

# The optimization of water distribution networks: a critical review

A. De Corte K. Sörensen University of Antwerp – ANT/OR EU/ME 2012, May 10-11, 2012





### Table of contents

Water distribution networks

Optimization of water distribution networks Problem analysis Problem definition Objective function

State of the art Overview Points of improvement

Network generation



### Water distribution networks

<ロト < 母 ト < 臣 ト < 臣 ト 三 3/29

#### Water distribution network (WDN)

A network that consists of different components (pipes, pumps, valves, reservoirs,...) that transport drinking water from one or more resource nodes to multiple demand nodes (domestic, industrial and commercial customers). The water must be supplied in sufficient quantities and at an adequate pressure.





Three different levels:

#### Table: Optimization levels

| decision level | phase       | decision variables              |  |
|----------------|-------------|---------------------------------|--|
| strategic      | layout      | system connectivity, topology   |  |
| strategic      | design      | pipe diameter, pipe roughness,  |  |
| operational    | operational | pump efficiency, valve control, |  |



Three different levels:

#### Table: Optimization levels

| decision level | phase       | decision variables              |  |  |
|----------------|-------------|---------------------------------|--|--|
| strategic      | layout      | system connectivity, topology   |  |  |
| strategic      | design      | pipe diameter, pipe roughness,  |  |  |
| operational    | operational | pump efficiency, valve control, |  |  |



Finding the optimal pipe-configuration out of a set of discrete pipe types in terms of investment cost, with respect to hydraulic principles and conservation laws.

- e.g.: three possible pipe types:
  - 1 (diameter=80mm,roughness=130)
  - 2 (diameter=80mm,roughness=100)
  - ▶ 3 (diameter=150mm, roughness=130)





### Pipe configurations







### Pipe configurations







<ロト < 団 ト < 臣 ト < 臣 ト 三 8/29

Finding the optimal pipe-configuration out of a set of discrete pipe types in terms of investment cost, with respect to hydraulic principles and conservation laws.

- $\rightarrow$  discrete decision variable
- $\rightarrow$  non-linear objective function
- $\rightarrow$  (non-) linear constraint functions

 $\Rightarrow$  combinatorial optimization problem



<ロト < 団 ト < 臣 ト < 臣 ト 三 8/29

Finding the optimal pipe-configuration out of a set of discrete pipe types in terms of investment cost, with respect to hydraulic principles and conservation laws.

- $\rightarrow$  discrete decision variable
- $\rightarrow$  non-linear objective function
- $\rightarrow$  (non-) linear constraint functions

 $\Rightarrow$  combinatorial optimization problem



<ロト < 団 ト < 臣 ト < 臣 ト 三 8/29

Finding the optimal pipe-configuration out of a set of discrete pipe types in terms of investment cost, with respect to hydraulic principles and conservation laws.

- $\rightarrow$  discrete decision variable
- $\rightarrow$  non-linear objective function
- $\rightarrow$  (non-) linear constraint functions

 $\Rightarrow$  combinatorial optimization problem



<ロト < 団 ト < 臣 ト < 臣 ト 三 8/29

Finding the optimal pipe-configuration out of a set of discrete pipe types in terms of investment cost, with respect to hydraulic principles and conservation laws.

- $\rightarrow$  discrete decision variable
- $\rightarrow$  non-linear objective function
- $\rightarrow$  (non-) linear constraint functions

 $\Rightarrow$  combinatorial optimization problem



An optimally designed WDN:

- has a minimal design cost
- satisfies hydraulic laws
- satisfies mass conservation laws
- satisfies energy conservation laws
- satisfies customer requirements



### Objective function

$$\mathsf{Minimize} \ TC = \sum_{p \in P} (D_p, L_p)$$

#### subject to:

$$\begin{split} \forall n \in N : & \sum_{i \in N} Q_{in} - \sum_{j \in N} Q_{nj} = D_n - S_n \quad (\text{mass conservation law}) \\ \forall l \in L : & \sum_{p \in l} \Delta H_p = 0 \quad (\text{energy conservation law}) \\ \forall n \in N : & H_n \geq H_n^{min} \quad (\text{minimal head requirement}) \end{split}$$



