The Economic Impact
of Automation Technology

Aydan Kutay

CMU-RI-TR-89-13^

The Robotics Institute
Carnegie Mellon University
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213

July 1989

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES

ABSTRACT

There Is a growing consensus among academicians, business leaders and government officials that the American competitive problem rests centrally on the slowing rate of Investment to Integrate new automation technology Into manufacturing operations. Although the source of major Innovations In automation technology Is from United States universities and research centers, American firms have been too slow In adopting these technologies. One of the major factors underlying this problem is the lack of an economic analysis technique specifically aimed at estimating the benefits of automation technology. This paper offers an economic analysis technique based upon the premise of Increased probability of capturing the market segments through economies of scope. The paper first demonstrates the Inadequacy of current economic analysis techniques to assess the benefits of automation technology, then proposes a new methodology which can be Integrated to an expert system to assess the economic Impact of various types of automation technology.

1. INTRODUCTION

It Is a well-documented fact that the American economy has been losing Its competitive *edge* relative to its major trade partners, Japan in particular. Between 1970 and 1987, for example, real production of manufactured products has more than doubled In Japan but has Increased only by 50 percent In the United States (Kutay, 1989).

There Is abundant evidence that productivity grows more rapidly In countries where Investment In new plant and equipment is highest, in fact, there Is a growing consensus among academicians, business leaders end government officials that the American competitive problem rests centrally on the slowing rate of Investment to integrate new automation technology Into manufacturing operations (Kutay, 1989; Hayes et.al., 1988; Cohen and Zysman, 1987). Although the source of major Innovations in automation technology Is U.S. universities and research centers, the American firms have been too slow in adopting these technologies.

One of the major factors underlying this problem is the lack of an economic analysis technique specifically aimed at estimating the benefits of automation technology. This paper attempts to fill this gap by offering an economic analysis technique based upon the premise of increased probability of capturing the market segments through economies of scape.

In the subsequent sections of the paper, It Is first demonstrated that the conventional economic theory upon which the current economic Impact methods are based can not assess the economic benefits of automation technology. In the mass production system, capital investments in new technology could usually be Justified by their potential to replace human labor by machines to Improve productivity. In the new system of flexible production, however, the economic foundations of the beneftts derived from automation technology are fundamentally different from the benefits obtained from capital Investments on new technology In the mass production system. Ihe use of conventional methods of economic performance, such as productivity improvements, would merely be a mlsmeasurement of the potential beneftts that could be obtained from automation technology.

In section two, a new conceptual framework *h* developed to evaluate the economic Impact of automation technology. The new conceptual framework suggests that the economic foundation of the beneftts of automation technology Is the economies of scope based upon the premise of shorter lead times. Increased flexfctty In production, c^d Improved product qudtty.

In section three, t *k* demonstrated that the economic impact of automation technology, considered 'Intangible* and therefore left unquanttfted *k* conventional economics, can be evaluated through potential gains In Inventory costs, sales revenue, and lower operating and labor eotts due to Improvements In lead times, flextbitty In production, and product qualty. ft is suggested that the entire analysis can be integrated Into a stcmdatl[1] economic Justflcdffon techriqtje such as Discounted Cash Row analysis, to mcrtce It understandable to company managers, accountants, and economists. An

expert system can then be developed to aid the users of automation technology to Identify the benefits they may obtain from Its Implementation.

Once the model of economic Impact analysis of automation technology developed In this paper is tested, *the* ultimate goal is to develop an expert system to achieve the following:

1. Prior to *thm* integration of a new technology, the expert system will enable a company to identify the areas In the manufacturing process In which the use of automation technology would be economically viable,

2. If the company is Interested In developing a new technology, the expert system will guide company managers to make a better allocation of the research and development funds Into areas which give the best return on investment.

3. The expert system will enable companies to make a better specification of the general range of conditions where new technologies can generate acceptable returns to justify their investment.

The arguments supporting the line of reasoning set forth in this paper need to be empirically verified by further research. This effort, nevertheless, is meant to provide a new 'methodology upon which future economic Impact studies of new automation technology may be based.

2. THE NEED FOR A NEW CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK TO ANALYZE THE ECONOMIC IMPACT OF AUTOMATION TECHNOLOGY

In recent years, a growing body of literature has developed on the fundamental changes in the production process facilitated by the new automation technology. The research In this area, however, tends to emphasize either direct labor displacement effects without considering the changes in the nature of work (for example Ayres and Miller, 1963), or tends to be advocacy type of efforts which assert the existence of certain benefits from automation technology without explaining the precise source of these benefits (Hayes et.al, 1988; Cohen and Zysman, 1987; Jelinek and Goldhar, 1984).

The fist economic or societal impact studies of automation technology overwhelmingly emphasized *labor* displacement issues which unfortunately encouraged the formation of a hostile attitude toward automation technology particularly on the *tabor* side. *White W h* true that automation technology replaces human labor circtty hvdved in the production of goods on the factoiy floor, It creates more jobs in processes Involved In the production of goods. Automation technology transforms the *natwm* of work from drectfy contributing to the production of finished goods to contributing to production Indirectly by generating information to reduce uncertainty in decisions related to the production* exchange, ctaJafion, cMrfbution and consumption of goods (Cohen *and* Zysman, 1987), Consequently, more jobs are created In *sm^W^ up* the production systems. In designing the products. In R&D efforts, and In finance, marketing, *and* dbfitxilton stages of production. 'Direct human tabor In

production has nevertheless been reduced for repetitive and hazardous tasks where displacement Is more advantageous for labor In the long term.

