



**INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ENGINEERING SCIENCES & RESEARCH
TECHNOLOGY**

**SOLUTION PROCEDURE FOR FUZZY PROJECT CRASHING PROBLEM
THROUGH GOAL PROGRAMMING TECHNIQUE**

M.Evangeline Jebaseeli¹*, D. Paul Dhayabaran

* PG and Research Department of Mathematics, Bishop Heber College, Tiruchirappalli-620 017, Tamil Nadu, India.

PG and Research Department of Mathematics, Bishop Heber College, Tiruchirappalli-620 017, Tamil Nadu, India.

ABSTRACT

Project management is one of the most important fields in business and industry. Every task in an organization can be taken into account as a project. Time Cost Trade Off problem is one of the main aspects of project scheduling. In this paper, we have presented a new algorithm for solving Fully Fuzzy Time Cost Trade Off problems through Goal Programming technique. Using this technique, the project manager will be able to determine the minimum total cost of the project and minimum duration of the project easily. An illustration is provided to demonstrate the efficiency of the method.

KEYWORDS: Triangular Fuzzy Number - Fully Fuzzy Time Cost Trade Off problem – Goal Programming.

INTRODUCTION

Project Management is a very important field employed for scheduling activities and monitoring the progress, in competitive and fluctuating environments. The feasible duration required to perform a specific project is determined using critical path method. However, because of competitive priorities, time is important and the completion time of a project determined using critical path method should be reduced to meet a deadline requested.

In scheduling a project, it is generally considered to expedite the duration of some activities through expanding extra budget in order to compress the project completion time. This procedure can be considered under either some fixed available budget or a threshold of project completion time. This problem is known as time cost trade off problem or project crashing problem in the project management literature.

The main objective of these kinds of problem is to determine the optimum duration and cost should be assigned to the activities such that the overall cost is minimized. The project duration can be shortened by the acceleration of the critical activity times. The acceleration of the activity times can be achieved using more resources (using more productive equipment, material or hiring more workers) which means higher costs. Project crashing problem analyzes how to modify project activities so as to achieve the tradeoff between the project cost and the completion time.

TIME COST TRADE OFF PROBLEMS IN DIFFERENT NATURE

By reviewing the literature, it is observed that there are several studies investigated and analyzed the project management problems. Mathematical and heuristic methods are the two major approaches used to solve the time cost trade off problems in project scheduling. Mathematical methods convert the project time cost trade off problems to mathematical models and utilize linear programming, integer programming, dynamic programming, goal programming or multi-objective linear programming to solve the problems. However, formulating the objective function as well as the required constraints is time-consuming and prone to errors. Heuristic methods provide a way to obtain good solutions but do not guarantee optimality. However, they require less computational effort than mathematical methods.

The problem of project time cost trade off was first introduced by Kelly [13]. By assuming that direct cost of an activity changes with time, mathematical programming models were developed to minimize the project's direct cost [13]. Thereafter, many researchers have developed mathematical programming model for these kinds of problems. The time cost trades off problems have been extensively investigated. Many models have been proposed and they can be categorized into two types: Deterministic scheduling and non-deterministic scheduling. Recently, Yang [23] proposed a chance-constrained programming model to analyze the time cost trade off problem, where funding variability is considered. Yang [23] took budget uncertainty into account on project time cost trade off in a chance-constrained programming model. A hybrid intelligent algorithm integrating simulation and genetic algorithm was designed for solving the proposed models.

The above mentioned time cost trade off models mainly based on probability theory. As generally known, it requires a prior predictable regularity or a posterior frequency distribution to construct the probability distribution of activity times. However, in real world applications some activity times must be forecasted subjectively; for example, we have to use human judgment instead of stochastic assumptions to determine activity times. An alternative way to deal with imprecise data is to employ the concept of fuzziness, whereby the vague activity times can be represented by fuzzy sets. The main advantages of methodologies based on fuzzy theory are that they do not require prior predictable regularities or posterior frequency distributions, and they can deal with imprecise input information containing feelings and emotions quantified based on the decision-makers subjective judgment.

