

Exact and genetic methods for scheduling maintenance tasks for mining equipment

Andrew W. Palmer, Robin Vujanic, Andrew J. Hill, Steven J. Scheduling

August 26, 2016

Abstract

Maintenance scheduling

1 Introduction

Mixed-Integer Linear Program (MILP) formulation.

Genetic Algorithm (GA). The motivation behind developing the GA is that Gurobi was unable to find feasible solutions in many cases, and was unable to improve upon heuristically generated solutions that were provided to it. Thus, the GA approach aims to reliably generate feasible schedules that can be incrementally improved upon.

2 Problem Formulation

An example task with 7 subtasks requiring 5 different types of workers is shown in Figure 1.

Each piece of equipment is a task, and has multiple subtasks.

2.1 Indices

t, s	time period
i	task
j, k	subtask
p	person type




Figure 1: An example task with its subtasks scheduled as early as possible taking into account the precedence constraints. Examples of the precedence constraints seen in this example are the vehicle must be washed before further tasks are performed, and the tyres must be removed to give access to the brakes. 5 different types of people are required (as specified by the colour of the subtask) in the numbers specified in each subtask.

2.2 Parameters

t_{\max}	maximum number of time periods
d_j	the duration of subtask j in time periods
$r_{j,p,s,t}$	the number of people of type p required for subtask j in timestep t if j started in timestep s
$a_{p,t}$	the number of people of type p available in time period t
m	the number of maintenance bays
b_i	ready time for task i
c_i	deadline for task i
J_i	the set of subtasks that belong to task i
M	the set of tasks that require a maintenance bay
K_j	the set of subtasks that must be performed before j
f_i	the weighting applied to the makespan of task i
g_i	the weighting applied to the lateness of task i

2.3 Variables

$x_{j,t}^{\text{start}}$	binary variable that is 1 if subtask j starts in time period t
$x_{i,t}$	binary variable that is 1 if task i is being performed in time period t
$x_{i,t}^{\text{start}}$	binary variable that is 1 if task i starts in time period t
$x_{i,t}^{\text{finish}}$	binary variable that is 1 if task i finishes in time period t
y_i^{makespan}	continuous variable for the makespan of task i
y_i^{lateness}	continuous variable for the lateness of task i

2.4 Objective function

The objective function, outlined in Eq. (1), is to minimise the sum of the weighted makespan and lateness of each task.

$$J = \min \sum_i f_i y_i^{\text{makespan}} + g_i y_i^{\text{lateness}} \quad (1)$$

2.5 Constraints

$$\sum_t x_{j,t}^{\text{start}} = 1 \quad \forall j \quad (2)$$

$$\sum_t (tx_{j,t}^{\text{start}}) + d_j \leq t_{\max} + 1 \quad \forall j \quad (3)$$

$$\sum_t (tx_{j,t}^{\text{start}}) \geq \sum_t (tx_{k,t}^{\text{start}}) + d_k \quad \forall j, k \in K_j \quad (4)$$

$$x_{j,t}^{\text{start}} = 0 \quad \forall i, j \in J_i, k \in K_j, t < b_i + d_k \quad (5)$$

$$\sum_t x_{i,t}^{\text{start}} = 1 \quad \forall i \quad (6)$$

$$\sum_t (tx_{i,t}^{\text{start}}) \leq \sum_t (tx_{j,t}^{\text{start}}) \quad \forall i, j \in J_i \quad (7)$$

$$\sum_t (tx_{i,t}^{\text{start}}) + y_i^{\text{makespan}} \geq \sum_t (tx_{j,t}^{\text{start}}) + d_j \quad \forall i, j \in J_i \quad (8)$$

$$\sum_t x_{i,t}^{\text{finish}} = 1 \quad \forall i \quad (9)$$

$$\sum_t (tx_{i,t}^{\text{finish}}) \geq \sum_t (tx_{i,t}^{\text{start}}) + y_i^{\text{makespan}} \quad \forall i \quad (10)$$

$$y_i^{\text{lateness}} \geq \sum_t (tx_{i,t}^{\text{finish}}) - c_i \quad \forall i \quad (11)$$

$$x_{i,-1} = 0 \quad \forall i \quad (12)$$

$$x_{i,t} = x_{i,t-1} + x_{i,t}^{\text{start}} - x_{i,t}^{\text{finish}} \quad \forall i, t \quad (13)$$

$$\sum_{i \in M} x_{i,t} \leq m \quad \forall t \quad (14)$$

$$\sum_j \sum_{s=\max(0,t-d_j)}^t x_{j,s}^{\text{start}} r_{j,p,s,t} \leq a_{p,t} \quad \forall p, t \quad (15)$$