One of the key arguments of this paper is that the lack of an economic analysis technique specifically aimed at assessing the benefits of automation technology Is the major cause of the confusion observed In the prior studies of automation. In the next section we direct the attention to the Inadequacy of conventional economic theory to assess the benefits of automation technology.

2.1. The Inadequacy of conventional economic theory to assess the benefits of automation technology

The foundations of traditional economic theory were developed during the time of the Industrial revolution when mass production and mass consumption prevailed In the world economy. In the system of mass production, the major production strategy to expand profits was to Increase the *size* of the *total* target market. The major dilemma a firm faced to meet competition was therefore to lower unit costs to expand the size of the market for Its product(s). The unit costs were lowered through economies of scale O.e., producing an increasing quantity of the same product) and by lowering labor and raw material costs through capital Investments. The economic pert oimance of a firm, dn industry, or the larger macro economy was therefore evaluated by •productivity* which measured the Increase In output relative to a unit Increase in capital, labor and raw materials.

The first recognized methods to Increase productivity were:

0 To Increase the division of labor, and

ID To delegate repetitive tasks to machinery.

These methods became economical at higher outputs sourctng in scale economies, Adam Smith's famous division of labor and Its heightened productivity from performing a single repetitive task could only be achieved by Increasing the division of labor and speckjWng Jobs into repetitive tasks which could then be replaced by machines. Capital investments in new technology could therefore be JusWled by their potential to replace human labor with machines to increase productivity,

Rnaiy, productivity improvements through the Increased use of machinery was only possfoi© through further starKtorctzatlan of products which led to a substantial ctocJne in unit production costs. Given the emphasis of lowering the unit costs of standardized products to expand *thm* total target market size, productivity was perfectly relevant to measure economic performance Sn the system of mass production.

Once the wortd markets began to saturate during the 1960s >€md the 1970s, ft became Increasingly dear that mass production of standardized products was no longer profitable since the size of the total target maricat could not be expanded. At the some lime, with en increase In IntamaHonal competffoix the number of mmufacktfecs attacking a market muttpied, muffing In a large number of cWferenftated product versions cm the martcet. The emphasis to gain the markets sbfted fiom ecQdQcnte&

of scale to economies of scope. That is, manufacturers produced a variety of products to satisfy a far greater range of market needs by increasing the capacity to manufacture goods cheapiy In small batches. Even If the size of the total target market could not be Increased (or even If the size of the pie coUd not be expanded), economies of scope ascertained that the *probability* of actually capturing the targeted total market could be Increased through product differentiation. New trends toward WwKitbriaizatfon of the world economy aiso Increased competition which. In turn propelled the need to shorten *mm* period of time necessary to introduce a variety of products to the market In small batches. As one can see, these trends In flexible production were In contrast to the way firms competed In *itw* system of mass production by producing large quantities of similar products. The new automation techfKtogy consequently became crucial in production since It Improved product lead-time, product cpcity, and the capability to increase product diversity.

Once the rules of *ihm* economic system started to change, one expected to a see a change In the performance measures of the economic system. While the measure of economic performance throtigh tabor, raw material and muftifactar productivity were perfectly relevant In the system of *mass* production, these techniques were Inadequate to measure economic performance In *flexible* production.

Th# Scey point is that the economic foundations of the benefits derived from new automation technology art fundamental/ dfferenf from the benefits obtained from capital Investments In the mass production system. *The* use of conventional methods of economic performance, such as productivity, would merely ml$mea«jre The potential benefits that could be obtained from automation technology. The main benefits of automation technology, such as reduced lead times, faster response to market shifts, ortd Increased flexibility *M* product differentiation, do not enter Into the calculus of the oarwMlfanal *mmmmm* of economic performance, it is no wonder that productivity studies of information techiwlogy conclude that user firms have not experienced productivity gains from automation technology and that the investment in other technologies would be more beneficial (Loveman, 1988). *mm* wtich n w i the early UMCS erf automation technology 'do experience Increases in employment. The *Gmmmltmci mmmmm* of economic perfaroance which regard reduction In labor costs due to capital frwwinmAi as a *pomm* change, only m«eod us. The lecent productivity measures developed by the •irtou of Labor SalWtes (peon and Kurae, 1988). on the ofher hand, consider technological change *m mmtoclm pmOmmmf* as the unexplained residual In output growth wtthout providing any measure of how much of fhe Increase to *tmMMockx* prodocfMfy could be attributed to automation technology.

