



Ain Shams University
Faculty of Engineering
Design & Production Engineering Department

Application of Multi-Objective Optimization Model for Supply Chain Network Design

A thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
M.Sc. in Mechanical Engineering

By
Mostafa Abdel Rahman Mohamed Abdel Rahman Moussa

Supervised By:
Prof. Dr. Amin M. K. El-Kharbotly
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nahid H. Afia
Dr. Mohammed M. El-Beheiry

2012

Examiners Committee

The undersigned certify that they have read and recommend to the Faculty of Engineering – Ain Shams University for acceptance a thesis entitled “Application of Multi-Objective Optimization Model for Supply Chain Network Design”, submitted by Mostafa Abdelrahman Mohamed Abdelrahman Moussa, as partial fulfillment of requirements for the degree of Master of Science in Mechanical Engineering.

Signature

Prof Dr. Mohamed Hamdy Salah Elwany

Professor of Industrial Engineering

Faculty of Engineering, Alexandria University

Prof Dr. Adel Zaky El-Shabrawy

Professor at the Higher Technological Institute

At the 10th of Ramadan City

Prof Dr. Amin Mohamed Kamel El-Kharbotly

Professor of Production Engineering

Faculty of Engineering, Ain Shams University

Date: 21 /11 / 2012

Statement

This thesis is submitted in the partial fulfillment of a Master of Science degree in Mechanical Engineering, to Ain Shams University.

The author carried out the work included in this thesis, and no part of this thesis has been submitted for a degree or qualification at any other university.

Signature

Mostafa Abdelrahman M. A. Moussa

“...And my success is not but through Allah. Upon him I have relied, and to Him I return.”

(Hud, 88)

Acknowledgment

A few words can hardly express my gratitude to many individuals who made this accomplishment possible. I am indebted to them for their support, inspiration, and encouragement, which have made the past four years such a rich experience to me.

First of all, I would like to thank my supervisor **Prof. Dr. Amin El-Kharbotly** who motivate me with his enthusiasm, guide me with valuable suggestions, and support me throughout the research project. His ability to select and to approach compelling research problems, his high scientific standards, and his hard work set an example which I am determined to remember in my future path in research.

I would also like to thank my supervision team: **Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nahid Afia**, for her kind support with care, and her encouragement in times of difficulties, and **Dr. Mohammed El Beheiry** for the insights he has provided in discussing my ideas and the depth to which he forced me to think and for his useful advices in the research.

Furthermore, I am grateful to all my colleagues who travelled this road alongside me, especially **Eng.Raghda Bahaa** for enduring the days, and (surely) uninteresting conversations regarding coding errors and programming difficulties, and **Eng.Tamer Ismail** for his help and encouragement.

Finally, I owe my deepest gratitude to my family who provided more support, continuous prayers and encouragement for me that I could have ever hoped for. I am truly humbled by the selflessness and love they have shown. Thank you - **Dad, Mum, Sister and Brother** - for helping me believe in myself and achieve a great thing.

Abstract

Research in the field of the multi-objective supply chain was given little attention as compared to that given to the single objective supply chain problems. In addition, most of researches, which tackle the multi-objective problems, aim at finding either one non-dominated solution for dynamic problem or Pareto front for static problem. Little attention has been given to consider the role of dynamic location allocation on designing supply chain.

In the present work multi-objective four echelons single product supply chain network design in dynamic environment is considered. The network under study consists of suppliers, plants, distributors and customers echelons. This problem is concerned with finding the Pareto front includes different SCNDs with trade-off between two objectives. These objectives are minimizing the total cost and maximizing the service level. At each solution, two decisions are taken. These decisions are locating plants and distributors in any period when they are needed and allocating quantities between each two successive echelons.

A Genetic Algorithm is developed to solve this problem. The developed algorithm applies a new chromosome representation with its decoding-encoding procedures to effectively tackle the multi-objective supply chain with dynamic nature.

The model has successfully tackled the multi-objective supply chain network design problem with dynamic location allocation. The results are more practical as it considers the Pareto front for minimizing the total cost and maximizing the service level, other than optimizing only one of these objectives. The results proved that considering different capacities for the potential plants and distributors is better than similar capacity as it leads to less total cost. The dynamic location allocation approach proved to be

superior to the static location dynamic allocation approach in increasing and product life cycle demand patterns, while in decreasing and constant demand patterns are approximately the same.

Keywords: Dynamic Supply Chain Network Design; Genetic Algorithm; Multi-objective Optimization.

Summary of the M.Sc. Thesis
“Application of Multi-Objective Optimization Model for
Supply Chain Network Design”

By:

Mostafa Abdelrahman Mohamed Abdelrahman Moussa

Supply chain network design is one of the widely discussed problems in the supply chain management domain. Supply chain network design is considered as location allocation problem, where locating of different facilities and allocate the quantities to be transported between these facilities decisions are taken with respect to some objectives. The design of a supply chain is critically important for implementing an efficient and effective supply chain.