Constraints (2)-(5) specify when a subtask can start. (3) restricts subtasks to starting at times that ensure it will finish before the maximum time period. (4) enforces the precedence between subtasks. (5) exploits the precedence constraints to reduce the size of the search space by specifying that subtasks can only start after the earliest time the previous subtasks can finish.

Constraints (6)-(13) then deal with the tasks. (7) specifies that the task start time is the minimum of its subtask start times. (8) calculates the makespan of the task. (10) calculates when the task is finished, and (11) calculates the lateness of the task.

(14) enforces a limit on the number of maintenance bays being used in each time period, and (15) enforces a limit on the number of workers of each type being used in each time period.

3 Genetic Algorithm

(ADD REFERENCES)

Genetic algorithms use a population of chromosomes to represent possible solutions to a problem. Each chromosome consists of a set of genes that describe the solution. To create a new generation of chromosomes, chromosomes from the current generation are randomly combined in proportion to their strength or fitness to emulate the process of natural selection. Genes are also randomly mutated to avoid convergence to locally optimal chromosomes. This process is outlined in Figure 2. A common variant to GAs is elitism, in which the best chromosome(s) from the current generation are propagated to the next generation without modification. Elitism guarantees that the solution quality will not decrease.

This section first discusses possible chromosome representations and how a maintenance schedule is generated from a chromosome, before presenting the methods used in each step of the GA.

3.1 Chromosome representation and schedule generation

Several different chromosome representations were considered. An obvious representation to choose is a direct representation, where the genes are integers representing the start times of the tasks or subtasks. However, most of the values that this chromosome representation can take result in infeasible schedules due to the constraints on the number of workers and maintenance bays available. Thus, it was desirable to develop a representation that would reliably produce feasible schedules. The chromosome representation proposed for this is an ordered list of tasks. The tasks are then scheduled using a greedy heuristic in the order specified by the chromosome. The greedy heuristic places the subtasks of each task as early as possible while satisfying the constraints listed in Section 2.5. Provided there is always at least 1 maintenance bay and the minimum number of workers required for any subtasks available in each time period, then this representation is guaranteed to always produce a feasible






Figure 2: Flowchart outlining the steps in the genetic algorithm.



(a) Tasks scheduled in order 1,2



(b) Tasks scheduled in order 2,1

Figure 3: This figure shows two tasks being scheduled by the greedy heuristic. Task 1 becomes available for maintenance in time period 0, and task 2 in time period 2 (denoted by the striped area). The tasks are otherwise identical, consisting of two subtasks that each require 1 worker to complete. The first subtask of each task has a duration of 1 time period, and the second subtask has a duration of 2 time periods. For this example, there is only 1 worker available and the tasks do not require maintenance bays. In (a), the tasks are greedily scheduled in the order 1,2, while in (b) the tasks are greedily scheduled in the order 2,1.

solution. Figure 3 shows the schedules resulting from using the greedy heuristic on the two possible chromosomes for a scenario with two tasks.

The greedy heuristic can fail to produce a feasible schedule in certain cases. For example, if the type of worker required for a specific subtask is only available for a small number of time periods at the beginning of the schedule, and the task requires a maintenance bay, then if the task is too far into the chromosome the greedy heuristic can fail to find a valid spot for the subtasks to be placed.

3.2 Initial population

The characteristics of the initial population of chromosomes can have a large impact on the performance of the algorithm (cite Initial Population for Genetic Algorithms: A Metric Approach by Diaz-Gomez and Hougen). There is a trade-off between having a good initial population, which improves the probability of finding a good solution (citation from Diaz-Gomez pg. 2), and having a diverse initial population, which helps avoid premature convergence (citation from Diaz-Gomez pg. 2). To strike a balance between diversity and quality, two of the

chromosomes in the initial population are selected using heuristics, while the remaining are randomly generated.

