

Perp. Sultanah Zanariah, UTM



30000010180295

104600 88

**EFFECT OF ADOPTING DIFFERENT DISPATCHING RULES ON
THE MEAN FLOW TIME IN A TWO MACHINE BATCH-SHOP
PROBLEM**

HAZIR FAROUK ABDELRAHEEM ELHAJ

**A project report submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
award of the degree of Master of Mechanical Engineering**

Faculty of Mechanical Engineering

University Technology Malaysia

DECEMBER 2005

To my beloved Family; the power of my life. To my dear Husband and my lovely Daughter; the light of my life.... To all those supported me to complete this study I dedicate this work with great respect and love.

Hazir

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I thank Allah, whose mercy and bounty have enabled me to overcome difficulties during my study and reach the final stage.

Secondly, I wish to express my sincere gratitude and appreciation to my supervisor; Professor Dr. Awaluddin Mohamed Shaharoun for his invaluable guidance and critical comment throughout this project which has given me a strong basis in handling it.

Gratitude and appreciation is also express to Professor Dr. Mohd Shariff Nabi Bakash, Dr. Masine Md. Tap, and Mr. Syed Ahmad Helmi for helping me in WITNESS. Their assistance helped me to improve my knowledge in using the software.

Finally, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to those that shared and sort out the difficulties during the progress of the project. Special thanks are also extended to friends for their patience and cheerfully sacrificing their precious time to share their knowledge, experience and most of their wisdom during Master study.

ABSTRACT

The two-machine flow shop problem was shown to be NP-hard when the objective is to minimize total (mean) completion time instead of makespan even for the case where setup times are neglected. This means that it is highly unlikely to find a polynomial algorithm to solve the problem. Therefore, researchers concentrated on developing branch-and-bound or heuristic algorithms. Ali Allahverdi, 1998 obtained the optimal solutions for minimizing mean flow time in a two-machine flow shop with Sequence-independent set up times by using three heuristic algorithms. In this project we addressed the same problem of Ali Allahverdi, based in his model a simulation model was built and validated using Witness software. Experiments were conducted for different number of jobs and different dispatching rules for jobs sequence. The setup-time also varied along the experiments. The effectiveness of the rules used was also measured by two other performance measures beside the mean flow time; they are WIP and machine utilization.

The results were analysed and discussed and it concluded that all the performance measures were affected by number of jobs and change of set-up time for all rules used. It found that SPT rule generally performs best in terms of minimizing flow time, minimizing average number of jobs in the system and maximize machine utilization.

ABSTRAK

Masalah syop aliran 2-mesin ditunjukkan sebagai NP-keras apabila objektif untuk meminimumkan jumlah masa penyiapan sebaliknya walaupun untuk kes dimana masa pasang adalah diabaikan. Ini bermakna bahawa bukan seperti untuk mencari polynominal algorithm bagi menyelesaikan masalah. Sehubungan denganitu, para penyelidik menumpukan untuk membangunkan algorithm cabang-dan-ikat atau herurisii. Ali Allahverdi, 1998 mendapati penyelesaian terbaik untuk meminimumkan jumlah aliran masa dalam kedai aliran 2-mesin dengan turutan berasingan masa pemasangan (setup) dengan menggunakan 3 algorithm heuristic. Ujikaji telah dijalankan untuk bilangan kerja dan penghantaran yang berbeza bagi peraturan untuk turutan kerja. Masa pemasangan juga dipelbagaikan sepanjang ujikaji. Keberkesanan peraturan yang diguna juga diukur dengan 2 pengukuran keupayaan yang lain disamping jumlah aliran masa; ianya adalah WIP dan mesin penjanaan. Keputusan-keputusan telah dianalisa dan dibincangkan dan ianya disimpulkan bahawa semua pengukuran keupayaa disebabkan; oleh bilangan pekerjaan dan perubahan masa gerak (setup) untuk semua peraturan yang digunakan. Diketahui bahawa peraturan SPT biasanya melaksanakan yang terbaik dalam meminimumkan aliran masa, purata jumlah pekevjaan dalam sistem dan memaksimumkan penjanaan mesin.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
TITLE PAGE	i
DECLARATION	ii
DEDICATION	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
ABSTRACT	v
ABSTRAK	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vii
LIST OF TABLES	x
LIST OF FIGURES	xi
LIST OF APPENDIXES	xii
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	
1.1 PROBLEM STATEMENT	1
1.2 OBJETIVE	2
1.3 SCOPE OF PROJECT	2
1.4 DEFINITION OF TERMS	3
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW	
2.1 INTRODUCTION	4
2.2 BACKGROUND	5

