## Chapter 3 <br> The Minimum Cost Method

MCM includes two phases: MCML and BRAM. By solving MCML and BRAM, we introduce MCM with $\mathrm{Q} \%$ of total loom width requirement.

### 3.1 A Simulation Algorithm Applied on All-IP Networks

In Chapter 2, we focus on maximizing the satisfaction function. In this chapter, we focus on how to find $Q \%$ of total bandwidth requirement? We say that the bandwidth $\tau$ satisfying $Q \%$ of total bandwidth requirement if $\frac{P^{*}(\vartheta \in \Omega: \vartheta \leq \tau)}{P^{*}(\Omega)}=Q \%$ holds, where $\Omega$ is the sample space of total bandwidth requirement and $P^{*}$ is a probability measure on $\Omega$. In implementation, we propose a simulation method to minimize the cost with which it satisfies $Q \%$ of total bandwidth requirement as well as maximize the satisfaction statistically. In specific, we focus on the choice of the routing paths which bring off twofold: seeking the maximum value of the satisfaction function and minimizing the cost [4]. We introduce the method as follows. Minimum cost model with variates of connections:

Generate 30 random samples $a_{1}, a_{2}, \Lambda, a_{m}$ of Poisson distributions with respect to each mean $E\left[\lambda_{1}\right], E\left[\lambda_{2}\right], \Lambda, E\left[\lambda_{m}\right]$. Consider the following MCML model.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { Minimize } & \sum_{e \in L} k_{e} x_{e} \\
\text { Subject to } & \sum_{e \in L} k_{e} x_{e} \leq B \tag{14}
\end{array}
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
& \sum_{e \in I_{n}} x_{e}=\sum_{e \in O_{n}} x_{e}, \forall e \in L .  \tag{15}\\
& M=\sum_{e \in O_{1}} x_{e}=\sum_{i=1}^{m} r_{i} a_{i}  \tag{16}\\
& x_{e} \leq U_{e}
\end{align*}
$$

Note (16) involves $a_{1}, a_{2}, \Lambda, a_{m}$. Because $\lambda_{i}$ is a random variable, it is very difficult to find the probability of $M$ such that $M=\sum_{e \in O_{1}} x_{e}=\sum_{i=1}^{m} r_{i} \lambda_{i}$ in (16) for each $e$. Furthermore, since $x_{e}$ is a random variable for each $i$, $\sum_{e \in Z} k_{e} X_{e}$ is a random variable in (13). Thus, $\theta^{i}$ is random in (11) so is $\sum_{i} x_{i}(e) \theta_{i e}=x_{e}$ in (12). It is difficult to solve the model by optimality conditions of mathematical analysis. Therefore, we use simulation method to solve it.

Assume that $M$ follows a Normal distribution. We need the following definition and theorem of Uniformly Minimum Variance Unbiased Estimator to investigate the property of sampling.

Definition 3.1 If $\tau$ is an unbiased estimator of $M, \operatorname{Var}(\tau)<\infty$, and for any estimator $\tau^{\prime}$ of $M$, we have $\operatorname{Var}(\tau)<\operatorname{Var}\left(\tau^{\prime}\right)$ then $\tau$ is a Uniformly Minimum Variance Unbiased Estimator (UMVUE).

Theorem 3.1 Suppose $\tau^{1}, \tau^{2}, \Lambda, \tau^{n}$ are random samples of $M$ from a Normal distribution with unknown average and variance. The sample standard deviation is $S . \quad$ Then $\tau_{Q \%}=\bar{\tau}+\beta_{Q \%} \times \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{n-1}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{n}{2}\right)} \times \frac{\sqrt{n-1}}{\sqrt{2}} \times S$ is an UMVUE of
$M$ for the $Q^{\text {th }}$ percentile, where $\bar{\tau}=\frac{\tau^{1}+\tau^{2}+\Lambda+\tau^{n}}{n}$ is the sample mean, and $\beta_{Q \%}$ is the $Q^{\text {th }}$ percentile of Standard Normal distribution [1].

