


```

37
38
39
40 U(e) " Capacity of link e in Model I "
41 /
42 1      230000
43 2      350000
44 3      100000
45 4      250000
46 5      210000
47 6      220000
48 7      200000
49 8      300000
50 9      210000
51 10     270000
52 11     150000
53 12     180000
54 13     300000
55 14     350000
56
57 /,
58 small_k(e) " The link cost of bandwidth for each link e in Model I "
59 /
60 1      5
61 2      6
62 3      10
63 4      5
64 5      4
65 6      11
66 7      6
67 8      8
68 9      6
69 10     7
70 11     12
71 12     6
72 13     5
73 14     6
74
75 /,
76 l(e) " Mean delay in Model I "
77 /
78 1      0.03
79 2      0.032
80 3      0.035
81 4      0.012
82 5      0.02
83 6      0.012
84 7      0.03
85 8      0.015
86 9      0.027
87 10     0.012
88 11     0.03
89 12     0.02
90 13     0.035
91 14     0.035
92
93 /,
94 capital_D(i) " Maximal end-to-end delay in Model I "
95 /
96 1      0.89
97 2      1.02
98 3      2.34
99

```

```

100 /,
101 a(i) " Asp. Level in Model I "
102 /
103 1      334
104 2      166
105 3      56
106
107 /,
108 r(i) " Res. Level in Model I "
109 /
110 1      167
111 2      83
112 3      28
113
114 /,
115 s(i) " Mean Packet Size in Model I "
116 /
117 1      35
118 2      16.6
119 3      12.5
120
121 /,
122 b(i) " Bandwidth requirement of class i in Model I "
123 /
124 1      160
125 2      80
126 3      25
127
128 /;
129
130 *Model I*
131
132 *變數限制*
133 *****
134 free variable Z " Total utilijation sum in Model I ";
135
136 positive variables q(i) " Bandwidth of each class i in Model I ";
137 positive variables w(i) " Weight of each class i in Model I ";
138
139 binary variables x(i,e) " Binary variables in Model I ";
140
141 *Model I*
142
143 *宣告限制式*
144 *****
145 EQUATIONS
146 OBJ " Maximizing total utilijation sum in Model I ",
147 budg " Sum of q(i)*x(i,e) is smaller then budget in Model I ",
148 capa(e) " Smaller then capacity in Model I ",
149 dela(i) " Smaller then delay in Model I ",
150 requ(i) " q(i) bigger then bandwidth requirement b(i) in Model I ",
151 sour(i) " Source sum is 1 in Model I ",
152 inout2(i) " in equal out in node 2 in Model I ",
153 inout3(i) " in equal out in node 3 in Model I ",
154 inout4(i) " in equal out in node 4 in Model I ",
155 inout5(i) " in equal out in node 5 in Model I ",
156 inout6(i) " in equal out in node 6 in Model I ",
157 dest(i) " Destination sum is 1 in Model I ",
158 weig " Sum of weight equal to 1 in Model I ";
159
160 *Model I*
161
162 *目標函數與限制式表示 *

```

```

163 *****
164
165 OBJ..
166 Z =e= SUM(i,w(i)*(log((q(i)+0.00001)/r(i)))/ (log(a(i)/r(i))));
167
168 budg..
169 SUM((i,e),J(i)*small_k(e)*q(i)*x(i,e))=l=capital_B;
170
171 capa(e)..
172 SUM(i,J(i)*q(i)*x(i,e))=l=U(e);
173
174 dela(i)..
175 SUM(e,l(e)*x(i,e))=l=capital_D(i);
176
177 requ(i)..
178 q(i)=g=b(i);
179
180 sour(i)..
181 x(i,'1')+x(i,'2')+x(i,'3')=e=1;
182
183 inout2(i)..
184 x(i,'1')=e= x(i,'4')+ x(i,'5')+ x(i,'6');
185
186 inout3(i)..
187 x(i,'2')+x(i,'4')=e= x(i,'7')+ x(i,'8');
188
189 inout4(i)..
190 x(i,'5')+ x(i,'3')+x(i,'7')=e= x(i,'9')+ x(i,'11')+x(i,'10');
191
192 inout5(i)..
193 x(i,'6')+ x(i,'9')+x(i,'12')=e= x(i,'13');
194
195 inout6(i)..
196 x(i,'10')+ x(i,'8')=e= x(i,'12')+ x(i,'14');
197
198 dest(i)..
199 x(i,'13')+x(i,'11')+x(i,'14')=e=1;
200
201 weig..
202 SUM(i,w(i))=e=1;
203
204 *Model I*
205
206 * 宣告模型 *
207 *****
208 MODEL Model_I /ALL/;
209 SOLVE Model_I USING MINLP MAXIMIZING Z;
210
211 *Model I*
212
213 * 結果呈現 *
214 *****
215
216 display q.1;
217
218 *Model I*