In the literature, there are several studies that have investigated the project management problems with fuzzy parameters. Liu et al. [18] proposed a Fuzzy Optimal construction Time Cost Trade Off method. In their study, the activity duration is accepted as fuzzy number. An acceptable risk level is defined as the minimum concept of the fuzzy set theory; fuzzy durations are transformed into crisp sets. Then the genetic algorithm techniques are used to find the optimal or near optimal solutions. Arikan and Gungor [2] applied Fuzzy Goal Programming to the Time Cost Trade Off problem with two objectives which are minimum completion time and crashing costs. The aspiration levels of the objective are defined as fuzzy numbers. The goal programming is solved using max-min approach. Wang and Liang [19] solved project management decision problem with multiple fuzzy goals in their study. The goals of the problem are defined using linear membership functions, and the multiple Fuzzy Goal Programming problem is solved after transforming into its crisp equivalent using Bellman and Zadeh's fuzzy decision concept. Eshtehardian et al. [5] presented a new approach for the solution of Time Cost Trade Off problems with uncertain costs. An appropriate genetic algorithm is used to find the solution of the Multi Objective Fuzzy Time Cost Problem. Lin [16] proposed an approach to solve project crashing problems with uncertain activity times and crash costs. The confidence-interval estimates and the previous statistical data are used to solve the fuzzy project crashing problem. In this study, level (1 -) fuzzy numbers were derived from confidence interval estimates of the statistical data with a distance ranking which is used to define the fuzzy ordering. The activities execution times and costs, the daily costs are accepted as triangular fuzzy numbers. The proposed approach explicitly embeds the fuzzy set theory into the optimization procedure and then a multi objective genetic algorithm is used to solve the discontinuous and multi objective fuzzy time cost model. Maa and Ke [13] solved Time Cost Trade Off problem with fuzzy activity duration times. The fuzzy activity duration times defined as fuzzy variables based on self-dual credibility measure. Then, the obtained Time Cost Trade Off problem is solved with a hybrid intelligent algorithm integrating fuzzy simulation and genetic algorithm. Ghazanfari et al. [10, 11] proposed a mathematical model to deal with Fuzzy Time Cost Trade Off problem. The normal and crash durations of activities are considered as triangular fuzzy numbers. For the solution of the fuzzy problem, a ranking fuzzy numbers method used. Liang [19] proposed a possibilistic linear programming approach for the solution of Fuzzy Multi Objective project management decision problem. The fuzzy parameters are defined using the triangular possibility distribution. In the proposed possibilistic linear programming approach, the fuzzy objectives and the fuzzy constraints are transformed into their crisp equivalents. Then, the obtained multi objective linear programming problem transformed into an equivalent linear programming problem using Zimmerman's fuzzy decision concept and the minimum operator. Chen and Tsai [3] proposed a new approach to solve Time Cost Trade Off problems. This approach described the minimum total crash cost of a project network via a membership function which completely conserves all the fuzziness of parameters, and the corresponding optimal activity time for each activity under different possibility levels are obtained. Tolunay Gocken [22] proposed a solution process for the Fuzzy Multi Objective Project Crashing problem.

In this paper, we have presented a new algorithm for solving Fully Fuzzy Time Cost Trade Off problems through Goal Programming technique. Using this technique, the project manager will be able to determine the minimum total cost of the project and minimum duration of the project easily. This is one of the easiest method to solve Fuzzy Time and Cost optimization problem occurring in real life situations. An illustration is provided to demonstrate the efficiency of the proposed method.

PRELIMINARIES

In this section, some basic definitions of fuzzy theory defined by Kaufmann, Gupta and Zimmermann, are presented.

Definition 1

The characteristic function μ_A of a crisp set $A \subseteq X$ assigns a value either 0 or 1 to each member in X. This function can be generalized to a function $\mu_{\tilde{A}}$ such that the value assigned to the element of the universal set X fall within a specified range i.e. $\mu_{\tilde{A}} : X \rightarrow [0,1]$. The assigned values indicate the membership grade of the element in the set A.

The function $\mu_{\tilde{A}}$ is called the membership function and the set $\tilde{A} = \{(A, \mu_A(x) : x \in X)\}$ defined by $\mu_{\tilde{A}}(x)$ for each $x \in X$ is called a fuzzy set.

Definition 2

A fuzzy set \tilde{A} defined on the set of real numbers R is said to be a fuzzy number if its membership function has the following characteristics:

1. $\mu_{\tilde{A}}(x) : R \rightarrow [0,1]$ is continuous.
2. $\mu_{\tilde{A}}(x) = 0$ for all $(-\infty, a] \cup [c, \infty)$.
3. $\mu_{\tilde{A}}(x)$ is strictly increasing on $[a, b]$ and strictly decreasing on $[b, c]$.
4. $\mu_{\tilde{A}}(x) = 1$ for all $x \in b$ where $a \leq b \leq c$.

