



AIN SHAMS UNIVERSITY

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING

Design and Production Engineering

# Production rescheduling optimization model

A Thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements of the degree of

Master of Science in Mechanical Engineering

(Design and Production Engineering)

by

**Moaz Magdy Tawfiq Mohamed**

Bachelor of Science in Mechanical Engineering

(Design and Production Engineering)

Faculty of Engineering, Ain Shams University, 2013

Supervised By

**Prof. Amin M. K. El-Kharbotly**

**Dr. Yomna M. Sadek**

Cairo - (2019)



AIN SHAMS UNIVERSITY  
FACULTY OF ENGINEERING  
Design and Production

# Production rescheduling optimization model

by

**Moaz Magdy Tawfiq Mohamed**

Bachelor of Science in Mechanical Engineering

(Design and Production Engineering)

Faculty of Engineering, Ain Shams University, 2013

## **Examiners' Committee**

### **Name and Affiliation**

Prof. Amin Mohamed Kamel El-Kharbotly  
Design and Production , Ain Shams University

Prof. Nahid H. Afia  
Design and Production , Ain Shams University

Prof. Mervat A. Badr  
Mechanical Engineering, National Research Centre

### **Signature**

.....

.....

.....

.

Date:21 February 2019

# Statement

This thesis is submitted as a partial fulfilment of Master of Science in Mechanical Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, Ain shams University.

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

**Moaz Magdy Tawfiq Mohamed**

Signature

.....

Date:21 February 2019

# Researcher Data

Name : Moaz Magdy Tawfiq Mohamed  
Date of birth : Jan 01, 1991  
Place of birth : Shubra Al Khaymah, Al Qalyubia, Egypt  
Last academic degree : Bachelor of Science  
Field of specialization : Design and Production Engineering  
University issued the degree : Ain Shams  
Date of issued degree : Jul 28, 2013  
Current job : .....

# **Thesis Summary**

## **Production rescheduling optimization model**

In the dynamic environment of production, the task of managing and controlling production systems becomes more difficult as a result of internal disruptions like machine breakdowns, and external disruptions (such as urgent jobs). Once the initial production schedule is disrupted, a corrective action should be taken to minimize the negative effects of disruption on the overall performance. Some of the practical strategies to handle disruptions are: working for overtime, outsourcing some of the production tasks and production rescheduling. Rescheduling refers to the process of updating an existing production schedule in response to disruptions or other changes to maintain schedule performance.

Production rescheduling studies considered the rescheduling problem from different perspectives. Some studies are focused on the nature of the scheduling environment which is static or dynamic scheduling. Some are concerned with the strategy of considering the uncertainty in the production system. Some are concerned with the policy that should to be followed to respond to disruptions whenever occur. Some are concerned with the method by which the disrupted schedule would be updated. Some are dedicated to find a solution for a specific machine environment problem under a specific set of assumptions. Some are concerned with finding appropriate performance measures for the rescheduling problem. Others are concerned with the optimization tool that is used to find an optimal or near-optimal solution.

Most of rescheduling studies consider static set of jobs to be rescheduled upon disruption occurrence. Two alternative policies are mostly followed to respond to disruptions either upon occurrence, event-driven policy, or periodic policy to be performed at equally spaced time intervals. The method of updating a disrupted schedule by generating a completely new schedule has been proven to be superior to other methods by computational results. The disruption of urgent job arrival has been considered in most of rescheduling studies. Despite its importance, the single machine environment was rarely considered in the rescheduling studies.

The objective of this study is to answer the following questions: Is rescheduling needed when disruptions occur? If yes, when to reschedule? and how often?

This study followed a reactive strategy to handle unexpected disruptions in a single machine environment such that the unexpected disruptions are not accounted for while generating the initial schedule. Instead, the schedule is revised when unexpected disruptions occur according to the followed rescheduling policy. The performance of different rescheduling policies is compared in terms of the total tardiness and total cost at different disruption parameters. The disruption parameters considered in this study are: disruption duration, time of disruption occurrence and the number of disruptions.

In this study, a genetic algorithm is used to generate the initial schedule and the updated schedules.

Since production rescheduling may be affected by many factors and our concern is to estimate the effect of these factors on the rescheduling decision, as well as the effect of possible interactions between these factors. Using Minitab® statistical software, a general factorial experiment, in which more than two factors are considered and each factor has different number of levels, is designed to study the performance of different rescheduling policies. In each complete trial of the experiment, all possible combinations of all levels of the factors are investigated. The experiment includes the following factors: 1) rescheduling policy. 2) time of disruption occurrence. 3) Number of disruptions during the planning period. 4) Disruption duration. 5) jobs' processing time represented by different number of jobs to be scheduled in the same planning horizon. and 6) the optimization objective (minimum total tardiness or minimum total cost).