```

COMPILATION TIME = 0.000 SECONDS 3.2 Mb WIN213-138 Feb 03, 2004

General Algebraic Modeling System
Equation Listing SOLVE Model_I Using MINLP From line 209

```

---- OBJ =E= Maximizing total utilijation sum in Model I

OBJ.. Z + (0)*q(1) + (0)*q(2) + (0)*q(3) + (23.9933447669109)*w(1)
      + (22.9846799057837)*w(2) + (21.4169953964944)*w(3) =E= 0 ; (LHS = 0)

---- budg =L= Sum of q(i)*x(i,e) is smaller then budget in Model I

budg.. (0)*q(1) + (0)*q(2) + (0)*q(3) + (0)*x(1,1) + (0)*x(1,2) + (0)*x(1,3)
      + (0)*x(1,4) + (0)*x(1,5) + (0)*x(1,6) + (0)*x(1,7) + (0)*x(1,8)
      + (0)*x(1,9) + (0)*x(1,10) + (0)*x(1,11) + (0)*x(1,12) + (0)*x(1,13)
      + (0)*x(1,14) + (0)*x(2,1) + (0)*x(2,2) + (0)*x(2,3) + (0)*x(2,4)
      + (0)*x(2,5) + (0)*x(2,6) + (0)*x(2,7) + (0)*x(2,8) + (0)*x(2,9)
      + (0)*x(2,10) + (0)*x(2,11) + (0)*x(2,12) + (0)*x(2,13) + (0)*x(2,14)
      + (0)*x(3,1) + (0)*x(3,2) + (0)*x(3,3) + (0)*x(3,4) + (0)*x(3,5)
      + (0)*x(3,6) + (0)*x(3,7) + (0)*x(3,8) + (0)*x(3,9) + (0)*x(3,10)
      + (0)*x(3,11) + (0)*x(3,12) + (0)*x(3,13) + (0)*x(3,14) =L= 1000000 ;
      (LHS = 0)

---- capa =L= Smaller then capacity in Model I

capa(1).. (0)*q(1) + (0)*q(2) + (0)*q(3) + (0)*x(1,1) + (0)*x(2,1) + (0)*x(3,1)
      =L= 230000 ; (LHS = 0)

capa(2).. (0)*q(1) + (0)*q(2) + (0)*q(3) + (0)*x(1,2) + (0)*x(2,2) + (0)*x(3,2)
      =L= 350000 ; (LHS = 0)

capa(3).. (0)*q(1) + (0)*q(2) + (0)*q(3) + (0)*x(1,3) + (0)*x(2,3) + (0)*x(3,3)
      =L= 100000 ; (LHS = 0)

REMAINING 11 ENTRIES SKIPPED

---- dela =L= Smaller then delay in Model I

dela(1).. 0.03*x(1,1) + 0.032*x(1,2) + 0.035*x(1,3) + 0.012*x(1,4)
      + 0.02*x(1,5) + 0.012*x(1,6) + 0.03*x(1,7) + 0.015*x(1,8) + 0.027*x(1,9)
      + 0.012*x(1,10) + 0.03*x(1,11) + 0.02*x(1,12) + 0.035*x(1,13)
      + 0.035*x(1,14) =L= 0.89 ; (LHS = 0)

dela(2).. 0.03*x(2,1) + 0.032*x(2,2) + 0.035*x(2,3) + 0.012*x(2,4)
      + 0.02*x(2,5) + 0.012*x(2,6) + 0.03*x(2,7) + 0.015*x(2,8) + 0.027*x(2,9)
      + 0.012*x(2,10) + 0.03*x(2,11) + 0.02*x(2,12) + 0.035*x(2,13)
      + 0.035*x(2,14) =L= 1.02 ; (LHS = 0)

