

Multi-Objective Optimization

Lecture 8 - Management Science

Dr. Tobias Vlček

Introduction

Client Briefing: EcoExpress Logistics

...

Operations Director's Dilemma:

"EU regulations demand 40% emission cuts, but we can't sacrifice profitability, service quality, or reliability!"

The Fleet Challenge

EcoExpress operates regional last-mile delivery across 3 cities

- EU Green Deal: 40% emission reduction by 2025
- Rising fuel costs (€2.1/L diesel)
- Amazon entering our market (speed pressure)
- Driver shortage (need automation-friendly vehicles)

...

Question: How do we transform our fleet while staying competitive?

Today's Learning Objectives

By the end of this lecture, you will be able to:

1. Explain why most real business decisions involve multiple competing objectives
2. Identify and visualize Pareto optimal solutions in multi-objective problems
3. Apply normalization techniques to make objectives comparable
4. Implement weighted sum and ϵ -constraint methods to find trade-off solutions
5. Choose the appropriate MOO method for different problem types
6. Make data-driven decisions from a Pareto frontier
7. Analyze real-world multi-objective trade-offs (Amazon, airlines, Tesla)

Quick Recap: Local Search

Last week we optimized routes for delivery:

- Started with greedy construction (e.g. Nearest Neighbor)
- Improved with local search (e.g. 2-opt)

- Considered time windows
- But: We only optimized distance

...

Question: What if we also care about emissions, cost, AND customer satisfaction?

The Problem

Single vs Multi-Objective

Single Objective

- “Minimize total distance”
- Clear winner. Easy, right!

...

Multiple Objectives

- “Minimize cost AND emissions AND maximize speed”
- No clear answer...

...

Question: Any idea how to approach this?

EcoExpress Vehicle Options


Type	Purchase Cost (€)	Operating (€/km)	CO2 (g/km)	Speed (km/h)	Capacity (parcels)	Range (km)
E-Truck	75000	0.18	0	55	300	250
Hybrid Van	45000	0.25	95	65	200	600
Diesel Van	35000	0.38	185	70	250	800
E-Cargo Bike	12000	0.05	0	30	50	60
Autonomous	25000	0.12	0	40	150	180

...

Question: Which vehicle is “best” for EcoExpress?

Trade-offs Everywhere

Cost vs Environmental Impact Speed vs Operating Cost Capacity vs Range



...

! Important

Every vehicle excels at something different!

Real Business Constraints

Beyond the numbers, consider:

- EU regulations: Carbon tax of €100/ton CO₂ starting 2025
- Competition: Amazon promises 2-hour delivery
- Labor market: Autonomous vehicles reduce driver dependency
- Urban zones: Zero-emission zones in city centers
- Peak times: Black Friday = 3x normal volume

...


! Important

There is no single “optimal” solution - only trade-offs

Pareto Optimality

Dominated Solutions

A solution is dominated if another solution is:



...

! Important

Better in at least one objective and not worse in any objective!

The Pareto Frontier


The Pareto frontier is the set of all non-dominated solutions

- No solution is objectively “better”
- Each represents a different trade-off
- Moving along frontier: gain in one objective, loss in another
- Decision makers choose based on preferences

...

Question Do you think you get the idea?

Find the Non-Dominated




...

Question: Which fleets are non-dominated?

Three+ Objectives

With 3 objectives, the Pareto frontier becomes a surface:

3D Pareto Frontier (Surface)




...

! Important

Harder to visualize, but same principle applies!

Transportation Problem

Multi-Objective Transportation



...

💡 Tip

Logistics decisions involve trade-offs: City traffic (slow, high emissions), Night delivery? → Highway (fast, but more distance), Customer priority? → Direct route (expensive)

Classic Transportation

Let's understand the foundation

...

From/To	Zone A	Zone B	Zone C	Zone D	Supply
DC Berlin	8	10	11	14	300
DC Hamburg	12	9	7	8	250
DC Munich	15	13	10	9	200

From/To	Zone A	Zone B	Zone C	Zone D	Supply
Demand	200	180	220	150	750

Note

Cost per 100 parcels (€) in the middle of the table!

Objective Function

The foundation of the classical model

$$\text{Minimize } Z = \sum_i \sum_j c_{ij} \cdot x_{ij}$$

Where:

- x_{ij} = parcels shipped from DC i to Zone j
- c_{ij} = cost per 100 parcels from i to j

Second Objective: Emissions

Now the real challenge - each route has different emissions:

From/To	Zone A	Zone B	Zone C	Zone D
DC Berlin	120	95	85	70
DC Hamburg	45	110	100	90
DC Munich	60	50	115	105

Note

Emissions per parcel (g CO₂) in the table

Objective Function II

Now with two objectives!

$$\text{Minimize } Z_1 = \sum_i \sum_j c_{ij} \cdot x_{ij} \quad (\text{Cost})$$

$$\text{Minimize } Z_2 = \sum_i \sum_j e_{ij} \cdot x_{ij} \quad (\text{Emissions})$$

Where e_{ij} = emissions per parcel from i to j

...