Definition 3

Triangular fuzzy number is a fuzzy number represented with three points as follows: $A = (a_1, a_2, a_3)$, this representation is interpreted as membership function.

$$\mu_A(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x < a_1 \text{ and } x > a_3 \\ \frac{x - a_1}{a_2 - a_1} & \text{if } a_1 \leq x \leq a_2 \\ \frac{a_3 - x}{a_3 - a_2} & \text{if } a_2 \leq x \leq a_3 \end{cases}$$

Definition 4

A triangular fuzzy number $\tilde{A} = (a_1, a_2, a_3)$ and $\tilde{B} = (b_1, b_2, b_3)$ is said to be a non-negative triangular fuzzy number if and only if $a_1 \geq 0$. The set of all these triangular fuzzy numbers is denoted by $TF(R)^+$.

Fully Fuzzy Linear Programming problem (FFLP)

Linear programming is one of the most frequently applied operations research technique. We assume that all parameters and variables are real numbers. But in real world environment, do not have precise information. So, the fuzzy numbers and fuzzy variables should be used Linear Programming problem. The standard form FFLP problems with m fuzzy equality constraints and n fuzzy variables as follows:

$$\text{Maximize (or Minimize) } (\tilde{C}^T \otimes \tilde{X}) \tag{1}$$

$$\text{Subject to } \tilde{A} \otimes \tilde{X} = \tilde{b}$$

\tilde{X} is a non-negative fuzzy number. Where $\tilde{C}^T = [\tilde{c}_j]_{1 \times n}$, $\tilde{X} = [\tilde{x}_j]_{n \times 1}$, $\tilde{A} = [\tilde{a}_{ij}]_{m \times n}$, $\tilde{b} = [\tilde{b}_i]_{m \times 1}$ and $\tilde{c}_j, \tilde{x}_j, \tilde{a}_{ij}, \tilde{b}_i \in F(R)$ where $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$ and $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$.

Remark [6]: $\tilde{x}^* = (x_1^*, x_2^*, x_3^*)$ is said to be an exact optimal solution of problem (1) if it satisfies in the following statements:

- i. $\tilde{x}^* = [\tilde{x}_j^*]_{n+1}$ where $\tilde{x}^* \in TF(\mathfrak{R})^+$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$
- ii. $A\tilde{x}^* = b$
- iii. $\forall \tilde{x} = (x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \tilde{S} = \{ \tilde{x} / \tilde{A}\tilde{x} = \tilde{b} \}$, we have that $\tilde{C}^T \tilde{x} \leq \tilde{C}^T \tilde{x}^*$ (in case minimization problem $\tilde{C}^T \tilde{x} \geq \tilde{C}^T \tilde{x}^*$)

Remark [6]: Let \tilde{x}^* be an optimal solution of problem (1) and there exist an $\tilde{C}^T \tilde{x}' = \tilde{C}^T \tilde{x}^*$, then \tilde{x}' is also an exact optimal solution of problem (1) is called an alternative exact optimal solution.

PROBLEM DESCRIPTION

With the progress of the project, project managers always need to make tradeoff between the cost and the completion time. Sometimes managers may make decision in order to finish the project sooner with project cost augment by accelerating the project schedule, which is also named as project crashing in project management. In other cases, motivated by reducing the project cost, managers may be conscripted to sacrifice with prolonging the project completion time. Therefore, it is naturally desirable for managers to find a schedule to complete a project with the balance of the cost and completion time.

The total cost function of a project has two components: direct and indirect costs. Direct costs are incurred because of the performance of project activities, while indirect costs include those items that are not directly related to individual project activities and thus can be assessed for the entire project. In general, indirect cost increases almost linearly with the increase of project duration and usually assumed as a percentage of project direct cost. The project time cost trade off problem, thus, is reduced to determine project cost against project duration. A possible way to solve time cost trade off problem is to use a mathematical programming model whose objective function is constructed so that project direct cost is minimized and the imposed constraints guarantee a desired project deadline, while the precedence requirements of the network are maintained.

Parameters and decision variables of model are as follows:

Parameters

- n Number of actual activities NT_{ij} Normal time for activity $i \rightarrow j$
- CT_{ij} Crash time for activity $i \rightarrow j$ NC_{ij} Cost of doing activity in normal time.

$d_i^+ = \max(0, f_i(X) - g_i)$ and $d_i^- = \max(0, g_i - f_i(X))$ are respectively over and under achievements of the i^{th} goal and $f_i(X)$ is the linear function of the i^{th} goal.

ALGORITHM TO SOLVE FULLY FUZZY PROJECT CRASHING PROBLEMS

The following is a new algorithm to find the optimal solution of Time Cost Trade Off problems using Goal Programming technique. The steps of proposed algorithm are given below:

Step 1: Set up the mathematical formulation of the Fuzzy Time Cost Trade Off problem as given in (2).