2.2.1 DIFFENETION OF SCHEDULING	5
2.22 SCHEDULING OBJECTIVE	6
2.2.3 SCHEDULING PROBLEM	7
2.3 SCHEDULING IN MANUFACTURING PROCESS	8
2.3.1 BATCH SHOP	9
2.3.1.1 TWO MACHINE BATCH SHOP SCHEDULING	10
2.3.1.2 DISPATCHING RULES	12
2.4 SCHEDULING APPROACHES	14
2.4.1 NUMERICAL METHODS	14
2.4.1.1 ANALYTICAL APPROACH	14
2.4.1.2 HUERISTIC APPROACH	15
2.4.1.3 ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE (AI) APPROACH	15
2.4.1.4 FUZZY LOGIC APPROACH	15
2.4.2 SIMULATION	16
2.4.2.1 WITNESS SIMULATION SOFTWARE	18

CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 INTRODUCTION	20
3.2 SUMMARY OF RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	22

CHAPTER 4: DATA COLLECTION

4.1 INTRODUCTION	23
4.2 SOURCE OF DATA	24
4.3 MODEL ASSUMBTIONS	25
4.3 JOB PARAMETERS	25
4.5 DISPATCHING RULES	25
4.6 PERFORMANCE MEASURES	26

CHAPTER 5: SIMULATION MODELING SYSTEM

5.1 INTRODUCTION	27
5.2 STRUCTURING THE MODEL	28
5.2.1 INPUT ANALYSIS	29
5.3 MODEL BUILDING AND VERIFICATION	29
5.4 MODEL VALIDATION	29

CHAPTER 6: EXPERIMENTATION

6.1 INTRODUCTION	33
6.1.1 WRM-UP TIMES AND START-UP CONDITIONS	33
6.1.2 RUN LENGTH	34
6.1.3 NUMBER OF REPLICATIONS	34
6.1.4 EXPERIMENTS	35
6.1.5 DETAIL BATCH EXPERIMENTATION	35
6.1.6 WITNESS XA	36

CHAPTER 7: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

7.1 INTRODUCTION	37
7.2 SIMULATION REPORTS OF AVERAGE FLOW TIME	38
7.3 SIMULATION REPORTS OF MACHINE UTILIZATION	40
7.4 SIMULATION REPORTS OF AVERAGE WIP	42

CHAPTER 8: CONCLUSIONS AND SUGESSTIONS

8.1 CONCLUSIONS	44
------------------------	-----------

8.2 SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY	45
REFERENCES	46
APPENDIX	48

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE NO.	TITLE	
PAGE		
1.1	Definition of terms	3
5.1	Comparison of calculation results and simulation results for 3-jobs	31
5.2	Comparison of calculation results and simulation results for 10-jobs (FCFS Rule)	31
5.3	Comparison of calculation results and simulation results for 10-jobs (SPT Rule)	32
5.4	Comparison of calculation results and simulation results for 10-jobs (EDD Rule)	32
7.1	Summary of Simulation Results of Average Flow Time for different no. of jobs.	38
7.2	Summary of Simulation Results of Average Flow Time for different Set-up times.	39
7.3	Summary of Simulation Results of Machine Utilization for different no. of jobs.	40
7.4	Summary of Simulation Results of Machine Utilization for different Set-up times.	41
7.5	Summary of Simulation Results of Average WIP for different no. of jobs.	42
7.6	Summary of Simulation Results of Average WIP for different Set-up times.	43

