

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
- 4 Computational Experiment

Outline

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Deterministic Approach
- 3 Robust Scheduling
- 4 Computational Experiment

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 a technical hurdle)

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 schedule 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
- 4 Computational Experiment

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} :

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

User-controlled binary 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:

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

Formulation

- a project can start at most once:

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

- 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 \tilde{d}_j months after j started, and vice versa:

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

Formulation

- a project can start at most once:

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

- 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 \tilde{d}_j months after j started, and vice versa:

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

Formulation

- a project can start at most once:

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

- 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 \tilde{d}_j months after j started, and vice versa:

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

Formulation

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

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

- the objective function can be evaluated:

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

Formulation

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

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

- the objective function can be evaluated:

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

Outline

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Deterministic Approach
- 3 Robust Scheduling**
- 4 Computational Experiment

Problem Description

Define:

$$I_f = \{\text{Project that fails}\}$$

$$I_\delta = \{\text{Project that delays but succeeds}\}$$

$$I_{f|\delta} = \{\text{Project that delays and then fails}\}$$

Each project has probabilities to delay, to fail, or to delay and then fail. The cost of each occurrence of bad luck can be calculated from these probabilities. The total cost must be less than or equal to the bad luck budget.

Given a bad luck budget W , want to find a schedule (S, T) that yields the largest NPV in the worst case.

$$\max_{S, T} \min_{I_f, I_\delta, I_{f|\delta}} NPV'_\gamma(S, T, I_f, I_\delta, I_{f|\delta})$$

Adaptive Scheduling

The schedule will be updated once any bad luck happens. The purpose is to reduce the loss.

Assumptions:

- Bad Luck only happens to a project at its scheduled ending time.
- Only projects that are scheduled to start at and after the time of bad luck can be updated.
- When updating the schedule, we don't take future bad luck into account.

Adaptive Scheduling

The schedule will be updated once any bad luck happens. The purpose is to reduce the loss.

Assumptions:

- Bad Luck only happens to a project at its scheduled ending time.
- Only projects that are scheduled to start at and after the time of bad luck can be updated.
- When updating the schedule, we don't take future bad luck into account.

Adaptive Scheduling

The schedule will be updated once any bad luck happens. The purpose is to reduce the loss.

Assumptions:

- Bad Luck only happens to a project at its scheduled ending time.
- Only projects that are scheduled to start at and after the time of bad luck can be updated.
- When updating the schedule, we don't take future bad luck into account.

Adaptive Scheduling

Example:

$$1 \succ 2 \succ 3 \text{ and } c_1 = c_2 = c_3 = 1$$

$$b_1 = b_2 = 0, b_3 = 10, d_1 = d_2 = d_3 = 12$$

The deadline is Month 36




Figure: Initial Schedule

Adaptive Scheduling




Figure: Project 2 delayed by 2 months

Project 3 cannot be completed by the deadline.




Figure: Updated Schedule after Delay

Delete Project 3 in the updated schedule.

Adaptive Scheduling

Given an initial schedule (S, T) and a triple of bad luck $(l_f, l_\delta, l_{f|\delta})$, can simulate and get a final realization (S', T') by solving a series of optimization problems.

General Framework

We use a **Solve and Robustify** approach to find a robust schedule.

Data: Initial Schedule (S, T) , budget of bad luck W

while *Stopping Criteria not satisfied* **do**

 Find $(l_f, l_\delta, l_{f|\delta})$ in the worst case scenario under **Adaptive Scheduling**;

 Robustify (S, T) based upon $(l_f, l_\delta, l_{f|\delta})$;

end

Output (S, T)

The initial schedule can be the solution in the simple case.

Estimation of Worst Case Scenario

Given the budget W , want to find a triple of bad luck $(l_f, l_\delta, l_{f|\delta})$ that maximizes the loss.

Cannot incorporate adaptive scheduling into a single optimization problem.

Brute-force approach: Try every combination of $(l_f, l_\delta, l_{f|\delta})$ and pick the one that yields the maximum loss. Computationally infeasible.

Estimation of Worst Case Scenario

- Our approach: Greedy Heuristics.
- Pros: Computationally efficient. Can get a bad scenario and identify critical projects in a reasonable amount of time.
- Cons: No proof for the optimality of $(l_f, l_\delta, l_{f|\delta})$.

Estimation of Worst Case Scenario

- Our approach: Greedy Heuristics.
- Pros: Computationally efficient. Can get a bad scenario and identify critical projects in a reasonable amount of time.
- Cons: No proof for the optimality of $(l_f, l_\delta, l_{f|\delta})$.

Estimation of Worst Case Scenario

- Our approach: Greedy Heuristics.
- Pros: Computationally efficient. Can get a bad scenario and identify critical projects in a reasonable amount of time.
- Cons: No proof for the optimality of $(l_f, l_\delta, l_{f|\delta})$.

