

A Robust Approach for Project Scheduling Problem

Xin Shen, Jubiao Yang
advised by: John E. Mitchell

Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
Troy, NY 12180

7th AIMMS-MOPTA Optimization Modeling Competition
Lehigh University, Bethlehem, PA, 2015

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Deterministic Approach
- 3 Robust Scheduling with Bad Luck
- 4 Conclusions

Outline

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Deterministic Approach
- 3 Robust Scheduling with Bad Luck
- 4 Conclusions

Introduction

Objective: to maximize the net present value of the project portfolio (sum of benefits and costs of portfolio projects discounted appropriately with hurdle rate).

Projects may have *dependencies*:

- **nonsimultaneity** (e.g. resource constraints on teams/equipments)
- **single precedence** (e.g. a project is decomposed into phases)
- **alternative precedence** (e.g. parallel-approach effort to overcome technical hurdles)

Introduction

Projects are subject to risks of bad luck (**delay**/**failure**/**delay and failure**).

Deterministic Approach: prepare for a certain bad-luck scenario beforehand (incl. scenario with no bad luck) and suggest a portfolio. disproportionate depreciation of portfolio value can be caused by "chain reaction" of bad lucks, thanks to project dependencies.

Robust Approach: to have the largest portfolio value under the worst possible outcome scenario (resilience to bad luck).

Outline

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Deterministic Approach**
- 3 Robust Scheduling with Bad Luck
- 4 Conclusions

Project dependencies

nonsimultaneity: if $i \approx j$, then $\Delta_{ij} = \Delta_{ji} = -1$

alternative precedence: if $\{i_1, \dots, i_N\} \vdash j$, then

$\Delta_{i_1 j} = \dots = \Delta_{i_N j} =$ a unique positive integer

single precedence: $i \succ j \Leftrightarrow \{i\} \vdash j$, thus a special case of $I \vdash j$ and can be treated the same way

e.g. for a project pool of $\{p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4, p_5\}$ with $p_1 \approx p_2$, $p_2 \approx p_3$, $p_3 \succ p_1$, $p_1 \succ p_4$, $\{p_2, p_5\} \vdash p_4$, $p_3 \succ p_4$, $\{p_1, p_3\} \vdash p_5$:

$$\Delta = \begin{matrix} & p_1 & p_2 & p_3 & p_4 & p_5 \\ \begin{matrix} p_1 \\ p_2 \\ p_3 \\ p_4 \\ p_5 \end{matrix} & \begin{pmatrix} & -1 & & 1 & 1 \\ -1 & & -1 & 2 & \\ 1 & -1 & & 3 & 1 \\ & & & & 2 \\ & & & & \end{pmatrix} \end{matrix}$$

Model

Binary variable X_{jt} :

$$X_{jt} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if Project } j \text{ starts at the beginning of the } i^{\text{th}} \text{ month} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

User-controlled parameters q_j^δ and q_j^f :

$$q_j^\delta = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if knew beforehand that Project } j \text{ would be delayed} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$q_j^f = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if knew beforehand that Project } j \text{ would fail} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Thus the adjusted durations and costs are:

$$\tilde{d}_j = d_j + q_j^\delta d_j^+, \quad \tilde{c}_j = c_j + q_j^f c_j^+, \quad \forall j \in J$$

- a project can start at most once:

$$\sum_{t=1}^T X_{jt} \leq 1 - q_i^f, \forall j \in J$$

- a project cannot start if it cannot complete by the deadline:

$$\sum_{t \geq T+1-\tilde{d}_j} X_{jt} = 0, \forall j \in J$$

- for $i \approx j$, i cannot be started within d_j months after j started, vice versa:

$$\sum_{t-\tilde{d}_j+1 \leq t' \leq t+\tilde{d}_i-1} X_{jt'} + X_{it} \leq 1, \forall i \approx j, \forall t \in \{1, \dots, T\}$$

- a project can start at most once:

$$\sum_{t=1}^T X_{jt} \leq 1 - q_i^f, \forall j \in J$$

- a project cannot start if it cannot complete by the deadline:

$$\sum_{t \geq T+1-\tilde{d}_j} X_{jt} = 0, \forall j \in J$$

- for $i \approx j$, i cannot be started within d_j months after j started, vice versa:

$$\sum_{t-\tilde{d}_j+1 \leq t' \leq t+\tilde{d}_i-1} X_{jt'} + X_{it} \leq 1, \forall i \approx j, \forall t \in \{1, \dots, T\}$$

- a project can start at most once:

$$\sum_{t=1}^T X_{jt} \leq 1 - q_i^f, \forall j \in J$$

- a project cannot start if it cannot complete by the deadline:

$$\sum_{t \geq T+1-\tilde{d}_j} X_{jt} = 0, \forall j \in J$$

- for $i \approx j$, i cannot be started within d_j months after j started, vice versa:

$$\sum_{t-\tilde{d}_j+1 \leq t' \leq t+\tilde{d}_i-1} X_{jt'} + X_{it} \leq 1, \forall i \approx j, \forall t \in \{1, \dots, T\}$$

