

## Exercise: Solving an IP formulation for Open Pit Mine Production Scheduling

In this exercise, we will implement an IP formulation for the *Open Pit Mine Production Scheduling Problem* (OPMPSP) using the SCIP callable library. We are given the following data:

- a number of time periods  $T$  with uniform discount factor  $\delta$  per period,
- a block model with block indices in  $\mathcal{N} = \{1, \dots, N\}$ ,
- for each block  $i \in \mathcal{N}$ :
  - a set  $\mathcal{P}(i)$  of immediate predecessors,
  - the amount of rock  $R_i$  contained in block  $i$ ,
  - the cost  $m_i$  of mining block  $i$ ,
  - the profit  $p_i$  from processing block  $i$ ,
- and mining and processing capacities  $M$  and  $P$  per period.

To model mining (i.e. excavation) and processing decisions, we use variables

- $x_{i,t} \in \{0, 1\}$       equal to 1 iff block  $i$  is mined within periods  $1, \dots, t$ , and  
 $z_{i,t} \in [0, 1]$       as the fraction of block  $i$  sent for processing in period  $t$ .

Then a simple IP formulation for the OPMPSP reads

$$\max \sum_{t=1}^T \delta^{t-1} \sum_{i=1}^N [-m_i(x_{i,t} - x_{i,t-1}) + p_i z_{i,t}]$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad x_{i,t-1} \leq x_{i,t} \quad \text{for } i \in \mathcal{N}, t = 2, \dots, T, \quad (1)$$

$$x_{i,t} \leq x_{k,t} \quad \text{for } i \in \mathcal{N}, k \in \mathcal{P}(i), t = 1, \dots, T, \quad (2)$$

$$z_{i,t} \leq x_{i,t} - x_{i,t-1} \quad \text{for } i \in \mathcal{N}, t = 1, \dots, T, \quad (3)$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^N R_i(x_{i,t} - x_{i,t-1}) \leq M \quad \text{for } t = 1, \dots, T, \quad (4)$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^N R_i z_{i,t} \leq P \quad \text{for } t = 1, \dots, T. \quad (5)$$

$$x_{i,t} \in \{0, 1\} \quad \text{for } i \in \mathcal{N}, t = 1, \dots, T, \quad (6)$$

$$z_{i,t} \in [0, 1] \quad \text{for } i \in \mathcal{N}, t = 1, \dots, T, \quad (7)$$

$$x_{i,0} = 0 \quad \text{for } i \in \mathcal{N}. \quad (8)$$

## Getting started

- (a) Extract the OPMPSP project (`tar xzfv COatWork-OPMPSP.tgz`). Amongst others, it contains:

`src/main.c` Main file, which reads the data files from the command line, initializes SCIP, calls a function to build the above IP formulation, calls SCIP to solve it, and displays the solution. (*nothing to do here*)

`src/opmpsp_data.h/c` Provides methods for reading data. (*nothing to do here, but look at the data structures `BLOCK` and `PIT`*)

`src/opmpsp_model.h/c` Contains method `createOpmpspModel`, which needs to be extended to build the above IP formulation within SCIP.

`src/opmpsp_presol.h/c` Contains an OPMPSP-specific presolver which may be extended to apply single block variable fixing and extend the clique table of SCIP.

`opmpsp.set` A SCIP settings file, which is automatically read by the command `SCIPreadParams(scip, "opmpsp.set")` in file `main.c`. This may be extended or changed, e.g. to set a time limit when dealing with larger instances.

`data/` A folder with small, randomly generated block model data of different sizes. Each instance is specified by two files: `randXXX.blocks` (containing the amount of rock and ore of each block) and `randXXX.arcs` (containing the immediate predecessors of each block). `XXX` indicates the number of blocks.

- (b) In the folder `COatWork-OPMPSP/lib`, create a softlink to your SCIP directory, e.g.  
`ln -s /home/coatwork/software/ziboptsuite-1.2.0/scip-1.2.0 scip`
- (c) In the folder `COatWork-OPMPSP`, try to compile the provided code: `make depend` and `make`.

## 1. Building the OPMPSP formulation

- (a) Open the file `src/opmpsp_model.c`: The function `createOpmpspModel` is already partially provided. You need to fill in the gaps marked by `BEGIN_TODO` . . . `END_TODO`: create the variables with their upper and lower bounds and objective coefficients and add the constraints (1)–(8).  
(*Note that in C we are using indices starting from 0, so time periods are numbered 0 to  $T - 1$  and blocks are numbered 0 to  $N - 1$ .*)
- (b) In the folder `COatWork-OPMPSP`, try to compile the code and run it on the smallest example: `bin/opmpsp data/rand035.blocks data/rand035.arcs`. The solving process can be interrupted by pressing `CTRL-C`. The optimal value is 7.300242.