Proof: Let $M \sim N\left(\mu, \sigma^{2}\right)$, where $\left\{\mu, \sigma^{2}\right\}$ are unknown.
$\left(\sum_{k=1}^{n}\left(\tau^{(k)}\right)^{2}, \sum_{k=1}^{n} \tau^{(k)}\right)$ is the complete sufficient statistic for this model.
The $Q^{\text {th }}$ percentile $\tau_{Q \%}$ of the distribution satisfies $P^{*}\left\{M \leq \tau_{Q \%}\right\}=Q \%$.
Namely, it is $P^{*}\left\{\frac{M-\mu}{\sigma} \leq \frac{\eta_{Q \%}-\mu}{\sigma}\right\}=Q \%$.
Equivalently, we have $\tau_{Q \%}=\mu+\beta_{Q \%} \times \sigma$.
Because of $E[\bar{\tau}]=\mu$, by Scheffe theorem (see Appendix A), we obtain that $\bar{\tau}$ is an UMVUE for $\mu$.
Let $T=\frac{(n-1) S^{2}}{\sigma^{2}} \rightarrow \chi^{2}(n-1)$
$\therefore E[\sqrt{T}]=\int_{0}^{\infty} t^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{t^{\frac{n-1}{2}-1}}{\Gamma\left(\frac{n-1}{2}\right) 2^{\frac{n-1}{2}}} e^{-\frac{1}{2}} d t=\frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{n}{2}\right) 2^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\Gamma\left(\frac{n-1}{2}\right)}$.
which implies $E\left[\frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{n-1}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{n}{2}\right) 2^{\frac{1}{2}}} \sqrt{n-1} S\right]=\sigma$
Hence, $\frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{n-1}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{n}{2}\right) 2^{\frac{1}{2}}} \sqrt{n-1} S$ is an unbiased estimator of $\sigma$. and is a
function of complete sufficient statistic.

Again, by Rao-Blackwell-Lehmann-Scheffe theorem, we have
$\frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{n-1}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{n}{2}\right) 2^{\frac{1}{2}}} \sqrt{n-1} S$ is an UMVUE for $\sigma$.

Hence, $\tau_{Q \%}=\bar{\tau}+\beta_{Q \%} \times \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{n-1}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{n}{2}\right) 2^{\frac{1}{2}}} \times \sqrt{n-1} \times S$ is an UMVUE of $M$ for the $Q^{\text {th }}$ percentile.

Consider in BRAM the satisfaction value $F$ in (10) is a function of $a_{1}, a_{2}, \Lambda, a_{m}$. The following theorem states a simulation result in BRAM model may be formulated as an UMVUE of $F$ for the $Q^{\text {th }}$ percentile.

## Theorem 3.2

Given $\left\{\left(a_{1}, a_{2}, \Lambda, a_{m}\right)^{1},\left(a_{1}, a_{2}, \Lambda, a_{m}\right)^{2}, \Lambda,\left(a_{1}, a_{2}, \Lambda, a_{m}\right)^{n}\right\}$ is a set of random samples of $\left(\lambda_{1}, \lambda_{2}, \Lambda, \lambda_{m}\right)$. Let $\quad\left(r_{1}, r_{2}, \Lambda, r_{m}\right) \bullet\left(a_{1}, a_{2}, \Lambda, a_{m}\right)^{1}=\tau^{1},\left(r_{1}, r_{2}, \Lambda, r_{m}\right) \bullet$ $\left(a_{1}, a_{2}, \Lambda, a_{m}\right)^{2}=\tau^{2}, \Lambda,\left(r_{1}, r_{2}, \Lambda, r_{m}\right) \bullet\left(a_{1}, a_{2}, \Lambda, a_{m}\right)^{n}=\tau^{n} . \quad$ Then $\quad \tau_{Q \%}=\bar{\tau}+\beta_{Q \%}$ $\times \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{n-1}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{n}{2}\right) 2^{\frac{1}{2}}} \times \sqrt{n-1} \times S$ is an UMVUE of $M$ for the $Q^{\text {th }}$ percentile. For inserting $\tau_{Q \%}$ and $\left(a_{1}, a_{2}, \Lambda, a_{m}\right)^{k}$ to BRAM, we obtain the value of the satisfaction function $F^{k}$ for $k=1, \Lambda, n$. Then the average of $\left\{F^{k}\right\}_{k=1}^{n}$ is an UMVUE of $F$ satisfying $Q \%$ of total bandwidth requirement.