```

```

del1a(3).. 0.03*x(3,1) + 0.032*x(3,2) + 0.035*x(3,3) + 0.012*x(3,4)
          + 0.02*x(3,5) + 0.012*x(3,6) + 0.03*x(3,7) + 0.015*x(3,8) + 0.027*x(3,9)
          + 0.012*x(3,10) + 0.03*x(3,11) + 0.02*x(3,12) + 0.035*x(3,13)
          + 0.035*x(3,14) =L= 2.34 ; (LHS = 0)

```

```

---- requ =G= q(i) bigger then bandwidth requirement b(i) in Model I

```

```

requ(1).. q(1) =G= 160 ; (LHS = 0, INFES = 160 ***)

```

```

requ(2).. q(2) =G= 80 ; (LHS = 0, INFES = 80 ***)

```

```

requ(3).. q(3) =G= 25 ; (LHS = 0, INFES = 25 ***)

```

```

---- sour =E= Source sum is 1 in Model I

```

```

sour(1).. x(1,1) + x(1,2) + x(1,3) =E= 1 ; (LHS = 0, INFES = 1 ***)

```

```

sour(2).. x(2,1) + x(2,2) + x(2,3) =E= 1 ; (LHS = 0, INFES = 1 ***)

```

```

sour(3).. x(3,1) + x(3,2) + x(3,3) =E= 1 ; (LHS = 0, INFES = 1 ***)

```

```

---- inout2 =E= in equal out in node 2 in Model I

```

```

inout2(1).. x(1,1) - x(1,4) - x(1,5) - x(1,6) =E= 0 ; (LHS = 0)

```

```

inout2(2).. x(2,1) - x(2,4) - x(2,5) - x(2,6) =E= 0 ; (LHS = 0)

```

```

inout2(3).. x(3,1) - x(3,4) - x(3,5) - x(3,6) =E= 0 ; (LHS = 0)

```

```

---- inout3 =E= in equal out in node 3 in Model I

```

```

inout3(1).. x(1,2) + x(1,4) - x(1,7) - x(1,8) =E= 0 ; (LHS = 0)

```

```

inout3(2).. x(2,2) + x(2,4) - x(2,7) - x(2,8) =E= 0 ; (LHS = 0)

```

```

inout3(3).. x(3,2) + x(3,4) - x(3,7) - x(3,8) =E= 0 ; (LHS = 0)

```

```

---- inout4 =E= in equal out in node 4 in Model I

```

```

inout4(1).. x(1,3) + x(1,5) + x(1,7) - x(1,9) - x(1,10) - x(1,11) =E= 0 ;
          (LHS = 0)

```

```

inout4(2).. x(2,3) + x(2,5) + x(2,7) - x(2,9) - x(2,10) - x(2,11) =E= 0 ;
          (LHS = 0)

```

```

inout4(3).. x(3,3) + x(3,5) + x(3,7) - x(3,9) - x(3,10) - x(3,11) =E= 0 ;
          (LHS = 0)

```

```

---- inout5 =E= in equal out in node 5 in Model I

```

```

inout5(1).. x(1,6) + x(1,9) + x(1,12) - x(1,13) =E= 0 ; (LHS = 0)

inout5(2).. x(2,6) + x(2,9) + x(2,12) - x(2,13) =E= 0 ; (LHS = 0)

inout5(3).. x(3,6) + x(3,9) + x(3,12) - x(3,13) =E= 0 ; (LHS = 0)

---- inout6 =E= in equal out in node 6 in Model I

inout6(1).. x(1,8) + x(1,10) - x(1,12) - x(1,14) =E= 0 ; (LHS = 0)

inout6(2).. x(2,8) + x(2,10) - x(2,12) - x(2,14) =E= 0 ; (LHS = 0)

inout6(3).. x(3,8) + x(3,10) - x(3,12) - x(3,14) =E= 0 ; (LHS = 0)

---- dest =E= Destination sum is 1 in Model I

dest(1).. x(1,11) + x(1,13) + x(1,14) =E= 1 ; (LHS = 0, INFES = 1 ***)

dest(2).. x(2,11) + x(2,13) + x(2,14) =E= 1 ; (LHS = 0, INFES = 1 ***)

dest(3).. x(3,11) + x(3,13) + x(3,14) =E= 1 ; (LHS = 0, INFES = 1 ***)

---- weig =E= Sum of weight equal to 1 in Model I

weig.. w(1) + w(2) + w(3) =E= 1 ; (LHS = 0, INFES = 1 ***)