I*t us mvtmr *Wm* baric ooteulaHoM of productivity to support this argument. The most common *mmmm* of pi«xli«IMty cdbukrte the growth to output due to growth in capital and labor tapufe 1h» n*e or growth in oulpuf *pm* hour of cf pewom employed InafIrmor Industry is recognized as labor ^^^mf\ and tto tote of growth h output pwuntof capital services is recognized as 'capital productivity. in nesnt yearn, the Bureau erf labor StotWfes (BIS) has started to measure multifactor

productivity by calculating the portion of growth rate In output that cannot be accounted for by the growth rate of combined Inputs of labor and capital and Is therefore attributed to technological change. The term named as multtfactor productivity (or what BLS recognizes as the benefit derived from technological change) Is actually the unexplained residual In the calculation. BLS does not even provide a method to attributing changes In the growth rate of output due to specific technologies such as automation. These formulations have been derived from the production function $Q \bullet A f0CO$, where A represents the state of the technology and Q, K, and L denote output, capital and labor respectively. Nowhere In this calculation can the potential benefits of automation technology such as product quality, the length of lead time, product cflfferentiation, and flexibility be evaluated.

The conventional methods of measuring economic performance served us well when the basic dilemma faced In the production process was to reduce the unit costs through economies of scale to expand demand for a standarcflzed product. Inflexible manufacturing based upon the economies of very large scale production of standardized products, however, severely ftmlts the number of product versions. Retooling of a plant or a production fine to meet the customer demand which a competitor is challenging, usually means the sacrifice of another market segment unless new plants are added to the manufacturing capacity with substantial costs. The long lead times from the conception of a new product to production reduce the ablty of the firm to meet competition on a timely basis. Automation of manufacturing operations Is, therefore, absolutely necessary to compete successfully In the system of flexible production.

What Is needed most is the development of new measures of economic performance which can evaluate the economic Impacts of automation technology In the system of flexible production. In the next section, we review the current methods used to assess the economic benefits of automation technology In U.5. firms and suggest that these techniques are Ineffective In evaluating the economic benefits that can be obtained from automation technology.

2.2. The inadequacy of economic impact analysis methods to evaluate the benefits of automation technology

The econorrtc Impact analysis aimed at integrating new technology or equipment Into the manufacturing operations of U,S. firms Is In the fbcrn of a captal Investment procedure which typically allocates current resources In the prospect of future returns. The principles of these techniques were *kM* down in 1934 when labor was the chief variable cost and when mass production propelled U.S. Industry to world dominance. These techniques simply shaped and generated decisions in such a way that a required level of financial attractiveness was achieved by simply focusing on short term financial goats ami responding to the Impied needs of a forecasted future by reducing labor casts.

Over the tot 20 yean, however, direct labor costs have been reduced to about 10 to 12% of the total production costs (JKutcry, 19S9). The *ma§m* attribute of many of the new technologies are, for

example, long term strategic goals such as the product quality, delivery speed and reliability, and the rapidity with which new products can be Introduced to the market. Yet the pool of labor from which the savings would come to justify the Investment on new technology has dwindled. Given the focus on reducing labor costs, strategic factors cannot be quantified within a traditional economic analysis. Therefore, capital investment on fundamentally different technologies Is much more difficult to Justify In economical terms. Retaining the existing manufocturbg equipment consequently performs as a better alternative than Investing In new technology.

The reluctance of many U,S. companies to adopt new technologies, therefore, partly reflects the Inability of traditional economic analysis procedures to evaluate the long term strategic benefits of automation technology. Firms which could achieve substantial benefits from new technologies may fall to use them simply because there Is no acceptable methodology to quantify the return on Investment.

Existing Bterature, when describing the advantages of new automation technology, suggests that a large number of 'Intangible' benefits exist which, by Implication, are unquantlfiable and thus are precluded from any rigorous economic evaluation (Cohen and Zysman, 1987; Meredith, 1986). Recent reports on the progress of automation In American manufacturing (Business Week, 1987, 1988) suggest 1hat top management often accept the automation technology as being a 'Justifiable act of faith on a strategic technology[1] and Implement them without the necessary understanding of the Implications critical to their successful operation. This approach stfll poses serious problems. First, although It is less Ukely that such strategic investments wttl be turned down by standard procedures because they do not meet traditional financial criteria, It tends to be highly dependent on a selection process that separates •strategic" from *nonstrateglc' Investments. Unfortunately, most U.S. companies treat the choice of manufacturing technology as a 'nonstrategJc' issue (Hayes etral., 1988). Most proposals of the investment on new equipment, therefore, end up getting evaluated within the standard budgeting process.

Second, *the* proems of automation through the use of automation technology represents a long term commitment, with Implementation extending over *several years.* The lock of quantifiable objectives prevents progress from being monitored in financial terms which ere understandable to management. Without defined financial objectives, any disruption can be used to abandon the new technology whose economic benefits ere reafeable In the Jang term. Kaplan (1986) suggests that problems *mbm* because *Urn* benefits of new technology ere nor *defined* In financial terms that top management con understand, American *machine* tod suppliers, for *example,* ore not fully committed to the production of new robot systems because they perceive the* If their potential customers cannot clearly Identify defined economic justfflcatiom then they wi not purchase such systems (Ameffccm Machinist *19BBX* These dWlcuties can be overcome *W* a new conceptoci framework which can quantify the Intanglble-ftioteglc' benefits of automation tecfmology 1$ developed end Is integrated in a

standard economic analysis procedure acceptable to company managers, economists, and accountants.

