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## Extending Winkler's Multivariate Normal <br> Aggregation

## P(Event)

$P\left(\right.$ Event $\left.\mid X_{1}, \ldots, X_{n}\right)$

## $P\left(\right.$ Event $\left.\mid X_{1}, \ldots, X_{n}\right)$

Event = Collision between two vessels
$X_{1}=$ Type of other vessel
$X_{2}=$ Proximity of other vessel
$X_{3}=$ Wind speed
$X_{4}=$ Wind direction
$X_{5}=$ Current speed
$X_{6}=$ Current direction
$\mathrm{X}_{7}=$ Visibility

## $P\left(\right.$ Event $\left.\mid X_{1}, \ldots, X_{n}\right)$

Event = Incoming vessel contains RDD
$X_{1}=$ Last country docked
$X_{2}=2 n d$ to last country docked
$X_{3}=3 r d$ to last country docked
$X_{4}=$ Frequency of US calls
$X_{5}=$ Vessel ownership
$X_{6}=$ Type of vessel
$X_{7}=$ Type of crew


## What is the probability of a collision?

On the Bremerton to Seattle route Crossing situation within 15 minutes

Other vessel is a navy vessel
No other vessels around Good visibility Negligible wind


On the Bremerton to Seattle route Crossing situation within 15 minutes

No other vessels around Good visibility Negligible wind


On the Bremerton to Seattle route Crossing situation within 15 minutes

No other vessels around Good visibility
Negligible wind

| Issaquah | Ferry Class | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SEA-BRE(A) | Ferry Route | - |
| Navy | I st Interacting Vessel | Product |
| Crossing | Traffic Scenario Ist Vessel | - |
| < I mile | Traffic Proximity Ist Vessel | - |
| No Vessel | 2nd Interacting Vessel | - |
| No Vessel | Traffic Scenario 2nd Vessel | - |
| No Vessel | Traffic Proximity 2nd Vessel | - |
| > 0.5 Miles | Visibility | - |
| Along Ferry | Wind Direction | - |
| 0 | Wind Speed | - |
|  | Likelihood of Collision | - |
| 987 | $\begin{array}{llllllllll}5 & 4 & 3 & 2 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5\end{array}$ | 789 |

## $P\left(\right.$ Event $\left.\mid X, p_{0}, \beta\right)=p_{0} \exp \left(X^{T} \beta\right)$

$$
\frac{P(\text { Event } \mid R, \beta)}{P(\text { Event } \mid L, \beta)}=\frac{p_{0} \exp \left(R^{T} \beta\right)}{p_{0} \exp \left(L^{T} \beta\right)}=\exp \left((R-L)^{T} \beta\right)
$$

## $y_{i, j}=\ln \left(z_{i, j}\right)=X_{i}^{T} \beta+u_{i, j}$






$$
\left\{\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
y_{1,1} & \cdots & y_{1, p} \\
\vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
y_{N, 1} & \cdots & y_{N, p}
\end{array}\right)=\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
x_{1,1} & \cdots & x_{1, q} \\
\vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
x_{N, 1} & \cdots & x_{N, q}
\end{array}\right)\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
\beta_{1} & \cdots & \beta_{1} \\
\vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
\beta_{q} & \cdots & \beta_{q}
\end{array}\right)+\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
u_{1,1} & \cdots & u_{1, p} \\
\vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
u_{N, 1} & \cdots & u_{N, p}
\end{array}\right)\right\}
$$

$$
\mathbf{Y}=\mathbf{X} \beta 1^{T}+\mathbf{U}
$$


$\underbrace{(\beta \mid \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{X}, \Sigma) \sim \operatorname{MVNormal}\left(\left(\mathbf{A}^{-1}+\mathbf{X}^{T} \mathbf{X}\right)^{-1}\left(\mathbf{X}^{T} \mathbf{X} \frac{\hat{\mathbf{B}} \Sigma^{-1}-1}{\underline{1}^{T} \Sigma^{-1}}+\mathbf{A}^{-1} \varphi\right), \frac{\left(\mathbf{A}^{-1}+\mathbf{X}^{T} \mathbf{X}\right)^{-1}}{\underline{1}^{T} \Sigma^{-1} \underline{1}}\right)}$

| Description | Notation | Values |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ferry route and class | FR_FC | 26 |
| Type of I st interacting vessel | TT_I | I3 |
| Scenario of Ist interacting vessel | TS_I | 4 |
| Proximity of Ist interacting vessel | TP_I | Binary |
| Type of 2nd interacting vessel | TT_2 | 5 |
| Scenario of 2nd interacting vessel | TS_2 | 4 |
| Proximity of 2nd interacting vessel | TP_2 | Binary |
| Visibility | VIS | Binary |
| Wind direction | WD | Binary |
| Wind speed | WS | Continuous |



Assume independence between the experts a priori

Comparing the two scenarios we pictured earlier a priori

## Doesn't dependence between experts increase posterior variance?





Comparing the two
scenarios we pictured earlier

Credibility Interval


90\% Prior [1.88*10-35, 5.32*1034]
Dependent $[4.38,5.84] \quad 1 / 2$ width $=0.73$ Independent [4.43,7.04] $1 / 2$ width $=1.3$

## Getting the Right Mix of Experts



(2, $Z_{1}, Z_{2}$
$\underbrace{}_{\left(z_{1}, \ldots, z_{n} \mid \theta, \Sigma\right) \sim \operatorname{MVNormal}(\theta, \Sigma)}$



$$
\left\{\begin{array}{c}
\left(z_{i} \mid \mu_{i}, \alpha_{i}, \gamma_{i}\right) \sim N\left(\mu_{i}, r_{i}\right) \\
\left(\mu_{i} \mid \theta, \lambda\right) \sim N(\theta, \lambda)
\end{array}\right.
$$




$$
\begin{gathered}
\left(z_{i} \mid \theta, r_{i}, \alpha_{i}, \gamma_{i}\right) \sim N\left(\theta+\alpha_{i}, \gamma_{i} r_{i}\right) \\
\left(r_{i} \mid \theta, z_{i}, a_{\gamma}, b_{\gamma}\right) \sim G a\left(a_{\gamma}, b_{\gamma}\right) \\
\alpha_{1}, \ldots, \alpha_{p} \sim N(0, \lambda) \\
\gamma_{1},, \ldots, \gamma_{p} \sim \operatorname{Gamma}(a, b)
\end{gathered}
$$

$$
\begin{gathered}
\left(z_{i} \mid \theta, r_{i}, \alpha_{i}, \gamma_{i}\right) \sim N\left(\theta+\alpha_{i}, \gamma_{i} r_{i}\right) \\
\left(r_{i} \mid \theta, z_{i}, a_{\gamma}, b_{\gamma}\right) \sim G a\left(a_{\gamma}, b_{\gamma}\right) \\
\left(\alpha_{1}, \gamma_{1}\right), \ldots,\left(\alpha_{p}, \gamma_{p}\right) \sim G \\
G \sim \operatorname{DP}\left(G_{0}, M\right) \\
G_{0}=\operatorname{gamma}(a, b)
\end{gathered}
$$
















