



Planning and long-term scheduling for PPG glass production

Ricardo Lima Ignacio Grossmann rlima@andrew.cmu.edu

Carnegie Mellon University

Yu Jiao

PPG Industries

Glass Business and Discovery Center





Goals of the project:

- Development of a Mixed Integer Linear Programming (MILP) model for the planning and scheduling of PPG tinted glasses production
 - capture the essence of the process that is not considered in the Master Production Schedule (MPS)
 - cullet management
 - changeovers driven by SKUs
 - that may lead to infeasible schedules
- develop a decision making production tool that can influence real world decisions





Continuous process:



Features

- Raw materials define color of the substrate
- Sequence dependent changeovers between substrates
- Zero length transitions between substrate and coated products
- Long transition times (order of days)
- High transition costs
- Continuous operation during changeover
- Minimum run length (days)

Products defined by color





Good cullet: generated during the production run





Good cullet: generated during the production run





Good cullet: generated during the production run





Good cullet: generated during the production run





Good cullet: generated during the production run



- For each color it is necessary to have in stock the same color of cullet available.
- Changeovers generate dilution cullet at the same operating conditions of production.
- There is a maximum storage capacity for cullet, extra cullet is sold below the production cost.
- The schedule determines the amount of cullet generated.



Given

- Time horizon of 18 months
- Transition, and inventory costs
- Set of products
 - deterministic demand
 - initial, minimum, and maximum inventory levels
 - production rates
 - sequence dependent transitions
 - operating costs
 - selling prices
- Cullet
 - initial, minimum, and maximum inventory levels
 - production rates
 - consumption rates
 - compatibility matrix between colors
 - selling price

Determine

- sequence of production (production times and amounts)
- inventory levels during and at the end of the time horizon
- economic terms: total operating, transition, inventory costs

That maximize the profit





Full space MILP model

- Detailed scheduling: slot based continuous time model (Erdirik-Dogan and Grossmann (2008))
- Planning model: traveling salesman sequence based model (Erdirik-Dogan and Grossmann (2008))

Proposed features

- Changeovers across due dates
- Minimum run lengths across due dates
- Aggregation of the products to cope with redundancy from zero length transition times
- Moving forward terminal constraints for minimum inventory levels at the end of the time horizon
- Cullet management





- Consumption profiles for good and dilution cullet
 - by group of colors
 - 2 operating conditions in terms of % of cullet fed to the furnace High % of cullet fed to the furnace, when there is enough cullet in stock Low % of cullet fed to the furnace, when the cullet in stock is close to the minimum

Cullet consumed in function of the length of the run High % of cullet







- Consumption profiles for good and dilution cullet
 - by group of colors
 - 2 operating conditions in terms of % of cullet fed to the furnace High % of cullet fed to the furnace, when there is enough cullet in stock Low % of cullet fed to the furnace, when the cullet in stock is close to the minimum
- New variables
 - Length of the production run
 - 0-1 variable to define if a new production run starts





- Consumption profiles for good and dilution cullet
 - by group of colors
 - 2 operating conditions in terms of % of cullet fed to the furnace High % of cullet fed to the furnace, when there is enough cullet in stock Low % of cullet fed to the furnace, when the cullet in stock is close to the minimum
- New variables
 - Length of the production run
 - 0-1 variable to define if a new production run starts
- New constraints
 - Mass balance to the process for each production run, for good and dilution cullet
 - Inventory balances for good and dilution cullet
 - Minimum inventory levels for each color of cullet
 - Total maximum capacity storage
 - Penalty for selling cullet





