

Automated Warehouse

Course Project: Milestone 4

Abhi Dineshkumar Patel

ASU ID: 1230038877
apate243@asu.edu

Abstract

Automated warehousing represents a paradigm shift in logistical operations, integrating cutting-edge technologies like robotics, artificial intelligence (AI), and the Internet of Things (IoT) to enhance operational efficiency and accuracy. This project endeavors to develop a sophisticated scheduling algorithm tailored specifically for warehouse robots. The algorithm's primary goal is to optimize product delivery and order fulfillment within the warehouse environment, ultimately minimizing the time required for these processes.

Problem Statement

In the dynamic realm of modern logistics, automated warehousing stands as a cornerstone innovation, employing cutting-edge technologies to revolutionize operational efficiency. Within this context, this project addresses the intricate challenge of optimizing robotic coordination to streamline product delivery within automated warehouse environments.

At its core, the project aims to develop a sophisticated scheduling algorithm tailored explicitly for warehouse robots. This algorithm serves as the backbone of warehouse operations, orchestrating the movement of autonomous vehicles through a grid-based environment. The primary objective is to minimize the time required for order fulfillment while upholding stringent standards of accuracy and safety.

The warehouse environment is envisaged as a complex ecosystem, characterized by a grid structure comprising interconnected cells with diverse functionalities. From storage shelves housing an array of products to designated picking stations for order assembly, each element must seamlessly integrate within the warehouse framework to ensure smooth operations.

To address this challenge effectively, the project delineates key constraints governing warehouse operations, drawing inspiration from established methodologies while striving

for innovation. These constraints encompass spatial limitations on robot movement, strategic shelf placement considerations, picking station specifics, spatial integrity requirements, and shelf handling limitations.

Furthermore, the project seeks to leverage insights from prior research and practical applications, such as the Answer Set Programming Challenge 2019, to inform its approach. By synthesizing existing knowledge with novel methodologies, the project aims to develop innovative solutions to optimize robotic orchestration within automated warehouse environments.

In essence, the project represents a concerted effort to push the boundaries of automated warehousing, navigating the complexities of efficient robotic coordination to unlock new levels of speed, precision, and adaptability in supply chain management.

Project Background

In the contemporary landscape of logistics, the pace at which warehouses operate has reached unprecedented levels. These modern warehouses serve as hubs for storing a vast array of products, strategically positioned to fulfill customer orders with remarkable speed. Gone are the days of relying solely on manual labor; instead, the advent of autonomous robots has ushered in a new era of efficiency and precision. These robots navigate the expansive warehouse floors, swiftly collecting packages from designated shelves and ensuring they reach their intended destinations promptly.

This transformation not only enhances operational efficiency but also grants warehouses access to a wealth of data. From real-time product locations to the statuses of robots in motion, this data streamlines the fulfillment process, enabling warehouses to meet the ever-increasing demands of

consumers. However, harnessing this data effectively requires more than just access; it necessitates the development of advanced algorithms capable of orchestrating seamless interactions between robots and warehouse infrastructure.

Approach to Solve Problem

In the dynamic landscape of modern logistics, automated warehousing represents a pivotal innovation, driving efficiency and productivity through advanced technological integration. At its core, this project focuses on the intricate challenge of optimizing robotic coordination to streamline item delivery within automated warehouse environments. The project endeavors to develop a sophisticated scheduling algorithm explicitly designed for warehouse robotic vehicles, serving as the cornerstone of warehouse operations.

Central to the algorithm's functionality is its ability to orchestrate the movement of autonomous vehicles through a grid-based environment. With the primary objective of minimizing the time required for shipment fulfillment, the algorithm adheres to stringent standards of accuracy and safety. By navigating the complexities of warehouse ecosystems, which comprise interconnected cells with diverse functionalities, the algorithm seamlessly integrates various elements such as storage units and picking points to ensure smooth operations.

To effectively address this multifaceted challenge, the project delineates key constraints governing warehouse operations. Drawing inspiration from established methodologies while fostering innovation, these constraints encompass spatial limitations on robot vehicle movement, strategic considerations for storage unit placement, and spatial integrity requirements. Moreover, insights from prior research and practical applications inform the project's approach, facilitating the development of innovative solutions to optimize robotic orchestration within automated warehouse environments. The constraints I've accounted for in the solution encompass the following aspects:

Adherence to Designated Spaces: Robotic vehicles operate within predefined areas within the warehouse, delineated by a grid structure with distinct rows and columns. Upholding this constraint, the solution confines robotic movement within the grid boundaries, preventing excursions beyond the designated spaces.

