

Managing Airline Delay Uncertainty by Adjusting Connection Slacks

A Stochastic Programming Approach

Sujeevraja Sanjeevi¹ Saravanan Venkatachalam²

¹Team Lead Operations Research
Sabre, TX, USA

²Assistant Professor
Wayne State University, MI, USA

INFORMS, October 2019

Contents

Introduction

Model

Decomposition Framework

Computational results

Summary

Table of Contents

Introduction

Model

Decomposition Framework

Computational results

Summary

Delays

- ▶ Domestic flight delay impact to the U.S. economy is **\$32.9 billion**, **Ann Brody Guy 2010**.
- ▶ **988,043 (19.95%)** flights of reporting carriers with arrival delays in 2019, **Bureau of Transportation Statistics 2019**.
- ▶ In Europe, en route delays doubled in 2018 compared with 2017, to more than **19 million minutes**, **IATA 2019**.

Managing Delays

Research Motivation

- ▶ Re-timing flights is expensive on day-of-ops.
- ▶ Account for uncertain delays when planning.
- ▶ Delay-friendly schedule.

Classifying flight delays

- ▶ Primary delay: independent of routing.
- ▶ Propagated delay: caused by up-stream flights.

Literature

- ▶ Lan, Clarke, and Barnhart 2006
 - ▶ Minimize $\mathbb{E}(\textit{propagated delays})$ on selected routes.
 - ▶ Discrete delay copies.
- ▶ Dunbar, Froyland, and Wu 2014
 - ▶ Minimize $\mathbb{E}(\textit{propagated delays})$ on selected routes.
 - ▶ Iterate between delay propagation, routing and crew planning.
- ▶ Yan and Kung 2016
 - ▶ Robust optimization.
 - ▶ Minimize maximal total propagated delay.

Our Contributions

- ▶ Balance cheap rescheduling today and costly uncertain routing/rescheduling tomorrow.
- ▶ Two-stage stochastic programming model.
- ▶ Solution framework with L-shaped method and column generation.
- ▶ Extensive computational study.

Table of Contents

Introduction

Model

Decomposition Framework

Computational results

Summary

Two Stage Model (TSM)

$$\begin{array}{lll} \text{Min} & c^T x + \mathbb{E}_{\Omega}[\phi(x, \omega)] & \\ \text{s.t} & x_i \leq s_{ij} + x_j, & (i, j) \in A^{orig} \\ & \sum_{f \in F} x_f \leq b, & \\ & x_f \in \mathbb{Z} \cap [0, l]. & f \in F \end{array}$$

- ▶ x_f : reschedule time of flight f
- ▶ $s_{ij} = dep_j - (arr_i + turn_{ij})$
- ▶ Ω : delay scenarios
- ▶ $\mathbb{E}_{\Omega}[\phi(x, \omega)] = \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} p^{\omega} \phi(x, \omega)$

Recourse Model

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(x, \omega) = \text{Min} \quad & e^T z^\omega \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_{r \in RT_i^\omega} y_r^\omega = 1, & i \in T, \\ & \sum_{r \in RF_f^\omega} y_r^\omega = 1, & f \in F, \\ & \sum_{r \in RF_f^\omega} pd_{rf}^\omega y_r^\omega - x_f \leq z_f^\omega & f \in F, \\ & z_f^\omega \geq 0, \quad f \in F, y_r^\omega \in \{0, 1\}, \quad r \in R^\omega \end{aligned}$$

- ▶ z_f^ω : excess delay of flight f .
- ▶ y_r^ω : 1 if route r is selected, 0 otherwise.
- ▶ $pd_{ij}^\omega = (pd_{ri}^\omega + d_i^\omega - s_{ij})_+$.