Step 2: The formulated Multi Objective Linear Mathematical model for problem (2) can be written as given below:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \text{Min } (C_1, C_2, C_3) \quad \text{Min } (T_{n1}, T_{n2}, T_{n3}) \\
 & \text{Subject to} \\
 & (T_{11}, T_{12}, T_{13}) = 0 \\
 & (T_{j1}, T_{j2}, T_{j3}) - (T_{i1}, T_{i2}, T_{i3}) - (D_{ij1}, D_{ij2}, D_{ij3}) \geq 0 \\
 & (C_{ij1}, C_{ij2}, C_{ij3}) = (s_{ij1}, s_{ij2}, s_{ij3}) \{ (NT_{ij1}, NT_{ij2}, NT_{ij3}) \\
 & \quad \quad \quad - (D_{ij1}, D_{ij2}, D_{ij3}) \} \quad (4) \\
 & (CT_{ij1}, CT_{ij2}, CT_{ij3}) \leq (D_{ij1}, D_{ij2}, D_{ij3}) \\
 & \quad \quad \leq (NT_{ij1}, NT_{ij2}, NT_{ij3}) \quad \forall (i, j) \in P \\
 & (C_1, C_2, C_3) = \sum_i \sum_j (C_{ij1}, C_{ij2}, C_{ij3}) + \tilde{I} * (T_{n1}, T_{n2}, T_{n3}) \\
 & \quad \quad \quad + \sum_n (K_{n1}, K_{n2}, K_{n3})
 \end{aligned}$$

Step 3: The above Multi Objective Linear Mathematical Model for problem (4) may be written as given below.

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \text{Min } (C_1, C_2, C_3), \quad \text{Min } (T_{n1}, T_{n2}, T_{n3}) \\
 & \text{Subject to} \\
 & T_{11} = 0, \quad T_{12} = 0, \quad T_{13} = 0 \\
 & T_{j1} - T_{i1} - D_{ij1} \geq 0, \quad T_{j2} - T_{i2} - D_{ij2} \geq 0, \\
 & \quad \quad \quad T_{j3} - T_{i3} - D_{ij3} \geq 0 \\
 & C_{ij1} = s_{ij1} \{NT_{ij1} - D_{ij1}\}, \quad C_{ij2} = s_{ij2} \{NT_{ij2} - D_{ij2}\}, \\
 & \quad \quad \quad C_{ij3} = s_{ij3} \{NT_{ij3} - D_{ij3}\} \quad (5) \\
 & CT_{ij1} \leq D_{ij1} \leq NT_{ij1}, \quad CT_{ij2} \leq D_{ij2} \leq NT_{ij2} \\
 & \quad \quad \quad CT_{ij3} \leq D_{ij3} \leq NT_{ij3} \quad \forall (i, j) \in P \\
 & C_1 = \sum_i \sum_j C_{ij1} + I_1 * T_{n1} + \sum_n K_{n1}, \\
 & C_2 = \sum_i \sum_j C_{ij2} + I_2 * T_{n2} + \sum_n K_{n2}, \\
 & C_3 = \sum_i \sum_j C_{ij3} + I_3 * T_{n3} + \sum_n K_{n3} \\
 & D_{ij2} - D_{ij1} \geq 0, \quad D_{ij3} - D_{ij2} \geq 0 \quad C_{ij2} - C_{ij1} \geq 0, \quad C_{ij3} - C_{ij2} \geq 0
 \end{aligned}$$

