Chapter 18: A Hybrid Model for the Routing and Wavelength Assignment Problem

Helmut Simonis

Cork Constraint Computation Centre
Computer Science Department
University College Cork
Ireland

ECLiPSe ELearning Overview

Licence

Outline

What We Want to Introduce

- Hybridisation by decomposition
- Combination of MIP and FD solver
- Best current solution to routing and wavelength assignment problem

Problem Definition

Routing and Wavelength Assignment (Demand Acceptance)

In an optical network, traffic demands between nodes are assigned to a route through the network and a specific wavelength. The route (called *lightpath*) must be a simple path from source to destination. Demands which are routed over the same link must be allocated to different wavelengths, but wavelengths may be reused for demands which do not meet. The objective is to find a combined routing and wavelength assignment which maximizes the number of accepted demands.

Example Network (NSF, 5 wavelengths)



Lightpath from node 5 to node 13 ($5 \Rightarrow 13$)



Conflict with demand $1 \Rightarrow 12$: Use different frequencies



Conflict with demand 1 ⇒ 12: Use different path



Conflict with demand 1 ⇒ 12: Reject demand





Solution Approaches

- Greedy heuristic
- Optimization algorithm for complete problem
- Decomposition into two problems
  - Route maximal number of demands
  - Assign wavelengths

Step 1: Route Maximal Number of Demands

- Ignore wavelengths
- Capacity constraints on all links
- Solve as MIP problem
- Source aggregation
- Find DAG to supply (all) demands with shared source
- Maximize number of accepted demands

Notation

- y_{sd}, integer number of accepted demands from s to d
- z_{se}, integer capacity used on edge e to satisfy demands sourced in s
- C, number of available wavelengths, edge capacity
- P_{sd}, requested number of demands from s to d
- T_s, total number of requested demands sourced from s
- D_s, nodes which have a requested demand sourced in s

Model (Step 1)

$$\max \sum_{s \in N} \sum_{d \in D_s} y_{sd}$$

s.t.

$$y_{sd} \in \{0, 1 \ldots P_{sd}\}, z_{se} \in \{0, 1 \ldots T_s\}$$

$$\forall e \in E: \quad \sum_{s \in N} z_{se} \leq C$$

$$\forall s \in N: \quad \sum_{e \in \mathrm{In}(s)} z_{se} = 0$$

$$\forall s \in N, \forall d \in D_s: \quad \sum_{e \in \mathrm{In}(d)} z_{se} = \sum_{e \in \mathrm{Out}(d)} z_{se} + y_{sd}$$

$$\forall s \in N, \forall n \neq s, n \notin D_s: \quad \sum_{e \in \mathrm{In}(n)} z_{se} = \sum_{e \in \mathrm{Out}(n)} z_{se}$$

Observation

- Optimal cost is upper bound for full problem
- LP Relaxation is also upper bound for full problem
- No 0/1 variables in model
- Source aggregation has massive impact on efficiency
  - Much better than treating each demand on its own
  - Reason 1: Reduced number of variables
  - Reason 2: Avoids symmetries due to multiple demands between nodes

Finding Accepted Demands

- Solution to MIP does not tell how demands are routed
- Program required to convert source “tree” into sets of paths
- Conversion not deterministic, may allow different solutions
- Solution may contain loops, these need to be removed

Step 2: Assign Wavelengths

- For each accepted accepted demand, find frequency
- All demands routed over a link compete for frequencies
- Graph coloring problem
- Graph given as sets of cliques
- Solve with finite domains
- If solution found, then optimal for complete problem

Cork Constraint Computation Centre

Model (Step 2)

- X_d finite domain variable $1..C$ for each accepted demand
- One `alldifferent` constraint for each edge
- Many `alldifferent` constraints are at capacity
- Possible to improve model

Cork Constraint Computation Centre

What Happens If No Solution Found

- Problem infeasible
  - Remove some demand and try again until solution found
  - Possibly sub-optimal solution of high quality
  - Different solution to MIP problem may lead to optimal solution
- No solution found within time limit
  - Try harder!
  - Improve reasoning and/or search technique
  - Special techniques to show infeasibility