### 3.1.1 A Statistical inference process of our study

We describe the procedure and the Statistical inference process of our study as follows.


Figure 3.1 The Statistical inference process of our study


Figure 3.2 The structure of our study

### 3.1.2 The simulation process

We propose a method which combines both simulation and optimization to reach the goal of $\mathrm{Q} \%$ satisfaction.

Generate random 30 samples $a_{1}, a_{2}, \Lambda, a_{m}$ of Poisson distribution with respect to each mean $E\left[\lambda_{1}\right], E\left[\lambda_{2}\right], \Lambda, E\left[\lambda_{m}\right]$. Denote by $\left(a_{1}, a_{2}, \Lambda, a_{m}\right)^{k}$ the value of $\left(\lambda_{1}, \lambda_{2}, \Lambda, \lambda_{m}\right)$ at the $k$ th run of the simulation. For each $k$, we solve the Minimum cost model to obtain the total bandwidth $\tau^{k}$ and the bandwidth of each links we purchase.

We use a simulation method for solving All-IP Networks Problem, and state our algorithm as follows:

Step 1. Given $\lambda_{1}, \lambda_{2}, \Lambda, \lambda_{m}$ compute the expected value $E\left[\lambda_{1}\right], E\left[\lambda_{2}\right], \Lambda$, $E\left[\lambda_{m}\right]$.

Step 2. Generate 30 random samples $a_{1}, a_{2}, \Lambda, a_{m}$ of Poisson distributions with respect to each mean $E\left[\lambda_{1}\right], E\left[\lambda_{2}\right], \Lambda, E\left[\lambda_{m}\right]$. Set $k=0$.

Step 3. $k=k+1$.
Step 4. Calculate $\left(r_{1}, r_{2}, \Lambda, r_{m}\right) \bullet\left(a_{1}, a_{2}, \Lambda, a_{m}\right)^{k}=\tau^{k}$.
Step 5. $k \leq 30$ ? If not,. go to Step 6, otherwise $k=k+1$. Go to Step 4.
Step 6. Stop and calculate the $Q \%$ of total bandwidth requirement by Theorem 3.1 and the bandwidth $\tau_{Q \%}$.

Step 7. Input $\tau_{Q \%}$ and solve BRAM to find the value of satisfaction.
Next, we introduce the algorithm of calculating the $Q \%$ of total bandwidth requirement.

## Calculating the $\mathbf{Q \%}$ of total bandwidth requirement

Step 1. Calculate $\bar{\tau}=\frac{\tau^{1}+\tau^{2}+\Lambda+\tau^{30}}{n}$.

Step 2. Calculate the sample variance $S^{2}$ of $\tau^{1}, \tau^{2}, \Lambda, \tau^{30}$.
Step 3. Find $\beta_{Q \%}$.
Step 4. Calculate $\tau_{Q \%}$.
By Theorem 3.1 $\tau_{Q \%}$ is an UMVUE of $M$ for the $Q^{t h}$ percentile.

## MCM algorithm



Figure 3.3 MCM algorithm

Next, consider BRAM with simulation. Different from MBM in Section 2.1 we replace (11) by $a_{1} \times \theta_{1}+a_{2} \times \theta_{2}+\Lambda+a_{m} \times \theta_{m}=M$. Input $M$ and solve BRAM to find the value of satisfaction $F$ and to obtain the bandwidth allocated to each class.

### 3.2 The Minimum Cost Method

### 3.2.1 Example 1 of MCM model

Consider a network topology $\mathrm{G}=\langle N, L\rangle$ as shown in Figure 2.2. All data remain the same as given in Section 2.2.

The process of our study is described in the following:
Generate 30 random samples $a_{1}, a_{2}, a_{3}$ of Poisson distributions with respect to each mean $10,10,10$ and calculate $r_{1} a_{1}+r_{2} a_{2}+r_{3} a_{3}$ simultaneously.