Step 4: Problem (5) is converted into the Multi Objective Linear Programming problem with three crisp functions as given below:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \text{Min } C_1, \quad \text{Min } C_2, \quad \text{Min } C_3, \\
 & \quad \quad \quad \text{Min } T_{n1}, \quad \text{Min } T_{n2}, \quad \text{Min } T_{n3} \\
 & \text{Subject to} \\
 & T_{11} = 0, \quad T_{12} = 0, \quad T_{13} = 0 \\
 & T_{j1} - T_{i1} - D_{ij1} \geq 0, \\
 & T_{j2} - T_{i2} - D_{ij2} \geq 0, \\
 & T_{j3} - T_{i3} - D_{ij3} \geq 0 \\
 & C_{ij1} = s_{ij1} \{NT_{ij1} - D_{ij1}\}, C_{ij2} = s_{ij2} \{NT_{ij2} - D_{ij2}\}, \\
 & \quad \quad \quad C_{ij3} = s_{ij3} \{NT_{ij3} - D_{ij3}\} \\
 & CT_{ij1} \leq D_{ij1} \leq NT_{ij1}, \quad CT_{ij2} \leq D_{ij2} \leq NT_{ij2} \\
 & \quad \quad \quad CT_{ij3} \leq D_{ij3} \leq NT_{ij3} \\
 & C_1 = \sum_i \sum_j C_{ij1} + I_1 * T_{n1} + \sum_n K_{n1} \\
 & C_2 = \sum_i \sum_j C_{ij2} + I_2 * T_{n2} + \sum_n K_{n2} \quad (6) \\
 & C_3 = \sum_i \sum_j C_{ij3} + I_3 * T_{n3} + \sum_n K_{n3} \\
 & D_{ij2} - D_{ij1} \geq 0, \quad D_{ij3} - D_{ij2} \geq 0, C_{ij2} - C_{ij1} \geq 0, \\
 & \quad \quad \quad C_{ij3} - C_{ij2} \geq 0, \quad \forall (i, j) \in P
 \end{aligned}$$

Step 5: Form the Weighted Goal Programming model given in section 4 for the model (5). The following is the WGP for model (6):

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \text{Min } \alpha_1 d_1^+ + \beta_1 d_1^- + \beta_2 d_2^- + \alpha_2 d_2^+ \\
 & \quad + \beta_3 d_3^- + \alpha_3 d_3^+ + \beta_4 d_4^- + \alpha_4 d_4^+ \\
 & \quad + \beta_5 d_5^- + \alpha_5 d_5^+ + \beta_6 d_6^- + \alpha_6 d_6^+ \\
 & \text{Subject to} \\
 & C_1 + d_1^- - d_1^+ = P, \quad C_2 + d_2^- - d_2^+ = Q, \\
 & \quad C_3 + d_3^- - d_3^+ = R \quad (7) \\
 & T_{n1} + d_4^- - d_4^+ = T_1, \quad T_{n2} + d_5^- - d_5^+ = T_2, \\
 & \quad T_{n3} + d_6^- - d_6^+ = T_3 \\
 & T_{11} = 0, \quad T_{12} = 0, \quad T_{13} = 0 \\
 & T_{j1} - T_{i1} - D_{ij1} \geq 0, \quad T_{j2} - T_{i2} - D_{ij2} \geq 0, \\
 & \quad T_{j3} - T_{i3} - D_{ij3} \geq 0 \\
 & C_{ij1} = s_{ij1} \{NT_{ij1} - D_{ij1}\}, C_{ij2} = s_{ij2} \{NT_{ij2} - D_{ij2}\}, \\
 & \quad C_{ij3} = s_{ij3} \{NT_{ij3} - D_{ij3}\} \\
 & CT_{ij1} \leq D_{ij1} \leq NT_{ij1}, \quad CT_{ij2} \leq D_{ij2} \leq NT_{ij2} \\
 & \quad CT_{ij3} \leq D_{ij3} \leq NT_{ij3} \quad \forall (i, j) \in P \\
 & C_1 = \sum_i \sum_j C_{ij1} + I_1 * (T_{n1} - T_{11}) + \sum_n K_{n1}, \\
 & C_2 = \sum_i \sum_j C_{ij2} + I_2 * (T_{n2} - T_{12}) + \sum_n K_{n2} \\
 & C_3 = \sum_i \sum_j C_{ij3} + I_3 * (T_{n3} - T_{13}) + \sum_n K_{n3} \\
 & D_{ij2} - D_{ij1} \geq 0, \quad D_{ij3} - D_{ij2} \geq 0, \\
 & C_{ij2} - C_{ij1} \geq 0, \quad C_{ij3} - C_{ij2} \geq 0 \\
 & d_i^+ \geq 0, \quad d_i^- \geq 0 \quad \forall i = 1, 2, \dots, 6
 \end{aligned}$$

Where P,Q and R denote the goal setting for cost and T₁, T₂ and T₃ the goal setting for time and α_i and β_i are the respective positive weights attached to the deviations in the achievement function.

Step (5): Solve the Goal Programming Model (7) given in step (4), the total fuzzy cost of the project and optimal fuzzy duration of the project is obtained by substitute the obtained values in (C_1, C_2, C_3) and (T_{n1}, T_{n2}, T_{n3}) .

NUMERICAL EXAMPLE

List of activities for creating a canteen in a factory is given below with other relevant details. Job A must precede all others while job G must follow and others, job can run concurrently. Table 1 represents the description of the project. In this project, time parameter and costs of the project are considered in triangular fuzzy number form. Indirect cost of the project per day is (3000, 3000, 3000). Activities information is given in Table 2.