- for $I \vdash j$, j cannot be started until at least one of the projects in I has been finished:

$$\sum_{i \in I} \sum_{t' \leq t - \tilde{d}_i} X_{it'} \geq X_{jt}, \quad \forall I \vdash j, \quad \forall t \in \{1, \dots, T\}$$

- the objective function can be evaluated:

$$NPV_{\gamma}(S, T) = - \sum_{j,t} \gamma^t \cdot \tilde{c}_j \cdot X_{jt} + \sum_{j,t} \gamma^{t+\tilde{d}_j} \cdot b_j \cdot X_{jt}$$

- for $I \vdash j$, j cannot be started until at least one of the projects in I has been finished:

$$\sum_{i \in I} \sum_{t' \leq t - \tilde{d}_i} X_{it'} \geq X_{jt}, \quad \forall I \vdash j, \quad \forall t \in \{1, \dots, T\}$$

- the objective function can be evaluated:

$$NPV_{\gamma}(S, T) = - \sum_{j,t} \gamma^t \cdot \tilde{c}_j \cdot X_{jt} + \sum_{j,t} \gamma^{t+\tilde{d}_j} \cdot b_j \cdot X_{jt}$$

SDCMPCC formulation

Want to solve:

$$\min_X \{ \text{rank}(X) : X \in \mathcal{C} \text{ and } X \in \mathbb{S}_+^n \}$$

Equivalently:

$$\min_{X,U} \quad n - \langle I, U \rangle$$

$$\text{subject to } X \in \mathcal{C}$$

$$0 \preceq U \preceq I$$

$$0 \preceq X \perp U \preceq 0$$

When X and U p.s.d, $X \perp U$ is equivalent to:

$$\langle X, U \rangle = 0$$

Note that if X has the eigenvalue decomposition,

$$X = P^T \Sigma P$$

then we can choose

$$U = P_0 P_0^T$$

where P_0 is composed of columns in P corresponding to 0 eigenvalue of X .

Thus, it is obvious that $\text{rank}(X) = n - \langle I, U \rangle$.

SDCMPCC formulation

We can apply the SDCMPCC formulation to the general case $X \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ by introducing an auxiliary variable Z :

$$Z = \begin{bmatrix} G & X^T \\ X & B \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0$$

For any X , can find matrix G and B such that $Z \succeq 0$ and $\text{rank}(Z) = \text{rank}(X)$

In the objective, we want to minimize the rank of Z .

Constraint Qualification of SDCMPCC Formulation

Common Constraint qualifications such as LICQ and Robinson CQ are violated for SDCMPCC.

Here we consider **Local Calmness**.

Definition

Suppose that \bar{x} is a local optimal solution to the problem:

$$\underset{x \in \mathcal{X}}{\text{minimize}} \quad f(x) \quad \text{subject to} \quad x \in \mathcal{L} \text{ and } g(x) \in -\mathcal{K} \quad (1)$$

Problem(1) is said to be calm of order $\alpha > 0$ at \bar{x} if there exists $M < \infty$ such that, for any sequence $\{z^q\}$ with $0 \neq z^q \rightarrow 0$ and any sequence $\{x^q\} \subset \mathcal{L}$ satisfying $x^q \rightarrow \bar{x}$ and $g(x^q) \in z^q - \mathcal{K}$, there holds

$$\frac{f(x^q) - f(\bar{x})}{\|z^q\|^\alpha} + M \geq 0 \quad (2)$$

Constraint Qualification of SDCMPCC Formulation

Huang et.al shows that local calmness or order 1 implies the existence of KKT multipliers:

Theorem

Let \bar{x} be a local optimal solution to Problem(1) and (1) is calm of order 1 at \bar{x} . Then, there exists $\mu \in K^$ such that the system:*

$$0 \in \partial f(\bar{x}) + \mu(\nabla g(\bar{x})) + N_{\mathcal{L}}(\bar{x})$$

$$\mu(g(\bar{x})) = 0$$

is consistent. $N_{\mathcal{L}}(\bar{x})$ is the Clarke normal cone of \mathcal{L} at \bar{x} .

Constraint Qualification of SDCMPCC Formulation

Proposition

Calmness of Order 1 holds at each local optimum (\bar{X}, \bar{U}) in the SDCMPCC Formulation.

In the proof, let (X^q, U^q) be a feasible solution to the perturbed SDCMPCC Formulation with perturbation parameter (z^q, r^q, h_1^q, h_2^q) .

Want to show the existence of $M < \infty$ that satisfies:

$$(n- < I, U^q >) - (n- < I, \bar{U} >) \geq -M \|(z^q, r^q, h_1^q, h_2^q)\|$$

for any $(X^q, U^q) \rightarrow (\bar{X}, \bar{U})$.