Recourse Model with Expected Excess

$$\begin{aligned}\phi(x, \omega) = \text{Min} \quad & e^T z^\omega + \lambda v^\omega \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_{r \in RT_i^\omega} y_r^\omega = 1, & i \in T, \\ & \sum_{r \in RF_f^\omega} y_r^\omega = 1, & f \in F, \\ & \sum_{r \in RF_f^\omega} p d_{rf}^\omega y_r^\omega - x_f \leq z_f^\omega & f \in F, \\ & c^T x + e^T z^\omega - \alpha \leq v^\omega, \\ & z_f^\omega \geq 0, f \in F, y_r^\omega \in \{0, 1\}, r \in R^\omega, v^\omega \geq 0\end{aligned}$$

- ▶ v^ω : excess cost.
- ▶ λ : risk aversion, α : risk target.
- ▶ minimizes $c^T x + \mathbb{E}_\Omega[(\phi(x, \omega) - \alpha)_+]$

Mean Delay Model (MDM)

$$\begin{array}{ll}\text{Minimize} & c^T x + e^T z^{\bar{\omega}} \\ \text{s.t.} & x_i \leq s_{ij} + x_j, \quad (i,j) \in A^{\text{orig}}, \\ & \sum_{f \in F} x_f \leq b, \\ & pd_f^{\bar{\omega}} - x_f \leq z_f^{\bar{\omega}}, \quad f \in F, \\ & z_f^{\bar{\omega}} \geq 0, x_f \in \mathbb{Z} \cap [0, l], \quad f \in F.\end{array}$$

- ▶ $\bar{\omega}$: scenario with average delays.
- ▶ $pd_f^{\bar{\omega}}$: propagated delay on original route.

Table of Contents

Introduction

Model

Decomposition Framework

Computational results

Summary

Decomposition Framework

Algorithm *L-shaped algorithm*

Solve master problem (MP) to obtain initial solution x^0

Set $UB \leftarrow \infty$, $LB \leftarrow -\infty$, $k \leftarrow 0$

while $UB - LB > \epsilon$ **do**

Find $\phi(x^k, \omega)$ for $\omega \in \Omega$ (in parallel)

$UB \leftarrow \min(UB, \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} p_{\omega} \phi(x^k, \omega))$

Add Benders cut(s) and solve MP (single/multi cut)

Update $z^* \leftarrow z^k$ and $x^* \leftarrow x^k$

$LB \leftarrow \max(LB, MP \text{ objective})$, $k \leftarrow k + 1$

end while

- $\phi(x, \omega)$: solved with column generation.

Table of Contents

Introduction

Model

Decomposition Framework

Computational results

Summary

Data

Table: Flight Networks

<i>Name</i>	<i>Flights</i>	<i>Aircraft</i>	<i>Paths</i>
s1	210	41	48,674
s2	248	67	20,908
s3	112	17	39,242
s4	110	17	56,175
s5	80	13	190,540

Parameters (data)

- ▶ Delayed flights: **hub**, rush (first quarter of day)
- ▶ Distributions: **log-normal**, exponential, truncated normal
- ▶ Means: **15**, 30, 45, 60 minutes
- ▶ Budgets: 0.25, **0.5**, 0.75, 1, 2 times average primary delay
- ▶ Flight reschedule limit: 30 minutes

Parameters (algorithm)

- ▶ Benders iterations: 30
- ▶ Parallel solvers: 30
- ▶ Number of recourse scenarios: 30
- ▶ Number of simulation scenarios: 100
- ▶ Column selection: first 10, best 10, all, full enumeration
- ▶ L-shaped cuts: single cut, multi cut

Computational Setup

- ▶ Language: Java
- ▶ Solver: CPLEX 12.9
- ▶ System:
 - ▶ Intel(R) Xeon(R) CPU E5-2640
 - ▶ 80 GB RAM
 - ▶ 8 cores, 16 logical cores
- ▶ Parallelism: Akka actor framework (<https://akka.io>)

Quality and Performance

<i>Delays</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Time</i>	<i>Gap (%)</i>	<i>Opt gap (%)</i>	<i>Cuts</i>	<i>Iter</i>
Hub	s1	78.42	0.35	3.42	886	30
	s2	53.94	2	3.87	900	30
	s3	15.94	0	0	93	6
	s4	14.04	0.05	7.61	304	15
	s5	73.16	0	6.18	352	16
Rush	s1	90.64	0.09	7.52	861	30
	s2	71.07	0.5	7.94	888	30
	s3	11.73	0.03	8.75	79	4
	s4	6.37	0	0.41	115	6
	s5	47.92	0	0.09	188	8