```

General Algebraic Modeling System
Column Listing SOLVE Model_I Using MINLP From line 209

---- Z Total utilization sum in Model I

```

Z
      (.LO, .L, .UP = -INF, 0, +INF)
1     OBJ

```

---- q Bandwidth of each class i in Model I

```

q(1)
      (.LO, .L, .UP = 0, 0, +INF)
(0)   OBJ
(0)   budg
(0)   capa(1)
(0)   capa(2)
(0)   capa(3)
(0)   capa(4)
(0)   capa(5)
(0)   capa(6)
(0)   capa(7)
(0)   capa(8)
(0)   capa(9)
(0)   capa(10)
(0)   capa(11)
(0)   capa(12)
(0)   capa(13)
(0)   capa(14)
1     requ(1)

```

```

q(2)
      (.LO, .L, .UP = 0, 0, +INF)
(0)  OBJ
(0)  budg
(0)  capa(1)
(0)  capa(2)
(0)  capa(3)
(0)  capa(4)
(0)  capa(5)
(0)  capa(6)
(0)  capa(7)
(0)  capa(8)
(0)  capa(9)
(0)  capa(10)
(0)  capa(11)
(0)  capa(12)
(0)  capa(13)
(0)  capa(14)
1    requ(2)

```

```

q(3)
      (.LO, .L, .UP = 0, 0, +INF)
(0)  OBJ
(0)  budg
(0)  capa(1)
(0)  capa(2)
(0)  capa(3)
(0)  capa(4)
(0)  capa(5)
(0)  capa(6)
(0)  capa(7)
(0)  capa(8)
(0)  capa(9)
(0)  capa(10)
(0)  capa(11)
(0)  capa(12)
(0)  capa(13)
(0)  capa(14)
1    requ(3)

```

---- w Weight of each class i in Model I

```

w(1)
      (.LO, .L, .UP = 0, 0, +INF)
(23.9933) OBJ
1    weig

```

```

w(2)
      (.LO, .L, .UP = 0, 0, +INF)
(22.9847) OBJ
1    weig

```

```

w(3)
      (.LO, .L, .UP = 0, 0, +INF)
(21.417) OBJ
1    weig

```

---- x Binary variables in Model I

```

x(1,1)

```



```

      (.LD, .L, .UP = 0, 0, 1)
(0)   budg
(0)   capa(1)
0.03  dela(1)
1     sour(1)
1     inout2(1)

```

x(1,2)

```

      (.LD, .L, .UP = 0, 0, 1)
(0)   budg
(0)   capa(2)
0.032 dela(1)
1     sour(1)
1     inout3(1)

```

x(1,3)

```

      (.LD, .L, .UP = 0, 0, 1)
(0)   budg
(0)   capa(3)
0.035 dela(1)
1     sour(1)
1     inout4(1)

```

REMAINING 39 ENTRIES SKIPPED

General Algebraic Modeling System
Model Statistics SOLVE Model_I Using MINLP From line 209

MODEL STATISTICS

BLOCKS OF EQUATIONS	13	SINGLE EQUATIONS	44
BLOCKS OF VARIABLES	4	SINGLE VARIABLES	49
NON ZERO ELEMENTS	268	NON LINEAR N-Z	135
DERIVATIVE POOL	52	CONSTANT POOL	40
CODE LENGTH	996	DISCRETE VARIABLES	42