Solution Approach



Demand Matrix (100 Demands)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1		1	1		1	1	1	1	1					
2	1		1						1			2		
3					2	2		1	1		1	1		1
4			1		3		1	1	1					
5		1				1				1		1		
6				2	2		1			1	1	1		
7				1		1		1		1	1	2		
8											1		1	
9		1	1		1						1	1		
10			2			1	1	1	1		1		1	2
11	1		1	1	1		2	1		2			1	
12		2				2	1	2			1		2	2
13			1		2						1	1		
14	1		1		1	1			3		1		1	

Color	Distance
blue	1
green	2
pink	3
yellow	4
red	≥ 5

Source Model Solution

Color	Type
light green	Source
light blue	Sink
pink	Unreached
red	Chosen Link

Source Node 1



Accepted Demands (86 Demands)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1		1	1		1	1	1	1	0/1					
2	1		1						0/1			2		
3					1/2	2		1	1		1	1		1
4			1		3		1	0/1	1					
5		1				1				1		1		
6				2	2		1			1	1	1		
7				1		1		1		1	1	2		
8											1		1	
9		1	1		0/1						1	1		
10			2			1	0/1	0/1	1		1		1	2
11	1		1	1	0/1		0/2	1		2			1	
12		1/2				2	1	2			1		2	2
13			1		0/2						1	1		
14	1		1		0/1	1			3		1		1	

Color	Distance
	1
	2
	3
	4
	≥ 5

Cork Constraint Computation Centre

Comparison

Demand Matrix

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1		1	1		1	1	1	1	1					
2	1		1						1			2		
3					2	2		1	1		1	1		1
4			1		3		1	1	1					
5		1				1				1		1		
6				2	2		1			1	1	1		
7				1		1		1		1	1	2		
8											1		1	
9		1	1		1						1	1		
10			2			1	1	1	1		1		1	2
11	1		1	1	1		2	1		2			1	
12		2				2	1	2			1		2	2
13			1		2						1	1		
14	1		1		1	1			3		1		1	

Accepted Demands

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1		1	1		1	1	1	1	0/1					
2	1		1						0/1			2		
3					1/2	2		1	1		1	1		1
4			1		3		1	0/1	1					
5		1				1				1		1		
6				2	2		1			1	1	1		
7				1		1		1		1	1	2		
8											1		1	
9		1	1		0/1						1	1		
10			2			1	0/1	0/1	1		1		1	2
11	1		1	1	0/1		0/2	1		2			1	
12		1/2				2	1	2			1		2	2
13			1		0/2						1	1		
14	1		1		0/1	1			3		1		1	

Cork Constraint Computation Centre

Observations

- Accepted demands do not always use shortest path
- Tendency to reject demands with larger minimal distance
- These use more resources
- Not compensated in objective function
- Not fair

Resource Requirements



Graph Coloring Problem



Graph Coloring Solution



Color	Wavelength
	1
	2
	3
	4
	5

Observation

- All demands could be assigned to frequencies
- Optimal solution to complete problem

Explaining Infeasibility



Explanations

- Ad-hoc: Find pattern which show infeasibility
  - Find large cliques
  - If clique is larger than number of colors, problem is infeasible
  - This is simple for graphs given
- General explanation techniques
  - Active research area

Cork Constraint Computation Centre

Explanation Method Used: QuickXPlain

- Find minimal subset of constraints which is infeasible
- *Conflict set*
- Works when overall problem fails without search
- Requires some trick to be applied here

Cork Constraint Computation Centre

Assigned Wavelengths

Wavelength 1



Accepted Demands (86 Demands)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1		1	1		1	1	1	1	0/1					
2	1		1						0/1			2		
3					1/2	2		1	1		1	1		1
4			1		3		1	0/1	1					
5		1				1				1		1		
6				2	2		1			1	1	1		
7				1		1		1		1	1	2		
8											1		1	
9		1	1		0/1						1	1		
10			2			1	0/1	0/1	1		1		1	2
11	1		1	1	0/1		0/2	1		2			1	
12		1/2				2	1	2			1		2	2
13			1		0/2						1	1		
14	1		1		0/1	1			3		1		1	

Color Distance
1
2
3
4
≥ 5

Benchmarks

- Fixed network structure

nsf	14 nodes, 42 edges
eon	20 nodes, 78 edges
mci	19 nodes, 64 edges
brezil	27 nodes, 140 edges

- Random network structure
  - Sizes from 30 to 100 nodes
  - Edge density 0.25
  - 500 demands, 30 wavelengths

