


A FRAMEWORK TO DETERMINE NEW SYSTEM REQUIREMENTS UNDER DESIGN PARAMETER AND DEMAND UNCERTAINTIES

Parithi Govindaraju, Navindran
Davendralingam and William A. Crossley

Purdue University

Acquisition Research Symposium 2015

Wednesday, May 13, 2015

A large, stylized graphic element in the bottom right corner, featuring a black shape with yellow and white curved lines, resembling a wing or a stylized letter 'P'.

Report Documentation Page				Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.					
1. REPORT DATE 13 MAY 2015		2. REPORT TYPE		3. DATES COVERED 00-00-2015 to 00-00-2015	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE A Framework to Determine New System Requirements Under Design Parameter and Demand Uncertainties				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S)				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Purdue University, School of Aeronautics and Astronautics, 701 W. Stadium Ave, West Lafayette, IN, 47907-2045				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution unlimited					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT Same as Report (SAR)	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 30	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT unclassified	b. ABSTRACT unclassified	c. THIS PAGE unclassified			

Overview

- Use an optimization-based approach to identify design requirements of new systems
 - Address issue that new systems operate along with existing systems
 - Seek fleet-level performance and capabilities
- Development of a decision-support framework
 - Determine requirements for – and suggest design of – a new system that will optimize fleet-level objectives to support acquisition
 - Fleet-level objectives are functions of new system requirements
 - Account for design parameter and demand uncertainties
- Used the framework to generate tradeoffs between fleet-level productivity and cost
 - Motivated by energy and fuel consumption, reflected via operating cost
 - Route network extracted from Air Mobility Command (AMC) operations
 - New aircraft design change across range of best tradeoff solutions

INTRODUCTION AND MOTIVATION



Motivation



- Fleet-level energy efficiency poses significant risks and operational constraints on military operational flexibility¹
- Growing emphasis on reducing fuel usage in military systems
 - Streamline operations of existing fleet
 - Acquire efficient platforms and platforms that lead to fleet-level efficiency
- Lack of a framework that captures the effect that fuel-saving measures can have on fleet-level performance metrics²
 - Do not accurately explore tradeoff opportunities
- Determining design requirements of 'yet-to-be-designed' systems to improve fleet-level metrics is difficult
 - Couples operation decisions with new system design
 - Non-deterministic nature of fleet operations
 - Assumptions in deterministic models leads to sub-optimal performance

¹AMC Vice Commander: *Saving fuel secures the future – one gallon at a time. Inside AMC*

²DoD Acquisition and Technology: *Energy Efficiency starts with the acquisition process*

Air Mobility Command

- AMC: One of the major command centers of the U.S. Air Force
- AMC is the DoD's single largest aviation fuel consumer (28 % of total aviation fuel use)*.
- Non-deterministic nature of AMC operations
 - Demand is highly asymmetric
 - Demand fluctuation on a day to day basis
 - Routes flown vary based on demand
 - Limited aircraft types: C-5, C-17, C-130, Boeing 747-F, KC-135, etc.
- AMC's mission profile includes
 - Worldwide cargo and passenger transport**
 - Aerial refueling and aeromedical evacuations
- Used Global Air Transportation Execution System (GATES) dataset
 - Large route network (1804 routes)



Sample route network from GATES

**Aviation fuel savings: AMC leading the charge. Air Mobility Command*

***This work only addresses cargo transport*

SCOPE AND METHOD OF APPROACH

A large, stylized graphic element in the bottom right corner, featuring a black, curved shape with yellow and white highlights, resembling a wing or a stylized letter 'P'.


How can our approach help?

- Our methodology
 - Helps determine the requirements for – and describe the design of – a new aircraft for use in the AMC fleet
 - Optimize fleet-level metrics that address performance and fuel use
- Describe how design requirements of the new aircraft would change for different tradeoff opportunities between productivity and cost

Method of Approach (1)

- Consider this as an optimization problem
 - Objectives
 - Fleet Productivity (speed of payload delivery)
 - Fleet Direct Operating Cost (strongly driven by fuel use)
 - Variables
 - New aircraft requirements (pallet capacity, range, speed)
 - New aircraft design variables (AR , W/S , T/W)
 - Assignment variables (flight on a particular route)
 - Constraints
 - Cargo demand
 - Aircraft performance (takeoff distance)
 - Fleet Operations (maximum operational hours)


Method of Approach (2)




**Monolithic
Formulation**

Subspace Decomposition


Classes of Uncertainties



Subspace Decomposition Approach (Deterministic)



Subspace Decomposition Approach



Top Level Subspace

Maximize Fleet-level Productivity

Productivity = Speed x Capacity

Subject to $14 \leq Pallet_x \leq 38$

Pallet Capacity Bounds

$350 \leq Speed_x \leq 550$

Cruise speed bounds (knots)

$2400 \leq Range_x \leq 3800$

Range at maximum payload
bounds (nm)

$Speed_x, Range_x \in R^+$

$Pallet_x \in Z^+$

Design variables

- Pallet capacity, Range and Speed bounds are set by strategic air lift aircraft description

Aircraft Sizing Subspace

Minimize $(DOC_{Pallet, Range, Speed})_X$

Direct Operating Cost

Subject to $6.0 \leq (AR)_X \leq 9.5$

Wing aspect ratio bounds

$65 \leq (W/S)_X \leq 161$

Wing loading bounds (lb/ft²)

