Data-driven optimization of processes with degrading equipment

Johannes Wiebe[1], Inês Cecílio[2], Ruth Misener[1]

Wednesday 1st August, 2018

[1]Department of Computing, Imperial College London, London, UK

[2]Schlumberger Research Cambridge, Cambridge, UK London

Motivation: Why degradation matters

Kondili, Pantelides and Sargent (1993)





Starting point: Process level MI(N)LP model

$$
\begin{aligned}
\min_{\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{m}} \quad & \text{cost}(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{m}) \\
\text{s.t.} \quad & \text{process model}(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{m}) && \text{(eg. balance equations)} \\
& \text{maintenance model}(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{m}) && \text{(eg. types of maint.)}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\boldsymbol{x}$ are process variables, $\boldsymbol{m}$ are maintenance variables

Starting point: Process level MI(N)LP model

$$\begin{aligned}
\min_{\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{m},\boldsymbol{h}} \quad & \text{cost}(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{m},\boldsymbol{h}) & \\
\text{s.t.} \quad & \text{process model}(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{m},\boldsymbol{h}) & \text{(eg. balance equations)} \\
& \text{maintenance model}(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{m},\boldsymbol{h}) & \text{(eg. types of maint.)} \\
& \text{health model}(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{m},\boldsymbol{h}), & \text{(eq. prognosis model)}
\end{aligned}$$

where $\boldsymbol{x}$ are process variables, $\boldsymbol{m}$ are maintenance variables, and $\boldsymbol{h}$ are health related variables.

Starting point: Process level MI(N)LP model

$$
\begin{aligned}
\min_{\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{m},\boldsymbol{h}} \quad & \text{cost}(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{m},\boldsymbol{h}) & \\
\text{s.t.} \quad & \text{process model}(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{m},\boldsymbol{h}) & \text{(eg. balance equations)} \\
& \text{maintenance model}(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{m},\boldsymbol{h}) & \text{(eg. types of maint.)} \\
& \text{health model}(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{m},\boldsymbol{h}), & \text{(eq. prognosis model)}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\boldsymbol{x}$ are process variables, $\boldsymbol{m}$ are maintenance variables, and $\boldsymbol{h}$ are health related variables.

Related Work

Vassiliads and Pistikopoulos (2001); Liu, Yahia and Papageorgiou (2014); Xenos, et int., Thornhill (2016); Aguirre and Papageorgiou (2018); Biondi, Sand and Harjunkoski (2017); Yildirim, Gebraeel and Sun (2017); Başçiftci, Ahmed, Gebraeel and Yildirim (2018)

Starting point: Process level MI(N)LP model

$$
\begin{aligned}
\min_{\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{m},\boldsymbol{h}} \quad & \text{cost}(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{m},\boldsymbol{h}) \\
\text{s.t.} \quad & \text{process model}(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{m},\boldsymbol{h}) && \text{(eg. balance equations)} \\
& \text{maintenance model}(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{m},\boldsymbol{h}) && \text{(eg. types of maint.)} \\
& \text{health model}(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{m},\boldsymbol{h}), && \text{(eq. prognosis model)}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\boldsymbol{x}$ are process variables, $\boldsymbol{m}$ are maintenance variables, and $\boldsymbol{h}$ are health related variables.

Idea

Combine process level MI(N)LP scheduling & planning with more sophisticated (stochastic) degradation modelling and robust optimization.

What is degradation modelling?



What is degradation modelling?

The degradation signal $s^{meas}(t)$ can be modelled by a stochastic process :

$$S(t) = \{S_t : t \in T\},$$

where S_t is a random variable (Alaswad and Xiang, 2017).

What is degradation modelling?

The degradation signal $s^{meas}(t)$ can be modelled by a stochastic process :

$$S(t) = \{S_t : t \in T\},$$

where S_t is a random variable (Alaswad and Xiang, 2017).

Often used: Lévy type processes (Applebaum, 2004)

- Independent increments: $S_{t_2} - S_{t_1}, ..., S_{t_n} - S_{t_{n-1}}$ are independent for any $0 < t_1 < t_2 < ... < t_n < \infty$
- Stationary increments: $S_t - S_s$ and S_{t-s} have the same distribution for any $s < t$

What is degradation modelling?

The degradation signal $s^{meas}(t)$ can be modelled by a stochastic process :

$$S(t) = \{S_t : t \in T\},$$

where S_t is a random variable (Alaswad and Xiang, 2017).

