



A Game-Theoretic Approach to Optimizing Behaviors in Acquisition

William E. Novak

Software Engineering Institute
Carnegie Mellon University
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Copyright 2017 Carnegie Mellon University. All Rights Reserved.

This material is based upon work funded and supported by the Department of Defense under Contract No. FA8702-15-D-0002 with Carnegie Mellon University for the operation of the Software Engineering Institute, a federally funded research and development center.

The view, opinions, and/or findings contained in this material are those of the author(s) and should not be construed as an official Government position, policy, or decision, unless designated by other documentation.

NO WARRANTY. THIS CARNEGIE MELLON UNIVERSITY AND SOFTWARE ENGINEERING INSTITUTE MATERIAL IS FURNISHED ON AN "AS-IS" BASIS. CARNEGIE MELLON UNIVERSITY MAKES NO WARRANTIES OF ANY KIND, EITHER EXPRESSED OR IMPLIED, AS TO ANY MATTER INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, WARRANTY OF FITNESS FOR PURPOSE OR MERCHANTABILITY, EXCLUSIVITY, OR RESULTS OBTAINED FROM USE OF THE MATERIAL. CARNEGIE MELLON UNIVERSITY DOES NOT MAKE ANY WARRANTY OF ANY KIND WITH RESPECT TO FREEDOM FROM PATENT, TRADEMARK, OR COPYRIGHT INFRINGEMENT.

[DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A] This material has been approved for public release and unlimited distribution. Please see Copyright notice for non-US Government use and distribution.

This material may be reproduced in its entirety, without modification, and freely distributed in written or electronic form without requesting formal permission. Permission is required for any other use. Requests for permission should be directed to the Software Engineering Institute at permission@sei.cmu.edu.

Carnegie Mellon® is registered in the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office by Carnegie Mellon University.

DM17-0726

Project Overview

Problem

“Government As The Integrator” (GATI) is now preferred approach

Incentives among contractors may not align with program objectives

Poor contractor cooperation causes delays, overruns, poor performance

Government is still learning how to “play” the “game” of GATI acquisition

~~Research builds on prior work in:~~

1. *Joint Program dynamic modelling*
2. *Signalling game cybersecurity modelling*
3. *Acquisition Archetypes*

Solution

Align contractor incentives using customized incentive mechanisms

Combine different incentive mechanisms to be more effective

Contractors acting in their interests also serves program interests

Approach

Describe & analyze GATI contractor incentives using game theory

Use agent-based modelling to quantify the game outcomes


Simulate incentive mechanisms in context of a full acquisition program

Select the most promising combinations of mechanisms

2017 Work: *Interview acquisition program staff to gather empirical data*

Future Work: *Pilot most promising mechanisms and measure results*


Research Approach



1

A GATI program has a CPAF contract with the ability to change the award fee structure every six months.


Research Approach



2

There are two contractors, each developing a subsystem, who must work cooperatively to produce the full system. A "Giver/Receiver" list describes the schedule for the areas where the contractors must interface their subsystems.

Research Approach




3

The PMO wants to successfully achieve the program's cost, schedule, & performance goals, and to do so can

- measure the contractor's actions and performance,
- perform some integration actions themselves, and
- implement coordination actions to encourage contractor cooperation.

Research Approach



4

The contractors want to maximize their own goals, and in doing so they both

- perform various development activities, and
- send (possibly deceptive) performance "signals" to the PMO about what they're doing.


Research Approach



5

While the contractors may want the program to succeed, they also have individual incentives to not cooperate with each other, such as concerns about disclosing proprietary information to a competitor, providing costly technical support, or agreeing on an interface that might simplify the other contractor's work, while making their own more difficult.

Research Approach



Contractor 2



Contractor 1




6

If a contractor doesn't cooperate, they may

- a) delay work and desynchronize the schedule,
- b) refuse to provide the data they should provide to the other contractor, or
- c) choose an interface that undermines the other—but they will manipulate the PMO's measurements to avoid detection, and conceal their motives to avoid penalties for being uncooperative.

Research Approach



	Assist	Reject
Assist	← (S)	← (S)
Reject	← (S)	→ (S)


The table is a 2x2 coordination game matrix. The columns are labeled 'Assist' and 'Reject'. The rows are labeled 'Assist' and 'Reject'. In the top-left cell (Assist/Assist), there is a blue arrow pointing left and a green arrow pointing up, with a dollar sign (\$) in the center. In the top-right cell (Assist/Reject), there is a blue arrow pointing left and a green arrow pointing down, with a dollar sign (\$) in the center. In the bottom-left cell (Reject/Assist), there is a blue arrow pointing left and a green arrow pointing down, with a dollar sign (\$) in the center. In the bottom-right cell (Reject/Reject), there is a blue arrow pointing right and a green arrow pointing down, with a dollar sign (\$) in the center.

Coordination Game

7

Assuming that contractors not cooperating on interfaces will hurt the program, combining the benefits and impacts ("utilities") to both the contractors and the overall program can produce the following payoffs—which form what's called a "coordination" game, where participants tend to end up in one of two solutions (i.e., "Nash equilibria")—but neither one is good for the program.

