

Restricted license - for non-production use only - expires 2023-10-25

MQ5:
tau: 4
tau: M: 53
tau: 10
Max Weeks Storage: 4
Discount Prices: [5, 20, 30, 53]
Discount Prices: [3 1 0.5]
Initial amount in warehouse: 20
Initial amount as supplier: 0
Weekly Demands: [30, 0, 0, 0, 6, 4, 4, 4, 4, 1]
Weekly Minimum inventory Requirements: [4.5, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0.8999999999999999, 0.6, 0.6, 0.6, 0.6, 0.15]

t: 4, t-(tau-1): 1
t: 5, t-(tau-1): 2
t: 6, t-(tau-1): 3
t: 7, t-(tau-1): 4
t: 8, t-(tau-1): 5
t: 9, t-(tau-1): 6
cost ware: 2.0, sup: 1.0
Gurobi Optimizer version 9.5.0 build v9.5.0rc5 (win64)
Thread count: 6 physical cores, 12 logical processors, using up to 12 threads
Optimize a model with 127 rows, 110 columns and 241 nonzeros
Model fingerprint: 0x1a9a2c6c
Model has 27 quadratic constraints
Model has 6 general constraints
Variable types: 60 continuous, 50 integer (50 binary)
Coefficient statistics:
Matrix range [1e+00, 5e+01]
QMatrix range [5e-01, 3e+00]
QMatrix range [1e+00, 1e+00]
Objective range [5e-01, 3e+00]
Bounds range [1e+00, 1e+00]
RHS range [1e-01, 1e+01]
QRHS range [1e+00, 6e+00]
GenCon rhs range [9e-05, 9e-05]
GenCon coe range [1e+00, 1e+00]
Presolve removed 26 rows and 8 columns
Presolve time: 0.00s
Presolved: 235 rows, 138 columns, 647 nonzeros
Variable types: 93 continuous, 45 integer (45 binary)
Found heuristic solution: objective 258.8500000
Root relaxation: objective 4.626087e+01, 54 iterations, 0.00 seconds (0.00 work units)
Nodes | Current Node | Objective Bounds | Work
Expl Unexpl | Obj Depth IntInf | Incumbent BestBd Gap | It/Node Time
0 0 46.26087 0 14 258.85000 46.26087 82.1% - 0s
H 0 0 238.000000 0 23 238.000000 60.47671 74.6% - 0s
H 0 0 60.47671 0 24 116.20000 60.47671 48.0% - 0s
H 0 0 67.61515 0 21 116.20000 67.61515 41.8% - 0s
H 0 0 104.300000 0 24 101.15000 67.61515 35.2% - 0s
H 0 0 101.150000 0 23 101.15000 68.97939 31.8% - 0s
H 0 0 69.02666 0 24 101.15000 69.02666 31.8% - 0s
H 0 0 89.350000 0 19 79.30027 70.44636 11.2% - 0s
H 0 0 70.44636 0 18 73.20045 70.53892 3.64% - 0s
* 0 0 0 0 73.200000 73.20000 0.00% - 0s
Cutting planes:
Gomory: 2
Implied bound: 7
MIR: 30
Flow cover: 23
Relax-and-lift: 4
Employed 1 nodes (353 simplex iterations) in 0.07 seconds (0.01 work units)
Thread count was 12 (of 12 available processors)
Solution count 9: 73.2 73.2004 79.3003 ... 258.85
Optimal solution found (tolerance 1.00e-04)
Warning: max constraint violation (9.0000e-05) exceeds tolerance
Warning: max general constraint violation (9.0000e-05) exceeds tolerance
Best objective 7.320000000000000e+01, best bound 7.320000000000000e+01, gap 0.0000%
OrderAmount_tr[0,0] 14.50000
OrderAmount_tr[0,1] 0.00000
OrderAmount_tr[0,2] 0.00000
OrderAmount_tr[1,0] 0.00000
OrderAmount_tr[1,1] 0.00000
OrderAmount_tr[1,2] 0.00000
OrderAmount_tr[2,0] 0.00000
OrderAmount_tr[2,1] 0.00000
OrderAmount_tr[2,2] 0.00000
OrderAmount_tr[3,0] 0.00000
OrderAmount_tr[3,1] 0.00000
OrderAmount_tr[3,2] 0.00000
OrderAmount_tr[4,0] 6.10000
OrderAmount_tr[4,1] 0.00000
OrderAmount_tr[4,2] 0.00000
OrderAmount_tr[5,0] 0.00000
OrderAmount_tr[5,1] 0.00000
OrderAmount_tr[5,2] 0.00000
OrderAmount_tr[6,0] 8.00000
OrderAmount_tr[6,1] 0.00000
OrderAmount_tr[6,2] 0.00000
OrderAmount_tr[7,0] 0.00000
OrderAmount_tr[7,1] 0.00000
OrderAmount_tr[7,2] 0.00000
OrderAmount_tr[8,0] 1.00000
OrderAmount_tr[8,1] 0.00000
OrderAmount_tr[8,2] 0.00000
OrderAmount_tr[9,0] 0.00000
OrderAmount_tr[9,1] 0.00000
OrderAmount_tr[9,2] -0.00000
OnHandSupplier_ts[0] 0.00000
OnHandSupplier_ts[1] 0.00000
OnHandSupplier_ts[2] 0.00000
OnHandSupplier_ts[3] 0.00000
OnHandSupplier_ts[4] 0.00000
OnHandSupplier_ts[5] 0.00000
OnHandSupplier_ts[6] 0.00000
OnHandSupplier_ts[7] 0.00000
OnHandSupplier_ts[8] 0.00000
OnHandSupplier_ts[9] 0.00000
OnHandWarehouse_tw[0] 4.50000
OnHandWarehouse_tw[1] 4.50000
OnHandWarehouse_tw[2] 4.50000
OnHandWarehouse_tw[3] 4.50000
OnHandWarehouse_tw[4] 4.60000
OnHandWarehouse_tw[5] 0.60000
OnHandWarehouse_tw[6] 4.60000
OnHandWarehouse_tw[7] 0.60000
OnHandWarehouse_tw[8] 1.60000
OnHandWarehouse_tw[9] 0.60000
ShipAmount_t[0] 14.50000
ShipAmount_t[1] 0.00000
ShipAmount_t[2] 0.00000
ShipAmount_t[3] 0.00000
ShipAmount_t[4] 6.10000
ShipAmount_t[5] 0.00000
ShipAmount_t[6] 8.00000
ShipAmount_t[7] 0.00000
ShipAmount_t[8] 5.00000
ShipAmount_t[9] -0.00000
HoldingLimitDecision_t[0] 0.00000
HoldingLimitDecision_t[1] 0.00000
HoldingLimitDecision_t[2] 0.00000
HoldingLimitDecision_t[3] 0.00000
HoldingLimitDecision_t[4] -0.00000
HoldingLimitDecision_t[5] 0.00000
HoldingLimitDecision_t[6] -0.00000
HoldingLimitDecision_t[7] -0.00000
HoldingLimitDecision_t[8] 0.00000
HoldingLimitDecision_t[9] 1.00000
ShipmentDecision_t[0] 1.00000
ShipmentDecision_t[1] 0.00000
ShipmentDecision_t[2] 0.00000
ShipmentDecision_t[3] 0.00000
ShipmentDecision_t[4] 1.00000
ShipmentDecision_t[5] 0.00000
ShipmentDecision_t[6] 1.00000
ShipmentDecision_t[7] 0.00000
ShipmentDecision_t[8] 1.00000
ShipmentDecision_t[9] -0.00000