Often used: Lévy type processes (Applebaum, 2004)

- Independent increments: $S_{t_2} - S_{t_1}, ..., S_{t_n} - S_{t_{n-1}}$ are independent for any $0 < t_1 < t_2 < ... < t_n < \infty$
- Stationary increments: $S_t - S_s$ and S_{t-s} have the same distribution for any $s < t$

Therefore $S_t - S_{t-\Delta t} = D \sim \mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{\Theta}, \Delta t)$, where $\boldsymbol{\Theta}$ are parameters of distribution $\mathcal{D}$.

What is degradation modelling?



A health model based on Lévy processes

Assumption

The health of each unit j can be described by a Lévy process $S_j(t)$ with increments $S_{j,t} - S_{j,t-\Delta t} = D_j \sim \mathcal{D}_j(\boldsymbol{\Theta}, \Delta t)$.

A health model based on Lévy processes

Assumption

The health of each unit j can be described by a Lévy process $S_j(t)$ with increments $S_{j,t} - S_{j,t-\Delta t} = D_j \sim \mathcal{D}_j(\boldsymbol{\Theta}, \Delta t)$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\min_{\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{m},\boldsymbol{h}} \quad & \text{cost}(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{m}, \boldsymbol{h}) \\
\text{s.t.} \quad & \text{process model}(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{m}, \boldsymbol{h}) \\
& \text{maintenance model}(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{m}, \boldsymbol{h}) \\
& S_{j,t} \leq s_j^{max} && \forall t, j \in J \\
& S_{j,t} = \begin{cases} S_{j,t-1} + D_j, & \text{if } m_{j,t} = 0 \\ s_j^0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} && \forall t, j \in J
\end{aligned}
$$

where $m_{j,t} = 1$ if maintenance is performed on unit j at time t.

A health model based on Lévy processes

Assumption (Liao and Tian, 2013)

All relevant operating variables are piecewise constant – i.e. the process has a set of discrete operating modes $k \in K$.

Accounting for effects of process variables

Assumption (Liao and Tian, 2013)

All relevant operating variables are piecewise constant – i.e. the process has a set of discrete operating modes $k \in K$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\min_{\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{m},\boldsymbol{h}} \quad & \mathrm{cost}(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{m}, \boldsymbol{h}) \\
\text{s.t.} \quad & \text{process model}(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{m}, \boldsymbol{h}) \\
& \text{maintenance model}(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{m}, \boldsymbol{h}) \\
& S_{j,t} \leq s_j^{max} && \forall t, j \in J \\
& S_{j,t} = \begin{cases} S_{j,t-1} + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} x_{j,k,t} \cdot D_{j,k}, & \text{if } m_{j,t} = 0 \\ s_j^0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} && \forall t, j \in J
\end{aligned}
$$

where $x_{j,k,t} = 1$ if unit j operates in mode k at time t.

Deriving a robust counterpart (Lappas and Gounaris, 2016)

Idea

Replace random variables $D_{j,k}$ and $S_{j,t}$ by uncertain parameter $\tilde{d}_{j,k} \in \mathcal{U}$ and second stage variable $s_{j,t}(\tilde{d}_{j,k})$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\min_{\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{m},\boldsymbol{h}} \quad & \text{cost}(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{m},\boldsymbol{h}) \\
\text{s.t.} \quad & \text{process model}(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{m},\boldsymbol{h}) \\
& \text{maintenance model}(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{m},\boldsymbol{h}) \\
& s_{j,t}(\tilde{d}_{j,k}) \leq s_j^{max} & \forall t, j \in J \\
& s_{j,t} = \begin{cases} s_{j,t-1} + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} x_{j,k,t} \cdot \tilde{d}_{j,k}, & \text{if } m_{j,t} = 0 \\ s_j^0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} & \forall t, j \in J
\end{aligned}
$$

$\forall \tilde{d}_{j,k} \in \mathcal{U}.$

Deriving a robust counterpart (Lappas and Gounaris, 2016)

Idea

Replace random variables $D_{j,k}$ and $S_{j,t}$ by uncertain parameter $\tilde{d}_{j,k} \in \mathcal{U}$ and second stage variable $s_{j,t}(\tilde{d}_{j,k})$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\min_{\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{m},\boldsymbol{h}} \quad & \text{cost}(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{m},\boldsymbol{h}) \\
\text{s.t.} \quad & \text{process model}(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{m},\boldsymbol{h}) \\
& \text{maintenance model}(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{m},\boldsymbol{h}) \\
& s_{j,t}(\tilde{d}_{j,k}) \leq s_j^{max} && \forall t, j \in J \\
& s_{j,t} = \begin{cases} s_{j,t-1} + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} x_{j,k,t} \cdot \tilde{d}_{j,k}, & \text{if } m_{j,t} = 0 \\ s_j^0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} && \forall t, j \in J
\end{aligned}
$$

$\forall \tilde{d}_{j,k} \in \mathcal{U}$. Approximate $s_{j,t}(\tilde{d}_{j,k})$ by linear decision rule. Utilize Robust Optimization reformulation techniques.