Research Approach




	Assist	Reject
Assist	(1, 3)	(3, 7)
Reject	(1, 3)	(7, 7)









Prisoner's Dilemma

8

If the contractors' incentives are slightly different due to the program's context (e.g., the level of distrust between them, or the criticality of the IP), the utilities can form another game called the "Prisoner's Dilemma," where participants end up in only one Nash equilibrium where neither cooperates—which is the worst outcome for the program.

Research Approach




	Assist	Reject
Assist	  $(3, 7)$	  $(3, 7)$
Reject	  $(1, 3)$	  $(1, 7)$

Incentive Solution

9

To prevent these undesirable outcomes, the PMO can incentivize the contractors to cooperate, using award fee incentives that change the game to one in which the only Nash equilibrium serves the interests of the program.

Research Approach




	Assist	Reject
Assist	 $(3, 7)$	 $(3, 7)$
Reject	 $(1, 3)$	 $(1, 7)$

Incentive Solution

10

Some specific solution "mechanisms" for contractor cooperation issues include "Shared Destiny" (all players win or lose based on the outcome), "Assigned Fault" (some win and some lose based on a fault determination), or a "Risk Pool" (a reserve fund used to mitigate issues that arise).

Research Approach




	Assist	Reject
Assist	↑ (3, 7)	↑ (3, 7)
Reject	↑ (1, 3)	↑ (1, 7)

Incentive Solution

11

The effectiveness of the solution approaches can be tested by simulating a model of each mechanism in the context of the program with its specific incentive values, playing out all combinations of moves and counter-moves into the projected future and evaluating the outcome. The most promising mechanisms can be piloted with the collaborating program.

Research Approach **Future Work**



12

The outcomes of the piloted efforts can be measured in terms of: 1) compliance with program's "Giver/Receiver" list schedule, 2) EVM performance and schedule variance, 3) defect counts from testing of that interface, and 4) the number of waivers/deviation requests submitted for interface issues.

Incentive Mechanisms in Combination

Distinct types of incentives affect contractors differently—and the combined impact can be more effective in influencing a range of contractors sufficiently to change their behavior.



Business: Future Business Incentives (*appeal to High-Level Management*)

- **Example: Reputation Tracking:** Reputational impacts affect future business opportunities in the absence of award or incentive fee.



Money: Direct Financial Incentives (*appeal to Project Management*)

- **Example: Truth-Revealing Incentive Mechanism (TRIM):** A sliding CPIF fee based on schedule (e.g., sooner completion, larger fee incentivizes early delivery).
- **Example: Shared Destiny:** All teams only receive as much award fee as the worst team gets, so all are incentivized to help the poorest performing team.



Social: Team Networking Incentives (*appeal to Project Teams*)

- **Example: Co-Location:** Teams with greatest potential for poor cooperation are co-located (and kept badge-less) to foster communication and trust.



Takeaway

Combine multiple incentives to align the contractor organization with the PMO, maximizing improvement

Truth-Revealing Incentive Mechanism (TRIM)

Example: PMO wants to keep contractors working on the program, and not diverting resources toward other profitable activities

The TRIM¹ mechanism has a sliding incentive fee for CPIF² contracts based on completion date (e.g., sooner completion, larger fee, with rapidly diminishing (non-linear) returns—incentivizing early delivery.



Using a hybrid agent-based/system dynamics model of TRIM, ran 200 simulations of contractor actions with randomized values from input distributions to determine the distribution of key performance measures.


Result: For a simulated 56-month/4.5-year program:

- *With TRIM:* only 6 of 200 runs fall below on-schedule (97% on schedule)
- *Without TRIM:* no runs are on schedule, and half the runs go more than a year over

¹Truth-Revealing Incentive Mechanism [Coughlan 2010]

²Cost-Plus Incentive Fee

Model of Systems Integration Cooperation and Effectiveness Across Multiple Program Segments




Context:

1. PMO Systems Engineering is resource constrained for doing integration.
2. Segment integration goals aren't consistent with program goals—view it locally, not globally.
3. Segments see PMO Systems Engineering as ineffective—although it isn't.





Visualizing the Effects of Cooperation Incentives on Performance -2

Composite Program Performance





Result of combining the “Shared Destiny” and TRIM incentive mechanisms

Acquisition Program Support Engagement Model



Is poor GATI contractor cooperation hindering the program? And if so, how can I improve it?





Continuing Work

- Conduct interviews of acquisition program stakeholders, and collect feedback on game theory-based model and candidate incentive mechanisms

Future Research

- Pilot incentive mechanisms on program to validate effect on contractor cooperation

Vision

- Develop a virtual acquisition modelling laboratory serving DoD acquisition programs to help program managers make evidence-based decisions based on projected performance

Contact Information

Presenter

William E. Novak

Senior Member of Technical Staff

Email: wen@sei.cmu.edu

Telephone: +1 412.268.5519

Contributors

Dr. William A. Casey

Julie B. Cohen

Andrew P. Moore

Dr. Bhubaneswar “Bud” Mishra

NYU Courant Institute