3. THE CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK FOR ECONOMIC IMPACT ANALYSIS

As pointed out In the previous section, the benefits derived from new automation technology are fundamentally different from the benefits obtained from capital Investments In the mass production system. Using the conventional methods of economic performance would only mlsmeasure the potential benefits that could be obtained from new automation technology. The main benefits of automation technology such as reduced lead times, faster response to market shifts, and Increased flexibility In product differentiation as weM as Its significantly enhanced capabilities to produce complex products of higher quality and reliability levels, do not enter the calculations of the conventional measures of economic performance, in this section, a new conceptual framework which can readily Integrate the benefits of automation technology Into the calculations of the Improvements In economic performance, Is developed.

5.1. Economies of scope: The economic foundation of the benefits of automation technology

The economic foundation of the automation technology Is the economies of scope as opposed to economies of scale which necesslates a paradigm shift In the way we measure economic performance. Economies of scope are said to exist If a single plant can produce a variety of products at lower unit cost than a combination of separate plants each producing a single product at the given level of output. More formally, there are Increasing returns to scope to a plant producing X and Y If

COCY) < C(X,O) + C(O,Y)

where X and Y are the given levels of output of each product and C(.) are their respective cost functions.

Automation technology has the potential to make It just as cheap to produce say fifty different versions of a product as It is to produce fifty Identical pieces of a given product The fundaments production problem faced by firms today b to capture different segments of a broadly defined market with cifferent tastes. If, for e&cample, refrigerators constitute a broaciy defined market a given firm may produce a number of dWemrtt models each of which Is aimed at capturing a subsection of that bfoaeBy defined marie** for the firm. This can be made possible by producing a certain model with the attributes which no other Win competing for the same mattet can produce. In this new system of ftexfoie production, firms no longer confront a situation of single uniform demand far a commodty called refrigerator (as It was wider the mass production sysfeuO, but foe* distributed demands for different types of refrigerators; some with tee maters, some with double doors, some powerful, some smcii and so oa Offering a standard model which only comes In white Ss not ikeiy to suffice *In* capturing the entire market for refrigerates In the ffexfofe production system, as the consumer tastes became diversified

and more complex, manufacturers must Identffy the segments of consumer demand within which tastes and purchasing power *are* relatively uniform. They must then offer those segments the products that *closely* match each segment's expectations.

The markets are no longer as predictable as they used to be under the mass production system. They have become more uncertain and complex, fcn order to quantify the benefits derived from automation technology In this new system of production, we have to move away from the traditional concept of •product[1] In conventional economic theory. Products should not be defined *as* physical commodities but should be conceptualized as a bundle of characteristics sought after by consumers. Going back to the refrigerator example, these characteristics may be size, color, Interior room, exterior Image, reliability, and energy consumption. We, therefore, can conceptualize a product as an n-element vector

$$X - (x_1, x_2, x_3, \ldots\ldots x_n)$$
where 'x_i' Is the product characteristics

$k\setminus$ the same n-clmenslonal space, a given consumer can be conceptualized In the form of a characteristics vector:

$$C\ m\ (c_1, c_2\ c_3, \ldots\ldots e_n)$$
where °cf k the characteristics the consumer seeks in a product

If x*c In the case of a given consumer, the probability for this consumer to buy the product should be 1. If x#c, the probability of a sale to that consumer is less than one.

Given the conceptual framework above, we can measure the performance of a firm not by growth rate of output relative to a change In labor and capital (as is the case In measures of productivity), but rather we measure the performance of a firm through the degree of product differentiation. This In turn determines the probability of capturing the segments of the market for which *ihe* firm *h* competing.

We can *express* fhb relationship more formafiy with a stochastic function F(M) designating the probability of capturing a matlcet segment

$$K M) - fQAMM)$$

where 3 « x_i - c_i < 0 *for* every *h characteristic in the ivspace_f *a h* y_i - c_i < 0 for every I Inrthe n~$pace_# where yf is an element of the product characteristic quantity vector y of *tbm* next most

competitive product to the product question. The partial derivatives of F(M) are negative with respect to 3 but positive with respect to 8 and Q and e Is the error term.

This formula suggests that the firm can capture the entire market by reducing 3 to zero or by producing as many customized varieties of the products as there are potential customers through automation technology. The degree of the minimization of 9, or the probability of capturing a market segment is determined by the degree of flexibility In product variation which h in turn dependent upon the use of automation technology. If 2 k the number of models or varieties of a given product that are produced by the firm, the smaller the Z, the larger the *size* of the consumer population the firm is trying to appeal to, the larger the variability of tastes In this particular consumer population, and therefore the smaller the probability of capturing the consumers ton that particular population.

This conceptual framework ascertains that Increasing product differentiation Increases the probablty of capturing the market segments which in turn Improves the economic performance of the firm. This new evaluation technique based on the degree of product differentiation Is a more effective way of measuring economic performance than measuring performance through productivity by emphasizing the ablty to lower the unit cost of a single product. The new conceptual framework ascertains that the probability of capturing the targeted total market Increases with product differentiation and breaks the role of product differentiation out of the bounds of being strictly an attempt to Increase sales. The ability to Increase the number of product versions, on the other hand, Is constrained by the degtee of integration of automation technology to the production process. The less the firm uses automation technology, the fewer the number of product versions It can offer to consumers, therefore the less the probability of capturing the market segments and Its economic peiformance wi be lower.