How do we choose $\mathcal{U}$?

Assumption: $\mathcal{U}$ is a box uncertainty set

$$\mathcal{U} = \{\tilde{d}_{j,k} | \bar{d}_{j,k}(1 - \epsilon_{j,k}) \leq \tilde{d}_{j,k} \leq \bar{d}_{j,k}(1 + \epsilon_{j,k})\}$$

How do we choose $\mathcal{U}$?

Assumption: $\mathcal{U}$ is a box uncertainty set

$$\mathcal{U} = \{\tilde{d}_{j,k} | \bar{d}_{j,k}(1-\epsilon_{j,k}) \leq \tilde{d}_{j,k} \leq \bar{d}_{j,k}(1+\epsilon_{j,k})\}$$



Choose $\epsilon_{j,k}$ from distribution $\mathcal{D}_{j,k}$:

$$\epsilon_{j,k} = 1 - F^{-1}(\alpha)/\bar{d}_{j,k}$$

Size of $\mathcal{U}$ depends on a single parameter α!

Case study: State-Task-Network (Kondili et al., 1993)





Case study: State-Task-Network (Kondili et al., 1993)

Biondi, Sand and Harjunkoski (2017) extend the STN to include...

- ...unit health and maintenance scheduling
- ...integrated scheduling and planning
- ...multiple operating modes per task



Case study: State-Task-Network (Kondili et al., 1993)

This work...

- ...replaces their deterministic health model by the proposed approach based on degradation modelling.
- ...utilizes robust optimization to obtain a solution that is likely to remain feasible.



Evaluating solution robustness



The price of robustness



Choosing α is its own optimization problem

We optimize α by solving

$$\min_{\alpha} c^*(\alpha) + \sum_j p_j^f(\alpha) \cdot c_j^f$$

- $c^*(\alpha)$ is the objective value of a MILP solution given α.
- $p_j^f(\alpha)$ is the corresponding probability of failure (of unit j).
- c_j^f is the cost of an unexpected failure.

Choosing α is its own optimization problem

We optimize α by solving

$$\min_{\alpha} c^*(\alpha) + \sum_j p_j^f(\alpha) \cdot c_j^f$$

- $c^*(\alpha)$ is the objective value of a MILP solution given α.
- $p_j^f(\alpha)$ is the corresponding probability of failure (of unit j).
- c_j^f is the cost of an unexpected failure.

Idea: Use Bayesian Optimization (BO)

Both c^* and p_j^f can be viewed as expensive black box functions.
BO is very suitable for this setting (Jones et al., 1998).

Saving time: a deterministic approximation

Assumption

Only the health model depends on $\tilde{d}_{j,k}$ and $\tilde{d}_{j,k} \geq 0$.

Then we can prove that a solution to

$$
\begin{aligned}
\min_{\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{m},\boldsymbol{h}} \quad & \mathrm{cost}(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{m}, \cancel{\boldsymbol{h}}) \\
\text{s.t.} \quad & \text{process model, maint. model}(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{m}, \cancel{\boldsymbol{h}}) \\
& s_{j,t} \leq s_j^{max} && \forall t, j \in J \\
& s_{j,t} = \begin{cases} s_{j,t-1} + \sum\limits_{k \in \mathcal{K}} x_{j,k,t} \cdot d_{j,k}^{max}, & \text{if } m_{j,t} = 0 \\ s_j^0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} && \forall t, j \in J
\end{aligned}
$$

with $d_{j,k}^{max} = \max_{\mathcal{U}} \tilde{d}_{j,k}$ is also feasible in the robust problem.

Saving time: a deterministic approximation



Saving time: data-driven approximations

An upper bound on the probability of failure p_j^f can be estimated from data (using logistic regression).