The first of the heuristics creates a chromosome by sorting the tasks by their ready times. The reasoning behind this heuristic is that it should avoid situations like Figure 3b where the task with the later ready time is performed in between the subtasks of the other task, leading to a large makespan for that task. The second heuristic is primarily aimed at producing a feasible schedule in scenarios where many of the chromosomes are unable to be converted into a feasible schedule by the greedy heuristic. Tasks that have subtasks that can only be performed in a limited range of times (due to, for example, limitations on the availability of the types of workers required) are placed earlier in the chromosome so that they are likely to be able to be scheduled by the greedy heuristic.

3.3 Calculating the fitness of a chromosome

Two fitness functions were investigated. The first fitness function calculates the fitness of the n -th chromosome, ϕ_n^1 , as:

$$\phi_n^1 = \max\{J_\nu \mid \forall \nu \in \{1, \dots, N\}\} - J_n \quad (16)$$

where N is the number of chromosomes in the population and J_n is calculated using the objective function from Eq. (1). Note that chromosomes that do not result in a feasible schedule do not have an objective value and are not incorporated in the max term. By subtracting from the maximum score, this is an adaptive fitness function—the relative fitness of each chromosome depends on the worst performing chromosome. If the current generation of chromosomes have similar fitness, then it will more strongly favour the fittest chromosome. On the other hand, it does not offer much discrimination between strong chromosomes when the generation has one or more very poor performing chromosomes.

The second function calculates the fitness, ϕ_n^2 , as:

$$\phi_n^2 = \frac{1}{J_n - \sum_i f_i \text{min-makespan}_i} \quad (17)$$

In this formula, the minimum possible makespan cost is subtracted from the value of the objective function. A perfect schedule in which all tasks take the minimum possible time and are completed before their deadlines would therefore result in a denominator value of 0, and a corresponding infinite fitness value. Note that if a perfect schedule is found, this can simply be returned as the best schedule without running the GA to completion.

ϕ_n^2 offers excellent discrimination between chromosomes when the chromosome costs are close to the minimum makespan. However, for larger objective values it is not able to discriminate as easily between chromosomes.

3.4 Parent selection

A pair of parents are randomly selected for each chromosome in the next generation in proportion to their fitness using the roulette wheel selection method (perhaps cite Davis 1991, Handbook of Genetic Algorithms - it is referenced in Deris et al. Ship maintenance by genetic algorithm...). Chromosomes that do not result in feasible schedules do not have a fitness and are not considered as valid parents.

3.5 Crossover

To create a new chromosome from two parents, one of the parents is selected at random to be the dominant parent. Two crossover points in the chromosome are then randomly selected. If the number of tasks between the crossover points is larger than the number of tasks outside the crossover points, then the dominant parent's tasks between the crossover points are copied to the child chromosome. Otherwise, the dominant parent's tasks outside of the crossover points are copied to the child chromosome. The tasks that were not copied across are then greedily placed into the child chromosome in the order in which they appear in the non-dominant parent. Figure 4 shows an example of the crossover process.

3.6 Mutation

The final step in the GA is to mutate the children. A probabilistic check against the mutation rate is performed for each gene in the chromosome. If the check succeeds, then the gene is swapped with another randomly selected gene in the chromosome. The result of this is shown in Figure 4d. In general, the mutation rate should be small as large values can prevent the algorithm from converging (REFERENCE).

4 Computational Study

The mine sites under consideration generated weekly maintenance schedules, and two of these weekly schedules were used to generate the input data used in this paper. Each weekly schedule had just under 100 pieces of equipment that had various services required. Each piece of equipment had between 1 and 50 subtasks, and in total there were approximately 800 subtasks to be performed in each schedule. 25 different types of people were required for performing the work, each with differing availability levels. Some types of people were only available during the day-shift, while others were available during both the day-shift and night-shift, but in different numbers. Some pieces of equipment were serviced in the field while others were serviced in the maintenance shed. It was assumed that the mine site had 5 bays available in the maintenance shed for holding equipment being serviced.

