equation for $g(\chi)$. It should be noted, however, that in order for $g(\chi)$ to be a classical inverse production function it should only involve a relationship between output, input, and any parameters which describe the technology of the conversion process itself (i.e., no costs or prices should be involved).

In order to uncover the inverse production function implied by Eq. (24), this equation must first be rewritten in terms of χ^* and $g(\chi^*)$ for use in setting up a differential equation for $g(\chi)$. Noting the definitions of $\hat{\phi}$ from Eq. (19) and C_f from Eq. (20), the capacity factor equation can be rewritten as follows,

$$\chi^* = \frac{\beta}{1 + \left\{ \frac{\alpha \left[\phi + \frac{wg(\chi^*)}{\chi^*} \right]}{p} \right\}^{\delta}} \tag{25}$$

This equation is trancendental in χ^* but can easily be solved for $g(\chi^*)$ to give,

$$g(\chi^*) = \chi^* \left[\frac{p}{w} \frac{1}{\alpha} \left(\frac{\beta - \chi^*}{\chi^*} \right)^{\frac{1}{\delta}} - \frac{\phi}{w} \right] \tag{26}$$

If several new variables are now defined as follows,

$$\eta \equiv \frac{1}{\delta} \qquad r \equiv \frac{p}{w} \qquad s \equiv \frac{\phi}{w} \tag{27}$$

Eqs. (26) and (22) can be finally written as,

$$g(\chi^*) = \chi^* \left[\frac{r}{\alpha} \left(\frac{\beta - \chi^*}{\chi^*} \right)^{\eta} - s \right] \tag{28}$$

$$g'(\chi^*) = r - s \tag{29}$$

From these two equations it is clear that the single equation defining the capacity factor [i.e., Eq. (20)] is not sufficient to uniquely define a classical production function which is not a function of prices or operating costs. If $g(\chi^*)$ were a function of r-s [i.e., $g(\chi^*) = g(r-s, \chi^*, \text{parameters})$], then Eqs. (28) and (29) would be sufficient, since $g'(\chi^*)$ in Eq. (29) could be substituted into Eq. (28) generating a differential equation in $g(\chi^*)$, χ^*, and the parameters α and η which could be solved for $g(\chi)$. The functional form of Eq. (28), however, is not sufficient for this procedure and another independent equation in r and s is needed to uniquely define a production function. This additional equation together with Eq. (29) could then be used to

solve for r and s in terms of $g'(\chi^*)$, $g(\chi^*)$ and χ^*, which could then be substituted into Eq. (28) to obtain the necessary differential equation to solve for $g(\chi)$.

The LEAP conversion process does have a third equation associated with it to complete the set of equations needed to solve for the three unknowns p, χ^*, and y^* given w. The complete set of equations are as follows,

$$(p-\hat{\phi})C_f = k \tag{30}$$

$$\chi^* \equiv C_f = \frac{\beta}{1+\left(\frac{\alpha\hat{\phi}}{p}\right)^{\delta}} \tag{31}$$

$$y^* = g(\chi^*) = C\chi^* \tag{32}$$

where Eq. (32) is the new defining equation for output y^* in terms of a fixed input-output coefficient C. Thus, LEAP uses a long term zero profit condition, Eq. (30), a capacity factor definition, Eq. (31), and a fixed input-output relationship, Eq. (32), to form a complete set of equations to solve for prices and quantities in conversion processes.

The two key questions which immediately arise are: what is the relationship between the fixed input/output equation and the equation defining the capacity factor/and are both of these consistent with the short run optimality condition given in Eq. (29)? To see these relationships more clearly Eqs. (31), (32) and (29) are rewritten in terms of r and s as follows:

$$g(\chi^*) = \chi^*\left[\frac{r}{\alpha}\left(\frac{\beta-\chi^*}{\chi^*}\right)^{\eta} - s\right] \tag{33}$$

$$g'(\chi^*) = r-s \tag{34}$$

$$g(\chi^*) = C\chi^* \tag{35}$$

It should be immediately evident that Eq. (35) is not a function of r and s and therefore does not satisfy the criteria needed for a third independent equation in r and s to complete the set of equations defining a differential equation for the production function $g(\chi)$. Furthermore since the parameter C is an exogeneous constant, $g(\chi)$ can be inferred directly from Eq. (35) to be a linear inverse production function without the need for any differential equation. This however is totally inconsistent with any short run optimality condition given by Eq. (34).