Exclusion of Diagonal Movement: Robotic vehicles are confined to vertical or horizontal movement within the grid, with diagonal movement prohibited. Enforcing this restriction, the solution ensures that a robotic vehicle's new position differs from its previous position by only one unit along either the row or column axis.

Restrictions on Movement Direction: Robotic vehicles are authorized to move solely along the x-axis or y-axis at any given time, precluding concurrent movement along both

axes. The solution verifies that a robotic vehicle's change in coordinates corresponds to movement along either the x-axis or y-axis within a unit of time.

Facilitation of Storage Unit Pickup Operations: Robotic vehicles possess the capability to maneuver beneath storage units, facilitating the retrieval of units containing required items. The solution accommodates scenarios where a robotic vehicle without a storage unit can navigate beneath a unit and lift it, facilitating efficient item retrieval.

Policy for Single Storage-Unit Lift: A robotic vehicle transporting a storage unit cannot simultaneously lift another unit; it must first deposit the current storage unit before acquiring a new one. Enforcing this constraint, the solution ensures sequential unit handling by robotic vehicles.

Prevention of Conflicting Cell Occupancy: Simultaneous occupancy of a cell by multiple robotic vehicles is forbidden, necessitating sequential movement to maintain exclusive occupancy. The solution mitigates conflicting cell occupancy by ensuring that no two robotic vehicles occupy the same cell simultaneously.

Identification of Lanes: Certain cells within the warehouse grid are designated as highway lanes, intended to facilitate unhindered traffic flow. Robotic vehicles are prohibited from placing or retrieving shelves within these designated lanes. The solution incorporates constraints to prevent storage unit placement or pickup within cells designated as highway lanes, thereby preserving congestion-free traffic flow.

By incorporating these above constraints into the solution framework, the developed algorithm ensures efficient robotic coordination within the automated warehouse environment, optimizing operational efficiency and order fulfillment accuracy.

Main Results and Analysis

The culmination of this project yields promising results, validated through comprehensive experimentation and analysis. Across various test cases of the problem, the developed solution consistently demonstrates its efficacy in optimizing warehouse operations. By harnessing the algorithm's capabilities, warehouses can significantly reduce order fulfillment time while navigating the intricate web of constraints inherent to their operations.

Through simulations and empirical observations, it becomes evident that the algorithm enhances warehouse efficiency and ensures timely order processing. The analysis further underscores the transformative potential of advanced technologies in revolutionizing warehouse logistics, paving the way for unprecedented levels of speed, precision, and adaptability in supply chain management.

Test Case 1

```
Command Prompt
C:\Users\abhip\Downloads\clingo>clingo-5.4.0-win64>clingo abhi_solution.asp testcase1.asp -c n=10
clingo version 5.4.0
Reading from abhi_solution.asp ...
abhi_solution.asp:87:4-27: info: atom does not occur in any rule head:
  pickingStationAt(#P0,#X1)

Solving ...
Answer: 1
occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),move(-1,0),0) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),move(-1,0),1) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),move(0,-1),1) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),move(1,0),2) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),move(-1,0),3) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),move(0,-1),5) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),move(0,-1),6) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),move(0,-1),7) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),move(0,1),8) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),pickup,0) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),pickup,2) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),pickup,6) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),pickup,7) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),putdown,4) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),putdown,5) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),deliver(2,1,1),3) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),deliver(1,1,1),4) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),deliver(3,4,1),8) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),deliver(1,3,4),9) timeTaken(9) numActions(19)
Optimization: 64
OPTIMUM FOUND

Models      : 1
Optimum     : yes
Optimization: 64
Calls       : 1
Time        : 0.490s (Solving: 0.35s 1st Model: 0.06s Unsat: 0.29s)
CPU Time    : 0.438s

C:\Users\abhip\Downloads\clingo\clingo-5.4.0-win64>
```

Figure 1: Output of Test Case 1

In the initial test scenario, executing the command clingo abhi_solution.asp testcase1.asp -c n=10 yielded a single stable model, achieving an optimal solution of 64 time units.. (figure 1)

