

Operations Research/Computer Science Interfaces Series

Kevin Tierney

Optimizing Liner Shipping Fleet Repositioning Plans



 Springer

Operations Research/Computer Science Interfaces Series

Kevin Tierney

Optimizing Liner Shipping Fleet Repositioning Plans



Springer

Operations Research/Computer Science Interfaces Series

Volume 57

Series Editors:

Ramesh Sharda

Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, USA

Stefan Voß

University of Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany

More information about this series at <http://www.springer.com/series/6375>

Kevin Tierney

Optimizing Liner Shipping Fleet Repositioning Plans

 Springer

Kevin Tierney
Decision Support & Operations
Research Lab
University of Paderborn
Paderborn, Germany

ISSN 1387-666X
Operations Research/Computer Science Interfaces Series
ISBN 978-3-319-17664-2 ISBN 978-3-319-17665-9 (eBook)
DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-17665-9

Library of Congress Control Number: 2015938698

Springer Cham Heidelberg New York Dordrecht London
© Springer International Publishing Switzerland 2015

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made.

Printed on acid-free paper

Springer International Publishing AG Switzerland is part of Springer Science+Business Media (www.springer.com)

Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Approach and Contributions	3
1.2	Outline	5
2	Containerized Shipping	7
2.1	Containers	8
2.2	Liner Shipping Networks	9
2.2.1	Services	10
2.2.2	Network Structure	12
2.3	Vessels	14
2.3.1	Fuel Consumption and Slow-Steaming	14
2.3.2	Stowage	16
2.4	Carrier Alliances	16
2.5	Ports and Container Terminals	17
3	Liner Shipping Fleet Repositioning	21
3.1	Repositioning Overview	22
3.2	Phase-Out and Phase-In	24
3.3	Repositioning Activities	25
3.3.1	Sailing and Slow-Steaming	25
3.3.2	Sail-on-Service	26
3.3.3	Inducement and Omission	29
3.3.4	Cargo Demands	29
3.3.5	Equipment	30
3.3.6	Flexible Visitations	31
3.4	Asia-CA3 Case Study	31
3.5	Related Problems	32
3.5.1	Shipping Problems	32
3.5.2	Vehicle Routing Problems	34
3.5.3	Airline Disruption Management	34
3.6	Chapter Summary	34

4	Methodological Background	35
4.1	Automated Planning	35
4.2	Partial-Order Planning	37
4.3	Linear and Mixed-Integer Programming	40
4.3.1	LP Duality	41
4.3.2	Mixed-Integer Programming	41
4.4	Constraint Programming	45
4.4.1	CSPs and COPs	45
4.4.2	Solving CP Problems	46
4.5	Metaheuristics	49
4.5.1	Local Search	50
4.5.2	Simulated Annealing	51
5	Liner Shipping Fleet Repositioning Without Cargo	53
5.1	Dataset	54
5.2	A PDDL Model of Fleet Repositioning	55
5.2.1	PDDL Model	55
5.2.2	Planners	58
5.2.3	POPF	59
5.2.4	PDDL Model Computational Evaluation in POPF	65
5.3	Temporal Optimization Planning	67
5.3.1	Linear Temporal Optimization Planning	70
5.3.2	Domain Independent Heuristic Cost Estimation	72
5.3.3	LTOP Model	73
5.3.4	Fleet Repositioning Specific Heuristics	74
5.3.5	LTOP Computational Evaluation	74
5.4	A Mixed-Integer Programming Model of Fleet Repositioning	76
5.4.1	Graph and MIP Description	76
5.4.2	MIP Model Computational Evaluation in CPLEX	78
5.5	A Constraint Programming Model of Fleet Repositioning	79
5.5.1	Model Description	79
5.5.2	CP Model Computational Evaluation in G12	85
5.6	Chapter Summary	87
6	Liner Shipping Fleet Repositioning with Cargo	89
6.1	Graph Construction	90
6.1.1	Phase-Out	91
6.1.2	Phase-In	91
6.1.3	Flexible Visitations	92
6.1.4	Sail-on-Service	92
6.1.5	Sailing Cost	94
6.1.6	Graph Formalization	94
6.2	Arc Flow Model	96
6.2.1	Parameters	96