Saving time: data-driven approximations



Bayesian Optimization



Bayesian Optimization



Conclusion



Degradation Modeling
Historical data
Logistic regression
$\mathcal{D}_{j,k}$
$\eta_{n_{j,k}}, \pi_{k,k^*}$
Robust MILP
Integrated MILP
Health model
Process & maintenance model
$\boldsymbol{x}_j^k$
T_S, T_P
c^*
Freq./Markov chain estimate
or
Rolling horizon
α
p_j^f
Bayesian Optimization: $\min_\alpha c^*(\alpha) + \sum_j c_j^f p_j^f(\alpha)$

Conclusion



Thank You!

Funding: EP/L016796/1, EP/R511961/1 no. 17000145, and EP/P016871/1

Imperial College London

computational optimisation group

HiPEDS

Schlumberger

References

Aguirre, A. M. and Papageorgiou, L. G. (2018). Medium-term optimization-based approach for the integration of production planning, scheduling and maintenance. Computers and Chemical Engineering, 0:1–21.

Alaswad, S. and Xiang, Y. (2017). A review on condition-based maintenance optimization models for stochastically deteriorating system. Reliability Engineering & System Safety, 157:54–63.

Applebaum, D. (2004). Lévy processes-from probability to finance and quantum groups. Notices of the American Mathematical Society, 51(11):1336–1347.

Başçiftci, B., Ahmed, S., Gebraeel, N. Z., and Yildirim, M. (2018). Stochastic Optimization of Maintenance and Operations Schedules under Unexpected Failures. IEEE Transactions on Power Systems, 8950(c):1–1.

Biondi, M., Sand, G., and Harjunkoski, I. (2017). Optimization of multipurpose process plant operations: A multi-time-scale maintenance and production scheduling approach. Computers and Chemical Engineering, 99:325–339.

Jones, D. R., Schonlau, M., and Welch, W. J. (1998). Efficient Global Optimization of Expensive Black-Box Functions. Journal of Global Optimization, 13:455–492.

Kondili, E., Pantelides, C., and Sargent, R. (1993). A general algorithm for short-term scheduling of batch operations - I. MILP formulation. Computers and Chemical Engineering, 17(2):211–227.

Lappas, N. H. and Gounaris, C. E. (2016). Multi-stage adjustable robust optimization for process scheduling under uncertainty. AIChE Journal, 62(5):1646–1667.

Liao, H. and Tian, Z. (2013). A framework for predicting the remaining useful life of a single unit under time-varying operating conditions. IIE Transactions, 45(9):964–980.

Liu, S., Yahia, A., and Papageorgiou, L. G. (2014). Optimal Production and Maintenance Planning of Biopharmaceutical Manufacturing under Performance Decay. Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research, 53(44):17075–17091.

Vassiliadis, C. and Pistikopoulos, E. (2001). Maintenance scheduling and process optimization under uncertainty. Computers and Chemical Engineering, 25(2-3):217–236.

Xenos, D. P., Kopanos, G. M., Cicciotti, M., and Thornhill, N. F. (2016). Operational optimization of networks of compressors considering condition-based maintenance. Computers and Chemical Engineering, 84:117–131.

Yildirim, M., Gebraeel, N. Z., and Sun, X. A. (2017). Integrated Predictive Analytics and Optimization for Opportunistic Maintenance and Operations in Wind Farms. IEEE Transactions on Power Systems, 32(6):4319–4328.

Degradation modelling



Degradation modelling with multiple operating modes



How does robust optimization work?

General idea

- Make constraints hold for all values in $\mathcal{U}$: $\sum_j \tilde{a}_{ij} x_j \leq b_i, \forall \tilde{a}_{ij} \in \mathcal{U}$
- Reformulate semi-infinite constraint:
  $\sum_j a_{ij} x_j + \text{protection}\,(\mathcal{U}) \leq b_i$
- How do we choose the right protection level?

