

Exact Methods for a Paint Shop Scheduling Problem from the Automotive Supply Industry

Felix Winter and Nysret Musliu

Christian Doppler Laboratory for Artificial Intelligence and Optimization for
Planning and Scheduling*
DBAI, TU Wien
`{winter,musliu}@dbai.tuwien.ac.at`

Every day, the paint shops of the automotive supply industry will paint a large number of items that are requested by car manufacturing companies. To ensure a cost efficient production, modern factories will utilize a high level of automation that includes multiple painting robots and conveyor belt systems. Because of the sophisticated production process it becomes a hard task to find good painting schedules, and human planners are usually not able to find optimized production sequences. Therefore, there is a strong need to develop automated techniques for paint shop scheduling.

In the literature related problems have been studied and several publications consider the minimization of color changes for paint shop scheduling (e.g. [8], [7], [6], [2]). However, the problem we investigate in this paper includes additional important practical features like the optimized allocation of materials onto carrying devices and the consideration of many sequence and resource constraints. We have previously introduced this real life paint shop scheduling problem that appears in the automotive industry in [9](todo). Its aim is to find a production sequence that fulfills a large set of given demands and to minimize the number of color changes as well as the number of carrying devices that are used to carry materials through the paint shop. To solve the problem, we previously proposed a greedy algorithm as well as a local search based approach and we provided a set of practical benchmark instances in [9]. However, up to now no exact solution approaches have been proposed and optimal solutions are not known yet for all instances.

In this work we investigate two modeling approaches for the paint shop scheduling problem using the MiniZinc constraint modeling language [5]. One of them using a direct modeling approach and the other one using deterministic finite automata (DFAs). Furthermore, we evaluate and compare our proposed modeling techniques by performing a series of benchmark experiments using state of the art constraint programming and mixed integer programming solvers on known practical paint shop scheduling benchmark instances from [9]. Although currently the exact methods we describe cannot be used to solve very large practical instances, the proposed approaches can provide optimal solutions

* The financial support by the Austrian Federal Ministry for Digital and Economic Affairs and the National Foundation for Research, Technology and Development is gratefully acknowledged.

for 7 benchmark instances that have been previously unknown. Final results in our experiments are shown in Table 1.

Additionally, we analyze the complexity of the decision variant of the paint shop scheduling problem and show that it is NP-complete(todo).

Chuffed Gurobi Cplex LS [9]				Chuffed Gurobi Cplex LS [9]					
I1	775*	775*	775*	844	I13	NA	NA	NA	116235
I2	842*	842*	842*	868	I14	NA	NA	NA	118628
I3	961*	961*	961*	990	I15	NA	NA	NA	172679
I4	918*	NA	1160	975	I16	NA	NA	NA	262252
I5	530*	17880	17880	593	I17	NA	NA	NA	421777
I6	842*	842*	842*	887	I18	NA	NA	NA	581021
I7	1046	NA	NA	1084	I19	NA	NA	NA	555829
I8	1237*	NA	NA	1834	I20	NA	NA	NA	927822
I9	1006	NA	NA	1735	I21	NA	NA	NA	917955
I10	973	NA	NA	1134	I22	NA	NA	NA	1128716
I11	NA	NA	NA	5476	I23	NA	NA	NA	1884125
I12	NA	NA	NA	5723	I24	NA	NA	NA	2086450

Table 1: The best results achieved with our models for instances 1–24 using Chuffed [1], Gurobi [4] and Cplex [3] compared with the best known upper bounds from [9](LS). Experiments have been performed on an Intel Xeon E5345 2.33 GHz CPU with 48 GB RAM under a one hour time limit. The best result within each line is formatted in bold face. A * denotes proven optimal solutions.

References

1. Chu, G., Stuckey, P.J., Schutt, A., Ehlers, T., Gange, G., Francis, K.: Chuffed, a lazy clause generation solver. <https://github.com/chuffed/chuffed> (2018)
2. Epping, T., Hochstättler, W., Oertel, P.: Complexity results on a paint shop problem. *Discrete Applied Mathematics* **136**(2), 217 – 226 (2004)
3. IBM, CPLEX: 12.8.0 cplex user’s manual (2017)
4. LLC, G.O.: Gurobi optimizer reference manual. <http://www.gurobi.com> (2018)
5. Nethercote, N., Stuckey, P.J., Becket, R., Brand, S., Duck, G.J., Tack, G.: Minizinc: Towards a standard CP modelling language. In: *Principles and Practice of Constraint Programming - CP 2007*, Providence, RI, USA, September 23-27, 2007, Proceedings. pp. 529–543
6. Prandtstetter, M., Raidl, G.R.: An integer linear programming approach and a hybrid variable neighborhood search for the car sequencing problem. *European Journal of Operational Research* **191**(3), 1004 – 1022 (2008)
7. Solnon, C., Cung, V.D., Nguyen, A., Artigues, C.: The car sequencing problem: Overview of state-of-the-art methods and industrial case-study of the rodef’2005 challenge problem. *European Journal of Operational Research* **191**(3), 912 – 927 (2008)
8. Spieckermann, S., Gutenschwager, K., Voß, S.: A sequential ordering problem in automotive paint shops. *International Journal of Production Research* **42**(9), 1865–1878 (2004)
9. Winter, F., Demirović, E., Musliu, N., Mrkvicka, C.: Solution approaches to an automotive paint shop scheduling problem. ICAPS 2019 (Accepted for publication)