Then by Theorem 3.1 we obtain the solutions in Table 3.1:

Table 3.1 The relation between Bandwidth and Q\% of total bandwidth requirement

| Bandwidth | 2345 | 2765 | 2952 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $Q \%$ of total bandwidth <br> requirement | $17 \%$ | $34 \%$ | $50 \%$ |
| Bandwidth | 3131 | 3470 | 3988 |
| Q\% of total bandwidth <br> requirement | $66 \%$ | $83 \%$ | $95 \%$ |
| Bandwidth | 4002 | 4570 |  |
| Q\% of total bandwidth <br> requirement | $97 \%$ | $99.5 \%$ |  |

If it requires $95 \%$ of total bandwidth requirement, then we can choose 3988 units for total budget. Next consider MCML. In order to minimize the cost, we insert the data to FMINCON as follows:

$$
A=\left[\begin{array}{cccccccccccccc}
5 & 6 & 10 & 5 & 4 & 11 & 6 & 8 & 6 & 7 & 12 & 6 & 5 & 6 \\
1 & 0 & 0 & -1 & -1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & -1 & -1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & -1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & -1 & 0 & -1 \\
1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
-1 & -1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{array}\right] ; \quad\left[\begin{array}{c}
100000 \\
0 \\
0 \\
0 \\
0 \\
0 \\
2300 \\
3500 \\
1000 \\
2500 \\
2100 \\
2200 \\
2000 \\
3000 \\
2100 \\
2700 \\
1500 \\
1800 \\
3000 \\
3500 \\
-3988
\end{array}\right)
$$

FMINCON (inline('5* $x_{1}+6^{*} x_{2}+10^{*} x_{3}+5^{*} x_{4}+4^{*} x_{5}+11^{*} x_{6}+6^{*} x_{7}+8^{*} x_{8}$ $\left.+6^{*} x_{9}+7^{*} x_{10}+12^{*} x_{11}+6^{*} x_{12}+5^{*} x_{13}+6^{*} x_{14}\right),[1 ; 1 ; 1 ; 1 ; 1 ; 1 ; 1 ; 1 ; 1 ; 1 ;$ $1 ; 1 ; 1 ; 1], A, b,[],[],[0 ; 0 ; 0 ; 0 ; 0 ; 0 ; 0 ; 0 ; 0 ; 0 ; 0 ; 0 ; 0 ; 0],[]$ ).

We obtain the bandwidth of each link as follows:

Table 3.2 The optimal solution

| $x_{1}$ | $x_{2}$ | $x_{3}$ | $x_{4}$ | $x_{5}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1720.5 kbps | 2267.5 kbps | 0 kbps | 0 kbps | 1720.5 kbps |
| $x_{6}$ | $x_{7}$ | $x_{8}$ | $x_{9}$ | $x_{10}$ |
| 0 kbps | 0 kbps | 2267.5 kbps | 1720.5 kbps | 0 kbps |
| $x_{11}$ | $x_{12}$ | $x_{13}$ | $x_{14}$ | $M$ |
| 0 kbps | 0 kbps | 1720.5 kbps | 2267.5 kbps | 3988 kbps |

With $95 \%$ of total bandwidth requirement, the cost of the resource allocation is 79767.4 dollars, compared with the cost of the resource allocation in Section 3.2 which is 100000 dollars, we save 20232.6 dollars. Moreover, it saves bandwidth projected about $20 \%$ in total, i.e., (5000-3988)/5000.

### 3.2.2 Example 1 of MCM with $w_{1}=w_{2}=w_{3}$

Suppose the number of connection is $\lambda_{i}$ and the expected value of $\lambda_{i}$ is 10 for the $i$ th class, each objective is regarded as important as each other. Suppose each class has equal weight $w_{1}=w_{2}=w_{3}=\frac{1}{3}$, and $\mathrm{M}=3988 \mathrm{kbps}$ after solving MCML.

For each $\tau$ and $\left(a_{1}, a_{2}, \Lambda, a_{m}\right)^{k}$ to BRAM, we are to obtain the value of the satisfaction function $F^{k}$ for $k=1, \Lambda, 30$. We set the data to FMINCON as follows:

FMINCON(inline('- $\frac{1}{3} * \log \left(\theta_{1} / 167\right)-\frac{1}{3} * \log \left(\theta_{2} / 83\right)-\frac{1}{3} * \log \left(\theta_{3} / 28\right)$ '), [1; 1 ; 1], $\left.\left[\left(a_{1}, a_{2}, \Lambda, a_{m}\right)^{k}\right],[3988],[],[],[167 ; 83 ; 28],[]\right)$.

