

Corporate Decision Analysis: An Engineering Approach

Victor Tang **Product Lifecycle Team** April 2006







Observations from corporate experience about senior-executive decisions under uncertainty.

Data quality Range of alternatives considered Importance of decision variables Uncontrollable variables Impact of uncontrollable variables Predictive power

largely untested narrow largely unaddressed largely unaddressed largely unaddressed low



Decision outcome = f(what's controllable & uncontrollable)





In situ experiment #3 High-tech manufacturing company (US)

- \$700 M/year global high-tech manufacturer failing to generate profit.
- Company de-listed from stock exchange.
- Board of directors appoints new president.

Wants an assessment of his turnaround strategy, survey of alternatives and their prospects to generate profit.





Frame the problem



problem	Survival						
outcomes	Profitability in 6 Months						
controllable variables	 Sales, general & admin expenses, SG&A Cost of goods sold, COGS Capacity utilization Customer portfolio structure Sales Financing 						
uncontrollable variables	 Customer base changes Senior management interaction Banker actions Loss of critical skill 						



Boundaries of the solution and uncertainty space → 729 alternatives and 54 uncontrollable environments

Controllable	level 1	level 2	level 3
1. SG&A	+10 %	\$ 54 M	-10 %
2. COGS	+2 %	\$ 651 M	-2 %
3. plant capacity	40 %	60 %	80 %
4. customer	current mix	dev<10%, a/t<6%,	dev<20%, a/t<12%,
portfolio mix		mfg.<4%	mfg.<8%
5. sales	-5 %	\$ 690M	+5 %
6. financing	\$10M short	Mexico action,	China action,
		+ \$12 M annualized	+ \$25 M annualized
BAU			
Uncontrollable	worse	current	best
1. cust. base change	net loss >5% GM	no change	net gain >5%GM
2. senior executives'	= current	weak management	strong management
interactions		unity	unity
3. banker actions	US banks drop	no change	US banks relax terms
4. critical skills	lose 3 skills	no change	gain 1 or 2 skills



		C	ontro fac	ollab tors	le		ui f	ncontrollab actor levels	le S
							level 2	level 1	level 3
	0	0	S	g		fin	level 2	level 2	level 3
	G8	Ö	Ipa	ortfo	ale	anc	level 2	level 1	level 3
	≻	ů,	lity	liö	ů.	ing	level 2	level 1	level 3
							current	worst	best
BAU	2	2	2	1	2	1			
2110	1	1	1	1	1	1			
	1	2	2	2	2	2			
	1	3	3	3	3	3			
	2	1	1	2	2	3			
	2	2	2	3	3	1			
	2	3	3	1	1	2			
	3	1	2	1	3	2			
	3	2	3	2	1	3			
	3	3	1	3	2	1			
	1	1	3	3	2	2			
	1	2	1	1	3	3			
	1	3	2	2	1	1			
	2	1	2	3	1	3			
	2	2	3	1	2	1			
	2	3	1	2	3	2			
	3	1	3	2	3	1			
	3	2	1	3	1	2			
	3	3	2	1	2	3			
	3	1	3	1	1	3			
	1	3	1	3	3	3			
	1	3	3	1	1	3			
2	3	2	3	3	1	1			

Collect and analyze the data.





Debiasing → **dispersions decline and confidence rises**



Unconstrained exploration of what if's

Contribution of each variable to the outcome

COGS	Cportfolio	SG&A	sales	financing	capacity
72 %	9 %	7 %	7 %	3 %	2 %

What if 2			profit \$ M					
			current	worst	best			
BAU		business as usual	-5.54	-9.40	-2.89			
BAU	+	COGS ⁺	-2.04	-5.90	+0.43			
BAU	+	cust. portfolio ⁺	-3.99	-7.73	-1.15			
BAU	+	$SG\&A^+$	-4.35	-8.28	-1.68			
BAU	+	sales ⁺	-4.43	-8.27	-1.90			
BAU	+	financing ⁺	-4.90	-8.17	-2.41			
BAU	+	plant capacity ⁺	-5.16	-8.43	-2.72			
BAU	+	COGS ⁺ + portfolio ⁺	-0.40	-4.24	+2.18			



Manufacturing company results: Plan versus actual



controllable		Plan		nce		
factors	level	values (level)	level	values (level)	vs. plan	
SG&A	3	\$54 M-10%	3	same	=	
COGS	2.5	\$651 M – 1%	2.5	same	=	
plant utilization	2	60 %	2.5	70 %	\uparrow	
portfolio actions	2	no change	2.5	improved mix	\uparrow	
sales	1.5	\$690 M -2.5%	1	\$690 M - 5%	\checkmark	
financing	1.5	shortfall ~\$5 M	1	shortfall ~\$10 M ↓		
results			reported to SEC \$ 1M			
	der	ived \$ -1.13M	derived \$ 0.41 M			

loss of \$16 M same quarter last year

loss of \$13 M previous quarter



Services company results: Plan versus actual





controllable	F	Post-BAU plan	ag	reed result	delivered		
factors	level	values (level)	level	values (level)	level	values (level)	
Project leadership	3	change project leader & program mgr.	3	=	3	=	
Project approach	2	3 waves. Focus US & Japan	2	2 =		=	
Cost contingency	2	use some contingency	2	2 =		=	
Project delivery	3	meet delivery date	3	3 =		slip 2-3 months	
		environment		environment		environment	
dariyad	3.6	worst		-	2.7	worst	
aerivea	3.8	current		-		current	
	4.1	best	4.1	<mark>.1</mark> best _		best	



Executives were enthusiastic about the method

"Let's take this to our board of directors."

- "Approach will make better decisions."
- "... excellent, rational ...Understand risk with factors cannot control."
- "Value of this process is in the process not the conclusions."
- "This process visualizes the decision ... instead of intuition."



Measurement system analysis





Forecasts vs. derived estimates give an indication of an operator's *repeatability* across forecasts.



Individual forecasts of 5 (test) treatments gives us an indication of *reproducibility* **across "operators"**





Can identify source of low quality data





New approach to ... senior-executive decisions under uncertainty.

Data quality Range of alternatives considered Importance of decision variables Uncontrollable variables Impact of uncontrollable variables Predictive power

can be improved entire solution space can be determined can be determined can be determined higher



NEW WAY TO ...

Analyze corporate decision-making

Controllable variables Uncontrollable variables

Explore the entire solution space

Systematically and economically

Explore outcomes over entire space of uncertainty

Unconstraint range of *what-if* scenarios



Experiment power



- Power is the ability to detect a difference when one exists.
- Power is the probability that you will reject a premise when it should be rejected.