Changing Budgets

Table: Propagated delay improvement for budget fraction 0.25

<i>Name</i>	<i>Original</i>	<i>MDM</i>	<i>RR (%)</i>	<i>TSM</i>	<i>RR (%)</i>
s1	845	628.06	25.67	562.57	33.42
s2	850.82	611.65	28.11	520.17	38.86
s3	50.24	26.88	46.5	15.68	68.79
s4	219.37	145.93	33.48	135.86	38.07
s5	254.29	215.02	15.44	160.18	37.01

Changing Budgets

Table: Propagated delay improvement for budget fraction 0.5

<i>Name</i>	<i>Original</i>	<i>MDM</i>	<i>RR (%)</i>	<i>TSM</i>	<i>RR (%)</i>
s1	836.37	474.79	43.23	406.51	51.4
s2	844.62	416.29	50.71	363.95	56.91
s3	42.45	19.89	53.14	8.6	79.74
s4	232.55	150.1	35.45	117.32	49.55
s5	250.1	123.74	50.52	115.61	53.77

Changing Budgets

Table: Propagated delay improvement for budget fraction 0.75

<i>Name</i>	<i>Original</i>	<i>MDM</i>	<i>RR (%)</i>	<i>TSM</i>	<i>RR (%)</i>
s1	861.65	373.57	56.64	365.71	57.56
s2	868.94	345.26	60.27	303.68	65.05
s3	46.81	25.88	44.71	11.76	74.88
s4	218.15	132.55	39.24	87.93	59.69
s5	242.06	116.37	51.93	102.03	57.85

Changing Budgets

Table: Propagated delay improvement for budget fraction 1

<i>Name</i>	<i>Original</i>	<i>MDM</i>	<i>RR (%)</i>	<i>TSM</i>	<i>RR (%)</i>
s1	832.36	349.93	57.96	272.63	67.25
s2	829.33	316.21	61.87	209.45	74.74
s3	49.48	29.62	40.14	19.71	60.17
s4	233.37	155.23	33.48	106.54	54.35
s5	246.86	123.38	50.02	89.9	63.58

Changing Budgets

Table: Propagated delay improvement for budget fraction 2

<i>Name</i>	<i>Original</i>	<i>MDM</i>	<i>RR (%)</i>	<i>TSM</i>	<i>RR (%)</i>
s1	849.18	351.68	58.59	238.15	71.96
s2	851.63	344.38	59.56	222.88	73.83
s3	49.12	28.81	41.35	16.94	65.51
s4	222.53	144.08	35.25	95.3	57.17
s5	243.47	116.92	51.98	79.63	67.29

Changing Distributions

Table: Propagated delay improvement for *Exponential*(30)

<i>Name</i>	<i>Original</i>	<i>MDM</i>	<i>RR (%)</i>	<i>TSM</i>	<i>RR (%)</i>
s1	2050.08	1562.11	23.8	1230.08	40
s2	1993.59	1336.85	32.94	1107.84	44.43
s3	141.43	87.52	38.12	55.89	60.48
s4	701.25	434.87	37.99	391.68	44.15
s5	599.99	411.45	31.42	330.68	44.89

Changing Distributions

Table: Propagated delay improvement for $LogNormal(30, 15)$

<i>Name</i>	<i>Original</i>	<i>MDM</i>	<i>RR (%)</i>	<i>TSM</i>	<i>RR (%)</i>
s1	1966.24	1233.31	37.28	867.31	55.89
s2	1849.07	999.45	45.95	663.77	64.1
s3	116.12	46.47	59.98	24.7	78.73
s4	575.49	223.43	61.18	203.98	64.56
s5	557.96	310.85	44.29	209.47	62.46

Changing Distributions

Table: Propagated delay improvement for *TruncNormal*(30, 15)

<i>Name</i>	<i>Original</i>	<i>MDM</i>	<i>RR (%)</i>	<i>TSM</i>	<i>RR (%)</i>
s1	2008.96	1204.15	40.06	903.91	55.01
s2	1919.41	900.75	53.07	693.99	63.84
s3	115.87	39.72	65.72	18.16	84.33
s4	615.21	248.11	59.67	207.77	66.23
s5	580.18	378.54	34.75	210.44	63.73

Changing Means

Table: Propagated delay improvement for *Exponential*(15)