This section first evaluates the performance of the MILP and GA approaches as the number of tasks is varied, followed by a comprehensive comparison of the

Parent 1	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Parent 2	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Child										

(a) Before crossover

Parent 1	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Parent 2	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Child		2	3	4	5	6	7			

(b) Dominant parent's genes copied across

Parent 1	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Parent 2	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Child	10	2	3	4	5	6	7	9	8	1

(c) Non-dominant parent's genes copied across

Child	10	2	3	4	5	6	7	9	8	1
-------	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Mutated	10	2	7	4	5	6	3	9	8	1
---------	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

(d) Mutation

Figure 4: Demonstration of the crossover and mutation process on chromosomes consisting of 10 genes. Parent 1 is selected as the dominant parent, and crossover points between the 1st and 2nd genes, and between the 7th and 8th genes are chosen. In (b), the genes between the crossover points in parent 1 are copied to the child. In (c), the genes not currently in the child chromosome are inserted in the order they appear in parent 2. Finally, in (d), a random mutation swaps the 3rd and 7th genes.




Figure 5: Optimality gap versus number of tasks.

methods on randomly generated datasets. The MILP model was solved using Gurobi (REFERENCE). Unless otherwise specified, a time limit of 600s was used for solving the model in Gurobi. The methods tested were the GA with fitness function 1 (GA1), the GA with fitness function 2 (GA2), the MILP model, and the MILP model which is seeded with an initial solution using a heuristic (MILP+H).

The GA used a population size of 100 chromosomes, 60 generations, a mutation rate of 0.1%, and elitism of 1 chromosome. These values were experimentally found to give good performance. Note that these parameters were not varied for the different fitness functions as the intention is to show the difference due only to the choice of fitness function.

4.1 Varying the number of tasks

The performance of the approaches as the size of the problem is varied was first examined. The optimality gap of the solution produced by each method to the best lower bound calculated by Gurobi. The MILP method was only able to find a solution in the first case of only 15 tasks.

MILP+H with the full number of tasks was run for 6 hours on a machine with 8 cores, and it was unable to improve from the initial solution. In addition, Gurobi was unable to improve upon the lower bound calculated by the initial root relaxation.




Figure 6: Calculation time versus number of tasks.

4.2 Random scenarios

For each of the nine combinations of worker tightness and due date tightness, 100 random scenarios were tested.

MILP found a feasible solution in only 6 of the 900 instances, and in 5 of these instances it was the optimal solution. The heuristic used to seed the MILP+H method failed to produce a feasible solution in 3 of the instances.

The MILP+H method found the optimal solution in 14 cases.

5 Conclusion

Perhaps run multiple GAs in parallel


Consider changing the fitness function depending on the value of the current best cost, or normalise them somehow?

Table 1: Average optimality gap to best known bound for random scenarios


	Due date tightness	Tight	→	Loose
Worker tightness	Method			
Tight	MILP+H	100.1%	100.4%	63.0%
	GA1	48.6%	43.1%	22.1%
	GA2	55.6%	46.6%	24.0%
↓	MILP+H	52.2%	42.7%	20.7%
	GA1	23.5%	15.3%	3.3%
	GA2	25.1%	15.1%	3.6%
Loose	MILP+H	15.3%	16.8%	7.5%
	GA1	5.3%	4.9%	0.3%
	GA2	5.9%	4.9%	0.6%

Table 2: Average performance deficit relative to GA1 for random scenarios. Bold entries are the cases where the GA1 method was outperformed by the respective method.

	Due date tightness	Tight	→	Loose
Worker tightness	Method			
Tight	MILP+H	34.4%	39.2%	32.6%
	GA1	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	GA2	4.9%	2.5%	1.5%
↓	MILP+H	21.6%	22.3%	16.4%
	GA1	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	GA2	1.3%	-0.1%	0.4%
Loose	MILP+H	9.2%	11.0%	7.0%
	GA1	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	GA2	0.5%	0.0%	0.2%



(a) High cost



(b) Low cost

Figure 7: Performance of the GA with fitness function 1 (GA1) and fitness function 2 (GA2) as the number of generations is increased. The minimum, average, and maximum costs in each generation are reported. In (a), the solution costs are significantly higher than the lowest possible schedule cost of approximately 2900, while in (b) the solution costs are very close to it.