Notice: Cheapest routes \neq Greenest routes!

Data Source

Where Do These Numbers Come From?

...

Cost Data:


- Historical records: Your accounting system
- Quotes: Request from carriers/suppliers
- APIs: Google Maps Distance Matrix (distance → cost)

...

Emissions Data:

- EU Standards or Carrier data
- Formula: $\text{Emissions} = \text{Distance} \times \text{Weight} \times \text{EmissionFactor}$

The Transportation Trade-off



Cost increase for greenest solution: +€26800 (42.1%)
Emissions reduction from cheapest: -32.2 kg (39.9%)

...

! Important

Each point represents a different allocation strategy!

Solution Approaches

Multi-Objective Optimization

You can use optimization solvers or heuristics!

...

With Optimization Solvers

- Weighted Sum Method
- ϵ -Constraint Method
- Goal Programming
- Optimal solutions
- Need mathematical model

With Heuristics

- Weighted Greedy Construction
- Multi-Objective Local Search
- Metaheuristics
- Good solutions, fast
- No optimality proof

...


! Important

In this lecture we use heuristic approaches!

Foundation: Extreme Points

First step for BOTH approaches - find the boundaries:

Step 1: Find Extreme Points Step 2: Normalize to [0,1] Scale




...

Question: Why is normalization essential?

Critical: Normalization

Without it, your analysis is meaningless



...

Question: Any intuition on how to do [0,1] normalization?

How to Normalize

The Normalization Formula for [0,1]

$$\text{Normalized}_i = \frac{x_i - x_{\min}}{x_{\max} - x_{\min}}$$

...

In Python, this is rather simple!

...

```
def normalize_objectives(data):  
    return (data - data.min()) / (data.max() - data.min())  
  
# Now weights actually mean something  
weighted_score = w1 * normalize(cost) + w2 * normalize(emissions)
```

...

💡 Tip

Easy, right?

Extreme Points

There are several reasons why extreme points matter:

1. Trade-off Space: Min/max values bound your Pareto frontier
2. Enable Proper Normalization: Need ranges for scaling to [0,1]
3. Feasibility: If single objectives not achievable, problem infeasible
4. Stakeholder: “Best cost is €50k, best emissions is 40kg”

...


Implementation Pattern:

```
def find_extreme_points(problem):  
    # Solve for minimum cost (ignore emissions)  
    min_cost_solution = minimize(cost_objective, constraints)  
    # Solve for minimum emissions (ignore cost)  
    min_emissions_solution = minimize(emissions_objective, constraints)
```

Computational Complexity

How hard does it get with more objectives?

...



...

💡 Tip

Why? Because there are just way more potential solutions to check!

Solver-Based Methods

Quick overview - you won't implement these in assignments

1. Weighted Sum: Minimize $w_1 \times \text{cost} + w_2 \times \text{emissions}$
 - Simple, fast for convex problems
2. ϵ -Constraint: Minimize cost subject to $\text{emissions} \leq \epsilon$
 - Systematically vary ϵ to find complete frontier
3. Goal Programming: Minimize deviations from targets
 - Set target for each objective, minimize weighted deviations

...

i Note

For your fleet optimization: You'll use heuristic approaches instead!

Heuristic Approach

The Heuristic Strategy

For problems without mathematical models

...

1. Construction: Build initial solutions with weighted greedy
2. Improvement: Multi-objective local search
3. Selection: Filter dominated solutions to find Pareto frontier

...

! Important

Key difference from solvers:

- Solvers: Need mathematical model, guarantee optimality
- Heuristics: Work with any evaluation function, find good solutions fast

Why Heuristics?

Depending on the problem:


- Combinatorial explosion
- Huge solution space even for one problem
- Evaluating one solution might thus take too long
- Need diverse Pareto frontier, not just one “optimal” solution
- Open Source Solvers too slow
- Commercial solvers too expensive

...

Question: How do we build good solutions without a solver?

The Three-Stage Heuristic Process

Heuristic Multi-Objective Optimization Workflow




...

This is what you'll implement in your assignments!

Construction & Improvement

Construction Methods for MOO

How to build initial solutions when you have multiple objectives?



...

Note

Three choices (for starters). Let's check them out!