The inescapable conclusion to be drawn from this analysis is that since LEAP uses Eq. (30) - (32), no short run optimization condition is in use in the LEAP conversion process. Furthermore, since short run optimization is unavailable, no production function within the framework of classic economic theory is consistent with the defining equation for the capacity factor. Both of these observations have never been clearly explained in the documentation of the LEAP code. To the contrary, all material published to date strongly implies that the equations in the conversion process are consistent with classical economical theory. The implications of these inconsistencies are of great practical importance and are explained more fully in the next section.

IV. ECONOMIC IMPLICATIONS OF USE OF LEAP EQUATIONS

The most immediate consequence of the choice of Eqs. (30) - (32) for use in LEAP is the fact that the short run optimality condition [i.e., Eq. (34)] is not consistent with the three conversion process equations. This clearly implies that LEAP can operate plants at sub-optimal production levels in the short run. Also, strict positive profit constraints no longer apply to the short run behavior of LEAP solutions. Since short run optimality conditions lie at the heart of many theoretical proofs of existence and uniqueness in equilibrium economics, the failure of LEAP to meet these conditions can give rise to economic behavior not customarily found in solutions to equilibrium modeling problems.

The implications of the use of the LEAP conversion process Eqs. (31) and (32) are best explored graphically. Figure 3 shows the generic behavior of these two relationships for an arbitrary set of exogeneous parameters. Note that while the $g_2(\chi^*)$ curve (representing the capacity factor equation) changes in magnitude as a function of prices p and w (i.e., r and s), the general shape of the curve remains the same. Since $g_2(\chi^*)$ represents the locus of all solutions to the conversion process equations as $g_1(\chi^*)$ traces out all values of the input-output coefficient C, its shape gives it the property of increasing returns-to-scale up to the peak of the curve and the somewhat unsatisfactory behavior of decreasing to negative returns-to-scale past the peak. Note also the range of profits on the $g_2(\chi^*)$ curve vary from maximum losses at $\chi^*=0$ to maximum profits at $\chi^*=\beta$ with zero profit somewhere in between near the peak of the curve.

ORNL-DWG 82-10252R



Fig. 3. Generic behavior of equilibrium solution of conversion process equations for LEAP production function $g_2(x)$ and input output function $g_1(x)$

From this figure it is clear that for some values of the parameter C, LEAP admits losses in the operation of a plant in its startup year. This in general will be the case when the parameter C is large and the slope of $g_1(x^*)$ is steep. Since Eq. (30) is also used by LEAP, long run profit will still be zero because short run losses will be made up by profits in future years. This behavior is not typically that predicted by simple classical theories, although it is more realistic in some instances. In the case of LEAP, however, this situation arises from poorly conceived economics rather than more realistic marketplace behavior. Plants are operated at a short term loss in LEAP because of sub-optimal behavior rather than the optimal balancing of future profits and short term losses.

While the modeling of sub-optimal short run losses early in plant life is in some sense a tolerable practical feature of the LEAP equations, the reverse situation is equally possible and this latter situation is most unsatisfactory as far as the economic theory of the firm is concerned. In the most widely used models constructed by the LEAP system,[4] this latter effect is clearly seen. High positive profits early in plant life are generated, eventually to be offset by losses in all future years of plant operation.[4,5] Such behavior is clearly economically unsound, since the plant should be shut down immediately upon incurring the first future year loss so as to avoid further losses. It is difficult to imagine an economic theory which would justify running plants at losses for the remainder of their useful lifetime without the possiblity of further profitability. The distortion caused in equilibrium price solutions as a result of such plant operation clearly needs further investigation if LEAP results are to be useful in energy-economy modeling.