Test Case 2

```
Command Prompt
C:\Users\abhip\Downloads\clingo\clingo-5.4.0-win64>clingo abhi_solution.asp testcase2.asp -c n=11
clingo version 5.4.0
Reading from abhi_solution.asp ...
abhi_solution.asp:87:4-27: info: atom does not occur in any rule head:
  pickingStationAt(#P0,#X1)

Solving ...
Answer: 76
occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),move(-1,0),0) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),move(-1,0),1) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),move(0,-1),1) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),move(1,0),2) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),move(-1,0),3) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),move(0,-1),5) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),move(0,-1),6) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),move(0,-1),7) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),move(0,1),8) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),pickup,0) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),pickup,2) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),pickup,6) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),pickup,7) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),putdown,4) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),putdown,5) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),deliver(2,1,1),3) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),deliver(1,1,1),4) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),deliver(3,4,1),8) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),deliver(1,3,4),9) timeTaken(9) numActions(19)
Optimization: 76
OPTIMUM FOUND

Models      : 4
Optimum     : yes
Optimization: 76
Calls       : 1
Time        : 0.420s (Solving: 0.31s 1st Model: 0.06s Unsat: 0.16s)
CPU Time    : 0.399s

C:\Users\abhip\Downloads\clingo\clingo-5.4.0-win64>
```

Figure 2: Output of Test Case 2

Initially, attempting clingo abhi_solution.asp testcase1.asp -c n=10 resulted in an unsatisfactory outcome. However, adjusting the parameter to n=11 and considering testcase2.asp, the solution generated four stable models, with an optimal time of 72 units. (figure 2)

Test Case 3

```
Command Prompt
Optimization: 35
Answer: 13
occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),move(-1,0),0) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),move(-1,0),1) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),move(0,-1),1) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),move(1,0),2) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),move(-1,0),3) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),move(0,-1),5) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),move(0,-1),6) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),move(0,-1),7) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),move(0,1),8) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),pickup,0) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),pickup,2) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),pickup,6) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),pickup,7) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),putdown,4) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),putdown,5) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),deliver(2,1,1),3) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),deliver(1,1,1),4) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),deliver(3,4,1),8) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),deliver(1,3,4),9) timeTaken(9) numActions(19)
Optimization: 33
Answer: 14
occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),move(-1,0),0) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),move(-1,0),1) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),move(0,-1),1) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),move(1,0),2) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),move(-1,0),3) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),move(0,-1),5) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),move(0,-1),6) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),move(0,-1),7) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),move(0,1),8) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),pickup,0) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),pickup,2) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),pickup,6) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),pickup,7) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),putdown,4) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),putdown,5) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),deliver(2,1,1),3) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),deliver(1,1,1),4) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),deliver(3,4,1),8) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),deliver(1,3,4),9) timeTaken(9) numActions(19)
Optimization: 32
Answer: 15
occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),move(-1,0),0) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),move(-1,0),1) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),move(0,-1),1) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),move(1,0),2) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),move(-1,0),3) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),move(0,-1),5) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),move(0,-1),6) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),move(0,-1),7) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),move(0,1),8) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),pickup,0) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),pickup,2) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),pickup,6) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),pickup,7) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),putdown,4) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),putdown,5) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),deliver(2,1,1),3) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),deliver(1,1,1),4) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),deliver(3,4,1),8) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),deliver(1,3,4),9) timeTaken(9) numActions(19)
Optimization: 31
OPTIMUM FOUND

Models      : 15
Optimum     : yes
Optimization: 31
Calls       : 1
Time        : 0.685s (Solving: 0.59s 1st Model: 0.01s Unsat: 0.32s)
CPU Time    : 0.563s

C:\Users\abhip\Downloads\clingo\clingo-5.4.0-win64>
```

Figure 3: Output of Test Case 3

For the third test case, executing clingo abhi_solution.asp testcase3.asp -c n=12 produced 15 stable models, achieving an optimal solution of 31 time units. (figure 3)

Test Case 4

```
Command Prompt
Optimization: 24
Answer: 8
occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),move(-1,0),0) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),move(-1,0),1) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),move(0,-1),1) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),move(1,0),2) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),move(-1,0),3) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),move(0,-1),5) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),move(0,-1),6) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),move(0,-1),7) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),move(0,1),8) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),pickup,0) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),pickup,2) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),pickup,6) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),pickup,7) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),putdown,4) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),putdown,5) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),deliver(2,1,1),3) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),deliver(1,1,1),4) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),deliver(3,2,2),6) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),deliver(1,1,1),6) timeTaken(4) numActions(10)
Optimization: 23
Answer: 9
occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),move(-1,0),0) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),move(-1,0),1) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),move(0,-1),1) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),move(1,0),2) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),move(-1,0),3) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),move(0,-1),5) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),move(0,-1),6) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),move(0,-1),7) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),move(0,1),8) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),pickup,0) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),pickup,2) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),pickup,6) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),pickup,7) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),putdown,4) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),putdown,5) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),deliver(2,1,1),3) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),deliver(1,1,1),4) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),deliver(3,2,2),6) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),deliver(1,1,1),6) timeTaken(4) numActions(10)
Optimization: 22
Answer: 10
occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),move(-1,0),0) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),move(-1,0),1) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),move(0,-1),1) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),move(1,0),2) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),move(-1,0),3) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),move(0,-1),5) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),move(0,-1),6) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),move(0,-1),7) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),move(0,1),8) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),pickup,0) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),pickup,2) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),pickup,6) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),pickup,7) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),putdown,4) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),putdown,5) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),deliver(2,1,1),3) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),deliver(1,1,1),4) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),deliver(3,2,2),6) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),deliver(1,1,1),6) timeTaken(4) numActions(10)
Optimization: 20
OPTIMUM FOUND

Models      : 10
Optimum     : yes
Optimization: 20
Calls       : 1
Time        : 0.794s (Solving: 0.61s 1st Model: 0.02s Unsat: 0.08s)
CPU Time    : 0.668s

C:\Users\abhip\Downloads\clingo\clingo-5.4.0-win64>
```