6.2.2	Variables	97
6.2.3	Objective and Constraints	97
6.3	Path-Based Model	99
6.3.1	Master Problem	100
6.3.2	Sub-problem	101
6.3.3	Reduced Graph	101
6.4	LSFRP with Inflexible Visitations	102
6.4.1	Preprocessing	105
6.4.2	Equipment as Flows	105
6.4.3	Equipment as Demands	107
6.5	Heuristic Approaches	108
6.5.1	Simulated Annealing	108
6.5.2	Late Acceptance Hill Climbing	110
6.5.3	Solution Representation	111
6.5.4	Initial Solution Generation	111
6.5.5	Neighborhoods	114
6.5.6	Objective Evaluation	115
6.6	Computational Complexity	118
6.7	Computational Evaluation	118
6.7.1	Dataset	119
6.7.2	Arc, Node and Path Flow Approach Evaluations	120
6.7.3	SA and LAHC Implementations	123
6.7.4	Initial Solution Heuristics Comparison	127
6.7.5	Neighborhood Analysis	128
6.7.6	SA and LAHC Results	130
6.7.7	Reference Instance Performance	137
6.8	Chapter Summary	138
7	Conclusion	141
7.1	Outlook	142
A	No Cargo LSFRP PDDL Domain	143
A.1	PDDL Model	143
A.1.1	Predicates	143
A.1.2	Functions	145
A.1.3	Time	147
A.1.4	Initial and Goal States	147
A.1.5	Actions	148
A.2	Forward PDDL Domain	154
A.3	Reversed PDDL Domain	159

- B An LTOP Model of Fleet Repositioning** 165
 - B.1 Constants 165
 - B.2 State Variables 166
 - B.3 Optimization Variables 166
 - B.4 Initial and Goal States 166
 - B.5 Actions 167
 - B.5.1 Phase-Out 167
 - B.5.2 Phase-In 168
 - B.5.3 Sailing 170
 - B.5.4 Sailing with Equipment 171
 - B.5.5 Sail-on-Service 171

- References** 173

- Index** 181

Chapter 1

Introduction

Situated at the heart of global trade, liner shipping networks transported over 1.5 billion tons of containerized cargo on over 5,000 seagoing container vessels in 2013 [156]. The world is becoming more and more connected through liner shipping networks. Indeed, according to the liner shipping connectivity index [69, 156], the average connectivity between nations has risen over 43 % between 2004 and 2013 alone. Container shipment volumes have also been steadily increasing ever since the container's invention in the 1950s [98, 156], despite a short period of decline in 2009. In fact, year-over-year global container throughput growth has been around 10 % for nearly two decades [65] with few exceptions. These trends show no signs of stopping as liner shipping continues to be responsible for more and more world trade [156].

Liner shipping networks consist of regularly scheduled, cyclical routes between ports. Some routes are short, visiting only several ports in a confined area such as the North Sea, while other routes span the entire globe. Figure 1.1 illustrates a service from Seago Line's 2014 network in the Mediterranean Sea. A defining feature of liner shipping compared to other forms of shipping, such as tramp shipping, is its periodicity. Liner routes have published schedules in which ports are visited at a regular frequency (e.g., weekly or bi-weekly).

Shipping lines primarily transport containers, which are steel boxes of one of several standardized dimensions that are filled with goods for shipment. All manner of cargo is carried over the seas, including everything from household goods to heavy machinery and even perishables like fruit and meat. Containers offer shippers security for their cargo as well as specialized features for cargo that needs to be cooled or cared for along its journey.

As the use of containers has increased, so too has the challenge of getting containers to their destinations on time and on budget. Modern shipping lines have networks that span the entire globe and use hundreds of container ships to move millions of containers. The liner carrier Maersk Line, for example, had enough capacity in 2014 on its ships to handle over 2.8 million 20-foot containers at a single given time [4]. Furthermore, the liner shipping market is competitive in many areas of




Fig. 1.1: The weekly Mediterranean Sea service offered by Seago Line in 2014 [131]

the world, requiring carriers to make their operations as efficient as possible to stay in business. In order to deal with the complexity and scale of the challenges they are facing, shipping lines are increasingly turning to algorithmic approaches and decision support systems that assist their employees in making difficult decisions. However, systems performing optimization of a cost or revenue based objective are still rare in the liner shipping industry. Indeed, the same aspects of such combinatorial problems that make them difficult for humans to solve also make them hard for computers to solve. Recent progress from computer scientists and operations researchers into liner shipping optimization has begun to make solving such problems possible, allowing a new generation of systems to emerge.