GENERATION TIME = 0.031 SECONDS 3.9 Mb WIN213-138 Feb 03, 2004

EXECUTION TIME = 0.031 SECONDS 3.9 Mb WIN213-138 Feb 03, 2004

General Algebraic Modeling System
Solution Report SOLVE Model_I Using MINLP From line 209

S O L V E S U M M A R Y

MODEL	Model_I	OBJECTIVE	Z
TYPE	MINLP	DIRECTION	MAXIMIZE
SOLVER	BARON	FROM LINE	209

**** SOLVER STATUS 1 NORMAL COMPLETION

**** MODEL STATUS 8 INTEGER SOLUTION

**** OBJECTIVE VALUE 2.0506

RESOURCE USAGE, LIMIT	1.970	1000.000
ITERATION COUNT, LIMIT	0	10000
EVALUATION ERRORS	0	0

Branch And Reduce Optimization Navigator
 Nikolaos Sahinidis and Mohit Tawarmalani
 The Optimization Firm, LLC.

Total time elapsed : 000:00:02, in seconds: 1.97
 on parsing : 000:00:00, in seconds: 0.03
 on preprocessing: 000:00:01, in seconds: 0.52
 on navigating : 000:00:00, in seconds: 0.03
 on relaxed : 000:00:00, in seconds: 0.06
 on local : 000:00:00, in seconds: 0.09
 on tightening : 000:00:00, in seconds: 0.03
 on marginals : 000:00:00, in seconds: 0.00
 on probing : 000:00:01, in seconds: 1.20

Total no. of BaR iterations: 201
 Best solution found at node: 10
 Max. no. of nodes in memory: 4

Solution = 2.05062619744 found at node 10
 Best possible = 2.27847355271
 Absolute gap = 0.22784735527 optca = 0.1
 Relative gap = 0.10000 optcr = 0.1

	LOWER	LEVEL	UPPER	MARGINAL
---- EQU OBJ	.	.	.	1.000
---- EQU budg	-INF	1.0000E+6	1.0000E+6	6.2185E-6

OBJ Maximizing total utilization sum in Model I
 budg Sum of $q(i)*x(i,e)$ is smaller then budget in Model I

---- EQU capa Smaller then capacity in Model I

	LOWER	LEVEL	UPPER	MARGINAL
1	-INF	30400.000	2.3000E+5	.
2	-INF	19600.000	3.5000E+5	.
3	-INF	.	1.0000E+5	.
4	-INF	.	2.5000E+5	.
5	-INF	30400.000	2.1000E+5	.
6	-INF	.	2.2000E+5	.
7	-INF	.	2.0000E+5	.
8	-INF	19600.000	3.0000E+5	.
9	-INF	30400.000	2.1000E+5	.
10	-INF	.	2.7000E+5	.
11	-INF	.	1.5000E+5	.
12	-INF	.	1.8000E+5	.
13	-INF	30400.000	3.0000E+5	.
14	-INF	19600.000	3.5000E+5	.

---- EQU dela Smaller then delay in Model I

	LOWER	LEVEL	UPPER	MARGINAL
1	-INF	0.112	0.890	.
2	-INF	0.082	1.020	.
3	-INF	0.082	2.340	.

---- EQU requ $q(i)$ bigger then bandwidth requirement $b(i)$ in Model I

	LOWER	LEVEL	UPPER	MARGINAL
1	160.000	160.000	+INF	-0.024
2	80.000	80.000	+INF	-0.012
3	25.000	116.000	+INF	.