We obtain the average of $\left\{F^{k}\right\}_{k=1}^{30}$ is 0.6073 . It is compared with the value of the satisfaction by BRAM in Section 2.3 that is 0.8113 . Obviously, it reduces about $25 \%$ which is computed by ( $0.8113-0.6073$ )/0.8113

The resource allocation to each class and each path are:

Class 1. $l_{1} \rightarrow l_{5} \rightarrow l_{9} \rightarrow l_{13}$, which holds bandwidth of 1720.5 kbps .
$l_{2} \rightarrow l_{8} \rightarrow l_{14}$, which holds bandwidth of 19.195 kbps.
Class 2. $\quad l_{2} \rightarrow l_{8} \rightarrow l_{14}$, which holds bandwidth of 1083.393 kbps .
Class 3. $\quad l_{2} \rightarrow l_{8} \rightarrow l_{14}$, which holds bandwidth of 1164.912 kbps .

### 3.2.3 Three classes have different weights

Suppose for each class their weights are $w_{1}=0.6, w_{2}=0.2, w_{3}=0.2$. However, let $M=3988 \mathrm{kbps}$ after solving MCML.

Next we solve BRAM by FMINCON:
FMINCON(inline('-0.6* $\log \left(\theta_{1} / 167\right)-0.2 * \log \left(\theta_{2} / 83\right)-0.2 * \log \left(\theta_{3} / 28\right)$ '), $[1 ; 1 ; 1]$, $\left.\left[\left(a_{1}, a_{2}, \Lambda, a_{m}\right)^{k}\right],[3988],[],[],[167 ; 83 ; 28],[]\right)$.

We obtain the average of $\left\{F^{k}\right\}_{k=1}^{30} 0.3981$. It is compared with the value of satisfaction in Section 2.4 which is 0.639 . Its satisfaction is cut down by about $30 \%$, i.e., (0.639-0.3981)/0.639.

The resource allocation for each class with a possible path is:
Class 1. $l_{2} \rightarrow l_{8} \rightarrow l_{14}$, which holds bandwidth 1951.364 kbps .

Class 2. $\quad l_{2} \rightarrow l_{8} \rightarrow l_{14}$, which holds bandwidth of 316.136 kbps .

$$
l_{1} \rightarrow l_{5} \rightarrow l_{9} \rightarrow l_{13} \text {, which holds bandwidth of } 716.753 \mathrm{kbps} .
$$

Class 3. $\quad l_{1} \rightarrow l_{5} \rightarrow l_{9} \rightarrow l_{13}$, which holds bandwidth of 1003.747 kbps .

### 3.3 Example 2 of MCM Model

Consider a network topology $\mathrm{G}=\langle N, L\rangle \quad$ as shown in Figure 2.2. All data remain the same as that given in Section 2.5.

Generate 30 random samples $a_{1}, a_{2}, a_{3}$ of Poisson distributions with respect to each mean $10,30,110$ and calculate $\gamma_{1} a_{1}+\gamma_{2} a_{2}+\gamma_{3} a_{3}$ for (16).

The total bandwidth and $Q \%$ of total bandwidth requirement is given in

Table 3.3:

Table 3.3 The relation between Bandwidth and Q\% of total bandwidth requirement

| Bandwidth | 6310 kbps | 6610 kbps | 6791.7 kbps |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Q\% of total bandwidth <br> requirement | $20 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $55 \%$ |

The maximum flow from source to destination is 6800 kbps under the current capacity of network. However, it indicats that 6791 kbps is only able to reach $55 \%$ of total bandwidth requirement in simulation. Thus, we suggest the system manager to add some links on the network or increase the capacity of some links to reach a specified $Q \%$ of total bandwidth requirement.