Estimation of Worst Case Scenario

Data: Initial Schedule (S, T) , budget of bad luck $W, (l_f, l_\delta, l_{f|\delta}) = \emptyset$

Result: Triple of bad luck in the worst case $(l_f, l_\delta, l_{f|\delta})$

while *The bad luck budget is not used up* **do**

 Add the project with type of bad luck that yields the maximum loss into the triple $(l_f, l_\delta, l_{f|\delta})$.

end

Robustification of Schedule

After getting the triple $(I_f, I_\delta, I_{f|\delta})$ in the worst case scenario, can take the following measures to robustify the schedule:

- If Project i fails in the worst case scenario:
 - ▶ i is in set I with $I \vdash j$. Add another project $k \in I$ to the schedule.
 - ▶ Delete Project i .
- If Project i is delayed in the worst case scenario:
 - ▶ Move the starting time of i forward if possible.
 - ▶ Delete Project i .

Robustification of Schedule

After getting the triple $(I_f, I_\delta, I_{f|\delta})$ in the worst case scenario, can take the following measures to robustify the schedule:

- If Project i fails in the worst case scenario:
 - ▶ i is in set I with $I \vdash j$. Add another project $k \in I$ to the schedule.
 - ▶ Delete Project i .
- If Project i is delayed in the worst case scenario:
 - ▶ Move the starting time of i forward if possible.
 - ▶ Delete Project i .

Robustification of Schedule

After getting the triple $(I_f, I_\delta, I_{f|\delta})$ in the worst case scenario, can take the following measures to robustify the schedule:

- If Project i fails in the worst case scenario:
 - ▶ i is in set I with $I \vdash j$. Add another project $k \in I$ to the schedule.
 - ▶ Delete Project i .
- If Project i is delayed in the worst case scenario:
 - ▶ Move the starting time of i forward if possible.
 - ▶ Delete Project i .

Robustification of Schedule

After getting the triple $(I_f, I_\delta, I_{f|\delta})$ in the worst case scenario, can take the following measures to robustify the schedule:

- If Project i fails in the worst case scenario:
 - ▶ i is in set I with $I \vdash j$. Add another project $k \in I$ to the schedule.
 - ▶ Delete Project i .
- If Project i is delayed in the worst case scenario:
 - ▶ Move the starting time of i forward if possible.
 - ▶ Delete Project i .

Robustification of Schedule

After getting the triple $(I_f, I_\delta, I_{f|\delta})$ in the worst case scenario, can take the following measures to robustify the schedule:

- If Project i fails in the worst case scenario:
 - ▶ i is in set I with $I \vdash j$. Add another project $k \in I$ to the schedule.
 - ▶ Delete Project i .
- If Project i is delayed in the worst case scenario:
 - ▶ Move the starting time of i forward if possible.
 - ▶ Delete Project i .

Robustification of Schedule

After getting the triple $(I_f, I_\delta, I_{f|\delta})$ in the worst case scenario, can take the following measures to robustify the schedule:


- If Project i fails in the worst case scenario:
 - ▶ i is in set I with $I \vdash j$. Add another project $k \in I$ to the schedule.
 - ▶ Delete Project i .
- If Project i is delayed in the worst case scenario:
 - ▶ Move the starting time of i forward if possible.
 - ▶ Delete Project i .

Outline


- 1 Introduction
- 2 Deterministic Approach
- 3 Robust Scheduling
- 4 Computational Experiment**

Small-size Example


The small-size Example contains 13 projects. We test various choices of bad luck budget W and hurdle rate γ .




(a) Initial Schedule



(b) Initial Worst Case




(c) Robust Schedule




(d) Robust Worst Case

Figure: $W = 1.4$, $\gamma = 0.99$


Small-size Example




(a) Initial Schedule



(b) Initial Worst Case




(c) Robust Schedule




(d) Robust Worst Case

Figure: $W = 2.5$, $\gamma = 0.99$


Small-size Example




(a) Initial Schedule



(b) Initial Worst Case



(c) Robust Schedule




(d) Robust Worst Case

Figure: $W = 2.5$, $\gamma = 0.95$

Large-size Example

- The large-size example contains 77 projects.
- We assume the hurdle rate is high and only considers project failure in the worst case scenario.
- We approximate the loss incurred by the failure on each project in the greedy heuristic.

Large-size Example



Graphical User Interface

hurdle rate = 0.990
 Input hurdle rate

Initialize with Data Sets 1 and 2
 Initialize with Data Set 3

Run Program

Deterministic Approach

Schedule with none/known bad luck

Total Benefit 8.403

What if projects delay?
☒ Job_9
☒ Job_1
☒ Job_2
☒ Job_3
☐ Job_4
☐ Job_5
☐ Job_6
☐ Job_7

What if projects fail?
☒ Job_9
☒ Job_1
☒ Job_2
☒ Job_3
☐ Job_4
☐ Job_5
☐ Job_6
☐ Job_7

Clear What-if Selections

Legend:
Schedule/On Schedule
Delayed
Failed
Delayed and Failed

Robust Approach

Approach 1: Initial Schedule

Total Benefit 11.948

Worst Possible Outcome of Approach 1

Total Benefit -0.285

Approach 2: Robust Schedule

Total Benefit 9.370

Worst Possible Outcome of Approach 2

Total Benefit 9.370

bad luck budget = 1.400

Input bad luck budget

Thank you!