Most of the developed models targeted the supply chain design problems in which single economical objective is considered. Much less work was done to consider objectives other than the economical ones or to consider multi-objective models. For the multi-objective supply chain network design, the majority of the researchers developed algorithms either to find the Pareto front (a set of non- dominated solutions) for static models or to find only one single non-dominated solution for dynamic models. Many researchers deal with dynamic supply chain problems by taking static location and only dynamic allocation decisions. Few researches deal with dynamic supply chain problems by taking dynamic location allocation decisions.

Due to the combinatorial nature of the problem, as it is proven to be NP-Hard problem, efforts are diverted to heuristic techniques and algorithms, opting to reach near optimal solutions besides they can easily be applied. One of the algorithms which proved to be superior in solving the supply

chain network design problem and also finding the Pareto front in general is the Genetic Algorithm.

The purpose of this research is to solve a multi-objective four echelons single product dynamic supply chain network design. The network under study consists of suppliers, plants, distributors and customers echelons. A dynamic location allocation is considered, where plants and distributors can be opened in any period when they are needed, yet any opened location cannot be closed later and allocating quantities between each two successive echelons. The capacities and locations of the suppliers, plants and distributors are known. Customers demands are known. It is not allowed to keep inventory from period to another at any echelon; while, order splitting between any two successive echelons is allowed.

The model explores the Pareto optimal front that includes non-dominated solutions offering different alternatives of designs that trade-off between two objectives. These objectives are minimizing the total cost and maximizing the service level. The total cost consists of plants fixed cost, distributors fixed cost, plants fixed operating cost, distributors fixed operating cost, plants variable operating cost, distributors variable operating cost, transportation costs, unutilized capacity cost, penalty cost.

In order to solve such problem, Genetic Algorithm is used, where one of the Pareto-ranking approaches is used namely non-sorting genetic algorithm II (NSGA-II). The developed chromosome consists of three parts. The first part represents the maximum number of plants and distributors that may be opened at each period. The second part represents the priority of each plant to be opened. The third part is as the same as the second one but for the distributors. Two crossover operators are used, simple crossover for the first part and Position based crossover for both the second and third parts. Also, two mutation operators are used simple mutation for the first part and modified swapping mutation for both the

second and third parts. The initial population is generated randomly and the selection function is tournament.

The developed model is tested on 10 benchmark problems to find the minimum total cost in order to test the ability of the new encoding-decoding procedures to solve static single objective supply chain network design problems. The developed model is used to solve dynamic problems to study the effect of changing the different cost parameters, customers locations and potential plants capacity on the Pareto front and the obtained supply chain network designs. The cost parameters are generated and set to be fixed then each of them is changed separately the problem is solved using the developed model to understand their effect on the Pareto front.

Experiments are made to compare between considering single objective and multi-objective while designing the supply chain. Generated problems are used to compare between having different and similar capacity for the potential plants and distributors under similar cost parameters and demands. Other problems are used to compare the performance of static location dynamic allocation and dynamic location allocation approaches under different demand patterns. Each problem is solved twice, once to find the Pareto front with the static location dynamic allocation approach, and the other to find the Pareto front with the dynamic location allocation approach.

The model has proved to be successful in reaching minimum cost of the tried benchmark problems. The results are more practical as it considers the Pareto front for minimizing the total cost and maximizing the service level, other than optimizing only one of these objectives. The results proved that considering different capacities for the potential plants and distributors is better than similar capacity as it leads to less total cost. The dynamic location allocation approach proved to be superior to the static location dynamic allocation approach in increasing and product life cycle

demand patterns, while in decreasing and constant demand patterns are approximately the same.

List of Tables

Table 5.1 Parameters used in the Single objective GA for Benchmark problems.....	79
Table 5.2 Plant Fixed cost for the 1 st benchmark problem	80
Table 5.3 Distributor Fixed cost for the 1 st benchmark problem	80
Table 5.4 Plant capacity for the 1 st benchmark problem.....	80
Table 5.5 Distributors capacity for the 1 st benchmark problem	80
Table 5.6 Suppliers capacity for the 1 st benchmark problem.....	81
Table 5.7 Customers demand for the 1 st benchmark problem.....	81
Table 5.8 Matrix for transportation cost per unit from distributor to customer for the 1 st benchmark problem.....	81
Table 5.9 Matrix for transportation cost per unit from plant to distributor for the 1 st benchmark problem	82
Table 5.10 Matrix for transportation cost per unit from supplier to plant for the 1 st benchmark problem.....	82
Table 5.11 Values of the basic experiment parameters	83
Table 5.12 Plant Fixed cost for 1st experiment for changing customers demand locations	86
Table 5.13 Plant Fixed operating cost for 1st experiment for changing customers demand locations	86
Table 5.14 Distributor Fixed cost for 1st experiment for changing customers demand locations	87
Table 5.15 Distributor Fixed operating cost for 1st experiment for changing customers demand locations	87
Table 5.16 Plants capacity for 1st experiment for changing customers demand locations	87
Table 5.17 Distributors capacity for 1st experiment for changing customers demand locations	87
Table 5.18 Suppliers capacity for 1st experiment for changing customers demand locations	87