Table 1 Description of the project

Activity	Description
1 → 2 (A)	Plan approval and site preparation
1 → 3 (B)	Laying foundations
1 → 4 (C)	Raising building walls
2 → 4 (D)	Tile proofing
3 → 4 (E)	Install electricity
3 → 5 (F)	Install Plumbing
4 → 5 (G)	Connect services to finish

Table 2 The Fuzzy Data of Project

Activity $i \rightarrow j$	Normal time $(\tilde{N}T_{ij})$	Crash time $(\tilde{C}T_{ij})$	Normal cost (\tilde{C}_{ij})	Slope cost (per day) (\tilde{S}_{ij})
A(1, 2)	(12, 14, 16)	(9,10, 11)	(9500, 10000, 10500)	(1200, 1500, 1800)
B(1, 3)	(17, 19, 21)	(15, 17, 19)	(9500, 10000, 10500)	(800, 1000, 1200)
C(1, 4)	(17, 18, 19)	(14, 15, 16)	(36000, 40000, 44000)	(1600, 1800, 2000)
D(2, 4)	(12, 15, 18)	(11, 13, 15)	(16000, 20000, 24000)	(800, 1200, 1600)
E(3, 4)	(18, 18, 18)	(15, 15, 15)	(150000, 160000, 170000)	(4700, 5000, 5300)
F(3, 5)	(17, 19, 21)	(15, 16, 17)	(20000, 21000, 22000)	(1000, 1300, 1600)
G(4, 5)	(20, 22, 24)	(18, 20, 22)	(38000, 40000, 42000)	(1000, 1500, 2000)

The solution procedure using the proposed method given in the previous section is described as follows: First, formulate the Fuzzy Multi Objective Linear Mathematical Model for the given project according to step (1). The

formulated FMOLP model can be written in the following form:

$$\text{Min } (C_1, C_2, C_3), \text{ Min } (T_{n1}, T_{n2}, T_{n3})$$

Subject to

$$T_{11} = 0, \quad T_{12} = 0, \quad T_{13} = 0$$

$$T_{j1} - T_{i1} - D_{ij1} \geq 0, \quad T_{j2} - T_{i2} - D_{ij2} \geq 0,$$

$$T_{j3} - T_{i3} - D_{ij3} \geq 0$$

$$C_{ij1} = s_{ij1} \{NT_{ij1} - D_{ij1}\},$$

$$C_{ij2} = s_{ij2} \{NT_{ij2} - D_{ij2}\},$$

$$C_{ij3} = s_{ij3} \{NT_{ij3} - D_{ij3}\}$$

$$CT_{ij1} \leq D_{ij1} \leq NT_{ij1}, \quad CT_{ij2} \leq D_{ij2} \leq NT_{ij2}$$

$$CT_{ij3} \leq D_{ij3} \leq NT_{ij3} \quad \forall (i, j) \in P$$

$$C_1 = \sum_i \sum_j C_{ij1} + I_1 * T_{n1} + \sum_{n=1}^5 K_{n1} \quad (8)$$

$$C_2 = \sum_i \sum_j C_{ij2} + I_2 * T_{n2} + \sum_{n=1}^5 K_{n2}$$

$$C_3 = \sum_i \sum_j C_{ij3} + I_3 * T_{n3} + \sum_{n=1}^5 K_{n3}$$

$$D_{ij2} - D_{ij1} \geq 0, \quad D_{ij3} - D_{ij2} \geq 0 \quad C_{ij2} - C_{ij1} \geq 0,$$

$$C_{ij3} - C_{ij2} \geq 0 \quad \forall i = 1 \dots 4 \ \& \ j = 2 \dots 5.$$

Second decompose the Multi Objective Linear Programming model (8) with six crisp objective functions for the project according to step (3). Obtain the goal for each objective in the following way: Model (5) can be reduced into six independent Linear Programming models. Solving these six models by common approach for Linear Programming, six goal values for each objective function is obtained. The obtained goal values from the above process are Rs. 436000 for C₁, Rs. 471000 for C₂ and Rs. 506000 for C₃ and 48 days for T₁, 52 days for T₂ and 56 days for T₃. Finally, this project is formulated as Goal Programming model as given below:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Min } & 0.2 * d_1^+ + 0.8 * d_1^- + 0.2 * d_2^+ + 0.8 * d_2^- \\ & + 0.2 * d_3^+ + 0.8 * d_3^- + 0.2 * d_4^+ + 0.8 * d_4^- \\ & + 0.2 * d_5^+ + 0.8 * d_5^- + 0.2 * d_6^+ + 0.8 * d_6^- \end{aligned}$$