For solving MCML in this case, we set $M=6791.7$ and provide data to FMINCON as follows:

$$
\left.A=\left[\begin{array}{cccccccccccccc}
5 & 6 & 10 & 5 & 4 & 11 & 6 & 8 & 6 & 7 & 12 & 6 & 5 & 6 \\
1 & 0 & 0 & -1 & -1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & -1 & -1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & -1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & -1 & 0 & -1 \\
1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
-1 & -1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{array}\right] ; \quad \begin{array}{c}
140000 \\
0 \\
0 \\
0 \\
0 \\
0 \\
2300 \\
3500 \\
1000 \\
2500 \\
2100 \\
2200 \\
2000 \\
3000 \\
2100 \\
2700 \\
1500 \\
1800 \\
3000 \\
3500 \\
6791
\end{array}\right)
$$

FMINCON(inline('5* $x_{1}+6 * x_{2}+10 * x_{3}+5 * x_{4}+4 * x_{5}+11 * x_{6}+6 * x_{7}+8 * x_{8}+6 * x_{9}$ $\left.+7^{*} x_{10}+12 * x_{11}+6^{*} x_{12}+5^{*} x_{13}+6^{*} x_{14}{ }^{\prime}\right),[1 ; 1 ; 1 ; 1 ; 1 ; 1 ; 1 ; 1 ; 1 ; 1 ; 1 ; 1 ; 1 ; 1], A$, $b$, [], [], [0; 0; 0; 0; 0; 0; 0; 0; 0; 0; 0; 0; 0; 0], [])

Then, the bandwidth of each link is obtained and given in Table 3.4.

Table 3.4 The optimal solution

| $x_{1}$ | $x_{2}$ | $x_{3}$ | $x_{4}$ | $x_{5}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2300 kbps | 3491.7 kbps | 1000 kbps | 0 kbps | 1400 kbps |
| $x_{6}$ | $x_{7}$ | $x_{8}$ | $x_{9}$ | $x_{10}$ |
| 900 kbps | 491.7 kbps | 3000 kbps | 2100 kbps | 0 kbps |
| $x_{11}$ | $x_{12}$ | $x_{13}$ | $x_{14}$ | $M$ |
| 791.7 kbps | 0 kbps | 3000 kbps | 3000 kbps | 6791.7 kbps |

The cost of the resource allocation is $\$ 140000$ dollars and we buy bandwidth of 6791.7 kbps , which is the same as that in Section 2.5.

Suppose classes have different weights: $w_{1}=0.6, w_{2}=0.2, w_{3}=0.2$ and let $M=6791.7 \mathrm{kbps}$. Inserting $\tau$ and $\left(a_{1}, a_{2}, \Lambda, a_{m}\right)^{k}$ to BRAM, we obtain the value of the satisfaction function $F^{k}$ for $k=1, \Lambda, 30$. Setup the data for FMINCON as follows:

FMINCON(inline('-0.6* $\left.\ln \left(\theta_{1} / 167\right)-0.2 * \ln \left(\theta_{2} / 83\right)-0.2 * \ln \left(\theta_{3} / 28\right) '\right),[1 ; 1 ; 1]$, [( $\left.a_{1}, a_{2}, \Lambda, a_{m}\right)^{(k)}$, [6791.7], [], [], [167; 83; 28], []).

In average, $\theta_{i}, i=1,2,3$, are given as follows:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \theta_{1}=187.82 \mathrm{kbps} \\
& \theta_{2}=40.847 \mathrm{kbps}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\theta_{3}=33.53 \mathrm{kbps}
$$

Hence we select a path $l_{1}, l_{2}, l_{5}, l_{8}, l_{9}, l_{13}, l_{14}$, and obtain the optimal value of satisfaction is $0.6 * f_{1}\left(\theta_{1}\right)+0.2 * f_{2}\left(\theta_{2}\right)+0.2 * f_{3}\left(\theta_{3}\right)=0.0205$.

### 3.4 The Application on another All-IP Networks Problem

Consider the same network topology $\mathrm{G}=\langle N, L\rangle$ as given in Section 2.6. All data are kept the same as that in Section 2.6.

Generate 30 random samples $a_{1}, a_{2}, a_{3}$ of Poisson distributions with respect to each mean 5,5 , and 10 . The maximum flow of the network from the source to the destination is 3500 kbps . Since the total bandwidth requirement is less than 3500 kbps , the total bandwidth and $Q \%$ of total bandwidth requirement for different $Q$ 's are given in Table 3.5.