The research community has identified and modeled several well-known optimization problems that attempt to alleviate the challenges that the liner shipping industry faces (see, e.g., [26, 27]). At the strategic level, shipping lines must create the routes in their network to satisfy their customers' demands, a problem that despite a number of years of research is still too difficult to solve for most realistic sized problems [5, 121]. At the tactical level, container ships are assigned to services in an existing shipping network in order to minimize the sailing costs while keeping customer's demands in consideration [119]. And, finally, at the operational level, shipping lines must determine vessels' sailing speeds [43, 161], which vessels carry which containers, where to stow containers on vessels, and manage disruptions [20].

Through our collaboration with Maersk Line, currently the world's largest container shipping line [4], we found that a key operational problem has not yet been addressed in the liner shipping literature. Liner shipping networks are regularly adjusted in order to handle fluctuations in seasonal demand, as well as to adjust the network to changing macroeconomic conditions. These adjustments can involve adding new routes to the network, removing unprofitable routes, or expanding/contracting existing routes. Container ships must be *repositioned* within the network to facilitate these changes. Repositioning involves sailing vessels between routes in a liner shipping network in order to minimize sailing costs, port fees, and disruptions to container flows. During repositioning, ships may undertake a number of cost saving activities, such as bringing empty containers to places where they are needed or

temporarily taking over operations on existing services. This problem is sometimes known in industry parlance as the *phase-in/phase-out* problem, which refers to the process of removing and inserting a repositioning vessel into normal operations, respectively.

Repositioning a ship can cost upwards of a million US dollars, and hundreds of ships are repositioned each year by the world's shipping lines. Finding plans of activities that minimize the cost of repositioning, while avoiding the disruption of cargo flows in the network, has the potential to save shipping lines significant amounts of money. Currently, ship repositioning plans are created by hand by employees of shipping lines. Furthermore, since one of the main cost components of repositioning ships is bunker fuel, optimizing vessel activities can also help shipping lines reduce their CO₂ output and become more sustainable. This monograph considers the following core question:

Can an algorithm be developed to create real-world realizable liner shipping fleet repositioning plans within a reasonable amount of CPU time?

Fleet repositioning involves a number of side constraints. We aim to model key constraints that determine a plan's real-world feasibility, such as constraints on the sailing speed and capacity of ships, and ensure that the routes determined for ships adhere to a number of liner shipping specific constraints. Our goal is to generate repositioning plans in under an hour in order to allow repositioning coordinators to use our algorithms in an interactive fashion in a decision support system. Since even a small improvement in the objective function can translate to tens of thousands of dollars in cost savings or increased revenue, our algorithms should find repositioning plans that are within a few percent of the optimal solution.

We show that fleet repositioning problems can be solved in many cases to optimality with or without cargo flows on a dataset based on real-world data from our industrial collaborator. In addition, we compare our solution approaches for fleet repositioning to a real world scenario from Maersk Line in 2011. Our solution methods are able to find a repositioning plan with a profit of \$32.1 million,¹ which is roughly \$14 million higher than the profit of the actual repositioning that was carried out by Maersk Line.

1.1 Approach and Contributions

We approach fleet repositioning problems from a variety of perspectives, both in terms of what level of abstraction we take in our models, as well as in the solution procedures used to generate repositioning plans. We call the general problem of repositioning the liner shipping fleet repositioning problem (LSFRP). We model this problem with and without cargo flows, which represents two different views

¹ All monetary units in this monograph are US dollars.

of operational goals for a shipping line. We test both of these models on datasets based on real scenarios from our industrial collaborator and crafted scenarios using industrial data.