Subject to

$$\begin{aligned} C_1 + d_1^- - d_1^+ &= 436000, \\ C_2 + d_2^- - d_2^+ &= 471000, \\ C_3 + d_3^- - d_3^+ &= 506000 \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

$$T_{51} + d_4^- - d_4^+ = 48, T_{52} + d_5^- - d_5^+ = 52,$$

$$T_{53} + d_6^- - d_6^+ = 56$$

$$T_{11} = 0, \quad T_{12} = 0, \quad T_{13} = 0$$

$$T_{j1} - T_{i1} - D_{ij1} \geq 0, \quad T_{j2} - T_{i2} - D_{ij2} \geq 0,$$

$$T_{j3} - T_{i3} - D_{ij3} \geq 0$$

$$C_{ij1} = s_{ij1} \{NT_{ij1} - D_{ij1}\}, C_{ij2} = s_{ij2} \{NT_{ij2} - D_{ij2}\},$$

$$C_{ij3} = s_{ij3} \{NT_{ij3} - D_{ij3}\}$$

$$CT_{ij1} \leq D_{ij1} \leq NT_{ij1}, \quad CT_{ij2} \leq D_{ij2} \leq NT_{ij2},$$

$$CT_{ij3} \leq D_{ij3} \leq NT_{ij3} \quad \forall (i, j) \in P$$

$$C_{ij3} - C_{ij2} \geq 0 \quad \forall i = 1 \dots 4 \quad j = 2 \dots 5$$

$$C_1 = \sum_i \sum_j C_{ij1} + I_1 * T_{n1} + \sum_{n=1}^5 K_{n1}$$

$$C_2 = \sum_i \sum_j C_{ij2} + I_2 * T_{n2} + \sum_{n=1}^5 K_{n2}$$

$$C_3 = \sum_i \sum_j C_{ij3} + I_3 * T_{n3} + \sum_{n=1}^5 K_{n3}$$

$$D_{ij2} - D_{ij1} \geq 0, \quad D_{ij3} - D_{ij2} \geq 0, \quad C_{ij2} - C_{ij1} \geq 0,$$

$$d_i^+ \geq 0, \quad d_i^- \geq 0 \quad \forall i = 1, 2 \dots 6$$

Main Objective of this model is to reduce the total project cost and the duration of the project. So we select the weight values for positive and negative deviations are 0.2 and 0.8 $\forall i = 1, 2 \dots 6$. Solve the above Goal Programming Model (9) using LINGO software package. The values of minimum fuzzy total cost and planned fuzzy duration of the project have been determined using LINGO solver. A computer package called LINGO (LINGO 2000 [7]) is used on a personal computer to solve the mathematical model of the example project. LINGO is a commercial package using the power of linear and non-linear optimization to formulate large problems concisely, solve them, and analyze the solution. In all tested runs, the linear mathematical model of the example project requires less than one second on LINGO to obtain the optimal solution.

The sample project is solved easily using Goal Programming technique and the computational results are tabulated.

Table 3 Crashing cost for each activity

Activity	Project Duration	Crashing Cost
A	(12, 14, 16)	(0, 0, 0)
B	(15, 17, 19)	(1600,2000,2400)
C	(17, 18, 19)	(0, 0, 0)
D	(12, 15, 18)	(0, 0, 0)
E	(18, 18, 18)	(0,0,0)
F	(17, 19, 21)	(0, 0, 0)
G	(18, 20, 22)	(2400, 3000,3600)

The optimum crash cost for each activity of the sample project is presented in Table 3. The minimum project cost is (436000, 471000, 506000) and the minimum duration is (51, 55, 59) days. The obtained results for the sample project have been compared with the method presented by Evangeline [7, 8].

CONCLUSION

In this paper, a new algorithm has been proposed to solve the Fully Fuzzy Time Cost Trade Off problem. Multi Objective Linear Programming Problem is formulated in the form Goal Programming and found the solution using existing procedure. By a simple example, the obtained result of presented algorithm has been compared with the method presented by Evangeline [7, 8]. It is concluded that the results coincide with each other.