 $\frac{\delta \text{-form piecewise linear formulation (PLF) to approximate cullet consumption}}{\overline{\theta}_{i,l,t} = MRT_i ZNS_{i,l,t} + \delta 1s_{i,l,t} + \delta 2s_{i,l,t}} \quad \forall i \in I, I \in LM, t \in T$

$$tc1_{i,l,t} = b_{i,0} ZNS_{i,l,t} + \frac{b_{i,1} - b_{i,0}}{a_{i,1} - a_{i,0}} \delta 1s_{i,l,t} + \frac{b_{i,2} - b_{i,1}}{a_{i,2} - a_{i,1}} \delta 2s_{i,l,t}$$
$$dc1_{i,l,t} = db_{i,0} ZNS_{i,l,t} + \frac{db_{i,1} - db_{i,0}}{a_{i,1} - a_{i,0}} \delta 1s_{i,l,t} + \frac{db_{i,2} - db_{i,1}}{a_{i,2} - a_{i,1}} \delta 2s_{i,l,t}$$

$$\delta 1 s_{i,l,t} \leq (a_{i,1} - a_{i,0}) ZNS_{i,l,t}$$

 $\delta 1 s_{i,l,t} \geq (a_{i,1} - a_{i,0}) ZCS_{i,l,t}$
 $\delta 2 s_{i,l,t} \leq (a_{i,2} - a_{i,1}) ZCS_{i,l,t}$
 $ZNS_{i,l,t} \geq ZCS_{i,l,t}$
 $ZNS_{i,l,t} \geq ZCS_{i,l,t}$

 $gcs_{i,l,t} = tcs_{i,l,t} - dcs_{i,l,t}$







 $\frac{\delta \text{-form piecewise linear formulation (PLF) to approximate cullet consumption}}{\overline{\theta}_{i,l,t} = MRT_i ZNS_{i,l,t} + \delta 1s_{i,l,t} + \delta 2s_{i,l,t}} \quad \forall i \in I, I \in LM, t \in T$

$$tc1_{i,l,t} = b_{i,0} ZNS_{i,l,t} + \frac{b_{i,1} - b_{i,0}}{a_{i,1} - a_{i,0}} \delta 1s_{i,l,t} + \frac{b_{i,2} - b_{i,1}}{a_{i,2} - a_{i,1}} \delta 2s_{i,l,t}$$
$$dc1_{i,l,t} = db_{i,0} ZNS_{i,l,t} + \frac{db_{i,1} - db_{i,0}}{a_{i,1} - a_{i,0}} \delta 1s_{i,l,t} + \frac{db_{i,2} - db_{i,1}}{a_{i,2} - a_{i,1}} \delta 2s_{i,l,t}$$

 $\delta 1 s_{i,l,t} \leq (a_{i,1} - a_{i,0}) ZNS_{i,l,t}$ $\delta 1 s_{i,l,t} \geq (a_{i,1} - a_{i,0}) ZCS_{i,l,t}$ $\delta 2 s_{i,l,t} \leq (a_{i,2} - a_{i,1}) ZCS_{i,l,t}$ $ZNS_{i,l,t} \geq ZCS_{i,l,t}$ $ZNS_{i,l,t} \geq ZCS_{i,l,t}$

 $gcs_{i,l,t} = tcs_{i,l,t} - dcs_{i,l,t}$

Disjunction to choose the cullet operating profile to use, $ZP25_{i,l,t}$ is a 0-1 variable to select the consumption profile

$$\begin{bmatrix} Z1_{i,l,t} \\ tc_{i,l,t} = tc1_{i,l,t} \\ dc_{i,l,t} = dc1_{i,l,t} \end{bmatrix} \vee \begin{bmatrix} \neg Z1_{i,l,t} \\ tc_{i,l,t} = tc2_{i,l,t} \\ dc_{i,l,t} = dc2_{i,l,t} \end{bmatrix} \quad \forall i \in IM, l \in LM, t \in T$$





Rolling horizon algorithm (RHA)

- Time horizon = 2 years
- 2 models are used: scheduling model and a planning model
- Aggregation of time periods in the planning model
- Rolling forward terminal constraints for the minimum inventory levels at the end of the time horizon.