---- EQU sour Source sum is 1 in Model I

	LOWER	LEVEL	UPPER	MARGINAL
1	1.000	1.000	1.000	-0.945
2	1.000	1.000	1.000	-0.249
3	1.000	1.000	1.000	-0.361

---- EQU inout2 in equal out in node 2 in Model I

	LOWER	LEVEL	UPPER	MARGINAL
1
2
3

---- EQU inout3 in equal out in node 3 in Model I

	LOWER	LEVEL	UPPER	MARGINAL
1	.	.	.	-0.189
2	.	.	.	-0.050
3	.	.	.	-0.072

---- EQU inout4 in equal out in node 4 in Model I

	LOWER	LEVEL	UPPER	MARGINAL
1	.	.	.	-0.756
2	.	.	.	-0.199
3	.	.	.	-0.289

---- EQU inout5 in equal out in node 5 in Model I

	LOWER	LEVEL	UPPER	MARGINAL
1	.	.	.	-1.890
2	.	.	.	-0.497
3	.	.	.	-0.721

---- EQU inout6 in equal out in node 6 in Model I

	LOWER	LEVEL	UPPER	MARGINAL
1	.	.	.	-1.701
2	.	.	.	-0.448
3	.	.	.	-0.649

---- EQU dest Destination sum is 1 in Model I

	LOWER	LEVEL	UPPER	MARGINAL
1	1.000	1.000	1.000	-2.836
2	1.000	1.000	1.000	-0.746
3	1.000	1.000	1.000	-1.082

	LOWER	LEVEL	UPPER	MARGINAL
---- EQU weig	1.000	1.000	1.000	2.051

weig Sum of weight equal to 1 in Model I

	LOWER	LEVEL	UPPER	MARGINAL
---- VAR Z	-INF	2.051	+INF	.

Z Total utilijation sum in Model I

---- VAR q Bandwidth of each class i in Model I

	LOWER	LEVEL	UPPER	MARGINAL
1 .	160.000	+INF	.	.
2 .	80.000	+INF	.	.
3 .	116.000	+INF	.	.

---- VAR w Weight of each class i in Model I

	LOWER	LEVEL	UPPER	MARGINAL
1 .	.	+INF	-2.112	.
2 .	.	+INF	-2.104	.
3 .	1.000	+INF	.	.

---- VAR x Binary variables in Model I

	LOWER	LEVEL	UPPER	MARGINAL
1.1 .	1.000	1.000	EPS	
1.2 .	.	1.000	EPS	
1.3 .	.	1.000	-0.189	
1.4 .	.	1.000	-0.756	
1.5 .	1.000	1.000	EPS	
1.6 .	.	1.000	-0.189	
1.7 .	.	1.000	-0.567	
1.8 .	.	1.000	EPS	
1.9 .	1.000	1.000	EPS	
1.10 .	.	1.000	-0.378	
1.11 .	.	1.000	-0.189	
1.12 .	.	1.000	-0.945	
1.13 .	1.000	1.000	EPS	
1.14 .	.	1.000	EPS	
2.1 .	.	1.000	EPS	
2.2 .	1.000	1.000	EPS	
2.3 .	.	1.000	-0.050	
2.4 .	.	1.000	-0.199	
2.5 .	.	1.000	EPS	
2.6 .	.	1.000	-0.050	
2.7 .	.	1.000	-0.149	
2.8 .	1.000	1.000	EPS	
2.9 .	.	1.000	EPS	
2.10 .	.	1.000	-0.099	
2.11 .	.	1.000	-0.050	
2.12 .	.	1.000	-0.249	
2.13 .	.	1.000	EPS	
2.14 .	1.000	1.000	EPS	
3.1 .	.	1.000	EPS	
3.2 .	1.000	1.000	EPS	
3.3 .	.	1.000	-0.072	

3.4	.	.	1.000	-0.289
3.5	.	.	1.000	EPS
3.6	.	.	1.000	-0.072
3.7	.	.	1.000	-0.216
3.8	.	1.000	1.000	EPS
3.9	.	.	1.000	EPS
3.10	.	.	1.000	-0.144
3.11	.	.	1.000	-0.072
3.12	.	.	1.000	-0.361
3.13	.	.	1.000	EPS
3.14	.	1.000	1.000	EPS

```
**** REPORT SUMMARY :      0  NONOPT
                          0  INFEASIBLE
                          0  UNBOUNDED
                          0  ERRORS
```

General Algebraic Modeling System
Execution

---- 216 VARIABLE q.L Bandwidth of each class i in Model I

1 1.600000E+2, 2 80.00000000, 3 1.160000E+2

EXECUTION TIME = 0.031 SECONDS 2.9 Mb WIN213-138 Feb 03, 2004

USER: Chin-Chen Fan H040721:1606AP-WIN
National ChengChi University, Department of Mathematical ScD04809
License for teaching and research at degree granting institutions

**** FILE SUMMARY