V. ECONOMIC CONSISTENCY WITHIN LEAP FRAMEWORK

A. Behavior of Exogenous Parameters

The major conclusions of the last section are that, 1) the LEAP conversion process equations yield sub-optimal solutions in which short term losses are possible, and 2) no classical production function defining the technology of plant operation is implied by the form of the LEAP equations. Looking at Eqs. (30) - (32), however, it is clear that under certain circumstances the LEAP model can be made consistent with classical theory. In particular, the limit as the parameter $\delta \to \infty$ (or $\eta \to 0$) is one in which the capacity factor approaches the discontinuous behavior characteristic of a Leontief or input-output production function of classical economics.[9] In this limiting case, when $p < \hat{\phi}$ the capacity factor is zero, and when $p > \hat{\phi}$ it is equal to its maximum, β. If, in addition the parameter $\alpha = 1$, then both Eqs. (33) and (34) become consistent since $g(\chi^*)$ can be made a function of $r - s$. This fact allows the short run optimality condition [i.e., Eq. (34)] to again become an operative constraint in the LEAP formalism [i.e., Eqs. (30) - (32)], restoring classical optimal behavior to LEAP solutions. This latter fact prevents short term losses from occurring and maintains both short and long run optimality and short term positive profits. In many important economic sectors of large scale modeling problems like Model 22C[4] these conditions are closely approximated and the solutions behave much like those arising from a classical Leontief model of the firm.

B. Alternate Formulation of Capacity Factor

To avoid the difficulties present in the current formulation of the LEAP conversion process equations, an alternate approach can be taken. This alternative preserves the positive behavioral features of the original LEAP capacity factor formulation while at the same time unifying the model with classical economic theory. In this light, an appropriate behavioral relationship defining the capacity factor will be chosen which is consistent with the short run optimality condition of classical equilibrium economics. Once this is accomplished a classical production function can be derived for this particular form of the capacity factor and a completely consistent classical set of equations for optimal short run production can be derived.

To begin, the following functional form, closely akin to the original LEAP formalism, is suggested for the behavior of the capacity factor.

$$C_f \equiv \frac{\beta}{1 + \dfrac{wg(\chi^*)/\chi^*}{\delta\left[p - \hat{\phi} - \dfrac{\alpha wg(\chi^*)}{\chi^*}\right]}} \tag{36}$$

where β, δ, and α have the same definitions as parameters as they had in the original capacity factor equation, except that α is assumed to be a very small positive number (i.e., $\alpha \cong 0$) for reasons explained later. Note here that this capacity factor definition has the same behavioral characteristics as the original one. Namely, for $p >> \hat{\phi}$ the capacity factor approaches its maximum (i.e., $C_f \to \beta$) and when $p \to \hat{\phi}$ (with $\alpha \cong 0$) the plant shuts down (i.e., $C_f \to 0$). Also, when $\delta \to \infty$ the capacity factor approximates a Leontief model as was observed before.

Rewriting Eq. (36) in terms of the variables r and s the differences between the new capacity factor and the old one became more readily apparent.

$$C_f \equiv \frac{\beta}{1 + \dfrac{1}{\delta\left[\dfrac{\chi^*(r-s)}{g(\chi^*)} - (1+\alpha)\right]}} \tag{37}$$

From Eq. (37) it is clear that the major difference between the new and old form is the functional dependence on r and s. Eq. (37) is a simple function of r-s. This simple behavior makes it possible to couple Eq. (37) with the short run optimality condition given in Eq. (34) to derive a unique production function for LEAP which is consistent with classical economic theory.

The two equations of interest here are,

$$g'(\chi^*) = r-s \tag{38}$$

$$C_f = \chi^* \equiv \frac{\beta}{1 + \dfrac{1}{\delta\left[\dfrac{\chi^*(r-s)}{g(\chi^*)} - (1+\alpha)\right]}} \tag{39}$$

which when coupled together yield the following differential equation for the underlying inverse production function $g(\chi)$,

$$g'(\chi) = \frac{g(\chi)}{\chi}\left[\eta\,\frac{\chi}{\beta-\chi} + (1+\alpha)\right] \tag{40}$$

Note here that, as before $\eta \equiv \frac{1}{\delta}$.

Solving this equation for $g(\chi)$ with the initial condition $g(0) = 0$ gives the following inverse production function,

$$g(\chi) = \frac{\chi^{1+\alpha}}{(\beta-\chi)^{\eta}} \tag{41}$$

The behavior of this function is such that it takes on all values from $0 \leq g(\chi) < \infty$ when χ varies between 0 and β. It is also easily shown that the slope of this function varies between $0 \leq g'(\chi) < \infty$ when χ varies between 0 and β for $\alpha > 0$. The production function, defining output χ^* as a function of input, y^* therefore has decreasing returns-to-scale over the whole range of equilibrium output values $0 < \chi^* < \beta$. This latter property allows both short-and long-term profit optimization conditions to be satisfied at all operating price levels, thereby assuring the consistency of the new model with positive optimal profit conditions and classical economic theory.