Table 5.19 Customers demand for 1st experiment for changing customers demand locations	88
Table 5.20 Matrix for transportation cost per unit from distributor to customer for 1st experiment for changing customers demand locations...	88
Table 5.21 Matrix for transportation cost per unit from plant to distributor for 1st experiment for changing customers demand locations	88
Table 5.22 Matrix for transportation cost per unit from supplier to plant for 1st experiment for changing customers demand locations	89
Table 5.23 Plant variable cost per unit for 1st experiment for changing customers demand locations	89
Table 5.24 Distributor variable cost per unit for 1st experiment for changing customers demand locations	89
Table 5.25 Unutilized cost per unit for 1st experiment for changing customers demand locations	89
Table 5.26 Penalty Cost per unit for 1st changing experiment for customers demand locations	89
Table 5.27 Customers' demand for 2 nd experiment for changing customers' demand locations	90
Table 5.28 Plants capacity 2 nd experiment for changing the potential plants' capacity.....	91
Table 5.29 Plant Fixed cost for the experiment of different capacities for the potential distributors and plants	92
Table 5.30 Plant Fixed operating cost for the experiment of different capacities for the potential distributors and plants.....	92
Table 5.31 Distributor Fixed cost for the experiment of different capacities for the potential distributors and plants	93
Table 5.32 Distributor Fixed operating cost for the experiment of different capacities for the potential distributors and plants.....	93
Table 5.33 Plants capacity for the experiment of different capacities for the potential distributors and plants	93

Table 5.34 Distributors capacity for the experiment of different capacities for the potential distributors and plants	93
Table 5.35 Customers demand for ten periods increasing demand pattern	95
Table 5.36 Customers demand for three periods decreasing demand pattern	96
Table 5.37 Customers demand for ten periods increasing demand pattern	96
Table 5.38 Customers demand for Product life cycle demand pattern.....	97
Table 5.39 Parameters used in the single objective GA	98
Table 5.40 Parameters used in the Multi-objective GA.....	98
Table 6.1 the optimum and average for 10 Benchmark problems	100
Table 6.2 the Number of Pareto Solutions at each Plant Fixed Cost.....	101
Table 6.3 The number of operating plants and distributors at each period for each solution	103
Table 6.4 Differences in total costs for Plant Fixed Cost fronts	105
Table 6.5 The Number of Pareto Solutions at each Distributor Fixed Cost	107
Table 6.6 Differences in total costs for distributor fixed cost fronts	110
Table 6.7 The Number of Pareto Solutions at each Plant Operating Fixed Cost	112
Table 6.8 Differences in total costs for Plant Operating Fixed Cost fronts	113
Table 6.9 the Number of Pareto Solutions at each Distributor Operating Fixed Costs.....	115
Table 6.10 Differences in total costs for Distributor Operating Fixed Cost fronts	116
Table 6.11 The Number of Pareto Solutions at each Plant Operating Variable Cost.....	119
Table 6.12 Differences in total costs for Plant Operating Variable Cost fronts	119
Table 6.13 The Number of Pareto Solutions at each Distributor Operating Variable Cost.....	121

Table 6.14a Differences in total costs for Distributor Operating Variable Cost fronts	122
Table 6.15 The Number of Pareto Solutions at each Transportation Cost	124
Table 6.16 a Differences in total costs for Transportation Cost fronts....	125
Table 6.17 The Number of Pareto Solutions at each unutilized Capacity Cost	128
Table 6.18 Unutilized quantity per period for each solution for the Pareto Front when unutilized capacity cost = 0.....	130
Table 6.19 The Number of Pareto Solutions at each Penalty Cost	130
Table 6.20 Unsatisfied demand quantity per period for each solution for the Pareto Front when Penalty cost = 0.....	131
Table 6.21 SCNDs for the Pareto front of the first experiment for changing customers demand location.....	134
Table 6.22 SCNDs for the Pareto front of the second experiment for changing customers demand location	135
Table 6.23 Transported quantities between plants and suppliers for the 1 st experiment for changing customers demand location for the 1 st period..	139
Table 6.24 Transported quantities between distributors and plants for the 1 st experiment for changing customers demand location for the 1 st period	139
Table 6.25 Transported quantities between customers and distributors for the 1 st experiment for changing customers demand location for the 1 st period	139
Table 6.26 Transported quantities between plants and suppliers for the 2 nd experiment for changing customers demand location for the 1 st period..	141
Table 6.27 Transported quantities between distributors and plants for the 2 nd experiment for changing customers demand location for the 1 st period	141