We first model the problem without cargo flows in order to focus on minimizing the cost of the activities chosen during repositioning, and call this problem the no-cargo LSFRP (NCLSFRP). This problem has a number of simplifications of the overall problem with cargo flows that we present in detail in Chap. 5. A number of activities, such as sailing a vessel, have time-dependent task costs, i.e., the cost of performing an activity is dependent on the action duration. The NCLSFRP is difficult to solve due to these costs as well as because of the interactions of vessels in choosing which activities each vessel should perform. Since the problem contains both scheduling and routing components, it is not clear a priori which types of solution method will solve it most effectively.

We present four different solution approaches and describe the trade-offs between them, starting with an automated planning model using the planning domain definition language (PDDL). Since existing automated planning techniques have difficulties with time-dependent task costs, we introduce a novel planning technique called linear temporal optimization planning (LTOP), which combines the well-known partial-order planning paradigm with linear programming. We model the NCLSFRP in the LTOP framework and show that planning and optimization need not be mutually exclusive endeavors. We also provide a mixed-integer programming (MIP) model and constraint programming (CP) model of the NCLSFRP, showing that while the MIP has a difficult time with the scheduling aspects of the problem, CP is able to outperform all other approaches, albeit with the least extensible model. Our PDDL, LTOP and MIP models were first published in [150], and our CP model in [88].

We then move to a model of the LSFRP with cargo and equipment flows. In addition to the challenge of optimizing activities with time-dependent task costs, we incorporate a multi-commodity flow problem to handle cargo and equipment. We also include a more realistic view of certain problem activities than in the NCLSFRP. We create a graph based representation of the problem that includes a number of key problem constraints and activities, such as sail-on-service opportunities, within the graph itself. We use this graph in all of our solution methods for the LSFRP with cargo and equipment flows.

We first model the problem as a MIP using an arc flow formulation and show that, while small instances can be solved to optimality, larger instances prove challenging for the MIP. We also introduce a node flow model for a special case of the LSFRP in which all activities have a fixed start and end time. On those instances that conform to this simplification of the LSFRP, we are able to find optimal solutions to nearly every instance in our dataset, including several instances that the arc flow model cannot solve.

Furthermore, we introduce a path based model which is solved using a column generation procedure. This approach solves even more problems that neither the arc flow or node flow models can solve. This model iterates between a master problem which selects vessel paths through the graph, and a sub problem that generates

paths. Since column generation can only be used for solving linear programs (rather than mixed-integer programs), the path based model is only guaranteed, from a theoretical perspective, to find a lower bound to the overall LSFRP. However, our path based model finds solutions with integer values for 95 % of our dataset, meaning it finds the optimal solution.

Finally, we also introduce two heuristic approaches based off of simulated annealing (SA) [90] and late acceptance hill climbing (LAHC) [21], respectively. Although our heuristic approaches are not always able to find optimal solutions, they are effective at providing good solutions quickly. We presented our work on the arc flow model of the LSFRP in [152], the node flow model in [153], and on solving the LSFRP with heuristics in [148] and [147].

The contributions of this monograph are as follows:

1. A planning model of the NCLSFRP.
2. A formalism of temporal optimization planning and its linear instantiation, linear temporal optimization planning.
3. A linear temporal optimization planning model of the NCLSFRP.
4. A mixed-integer programming model of the NCLSFRP.
5. A constraint programming model of the NCLSFRP.
6. A graph construction and arc flow mixed-integer programming model of the LSFRP with cargo flows.
7. A simulated annealing and late acceptance hill climbing approach to the LSFRP with cargo flows.
8. A node flow mixed-integer programming model of a specialized version of the LSFRP with cargo flows.

We therefore answer the core question of this monograph with “yes”; that is, an algorithm can be developed to create liner shipping fleet repositioning plans for a decision support system within a reasonable amount of CPU time.

1.2 Outline

The outline of this monograph is as follows.

Chapter 2 We provide background on containerized shipping both at sea and on land. We describe the components relevant to fleet repositioning, inter-terminal transportation and the capacitated k -shift problem, including liner shipping networks, container ships, and port operations.

Chapter 3 In this chapter, we describe liner shipping fleet repositioning in detail. We introduce all of the cost saving (and revenue earning) activities present in fleet repositioning, as well as describe a case study performed with our industrial collaborator.

Chapter 4 We provide background information for the several different solution approaches used in this monograph, including automated planning, mixed-integer programming and constraint programming.