The results are first analyzed using ANOVA to identify parameters with statistically significant variation. Then the results are further analyzed and discussed using different graphical methods.

The computational results showed that the timing of the occurrence of disruption as related to scheduling horizon has a major effect on determining the best rescheduling policy. Event-driven policy is found to be superior to other policies for short infrequent disruptions. On the other hand, the periodic rescheduling policy is found to be superior to other policies for long and/or frequent disruptions.

**Key words:** Single machine, rescheduling, event-driven rescheduling, periodic rescheduling, rescheduling frequency.

# **Acknowledgment**

I would like to express my gratitude to the supervision team, Prof. Amin El-Kharbotly, with his experience, support, motivation, and guidance to this interesting point, and throughout the work, and Dr. Yomna, with her sincere support, accurate comments, close supervision and useful advices in the research and in many other things as well.

**February 2019**

# Table of Contents

## **CHAPTER 1 : INTRODUCTION ..... - 18 -**

1.1 ORGANIZATION OF THESIS..... - 19 -

## **CHAPTER 2 : LITERATURE REVIEW ..... - 20 -**

2.1 INTRODUCTION ..... - 20 -

2.2 BASIC CONCEPTS OF RESCHEDULING ..... - 20 -

2.2.1 Common rescheduling terms..... - 20 -

2.2.2 Rescheduling factors..... - 20 -

2.3 CLASSIFICATION AND REVIEW OF RESCHEDULING STUDIES ..... - 21 -

2.3.1 Rescheduling strategies..... - 21 -

2.3.2 Rescheduling environment..... - 24 -

2.3.3 Rescheduling methods ..... - 25 -

2.3.4 Rescheduling policies ..... - 27 -

2.3.5 Machine environment ..... - 29 -

2.3.6 Performance measures ..... - 32 -

2.3.7 Rescheduling tools..... - 37 -

2.3.8 Summary of rescheduling literature..... - 39 -

2.4 OTHER APPLICATIONS FOR RESCHEDULING ..... - 42 -

2.5 FINDINGS FROM LITERATURE ..... - 43 -

2.6 OBJECTIVES OF THIS STUDY ..... - 43 -

## **CHAPTER 3 : PROPOSED PRODUCTION RESCHEDULING MODEL - 45**

-

3.1 INTRODUCTION ..... - 45 -

3.2 PROBLEM DESCRIPTION..... - 45 -

3.2.1 Problem parameters ..... - 48 -

3.2.2 Objective function ..... - 48 -

3.3 THE PROPOSED MODEL..... - 49 -

3.3.1 Model Description ..... - 49 -

3.3.2 Model Assumptions ..... - 50 -



3.3.3 Jobs' characteristics .....	51 -
3.3.4 Disruption parameters .....	52 -
3.3.5 Determination of rescheduling time .....	53 -
3.4 GENERATING THE INITIAL SCHEDULE.....	53 -
3.5 GENERATING UPDATED SCHEDULE .....	54 -
3.6 MODEL MATHEMATICAL FORMULATION .....	60 -
3.7 THE GENETIC ALGORITHM (GA) .....	63 -
3.7.1 Crossover operators .....	63 -
3.7.2 Mutation operator .....	66 -
3.7.3 Stopping criterion .....	66 -
<b>CHAPTER 4 : RESULTS AND DISCUSSION .....</b>	<b>67 -</b>
4.1 INTRODUCTION.....	67 -
4.2 DESIGN OF EXPERIMENTS .....	67 -
4.3 PERFORMANCE MEASURES .....	70 -
4.3.1 Total tardiness .....	71 -
4.3.2 Total cost.....	71 -
4.4 GENETIC ALGORITHM PARAMETERS .....	72 -
4.5 COMPUTATIONAL RESULTS AND DISCUSSION .....	72 -
4.5.1 Analysis of Variances (ANOVA).....	74 -
4.5.2 First set of experiments' results.....	93 -
4.5.3 Second set of experiments' results .....	98 -
4.6 SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS .....	102 -
4.6.1 Due date tightness.....	102 -
4.6.2 Cost coefficients .....	104 -
<b>CHAPTER 5 : CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK .....</b>	<b>107</b>
5.1 CONCLUSION .....	107
5.2 FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTION .....	108
<b>REFERENCES .....</b>	<b>110</b>
<b>APPENDIX A: EXPERIMENTAL TRIALS .....</b>	<b>116</b>