By shifting the emphasis from economies of scale to economies of scope, the new conceptual framework suggests that the economic benefits of automation technology are:

- to Increase product differentiation
• to shorten product lead times, and
• to Improve product quality.

Within the wisdom of conventional economics, however, the main benefit of new technology Is almost always recognized as the ability to lower units costs to improve productivity. The benefits that can be derived from automation technology are therefore overlooked as 'Intangibles' and ore not incorporated into *an* economic Impact analysis.

4. THE ECONOMIC IMPACT ANALYSIS OF AUTOMATION TECHNOLOGY

We suggest that the economic benefits derived from automation technology considered to be 'Intangibles' and are overlooked In conventional economics, can be quantified and Incorporated Into a standard method of economic evaluation.

The benefits of automation technology Include Increased flexibility, faster response to market shifts. Improved product quality, and reduced lead times. These benefits represent a comparative advantage which may Increase the competitiveness of the firm In the markets. Making the correct link between the benefits of automation technology and the traditional categories of accounting can remedy the problem of quantification

One way of quantifying strategic benefits Is to consider the variations In Inventory which can be highly Influenced by, for example, reduced lead times. Another way of quantifying benefits may be through sales expansion and revenue enhancement. Same of the benefits obtained from reduced lead time, for example, can be Incorporated into an estimate of savings from Inventory reductions. The process flexibility, better product flow, higher quaity, and better scheduling, cut both Work In Process (WIP) and finished goods Inventory levels. The reduction In average Inventory levels provides a large cash Inflow which can be captured In a Discounted Cash Factor (DCF) analysis. Better quality products can be quantified through reductions In the defect rate, waste, scrap, rework. Inspection stations and Inspectors, and reductions In warranty *BxpBnse.* Reductions In 'Accounts Receivable' can also be used to quantify the benefits from better quality products since the Incidence of customers who defer payment untíl quality problems ore resolved can be eliminated by producing better quality products. Since the new technologies also have the potential to increase sales, increased cash flow from the inventory reductions will continue in ail future years by reducing the cost of sales. The major impact, however, wlil be on marketing advantage and on the ability to meet customer demand with shorter lead times and to respond quickfy to *changes* In demand which can be estimated from past marketing and sales data. The generation of extra sales due to strategic benefits, such as reduced lead times, fester response to market shifts, and Increased flexíbilíty will result in an increased contribution to revenues.

The *Impact* of reduced *product* costs on product prices *and* market share can be estimated from past safes and marketing performance of the product. DecJMng cash flaws, market share, and pro# margins may also be possible if the firm decides not to invest In automation technology since *thme* is always fhe ikeihood that some competitors may start tiring the new technology giving them the competitive advantage.,

Savings in *ttm* cost of space, either through square-foot rental value or fhe annua&ed cost of new construction, is another benefit Item which can be computed In terms of *the* opportunity cast of the space.

Identification of benefits within the standard accounting categories of sales, Inventory, operating costs, and labor costs enables their quantification since data on these categories should be normally available In the accounting records of a firm.

The conceptual framework, which we win develop In more detail In the rest of this paper, highly differs from the conventional methods of economic Impact analysis used in the current Justification of new technologies. Current methods only consider possible reductions In costs already Incurred using the existing technologies. Our proposed framework considers revenue enhancements due to strategic benefits such as reduced lead times and Increased flexibility as well as cost reductions.

Using conventional methods. Investment on new technology Is typically evaluated against a status-quo alternative that assumes a continuation of current market share, seling price, and costs. A correct alternative to Investment on new technology should also consider factors such as declining cash flows, market share, and profit margins. Once a new technology becomes commercially applicable, even If one company decides not to Invest In It, the ftkelhood Is that some competitors wi. We Integrate the possible impacts of changing market condtfons and competitor behavior into the economic Impact analysis via a computer program that simulates the probabiisfic occurrences of alternative futures. This program readily interacts with the economic analysis program and provides a magnitude of benefits under different alternatives.

We suggest the framework depicted In Bgure 1. Depending on the type of robot or automation system, certain cost or benefit categories identified In the framework can be omitted or expanded upon.

4.1. Identifying the beneffts and costs associated with automation technology

This stage Includes a detailed Itemtzation of al the broad scaie benefits *and* costs Identified in the first stage within standard accounting categories and their quantification using the existing accounting records of a firm or manufacturing plant. Identification of costs end benefits within the standard accounting categories enables their precise quantification sbce data on those term should normaiy be avaiabJe In the accounting records.