Cork Constraint Computation Centre

Problem
Model
Worked Example
Results

Overall Distribution of Solutions

Type	Technique	Count
Infeasible	clique	50
	preassign	38
Feasible	credit total	59962
	of that, credit a units	58861
	of that, credit a^2 units	940
	of that, credit a^3 units	161
	complete search, BC alldifferent	25
	complete search, GAC alldifferent	12

Cork Constraint Computation Centre

Selected Examples (100 Runs Each)

Network	Dem.	λ	Opt.	Avg LP	Avg MIP	Avg FD	Max Gap	Avg Time	Max Time
brezil	500	15	98	483.86	483.86	483.84	1.00	0.92	1.34
brezil	600	20	100	590.96	590.96	590.96	0.00	1.00	1.34
brezil	700	20	100	672.53	672.53	672.53	0.00	1.19	1.78
brezil	800	25	99	781.39	781.39	781.37	2.00	1.44	11.47
eon	500	20	100	471.56	471.56	471.56	0.00	0.65	0.77
eon	600	25	100	574.80	574.80	574.80	0.00	0.82	1.13
eon	700	30	100	677.35	677.35	677.35	0.00	1.05	1.81
eon	800	35	100	779.17	779.17	779.17	0.00	1.28	1.94
mci	500	25	100	486.38	486.38	486.38	0.00	0.80	2.28
mci	600	30	100	585.18	585.18	585.18	0.00	1.27	29.81
mci	700	35	100	684.00	684.00	684.00	0.00	1.30	3.53
mci	800	40	100	782.86	782.86	782.86	0.00	1.68	5.21
nsf	500	35	100	495.20	495.20	495.20	0.00	0.50	0.60
nsf	600	40	100	588.63	588.63	588.63	0.00	0.66	0.98
nsf	700	45	100	678.44	678.44	678.44	0.00	0.86	1.35
nsf	800	45	100	727.15	727.15	727.15	0.00	0.95	1.56

Compared to MIP Model for Complete Problem

Network	Dem.	λ	Opt.	Hybrid Model Avg FD	Hybrid Model Avg Time	Hybrid Model Max Time	Full MIP Avg Opt	Full MIP Avg Time	Full MIP Max Time
brezil	500	15	98	483.84	0.92	1.34	483.86	1218.40	14103.84
brezil	600	20	100	590.96	1.00	1.34	590.96	6076.81	87767.95
brezil	700	25	98	695.48	1.01	1.80	*695.48*	*13623.15*	*78463.89*
brezil	800	25	99	781.37	1.44	11.47	781.39	7567.68	15456.50
eon	500	20	100	471.56	0.65	0.77	471.56	352.21	585.45
eon	600	25	100	574.80	0.82	1.13	574.80	1411.67	2877.88
eon	700	30	100	677.35	1.05	1.81	677.35	1727.52	3568.13
eon	800	35	100	779.17	1.28	1.94	779.17	2485.64	4116.11
mci	500	25	100	486.38	0.80	2.28	486.38	1023.16	1664.31
mci	600	30	100	585.18	1.27	29.81	585.18	1621.30	2895.88
mci	700	35	100	684.00	1.30	3.53	684.00	1987.23	3428.41
mci	800	40	100	782.86	1.68	5.21	782.86	2316.88	4402.44
nsf	500	35	100	495.20	0.50	0.60	495.20	82.85	173.19
nsf	600	40	100	588.63	0.66	0.98	588.63	155.90	373.63
nsf	700	45	100	678.44	0.86	1.35	678.44	205.82	586.61
nsf	800	45	100	727.15	0.95	1.56	727.15	173.53	410.97