## 2. Implementing a problem-specific presolver

The precedence graph  $(\mathcal{N}, \{(i, k) \mid k \in \mathcal{P}(i)\})$  is usually given transitively reduced to save constraints of type (2). Suppose we additionally compute  $\mathcal{C}(i)$ , the full predecessor cone, i.e. the set containing  $i$  itself and all predecessors of block  $i$  in the transitive closure of the precedence graph. If the amount of rock in  $\mathcal{C}(i)$  exceeds the mining capacity  $M$ , then block  $i$  cannot feasibly be excavated in the first time period, i.e.  $x_{i,1}$  may be fixed to 0. In general, we may fix

$$x_{i,1}, \dots, x_{i,t} = 0 \tag{9}$$

if  $\sum_{k \in \mathcal{C}(i)} R_k > tM$  holds.

- (a) Open the file `src/opmpsp_presol.c`, which already contains a partial implementation of the presolver. You need to extend the execution method of the presolver `presolExecOpmpsp`. The transitive closure of the precedence graph is already available in the presolver data: `presoldata->transpreds[i][k] == TRUE` iff  $k \in \mathcal{C}(i)$ . The variable  $x_{i,t}$  can be accessed by `presoldata->xvars[i][t]`.
- (b) Fill in the gaps marked by `BEGIN_TODO_1...END_TODO_1`: compute the value of  $\sum_{k \in \mathcal{C}(i)} R_k$  and store it in `predrock[i]`.
- (c) Fill in the gap marked by `BEGIN_TODO_2...END_TODO_2`: implement the single block variable fixing according to (9).

The idea of single block variable fixing can be extended to multiple blocks. As a special case, consider two blocks  $i, j \in \mathcal{N}$ , which are incomparable, i.e.  $i \notin \mathcal{C}(j)$  and  $j \notin \mathcal{C}(i)$ . Again, if the amount of rock in  $\mathcal{C}(i) \cup \mathcal{C}(j)$  exceeds the mining capacity  $M$ , then at most one of  $i$  and  $j$  can feasibly be excavated during the first time period. In general, if

$$\sum_{k \in \mathcal{C}(i) \cup \mathcal{C}(j)} R_k > tM$$

holds for time period  $t$ , then the inequality

$$x_{i,t} + x_{j,t} \leq 1 \tag{10}$$

is valid. One way of using this information in SCIP is to add the edge  $(x_{i,t}, x_{j,t})$  to the so-called *clique graph*. The clique separator will then dynamically try to separate these inequalities if violated.

- (d) Fill in the gap marked by `BEGIN_TODO_3...END_TODO_3` by generating the two block conflicts (10): For each pair of blocks  $i < j$ , check whether they are incomparable using `presoldata->transpreds[i][j]` and `presoldata->transpreds[j][i]`. If so, compute  $\sum_{k \in \mathcal{C}(i) \cup \mathcal{C}(j)} R_k$ , and for all  $t$  with (10), add the edge  $(x_{i,t}, x_{j,t})$  to the clique graph. Use the command `SCIPAddClique` as explained in the code.

## 3. Experiments

- (a) Compile your project and test it on the provided OPMPSP instances. In the file `opmpsp.set` you can turn your presolving techniques off by adjusting the lines `presolving/opmpsp/varfix = ...` and `presolving/opmpsp/pckcliques = ...`. You may also have to choose the time and node limits suitably, because the primal-dual gap can typically not be closed completely.

- (b) Pick one of the test instances in folder `data/` and analyse the computational behaviour with and without your presolving techniques:
- Do they help to increase the overall number of fixings and implications which SCIP is able to generate in presolving?
  - How many clique cuts are generated? (Search the SCIP statistics.)
  - How do they effect the dual bound at the root node and during solving?
  - Experiment with the clique separator settings in `opmmps.set`: By default, it is only called at the root node, but using `separating/clique/freq = ...` you can call it additionally during the branch-and-bound tree. Does this help to decrease the dual bound faster? Does it affect the primal bound?
  - In general, which primal heuristics seem to be especially effective in finding or improving feasible solutions? (to decypher the abbreviations on the left of the SCIP output, type `disp heur` in a separate SCIP shell.)
  - Are some of the constraints (1)–(8) redundant? Does leaving leaving them out improve or hinder the performance of SCIP?

A note of caution: Results on randomly generated data are not always conclusive for real-world instances.

Good luck!