$0.18 \leq (T/W)_X \leq 0.35$

Thrust-to-weight ratio bounds

$S_{TO}(Pallet_X, (AR)_X, (W/S)_X, (T/W)_X) \leq D_{takeoff}$

Aircraft takeoff distance

$(AR)_X, (W/S)_X, (T/W)_X \in R^+$

Design variables

- Bounds for aircraft design variables based on current military cargo aircraft

Uncertainty in Aircraft Design Parameters

Uncertain design parameter	Range of values
ΔW_E (lbs) – empty weight	$\pm 10\%$
ΔC_{D0} – drag coefficient	$\pm 10\%$
$\Delta \text{DOC/BH}$ (\$/hr) – direct operating cost / block hour	$\pm 10\%$
ΔSFC (1/hr) – specific fuel consumption	$\pm 10\%$ (Baseline value: 0.5)

- Four-factor, three-level full factorial design of experiments (DOE)
 - Levels: 90%, 100% ,and 110% of baseline or empirically-predicted value
 - 81 experiments = 81 sizing + allocation under uncertainty
- Best aircraft design based on mean from DOE trials
 - Our approach to account for uncertainty with low computational cost

Fleet Assignment Subspace

Maximize

$$\sum_{p=1}^P \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N x_{p,k,i,j} \cdot \left(\text{Speed}_{p,k,i,j} \cdot \text{Pallet}_{p,k,i,j} \right)$$

Productivity =
Speed × Capacity

Subject to

$$\sum_{p=1}^P \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N x_{p,k,i,j} \cdot C_{p,k,i,j} \leq M$$

Fleet-level DOC limits

$$\sum_{i=1}^N x_{p,k,i,j} \geq \sum_{i=1}^N x_{p,k+1,i,j} \quad \forall k = 1, 2, 3 \dots K,$$

$$\forall p = 1, 2, 3 \dots P, \quad \forall j = 1, 2, 3 \dots N$$

Node balance
constraints

Fleet Assignment Subspace

Subject to

$$\sum_{p=1}^P \sum_{k=1}^K Cap_{p,k,i,j} \cdot x_{p,k,i,j} \geq dem_{i,j}$$

$$\forall i = 1, 2, 3 \dots N, \forall j = 1, 2, 3 \dots N$$

Demand constraints

$$\sum_{i=1}^N x_{p,1,i,j} \leq O_{p,i} \quad \forall p = 1, 2, 3 \dots P, \forall i = 1, 2, 3 \dots N$$

Starting location of
aircraft constraints



$$\sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N x_{p,k,i,j} \cdot BH_{p,k,i,j} \leq B_p \quad \forall p = 1, 2, 3 \dots P$$

Trip constraints

$$x_{p,k,i,j} \in \{0, 1\}$$

Binary decision variable

Uncertainty in Pallet Cargo Demand



- Highly uncertain cargo demand
- Monte Carlo sampling (MCS) methods
 - Repeated deterministic calculations for statistical distribution of input random parameters



Palletized and Oversized Cargo Transport for Military Airlift Operations

SCENARIOS & STUDIES


A large, stylized graphic element in the bottom right corner, featuring a black shape with yellow and white curved lines, resembling a wing or a stylized letter 'P'.

Three-base Problem


- Simple three-base problem consisting of 6 directional routes
 - Extracted from the GATES dataset
 - Most flown routes in May 2006
- Existing fleet for AMC
 - Three C-5: 36 pallet capacity
 - Three C-17: 18 pallet capacity
 - Three B747-F: 29 pallet capacity
- 1 new aircraft of type X is introduced




Subspace Decomposition Approach



Three-base Results



Three-base Results



Error bars show min-max variation in fleet-level metrics due to uncertainties in demand and in the new aircraft design

- Degree of dispersion for some results are smaller than for others
- For the same productivity, some maximum fleet costs values on this plot still lower than costs of using existing fleet

CONCLUDING STATEMENTS AND FUTURE WORK

A large, stylized graphic element in the bottom right corner, featuring a black shape with yellow and white curved lines, resembling a wing or a stylized letter 'P'.

Concluding Statements

- We felt there was a need for an efficient decision-support tool to determine design requirements for new, to-be-acquired systems
- We developed a framework that identifies the tradeoffs between fleet-level metrics
 - Each tradeoff solution describes the design requirements, and optimal design of the new aircraft
 - MCS techniques to address uncertainty in demand
 - DOE to explore uncertainty in system design
 - Framework appears domain agnostic, should apply to many different applications, vehicles, etc.

Future Work

- Robust/Reliability-based problem formulations
- Reduce computational expense
 - Metamodeling or response surfaces
 - Improved sampling techniques

Thank You

A large, stylized graphic element in the bottom right corner, featuring a black shape with yellow and white curved lines, resembling a wing or a stylized letter 'P'.


BACKUP SLIDES



Multi-Objective Formulation


- Two objectives
 - Maximize fleet-level productivity
 - Minimize fleet-level cost
- Epsilon (Gaming) constraint formulation
 - Converts multi-objective to single objective
 - Identify a primary objective
 - Place limits on other objectives (inequality constraints)

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{Maximize} & f_p(x) \\ \text{Subject to} & f_l(x) \leq \varepsilon_l \quad l = 1 \dots n_{obj} (l \neq p) \\ & g_j(x) \leq 0 \\ & h_k(x) = 0 \end{array}$$



Air Mobility Command

- Used Global Air Transportation Execution System (GATES) dataset
- Filtered route network from GATES dataset
 - Demand for subset served by C-5, C-17 and 747-F (~75% of total demand)
 - Fixed density and dimension of pallet (463 L)
- Our aircraft fleet consists of only the C-5, C-17 and 747-F.



Source: www.amc.af.mil