Using the results given in Eq. (41), the final alternative LEAP conversion process equations are the following,

$$(p-\hat{\phi})C_f = k \qquad \text{long-run zero profit} \tag{42}$$

$$C_f = \frac{\beta}{1 + \dfrac{1}{\delta\left[\dfrac{\chi^*(r-s)}{g^*(\chi)} - (1+\alpha)\right]}} \qquad \text{capacity factor} \tag{43}$$

$$g(\chi^*) = \frac{(\chi^*)^{1+\alpha}}{(\beta-\chi^*)^{\eta}} \qquad \text{inverse production function at optimum} \tag{44}$$

$$g'(\chi^*) = r-s \qquad \text{short run profit optimum} \tag{45}$$

The major differences between the equations here and those currently used in LEAP are not behavioral in nature but the fact that Eqs. (44) and (45) are consistent with classical economic theory.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

The major finding of this study is that the particular functional form chosen for the capacity factor in LEAP is not consistent with classical economic theory. This fact leads to sub-optimal production levels and the possibility of plant operation at negative profits. The key element missing in the LEAP conversion process is an underlying classical production function for the conversion technology. A valid production function would allow the LEAP equations to satisfy both short and long run optimal profit conditions which would preclude negative profits.

Under certain conditions related to the limiting values of several parameters, however, the LEAP conversion process can be made to approximate a Leontief model of the firm. In this limit all optimality conditions are restored and losses do not occur. Unfortunately the Leontief model is restrictive and reduces the capabilities of LEAP to model more complex behavioral processes.

The easiest way to remedy the problems in the code is to modify slightly the behavioral relationship for the capacity factor. A suggested alternative was presented in this paper by choosing a very similar but functionally different form for the capacity factor and then deriving the underlying production function consistent with classical economic theory. The form suggested is close in behavioral characteristics to the original LEAP capacity factor definition, but it has the property that it satisfies all the optimality conditions in both the short and long run. Its implementation in LEAP, although time consuming, should not be a major chore.

REFERENCES

1. R. Adler, E. Cazalet, S. Haas, R. Marshalla, D. Nesbitt and R. Phillips, The DFI Generalized Equilibrium Modeling System, Decision Focus, Inc., Palo Alto, California (1979).

2. S. Cohen and J. Pearson, The LEAP-EMS Users Manual, Department of Energy (draft, release V2-10/22/79, to be published).

3. E. M. Oblow, Existence and Uniqueness of Solutions from the LEAP Equilibrium Energy-Economy Model, ORNL/TM-8177.

4. R. W. Peelle, C. R. Weisbin and R. G. Alsmiller, Jr., An Evaluation of the Long-Term Energy Analysis Program used for the 1978 EIA Administrator's Report to Congress, ORNL-5741, (September 1981).

5. M. Hutzler, private communication to E. M. Oblow (ORNL) Energy Information Administration, Department of Energy (1981).

6. H. Brock and D. Nesbitt, Large Scale Energy Planning Models: A Methodological Analysis, Stanford Research Institute, Menlo Park, California (1977).

7. R. G. Alsmiller, Jr., J. Barish, D. Bjornstad, D. J. Downing, W. E. Ford, J. Horwedel, C. J. Lee, J. McAdoo, E. M. Oblow, R. W. Peelle, F. G. Perey, L. Stewart and C. R. Weisbin, Interim Report on Model Evaluation Methodology and the Evaluation of LEAP, ORNL/TM-7245, April 1980, see chapter on "Economic Foundation of LEAP".

8. J. Hansen, M. Becker and J. Trimble, The Economic Foundations of LEAP Model 22C, ORNL-5748, (April 1981).

9. M. D. Intriligator, Mathematical Optimization and Economic Theory, Chapter 8, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N.J. (1971).

10. M. C. Intriligator, Mathematical Optimization and Economic Theory, Chapter 4, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N.J. (1971).

11. M. Goldstein, R. G. Alsmiller, Jr. and J. Barish, Specification of the Equations for LEAP Model 22C, ORNL-5707, (March 1981).