Table 3.5 The relation between Bandwidth and $\mathbf{Q} \%$ of total bandwidth requirement

| Bandwidth | 1133 kbps | 1446 kbps | 1663 kbps |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Q\% of total bandwidth <br> requirement | $17 \%$ | $34 \%$ | $50 \%$ |
| Bandwidth | 1791 kbps | 1961 kbps | 2484 kbps |
| Q\% of total bandwidth <br> requirement | $66 \%$ | $83 \%$ | $95 \%$ |
| Bandwidth | 2492 kbps | 2720 kbps |  |
| Q\% of total bandwidth <br> requirement | $97 \%$ | $99.5 \%$ |  |

If it requires a $95 \%$ of total bandwidth requirement, then we can setup a total bandwidth of 2484 kbps . In order to minimize the cost, we set the data to FMINCON as follows:

$$
A=\left[\begin{array}{cccccccccccccc}
5 & 6 & 10 & 5 & 4 & 11 & 6 & 8 & 6 & 7 & 12 & 6 & 5 & 6 \\
1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
1 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\
1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
-1 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{array}\right] ;=\left[\begin{array}{c}
140000 \\
0 \\
0 \\
0 \\
0 \\
0 \\
0 \\
0 \\
0 \\
0 \\
0 \\
2300 \\
3500 \\
1000 \\
2500 \\
2100 \\
2200 \\
2000 \\
3000 \\
2100 \\
2700 \\
1500 \\
1800 \\
3000 \\
3500 \\
-2490
\end{array}\right)
$$

FMINCON(inline('5* $x_{1}+6 * x_{2}+10 * x_{3}+5 * x_{4}+4 * x_{5}+11^{*} x_{6}+6 * x_{7}+8 * x_{8}+6 * x_{9}$ $\left.+7 * x_{10}+12 * x_{11}+6^{*} x_{12}+5^{*} x_{13}+6^{*} x_{14}{ }^{\prime}\right), A, b,[],[],[0 ; 0 ; 0 ; 0 ; 0 ; 0 ; 0 ; 0 ; 0 ; 0 ; 0 ;$ 0; 0; 0], [])

The bandwidth of each link is given as follows:

Table 3.6 The optimal solution

| $x_{1}$ | $x_{2}$ | $x_{3}$ | $x_{4}$ | $x_{5}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 384 kbps | 384 kbps | 384 kbps | 2100 kbps | 2100 kbps |
| $x_{6}$ | $x_{7}$ | $x_{8}$ | $x_{9}$ | $x_{10}$ |
| 0 kbps | 0 kbps | 0 kbps | 0 kbps | 0 kbps |
| $x_{11}$ | $x_{12}$ | $x_{13}$ | $x_{14}$ | $M$ |
| 0 kbps | 0 kbps | 0 kbps | 2484 kbps | 2484 kbps |

The cost for the resource allocation is 42030 dollars with which we buy bandwidth 2484 kbps. Suppose classes have different weights: $w_{1}=0.6$, $w_{2}=0.2, w_{3}=0.2$, and let $M=2484$ kbps. Input $\tau^{*}$ and $\left(a_{1}, a_{2}, \Lambda, a_{m}\right)^{k}$ to BRAM, we obtain the value of the satisfaction function $F^{k}$ for $k=1, \Lambda, 30$. After applying FMINCON(inline( ${ }^{\prime}-0.6^{*} \ln \left(\theta_{1} / 167\right)-0.2 * \ln \left(\theta_{2}\right.$ /83)-0.2* $\ln \left(\theta_{3} / 28\right)$ '), [1; 1;1], [ $\left.\left(a_{1}, a_{2}, \Lambda, a_{m}\right)^{k}\right],[2490],[],[],[167 ; 83 ;$ 28], []).

In average, we obtain $\theta_{i}, i=1,2,3$, as follows:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \theta_{1}=274.6538 \mathrm{kbps} \\
& \theta_{2}=125.9787 \mathrm{kbps} \\
& \theta_{3}=48.6837 \mathrm{kbps}
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence we select a path $l_{1}, l_{2}, l_{5}, l_{8}, l_{9}, l_{13}, l_{14}$, and obtain the
optimal value of the satisfaction is $0.6 \times f_{1}\left(\theta_{1}\right)+0.2 \times f_{2}\left(\theta_{2}\right)+0.2 \times f_{3}\left(\theta_{3}\right)=0.4926$. That is, the bandwidth allocated to class 1 is 1371.269 kbps , the bandwidth allocated to class 2 is 627.8935 kbps , and the bandwidth allocated to class 3 is 484.837 kbps .