Rolling horizon algorithm (RHA)

- Time horizon = 2 years
- 2 models are used: scheduling model and a planning model
- Aggregation of time periods in the planning model
- Rolling forward terminal constraints for the minimum inventory levels at the end of the Terminal inventory



EWO meeting - p. 9





- Case 1 Scheduling without terminal constraints
 Time periods = 1 month.
 10 substrates, 9 coated products, 1 different thickness.
- Case 2 Scheduling with terminal constraints
 Time periods = 28 days in the planning model, 7 days in the scheduling model.
 10 substrates, 9 coated products, 1 different thickness.





- Case 1 Scheduling without terminal constraints
 Time periods = 1 month.
 10 substrates, 9 coated products, 1 different thickness.
- Case 2 Scheduling with terminal constraints
 Time periods = 28 days in the planning model, 7 days in the scheduling model.
 10 substrates, 9 coated products, 1 different thickness.
- Case 3 Scheduling and cullet management
 Time periods = 1 month.
 12 substrates, 12 coated products, 1 different thickness

Models implemented in GAMS and solved with Cplex in a machine running Linux with 8 CPUs Intel Xeon, 1.86GHz and 8GB of RAM



Gantt charts and performance



Case I

Profit 1st year = 4.711m.u

Objective function = -83.54m.u

Transition days = 125.5

Case II

Profit 1st year = 4.131m.u.

Objective function = 7.87m.u.

Transition days = 70.5



Day



Case II

Gap*=1%	SP	# Eq.	Total	Binary	Slots	Gap (%)	$RMIP^\dagger$	Profit (m.u.)	CPU (s)
CPU* = 3,600s	1	9,095	8,115	3,860	-	1.7	4.233	4.078	3,600
CPU* = 3,600s	2	5,973	5,329	2,289	17	0.8	4.219	4.071	554
CPU* = 3,600s	3	10,252	9,152	3,960	17	1.4	6.071	5.945	3,600
CPU* = 10,800s	4	6,827	6,016	2,149	30	1.0	6.025	5.919	96
CPU* = 10,800s	5	11,185	9,989	3,960	30	1.0	8.214	8.095	3,605
CPU* = 10,800s	6	7,755	6,837	2,140	43	0.8	8.177	8.075	384

* - Minimum integrality gap and maximum CPU time set. SP - Subproblem. † - Linear relaxation in the root and en







The transition cost is smaller than the production cost. If the demand can be met the model increases the number of changeovers. This leads to the depletion of inventory.

Terminal constraints for the minimum inventory levels at the end of the 2nd year prevent the depletion of inventory.







Fixing the binary variables still allows some flexibility to change the amounts produced between subproblems. With time periods of one week, the binary variables for the transitions across due dates restrict changes in the length of the production runs.





Case 3 - Scheduling and culet management

Relation between the inventory cullet profile of one product and the Gantt chart



The trend between the length of the production run and the accumulation of cullet is captured by the model.

EvvO meeting - p. 13





Case 3 - Scheduling and culet management Relation between the **inventory cullet profile** of one product and the Gantt chart



Results for subproblem 6 of the proposed RHA.

SP	# Eq.	Total	Binary	Slots	Gap (%)	RMIP [†]	Profit (m.u.)	CPU (s)
6	56,986	41,308	4,633	47	14.8	-3,316,534	-4,461,342	3,600
Minim	num integralit	y gap = 5%, 1	max CPU =	10,800/360	00s for the first	and remaining su	ubproblems, respe	ctively. SP -

Minimum integrality gap = 5%, max CPU = 10,800/3600s for the first and remaining subproblems, respectively. SP - Subproblem. † - Linear relaxation in the root node.





- The scheduling model without cullet management can be tackled for time horizons of 18 months.
- The cullet model is in agreement with the scheduling model.
- Adding the cullet management to the scheduling model poses a challenge in terms of obtaining solutions with small integrality gaps.

Current Work

- Development of an improved solution strategy to handle the scheduling and cullet management.
- Include another production line into the model, which is able to produce some of the current products, and it is integrated through the cullet management and inventory space.