INTERNAL DISTRIBUTION

1-3. L. S. Abbott
4. R. G. Alsmiller, Jr.
5. J. Barhen
6. D. E. Bartine
7. D. G. Cacuci
8. G. de Saussure
9. EPIC
10. W. Fulkerson
11. D. A. Gardiner
12. L. Hill
13. E. Hirst
14. J. Horwedel
15. A. S. Loebl
16-20. F. C. Maienschein
21. B. F. Maskewitz
22-26. E. M. Oblow
27. S. C. Parikh
28. R. W. Peelle
29. F. G. Perey
30. M. W. Rosenthal
31. J. Trimble
32-36. C. R. Weisbin
37. T. J. Wilbanks
38. M. L. Williams
39. A. Zucker
40. P. W. Dickson (Consultant)
41. H. J. C. Kouts (Consultant)
42. W. B. Lowenstein (Consultant)
43. R. Wilson (Consultant)
44-45. Central Research Library
46. ORNL Y-12 Technical Library - Document Reference Section
47. Laboratory Records
48. ORNL Patent Office
49. Laboratory Records - RC

EXTERNAL DISTRIBUTION

50. Office of Assistant Manager for Energy Research and Development, DOE-ORO, Oak Ridge, TN 37830

51. R. L. Basmann, Department of Economics, Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas 77843

52. M. Becker, Dept. of Nuclear Engineering, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Tibbets Avenue, Troy, NY 12181

53. D. J. Beecy, Acting Director, Division of Policy & Strategic Planning, Office of Fossil Energy, MS C-125, U.S. Department of Energy, Washington, DC 20545

54. E. Cazalet, Decision Focus, Incorporated, 5 Palo Alto Square, Suite 410, Palo Alto, CA 94303

55. S. Cohen, Energy Information Administration, U.S. Department of Energy, 12th and Pennsylvania, Ave. NW Washington, DC 20461

56. Ned Dearborn, Energy Information Administration, U.S. Department of Energy, 12th and Pennsylvania Ave., NW, Washington, DC 20461

57. Energy Systems Library, Brookhaven National Laboratory, Building 475, Upton, Long Island, NY 11973

58. A. Ford, Los Alamos National Laboratory, P.O. Box 1663, Los Alamos, NM, 87545

59. D. Freedman, Professor of Statistics, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94708

60. O. Gildersleeve, Electric Power Research Institute, 3412 Hillview Ave., Palo Alto, CA 94303

61. Neil Goldman, Energy Laboratory, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139

62. M. Greenberger, Stanford University Graduate School of Business, Room 383, Stanford, CA 94305

63. James Gruhl, Energy Model Analysis Program, Model Validation Group, MIT Energy Laboratory, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138

64. N. Gruhl, 142 Plain Road, Wayland, Massachusetts 01778

65. D. E. Hale, Office of Energy Information Validation, U.S. Department of Energy, 12th and Pennsylvania, NW, Washington, DC 20461

66. John Hansen, Charles River Associates, 200 Clarendon Street, Boston, MASS 02116

67. J. Hausman, Economics Department, E-52, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MASS 02139

68. Mary Hutzler, Energy Information Administration, 12th and Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20461

69. R. H. F. Jackson, Center for Applied Mathematics, U.S. Department of Commerce, National Bureau of Standards, Washington, DC 20234

70. G. M. Lady, Energy Information Administration, U.S. Department of Energy, 12th and Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20461

71. Joel Lambert, National Bureau of Standards, Building 101, Washington, DC 20234

72. C. J. Lee, Department of Economics, Knox College, Galesburg, IL 61401

73. A. Linden, Jr., Energy Information Administration, U.S. Department of Energy, 2000 M Street, Washington, DC 20545

74. T. V. Long, II, University of Chicago, The Committee on Public Policy Studies, 1050 E. 59th Street, Chicago, IL 60637

75. M. D. McKay, Los Alamos National Laboratory, P.O. Box 1663, Los Alamos, NM 87545

76. R. H. Males, Director, Energy Systems, Environment and Conservation Division, Electric Power Research Institute, 3412 Hillview Avenue, P.O. Box 10412, Palo Alto, CA 94303

77. J. S. Maybee, University of Colorado, Mathematics Department, Boulder, CO 90309

78. G. H. Moore, Center for Energy Studies, University of Texas, Austin, TX 78712

79. D. M. Nesbitt, Decision Focus, Inc., Los Altos Office Center, Suite 200, 4984 El Camino Real, Los Altos, CA 94022

80. David Nissen, Chase Manhattan Bank, 1 Chase Manhattan Plaza, New York, NY 10015

81. John Pearson, Energy Information Administration, U.S. Department of Energy, 12th and Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20461