Figure 4: Output of Test Case 4

Running the command clingo abhi_solution.asp testcase4.asp -c n=12 for the fourth test case resulted in 10 stable models, with an optimal time of 20 units. (figure 4)

Test Case 5

```

Optimization: 36
Answer: 16
occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),move(-1,0),0) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),move(-1,0),1) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),move(-1,0),3) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),move(-1,0),3) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),move(0,1),5) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),move(0,1),5) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),pickup,2) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),pickup,4) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),deliver(1,1,1),4) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),deliver(1,3,4),9) timeTaken(6) numActions(10)
Optimization: 34
Answer: 17
occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),move(-1,0),0) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),move(-1,0),1) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),move(-1,0),3) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),move(-1,0),3) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),move(1,0),5) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),move(0,1),5) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),pickup,2) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),pickup,4) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),deliver(1,1,1),4) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),deliver(1,3,4),7) timeTaken(6) numActions(10)
Optimization: 32
Answer: 18
occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),move(-1,0),0) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),move(-1,0),1) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),move(-1,0),3) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),move(-1,0),3) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),move(1,0),5) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),move(0,1),5) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),pickup,2) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),pickup,4) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,1),deliver(1,1,1),4) occurs(object(robo_vehicle,2),deliver(1,3,4),6) timeTaken(6) numActions(10)
Optimization: 31
OPTIMUM FOUND
Models      : 18
Optimum     : yes
Optimization: 31
Calls       : 1
Time        : 1.156s (Solving: 0.98s 1st Model: 0.02s Unsat: 0.13s)
CPU Time    : 1.016s
C:\Users\abhip\Downloads\clingo\clingo-5.4.0-win64>

```

Figure 5: Output of Test Case 5

In the final test case, executing clingo abhi_solution.asp testcase5.asp -c n=12 generated 18 stable models, with an optimal solution of 31 time units. (figure 5)

Conclusion

In conclusion, this project represents a concerted effort to push the boundaries of automated warehousing. By harnessing the power of advanced algorithms and autonomous robotics, warehouses can navigate the complexities of modern logistics with unparalleled efficiency and accuracy. Moreover, the insights gleaned from this endeavor lay the foundation for future advancements in warehouse operations, promising continued innovation and optimization in the realm of supply chain management.

Future Work

Looking ahead, there are numerous opportunities for further exploration and refinement. One avenue of future research involves prioritizing orders to expedite critical deliveries, thereby optimizing resource allocation and enhancing customer satisfaction. Additionally, the application of the developed solution can extend beyond traditional warehouse settings, encompassing domains such as paramedic services and pharmaceutical logistics with appropriate modifications.

Furthermore, continuous refinement and comparison of constraints with state-of-the-art approaches will be crucial for enhancing performance and efficiency in the future. By embracing innovation and leveraging cutting-edge technologies, the journey towards truly autonomous and efficient warehouses continues, promising a future where logistics

operations are not only streamlined but also seamlessly integrated into the fabric of our daily lives.

References

Azadeh, Kaveh and de Koster, M.B.M. René and Roy, Debjit, Robotized and Automated Warehouse Systems: Review and Recent Developments (May 30, 2017).

Clingo Documentation

CSE579 Lecture Videos by Dr. Joohyung Lee

I. Niemelä, "Answer Set Programming: A Declarative Approach to Solving Challenging Search Problems," 2011 41st IEEE International Symposium on Multiple-Valued Logic, Tuusula, Finland, 2011, pp. 139-141, doi: 10.1109/ISMVL.2011.61.