4.1.1. Strategic benefits

A. Reduction In Inventory costs:

Reduction In Inventory costs *U* a beneft Hem which Is usually overfooieed h most economic Impact shxies. The new automation technology, on the-ofrher hand, offers Ihe pos$foJ»y of reducing stock levels In wark-Irvprocess (WIP), finished goods and raw materidl trwentory due to greater predictably of the production process, faster throughout times and due to the reduction of scrap and rework. Calculating the financial savings resulting from a given Inventory reductkm Is *mom* complex than narmaiy assumed. The only benefit Item that has been included h prior studies hat been the direct

Figure 1 - *fh»* conceptual frormworic

cash savings (See for example Kaplan (1986) and Meredith (1985)). Within our conceptual framework, we suggest the Inclusion of the benefits below:

a. *Direct cash savings:* Any savings In inventory costs due to the Introduction of a new technology should be valued on the basis of old technology since the existing levels of stock are produced by existing manufacturing processes. Savings in the raw material stock should be considered not only In raw material Inventory but also In WIP and finished goods Inventory. Reduction in those inventory Items should also be reflected tb the direct labor content of WIP and finished goods, an Hern which b disregarded In prior studies. Since these reductions appear In the balance sheets as an increase In cash rather than an Increase In profits, no oddltonal tax expense shouid be Incurred.

b. *OverhBad savings:* Since the reduction In Inventory levels wi alter the book value due to a reduction In fixed and variable overheads, a decrease in proms wil be Incurred. Sine© the decrease In profits Is purely a reduction on paper, the tax liability wil also fai which should be Included as a berveft In the economic Impact analysis.

The reduction in average inventory levels represents a large cash Inflow at the time the automation technology becomes operational. Automation technology, on the other hand, reduces scrap and rework. Increases the predictability of the production process, end shortens lead times. These Improvements permit a major reduction In average Inventory levels, The fallowing Is a W of benefits that shouid be Included In the economic Impact analysis:

BENEFITS	METHOD OF QUANTIFICATION
Shorter lead time	Reduction in WIP due to shorter lead times
Reduced delays	Reduction in assembly WIP due to the avoldance of unplanned shortages
Shorter lead time	Reduction In raw irtateftots Inventory
Shorter Seed time and Improved ordering poicy	Reduction In intshed good* Inventory
improved quafty	Reduction in unwanted stock due to the *mokimem* of

	duplicate parts
Improved quality	Reduction In obsolete stock
	identified for disposal
Improved quality	Reduction in spares stock
improved quality	Reduction In scrap material
Shorter delivery time	Reduction In finished product stock.
Lower tax Mobility	Overhead savings due to the reduction of Inventory.

B. *Sales* enhancement:

A major advantage of automation technology is the generation of extra sales because of strategic benefits, such as reduced lead times, foster response to market shifts, and increased ftadbWy resulting in an Increased contrfbution to revenues which can be identified through sales enhancement The method of calculating the additional contribution primarily relates to the question, 'What V percent of Increased sales can be expected from a y percent reduction In say lead time?' Although f! is difficult to determine the appropriate value of y to Insert in the above question, ft Is also true that *an* estimate should *sM* be made of the potential Increase in sales. This estimation can be made by using the exisfant Information on *BC^BS* lost due to rejection, iate delivery, or not being able to meet customer needs In product specification. Another way to estimate sales enhancement is to forecast the growth *t* market share due to lower prices because of a reduction in product costs.

Automation technology *reduces* deivery times and increase *itm* reliability of a firm which may Improve the soles record ami prevent *potential* sates torn being *lost.* Sales lost due to delivery f I m rejection of products, lower quaffy can be obtained from the marketing acre. *Marketing* can esc bt used to provide an estimate of the percentage Increase In sates due to reduced deiveiy time. The Increase in safes ecu be easty converted to a reduction in overhead costs.,

Automation technology also enables the *mMm* launch of new products to *fbm* market end therefore Increase sates due to mortcet penetration, Whfo accurate dollar estimates of such a sate Jmpro¥efiwit *h mar*® cMculf to obtain, estimates can be obtained by analyzing the martwftig dote* The foSawfrtg Is a *M* of beoefffs due to sale® ertsam^ment that sbotJd 'be Included In the *mcommk:* Impact analysis.

BENEFITS	METHOD OF QUANTIRCATION
Shorter lead time	increased sales due to capacity increase and shorter set-up time
Shorter delivery time	Sales lost due to delays in ordering policy
Improved quality	Sales lost due to rejections
Improved quality	Sales lost due to Incorrect parts
Increased flexibility In product	Sales lost due to the dissatisfaction of customer needs Potential increase in sales due to more precise products based on customer needs Potential increase in sates due to increased market penetration and more *variable* product mix
Increased market share	Potential increase in sates *due* to lower prices.

4.1.2. Reduction In labor costs

Automation technology reduces labor costs m the design, production and maintenance stages as we! as In the supervision and Inspection of the manufactured components or products. Although labor costs currently constttute 8 to 12% of total production costs, the magnttuo* In **savings** should sti be Included In the economic Impact **analysis.**

Automation technology offers the potential to reduce labor costs In the design, production and maintenance stages *as* well as In supervision and Inspection of the components. Since the technology offers the potential to produce components In precise accuracy, supervision and Inspection costs should be signiglcantly reduced. The benefits due to lower labor costs have been Identified as reduction In:

* direct production labor costs doe to fewer set-ups.

- support tabor costs due to supervision and Inspection.

- labor costs due to overtime payments,

- labor costs due to recruitment and training.

- Inventory control labor costs due to lower WIP and finished goods Inventory.

- labor costs due to todng.

- labor costs in manufacturing design.

- *labor* costs due to maintenance.

- operating costs due to engineering and design

- labor costs due to the reduction of fitting *cmd* assembly requirements.

- labor costs in prototype production.

- labor costs In materials handling,

- labor costs In fbcfurfng.

- production control costs.