# List of Figures

Figure 2.1: Classification of rescheduling studies .....	- 22 -
Figure 2.2: Periodic rescheduling policy. ....	- 27 -
Figure 2.3: Event-driven rescheduling policy .....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
Figure 3.1: Problem description projected on the classification of rescheduling studies .....	- 47 -
Figure 3.2: Right-shifting model flow chart.....	- 55 -
Figure 3.3 (a) Initial schedule is disrupted during J6 processing. (b) Unprocessed jobs' start time is right-shifted by disruption duration.....	- 56 -
Figure 3.4: Event-driven rescheduling model flow chart.....	- 57 -
Figure 3.5 (a) Initial schedule is disrupted during J6 processing. (b)Unprocessed jobs are rescheduled to optimize objective of concern. ....	- 58 -
Figure 3.6: Periodic rescheduling model flow chart.....	- 59 -
Figure 3.7 (a) Initial schedule is disrupted during J6 processing. (b) Unprocessed jobs' start time is right-shifted by disruption duration. (c) At the rescheduling time, unprocessed jobs are rescheduled.....	- 60 -
Figure 3.8 Chromosome representation.....	- 63 -
Figure 3.9 precedence preservative crossover operator example .....	- 64 -
Figure 3.10 Set-partition crossover operator example .....	- 65 -
Figure 3.11 Inversion mutation operator.....	- 66 -
Figure 4.1: Residuals plots for original total tardiness results for first set of experiments.....	- 77 -
Figure 4.2: Box Cox transformation factor plot for total tardiness results for first set of experiments. ....	- 77 -
Figure 4.3: Residuals plot for transformed total tardiness results for first set of experiments.....	78
Figure 4.4: Residuals plots for original total cost results for first set of experiments.....	- 81 -
Figure 4.5: Box Cox transformation factor plot for total cost results for first set of experiments. ....	- 82 -
Figure 4.6: Residuals plot for transformed total cost results for first set of experiments. ....	- 83 -
Figure 4.7: Residuals plots for original total tardiness results for second set of experiments .....	- 86 -
Figure 4.8: Box Cox transformation factor plot for total tardiness results for second set of experiments.....	- 86 -
Figure 4.9: Residuals plot for transformed total tardiness results for second set of experiments. ....	- 87 -
Figure 4.10: Residuals plots for original total cost results for second set of experiments.....	- 90 -
Figure 4.11: Box Cox transformation factor plot for total cost results for second set of experiments. ....	- 91 -
Figure 4.12: Residuals plot for transformed total cost results for second set of experiments.....	- 91 -
Figure 4.13: Total tardiness for different rescheduling policies at different disruption durations and different time of disruption occurrence and problem size 25 jobs with minimum total tardiness as an objective. -	94

Figure 4.14: Total cost resulted from different rescheduling policies at different disruption durations and different time of disruption occurrence and problem size 25 jobs with minimum total tardiness as an objective. ....	- 94 -
Figure 4.15: Total Cost elements result for periodic rescheduling policy ( $R=8$ ) subject to three long disruptions, 25 jobs problem and minimum total tardiness as the objective.....	- 95 -
Figure 4.16. Total tardiness for different rescheduling policies with long middle disruption and different problem size.....	- 96 -
Figure 4.17. Total tardiness for different rescheduling policies with short middle disruptions and different problem sizes. ....	- 96 -
Figure 4.20. Total cost resulted from different rescheduling policies at different disruption durations and different time of disruption occurrence and problem size 25 job with minimum total cost as an objective. -	97 -
Figure 4.21: Total tardiness for different rescheduling policies at different disruption durations and different time of disruption occurrence and problem size 25 job with minimum total cost as an objective. ....	- 97 -
Figure 4.22. Total cost resulted from different rescheduling policies at short middle disruption for different problem size.....	- 98 -
Figure 4.23. Total cost resulted from different rescheduling policies at long middle disruption for different problem size.....	- 98 -
Figure 4.18. Percentage improvement in total tardiness compared to right-shifting policy due rescheduling for different rescheduling frequency at different values for total disruption time. ....	- 99 -
Figure 4.19. Total tardiness resulted from different rescheduling frequencies for 25 jobs problem at different number of disruptions with the same total disruption duration .....	- 100 -
Figure 4.24. Total cost of rescheduling for different rescheduling frequencies at different values of scheduling/tardiness cost ratio for 25 jobs problem. ....	- 101 -
Figure 4.25: Total cost of different rescheduling policies under different number of disruptions with the same total disruption duration.....	- 102 -
Figure 4.26. Total tardiness changes due to changing due date tightness factor with long middle disruption for 25 jobs problem.....	- 103 -
Figure 4.27. Effect of changing tardiness cost coefficient on total cost for different rescheduling policies at long middle disruption and 10 job problem. ....	- 105 -
Figure 4.28. Effect of changing WIP holding cost coefficient on total cost for different rescheduling policies at long middle disruption and 10 job problem.....	- 106 -
Figure 4.29. Effect of changing expediting cost coefficient on total cost for different rescheduling policies at long middle disruption and 10 job problem.....	- 106 -