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE NO.	TITLE	PAGE
1.1	Definition of terms	3
5.1	Comparison of calculation results and simulation results for 3-jobs	31
5.2	Comparison of calculation results and simulation results for 10-jobs (FCFS Rule)	31
5.3	Comparison of calculation results and simulation results for 10-jobs (SPT Rule)	32
5.4	Comparison of calculation results and simulation results for 10-jobs (EDD Rule)	32
7.1	Summary of Simulation Results of Average Flow Time for different no. of jobs.	38
7.2	Summary of Simulation Results of Average Flow Time for different Set-up times.	39
7.3	Summary of Simulation Results of Machine Utilization for different no. of jobs.	40
7.4	Summary of Simulation Results of Machine Utilization for different Set-up times.	41
7.5	Summary of Simulation Results of Average WIP for different no. of jobs.	42
7.6	Summary of Simulation Results of Average WIP for different Set-up times.	43

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE NO.	TITLE	PAGE
2.1	Different flexibility for manufacturing processes	8
2.2	Batch shop process	9
2.3	Gantt chart for the example	11
2.4	Flowchart of the Basic Simulation Project Methodology	16
2.5	Witness Simulation Tool	18
3.1	Summary of Research Methodology	22
5.1	Preliminary Model	28
6.1	Estimation of Warm-up Period	36
7.1	Average Flow Time vs. No. of Jobs by different dispatching rules	38
7.2	Average Flow Time vs. Set-up Time by different dispatching rules	39
7.3	Machine Utilization vs. No. of Jobs by different dispatching rules	40
7.4	Machine Utilization vs. Set-up Time by different dispatching rules	41
7.5	Average WIP vs. No. of Jobs by different dispatching rules	42
7.6	Average WIP vs. Set-up Time by different dispatching rules	43

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX	TITLE	PAGE
A	Data for model validation	48
B	Simulation reports and calculation results for 3 and 10 jobs	50
C	Summary of simulation models	55
D	Simulation reports by different dispatching rules	57
E	Simulation reports by different set-up time and different dispatching rule.	124

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Problem statement

The two-machine flow shop problem was shown to be NP-hard when the objective is to minimize total (mean) completion time instead of makespan even for the case where set up times are neglected. This means that it is highly unlikely to find a polynomial algorithm to solve the problem. Therefore, researchers concentrated on developing branch-and-bound or heuristic algorithms to find the optimal solution, using different assumptions.

With separate setup time, two problem types exist. In the first problem, setup time depends only on the job to be processed, hence called sequence independent. Whereas, in the second, setup time depends on both the job to be processed and the

previous job, hence called sequence dependent. If there exists some idle time on the second machine, which is usually the case, then the setup time for a job on the second machine can be performed prior to the completion time of the job on the first machine [1].

Ali Allahverdi [2] obtained the optimal solutions for two special flow shops, with sequence-independent setup times and mean flow time performance criterion. He presented three heuristic algorithms, and evaluated the efficiencies of the branch-and-bound and heuristic algorithms. In this project we are going to use the mathematical model he proved in his study to validate a simulation model for finding the mean flow time adopting different dispatching rules.

1.2 Objective

The objectives of this project are:

- To determine the effect of dispatching rules on mean flow time in a batch shop.
- To determine which dispatching rules will give the lowest mean flow time under certain conditions.
- To construct and validate a simulation model which will be the base for the study.

1.3 Scope of the study

- I. Four dispatching rules will be used for job priorities they are;
 - 1) First Come First Served - FCFS
 - 2) Shortest Processing Time - SPT
 - 3) Earliest Due Date - EDD

II. The performance measures to be used beside men flow time are;

- 1) WIP
- 2) Machine utilization

III. The simulation tool used in this project is Witness simulation package.

1.4 Definition of Terms

In conducting this project, the terms in table (1) are used to simplify the meaning of the specific characteristics and techniques used.

Table 1.1: Definition of terms

Dispatching rules	
FCFS	First come first serve
SPT	Shortest processing time
EDD	Earliest due date
Performance measures	
MFT	Mean flow time
WIP	Work-in -process
Problem formulation	
PT_{ij}	Processing time for job i in machine j
ST_{ij}	Set-up time for job i in machine j
CT_{ij}	Total Completion Time
TFT	Total flow time