4.1.3. Identifying costs associated wtth automation technology

ft is Important that the potential user of a new technology Is aware of aH the casts associated wtth the new technology, so that they can be adequately albwed for. Costs should be extinguished based an whether the casts incurred are 'one-off type or 'ongoing* costs to be able to Identify the timing and magnitude of cash flows. For example, the Initial cost of customizing software *should* be separated from that of the software programmers required to keep the system operational.

Ihe most Immeclafe co«t reduction In the introduction of new technology is the savings In *labor* costs. However, f Ss equciy important to Identify deportments where extra staff may be needed to operate the system. :*Mod* automation technology, far example. Invoices the development of CAD software with the need for computer support staff to 'be conridMKL

Installation end staf up costs should include:

* Computer Hardware

- Computer kvtalGrtton co*ts

- Software costs

- Co§t of witting software in-house

- Bclemai costs far cudomkdng pwchoted software

- Internal costs for customizing purchased software

- Consulting costs

- Company-wide education of personnel who need to understand the system

- Education and training cost of people who will directly operate the system

- Cost of temporary staff to Install and run the system

- Cost of disrupted production during Implementation

- Cost of subcontract work to avoid lost production during Implementation

- Redundancy costs

The Running Costs should Include:

- Hire or lease of hardware and software

- Maintenance contract for hardware and software

- Insurance

- Operating costs

- Consumables.

- Cost of Software updates.

- The management costs of the system.

- Programmer costs,

• Ongoing education and training.

- Staff upgrading costs.

4.2. Unking the economic Impact analysis to Discounted Cash Flow (DCF) analysis

Once costs and benefits are quantified, the Discounted Cash Flow (PCF) analysis Is aimed at measuring the economic returns on Investment of new technology over time.

DCF analysis Is based on the concept of time value of money* approach. The basic Idea underlying this approach Is to translate the returns that can be obtained from a certain Investment over a certain period of time Into an amount equivalent to a value today. Afl cash inflows (benefits) and outflows (costs) associated with an Investment are discounted to a certain value today so that the magnitude of Investment Is not larger than the present value of future savings. The discounting function serves to make cash flows received In the future equivalent to cash flows received at the present.

There are other capital Investment evaluation methods such as the payback, payback reciprocal and accounting rate of return which ere simpler to use than the DCF method but Ignore the time value of cash flows. These methods simply determine the period of time It takes for a project to return me original amount of money Invested In It. This Is particularly disturbing If we consider *m& long* term commitment the implementation of automation technology requires. Since *ttw* potential benefits of

the technology con be realized only In the long term, any short run disruption can be used to abonden the new technology. By providing quantifiable objectives, the DCF method enables progress to be monitored in financial terms understandable to management

A critical factor In DCF analysis Is the timing of cash flows associated with the Investment. Traditional capital Investment evaluations generally assume that the total expenditure on a new technology takes place at a single point in time, with full cash flow savings similarly being achieved Wtth more complex technologies, however, the cost of commissioning and the loss of revenue during a period of run-up may seriously affect Its financial viabiirty. Cautious optimism Is necessary In regard to the start-up period and the timing of expenditure. There may be an extensive period of proving robot fixtures, and control CAD software and hardware. The level of manning also may not reflect the time-scale of production build-up. Prior research on flexible manufacturing systems (Darnell and Dale, 1982; Kutay, 1988a) point out that a period of up to three to five years may be required between the first major expenditure on a system and the commencement of production. This delay may even be followed by additional years before ful benefits are achieved.

Conventional techniques also assume that when a new technological Innovation *h* commissioned, the corresponding outmoded facity Is terminated. Therefore, Incremental cash flows of both cash and savings, occupy the same time scale. This assumption is certainly Invalid In the case of automation technology whose complexity may campflcate Its reafeatfon and increase the time at which It can be considered to be fully commissioned.

This problem wi be resolved by developing a computer program to regulate the timing of cosh flows with due provision being made for lower savings during the start-up period. Figure 2 depicts slmplsflc assumptions Incorporated within a traditional evaluation, whereas Figure 3 represents the more complex way *k* which cosh flows change with time in a more complex automation techm>togy» The computer program wll! determine the *rwi* cash flow by evaluating the Individual cash flows separately based on three DCF methods:

1) IntmmcM Rate of Return 0RR): The SJB* *h* the Interest rate that discounts an Investment's future cash tews to the present so *Ihdt* the present value of the cash tews *exactly* equals the cost of investment The *Ml K* In fact, the Interest rate that 's earned on toe investment. Once the RR *k* fo^c. ft wi be compared with the minimum rate of return which *k* the ftnfs cent of capial

2) Mmf Prment Vakm (NPV): NPV of •valuaHng an ttweitment Involve® discounting aR the projeefs cosh tows to thsf present value using a targe: fate of Interest, which Is the firm*®cos of capital The computation of the NPV wt iw* on the assumption thai of Inflows from the investment *mm* neiovwted of the *Hnri** forget rate of uttum.