REFERENCES

- [1] Ammar M., "Optimization of Project Time Cost Trade Off Problems with Discounted Cash Flows", J. Constr. Eng. Manage., Vol. 137, No.1, ISSN 0733-9364/2011/1-65-71, 2011.
- [2] Arikan F., Gungor Z., "An application of fuzzy goal programming to a multi objective project network problem". Fuzzy Sets and Systems 119, 49-58, 2001.
- [3] Chen, S., Tsai, M., "Time-Cost Trade-Off Analysis of Project Networks in Fuzzy Environments". European Journal of Operations Research, 212, 386-397. ISSN 0377-2217, 38, 2011.
- [4] Ching T Chang, "Multi-Choice Goal Programming". Omega, 35, 389-396, 2007.
- [5] Eshtehardian, E., Afshar, A., and Abbasnia, R. "Fuzzy-based MOGA approach to stochastic time-cost trade-off problem." Automation in Construction, Vol. 18, No. 5, pp. 189-198, 2009.
- [6] R. Ezzati, A new algorithm to solve fully fuzzy linear programming problems using the MOLP problem. Applied Mathematical Modelling. doi:10.1016/j.apm.2013.03.014.
- [7] Evangeline M. Jebaseeli, D. Paul Dhayabaran and I. Christopher Vinoth, "A New Solution Procedure to Fully Fuzzy Time Cost Trade Off Problems", Jamal Academic Research Journal, February 2014, ISBN No: 0973-0303, pp. 472-476.
- [8] Evangeline M. Jebaseeli, D. Paul Dhayabaran, "An Algorithm to Solve Fully Fuzzy Time Cost Trade Off Problems", International Journal of Engineering Science and Innovative Technology, ISSN No: 2319-5967, Vol. 4, Issue 3, 2015.
- [9] Feng, C., Liu, L., and Burns, S., "Using genetic algorithms to solve construction time cost trade off problems", J. Comput. Civ. Eng., 11(3), 184-189, 1997.
- [10] Ghazanfari M., A.Yousefli, M.S. JabalAmeli, A. Bozorgi-Amiri, "A new approach to solve time- cost trade off problem with fuzzy decision variables". Int J Manuf Tech nol, 42:408-414, 2009.
- [11] Ghazanfari M., K Shahanaghi and A.Yousefli, "An application of Possibility Goal Programming to the Time Cost Trade off Problem". First Joint Congress on Fuzzy and Intelligent Systems, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, 2007.
- [12] Hegazy, T., "Optimization of construction time cost trade off analysis using genetic algorithms". Can. J. Civ. Eng., 26, 685-697, 1999.
- [13] J.R. Kelly, "Critical Path Planning and Scheduling: Mathematical basis, Operations Research". vol.9, pp. 296-320, 1961.
- [14] Ke, H., Maa, W., Ni, Y., "Optimization Models and a GA Based Algorithm for Stochastic Time-Cost Trade Off". Applied Mathematics and Computations 215, 308-313, 2009.
- [15] Li, H. and Love, P., "Using Improved Genetic Algorithms to Facilitate Time-Cost Optimization". J. Constr. Eng. Manage., 123(3), 233-237, 1997.

- [16] Lin F.T., “Fuzzy Crashing Problem on Project management Based on Confidence-Interval Estimates”. Eighth International Conference on Intelligent Systems Design and Applications. DOI: 10.1109/ISDA.2008.190, 2008.
- [17] LINGO, 2000. LINGO user’s manual, LINDO Systems Inc., Chicago.
- [18] Liu, L., Burns, S., and Feng, C., “Construction Time-Cost Trade-Off Analysis using LP/IP Hybrid Method”. J. Constr. Eng. Manage., 121(4), 446-454, 1995.
- [19] T.F. Liang, E.J. Wang and C.Y. Ding, “A Study on Project crashing decision with multiple fuzzy goals”. Journal of the Chinese Institute of Industrial Engineers, Vol. 20, no. 4, pp. 355-372, 2003.
- [20] T.F. Liang, “Applying fuzzy goal programming to project management decisions with multiple goals in uncertain environments”. Expert Systems with Applications: An International Journal, Vol. 37, Issue 12, Pages: 8499-8507, 2010.
- [21] Tareghian, H., and Taheri, S., “On the Discrete Time, Cost and Quality Trade Off Problem”. Appl. Math. Comput., 181, 1305-1312, 2006
- [22] Tolunay Gocken, “Solution of Fuzzy Multi-Objective Project Crashing Problem”. Neural Comput & Applic, 23: 2167-2175. DOI: 10.1007/s00521-012-1167-z, 2013.
- [23] Yang, I., Using Elicit Particle Swarm Optimization to Facilitate Bicriterion Time-Cost Trade Off analysis”. J. Constr. Eng. Manage., 133(7), 498-505, 2007.