Example: Soyster's method (worst case) [1973]

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{x_1, x_2} \quad & x_1 + x_2 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \tilde{a}_{11} x_1 + \tilde{a}_{12} x_2 \leq b_1, \\ & \forall \tilde{a}_{ij} \in \mathcal{U} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{x_1, x_2} \quad & x_1 + x_2 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & a_{11} x_1 + a_{12} x_2 + \sum_j \hat{a}_{ij} |x_j| \leq b_1 \end{aligned}$$

Given: $[a_{11}, a_{12}] = [1, 2], [\hat{a}_{11}, \hat{a}_{12}] = [0.1, 0.2], [b_1] = [2]$

Formulation

Scheduling

$$M_{j,t}S_{j,0} \leq S_{j,t} \leq S_{j,max} + M_{j,t} \cdot (S_{j,0} - S_{j,max}) \qquad \forall t, j \in J, D \in \mathcal{D}$$

$$S_{j,t} \geq S_{j,t-\Delta t} + \sum_k Z_{j,k,t} D_{j,k,t} + M_{j,t} \cdot (S_{j,0} - S_{j,max}) \qquad \forall t, j \in J, D \in \mathcal{D}$$

$$S_{j,t} \leq S_{j,t-\Delta t} + \sum_k Z_{j,k,t} D_{j,k,t} \qquad \forall t, j \in J, D \in \mathcal{D}$$

Planning

$$S_{j,t} \leq S_{j,max} \qquad \forall t, j \in J$$

$$S_{j,t} \geq S_{j,t-\Delta t} + \sum_k N_{j,k,t} D_{j,k,t} + M_{j,t} \cdot (S_{j,0} - S_{j,max}) \qquad \forall t, j \in J$$

$$S_{j,t} \leq S_{j,t-\Delta t} + \sum_k N_{j,k,t} D_{j,k,t} \qquad \forall t, j \in J$$

Adjustable robust optimization

Affine decision rule

$$S_{j,t} = [S_{j,t}]_0 + \sum_k \sum_{t'=0}^{t} [S_{j,t}]_{k,t'} D_{j,k,t'}. \tag{1}$$

Size of toy problem

	deterministic	robust $D \neq f(t)$	robust $D = f(t)$
# vars	913	3011	27719
# binaries	338	338	338
# constraints	1198	2356	13300
time to solve [s]	2	0.3-10	0.3-10
gap [%]	0	0	0
scheduling periods	30	30	30
planning periods	8	8	8
task-unit-op. mode combinations	6	6	6

Size of realistic problem

	deterministic	robust $D \neq f(t)$	robust $D = f(t)$
# vars	5389		397361
# binaries	2492		2492
# constraints	6798		180858
time to solve [s]	7883		16756
gap [%]	3.62		31.02
scheduling periods	56	56	56
planning periods	24	24	24
task-unit-op. mode combinations	24	24	24

Deriving a robust counterpart

Replace $D_{j,k}$ by an uncertain parameter $\tilde{d}_{j,k}$ bounded by a set $\mathcal{U}$:

$$s_{j,t} \leq s_j^{max} \qquad \forall t, j \in J$$

$$s_{j,t} = \begin{cases} s_{j,t-1} + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} x_{j,k,t} \cdot \tilde{d}_{j,k}, & \text{if } m_{j,t} = 0 \\ s_j^0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \qquad \forall \tilde{d}_{j,k} \in \mathcal{U}, t, j \in J$$

Reformulate:

$$m_{j,t} s_j^0 \leq s_{j,t} \leq s_j^{max} + m_{j,t} \cdot (s_j^0 - s_{j,max}) \qquad \forall t, j \in J, \tilde{d}_{j,k} \in \mathcal{U}$$

$$s_{j,t} \geq s_{j,t-\Delta t} + \sum_k x_{j,k,t} \tilde{d}_{j,k} + m_{j,t} \cdot (s_j^0 - s_j^{max}) \qquad \forall t, j \in J, \tilde{d}_{j,k} \in \mathcal{U}$$

$$s_{j,t} \leq s_{j,t-\Delta t} + \sum_k x_{j,k,t} \tilde{d}_{j,k} \qquad \forall t, j \in J, \tilde{d}_{j,k} \in \mathcal{U},$$

Replace $s_{j,t}$ by linear decision rule $s_{j,t} = [s_{j,t}]_0 + \sum_k [s_{j,t}]_k \tilde{d}_{j,k}$.

Results: metrics data-driven approximation

instance	bound	rms_all	rms_max	p_out
toy	freq	8.00	1.53	29.40
toy	mc	10.41	3.08	21.27
P1	freq	12.61	3.52	17.54
P1	mc	17.25	4.39	9.62
P2	freq	7.40	2.31	18.08
P2	mc	13.68	4.98	10.13
P4	freq	9.17	3.27	47.78
P4	mc	11.43	2.84	32.50
P6	freq	18.75	8.94	12.17
P6	mc	20.84	10.09	10.98
all	freq	11.19	3.91	24.99
all	mc	14.72	5.08	16.90