-----Does it make sense?-----
Obj: 73.20

Solution Discussion

The solution...

I expected the solution to try to have as much in supplier storage as possible, only order as much as needed to cover the expected demands and only ship to the warehouse what they need. The solution does this but does not utilize the supplier storage at all. The solution orders on (week 1) initial 14.5 to go along with its already available 20 units and ships that so that the warehouse has an initial total value of 34.5 and with the initial demand of 30 that leaves exactly 4.5 which is the minimum stock amount for that week. The next order occurs at the fifth week where an order of 6.1 units is made and immediately shipped to the warehouse so that the 6 unit demand can be met leaving 4.6 units at the warehouse. The next order is made at week 7 of 8 units to meet the 4 unit demand in that week leaving 4.6 units at the warehouse. The next order is for 5 units in week 9 to meet the 4 unit demand in that week leaving 1.6 units at the warehouse in week 9. Finally the week 10 demand of 1 unit is met with the remaining 1.6 units at the warehouse leaving only .6 units in the warehouse. The suggested solution does meet all required demands, the minimum inventory requirements for each week, and the minimum order/shipping requirements. The supposed optimal solution is an overall cost of **873.20K** I feel there may be some error since the solution does not try to utilize the lower storage costs at the supplier at all.

```
In [6]: #save the notebook as a pdf
        to_PDF(notebook_name)
```

```
Filename: _IP4_Gerald_Jones.ipynb
```