Mass conservation law



$$orall n \in N$$
 :  $\sum_{i \in N} Q_{in} - \sum_{j \in N} Q_{nj} = D_n - S_n$   
for node 2 :  $Q_{12} - (Q_{24} + Q_{23}) = D_2$ 

<ロ> < 母> < 臣> < 臣> < 臣 > 臣 12/29



### Objective function

<ロト<回ト<差ト<差ト<差ト 12/29

$$\mathsf{Minimize} \ TC = \sum_{p \in P} (D_p, L_p)$$

#### subject to:

$$\begin{split} \forall n \in N : & \sum_{i \in N} Q_{in} - \sum_{j \in N} Q_{nj} = D_n - S_n \quad (\text{mass conservation law}) \\ \forall l \in L : & \sum_{p \in l} \Delta H_p = 0 \quad (\text{energy conservation law}) \\ \forall n \in N : & H_n \geq H_n^{min} \quad (\text{minimal head requirement}) \end{split}$$



<ロト < 回 > < 直 > < 亘 > 三 13/26



### Objective function

<ロト<部ト<差ト<差ト 14/29

$$\mathsf{Minimize} \ TC = \sum_{p \in P} (D_p, L_p)$$

#### subject to:

$$\begin{array}{ll} \forall n \in {\sf N}: & \sum_{i \in {\sf N}} Q_{in} - \sum_{j \in {\sf N}} Q_{nj} = D_n - S_n \quad ({\rm mass \ conservation \ law}) \\ \\ \forall l \in {\sf L}: & \sum_{p \in {\sf l}} \Delta H_p = 0 \qquad ({\rm energy \ conservation \ law}) \\ \\ \forall n \in {\sf N}: & H_n \geq H_n^{min} \qquad ({\rm minimal \ head \ requirement}) \end{array}$$





<ロト < 課 > < 差 > < 差 > 差 15/36











### Benchmark networks

<ロト < 団 ト < 臣 ト < 臣 ト 三 18/30 18/30

#### Two loop network (Alperovits & Shamir, 1977)



- 6 demand nodes
- 1 reservoir node
- ► 8 pipes
- 2 loops



### Benchmark networks

#### New York City Tunnels (Schaake & Lai, 1969)



- 20 demand nodes
- 1 reservoir node

<ロト < 団 ト < 臣 ト < 臣 ト 三 19/36

- ▶ 21 pipes
- ► 2 loops



### Realistic network









</







< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □



### Comparison of networks

<ロト<部ト<差ト<差ト<差ト 23/29

#### Table: Dimensions of benchmark and realistic networks

|                 | Two loop                              | New York   | Hanoi                                  | realistic network   |
|-----------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| junctions       | 7                                     | 20   | 32                                     | j   |
| loops           | 2                                     | 2  | 3                                      | (6,166 + 1 - j)   |
| pipes           | 8                                     | 21   | 34                                     | 6,166   |
| cost function   | 1                                     | 1  | 1                                      | 1   |
| available pipes | 14                                    | 16   | 6                                      | 90  |
| equations       | 18                                    | 44   | 70                                     | 12,334  |
| solution space  | $14^{8}$<br>= 1.476 × 10 <sup>9</sup> | $\begin{array}{l} 16^{21} \\ = 0.193 \times 10^{26} \end{array}$ | $6^{34}$<br>= 2.865 × 10 <sup>26</sup> | $\begin{array}{l} 90^{6,166} \\ = 5.301 \!\times\! 10^{10,826} \end{array}$ |



