Scheduling of daily activities: an optimization approach

Janody Pougala Tim Hillel Michel Bierlaire

Transport and Mobility Laboratory School of Architecture, Civil and Environmental Engineering Ecole Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne

November 25, 2019



Outline



Model

3 Mixed integer optimization problem

4 Examples





Pougala, Hillel, Bierlaire (EPFL)

Scheduling of daily activities

November 25, 2019 2 / 42

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ >

Introduction



- Travel demand is derived from activity demand.
- Activity demand is influenced by socio-economic characteristics, social interactions, cultural norms, basic needs, etc. [Chapin, 1974]
- Activity demand is constrained in space and time [Hägerstraand, 1970].





Literature

Econometric models

$$\begin{split} & \tilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_{1} = \tilde{\boldsymbol{\pi}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_$$

Rule-based models



< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ >



æ

State of the art: econometric approach

[Pinjari et al., 2011]

- ... individuals make their activity-travel decisions to maximize the utility derived from the choices they make.
- These model systems usually consist of a series of ... discrete choice models ... that are used to predict ... individuals' activity-travel decisions.
- these model systems employ econometric systems of equations ... to capture relationships between ... socio-demographics and ... attributes on the one hand and the observed activity-travel decision outcomes on the other.



State of the art: econometric approach

[Pinjari et al., 2011]: main criticisms

- individuals are not necessarily fully rational utility maximizers
- the approach does not explicitly model the underlying decision processes and behavioral mechanisms that lead to observed activity-travel decisions.





Research question

Relax the series of discrete choice models approach

- The interactions of all decisions is complex.
- Sequence of models is most of the time arbitrary.

Integrated approach

Develop a model involving all activity-based decisions:

- activity participation,
- activity pattern,
- location choice,
- time of day,
- duration.



Research objectives

- Integrated approach based on first principles.
- Theoretical framework: utility maximization.
- Individuals solve a scheduling problem.
- Important aspects: trade-offs on activity duration.





November 25, 2019 8 / 42

Outline



Model

3 Mixed integer optimization problem







Pougala, Hillel, Bierlaire (EPFL)

Scheduling of daily activities

November 25, 2019 9 / 42

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ >

First principles



- Each individual *n* has a time-budget (a day).
- Each activity *i* considered by *n* is associated with a utility U_{in} .
- Individuals schedule their activities as to **maximize** the total utility, subject to their time-budget constraint.



Further assumptions



Individuals are time sensitive

- Have a desired *start time*, *duration* and/or *end time* for each activity
- Deviations from their desired times in the scheduling process decrease the utility function



Pougala, Hillel, Bierlaire (EPFL)

Scheduling of daily activities

November 25, 2019 11 / 42

Time



- Time horizon: 24 hours.
- Discretization: T time intervals.
- Trade-off between model accuracy and computational time.

< □ > < □ >



Space



- Discrete and finite set *S* of locations, indexed by *s*.
- Trips between location are modeled exogenously.
- For each (s_o, s_d), ρ(s_o, s_d) is the travel time.
- Extensions to include mode and route choices are possible.

A B A B A
 B A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 A
 A





Activities

Definition: Activity

An activity requires a trip to/from a given location.



Definitions

Activities



- Set A of activities.
- Location s_a.
- Starting time x_a , $0 \le x_a \le T$.
- Duration: $\tau_a \ge 0$.
- Feasible time interval: [γ⁻_a, γ⁺_a] (e.g. opening hours).
- "Home": same, except for boundary conditions.

Modeling location choice

An activity that can take place at m locations is modeled as a set B_k of m activities with a unique location.



Definitions

Scheduling





EPFL æ

Pougala, Hillel, Bierlaire (EPFL)

Scheduling of daily activities

-November 25, 2019 16/42

I ∃ ►

< □ > < 同 >

Definitions

Categories



- [Castiglione et al., 2014]: mandatory, maintenance, discretionary.
- Flexible, somewhat flexible, not flexible.

Category

Activities that share the same preference profile.



17 / 42

4 E b

November 25, 2019

Preferences

Preferences

- desired starting time x^{*}_a,
- desired duration τ_a^* .