Weighted Greedy Construction

Making greedy choices on a weighted objective

1. Choose weight vector $w = (w_1, w_2)$
2. At each step, pick the choice that minimizes:

$$w_1 \cdot \text{cost}(x) + w_2 \cdot \text{emissions}(x)$$

3. Build complete solution greedily
4. Repeat with different weights to explore frontier

...

Tip

Different weights explore different trade-offs! Easy, right?

Sequential Greedy (Lexicographic)

Optimize one objective at a time, in priority order

1. Rank objectives by priority
 - E.g. cost (most important) and then emissions (tie-breaker)
2. At each step:
 - Find choices that minimize primary objective
 - If tie → use secondary objective
3. Build one working solution

...

Tip

We could also accept primary values within 10% of best so secondary has more influence!

Diverse Starting Pool

Generate many random solutions, keep the non-dominated ones

1. Generate N random solutions (e.g., N=100)
2. Evaluate all solutions on both objectives
3. Filter to keep only non-dominated solutions
4. Result: A diverse set of Pareto-optimal solutions

...


Tip

- Explores entire solution space
- No bias toward specific weights
- Great for warm-starting local search

Local Search for Multi-Objective

Special moves that improve multiple objectives:

Multi-Objective Local Search: Not All Moves Are Equal!



...

Question: Which moves are acceptable?

MOO Local Search Rules

Accept a move if:

1. Dominance: New solution dominates current (win-win!)
2. Trade-off: Improves primary, acceptable loss in secondary
3. Diversity: Fills gap in current Pareto front
4. Probabilistic: Use temperature (like simulated annealing)

...

! Important

Always keep all your objectives in mind when making decisions.

From Pareto Front to Decision


How to Choose!

1. The Knee Point: Find the “elbow” where improvement slows
2. Satisficing Levels: Set minimum acceptable thresholds
 - Cost must be < €100k (budget constraint)
 - Emissions must be < 100 kg (regulatory limit)
 - Service level must be > 90% (customer requirement)
3. Stakeholder Preferences: Let business priorities guide
 - Sustainability: Minimum emissions that meets constraints

- Operations: Maximum service level within budget

Weighted Sum Along the Frontier

The weight influences the final choice:




...

Note

The iso-cost lines show the trade-offs between cost and emissions.

Weighting has an Impact

The weights thus reflect your values!



...



Tip

Depending on your weight, the choice will vary.

Advanced

Speed vs Sustainability Dilemma

The Three-Way Trade-off in E-Commerce

1. Minimize Delivery Time (1-day/2-hour promise)
2. Minimize Cost (fuel, labor, fulfillment)
3. Minimize Environmental Impact (carbon footprint)

...

Faster delivery = More vehicles less full = Higher emissions

...

Question: What could retailers do?

Moving the Frontier

Instead of point on the frontier, move the entire frontier:

...

Question: Any idea of examples?

...



Tip

R&D can fundamentally change what's possible!

Briefing

Today

Hour 2: This Lecture

- Multi-objective
- Pareto optimality
- Weighted greedy
- Local search MOO

Hour 3: Notebook

- Bean Counter CEO
- Find Pareto frontier
- Apply weighted greedy

- Normalize objectives

Hour 4: Competition

- Transportation problem
- Fleet selection
- Cost vs emissions
- Justify choice!

The Competition Challenge

EcoExpress Sustainable Fleet Design

...

1. Solve multi-objective transportation (DCs → Zones)
2. Select optimal fleet mix (5 vehicle types)
3. Balance cost, emissions, service quality
4. Meet EU emission targets (40% reduction)

...

! Important

Find the best trade-off for your business priorities!

Choosing Your MOO Approach

Different situations call for different methods:

Situation	Best	Why
Clear priorities	Sequential greedy	Fast, hierarchy
Exploring	Weighted greedy	Different solutions
Many solutions	Diverse pool	Builds frontier
Quick solution	Single weighted	One good compromise
Improve existing	Multi-objective local	Refines trade-offs

...

💡 Tip

Competition? Generate diverse pool or weighted, then improve with local search.

Implementation Pitfalls to Avoid

Common bugs that cost you time:

1. Forgetting to Normalize

- Always normalize to $[0,1]$ first!
2. Optimizing Too Many Objectives
 - 2-3: Manageable, 4+: Exponentially harder
 - Combine related objectives or use constraints
 3. Not Checking Solution Feasibility
 - Always verify constraints after optimization

Summary

Key Takeaways:

- Real decisions have multiple conflicting objectives
- Pareto frontier shows all rational trade-offs
- Normalization is essential for fair comparison
- Weighted sum works for convex frontiers
- ϵ -constraint handles non-convex cases
- Weights reflect values, make them explicit
- Visualization crucial for decision-making

Break!

Take 20 minutes, then we start the practice notebook

Next up: You'll become Bean Counter's expert

Then: The Sustainability competition

Bibliography