<i>Name</i>	<i>Original</i>	<i>MDM</i>	<i>RR (%)</i>	<i>TSM</i>	<i>RR (%)</i>
s1	860.29	521.5	39.38	472.28	45.1
s2	853.49	453.26	46.89	395.58	53.65
s3	42.41	23.41	44.8	9.34	77.98
s4	235.08	155.06	34.04	122.52	47.88
s5	252.87	149.5	40.88	122.54	51.54

Changing Means

Table: Propagated delay improvement for *Exponential*(45)

<i>Name</i>	<i>Original</i>	<i>MDM</i>	<i>RR (%)</i>	<i>TSM</i>	<i>RR (%)</i>
s1	3504.48	2554.76	27.1	2286.38	34.76
s2	3079.29	1930.02	37.32	1818.79	40.93
s3	267.3	166.12	37.85	142.39	46.73
s4	1199.09	762.59	36.4	703.14	41.36
s5	1042.92	723.06	30.67	653.13	37.37

Changing Means

Table: Propagated delay improvement for *Exponential*(60)

<i>Name</i>	<i>Original</i>	<i>MDM</i>	<i>RR (%)</i>	<i>TSM</i>	<i>RR (%)</i>
s1	5247.03	3922.66	25.24	3715.71	29.18
s2	4674.16	3045.3	34.85	2938.05	37.14
s3	412.07	280.51	31.93	257.87	37.42
s4	1825.04	1322.64	27.53	1168.95	35.95
s5	1437.66	1138.58	20.8	958.5	33.33

Column Selection

Table: Time comparison for column generation strategies

<i>Name</i>	<i>Enumeration</i>	<i>All paths</i>	<i>Best paths</i>	<i>First paths</i>
s1	958.58	112.33	75.61	77.45
s2	161.19	63.45	47.46	49.87
s3	170.61	19.64	9.87	9.49
s4	417.46	28.32	15.20	14.28
s5	3086.92	121.61	65.81	69.34

Parallelism

Table: Run-time comparison for parallel sub-problems

<i>Name</i>	<i>Number of parallel solvers</i>			
	<i>1</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>30</i>
s1	692.71	123.49	98.63	77.88
s2	402.31	74.53	60.54	48.52
s3	64.64	12.58	10.16	8.00
s4	117.12	22.50	18.53	14.40
s5	607.55	104.76	88.55	74.04

Single vs Multi Cut

Table: Comparison of single vs multi cut L-shaped method

<i>Name</i>	<i>Multi-cut</i>			<i>Single-cut</i>		
	<i>Time</i>	<i>Gap</i>	<i>Iter</i>	<i>Time</i>	<i>Gap</i>	<i>Iter</i>
s1	686.81	0.4	30	708.91	24.28	30
s2	406.39	2.51	30	455.63	33.08	30
s3	58.16	0	4.8	214.2	0	19.6
s4	105.99	0.01	14	223.77	11.88	30
s5	579.02	0.03	14.4	1172.27	12.36	30

Column Caching

Table: Time comparison for caching columns between iterations

<i>Instance</i>	<i>Caching</i>	<i>No caching</i>
s1	686.78	715.77
s2	399.28	422.96
s3	62.31	61.52
s4	112.8	105.6
s5	615.87	585.76

Table of Contents

Introduction

Model

Decomposition Framework

Computational results

Summary

Summary

- ▶ Two-stage stochastic programming model to manage uncertain delays.
- ▶ Differentiates (planning) rescheduling and (day-of-ops) delay costs.
- ▶ Significant delay improvements over wide range of data.
- ▶ Recommended parameters to improve run-times.

References



Ann Brody Guy. *Flight delays cost more than just time*. 2010.



Bureau of Transportation Statistics. *On Time Performance - Flight Delays at a Glance*. 2019.



Michelle Dunbar, Gary Froyland, and Cheng-Lung Wu. “An integrated scenario-based approach for robust aircraft routing, crew pairing and re-timing”. In: *Computers & Operations Research* 45 (2014), pp. 68–86.



IATA. *Annual Review*. 2019.



Shan Lan, John-Paul Clarke, and Cynthia Barnhart. “Planning for robust airline operations: Optimizing aircraft routings and flight departure times to minimize passenger disruptions”. In: *Transportation science* 40.1 (2006), pp. 15–28.



Chiwei Yan and Jerry Kung. “Robust aircraft routing”. In: *Transportation Science* 52.1 (2016), pp. 118–133.