Penalties

- Starting early [Small, 1982]: $\theta_e \max(x_a^* x_a, 0).$
- Starting late [Small, 1982]: $\theta_{\ell} \max(x_a x_a^*, 0).$
- Shorter activity: $\theta_{ds} \max(\tau_a^* \tau_a, 0)$.
- Longer activity: $\theta_{d\ell} \max(\tau_a \tau_a^*, 0)$.





A 3 1

- ∢ /⊐ ▶



Preferences

Parameters depend on the category type



Definitions

Disutility of travel



Traveling is part of the activity

- Travel from *a* to *a*⁺ contributes to *U_a*: *t_a*.
- Exception: last activity of the day (home).
- In this version, travel choices are exogenous.



Utility function

An individual n derives the following utility from performing activity a, with a schedule flexibility k:

$$\begin{aligned} J_{an} &= \theta_e \max(x_a^* - x_a, 0) \\ &+ \theta_\ell \max(x_a - x_a^*, 0) \\ &+ \theta_{ds} \max(\tau_a^* - \tau_a, 0) \\ &+ \theta_{d\ell} \max(\tau_a - \tau_a^*, 0) \\ &+ \theta_{tt} t_a \\ &+ c_{an} + \sigma_{an} \varepsilon_{an}, \end{aligned}$$

where ε_{an} is a random term with mean 0 and variance 1.



< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ >

Definitions

Utility function



Error terms

- Rely on simulation.
- Draw ξ_{anr} , $r = 1, \ldots, R$.
- Optimization problem for each r.
- Utility: U_{anr}.



イロト イボト イヨト イヨ

Outline





3 Mixed integer optimization problem







Pougala, Hillel, Bierlaire (EPFL)

Scheduling of daily activities

November 25, 2019 23/42

・ロト ・ 日 ・ ・ ヨ ・ ・ ヨ ・

Decision variables for individual n and draw r

For each (potential) activity a:

- Activity participation: $w_{anr} \in \{0, 1\}$.
- Starting time: $x_{anr} \in \{0, \ldots, T\}$.
- Duration: $\tau_{anr} \in \{0, \ldots, T\}$.
- Scheduling: $z_{abnr} \in \{0,1\}$: 1 if activity b immediately follows a.
- Travel time: t_{anr}: travel time from a to the next activity.



24 / 42

November 25, 2019

Objective function

Additive utility

$$\max \sum_{a \in A} w_{anr} U_{anr}$$





Pougala, Hillel, Bierlaire (EPFL)

Scheduling of daily activities

November 25, 2019 25 / 42

イロト イポト イヨト イヨト

Constraints

Time budget

$$\sum_{a} \tau_{anr} = T, \; \forall n, r.$$

Time windows

$$0 \leq \gamma_a^- \leq x_{anr} \leq x_{anr} + \tau_{anr} \leq \gamma_a^+ \leq T, \ \forall a, n, r.$$



Pougala, Hillel, Bierlaire (EPFL)

Scheduling of daily activities

EPFL

э

26 / 42

イロト イポト イヨト イヨト

November 25, 2019

Constraints

Precedence constraints

$$z_{abnr} + z_{banr} \leq 1, \ \forall a, b, n, r.$$

Single successor/predecessor

$$\sum_{b \in A \setminus \{a\}} z_{abnr} = w_{anr}, \ \forall a, n, r,$$
$$\sum_{b \in A \setminus \{a\}} z_{banr} = w_{anr}, \ \forall a, n, r.$$



Constraints

Travel time

$$t_{anr} = \sum_{b \in A} z_{abnr} \rho(s_a, s_b).$$

Consistent timing

$$(z_{abnr}-1)T \leq x_{anr} + au_{anr} + t_{anr} - x_b \leq (1-z_{abnr})T, \ \forall a, b, n, r.$$

Mutually exclusive duplicates

$$\sum_{a\in B_k} w_{anr} = 1, \ \forall k, n, r.$$

TRANSP-OR

Outline





Mixed integer optimization problem







Pougala, Hillel, Bierlaire (EPFL)

Scheduling of daily activities

November 25, 2019 29 / 42

イロト イポト イヨト イヨト

Internal data set



Data collection

- One-week survey on planned daily schedules for 10 individuals.
- Planning across week and day.
- Resulting data (unavailable in traditional trip diaries):
 - Set of all considered activities and locations.
 - Preferences in terms of start times and duration.
 - Flexibilities for start times and duration.