# List of Tables

Table 2.1: Summary of literature.....	- 40 -
Table 2.1 (Cont.): Summary of literature.....	- 41 -
Table 4.1: Design of the first set of experiments (effect of rescheduling policy) .....	- 69 -
Table 4.2: Design of the second set of experiments (effect of rescheduling frequency).....	- 70 -
Table 4.3: Cost coefficients .....	- 71 -
Table 4.4: Genetic algorithm parameters.....	- 72 -
Table 4.5: 10 jobs' processing time and due dates.....	- 73 -
Table 4.6: 25 jobs' processing time and due dates.....	- 73 -
Table 4.7: ANOVA table for first set of experiments' total tardiness results.....	- 80 -
Table 4.8: ANOVA table for first set of experiments' total cost results.....	- 84 -
Table 4.9: ANOVA table for second set of experiments' total tardiness results.....	- 88 -
Table 4.10: ANOVA table for second set of experiments' total cost results .....	- 92 -
Table 4.11: Effect of due date tightness and rescheduling policy on tardiness .....	- 104 -

# List of Abbreviations

AWI-J	Active Wilkerson Irwin – Job
AWI-O	Active Wilkerson Irwin – Operation
AOR	Affected Operations Rescheduling
ATC	Apparent Tardiness Cost
ACO	Ant Colony Optimization
ANOVA	Analysis of Variance
BB	Branch and Bound
BS	Beam Search
CFJIT	Critical First Job Idle Time
CPU	Central Processing Unit
DHS	Discrete Harmony Search
DOE	Design of Experiments
ED	Event-Driven
EDD	Earliest Due Date
FMS	Flexible Manufacturing System
FJR	Fit Job Repair
FBS	Filtered Beam Search
GA	Genetic Algorithms
GDP	Ground Delay Program
HFBS	Heuristic Filtered Beam Search
IG	Iterated Greedy
LP	Linear Programming

LTL	Less than Truck Load
LEPST	Longest Expected Processing with Setup Time
MCR	Minimum Critical Ratio
MLEPST	Modified Longest Expected Processing with Setup Time
MDD	Modified Due Dates
MAIT	Maximum Allowable Idle Time
MWCTD	Minimum Weighted Completion Time Difference
MSB	Modified Shifting Bottleneck
MTBF	Mean Time Between Failures
MTTR	Mean Time to Repair
MPS	Master Production Schedule
NP	Non-Polynomial
PR	Periodic Rescheduling
RSR	Right Shift Repair
RS	Right Shifting
SPT	Shortest Processing Time
SOPT	Shortest Operation Processing Time
TR	Total Rescheduling
TWK	Total Work content
VNS	Variable Neighborhood Search
WSPT	Weighted Shortest Processing Time
WIP	Work-In-Process
WSPT	Weighted Shortest Processing Time

# List of Symbols

$a$	The lower bound of time of disruption occurrence.
$b$	The upper bound of time of disruption occurrence.
$C_j$	Completion time of job (j) [in hrs.].
$C_{[k]}(v)$	Completion time of job k in schedule v [in hrs.].
$C_{tardiness}$	Total tardiness cost.
$C_{WIP}$	Total WIP holding cost.
$C_{expediting}$	Total material expediting cost.
$C_{sch/res}$	Total computational cost of scheduling/rescheduling.
$C_{earliness}$	Total earliness cost.
$d_j$	Due date of job (j) [in hrs.].
$DS_d$	Start time of disruption (d) [in hrs.].
$DE_d$	End time of disruption (d) [in hrs.].
$DL_d$	Duration of disruption (d) [in hrs.].
$e$	The lower bound of disruption duration.
$h$	Upper bound of jobs' processing time.
$j$	The job number, where $j = 1, \dots, N$ .
$J_o$	Set of jobs to be initially scheduled, where $J_o = \{1, \dots, N\}$ .
$k$	The disrupted job.
$l$	Lower bound of jobs' processing time.
$M$	The makespan of the initial schedule [in hrs.].
$M'$	The makespan of the actually realized schedule [in hrs.].
$P_j$	Processing time of job (j) [in hrs.].