3) PmOtab&ty indm <P0; P l w l b t computed to convert the NPV to cc^Tiparoble figures wHtt other Inveftmenls the firm may be considering to undertake. PI *U* the ratio of the present vdue of cash Mows to *Htm* pment value of the cash outflows.

tCUCNUE/
cons

Existing
Costs

Savings

New costs

¥••1-1   Vter 2   Vitr3

Figure 2 - Conventional assumption of co*h How

Figure 3 - Cash flow with automation technology

The DCF analysis also requires the computation of the cost of capital so that the return on Investment on a new technology can be comparable to a target value. Theoretically, the cost of capital can be computed as the weighted average of the rates paid to various Investors. For many firms, however, the cost of capital may be difficult to compute because the cost of borrowing or the cost of equity funds may change wtth changes In the economy, government actions and changes In the risk of vartous types of investments. The DCF approach, on the other hand, usually goes wrong when firms set arbitrarily high target rates or •hurdle rates' for evaluating the returns on Investment.

The computer program will compute the cost of capital based on three methods:

1. The opportunity cost of capital, which Is the return available in the capital markets for investments of the same risk.

2. Cost of Common Stock, which Is the ratio of dividend per share to market per share.

3. Cost of Preferred Stock, which is the ratio of preferred dividend per share to market price of preferred share.

4. Cost of Long-Term Debt.

5. Weighted Average Cost of Capital which Is the weighted averages of Long-Term Debt, Cost of Preferred Stock and Cost of Common Stock based on the proportion of the c^apltafaation of the *debit* of a firm,

A.Z. Integration of the variability of market conditions to economic Impact analysis

Using conventional methods, Investment on new technology is typically evaluated against a status-quo alternative that usually assumes a continuation of current market share, selling price, and costs. Correct alternative to investment on new technology should also consider a situation of declining cash flows, market share, and profit margins. Once a new technology becomes commercially applicable, even If one company decides not to invest in It, the Slkelihood is that some competitors will

In this study, the possible changes in market share, selling price, and costs will be simulated by a computer program based on decision systems analysis. The computer program wili be based on *the* probability occurrences of possible alternatives which results If a firm decides to authorize or kill *the* Investment on a new technology. This program wttl readily Interact with the economic evaluation program as depicted in Figure 4.

gterktt *fcar«

Demand growth

High

Medium

Competitor
Accepts

Low

kczmpz

Competitor
doesn't
accept

Demand growth

high

Medium

Low

Do not
Accept

Demand
growth
high

medium

Competitor
accepts

low

Demand
growth

high

Competitor
doesn't accept

medium

low

flgim 4 - Simulation of market conditions

5. CONCLUDING COMMENTS

One of key arguments of this paper Is that the lack of an economic analysis technique specifically aimed at assessing the benefits of automation technology Is the major cause of the slow rate of Investment on new technologies In the United States. The paper addressed this problem by developing a new conceptual framework based upon the premise of Increased probability of capturing the market segments through economies of scope. The paper also demonstrated that the proposed framework Is conceptually implementabJe In practice and can be Integrated Into a standard method of economic evaluation understandable to company executives, accountants and economists. The arguments supporting the line of reasoning set forth in this paper need to be empirically verified by further research. This effort, nevertheless. Is meant to provide a new methodology upon which future economic Impact stucfies of new automation technology may be based.

4. REFERENCES

Business Week (1987) *"Special Report Product* Quaff/. Ap* 21.

Butliiis Week 0W8) *"Special ReportTbe Productivity Pcwadax/* June *6.*

Cohen, 1 and Zyvnan, J. (19S7) *'Manufacturing* Matters/ Basic Books, New York.

Dean, E end IC Kurae (1988) •Recent changes m th# yowth of U5. multtactor productivity". Monthly ioixif ^v^ir. May.

Hayw, EH. Wheelwright, S.C Ctaric K. (1988) •Dynamic *Manufacturing;* The Free Press, New Yortc.

Kaplan* RA (1989) *Cc^ ccoounHno cfctorti product costs. *Harvard Bwlnmss Review,* January-February,

Kaplan. *ML* (1986) 1AM CW b# JmWI^i by *f(M* akxwT *Harvard Business Review,* March-April.

Kutay, A« (19Sta) The chomping organlzatiem erf production in flexible rnanufacturtng systems'. Paper presented at !M> ^T^rteJi W*n*^ A»csctoffcyi' Meetings, October. Forthcoming, JUA.

Kutay, *K* 0988b) tnpcKts of t^tccmniwAMltew *Imcbnokogf* on Organbatfonal Stru'Ctures and Employn« #f ^p w pHHontad at the European Meetinp of the RSA. take Garda, Italy, July, end European *tmmtmwtimitf Mm>ckmm* Meetfr^, ^In«s#te, Setglim October. Also forthcoming In *mtimmmm* proceedings.

KatOfy, A, (1988e) *Technological* change end spatial trcmffcwiK^on In an information economy." Environment and Planning A, v.20.

Mtftay, A (1987) The Structural ISCTrfswiwtoi erf Ihe UJi Economy: knpfeaflom for Lrtxx and Technology policy'. Paper presented c* Ihe *A$m*CQ$$A Cantmwnom-* Ato h. *Proceedings American Society of Mechanical Engineers. Sfftpmkm m* VcHir jh *TmmMm: Tmchmlogicai Change'.* Aprf₀

Loveman. G.W. (1988) "An assessment of the productivity (mpacT of Information technoioglet". Sloan School of Management. MIT.