Data set

- Weekly plan: filled on Sunday, considerations for next Mon-Sun
- Considered activities (*Which out-of-home activities do you plan to do this week?*):
 - Choice between 9 categories + 1 "other" option
 - Frequency of the activity
- Set of transportation modes (for travel time computations)
- Routine preferences:
 - Minimal daily duration at home (Mon-Fri and Sat-Sun)
 - Typical daily duration at work
 - Earliest departure from home (Mon-Fri and Sat-Sun)
 - Latest arrival at home (Mon-Fri and Sat-Sun)



(4) (日本)

Data set

- Daily plan: filled each day (Sun-Sat), considerations for the next day
- Considered activities (Which activities do you plan to do tomorrow?)
- Preferred times:
 - Start time: absolute value or relative, e.g. "after work"
 - End time
 - Duration
- Considered location(s) and feasible time windows for each
- Flexibility (early, late, short, long):
 - -1: not flexible
 - 0: moderately flexible (threshold value to be specified in minutes)
 - 1: flexible

• Other constraints (e.g. drop-off at home after grocery shopping)

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ >

Data set

Model input:

- All possible activities for the week (Mon-Fri and Sat-Sun)
- All considered locations and travel times matrix (for the preferred mode(s), computed using Google Maps)
- Individual flexibilities and preferred times for each activity

• Output:

• Optimal schedule for 1 day (Mon-Fri or Sat-Sun)



33 / 42

< (17) > < (17) > <

November 25, 2019

Individual 1 (weekday)

• Considered activities \rightarrow location(s):

work \longrightarrow 1 (home), 2 education \longrightarrow errands \longrightarrow 2, 3 fitness \longrightarrow leisure/social \longrightarrow lunch \longrightarrow

• Timing preferences and flexibility from daily schedules

• Preference for home time from week schedule

Pougala, Hillel, Bierlaire (EPFL)

TRANSP-OR

Scheduling of daily activities

イロト イヨト イヨト



Individual 1 (weekday)

Optimal schedules generated for random draws of $\varepsilon_{a_n} \sim \mathcal{N}(0,1)$





Individual 2 (weekday)

Considered activities → location(s):

work \longrightarrow 1 (home), 2 errands \longrightarrow 3, 4, 5 fitness \longrightarrow 1 leisure/social \longrightarrow 2, 6 lunch \longrightarrow 2



< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ >

EDE!

3

Individual 2 (weekday)

Optimal schedules generated for random draws of $\varepsilon_{a_n} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$





Pougala, Hillel, Bierlaire (EPFL)

Conclusions

Achievements so far

- Formulation of the model.
- Applied on a simple case.
- The results make sense.
- We are able to draw from a distribution of activity schedules.

Challenges

- Use of real data.
- Parameter estimation.





Examples

Conclusions





Real data

- 2015 Swiss Mobility and Transport Microcensus.
- Daily trip diaries for 20'000 individuals.
- Records of activities and visited location.
- Also: 2012–2015 London Travel Demand Survey.

Challenges: classical RP issues

- No information about unchosen alternatives.
- Latent preferences.

Conclusions



Parameter estimation

- Prior: $f(\beta)$.
- Data: $Y = (i_n, x_n)_{n=1}^N$.
- Likelihood: $L(Y|\beta)$.
- Parameters:

$$f(\beta|Y) \propto L(Y|\beta)f(\beta).$$

A D F A B F A B F A B

Challenges

- Metropolis-Hastings algorithm.
- Calculation of the likelihood.



21

Bibliography I

Castiglione, J., Bradley, M., and Gliebe, J. (2014). Activity-Based Travel Demand Models: A Primer. Transportation Research Board, Washington, D.C.

Chapin, F. S. (1974).

Human activity patterns in the city: Things people do in time and in space, volume 13. Wiley-Interscience.

Hägerstraand, T. (1970).
 What about people in regional science?
 Papers in Regional Science.

Pinjari, A. R., Bhat, C. R., et al. (2011).
 Activity-based travel demand analysis.
 A Handbook of Transport Economics, 10:213–248.

< 日 > < 同 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > <

Bibliography II

Small, K. A. (1982). The scheduling of consumer activities: work trips. *American Economic Review*.

Pougala, Hillel, Bierlaire (EPFL)

Scheduling of daily activities

November 25, 2019 42 / 42

3

< □ > < 同 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 >