82. R. Phillips, Decision Focus, Inc., Los Altos Office Center, Suite 200, 4984, El Camino Real, Los Altos, CA 94022

83. B. Poole, Energy Information Administration, U.S. Department of Energy, 12th and Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20461

84. J. Rambo, Lawrence Livermore Laboratory, University of California, Livermore, CA 94550

85. Richard Richels, Electric Power Research Institute, 3412 Hillview Avenue, P.O. Box 10412, Palo Alto, CA 94303

86. Fred S. Roberts, Rutgers University, Department of Mathematics, New Brunswick, NJ 08903

87. L. Rubin, Electric Power Research Institute, 3412 Hillview Avenue, P.O. Box 10412, Palo Alto, CA 94303

88. Roy Shanker, Resource Planning Associates, 1901 "L" Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036

89. John B. Shewmaker, Energy Information Administration, U.S. Department of Energy, 12th and Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20461

90. C. Smith, Energy Information Validation, U.S. Department of Energy, 12th and Pennsylvania Avenues, NW, Washington, DC 20461

91. James Sweeney, Energy Modeling Forum, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305

92. Takashi Takayama, Energy Information Administration, U.S. Department of Energy, 12th and Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20461

93. J. Weatherly, Institute of Gas Technology, 3424 S. State Street, Chicaco, IL 60601

94. A. M. Weinberg, Institute for Energy Analysis, Oak Ridge Associated Universities, Oak Ridge, TN 37830

95. P. Werbos, Office of Energy Information Validation, U.S. Department of Energy, 12th and Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20461

96. D. O. Wood, Energy Laboratory, #-38, 418, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02139

97-123. Technical Information Center (TIC)

74. T. V. Long, II, University of Chicago, The Committee on Public Policy Studies, 1050 E. 59th Street, Chicago, IL 60637

75. M. D. McKay, Los Alamos National Laboratory, P.O. Box 1663, Los Alamos, NM 87545

76. R. H. Males, Director, Energy Systems, Environment and Conservation Division, Electric Power Research Institute, 3412 Hillview Avenue, P.O. Box 10412, Palo Alto, CA 94303

77. J. S. Maybee, University of Colorado, Mathematics Department, Boulder, CO 90309

78. G. H. Moore, Center for Energy Studies, University of Texas, Austin, TX 78712

79. D. M. Nesbitt, Decision Focus, Inc., Los Altos Office Center, Suite 200, 4984 El Camino Real, Los Altos, CA 94022

80. David Nissen, Chase Manhattan Bank, 1 Chase Manhattan Plaza, New York, NY 10015

81. John Pearson, Energy Information Administration, U.S. Department of Energy, 12th and Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20461

82. R. Phillips, Decision Focus, Inc., Los Altos Office Center, Suite 200, 4984, El Camino Real, Los Altos, CA 94022

83. B. Poole, Energy Information Administration, U.S. Department of Energy, 12th and Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20461

84. J. Rambo, Lawrence Livermore Laboratory, University of California, Livermore, CA 94550

85. Richard Richels, Electric Power Research Institute, 3412 Hillview Avenue, P.O. Box 10412, Palo Alto, CA 94303

86. Fred S. Roberts, Rutgers University, Department of Mathematics, New Brunswick, NJ 08903

87. L. Rubin, Electric Power Research Institute, 3412 Hillview Avenue, P.O. Box 10412, Palo Alto, CA 94303

88. Roy Shanker, Resource Planning Associates, 1901 "L" Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036

89. John B. Shewmaker, Energy Information Administration, U.S. Department of Energy, 12th and Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20461

90. C. Smith, Energy Information Validation, U.S. Department of Energy, 12th and Pennsylvania Avenues, NW, Washington, DC 20461

91. James Sweeney, Energy Modeling Forum, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305

92. Takashi Takayama, Energy Information Administration, U.S. Department of Energy, 12th and Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20461

93. J. Weatherly, Institute of Gas Technology, 3424 S. State Street, Chicaco, IL 60601

94. A. M. Weinberg, Institute for Energy Analysis, Oak Ridge Associated Universities, Oak Ridge, TN 37830

95. P. Werbos, Office of Energy Information Validation, U.S. Department of Energy, 12th and Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20461

96. D. O. Wood, Energy Laboratory, #-38, 418, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02139

97-123. Technical Information Center (TIC)