Increasing Number of Demands

Network	Dem.	λ	Opt.	Avg LP	Avg MIP	Avg FD	Max Gap	Avg MIP Time	Max MIP Time	Avg FD Time	Max FD Time
eon	800	30	100	741.78	741.78	741.78	0.00	0.15	0.17	0.83	1.61
eon	900	40	100	880.59	880.59	880.59	0.00	0.14	0.16	1.18	2.17
eon	1000	40	100	950.36	950.36	950.36	0.00	0.15	0.17	1.37	3.42
eon	1100	50	100	1082.61	1082.61	1082.61	0.00	0.14	0.16	1.71	2.83
eon	1200	50	100	1156.38	1156.38	1156.38	0.00	0.15	0.17	2.07	5.92
eon	1300	50	100	1219.82	1219.82	1219.82	0.00	0.16	0.17	2.22	5.24
eon	1400	60	100	1361.47	1361.47	1361.47	0.00	0.15	0.16	2.92	4.94
eon	1500	60	99	1428.78	1428.78	1428.77	1.00	0.15	0.17	4.22	106.97
eon	1600	70	100	1565.90	1565.90	1565.90	0.00	0.15	0.16	3.89	8.48
eon	1700	70	100	1637.47	1637.47	1637.47	0.00	0.16	0.17	4.58	13.59
eon	1800	80	100	1769.86	1769.86	1769.86	0.00	0.15	0.16	5.19	8.81
eon	1900	80	99	1844.46	1844.46	1844.45	1.00	0.15	0.17	7.23	163.41
eon	2000	90	100	1972.66	1972.66	1972.66	0.00	0.15	0.17	6.34	9.61

Random Networks (Edge Density 0.25, 100 Runs Each)

Network	Dem.	λ	Opt.	Avg LP	Avg MIP	Avg FD	Avg MIP Time	Max MIP Time	Avg FD Time	Max FD Time
r30	500	30	100	391.82	391.82	391.82	0.45	0.55	0.12	0.16
r40	500	30	100	424.58	424.58	424.58	1.07	1.23	0.14	0.17
r50	500	30	100	437.69	437.69	437.69	2.13	2.38	0.09	0.13
r60	500	30	100	447.21	447.21	447.21	3.92	4.34	0.08	0.16
r70	500	30	100	453.41	453.41	453.41	6.78	7.50	0.10	0.17
r80	500	30	100	457.65	457.65	457.65	10.75	11.95	0.10	0.17
r90	500	30	100	464.69	464.69	464.69	16.08	17.45	0.08	0.22
r100	500	30	100	466.67	466.67	466.67	22.74	25.22	0.09	0.25

Observations

- MIP and LP relaxation of phase 1 are very good bounds
- Solved to optimality in most cases
- Simple decomposition quite effective
- Good solution even if initial graph coloring infeasible
- Special structure of graph coloring helps FD model

Cork Constraint Computation Centre

Conclusions

- Combination of MIP and FD solver in problem decomposition
- Each doing what they do best
  - MIP: optimal solution, select items to include
  - FD: find feasible solution, explain infeasibility
- Hybrid model produces very high quality results
- Proven optimality in over 99.85% of problems tested
- Near optimal solutions by relaxation
- Much faster than monolithic MIP solution

Cork Constraint Computation Centre

More Information

- Rajiv Ramaswami and Kumar N. Sivarajan.
  Routing and wavelength assignment in all-optical networks.
  IEEE/ACM Trans. Netw., 3(5):489–500, 1995.
- Dhritiman Banerjee and Biswanath Mukherjee.
  A practical approach for routing and wavelength assignment in large wavelength-routed optical networks.
  IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications, 14(5):903–908, June 1996.

More Information

- Brigitte Jaumard, Christophe Meyer, and Babacar Thiongane.
  ILP formulations for the routing and wavelength assignment problem: Symmetric systems.
  In M. Resende and P. Pardalos, editors, *Handbook of Optimization in Telecommunications*, pages 637–677. Springer, 2006.
- Brigitte Jaumard, Christophe Meyer, and Babacar Thiongane.
  Comparison of ILP formulations for the RWA problem.
  Optical Switching and Networking, 4(3-4):157–172, 2007.

More Information

Ulrich Junker.
Quickxplain: Conflict detection for arbitrary constraint propagation algorithms.
In *IJCAI'01 Workshop on Modelling and Solving problems with constraints (CONS-1)*, Seattle, WA, USA, August 2001.

More Information

Helmut Simonis.
Constraint applications in networks.
In F. Rossi, P. van Beek, and T. Walsh, editors, *Handbook of Constraint Programming*. Elsevier, 2006.

Helmut Simonis.
A hybrid constraint model for the routing and wavelength assignment problem.
CP 2009, Lisbon, September 2009.
`http://4c.ucc.ie/~hsimonis/rwa.pdf`

More Information

Helmut Simonis.
Solving the static design routing and wavelength assignment problem.
CSCLP 2009, Barcelona, Spain, June 2009.