#### Overview of results: NY City Tunnels problem by Schaake and Lai, 1969

| Method                          | Authors                 | hydraulic <i>w</i><br>coefficient | F/IF under<br>EPANET2? | Total Cost<br>(in mUSD) |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|
| Tabu Search 1                   | Cunha and Ribeiro, 2004 | na                                | IF                     | 37.13                   |
| Tabu Search 2                   | Cunha and Ribeiro, 2004 | na                                | IF                     | 37.13                   |
| Genetic Algorithm               | Savic and Walters, 1997 | 10.5088                           | IF                     | 37.13                   |
| Genetic Algorithm               | Lippai et al., 1999     | 10.5088                           | IF                     | 38.13                   |
| Simulated Annealing 1           | Cunha and Sousa, 2001   | 10.5088                           | IF                     | 37.10                   |
| Scatter Search                  | Lin et al., 2007        | 10.5088                           | IF                     | 36.68                   |
| Immune Algorithm                | Chu et al., 2008        | 10.5088                           | IF                     | 37.13                   |
| modified Immune Algorithm       | Chu et al., 2008        | 10.5088                           | IF                     | 37.13                   |
| Ant Colony Optimization         | Maier et al., 2003      | 10.6668                           | F                      | 38.64                   |
| Shuffled Frog Leaping Algorithm | Eusuff and Lansey, 2003 | 10.6688                           | F                      | 38.80                   |
| Ant System                      | Zecchin et al., 2005    | 10.6688                           | F                      | 38.64                   |
| Max-Min Ant System              | Zecchin et al., 2006    | 10.6688                           | F                      | 38.64                   |
| Harmony Search                  | Geem, 2006              | 10.6688                           | F                      | 38.64                   |
| Particle Swarm Harmony Search   | Geem, 2009              | 10.6688                           | F                      | 38.64                   |
| Differential Evolution          | Vasan2010               | 10.6668                           | F                      | 38.64                   |
| Scatter Search                  | Lin et al., 2007        | 10.675                            | F                      | 38.64                   |
| Simulated Annealing 2           | Cunha and Sousa, 2001   | 10.6792                           | IF                     | 38.80                   |
| Genetic Algorithm               | Savic and Walters, 1997 | 10.9031                           | F                      | 40.42                   |
| Simulated Annealing 1           | Cunha and Sousa, 2001   | 10.9031                           | IF                     | 40.40                   |
| Scatter Search                  | Lin et al., 2007        | 10.9031                           | F                      | 40.42                   |
| Immune Algorithm                | Chu et al., 2008        | 10.9031                           | F                      | 40.42                   |
| modified Immune Algorithm       | Chu et al., 2008        | 10.9031                           | F                      | 40.42                   |



### Our simple algorithm on NYCT

Sort pipes according to decreasing pipe length

Step 1. Set diameters on max

Set all pipe diameters on maximum

- $\rightarrow$  maximal cost
- $\rightarrow$  hydraulic feasible

#### Step 2. Two local search mechanisms

- 1. Iteratively decrease
- 2. Iteratively increase + decrease

#### Step 3. Perturbation

Set random selected pipes on maximum

 $\rightarrow$  also led to reported minimal cost 38.64 mUSD (EPANET 2)

<ロト < 団 ト < 臣 ト < 臣 ト 三 25/29



<ロト < 団 ト < 臣 ト < 臣 ト 三 2000 26/29

Shortcomings earlier developed methods:

- Methods not based on established principles of metaheuristic design
- Heuristics are case-specific
- Methods are not adequately tested

Therefore, heuristics are not applicable on real networks

#### Need for:

- Correctly designed metaheuristics that can be used in real-life situations
- High-quality networks on which developed methods can be adequately and profoundly tested



### Network generation

<ロト < 団 ト < 臣 ト < 臣 ト 三 27/36

Develop a method to generate realistic WDN

Characteristics:

- ► algorithmic generation → networks of different sizes and characteristics (~ realistic networks)
- free and online available
- EPANET-format

Objective:

- extensive library should become new benchmark
- stimulate development of more effective optimization methods



## Thank you for your attention! Any questions?

<ロト < 団 ト < 臣 ト < 臣 ト 三 28/36

Slides available at http://webhost.ua.ac.be/antor/ Contact via annelies.decorte@ua.ac.be