An upper bound of $n- < I, \bar{U} >$ is $\text{rank}(\bar{X})$.

Sketch of Proof

Want to get a lower bound for $n - \langle I, U^q \rangle$. (X^q, U^q) is feasible to the perturbed problem:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \underset{X, U \in \mathbb{S}^n}{\text{minimize}} && n - \langle I, U \rangle \\
 & \text{subject to} && X + z^q \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}} \cap \mathcal{S}_+^n \\
 & && - \langle X, U \rangle \leq r^q \\
 & && \langle X, U \rangle \leq r^q \\
 & && I - U \succeq -h_1^q I \\
 & && U \succeq -h_2^q I
 \end{aligned}$$

The lower bound can be acquired by fixing $X = X^q$ in the perturbed problem.

Sketch of Proof

By fixing $X = X^q$ we can get the following problem:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \underset{U \in \mathbb{S}^n}{\text{minimize}} && n - \langle I, U \rangle \\
 & \text{subject to} && -\langle X^q, U \rangle \leq r^q, && y_1 \\
 & && \langle X^q, U \rangle \leq r^q, && y_2 \\
 & && I - U \succeq -h_1^q I, && \Omega_1 \\
 & && U \succeq -h_2^q I, && \Omega_2
 \end{aligned}$$

where $y_1, y_2, \Omega_1, \Omega_2$ are the Lagrangian multipliers for the corresponding constraints.

U^q is feasible to the above problem.

Slater condition holds for the above problem. Can find a lower bound the objective by **Strong Duality**

Sketch of Proof

The dual problem is:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \underset{y_1, y_2 \in \mathbb{R}, \Omega_1, \Omega_2 \in \mathbb{S}^n}{\text{maximize}} && n + r^q y_1 + r^q y_2 - (1 + h_1^q) \text{trace}(\Omega_1) - h_2^q \text{trace}(\Omega_2) \\
 & \text{subject to} && -y_1 X^q + y_2 X^q - \Omega_1 + \Omega_2 = -I \\
 & && y_1, y_2 \leq 0 \\
 & && \Omega_1, \Omega_2 \succeq 0
 \end{aligned}$$

By diagonalizing X^q we can get a tightened problem:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \underset{y_1, y_2 \in \mathbb{R}, f, g \in \mathbb{R}^n}{\text{maximize}} && n + r^q y_1 + r^q y_2 - (1 + h_1^q) \sum_i f_i - h_2^q \sum_i g_i \\
 & \text{subject to} && -y_1 \lambda_i^q + y_2 \lambda_i^q - f_i + g_i = -1, \forall i = 1 \dots n \\
 & && y_1, y_2 \leq 0 \\
 & && f_i, g_i \geq 0, \forall i = 1 \dots n
 \end{aligned}$$

Sketch of Proof

Since $X^q \rightarrow \bar{X}$, $\lambda_i^q \rightarrow \lambda_i$. Can get a lower bound for the objective of the dual problem, which is:

$$\text{rank}(X) - \frac{2r^q}{\tilde{\lambda}} - (n - \text{rank}(X))(h_1^q + (1 + h_1^q)\frac{2}{\tilde{\lambda}}\|z^q\|) - \frac{h_2^q}{\tilde{\lambda}}\|\bar{X}\|^*$$

where $\tilde{\lambda}$ is the smallest positive eigenvalue of \bar{X} . We can take

$$M = \frac{2}{\tilde{\lambda}} + \frac{1}{\tilde{\lambda}}\|\bar{X}\|^* + (n - \text{rank}(X))(1 + \frac{4}{\tilde{\lambda}})$$

KKT Condition of SDCMPCC Formulation

Given $\mathcal{C} = \{X \mid \langle A_i, X \rangle \geq b_i, \forall i = 1 \dots p\}$

The KKT condition is:

$$\begin{aligned}
 0 &\preceq U \quad \perp \quad -I + \mu X + Y \succeq 0 \\
 0 &\preceq X \quad \perp \quad -\sum \lambda_i A_i + \mu U \succeq 0 \\
 0 &\preceq Y \quad \perp \quad I - U \succeq 0 \\
 0 &\leq \lambda_i \quad \perp \quad b_i - \langle A_i, X \rangle \geq 0, \forall i = 1 \dots p
 \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

Where λ, μ and Y are lagrangian multipliers corresponding to the constraints $A(X) = b$, $\langle X, U \rangle = 0$ and $I - U \succeq 0$ respectively.

Any feasible pair (X, U) with U given by $P_0 P_0^T$ with columns of P_0 to be the eigenvectors in the null space of X , is a KKT stationary point of the SDCMPCC Formulation.

Outline

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Deterministic Approach
- 3 Robust Scheduling with Bad Luck**
- 4 Conclusions

Outline

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Deterministic Approach
- 3 Robust Scheduling with Bad Luck
- 4 Conclusions**